



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 2019

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 2019

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick – correct answer
	Cross – incorrect answer
+ve / -ve	Evaluation points
	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	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>Three marks for an explanation.</p> <p>Candidates may include the following aspects regarding how / why an evidence base is used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the treatment works / to know that drug works / effectiveness of drug • Cost effectiveness • Side effects/risks / to have an understanding of the side effects • Positive effects of the drug • Patient preferences/ feedback / user evidence of side effects • The drug has gone through intensive trials • The use of different research methods / data obtained – integration of evidence • Opinions of respected authorities, studies, and/or reports of expert committees • NICE recommendations • Allows professionals to use the best available research to ensure drug treatments are effective, safe and appropriate to be prescribed • Provide accurate information to prospective patients / enabling discussion • Conformity to ethics <p>Accept other well explained answers</p>	<p>3 (1x3)</p>	<p>For three marks the explanation must be clear</p> <p>Three marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear explanation including concept of evidence base and link to drug / prescription <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts explanation but lacks depth • May not link to drug / prescription <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear explanation • May be list-like <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; margin: 10px 0;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make you better • Will not cause harm • Safer – unless qualified

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
1	(b)*	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 -explanation</p> <p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed explanation • Explicit link to scenario evident • Both strengths and limitations included • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • QWC - high <p>Level 1 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic explanation • Implicit/no link to scenario evident • One strength and/or limitation included • information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low <p>Annotation: +ve / -ve</p>	<p>Level 2: 4-5 marks Answers provides a clear explanation of strengths and limitations of using unstructured interviews for this research. There will be an explicit link to the research. There is accurate use of appropriate terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-3 marks Answer provides a limited or basic explanation of -one strength and/or one limitation of using unstructured interviews for this research. Link to this research may be lacking/ 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>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>


Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of researcher bias • Hawthorne effect • May not be reliable • Interviewees / interviewers going off on a tangent • Limited quantitative data • Poor interviewer technique <p>Accept other appropriate strengths/limitations</p>			

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p data-bbox="174 264 853 296">(c) One mark for a suitable sampling method from:</p> <p data-bbox="237 331 562 499">Stratified Self-selecting (volunteer) Snowball Systematic Opportunity</p> <p data-bbox="237 571 450 603">Do not accept:</p> <ul data-bbox="237 608 875 707" style="list-style-type: none"> • Random • Methods of primary and secondary research • Focus group 	<p data-bbox="1245 264 1317 328">1 (1x1)</p>	<p data-bbox="1350 264 2045 360">Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p data-bbox="1350 400 2029 464">For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div data-bbox="1592 480 1962 560" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> A TV REP SEEN </div>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
1	<p>(d)*</p> <p>If the answer given in 1c is incorrect then 1d is also incorrect</p> <p>STRATIFIED:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be representative of the population • Results can be generalised to the population • Prevents a biased result if the selection is accurate <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It takes more time and resources to plan. • Care must be taken to ensure each key characteristic present in the population is selected across strata, otherwise this will design a biased sample. • Small samples will skew the results <p>SELF-SELECTING (VOLUNTEER):</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This often achieves a large sample size through reaching a wide audience, for example with online advertisements. • Quick and relatively easy to do. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those who respond to the call for volunteers may all display similar characteristics so increasing the chances of yielding an unrepresentative sample. • Can be costly to advertise / predict sample size 	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 evaluation.</p> <p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound evaluation • Both strength and weakness included • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • QWC - high <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic evaluation • One strength and/or weakness included • Information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions of sampling method • Comparisons to other sampling methods 	<p>Level 2 (4-5 marks) Answer provides a sound evaluation of a sampling strategy Both a strength and weakness are included. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>Level 1 (1-3 marks) Answer provides a basic evaluation of a sampling strategy. List like answers should be placed in this band. Errors of grammar and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive. Sub-max 3 for one strength or weakness done well.</p> <p>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
	<p>SNOWBALL:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It allows for studies to take place where otherwise it might be impossible to conduct because of a lack of participants. • Snowball sampling may help you discover characteristics about a population that you weren't aware existed. • Likely to get willing participants <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is usually impossible to determine the sampling error or make inferences about populations based on the obtained sample. • May stop suddenly (no more friends to recommend/ small/limited sample) • Could result in a lack of representative sample <p>SYSTEMATIC:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes bias in selection / Equal chance of being selected • Simple and easy <p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a sampling frame, e.g. names of people attending a back pain clinic / data protection issues • Unrepresentative / selected by chance • Some groups could be over or under represented • Cannot make accurate generalisations 		<p>Annotation: +ve / -ve</p>	

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
	<p>OPPORTUNITY:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants who are engaged • Sample selected will be relevant to research but only if you use the right setting • Easy to conduct <p>Weakness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrepresentative / may be only one setting used • Can't make accurate generalisations • Bias in section <p>Accept other appropriate strengths/weaknesses.</p>			

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>(e)</p> <p>Three explanations required, Two marks each. The focus of the question is on how each are maintained.</p> <p>Cause no harm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants informed of rights/ nature of the research / know what they are signing up to • Repetition of the right to withdraw • Procedures stopped if participant shows distress at talking about pain/ medical condition • Published results do not identify those who took the drug/ have back pain / anonymity is guaranteed • Confidentiality is maintained • Risk assessments have been carried out – medical history, allergies , possible adverse reactions with other medication being taken <p>Obtain informed consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants told of the overall aim of the research into the effectiveness of the drug/ back pain / Know what they are signing up to / making an informed decision • Written consent gained • Time to read requirements, prior to giving consent • Copy of signed consent form issued <p>Allow the right to withdrawal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully informed of the right not to answer questions/ stop the research into pain. • Reminded of right to withdraw results/ information • No pressure applied to stay / can withdraw at any time • No reason required if choosing to withdraw • Clear method for withdrawal • Ethics • Accept other appropriate correct responses. 	<p>6 (2x3)</p>	<p>For two marks the explanation must be in context , i.e. the scenario of the research)</p> <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear explanation that demonstrates understanding <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limitation explanation that lacks clarity <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;">  </div>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(a)* A: Effect of music on urological procedures B: Breast feeding / peer support C: Homelessness – views and experiences of palliative care Evaluation of one of the following: Library search Internet search Use of key terms Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated (measure what was intended to measure) • easy access • Quick to do / immediate access • Non biased sources/researcher can be found • For internet search – use of google scholar • Accessibility • For internet / library – inputting key words from the pre release • Free • Specifying country • Convenient Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researcher bias- look for what you want • Restricted access • Too much information to use • Risk of accessing opinions rather than peer reviewed work • Bias of researcher /publication • Lack of objective measures • Information is too technical • Lack of discernment • Validity of author difficult to assess at times • Out of date information • Failure to specify country 	6	This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is evaluation . Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. Level 2 checklist: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound evaluation • Both strength and weakness included • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • QWC - high Level 1 checklist: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic evaluation • One strength and/or weakness included • Information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low Annotation: +ve / -ve	Level 2: 4-6 marks Answer provides a sound evaluation of how one of the ways of locating sources was used. There will be a strength and weakness included. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling Level 1: 1-3 marks Answer provides a limited or basic evaluation of how one of the ways of locating sources was used. May be one-sided (only a strength or weakness). 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 Sub max 3 for strength or weakness done well. 0 marks = response not worthy of credit SEEN for a zero mark response

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lost connection <p>Strengths and weaknesses may be applicable to any of the chosen ways of locating sources.</p> <p>Accept other appropriate strengths and weaknesses</p>			

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(b)	<p>A: Effect of music on urological procedures B: Breast feeding / peer support C: Homelessness – views and experiences of palliative care</p> <p>Two identification points required.</p> <p>Identification points may include:</p> <p>Checking/matching sources for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methods, e.g. questionnaires, pilot studies • Topics • Key words / phrases • Sampling method • Similar format / structure • Comparable data collection – quantitative and qualitative • CARS – credibility, accuracy, reasonableness, support <p>Accept other suitable responses e.g. finding other similarities.</p>	<p>2 (2x1)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded. For an incorrect answer use the cross.</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; margin: 10px 0;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Do not accept: Country of origin</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(c)* A: Effect of music on urological procedures B: Breast feeding / peer support C: Homelessness – views and experiences of palliative care Two of the following considered: Manageable in scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions/limits made on use of resources Complexity of language Clear targeting of specific topics/methods Setting a time period Focusing on one aspect/area Creating a hypothesis Original / interesting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time period - research contemporary, relevant, topical or comparative Unusual, rare design and methods used Personal interest Relevant to career / other subjects being studied Personal challenge Answerable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMART criteria Hypotheses / aims clear and objective Use of sources within subject area applicable Recognised sources 	8	<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>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed explanation two of the considerations included balanced well-developed line of reasoning logically structured QWC - high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sound explanation two of the considerations included some structure correct use of terminology Sub max of 4 for one done well QWC - mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited/basic explanation information presented in an unstructured way/ list like limited/no use of terminology QWC - low 	<p>Level 3: 7- 8 marks Answer provides a detailed explanation of how two of the considerations were used when using sources. Answers will be balanced. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>Level 2: 4 - 6 marks Answer provides a sound explanation of how two of the considerations were used when using sources. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max of 4 for only one done well.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-3 marks Answer provides a limited/basic explanation of how one / two of the considerations were used when using sources. 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>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relevant sources <p>Accept other appropriate responses</p>			

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(d)	<p>A: Effect of music on urological procedures B: Breast feeding / peer support C: Homelessness – views and experiences of palliative care</p> <p>Answer will present two findings in response to the article the candidate chose.</p>	<p>4 (2 x 2)</p>	<p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear presentation of a finding • Understanding in context shown <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief/limited presentation of a finding that lacks clarity • May not be in context <p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded. For an incorrect answer use the cross.</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	(e)* A: Effect of music on urological procedures B: Breast feeding / peer support C: Homelessness – views and experiences of palliative care <u>Methods (list not exhaustive)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissertation • Peer review • Content analysis • Case studies • Internet • Literature review • Blogs • Podcasts • Magazines • Television • Radio • Library • Newspapers • Books • Journals • Social media • Government publications • Office of National Statistics (ONS) <p>The following strengths and weaknesses are interchangeable – professional judgement required</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carried out by professional researchers • Peer reviewed • Generalisable 	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>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation • Strength and weakness of two methods included • Appropriate terminology • Well-developed line of reasoning • Logically structured • QWC - high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound evaluation strengths and weaknesses of two methods included • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • Sub max of 5 for only strengths or weaknesses <u>or</u> only one method • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic evaluation • Information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks Answer provides a detailed evaluation of methods used. At least one strength and one weakness for both methods needed. Detailed reflective judgements are made. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2: 5-7 marks Answer provides a sound evaluation of both methods used. Some reflective comments are made. Answers will be factually correct. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max 5 for only strengths or weaknesses <u>or</u> only one method</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks Answer provides a limited evaluation of methods used. Answers may be descriptive. 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> <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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliable • Representative • Valid <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of information • May not be trustworthy • Possible researcher bias • Not generalisable • Not reliable • Not representative • Lack of relevancy/validity • Research sponsored by interested parties / bias <p>Accept other suitable evaluation points</p>		<p>Annotation: +ve / -ve</p> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism • Referencing 	

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(f)*	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 discussion.</p> <p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed discussion • balanced • two implications included • appropriate terminology • well-developed line of reasoning • logically structured • QWC - high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound discussion • two implications included • some structure • Correct use of terminology • Sub max of 5 for one done well • QWC - mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic discussion • information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC - low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks Answers provide a balanced detailed discussion of two possible implications. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>Level 2: 5-7 marks Answer provides a sound discussion of two possible implications. May have some errors or omissions in the use of terminology. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max 5 for one implication done well.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks Answer provides a basic discussion of possible implications of findings. 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> <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 2019

