

**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 2020

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 2020

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

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick – correct answer
	Cross – incorrect answer
	Plus – use for positives
	Minus – use for negatives
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Benefit of doubt (This does count as a mark – so do not ‘tick’ as well)
	Omission mark
	Too vague
	Repeat
 or 	Noted but no credit given

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance								
1	(a)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Example</th> <th>Area of research</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Restricting promotions on sale of food and drink that are unhealthy</td> <td>Health policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provision of age appropriate activities and toys.</td> <td>Child development</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child protection and e-safety.</td> <td>Early years and childcare policy</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Example	Area of research	Restricting promotions on sale of food and drink that are unhealthy	Health policy	Provision of age appropriate activities and toys.	Child development	Child protection and e-safety.	Early years and childcare policy	3 (3x1)	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>If more than one answer is given in a box, credit the first one.</p>
Example	Area of research											
Restricting promotions on sale of food and drink that are unhealthy	Health policy											
Provision of age appropriate activities and toys.	Child development											
Child protection and e-safety.	Early years and childcare policy											
1	(b)	<p>Choose two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve outcomes for individuals • Establish evidence base • Improve practice • Identify gaps in provision / identifying needs • Measure impact • Increase knowledge and understanding • Assess and review • Cost effectiveness • Identify needs of users 	2 (2x1)	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers linked to informing policy 								

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<p>1 (c) (i) (ii)</p>	<p>Two marks Choose one research method AND one linked advantage</p> <p>survey / questionnaire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • asking of closed questions • balance of open and closed questions • balance of quantitative and qualitative data • allows use of Likert scales/scaled responses • can be administered by post or email as well as on telephone or face-to-face • large sample • cheap to administer • accessible – remote / face to face • statistical evidence from closed questions <p>interviews / focus groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • choice of format: structured, semi-structured or unstructured • allows asking of open as well as closed questions • can be recorded orally/tape recorded • able to expand on answers <p>case study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allows in-depth study of an individual, group or organisation • allows study over a period of time <p>Accept any other reasonable responses that are clearly linked to the advantage of using the chosen research method.</p> <p>The following methods are not suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experimental method (Randomised Controlled Trial) • observation, i.e. formal and informal • action research 	<p>2 (1x1 1x1)</p>	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">  </div> <p>If the primary research is incorrect in part (i) then part (ii) must be marked as incorrect.</p> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers linked to ethical issues, e.g. confidentiality

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(d)*	<p>Literature reviews positives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides a range of different sources comprehensive and detailed sources are referenced credentials of publications and authors are taken into account forms a basis / insight into your own research can provide data easily accessible; internet / library same perspective as own research reliability validity <p>negatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> bias / personal viewpoint question reliability reliability validity generalisability sponsored by industry time consuming complex terminology may be a cost involved different perspective as own research out of date information 	6	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is evaluate.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fully detailed evaluation at least two positives and two negatives <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sound evaluation at least one positive and negative <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited / basic evaluation positive and /or negative points <p>Annotation  For strengths and  for limitations</p>	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Answers will provide a detailed evaluation of methods of secondary research. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Answers will provide some evaluation Answers are presented with some structure and are relevant to secondary research. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence. Sub max of 3 for either positives or negatives done well</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Answer provides basic/limited evaluation. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</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>Journals:</p> <p>positives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written by subject experts • factual documented information • go through a "peer-review" process • checked by academics / experts • information is reliable • can include reports of current research • can include topic-specific information. • original research on a topic <p>negatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • peer-review process can take time • they are not the best sources for general interest topics • wording may be difficult to understand • they may not have up-to-date information • may have to pay for information <p>books:</p> <p>positives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contain historical data • comprehensive detail • contain background information • contain in-depth information • contain views of experts • authoritative information <p>negatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can take a long time to write • can take a long time to publish • they may not have up-to-date information 			

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">multi-methodology OR mixed methods	1 (1x1)	<p>No other answers are acceptable.</p> <p>Annotation: The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">^ TV REP SEEN</div>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(f)*	<p>Ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure transparency – who commissioned it and purpose of research avoid deception ensure personal information is secure keep participants informed offer opportunities to see finished research ensure access to support groups cause no harm / maintain safety of participants obtain informed parental consent / permission obtain individual consent obtain consent from the youth centre protect anonymity or confidentiality consider age appropriateness use research findings responsibly allow participants the right to withdraw maintain integrity consult ethical review boards consult legislation debrief participants 	6	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is discuss.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fully detailed discussion well-developed, clear and logically structured <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sound discussion mostly relevant and accurate information <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited / basic discussion basic information 	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Answers will provide a detailed discussion of ethical issues that needed to be considered. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Answers will provide sound discussion of ethical issues that needed to be considered. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence. Sub max of 3 for one ethical issue done well or several briefly discussed</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Answer provides basic/limited discussion. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</p> <p>0 marks – response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Content	Levels of response
2 (a)*	<p>Source A: The role of inequality and materialism Source B: Sexual and reproductive health and human rights of women living with HIV Source C: The first generation growing older with HIV</p> <p>trustworthiness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chose sources that were unbiased • checked websites/ evidence for claims used. • use of academic sources of information. • use of sources that had been peer-reviewed • CARS method – credibility, accuracy, responsibility and support • ethical considerations <p>appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • credible authorship • credible organisation, e.g. reputable charities and government publications • suitable level of scholarship • accessibility of language • provides quality of information • variety of styles – research methods used <p>relevance to pre-release material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has same similar research question or objectives • comparable timeframe • relevance to chosen topic • information from similar countries / regions • contrasting information • use of key terms <p>complementary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complements pre-release • used to support data • similar findings <p>validity reliability</p>	6	<p>Annotation: The number of ticks will not necessarily correspond to the marks awarded. This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is explain.</p> <p>Level 3 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fully detailed explanation • explicitly related to article chosen from pre-release • at least two reasons for selection explained <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound explanation • implicitly related to article chosen from pre-release • two reasons for selection with some explanation <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited / basic explanation • basic information <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of the internet / libraries: the Q is related to choice of secondary sources not ease of accessibility 	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Answers will provide a detailed explanation for selection of secondary sources. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Answers will provide some explanation for selection of secondary sources. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence. Sub-max of 3 if only one reason for selection explained or several briefly explained</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Answer provides basic/limited explanation. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</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
2 (b)*	<p>Source A: The role of inequality and materialism</p> <p>Source B: Sexual and reproductive health and human rights of women living with HIV</p> <p>Source C: The first generation growing older with HIV</p> <p>Developing a focus / theme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is relevant to the pre-release topic it is original and interesting linked to personal interest / career use of key terms / phrases / points developing a hypothesis <p>Writing good research questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> range of questions; open and closed questions that produce both qualitative and quantitative data use of pilot questions questions are answerable appropriate / accessible language examples of questions provided developing a hypothesis <p>Making accurate notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> notes in their own words avoiding plagiarism acknowledging sources use of referencing systems to support conclusions acknowledging patterns / trends / comparisons Make key terms clear 	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 analyse</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 done well <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sound analysis understanding of the context may be implicit related to article chosen from pre-release analysis in the most part well developed <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited / basic analysis basic information presented in an unstructured way 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks Answers provide a detailed analysis. All three aspects will be addressed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2: 5-7 marks Answers provide a sound analysis. Two of the aspects will be addressed. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks Answers provide a limited analysis. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</p> <p>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(c)	<p>Choose two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well-structured • has an introduction • has a conclusion / makes judgments • clear expression / clarity • justified appropriateness of research methods • references • no slang / jargon • provide recommendations • State hypothesis / research questions • no bias • non judgemental • including data to support argument • accuracy <p>Accept any other reasonable responses that are clearly linked to formal writing</p>	<p>2 (2x1)</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build an argument • plagiarism • ethical issues

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(d)*	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 presenting conclusions</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 presentation • clear understanding of the context • conclusions are backed up <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound presentation • sound understanding of the context <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basic / limited presentation • lacking an understanding of the context 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks Answers provide a detailed presentation of their conclusions. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2: 5-7 marks Answers provide a sound presentation of their conclusions. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-4 marks Answers present limited conclusions. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</p> <p>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<p>2 (e)</p>	<p>One mark for each point made, four required</p> <p>(i) Strengths e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large amount of information / data available • large sample size • generalisable • easily available • reliable • valid • can find topic areas • cost effective • up to date • peer reviewed • relevance • ethical • qualitative data / in depth <p>(ii) Limitations e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible bias • may have changed over time • difficult to make comparisons • may have lacked authenticity • could not verify author • may not be representative • no peer review • out of date • interpretation concerns • time consuming <p>Accept any other reasonable responses</p>	<p>4</p> <p>(2 x 1)</p> <p>(2 x 1)</p>	<p>Annotation:</p> <p>The number of ticks must match the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>For incorrect answers use the cross or appropriate annotation from the following:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(f)*	8	<p>This is a level of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of answer is discuss.</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 • implications drawn relevant to findings <p>Level 2 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound discussion • implications reasonably relevant to findings <p>Level 1 – checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basic / limited discussion • implications drawn may not be explicit 	<p>Level 3: 7-8 marks Answers provide a detailed discussion of the possible implications of their findings. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p>Level 2: 4-6 marks Answer provides a sound discussion of the possible implications of their findings. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence. Sub-max of 4 for only one done well.</p> <p>Level 1: 1-3 marks Answer provides a brief discussion of the possible implications of their findings. There is an attempt at a logical line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</p> <p>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</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 2020

