

## **Cambridge Technicals**

### **Health and Social Care**

Unit **25**: Research methods in health, social care and childcare

Level 3 Cambridge Technical Certificate/Diploma in Health and Social Care  
**05871**

### **Mark Scheme for January 2018**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2018

Annotations to be used when marking Unit 25.

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick – correct answer
	Cross – incorrect answer
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Benefit of doubt (This <b>does</b> count as a mark – so do not ‘tick’ as well)
	Omission mark
	Too vague
	Repeat
 or 	Noted but no credit given

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Two</b> marks for a benefit. <b>Two</b> required.</p> <p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• first hand data (primary) - cost effective/quick response</li> <li>• children may not be aware - less likely to change behaviours / natural behaviour displayed / more accurate</li> <li>• real life behaviours shown - higher ecological validity</li> <li>• use of coding scheme allows replicability</li> <li>• is ethical - if consent gained/anonymity</li> <li>• Take field notes</li> <li>• Can be structured / unstructured</li> <li>• Can use a standardised checklist</li> <li>• Can produce quantitative and / or qualitative data</li> <li>• Observation can be both covert and overt</li> <li>• More accurate – present to see behaviour</li> <li>• Own observation – not reliant on anyone else</li> <li>• Easy to record findings / understand</li> <li>• Benefit given in comparison to other methods</li> <li>• Easy to conduct</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b> (2x2)</p>	<p>For two marks the benefit must be in context ( i.e. observation of the children/ purpose of study ).</p> <p><b>One mark:</b> A benefit identified but not in context.</p> <p><b>Two marks:</b> A benefit identified in context.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	(b)	<p><b>Two</b> marks for a limitation. <b>One</b> required.</p> <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible bias in recording / subjectivity on what disruptive behaviour is</li> <li>• only gaining numbers / quantitative data</li> <li>• recording of qualitative data could mean missing out on further observation</li> <li>• wide range of different behaviours to record</li> <li>• time consuming</li> <li>• difficult to analyse</li> <li>• may not observe all participants</li> <li>• bias</li> </ul> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may be difficult to code/record all behaviours / distractions</li> <li>• miss some behaviours</li> <li>• some children may act differently if aware of the study / Hawthorn effect</li> <li>• behaviour can change</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> (1 x 2)</p>	<p>For two marks the limitation must be in context ( i.e. observation of the children/ purpose of study ).</p> <p><b>One mark:</b> A limitation identified but not in context.</p> <p><b>Two marks:</b> A limitation identified in context.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p>

Question		Answer/indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(c)*	<p><b>Ethical considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethical principles and ethics in practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide benefit</li> <li>○ Cause no harm / safety</li> <li>○ Obtain informed consent /parental consent / permission</li> <li>○ Protect anonymity or confidentiality / personal information is secure</li> <li>○ Avoid deception</li> <li>○ Allow the right to withdraw</li> <li>○ Ensure transparency and integrity</li> <li>○ Keeping participants informed</li> <li>○ Responsible use of research findings</li> <li>○ Consult ethical review boards</li> <li>○ Consult legislation</li> <li>○ Opportunities to see finished research</li> <li>○ Follow up – offer counselling if needed</li> <li>○ De brief if required</li> <li>○ Use of a gate keeper</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	6	<p>This is a level of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is explain</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed explanation</li> <li>• clear understanding of the context will be evident</li> <li>• well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>• logically structured</li> <li>• QWC – high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sound explanation</li> <li>• understanding of the context may be implicit</li> <li>• a line of reasoning in the most part well developed</li> <li>• QWC – mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 – checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• descriptive (upper end) list like (low end)</li> <li>• lacking an understanding of the context</li> <li>• basic information presented in an unstructured way</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 5 - 6 marks</b> Answer provides a detailed explanation of how the researcher could ensure that the research they conduct will be ethical. Answers are factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3 - 4 marks</b> Answer provides a sound explanation of how the researcher could ensure that the research they conduct will be ethical. Answers are factually correct and may use some appropriate terminology. There may be some noticeable errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Sub max of 3</b> for one done well.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 2 marks</b> Answer provides a limited or basic explanation of how the researcher could ensure that the research they conduct will be ethical. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1 (d)	<p><b>One</b> mark for a way. <b>Three</b> required.</p> <p>In general :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• help improve outcomes for all children</li> </ul> <p>To help school make informed/evidence based decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• plan services/practices for the school / provide breakfast</li> <li>• to measure impact/benefits on the children and academic performance</li> </ul> <p>To help school support individuals associated with the school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• publicise findings e.g. on school website</li> <li>• children/pupils – to see the benefit of eating breakfast</li> <li>• parents/guardians of pupils – to see the benefits of providing breakfast</li> <li>• learn how breakfast club helps them</li> <li>• to make the connection between breakfast and behaviour</li> </ul> <p>To establish base for future research in the school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• which pupils benefit the most e.g. age/gender</li> <li>• larger range of foods to provide – matching different cultures</li> <li>• expansion of breakfast club</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other suitable ways.</p>	<p><b>3</b> (3x1)</p>	<p>Three ways required. One mark for each way identified.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
1	(e)* Other methods (must be primary):  <b>Surveys/questionnaires</b> – given to children/parents or teachers  <b>Interviews (structured and unstructured) / focus groups-</b> to parents/teachers or children  <b>Experimental method</b> – manipulation of sample- introduction of controls  <b>Case studies</b> of a few children  <b>Action research</b> – find other places with similar schemes	5	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is description.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 2 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed description</li> <li>• explicitly links to the context</li> <li>• correct use of terminology</li> <li>• QWC – high - mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic description</li> <li>• list like</li> <li>• limited knowledge or understanding of method</li> <li>• limited/lack of understanding of context</li> <li>• QWC - low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2: 4 - 5 marks</b> Answer provides a detailed description of the key features of one other method of primary research that the researcher could use to investigate why the children attended the breakfast club are less disruptive than those that did not. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 3 marks</b> Answer provides a limited description of one other method of primary research that the researcher could use to investigate why the children attended the breakfast club are less disruptive than those that did not. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p><b>Sub max of 3</b> for one feature of the method done well.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(a)*	10	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is explanation.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed explanation of chosen focus – with a well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>• focus explicitly links to chosen source</li> <li>• correct use of terminology</li> <li>• QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sound explanation</li> <li>• link of focus to source may be implicit</li> <li>• a line of reasoning in the most part well developed</li> <li>• QWC – mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• basic explanation</li> <li>• list like</li> <li>• limited knowledge or-understanding evident</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8 - 10 marks</b> Answer provides a detailed explanation of the focus chosen for candidates' own secondary research in response to a research article from the pre-release material. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 4 - 7 marks</b> Answer provides a sound explanation of the focus chosen for candidates' own secondary research in response to a research article from the pre-release material. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some noticeable errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 3 marks</b> Answer provides a limited or basic explanation of the focus chosen for candidates' own secondary research in response to a research article from the pre-release material. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(b)*	10	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is writing a report.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed analysis</li> <li>• positives and negatives must be explicit for top of level 3</li> <li>• well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>• logically structured</li> <li>• shows synthesis</li> <li>• QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sound analysis</li> <li>• a line of reasoning in the most part relevant</li> <li>• some logic shown in structure</li> <li>• QWC - mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 – checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• descriptive (upper end) list like (low end)</li> <li>• basic information presented in an unstructured way</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8 - 10 marks</b> Answer provides a detailed analysis. Links to chosen focus will be clear. Findings will be compared. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 5 - 7 marks</b> Answer provides a sound analysis. Links to chosen focus will be reasonably clear. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some noticeable errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Sub max 5</b> for one finding done well / not specifically linked to pre release.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 4 marks</b> Answer provides a limited or basic analysis. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(c)* <p><b>VALIDITY</b> i.e. did the research methods used measure what they were intending to measure?</p> <p><b>Positive:</b>            valid sources – measure what they were intended to measure            Clear objective measures            Peer reviewed            Non biased source/ researcher            Accept reliability if linked to validity</p> <p><b>Negative:</b>            Socially desirable answers/ demand characteristics            Bias of researcher /publication            Lack of objective measures            Confirmation bias</p> <p><b>GENERALISABILITY</b> i.e. how relevant is the research to other settings? How representative was the sample used in the research?</p> <p><b>Positive:</b>            Sample size            Representative sampling method            Variety of sample used appropriate for chosen topic</p> <p><b>Negative:</b>            Small samples            Biased sample/groups</p> <p><i>Accept other appropriate answers.</i></p>	10	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is evaluation.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b>            The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed evaluation</li> <li>• well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>• both validity and generalisability</li> <li>• both positive and negative</li> <li>• explicitly linked to source material</li> <li>• correct use of terminology</li> <li>• QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sound evaluation</li> <li>• both validity and generalisability</li> <li>• implicit links to source material</li> <li>• QWC – mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limited / basic analysis</li> <li>• limited relevance to source material</li> <li>• list like / muddled</li> <li>• QWC - low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8 - 10 marks</b>            Answer provides a detailed evaluation of secondary sources in terms of <b>both</b> validity and generalisability. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. Context of chosen source will be explicit. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Examples may be given explicitly linked to childcare, social care or health care settings.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 4 - 6 marks</b>            Answer provides a basic evaluation of secondary sources in terms of <b>both</b> validity and generalisability. Context of chosen source may be implicit. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some noticeable errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Sub max of 5</b> for only validity OR generalisability done well OR positive / negative done well.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 3 marks</b>            Answer provides an attempt at an evaluation of secondary sources in terms of validity and/or generalisability. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
	Do not accept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reliability as a separate entity</li></ul>			<b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(d)	6	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is discussion. The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>detailed discussion of implications for practitioners or government policy with a well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>correct use of terminology</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sound discussion of implications for practitioners or government policy</li> <li>a line of reasoning in the most part well developed</li> <li>QWC – mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 checklist:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>basic discussion of implications for practitioners or government policy</li> <li>list like</li> <li>limited knowledge or understanding evident</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 5 - 6 marks</b> Answer provides a detailed discussion of implications of findings for practitioners or government policy.</p> <p>Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3 - 4 marks</b> Answer provides a sound discussion of implications of findings for practitioners or government policy. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some noticeable errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Sub max 3</b> for one implication done well.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 2 marks</b> Answer provides a limited or basic discussion of implications of findings for practitioners or government policy. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2	(e)	Answer should explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a possible area for further research that is plausible and realistic</li><li>• how possible area links to candidate's findings from secondary research</li></ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>One mark:</b> A possible area identified but lacking context/link to secondary research</li><li>• <b>Two marks:</b> An area identified in context/linked to secondary research</li><li>• <b>Three marks:</b> An area explained in context/linked to secondary research</li><li>• <b>Four marks:</b> An area explained in context/linked to secondary research with well-developed reasoning and showing understanding</li></ul> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p>

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

