Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

May 2018

Psychology

Higher level

Paper 3

7 pages

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Short cut
	Unclear	
	Incorrect Point	
	Good Response/Good Point	
IR	Irrelevant	
AQ	Answers the Question	
CKS	Clear Knowledge Shown	
NAQ	Not Answered Question	
	Apply to blank pages	
	On-page comment text box (for adding specific comments)	
	Highlight (can be expanded)	
TNCE	Theory is Not Clearly Explained	
CON	Contradiction	
DEV	Development	
D	Description	
DET	Relevant Detail	
EG	Example	
EVAL	Evaluation	
EXC	Excellent Point	
GP	Good Point	
	Wavy Underline Tool	
NE	Not Enough	
VL	Very Limited	
WKAR	Weak Argument	

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the  annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

Paper 3 markbands

Marks Level descriptor

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	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.
4–7	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.
8–10	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 **two or more** ethical considerations relevant to this study. **[10]**

Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term "explain" requires candidates to give a detailed account, including reasons, for the relevance of two or more ethical considerations to the study.

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

Relevant ethical considerations in this study could include, but are not limited to:

- **Anonymity/confidentiality**: An important ethical consideration in all research is to guarantee anonymity/confidentiality. The eight participants in this study were asked to come up with another name to use in the research report. This indicates that the researchers have ensured anonymity as the participants appear under a different name – and furthermore, a name that they have chosen themselves. Candidates may elaborate on this and say that due to the small number of participants and because very few people are involved in extreme sports it is possible that the participants may all know each other. It may therefore be difficult to achieve total anonymity but the researchers have done what they could to ensure that the identities of the participants were not revealed in the final report.
- **Research ethics committee**: According to the stimulus material an ethics committee approved the study. This is a standard procedure to ensure ethical standards are in line with ethical guidelines (*eg* American Psychological Association) in research involving human participants, for example ensuring that individuals receive sufficient information and that appropriate strategies are in place to protect participants from potential damaging effects of the research. It is also important that there is no conflict of interest between participants and the researcher. The interests of the participants always come first and it is obvious from the stimulus material that the researchers in this study took great care to ensure that the study was ethically sound.
- **Informed consent**: In the stimulus material, it is stated that all participants signed informed consent before the study began. This is an important ethical consideration that includes that participants are fully informed about the purpose of the study, benefits of the research, right to confidentiality and participants' rights, for example, that they can withdraw their data at any point. Such considerations may also be explained as separate ethical considerations by candidates and receive marks.
- The participants in this study were also invited to choose the location of the interview themselves so that they could feel comfortable and safe during the interview. Candidates may relate this to part of the informed consent or protection/ensuring the wellbeing of participants.

Candidates may refer to ethical considerations taken by the researcher in the study in the stimulus material and/or considerations that could have been taken. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

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

If a candidate explains only one ethical consideration, apply the markbands up to a maximum of **[5]**.

2. Discuss the use of semi-structured interview in this study. **[10]**

Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term “discuss” requires candidates to offer a considered review of factors relevant to the use of a semi-structured interview in this research study.

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

Semi-structured interviews normally use a combination of closed and open-ended questions and the interview is often informal and conversational in nature with many open-ended questions. The semi-structured interview is based on an interview guide with a number of themes to explore. This is a checklist to encure standardization of interviews but there is flexibility in terms of order of questions and how to phrase them.

Discussion related to reasons for choosing the semi-structured interview in this study could include, but is not limited to:

- Good reasons for choosing the flexibility of the semi-structured interview could be the personal and somewhat sensitive nature of the topic in this study. Using open-ended questions makes it possible for respondents to give a detailed account of their personal experiences and to reflect on their motives for participating in extreme sports, which would eventually provide richer data in relation to this rather unexplored topic.
- The interviewer can also ask participants to elaborate if more information is needed on topics brought up by the respondent. This seems a major advantage in this study where the purpose is to get an insight into the complex motives for engaging in a sport that is potentially deadly.
- The semi-structured interview allows researchers to not only use open-ended questions, which means that they get rich data, but also to get answers to specific questions, for example related to the specific version of extreme sport of each participant.
- If the researchers had used a structured interview with closed questions, they would probably not gain the same insight into the eight participants' ideas, perceptions and feelings about motivations to participate in extreme sports. There is still limited research on possible motivations for participating in extreme sports. The results of this study could serve as a platform for further research into the topic, using other methods.
- If the researchers have chosen not to use a focus group interview it is possibly because it is impossible to guarantee anonymity of participants, which was very important in this study. Another reason could be that the topic of this investigation is sensitive and with more participants present there is a risk that participants do not want to disclose what they really feel and this could compromise the purpose of this research.
- In the discussion of the use of semi-structured interviews candidates are likely to include particular strengths of the semi-structured interview and link them to this specific study. One example could be that the more informal and conversational nature of the semi-structured as well as the one-on-one encounter is more likely to have participants open up and reveal their subjective experiences of engaging in extreme sports. This contributes useful information to this research in a new area.

Candidates may (but do not have to) refer to the disadvantages of semi-structured interviews, for example, that analysis of data is extremely time-consuming or that there may only be limited space to explore themes that have not been planned beforehand. Since the researchers have chosen to use the semi-structured interview in spite of possible limitations, it could be because of the possibility to obtain rich data in a field that has only just begun to be studied by qualitative researchers.

Responses may refer to other research methods and be credited for this as long as the focus of the response is on semi-structured interviews.

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

Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.

The command term "describe" requires candidates to give a detailed account of how inductive content analysis could be used on the interview transcripts in the study.

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

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

- Reading and rereading the transcripts of the interview to identify possible categories and themes (coding the raw data) that relate to how the participants describe their motivation to participate in extreme sport.
- After coding of data the analysis may reveal emerging themes such as "to be in the present"; feelings of "achievement or mastery"; and accepting suffering and physical injury as part of the experience.
- The different themes should be connected with relevant quotations from the eight participants in the study to support the choice of each theme.
- After initial analysis the researcher could try to identify possible low-level as well as higher-level themes and connect them in meaningful ways to establish hierarchies of themes.
- Construction of a summary table of higher-order themes and illustrating with quotations, for example "the challenge of pushing themselves beyond their existing mental and physical limits"; "striving for achievement and mastery of their sport" and lower-order themes, for example "experiencing pleasurable feelings such as excitement or 'adrenaline rush'" and also "accepting suffering and physical injury as part of the experience of doing extreme sports".
- The analysis will continue until saturation of the data.
- The final task is to make interpretations based on the summary table in order to find a relationship between the different themes. This could lead to formulation of theory to include in the final report.
- Credibility checks can take place during the whole process of inductive content analysis, for example checking themes with other coders or researchers as well as participants to have them confirm the interpretation of data. Credibility checks could also include reflexivity, that is, the researcher controls for own biases.

Responses that identify themes mentioned in the stimulus material and only say that inductive content analysis is about finding themes in the transcripts but fail to describe specific elements of the process of inductive content analysis should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3]**.

Responses that merely quote themes mentioned in the stimulus material but fail to describe any elements of the process of inductive content analysis should be awarded **[0]**.

Responses that merely state that inductive content analysis is concerned with finding themes in the transcripts but fail to describe any elements of the process of inductive content analysis should be awarded **[0]**.