

**Cambridge Technicals
Health and Social Care**

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

Level 3 Cambridge Technical in Health and Social Care
05830 - 05833

Mark Scheme for January 2021

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 2021

Annotations - These are the annotations to be used when marking Unit 25:

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick – correct answer
	Cross – incorrect answer
	Plus – use for positives
	Minus – use for negatives
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Benefit of doubt (This does 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	
1	<p>(a)*</p> <p><i>Evaluate primary research methods that could be used in this qualitative study.</i></p> <p>Method: survey / questionnaire</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost effective • Easy to conduct • Easy to analyse • Replicable/reliable • Able to gather large samples/ amount of data • People are used to them so willing to complete • Can be sent out via e-mail /computer based systems –saving time effort and costs • Can provide both qualitative and quantitative data to allow some insight and statistical analysis • Choice of format, e.g. postal or e-mail • Cheap to administer • Use of Likert scales / scaled responses • Generalisability • Anonymity <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents may not give honest responses or accurate answers • Cannot verify participant(s) • Socially desirable answers / Hawthorn effect • Questions can be poorly worded/ confusing / misunderstood • Questions may not cover all options/topics the respondent wants • Standard response bias- people may just tick the same option to complete the questionnaire quickly • Low response rate • There could be some communication difficulties with the client group • Time consuming • Large sample to analyse data • Biased results due to poor sampling method <p>Method: formal observation / informal observation</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • useful when survey/questionnaires are impossible to use • can be video-ed / recorded • gives what people actually say or do • real-life situations • can give more valid findings • can give valuable insights into issues • useful for situations where people may be too afraid to give honest answers in interview • can be done at home 	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time-consuming • may be too subjective • ethical considerations may not be achieved • difficult to write when observing • people may behave differently if they know they are being observed • harder to analyse <p>Method: interviews – structured / semi-structured / unstructured</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • questions can be explained • variety of different data collection can be used • can spend time with participants • verifies it is the participants who are answering questions • may be less intimidating • can be done at home <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may be too personal • people may be more reluctant to answer certain questions • interviewers need training • time-consuming • may be expensive • may get interviewer bias <p>Method: focus group</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may be less time-consuming • inexpensive • better for people who may struggle with literacy • group dynamic may encourage responses • follow up questions may emerge • could change sample size <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of anonymity • need for a meeting space • participants have to travel • some people may not be confident in group situations • interviewers need training <p>Accept other appropriate positives/negatives to all primary research methods if appropriate</p>

Question		Mark	Content	Guidance
				Levels of response
1	(a)*	8	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is evaluate.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fully detailed evaluation • both positives and negatives for two methods • well-developed, clear and logically structured • factually accurate & relevant • correct use of terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound evaluation • both positives and negatives • two methods • mostly relevant and accurate information • Sub-max of 4 if only one method done well <u>OR</u> only positives or negatives • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited / basic evaluation • basic information • positive or negative aspect of one method • limited structure, may be list like or muddled • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (7–8 marks) Answers will provide a detailed evaluation of two methods of primary research. Answers have a well-developed line of reasoning, are clear and logically structured. Information presented is factually accurate and relevant, with correct use of terminology regarding methods of primary research for a qualitative study. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) Answers will provide a sound evaluation of two methods of primary research, with both positives and negatives. Answers are presented with some structure, with content mostly relevant and accurate. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub-max of 4 if only one method done well <u>OR</u> only positives or negatives</p> <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Answer provides basic/limited evaluation. Answers may be list like, muddled, demonstrating little knowledge or understanding. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p> <p>Annotation  For strengths and  for limitations</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance								
1	(b)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Statement</th> <th>True (T) or False (F)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Stratified sampling selects data from a whole population.</td> <td>False or F</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In random sampling each participant will have an equal chance of being chosen.</td> <td>True or T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opportunity sampling selects participants who are willing and available to take part in the study.</td> <td>True or T</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Statement	True (T) or False (F)	Stratified sampling selects data from a whole population.	False or F	In random sampling each participant will have an equal chance of being chosen.	True or T	Opportunity sampling selects participants who are willing and available to take part in the study.	True or T	3 (3x1)	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>No other answers acceptable.</p>
Statement	True (T) or False (F)											
Stratified sampling selects data from a whole population.	False or F											
In random sampling each participant will have an equal chance of being chosen.	True or T											
Opportunity sampling selects participants who are willing and available to take part in the study.	True or T											

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	(i)	<p>Two marks for correct identification, two required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To see if music therapy improved memory of patients To see if music therapy improved relationships between patients and relatives / carers To see if music therapy improved recognition of relatives / carers To improve outcomes for carers To establish an evidence base for treatments / interventions To improve practice To inform policy To increase knowledge and understanding To identify gaps in provision <p>This list is not exhaustive. Accept other, appropriate, possible purposes for this study</p>	<p>2 (2 x 1)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To slow down the rate of dementia Repetition of impact, e.g. improve moods, improve mental health and well being
1	(c)	(ii)	<p>One mark for correct identification, one required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therapy may be extended into care homes for dementia patients Specified <u>improved outcomes</u>, e.g. improved mood and well being May inform practice / policy for care of dementia patients To provide additional training to carers re music therapy May help support carers / relatives of dementia patients Increase funding to support music therapy Further research <p>This list is not exhaustive. Accept other, appropriate, ways.</p>	<p>1 (1x1)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding by itself

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
1	<p>(d)* <i>Discuss other ethical practices that should be put in place when carrying out the study</i></p> <p>Researcher should put in place practices to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure transparency – who commissioned and purpose of research • Avoid deception • Debrief participants • No harm / safety of participants maintained • Anonymity or confidentiality protected • Pseudonyms used • No identifying information • Personal information is secure • Responsible use of findings • Allow participants the right to withdraw • Maintain integrity • Keep participants informed • Consult ethical review boards • Consult legislation • Offer opportunities to see finished research • Ensure access to support groups <p>Accept any other reasonable responses</p>	6	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is discuss.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully detailed discussion • Explicit links to the scenario • Well-developed, clear and logically structured • Factually accurate & relevant • Correct use of terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound discussion • Implicit link to scenario • Mostly relevant and accurate information • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited / basic discussion • Basic information • Limited structure, may be list like or muddled • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Answers will provide a detailed discussion of other ethical practices that should be put in place. Explicit links to the scenario will be given. Answers are coherent, clear and logically structured. Information presented is accurate and relevant to ethical practices and there is correct use of terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Answers will provide a sound discussion of other ethical practices that should be put in place. Link to scenario may be implicit. Answers are presented with some structure and are relevant to ethical practices that should be put in place. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Answer provides basic/limited discussion. Answers may be list like, muddled, demonstrating little knowledge or understanding. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Source A: Touch screen use / reduced sleep Source B: Homelessness and social control Source C: Sexual health economy – web based activity Four marks for correct identification of aspects, two required for relevance and two for trustworthiness</p> <p>Relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • similar topic to article • has same similar research question or objectives • information over similar time period • current up-to-date information • information from similar geographical location • enabled development of hypothesis • comparable timeframe • relevance to chosen topic • contrasting information • use of key terms <p>Trustworthiness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides details of sources used • sources used are verifiable • is produced by a reputable author or organisation e.g. governmental source, national charity, academic study • chose sources that were unbiased • checked websites/ evidence for claims used. • use of academic sources of information. • use of sources that had been peer-reviewed • CARS method – credibility, accuracy, responsibility and support • ethical considerations <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unqualified statistical evidence • up to date without qualification 	<p>4 (2 x 1 + 2 x 1)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2 (b)*	<p>Source A: Touch screen use / reduced sleep Source B: Homelessness and social control Source C: Sexual health economy – web based activity <i>Explain how you carried out your secondary research in response to the article you chose with regards to:</i> <i>* locating your sources</i> <i>* using your sources</i></p> <p>Locating sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of key terms such as to what extent / in what way this method helped in location of suitable sources • Use of library catalogues / books / media • Internet search • Use of abstract searches • Use of academic web searches, e.g. google scholar, JSTOR • Use of key terms / refining tools to search for relevant material • Cost of access <p>If candidates within their answer refer to citation it must be fully qualified, e.g. 'I used this secondary research as it contained many citations from other qualified professionals'</p> <p>Using sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop a theme, helping to develop original ideas and/or interesting topic, leading to appropriate sources • To write research questions/hypothesis, helping to develop a manageable investigation and/or answerable question or hypothesis • To make accurate notes, in order to help to maintain clarity, acknowledge sources, avoid plagiarism • To develop comparisons / contrasts • Statistical evidence able to extract and use • Fine tuning / discarding selecting / dismissing the most relevant / irrelevant 	10	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is explain.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fully detailed explanation • both locating and using sources • well-developed, clear and logically structured • factually accurate & relevant • correct use of terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound explanation • both locating and using sources • mostly relevant and accurate information • sub-max of 5 for locating OR using sources done well. • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited / basic explanation • basic information • limited structure, may be list like or muddled • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (8–10 marks) Answers will provide a detailed explanation regarding both locating and using secondary sources related to article chosen. Answers are coherent, clear and logically structured. Information presented is accurate and relevant to locating and using secondary sources, with correct use of terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2 (5–7 marks) Answers will provide a sound explanation regarding for locating and using secondary sources related to article chosen. Answers are presented are mostly accurate and relevant to locating and using secondary sources. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub-max of 5 for locating <u>OR</u> using sources done well.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Answer provides basic/limited explanation. Answers may be list like, muddled, demonstrating little knowledge or understanding. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit. SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(c)	<p>Source A: Touch screen use / reduced sleep Source B: Homelessness and social control Source C: Sexual health economy – web based activity</p> <p>Three marks for an outline, two required. Building an argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated main point • Provided evidence – for and against / similarities and differences • Balanced argument • May acknowledge a counter argument • Logic behind reasoning • Persuasive language • Statistical evidence to support claims • Conclusion reinforcing argument • Aimed to convince reader <p>Avoiding plagiarism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used quotes • Did not copy and paste • Used own words • Cited / referenced the source material • Used a plagiarism checker <p>Accept other appropriate responses</p>	<p>6 (2x3)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For an incorrect answer use the cross.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Three marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear outline evidenced from chosen research <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts an outline but link to chosen research is not clear <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points identified but not in context of chosen research • May be list-like

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(d)*	10	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is analyse.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully detailed analysis Balanced analysis Both validity and reliability Well-developed, clear and logically structured Factually accurate & relevant Correct use of terminology QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound analysis Balanced analysis Mostly relevant and accurate information Sub-max of 5 for either validity or reliability done well QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited / basic analysis Basic information Validity or reliability Limited structure, may be list like or muddled QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (8–10 marks) Answers will provide a detailed analysis with regards to validity and reliability of chosen secondary sources. Answers are coherent, balanced and logically structured. Information presented is accurate and relevant with regards to validity and reliability of chosen secondary sources with correct use of terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2 (5–7 marks) Answers will provide a sound analysis of with regards to validity and reliability of secondary sources chosen. Answers are mostly accurate, are presented with some structure and with some relevance to secondary sources with regards to validity and reliability. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub-max of 5 for either validity or reliability done well.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Answer provides basic/limited analysis. Answers may be list like, muddled, demonstrating little knowledge or understanding. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit. SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
	<p>Reliability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unbiased source/ researcher • Reputable publication / web-site used • Qualified / expert author • Current information • Not written by unqualified observer e.g. Blogger • No conformation bias • No out-dated information • Investigation in source showed evidence of repetition • Authentic documentation used • Consistent with other articles • Credible source <p><u>Negatives for reliability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socially desirable answers/ demand characteristics • Bias of researcher /publication • Lack of objective measures • Conformation bias • Out of date <p>Do not accept reversal of points, e.g. In date / out of date</p>			

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2 (e)*	<p>Source A: Touch screen use / reduced sleep Source B: Homelessness and social control Source C: Sexual health economy – web based activity</p> <p><i>Using your secondary research, discuss the possible implications of your findings with regards to one of the following: health care settings and practices, social care settings and practices childcare settings and practices.</i></p> <p>Examples (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approaches e.g. Preventative/treatment • Empowerment • Funding • Pay and conditions for workers • Planning • Prioritising/making choices • Provision • Resources • Targeting/priorities • Work hours • Work practices roles/tasks • Reinforcing policies • Facilitates improvements • Informs third parties • May initiate defensive practices • May trigger debate • Further research • Training 	10	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is discuss.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully detailed discussion • Well-developed, clear and logically structured • Factually accurate & relevant • Correct use of terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound discussion • Mostly relevant and accurate information • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited / basic discussion • Basic information • Limited structure, may be list- like or muddled • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (8–10 marks) Answers will provide a detailed discussion of implications of findings. Answers are coherent, clear and logically structured. Information presented is accurate and relevant to implications of findings with correct use of terminology. There will be few errors, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2 (5–7 marks) Answers will provide a sound discussion of implications. Answers are presented with some structure and are mostly accurate and relevant to implications of findings. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Answer provides basic/limited discussion. Answers may be list like, muddled, demonstrating little knowledge or understanding. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit. SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2021

