

**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 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
	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/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(a)*	<p>Possible purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess /review any interventions used in the housing department. Check for cost effectiveness (may be financial or in terms of time/staff/ resources) To improve outcomes for individuals using the housing department/ and or staff To improve practice in the housing department To establish an evidence base for interventions To identify gaps in provision/ make improvements to the housing department To identify the needs of users of the housing department/ staff needs To inform / review policies – may help suggest new policies or changes to some To increase knowledge and understanding of the needs of staff and/or users To measure the impact of policies on practice in the housing department Are current practices fit for purpose How people currently benefit <p>Do not accept – How many houses they need / reduce harm and abuse / to gain quantitative data</p>	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 Two possible purposes 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 At least one purpose May identify information presented in an unstructured way/ list like Limited/no use of terminology QWC - low 	<p>Level 2: (4-5 marks) Answer provides a detailed explanation of two possible purposes of this research. There is accurate use of appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 1: (1-3 marks) Answer provides a limited or basic explanation of one or two possible purposes of this research. Links to the scenario 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. Sub- max 3 if only one purpose done well.</p> <p>0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p> <p>SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(b)	(ii)	<p>One mark for a suitable question that would gain qualitative data. One required.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>How would you describe your experience of using the Housing Department?</p> <p>The question may be targeted at users and/or staff – both creditworthy</p> <p>Accept any suitable question format</p>	<p>1 (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>Only credit questions that have relevance to the research</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
1	(b)(iii)*	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost effective • Easy to conduct • Easy to analyse • Primary research • Replicable/reliable • Able to gather large samples/ amount of data • People are used to them so willing to complete • Can be sent out via e-mail /computer based systems –saving time effort and costs • Can provide both qualitative and quantitative data to allow some insight and statistical analysis • Choice of format, e.g. postal or e-mail • Generalisability • Anonymity 	<p>Strengths/Limitations</p> <p>Do not accept reference to expense unless qualified</p>	<p>10</p> <p>This is a levels 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 • Two strengths and two limitations • Correct use of appropriate terminology • Explicit links to the scenario • Well-developed line of reasoning • Logically structured • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound analysis • Link to scenario may be implicit • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic analysis • Information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: (8-10 marks)</p> <p>Answer provides a detailed analysis of the use of questionnaires. At least two strengths and two limitations of questionnaires. Explicit links to the scenario will be given. 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 a sound analysis of the use of questionnaires. Link to scenario may be implicit. Answers will be factually accurate. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub-max of 5 for only strengths and/or limitations done well.</p> <p>Level 1: (1-4 marks)</p> <p>Answer provides a limited analysis of use of questionnaires. At lower end answers may be descriptive. 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
	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents may not give honest responses or accurate answers • Cannot verify participant(s) • Socially desirable answers / Hawthorn effect • Questions can be poorly worded/ confusing / misunderstood • Questions may not cover all options/topics the respondent wants • Standard response bias- people may just tick the same option to complete the questionnaire quickly • Low response rate • There could be some communication difficulties with the client group • Time consuming • Large sample to analyse data • Biased results due to poor sampling method <p>Accept other suitable strengths/limitations</p> <p>Candidates may analyse by comparing the use of questionnaires to other research methods; this is creditworthy</p>		<p>Annotation  For strengths and  for limitations / COMP for comparisons to other methods</p>	

Question	Answer/indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1 (c)	<p>Three marks for an outline. One required</p> <p>Candidates may include the following aspects in regards to ethical principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent – making sure the resident knows the purpose of the research and how it may be used • Maintaining anonymity/ confidentiality- use of fake names/ not using the residents' real name or any identifying features. They could be worried about being evicted – another reason for this aspect. • Protection from harm – the resident should not be caused to feel distressed Procedures stopped if participant shows distress in relation to the case study topics/questions • Debrief- check at the end of the case study that they understood the purpose • Withdrawal- allow the resident the right to withdrawal at any point during the research • Responsible use of the findings • Written consent gained – with time given for the resident to read through information on the case study • Fully informed of the right not to answer questions/ stop the research • To avoid deception • To ensure transparency and integrity 	3 (1x3)	<p>For three marks the outline must be clear</p> <p>Three marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear outline of an ethical principle applying to the use of a case study for this research <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts an outline but link to case study method and/or research is not clear <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle identified but not in context of case study or this research. 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;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div>



Question		Answer/indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p>Source A: Factor VIII Gene Transfer Source B: Daily Mile Source C: Person-Centred Care on Quality of Life</p> <p>One mark for each identification. Two required</p> <p>Candidates will identify ways that they avoided plagiarism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making notes in own words • Acknowledging sources of information / referencing • Clarity in providing quotations <p>Accept other suitable possible ways</p>	<p>2 (2 x 1)</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;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(b)*	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 • Both locating and selecting aspects covered • Appropriate use of correct terminology • Well-developed line of reasoning • Logically structured • QWC - high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound discussion • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • 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) Answer provides a detailed discussion of the sources of information used, both in terms of locating sources and selecting sources. 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 the sources of information used, both in terms of locating sources and selecting sources. Answers will be coherent, with correct use of terminology. 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) Answer provides a basic discussion of the sources of information used. Answer provides a limited or basic discussion 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>

Question	Answer/indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 (c)	<p>Source A: Factor VIII Gene Transfer Source B: Daily Mile Source C: Person-Centred Care on Quality of Life</p> <p>Two marks for a summary.</p> <p>Candidates may include any benefits of using sources of information to help them develop a focus. This may include (list not exhaustive)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping to pin down key findings/ samples • Identifying trends in research • Gaining contemporary sources of information making sure the research is relevant • Making the research focus manageable in scope • Finding original and interesting research to help choose a focus • Making the focus answerable • Helping gain clarity in terms of their focus. • Helping them to discount some ideas early on to save time • Aiding the development of research Q / hypothesis. <p>Accept other well summarised, appropriate, answers.</p>	2 (1x2)	<p>For two marks the summary must be clear</p> <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear summary with link to the candidates chosen focus <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts summary but lacks clarity/ and/or no link to own focus of research <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>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(d)* Source A: Factor VIII Gene Transfer Source B: Daily Mile Source C: Person-Centred Care on Quality of Life Differences and Similarities may include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity • Reliability • Ethical considerations • Usefulness • Sampling issues • Generalisability • Implications of the research • Research methods used • Potential bias • Trustworthiness of sources 	6	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is comparison.</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 contrast and comparison • To have specified their two sources • Appropriate use of correct terminology • Well-developed line of reasoning • Logically structured • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound contrast and comparison • In context of own research/focus • Link to their secondary sources may be implicit. • Logically structured • Correct use of terminology • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic contrast and comparison • May not place in context of own research/focus • information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC – low 	<p>Level 3: (5-6 marks) Answer provides a detailed contrast and comparison of findings from secondary research. Link to their secondary sources will be explicit. At least two findings compared. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2: (3-4 marks) Answer provides a sound contrast and comparison in relation to their findings. Link to their secondary sources may be implicit. Answers will be coherent, with correct use of terminology. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub-max of 3 for one comparison point done well.</p> <p>Level 1: (1-2 marks) Answer provides a limited/basic contrast and comparison in relation to their findings. Points made may not be in context of their research. 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 SEEN for a zero mark response</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2	(e)*	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 • Well-developed line of reasoning • Both reliability and generalisability • Both positive and negative • Explicitly linked to secondary • Correct use of terminology • QWC - high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound evaluation across both terms • Both validity and generalisability • Implicit links to secondary sources • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited / basic analysis • Limited relevance to secondary • List like / muddled • QWC - low 	<p>Level 3: 8-10 marks Answer provides a detailed evaluation of secondary sources in terms of both reliability and generalisability. 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 evaluation of secondary sources across reliability and generalisability. Answers will be factually accurate. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max of 5 for only reliability or generalisability done well. OR positives or negatives done well</p> <p>Level 1: 1 - 4 marks Answer provides a limited attempt at an evaluation of secondary sources in terms of reliability and/or generalisability. 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 0 marks - response not worthy of credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
	<p>Generalisability of secondary sources</p> <p>Positive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large sample • Representative sampling method • Variety of sample used appropriate for chosen topic <p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small samples • Bias sample/groups • Cultural differences 		<p>Annotation  For positives and  for negatives</p>	

Question	Answer/indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 (f)	<p>Source A: Factor VIII Gene Transfer Source B: Daily Mile Source C: Person-Centred Care on Quality of Life</p> <p>Two descriptions. Two marks each.</p> <p>Answers may describe implications for:</p> <p>Practitioners/professionals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work practices/roles/tasks • Approaches e.g. preventative/treatment, empowerment • Prioritising/making choices • Work hours • Pay and conditions <p>Government policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Planning/policies/laws • Resources • Targeting/priorities • Provision <p>Individuals/ groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treatments • Use of services • Feedback • Time scales for assessments <p>Settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy implications • Staffing issues • Accessibility issues. • Further research 	4 (2x2)	<p>For two marks the description must be clear.</p> <p>Two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description in context of the implications of their own findings <p>One mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts description, but no link to own findings <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-top: 10px;"> ^ TV REP SEEN </div>

Question	Answer/indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Systems in place• Training• Policy implementation• Clear procedures• Accountability <p>The above can be interchangeable</p> <p>Accept other appropriate implications</p> <p>Do not accept repeats</p>		

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance	
			Content	Levels of response
2 (g)*	<p>Source A: Factor VIII Gene Transfer Source B: Daily Mile Source C: Person-Centred Care on Quality of Life</p> <p>Suggestions of areas for future research will be applicable to the candidates chosen focus /own research</p> <p>Suggestions for future research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions that have not been answered • Alternative research methods that could be used (and so gain different information) • Gaps in research/ further information needed • To check reliability and/or validity of the findings <p>Accept other suitable justifications.</p>	6	<p>This is a levels of response question – marks are awarded on the quality of the response given. The focus of the question is suggestion and justification using reasons</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 suggestions • Appropriate use of correct terminology • At least two areas. • Well-developed line of reasoning • Logically structured • QWC – high <p>Level 2 checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound suggestions • Logically structured • Sub max 3 for one suggestion done well. • Two areas given • Correct use of terminology • QWC – mid <p>Level 1 checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited/basic suggestions • Little or no explicit link to findings • Information presented in an unstructured way/ list like • Limited/no use of terminology • QWC - low 	<p>Level 3: (5-6 marks) Answer provides detailed suggestions of areas for future research. Link to their findings will be explicit. At least two areas. Answers will be factually accurate, using appropriate terminology. There will be few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p> <p>Level 2: (3-4 marks) Answer provides sound suggestions of areas for future research. Link to their findings will be implicit. Answers will be coherent, with correct use of terminology. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Sub max 3 for one suggestion done well.</p> <p>Level 1: (1-2 marks) Answer provides limited or basic suggestion(s) for areas for future research. Suggestions will be brief and/or not explicitly linked to own research. 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 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

