

Cambridge TECHNICALS LEVEL 3

Cambridge
TECHNICALS
2016

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

Feedback on the June 2018 exam paper
(including selected exemplar candidate answers
and commentary)

Unit 25 – Research methods in health, social care and childcare
Version 1

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
General examiner comments on the paper	4
Questions 1(a) and (b)	5
Exemplar candidate work	7
Question 1(c)	10
Exemplar candidate work	11
Questions 1(d) and (e)	14
Exemplar candidate work	16
Question 2(a)	19
Question 2(b)	21
Question 2(c)	23
Question 2(d)	25
Exemplar candidate work	27

INTRODUCTION

This resource brings together the questions from the June 2018 examined unit (Unit 25), the marking guidance, the examiners comments and the exemplar answers into one place for easy reference.

We have also included exemplar candidate answers with commentary for questions 1(a), 1(c), 1(e) and 2(d).

The marking guidance and the examiner's comments are taken from the Report to Centre for this question paper.

The Question Paper, Mark Scheme and the Report to Centre are available from:

<https://interchange.ocr.org.uk/>

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Level 3 Cambridge Technical in Health and Social Care
05871

Unit 25: Research methods in health, social care and childcare
Friday 22 June 2018 – Morning

Duration: 2 hours
C449/1806

You must have:
• Pre-release booklet (C449)

First Name: _____ Last Name: _____
Centre Number: _____ Candidate Number: _____
Date of Birth: D D M M Y Y Y Y

INSTRUCTIONS

- Use black ink.
- Complete the boxes above with your name, centre number, candidate number and date of birth.
- Answer **all** the questions.
- Write your answer to each question in the space provided.
- Additional paper may be used if required but you must clearly show your candidate number, centre number and question number(s).

INFORMATION

- The total mark for this paper is 60.
- The marks for each question are shown in brackets [].
- Quality of extended response will be assessed in questions marked with an asterisk (*).
- This document consists of 8 pages.

FOR EXAMINER USE ONLY	
Question No.	Mark
1	(20)
2	(40)
Total	(60)

© OCR 2018 (A18/15/17E)
C449/18066 OCR is an exempt Charity Turn over

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Cambridge Technicals Level 3
Health and Social Care

05830-05833, 05871
Unit 25 Research Methods

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

PRE-RELEASE MATERIAL

The question paper is based on a pre-release research brief which is issued to centres 6-8 weeks before the examination.

Learners should refer to this pre-release material to answer questions in the question paper.

The pre-release Research Brief can be found on Interchange.

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Level 3 Cambridge Technical in Health and Social Care
05871

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

Pre-release material
Friday 22 June 2018 – Morning

First Name: _____ Last Name: _____
Centre Number: _____ Candidate Number: _____
Date of Birth: D D M M Y Y Y Y

GUIDANCE NOTES

- This pre-release material contains three research articles on three different themes.
- The question paper will require learners to respond to questions about research they have completed and questions which are associated with general research principles.
- Learners need to conduct research linked to the pre-release material in the five weeks they have access to the document.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS

- This material must be issued 6 weeks prior to the published examination date.
- This material must be printed on A4 only.
- Learners are permitted to summarise their research findings and record results/evidence/data gathered in the notes pages at the back of this document only (not in the margins or around the pre-release material itself or on additional sheets) and must not exceed the 2 pages provided.
- The notes section must not be used to produce a formal write-up of the research conducted.
- Teachers must collect in each learner's pre-release material and notes one calendar week prior to the exam date.
- Teachers must check that the notes made are appropriate and are the learners' own work in advance of the examination taking place.
- The pre-release and notes must then be returned to learners immediately before the exam commences.
- The pre-release and notes must be submitted along with the learners' Question Paper at the end of the examination.

© OCR 2018 (A18/15/17E)
C449/18066 OCR is an exempt Charity Turn over

GENERAL EXAMINER COMMENTS ON THE PAPER

Centres had prepared their candidates well for this examination. Candidates were very familiar with the pre-release material and were able to answer questions on their chosen pre-release focus with both competence and confidence.

Resources which might help address the examiner comments:

From the link below, you'll find 'The OCR guide to examinations' (along with many other skills guides)

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/skills-guides/>

Command verbs definitions

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/273311-command-verbs-definitions.pdf>

Questions 1(a) and (b)

Answer **all** the questions.

- 1 A researcher plans to assess the effectiveness of a new type of cream to help reduce itching felt by patients with liver disease. He decides to use an experimental method.

(a)* Describe how a randomised controlled trial could be used in this research.

Randomised controlled trial:

- People are allocated at **random** (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.
- **Used as a control/standard for comparison.**
- Someone who takes part in a randomised controlled trial called a participant or subject, so in this case patients who have **problems with itching/liver disease/required characteristics.**
- The researcher will seek to **measure and compare** the outcomes after the participants receive the interventions, normally through some quantitative data.
- **Individuals will receive the cream/control in a random order** – they will not know what they are receiving.
- **Standardised instructions** for all to follow.
- **Must have two or more groups.**
- **Monitoring** of participants.
- **Assess** lifestyle/characteristics of participants.

.....[6]

(b) Identify **one** sampling method that could be used to gain participants for this research.

One mark for a sampling method. **One** required.

- Stratified
- Opportunity
- Self-selecting (volunteer)
- Snowball
- Random.

.....[1]

Mark Scheme Guidance

Question 1(a):

Content	Levels of response
<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>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 description • factually accurate • explicit link to the scenario • correct terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited/basic description • list like/information presented in an unstructured way • lacking an understanding of the context/only implicit link • limited terminology • QWC – low <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide different dosage of cream for comparison • Could be replicated • How effective the cream is • Aims to reduce bias • May provide information on adverse effects. <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>	<p>Level 2: 5 - 6 marks</p> <p>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>Level 1: 1 - 4 marks</p> <p>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>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question 1(b):

One mark:

Identification of suitable sampling method.

Annotation:

The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.

For an **incorrect** answer use the **cross**.

Examiner comments

Question 1(a) – This question was poorly answered. The focus of the question was on how a randomised controlled trial could be used. Many candidates went on to describe the effects of the trial and missed the point of the question. We saw very few candidates being awarded level 2. The most common answers were the random selection of participants and identifying who would take part in the trial, i.e. people with liver disease and/or people who suffered with itching.

Question 1(b) – Many were able to correctly state an appropriate sampling method. However a number of candidates cited primary methods of research, e.g. questionnaires, seemingly not understanding methods of sampling.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(a) – Low level answer

- 1 A researcher plans to assess the effectiveness of a new type of cream to help reduce itching felt by patients with liver disease. He decides to use an experimental method.

(a)* Describe how a randomised controlled trial could be used in this research.

A randomised controlled trial could be used in this research by gathering a number of patients who have liver disease at random. They would need to explain what the experiment is about. A randomised control trial could be used to test ~~at~~ a group of people on the effectiveness of this cream which could help him

[6]

Commentary

This is a low level answer as the candidate only gave a basic description. They made two basic points; that the people involved would have to have liver disease and that they were selected at random. To improve upon this answer the candidate needed to provide more description; they could have chosen from any of the following points:

- Providing standardised instructions.
- Must have two or more groups.
- Assess the lifestyle/characteristics of the participants.
- Participants will be in the receipt of the cream in a random order.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(a) – Medium level answer

- 1 A researcher plans to assess the effectiveness of a new type of cream to help reduce itching felt by patients with liver disease. He decides to use an experimental method.

(a)* Describe how a randomised controlled trial could be used in this research.

A randomised control trial is where individuals with the liver disease are selected at random. This could be used by selecting a decent amount of people that suffer with liver disease to try the cream. The individual could use this cream for a few days to get a fair test of the cream and would write down their findings of how the cream works. All the information from each individual would get gathered together and analysed to discover the results of the cream. Each person would have the cream for the same amount of time. [6]

Commentary

Whilst the candidate had provided three points (participants had liver disease, they were selected at random and each participant had the cream for the same amount of time) the answer was rather limited in its description and it was felt that the information provided showed a limited understanding of how the method was being used.

To improve upon this answer the candidate needed to provide a detailed description looking into how the randomised controlled trial could be used:

- To measure and compare the outcomes of participants, probably through quantitative data.
- To ensure that all participants were given standardised instructions for follow.
- Monitoring of the participants throughout the trial.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(a) – High level answer

- 1 A researcher plans to assess the effectiveness of a new type of cream to help reduce itching felt by patients with liver disease. He decides to use an experimental method.

(a)* Describe how a randomised controlled trial could be used in this research.

A randomised controlled trial could be used be used by first selecting participants from the target population of those with liver disease and then randomly picking out names from a hat or randomly generating names on a computer. This means all participants will get an equal chance of being picked. Then through an experimental method standardised instructions can be read to participants in a controlled lab setting so that cause and effect can be established increasing reliability. [6]

Commentary

Whilst this answer was placed in level 1 (top end), it was still considered to be a higher level answer.

This candidate had provided some description of the points that they made; they had described how the random sampling could be generated as well as showing they had knowledge of the need for standardised instructions needed for this trial. To further improve upon this answer the candidate needed to provide further description showing how the randomised controlled trial could be used:

- To measure and compare the outcomes of participants, probably through quantitative data.
- Monitoring of the participants throughout the trial.
- Assessing the lifestyle/characteristics of participants.

Question 1(c)

- (c) The researcher decides to use a structured interview to assess the effectiveness of the cream.

Outline **two** benefits of this method.

Benefit 1 **Two** marks for a benefit. **Two** required.

Example benefits:

- • Structured interviews are **easy to replicate** as a fixed set of closed questions are used, which are easy to quantify and restrict the interviewer from going off on a tangent.
-
- Benefit 2 • Easy to test for **reliability**.
- • Structured interviews are **fairly quick to conduct** which means that many interviews can take place within a short amount of time.
- • A **large sample** can be obtained resulting in the findings being representative and having the ability to be generalised to a large population.
- • **Less training** needed as questions are fixed and so less room for discussion/additional questions. **[4]**
- • **Cheaper** – as less time consuming than unstructured which will require more experienced interviewers and take longer.
- • **Provides quantitative data** which is easier to **analyse**.
- • **Reliability**

Accept other suitable benefits.

© OCR 2018

Mark Scheme Guidance

For two marks the benefit must be clear.

Two marks:

An appropriate benefit clearly outlined.

One mark:

- A benefit identified but not outlined.
- May be list like.

Annotation:

The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.

For an **incorrect** answer use the **cross**.

Examiner comments

We saw mixed responses to this question. Some candidates were fully versed in the benefits of structured interviews and were able to provide detailed benefits. The main responses tended to be around being easy to replicate, fixed set of closed questions, providing quantitative data and being fairly quick to conduct. From some responses seen it was obvious that some candidates did not understand what a structured interview was.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(c) – Low level answer

(c) The researcher decides to use a structured interview to assess the effectiveness of the cream.

Outline **two** benefits of this method.

Benefit 1 This method is quick and will be easy it
..... allow the researcher to ask questions that
..... will be straight to the point.....

Benefit 2 The researcher can get a detailed
..... explanation of how the cream worked
..... for each individual The information is accurate

[4]

Commentary

This answer is a low level answer as the candidate had only provided one benefit; that the method is quick to conduct allowing the researcher to get straight to the point. The second benefit provided did not relate to the question and failed to look at the benefits of carrying out a structured interview.

To improve upon this answer the candidate needed to provide another benefit to using unstructured interviews:

- They are easy to replicate.
- Easy to test for reliability.
- Will provide quantitative data.
- Less training is needed.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(c) – Medium level answer

- (c) The researcher decides to use a structured interview to assess the effectiveness of the cream.

Outline **two** benefits of this method.

Benefit 1 Provides quantitative data which is more reliable

It is repeatable it can be repeated

Benefit 2 It is more accurate and is not time consuming

[4]

Commentary

This is a medium level answer as this candidate gave one benefit which was clearly outlined; provides quantitative data which is more reliable. The second benefit was an identification; they identified that this was not time consuming. To have developed this answer more the candidate could have developed this point; this method is not time consuming so could be considered a cheaper method to use as more people can be interviewed in a shorter amount of time.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(c) – High level answer

(c) The researcher decides to use a structured interview to assess the effectiveness of the cream.

Outline **two** benefits of this method.

Benefit 1 Set questions allow the interviewer the interview
not to go off topic, staying on track allows the researcher
to ensure he gains the right sort of answers

Benefit 2 Can produce quantitative data which
can be statistically analysed by professional
to gain a better understanding of how the cream works

[4]

Commentary

This is a high level answer as both benefits were seen to be 'appropriate and clearly outlined'.

Benefit 1: Set questions which will prevent the interviewer from going off on a tangent.

Benefit 2: Will produce quantitative data which is easier to analyse.

Mark Scheme Guidance

Question 1(d):

Annotation:

The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.

For an **incorrect** answer use the **cross**.

Do not accept:

- Further research.

Question 1(e):

Two marks:

- a clear definition that demonstrates understanding.

One mark:

- a simple definition/statement which lacks clarity
- a basic attempt at a definition.

Annotation:

The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.

For an **incorrect** answer use the **cross**.

Examiner comments

Question 1(d) – Generally this question was answered well with the most common responses being to improve outcomes, to establish an evidence base, to improve practice and to identify gaps in provision.

Question 1(e) – A range of response were seen to this question. Some candidates seemingly had no or limited knowledge of the research methods they were asked to define. However we did see some very well informed answers and it was clear that many candidates were well versed in the specified research methods.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(e) – Low level answer

(e) Define the following research methods.

Literature review

Written analysis analysis of your chosen subject which you would like to research. For example, Shakespeare's Sonnets.

Action research

An individual carries out research themselves whilst they are working. For example, a teacher might do action research to see what teaching style suits her pupils.

Case study

In-depth analysis on a person or group to see how they go on in everyday life. For example, Bandura's Bobo doll experiment.

[6]

Commentary

This is a low level answer due to the candidate being unable to define literature review and they were only able to provide a basic description of the other two terms:

- 'Action research' (to see what teaching style suits her pupils).
- 'Case study' (in depth analysis).

To improve upon this answer the candidate needed to provide definitions that demonstrated understanding:

Literature review: surveys scholarly articles, providing a description, summary or a critical evaluation.

Action research: to build up on the initial point made they could have gone on to talk about improving practice, developing practical solutions and implementing change.

Case study: to build up on the initial point made they could have gone on to state that the in depth analysis could have been based on either an individual or on a small group of individuals.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(e) – Medium level answer

(e) Define the following research methods.

Literature review

Literature review involves journals and books which there is a lot of information written in depth. It is qualitative ~~both have a~~ background information and inspiration as data well as that can be analysed.

Action research

Action research is when a researcher takes part in the research they are conducting.

Case study

A case study involves a description of an individual and its seen as something that can come across as bias.

[6]

Commentary

This is a medium level answer as the candidate had provided a clear definition which demonstrated understanding for the literature review; they knew that this involved looking into journals and books and the information gained could be analysed.

They were only able to provide a basic definition for action research; they knew that the researcher themselves took part (poorly written but it was felt that this warranted 1 mark).

Whilst this candidate had mentioned 'a description of an individual' it was felt that the candidate did not understand the term.

To improve upon this answer the candidate needed to develop their point for action research, citing that different research methods could be applied; evaluative, investigative and analytical. They could have said that this method aims to improve practice and helps to provide practical solutions.

Show a better understanding of 'case study'; stating that this produces in depth detail that is based on either an individual, a small group of individuals or a situation/setting.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 1(e) – High level answer

(e) Define the following research methods.

Literature review

Identifies research that has been carried out ^{by} people. It finds theories and approaches that are relevant to your focus question/research in one specific field/topic

Action research

This is research that aims to produce a better outcome for example in a health care environment, it is used to find research treatment e.g. medicine to improve health of the public for a life threatening condition

Case study

This is an in-depth study about one person or a group of people. It produces rich qualitative data

[6]

Commentary

This is a high level answer as the candidate had provided two definitions which demonstrated understanding:

- Case study; they knew that this was an in depth study, that it was based on an individual or a group of people and that it could produce qualitative data.
- Action research; they know that it could provide a better outcome and that it could implement change (medicines to improve the health of the public).

Their answer on a literature review was seen as basic as they only stated that this 'finds theories and approaches that are relevant (equates to provides an overview of literature) to have developed this answer they could have stated that a literature review surveys scholarly articles, books and other sources relevant to particular issue or area of research.

Mark Scheme Guidance

Content	Levels of response
<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>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 analysis • clear understanding of the context of their own research will be evident • related to article chosen from pre- release e.g. focus clearly outlined • all three aspects • logically structured • Top end Level three must have consideration of negative points • QWC – high <p>Level 2 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound analysis • understanding of the context may be implicit • two aspects • related to article chosen from pre-release • analysis in the most part well developed • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • descriptive (upper end) list like (low end) • lacking an understanding of the context • basic information presented in an unstructured way • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks</p> <p>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>Level 2: 5-7 marks</p> <p>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. Sub max of 5 for one aspect done well.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks</p> <p>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> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p>

Examiner comments

All candidates demonstrated that they were conversant with their chosen pre-release material. The question asked candidates to explain how they developed their focus of their secondary research in response to their chosen pre-release material. We saw some excellent answers which clearly showed significant links to both the pre-release and the process that they adopted. When candidates were analysing how they selected trustworthy sources we saw some very precise answers, e.g. the use of academic sources, the use of Google Scholar and the CARS (credibility, accuracy, reasonableness, support) method. However we also saw answers that had no understanding of the key word trustworthy. How they avoided plagiarism was done well with many stating that they would make notes in their own words as well as using referencing systems. A small minority did not appear to understand the word plagiarism.

Mark Scheme Guidance

Content	Levels of response
<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>Level 3 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed, clear presentation of findings • context of own research explicit throughout • one logical conclusion made. • well-developed line of reasoning, logically structured • clear link of secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings • secondary sources used variety of research methods/ considers these in own findings • compares/contrasts findings • QWC – high <p>Level 2 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentation of findings is clear • conclusion broadly in context of findings • sound link of secondary research to own findings • line of reasoning in the most part relevant • sound structure • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • descriptive (upper end) list like (low end) • lacks understanding of link between secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings • basic information presented in an unstructured way • conclusion may be unclear • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks</p> <p>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>Level 2: 5-7 marks</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sub max 5: if no conclusion provided or no findings.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks</p> <p>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> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p>

Examiner comments

Some excellent responses were seen to this question. Candidates were able to comprehensively showcase their findings; some were extremely focussed and engaging to read. Centres are to be congratulated with how they prepared their candidates; some of their findings were thoughtfully considered and logically produced. The majority of candidates were able to provide a conclusion which drew upon many of their findings.

Mark Scheme Guidance

Content	Levels of response
<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>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. The focus of the question is discussion.</p> <p>Level 3 – checklist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed discussion • clear understanding of the context will be evident • implications drawn highly appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done • well-developed line of reasoning • logically structured • correct use of terminology • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound discussion • understanding of the context may be implicit • implications drawn reasonably appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done • line of reasoning in the most part relevant • sound structure • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • descriptive (upper end) list like (low end) • lacking an understanding of the context • implications drawn may not be appropriate/relevant to findings from secondary research done • basic information presented in an unstructured way • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks</p> <p>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>Level 2: 5-7 marks</p> <p>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>Level 1: 1-4 marks</p> <p>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.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>If answers are generic and do not relate to their findings only level 1 can be awarded.</p>

Examiner comments

Some very inventive and well considered implications were provided in many candidates' responses. A common error though, for a small minority, was to reiterate their findings; they had seemingly misread the question or did not understand the word implication.

Mark Scheme Guidance

Content	Levels of response
<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>Level 3 – checklist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed evaluation on how sources were located • detailed evaluation of validity • both +ve and –ve in whole answer • well-developed line of reasoning • logically structured • QWC – high <p>Level 2 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound evaluation on how source were located • sound evaluation of validity • line of reasoning in most part relevant and logical • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basic evaluation of how sources were located • attempts to evaluate validity • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3 (8-10 marks)</p> <p>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>Level 2 (5-7 marks)</p> <p>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. Sub max of 5 for one done well or positive/and or negatives.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</p> <p>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> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p>

Examiner comments

The section on locating secondary sources was generally completed well, with many candidates being able to reflect on the use of key terms, carrying out a literature review and using Google Scholar or equivalent. Many still struggled with the concept of validity and often failed to give a balance of positives and negatives.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 2(d) – Low level answer

(d)* Evaluate your secondary sources with reference to:

- how you located them
- validity.

The secondary research gathered was located through the use of google scholar, this is a reliable source as it filters out any ~~unreliable~~ sources and only shows sources produced by professionals who have a vested interest in the area. Also the secondary research was taken from Alzheimers society which is run by professionals who have a vested interest in dementia. The secondary sources gathered were not only taken from scholarly sources they were also valid and I know this as they were UK based sources and this means that you would get the same findings in one part of the country as you would another, another way that I could see that the research was valid was by checking ~~to~~ out the qualifications that the researchers had and the researchers were all qualified which shows that the research is reliable and appropriate to use to back up ~~to~~ Source B. Overall the sources found were reliable and of a high standard which ~~is~~ ~~shows~~ shows ~~to~~ that they were fit for use.

[10]

Commentary

This was a low level answer as this candidate only provided a basic evaluation; this answer was descriptive rather than showing the skills of evaluation.

They had described how they had located sources through the use of google scholar.

An attempt was made at addressing validity; they identified that some of the sources used were written by professionals linked to the Alzheimer's Society (However this credit was provided by the examiner as the candidate did not directly address the issue of validity).

To improve upon this answer for how they located sources they should have developed more points and within these points highlighted strengths and weaknesses:

- The use of key terms.
- Carrying out a literature review.

To improve upon this answer with respect to the validity of their sources they needed to have been more explicit:

Positive points linked to validity	Negative points linked to validity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear objective measures• Peer reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Socially desirable answers• Bias of researcher/publisher

Exemplar candidate work

Question 2(d) – Medium level answer

(d)* Evaluate your secondary sources with reference to:

- how you located them
- validity.

I used mainly internet searches to find my ^{Sources} ~~sources~~. I then researched further into what I was finding which then lead me to more research with another focus, still relating to my chosen source.

In terms of validity, all sources used were trust worthy and relevant. The research and research methods used did measure what they intended to measure, which was proving that childcare costs are too high. All numerical data helped to show accurate statistics, and surveys and interviews taken were efficient as they both provided first-hand ^{and} reliable data which helped to build evidence against my chosen source.

[10]

Commentary

This was a medium level answer and was placed in the bottom of Level 2. This candidate had provided evidence for both how they located sources and the validity of the sources but they had failed to state any positives and negatives.

How they located sources	Validity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Through internet searches	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• From a trustworthy source• They measured what they intended to measure

This candidate could have further developed their answer by being more explicit with evaluation points; they needed to look at both positive and negatives with respect to both of the required aspects.

Exemplar candidate work

Question 2(d) – High level answer

(d)* Evaluate your secondary sources with reference to:

- how you located them
- validity.

Firstly, I located my secondary sources using many different methods such as library databases, I used key words from my focus question such as "beetroot juice and hypertension" this gave me information on how effective beetroot juice was in aiding in preventing or helping with hypertension. I then based my location on finding out the link between hypertension and beetroot juice and the different types of research which had been carried. I used different websites to find out the different health benefits of beetroot juice and its significant role it had on hypertension. I also used key terminology in order to locate my sources in order to ensure they were complementary to one another. In addition, at one point I used "Google Scholar" in order to find scientific articles on the health benefits of beetroot juice and the link to decreasing hypertension, though that did not work I then based my research on using key terms in order to find my two complementary articles. Once I had located my sources I then had to determine whether they were supportive of my original article, I had a selection of four articles, though they were similar, I encountered a few problems as two of them were done [10]

2	d	On the individuals with conditions this strayed away from my original article so I decided not to pick it. I then had to check the validity, ensuring it was true (I done this by ensuring that the credibility of the publication journal and that they were recognised and the information was accurate. One of my sources was peer reviewed before its publication. The Clinton experiment was by nutrition journal and Siervo was by Oxford Academic.
---	---	---

Commentary

This was a high level answer as the candidate provided a detailed evaluation for how they located sources and they were able to provide positives with respect to the validity of the sources used.

How they located sources	Validity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of key terminology The use of library data bases Google scholar Some searches were seen as negative as they contained articles on people who 'strayed away from the original' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed An Oxford academic

Whilst they only provided one negative the answer 'was factually accurate, using appropriate terminology' and could therefore be placed in Level 3.

To further develop this answer the candidate should provide more negative points, particularly with reference to the validity of the sources used:

- Socially desirable answers.
- Bias of researcher.
- Lack of objective measures.



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:
resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk/healthandsocialcare OCR Customer Contact Centre

Vocational qualifications

Telephone 02476 851509

Facsimile 02476 851633

Email vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge 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 2018** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office 1 Hills Road, Cambridge CB1 2EU. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



**Cambridge
Assessment**



ISO 9001

001