

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

05871

Mark Scheme for January 2025

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 2025

MARKING PREPARATION

PREPARATION FOR MARKING

RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.*)

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.
7. There is a NR (**No Response**) option. Award NR (No Response):
 - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**
9. *Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.*
10. For answers marked by levels of response: Not applicable in F501
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

Annotations available for marking of scripts

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick – correct answer
	Cross – incorrect answer
	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
	To acknowledge additional pages/ notes were read
	Not Relevant - ‘noted but no credit given’
	Blank Page

DO NOT USE ANY OTHER ANNOTATION

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance								
1	(a)		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Statement</th> <th>True (T) or False (F)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Parents of babies and young children would be included as participants.</td> <td>True or T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The questionnaire was designed to ensure the team had numerical data.</td> <td>False or F</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The area of research was mainly targeted at social care policy for the adults in the community.</td> <td>False or F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Statement	True (T) or False (F)	Parents of babies and young children would be included as participants.	True or T	The questionnaire was designed to ensure the team had numerical data.	False or F	The area of research was mainly targeted at social care policy for the adults in the community.	False or F	3	<p>Answers must be in this order in the table</p> <p>1 mark per row</p> <p>For an incorrect answer use the cross.</p>
		Statement	True (T) or False (F)										
		Parents of babies and young children would be included as participants.	True or T										
		The questionnaire was designed to ensure the team had numerical data.	False or F										
The area of research was mainly targeted at social care policy for the adults in the community.	False or F												
1	(b)	(i)	<p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • structured interviews • semi-structured interviews • unstructured interviews • interviews • focus groups • survey • case studies / case study • action research 	1	<p>One mark</p> <p>For an incorrect answer use the cross.</p> <p>IGNORE observation and experimental methods as not suitable in this scenario</p>								

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
----------	--------	-------	----------

1	(b)	<p>(ii)*</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Detailed explanation of the benefits of using secondary methods. Explicit reference made to the scenario.</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Sound explanation of the benefits of using secondary method – link to scenario is implicit</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited explanation of the benefits of using secondary research methods.</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <p>Do not accept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answers that are clearly linked to primary methods • relevance • ‘easy’ 	<p>6</p> <p>Secondary methods – These do not have to be referred to within answers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • literature reviews e.g. books and journals • documentary sources – government organisations – • Published statistics – ONS, DH, DfE • use of websites <p>Benefits of using secondary sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of literature e.g. books and journals – summative points provided • saves time • cost effective • easier and quicker • use of websites from organisations disseminating research – results already provided / questions asked re the effectiveness / use of statistical findings • large number of journals available; to provide different perspectives / results - able to compare • trustworthy – if verified / peer reviewed / little or no bias • use of e.g. government documents or statistics – trustworthy • large data sets available - generalisability • means of researching previous studies – comparing data with other sources • useful for making comparisons over time • many secondary sources, including those produced by the government e.g. official statistics, are available free of charge / inexpensive • allows the public health team to learn findings of trials/ studies of health care practices • ensures the review will be supported by research-based evidence • cost effectiveness; do not need to invest money or time in gathering own data through primary
---	-----	---	---

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
					research • data is already in a format to analyse and compare • can provide a basis for primary research design if needed • Research is carried out by professionals; expert knowledge and improved accuracy Any other appropriate response to be accepted

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	<p><i>To improve outcomes for individuals linked to scenario – babies, children and parents</i></p> <p>ANY TWO FROM: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve physical health of babies and / or young children • improve uptake of (childhood) vaccinations • improve immunity e.g. herd immunity amongst children • parents have improved confidence in vaccination • parents have more informed choice about vaccination • idea of parents gaining peace of mind about vaccinations • to seek out other healthcare services in their locality • increase knowledge and understanding of the vaccination process / consequences of not being vaccinated • to reduce stigma linked to being vaccinated <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	2	<p>Two marks</p> <p>For an incorrect answer use the cross.</p> <p>ACCEPT other appropriate responses</p> <p>Do not accept generic responses, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve knowledge and understanding • improve benefits • improve outcome • negative outcomes • improve practice • answers applied to services / practitioners

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (d)*	<p>Level 3 (7-8 marks) Detailed discussion that includes ethical issues explicit to the scenario.</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (4-6 marks) Sound discussion that includes ethical issues, link to scenario is implicit</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1-3 marks) Limited or basic discussion of ethical issues</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p>	8	<p>Ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides benefit • cause no harm / maintain safety of participants • obtain informed consent • protect anonymity and confidentiality • avoid deception • allow participants the right to withdraw • ensure transparency and integrity - substances within the vaccine, e.g. ingredients (alert to allergies) / side effects • debrief participants • adherence to the Data Protection Act / Human rights Act • independence of research - who has commissioned it / what is the purpose of the research / not having a conflict of interest • access to information • who the research may effect / how they may be affected • keep participants informed • responsible use of research findings • consult ethical review boards <p>Answers can be written about how ethical issues have not been followed.</p> <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
----------	--------	-------	----------

2	(a)*	<p>Level 3 (7-8 marks) Detailed evaluation of two selected ways used when locating secondary source material. Includes both includes positive and negative statements</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (4-6 marks) Sound evaluation of two selected ways used when locating secondary source material. includes positive and negative statements.</p> <p>Sub max of 4 for one selected way done well / have only addressed positives or negatives <i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1-3 marks) Limited or basic evaluation that includes some positive or negative statements ;applied to locating sources.</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <p>Do not accept answers that refer to <u>selecting sources</u> , e.g. relevance, trustworthiness, bias and appropriateness</p> <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	8	<p><u>Libraries: positives when locating</u> ANNOTATE +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free access / easily accessible / cost effective • large number of journals / books available • access to the internet • full texts available • professional librarian to help with search • able to find up to date research • library catalogues – to narrow research • use of abstract searches • using an academic library – find more credible sources <p><u>Libraries: negatives when locating</u> ANNOTATE -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no relevant books / journals difficult to find sources linked to pre release • time consuming / slow • need to use correct search terms / key terms – time consuming • only able to locate books / journals that are out of date • payment for information • difficult to find sources / navigate around the library • library catalogues – difficult to navigate • may have to book time slot for use of the internet / limited time therefore to access the internet • Limited access to specific areas • Limited accessibility of libraries – closures / not 24/7 • Issues in locating books/journals within library e.g. missing, need to understand complex ordering systems <p><u>Internet searches – positive when locating</u> ANNOTATE +</p>
---	------	---	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fast • flexible – can complete anywhere • easy to access – 24/7 • worldwide search available / wide range of sources • varied search engines, e.g. google • easy to match key terms / by date • usually no cost • easy to skim articles • use of academic web searches or academic websites, e.g. google scholar, JSTOR, Universities, • use of key terms to search for relevant materials • use of refining tools, e.g. google advanced search to search for relevant materials <p><u>Internet searches – negative when locating</u> ANNOTATE -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have to pay e.g. to download articles • some articles could be locked • some articles only available in print • need to use correct search terms • no professional person to help • time consuming • volume of results can be excessive and overwhelming • SEO (search engine optimisation) systems can rank some websites higher, and this could influence choice • Loss of connection
--	--	--	---

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><u>Use of key terms - positive when locating</u> ANNOTATE +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • precise, specific keywords can focus your search on your intended topic / pre release • narrows the search • fast • allows for similar information to be found <p><u>Use of key terms - negative when locating</u> ANNOTATE -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can elicit results on other topics • may need more than one keyword • may give too many results / data • may result in limited results due to the key terms being too specific / lacking specifics • key terms inputted may not be relevant / inaccurate • may give inappropriate sources / data • need to ensure correct spelling of terms • may give irrelevant information • SEO system could restrict the use of a key term and this may limit access to some websites • different countries may use different terminology / phrased differently • time consuming

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
----------	--------	-------	----------

2	(b)	<p>Factor: complementary</p> <p>any TWO points for explanation (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the use of different / the same research methods • can support findings – shows same results and same conclusions OR have differing results / conclusions • information presented in different ways – qualitative / quantitative – with the same focus • clarification of information – have different or the same perspective / focus • reinforcement of ideas within pre-release material / comparable to pre release material • elaboration of information found within the pre- release – to develop a greater understanding • can provide broader overview to the chosen topic • comparable key words / phrases • sampling methods – the same or different • comparable format / structure <p>Factor: relevant / relevance</p> <p>any TWO points for explanation (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure similar topic to article • has same similar research question or objectives • current up-to-date information • enabled development of hypothesis • similar country / countries • similar ages group, health conditions, demographics 	3	<p>One factor linked to an explanation</p> <p>For an incorrect answer use the cross.</p> <p>ACCEPT other appropriate responses</p> <p>If the factor given is incorrect then the explanation has to be marked as incorrect</p>
---	-----	--	---	--

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Factor: appropriate / appropriateness any TWO points for explanation (not exhaustive):</p> <p><u>Appropriateness when selecting secondary source material</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • date articles were written – in date or out of date • authors – credentials unknown or known - validity / peer reviewed • credible organisation, e.g. reputable charities and government publications • quality / lack of quality of information • similar / different dates • reliable if you have selected up to date sources • same topics / linked to prerelease: <p>A: Early childhood bilingualism – effects on brain B: Dieticians working in care homes C: Variation of health check attendance in later life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • similar / different countries /regions • CARS – credibility, accuracy, reasonableness, support • applies to research question / hypothesis • sample size / generalisability • bias / non bias • accessibility of language / format • suitable level of scholarship • accessibility of language • provides quality of information 		

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(c)	(i)	<p>Any one from: <i>Enabled to develop a topic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning out of main areas for study • enables you to refine / develop a research question / hypothesis • hypothesis / research question stated • enables you to select key themes / key terms • links to pre release material <p>A: Early childhood bilingualism – effects on brain ➤ boost executive control (EC) skills – children and adults</p> <p>B: Dieticians working in care homes ➤ management of malnutrition ➤ improved quality of life / autonomy of residents</p> <p>C: Variation of health check attendance in later life ➤ assess associations between factors from childhood and adulthood ➤ Women: childhood socioeconomic advantage / being more physically active ➤ Men: greater self-organisation / being married</p> <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	1	<p>For incorrect answers use the cross</p> <p>Candidate's chosen focus may also be stated to exemplify these features</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(c)	(ii)	<p>To include any two points from: EITHER: <u>Appropriate acknowledgment of sources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acknowledge the original author • citation, e.g. in text citation • state name of organisation issuing source • used footnotes to reference the source • used a standard referencing system e.g. Harvard • bibliography • hyperlinks within text <p>OR:</p> <p><u>Avoided plagiarism</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use quotation marks when quoting from the secondary sources • didn't copy and paste • used own words • cite / reference the source material • used a plagiarism checker • paraphrase <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	2	<p>Two marks for two points must both be from EITHER or from OR.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (d)*	<p>Level 3 (8-10 marks) Detailed presentation of research that builds an argument and links research ideas together and justifies appropriateness of research methods. All three bullet points addressed</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (4-7 marks) Sound presentation of research that builds an argument and / or links research ideas together and / or justifies appropriateness of research method Two bullet points addressed Sub max of 4 for one bullet point done well</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited information presented in an unstructured way that may be list like / descriptive at the lower end.</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks - No response worthy of credit.</p>	10	<p>Formal writing that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> written with clarity / clear presentation easy to read <p><u>Builds an argument</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point, evidence and explanation Point – state hypothesis or RQ Evidence – findings / results from secondary sources, e.g. quotations / statistical evidence Explanation – how this links back to hypothesis / RQ Conclusion reinforcing argument <p><u>Linked research ideas together:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparable key themes from the secondary sources – could also link to pre release Questions / research question developed from chosen pre-release / secondary sources Hypothesis developed from secondary sources / pre release Drawing conclusions from the secondary sources / combining together Compare and contrast findings <p><u>Justified appropriateness of research methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether qualitative / quantitative data is generated / multi methodology primary / secondary methods: strengths and limitations quality of information generated sampling: generalisability relevant links to being / showing trustworthiness / validity / reliability

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(e)	<p>A: Early childhood bilingualism – effects on brain B: Dieticians working in care homes C: Variation of health check attendance in later life</p> <p>Implications for individuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved health and well being • improve work practices for staff / raising awareness • attend relevant training • improved knowledge and understanding • improved access to services and provision • empowerment due to knowledge gained • actual outcomes may not be as expected • took part in research but did not see any benefits • could affect beliefs or attitudes • third parties may be informed – disclosure of issues e.g. safeguarding <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	4	<p>ALLOW other relevant statements</p> <p>Responses can be positive or negative</p> <p>Could award 4 marks for 4 points</p> <p>OR 2 x 2 for outline</p> <p>Do not accept answers that link to <u>settings</u></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (f)*	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Detailed discussion of how secondary sources can be assessed for validity.</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Sound discussion of how secondary sources can be assessed for validity.</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited discussion of how secondary sources can be assessed for validity and may be list like.</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in date / up to date • author by itself • reliability • generalisability 	6	<p>Indicative points (not exhaustive):</p> <p>How validity can be assessed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • truthfulness of the source • reputation, status or credentials of author - individual(s) • sources produced by a reputable organisation e.g. governmental source, national charity, academic study • whether citations are provided • measures what it intended to measure • published in a credible journal • peer-reviewed / reviewed by other experts in the field • non bias / declared conflict of interest / conformation bias • research methods that were used, e.g. unstructured interviews • ethical principles were adhered to • evidence to support claims • CARS method – credibility, accuracy, responsibility and support • Use of academic search engines, e.g. google scholar • Suitability of the research methods used within secondary source material

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (g)*	<p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 8 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Detailed discussion of why further research may be needed</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Sound discussion of why further research may be needed with</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited discussion of why further research may be needed and may be list like.</p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p>0 marks <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <p>Any other appropriate response to be accepted</p>	6	<p>Indicative points (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • questions that have not been answered • research methods not appropriate • alternative research methods could be used – provide an example • want to gain more knowledge / findings • data was limited / lack of up to date information • want to extend data / information • larger sample size • adopt a different sampling method • Specific links to pre-release / secondary research – more research needed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A: Early childhood bilingualism – effects on brain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The bilingualism factors that alter brain connectivity ➤ A much bigger sample size (only 48 participants) B: Dieticians working in care homes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A much bigger sample size (only 6 participants) ➤ Limited evidence on the role of dieticians ➤ Longer interviews needed ➤ To widen the study – include MDT and the residents’ perspectives C: Variation of health check attendance in later life <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To start a new longitudinal study from 2025 onwards ➤ Lower the age for data collection ➤ To consider ethnic differences ➤ Why is there an association between greater educational attainment and attendance?

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder

 ocr.org.uk

 [Twitter/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/company/ocr](https://www.linkedin.com/company/ocr)

 [/ocrexams](https://www.youtube.com/ocrexams)



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2025 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 operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.