

4.1 HL methods, ethics and transferability: supported rehearsal

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 6 marks**

Objective

Supported preparation: Analyse unseen research scenarios and ethical choices; Evaluate credibility, sampling and transferability. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Evaluate quantitative and qualitative methods for their questions. Interviews investigate meanings; transparent recruitment, analytic decisions, supporting excerpts and researcher reflexivity support credibility. Large sample size alone does not establish it.

Original source / task evidence

Task: volunteers from one club describe a shared activity. A report generalizes to every pupil.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
HL methods, ethics and transferability

Task: volunteers from one club describe a shared activity. A report generalizes to every pupil. Revise and improve the analysis.

Limit the account to recruited participants and the investigated setting. Compare differing accounts, document how themes were developed and consider absent perspectives and the researcher's role. Seek approved contrasting recruitment where relevant.

2 Practice

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Why is a randomized treatment trial not the sole standard for an interview inquiry about meaning? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

Solutions

2.1 Limit the account to recruited participants and the investigated setting. Compare differing accounts, document how themes were developed and consider absent perspectives and the researcher's role. Seek approved contrasting recruitment where relevant. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

3.1 The question concerns participants' interpretations, not an estimated treatment contrast. Evaluate recruitment, context, analytic transparency, supporting excerpts, reflexivity and ethics. Quantitative causal standards do not replace these checks, but qualitative labels do not excuse unsupported or overgeneralized claims. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.