



## **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 June 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 2018

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 <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	Mark	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(a)*	<p><b>Randomised controlled trial:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People are allocated at <b>random</b> (by chance alone) to receive one of several clinical interventions, so in this case the new cream and a placebo /different cream or no treatment at all.</li> <li>• <b>Used as a control/ standard</b> for comparison.</li> <li>• Someone who takes part in a randomised controlled trial called a participant or subject, so in this case patients who have <b>problems with itching / liver disease / required characteristics</b></li> <li>• The researcher will seek to <b>measure and compare</b> the outcomes after the participants receive the interventions, normally through some quantitative data</li> <li>• <b>Individuals will receive the cream/control in a random order</b> – they will not know what they are receiving</li> <li>• <b>Standardised instructions</b> for all to follow</li> <li>• <b>Must have two or more groups</b></li> <li>• <b>Monitoring</b> of participants</li> <li>• <b>Assess</b> lifestyle / characteristics of participants</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 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>• factually accurate</li> <li>• explicit link to the scenario</li> <li>• correct terminology</li> <li>• QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 – checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limited/basic description</li> <li>• list like/information presented in an unstructured way</li> <li>• lacking an understanding of the context /only implicit link</li> <li>• limited terminology</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2: 5 - 6 marks</b> Answers provide a detailed description of the key features of how a randomised controlled trial could be used. There will be an explicit link to the scenario. There is accurate use of appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 - 4 marks</b> Answers provide a limited or basic description of how a randomised controlled trial could be used. Limited understanding of the method may be shown. Link to the scenario may be lacking or implicit. May be list-like and/or muddled with limited use of appropriate terminology. 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	Mark	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
		<p><b>Do not accept:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide different dosage of cream for comparison</li> <li>• Could be replicated</li> <li>• How effective the cream is</li> <li>• Aims to reduce bias</li> <li>• May provide information on adverse effects</li> </ul> <p>Note for examiners – the focus of the question is how a randomised control trial could be used – we are not looking for results / effectiveness</p>			

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(b)	<p><b>One</b> mark for a sampling method. <b>One</b> required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stratified</li> <li>• Opportunity</li> <li>• Self-selecting (volunteer)</li> <li>• Snowball</li> <li>• Random</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>One mark:</b> Identification of suitable sampling method</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded. For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1 (c)	<p><b>Two</b> marks for a benefit. <b>Two</b> required.</p> <p><b>Example benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structured interviews are <b>easy to replicate</b> as a fixed set of closed questions are used, which are easy to quantify and restrict the interviewer from going off on a tangent.</li> <li>• Easy to test for <b>reliability</b>.</li> <li>• Structured interviews are <b>fairly quick to conduct</b> which means that many interviews can take place within a short amount of time.</li> <li>• A <b>large sample</b> can be obtained resulting in the findings being representative and having the ability to be generalised to a large population.</li> <li>• <b>Less training</b> needed as questions are fixed and so less room for discussion/ additional questions</li> <li>• <b>Cheaper</b>- as less time consuming than unstructured which will require more experienced interviewers and take longer</li> <li>• <b>Provides quantitative data</b> which is easier to analyse</li> <li>• <b>Reliability</b></li> </ul> <p>Accept other suitable benefits</p>	<p><b>4</b> (2x2)</p>	<p>For two marks the benefit must be clear.</p> <p><b>Two marks:</b> An appropriate benefit clearly outlined.</p> <p><b>One mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A benefit identified but not outlined.</li> <li>• May be list like.</li> </ul> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded. For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1 (d)	<p><b>One</b> mark for a justification identified. <b>Three</b> required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To <b>improve outcomes</b> for individuals – new treatments may reduce pain, discomfort stress, aid recovery or offer cures.</li> <li>• <b>Establish evidence base</b> for interventions treatments/</li> <li>• <b>increase knowledge and understanding</b> – new treatments should be checked for effectiveness, use of scientific method to help provide additional research for professionals to utilise</li> <li>• <b>Improve practice</b>- new treatments may help service users and staff in terms of comfort, experience of provision</li> <li>• <b>Identify gaps in provision</b> – new treatments may have been used effectively elsewhere and so may be useful to a new setting</li> <li>• <b>Identify the needs of groups or individuals</b> – new treatment may help identify ways to meet the needs of service users</li> <li>• <b>Inform policy</b>- new treatments may help inform government, purchasers of health carer, NICE</li> <li>• <b>To measure impact</b> – new treatments should be checked for <b>effectiveness</b> ( in terms of helping service users and in terms of cost/ practicalities)</li> </ul> <p>Accept other suitable purpose/justification</p>	<p><b>3</b> (3x1)</p>	<p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded. For an <b>incorrect</b> answer use the <b>cross</b>.</p> <p><b>Do not accept:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further research</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	<p>(e) <b>Two</b> marks for a definition. <b>Two</b> required.</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <p><b>Literature review</b> A literature review <b>surveys</b> scholarly articles, books and other sources relevant to a particular issue, area of research, or theory, providing a <b>description, summary, and critical evaluation</b>. A literature review also <b>assesses, analyses</b> and <b>provides an overview of</b> literature. This is a form of <b>secondary research</b>.</p> <p><b>Action Research</b> Refers to a wide variety of <b>evaluative, investigative, and analytical</b> research methods designed to <b>diagnose problem / improve practice or weaknesses</b> and <b>help develop practical solutions</b> and <b>implement change</b> as well as <b>increasing knowledge</b>. It would normally be carried out 'in the field' e.g. clinical. /educational settings.</p> <p><b>Case study</b> Case study research can take either a <b>qualitative</b> or <b>quantitative</b> approach; It normally focuses on <b>providing in depth detail</b> on an individual or a small group of individuals or a situation/setting.</p>	<p><b>6</b> (3x2)</p>	<p><b>Two marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a clear definition that demonstrates understanding</li> </ul> <p><b>One mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a simple definition/statement which lacks clarity</li> <li>• a basic attempt at a definition</li> </ul> <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	Mark	Guidance	
			Content	Content
2	(a)*	10	<p>This is a level of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is analysis</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>• clear understanding of the context of their own research will be evident</li> <li>• related to article chosen from pre-release e.g. focus clearly outlined</li> <li>• all three aspects</li> <li>• logically structured</li> <li>• <b>Top end Level three must have consideration of negative points</b></li> <li>• QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sound analysis</li> <li>• understanding of the context may be implicit</li> <li>• two aspects</li> <li>• related to article chosen from pre-release</li> <li>• analysis 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8-10 marks</b> Answers provide a detailed analysis of their research process in regards to developing a focus, avoiding plagiarism and selecting trustworthy sources. Answers will be factually accurate in relating chosen article to own research, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 5-7 marks</b> Answers provide a detailed analysis of their research process in regards to two from developing a focus, avoiding plagiarism and selecting trustworthy sources. Answers will be factually accurate, in the most part relating chosen article to own research in a logical manner. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. <b>Sub max of 5 for one aspect done well</b></p> <p><b>Level 1: 1-4 marks</b> Answers provide a limited analysis of their research process in regards to developing a focus, avoiding plagiarism and selecting trustworthy sources List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers are likely to be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance	
			Content	Content
	<p>information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of google scholars or equivalent / caution with using Wikipedia</li> <li>• CARS method – credibility, accuracy, responsibility and support</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not accept:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Date of publication</li> </ul> <p><b>Avoiding plagiarism:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making notes in their own words and acknowledging sources used</li> <li>• Use of referencing systems/ ways to record data sources used.</li> </ul> <p><b>For all of the points listed above they can be provided in reverse – the verb analyse enables candidates to provide pros and cons – watch out for repetition. These responses should be annotated with a -</b></p>		<p>unstructured way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(b)*	10	<p>This is a level of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the answer is presentation of findings. 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, clear presentation of findings</li> <li>context of own research explicit throughout</li> <li>one logical conclusion made.</li> <li>well-developed line of reasoning, logically structured</li> <li>clear link of secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings</li> <li>secondary sources used variety of research methods/considers these in own findings</li> <li>compares/contrasts findings</li> <li>QWC - high</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>presentation of findings is clear</li> <li>conclusion broadly in context of findings</li> <li>sound link of secondary research to own findings</li> <li>line of reasoning in the most part relevant</li> <li>sound 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>lacks understanding of link between</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8-10 marks</b> Answers provide a well-structured report on the main findings of their research and one conclusion made. Context of their own research will be made explicit throughout with clear links of secondary research. Ideas/key themes to own findings. 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> Answers provide a clear presentation of their main findings with one conclusion. Context of their own research will be provided with a sound link of secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. <b>Sub max 5:</b> if no conclusion provided or no findings.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1-4 marks</b> Answers provide a brief presentation of findings and/or unclear conclusion. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers are likely to be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling will be noticeable and intrusive.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
				secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• basic information presented in an unstructured way</li> <li>• conclusion may be unclear</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance	
			Content	Content
2	(c)	10	<p>This is a level of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of answer is discussion.</p> <p><b>Annotation:</b> The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. The focus of the question is discussion.</p> <p><b>Level 3 checklist.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed discussion</li> <li>• clear understanding of the context will be evident</li> <li>• implications drawn highly appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done</li> <li>• well-developed line of reasoning</li> <li>• logically structured</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 discussion</li> <li>• understanding of the context may be implicit</li> <li>• implications drawn reasonably appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done</li> <li>• line of reasoning in the most part relevant</li> <li>• sound 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>• lacking an understanding of the context</li> <li>• implications drawn may not be appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done</li> <li>• basic information presented in an unstructured way</li> <li>• QWC – low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3: 8-10 marks</b> Answers provide a detailed discussion of the possible implications of their findings. 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 sound discussion of the possible implications of their findings. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max 5 for only two aspects done well.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1-4 marks</b> Answer provides a brief discussion of the possible implications of their findings. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers are likely to be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling will be noticeable and intrusive. <b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.</p> <p><b>If answers are generic and do not relate to their findings only level 1 can be awarded.</b></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2 (d)	<p><b>Pre-release focus:</b>  <b>A = Grandparents providing childcare</b>  <b>B = Place memory and dementia</b>  <b>C = Fruit and vegetable consumption and all-cause cancer and CVD mortality</b></p> <p><b>Locating secondary sources:</b>  <b>Effectiveness of / evaluative comment on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library search carried out e.g. whether library catalogues accessed were extensive or limited.</li> <li>Use of key terms e.g. to what extent / in what way this method helped in location of suitable sources.</li> <li>Internet search carried out e.g. in locating academic studies, journal articles, different types of source, e.g. In locating relevant, trustworthy sources.</li> <li>Carrying out a literature review</li> <li>The use of google scholar or alternatives</li> </ul> <p><b>Validity:</b>  <b>Positive:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>valid sources – measure what was intended to measure</li> <li>clear objective measures</li> <li>peer reviewed</li> <li>non biased source/ researcher</li> <li>Trustworthy website</li> <li>The use of government statistics</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>socially desirable answers/ demand characteristics</li> <li>bias of researcher /publication</li> </ul>	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>Level 3 checklist.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>detailed evaluation on how sources were located</li> <li>detailed evaluation of validity</li> <li>Both +ve and –ve in whole answer</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 evaluation on how source were located</li> <li>sound evaluation of validity</li> <li>line of reasoning in most part relevant and logical</li> <li>QWC - mid</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 checklist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>basic evaluation of how sources were located</li> <li>attempts to evaluate validity</li> <li>QWC - low</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3 (8-10 marks)</b>  Answers provide a detailed evaluation of the sources used including how they were located and why they were selected. Detailed reflective judgements are made. Validity is evaluated both positively and negatively. 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>  Answers provide a sound evaluation of the sources used including how they were located and why they were selected. Some reflective comments are made. Validity is evaluated. May have some errors or omissions in the use of terminology. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. <b>Sub max of 5 for one done well or positive / and or negatives</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b>  Answers provide a basic evaluation of sources used including how they were located and/or why they were selected. At lower end answers may be descriptive. Answer provides limited answering and understanding in evaluating validity. List like answers should be placed in this band. Answers may be muddled and lack technical detail. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• lack of objective measures</li><li>• conformation bias</li></ul>			<b>0 marks</b> - response not worthy of credit.

**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](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; 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 2018

