

# **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  
**05871**

## **Mark Scheme for June 2022**

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 2022

## MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

### PREPARATION FOR MARKING

#### TRADITIONAL

Before the Standardisation meeting you must mark at least 10 scripts from several centres. For this preliminary marking you should use **pencil** and follow the **mark scheme**. Bring these **marked scripts** to the meeting.

### MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2 deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or by email.

5. **Crossed Out Responses**

Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

#### **Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions**

Where candidates have a choice of questions across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

#### **Multiple Choice Question Responses**

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate). When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

**Contradictory Responses**

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

**Short Answer Questions** (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

**Short Answer Questions** (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

**Longer Answer Questions** (requiring a developed response)














Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional lined pages if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add an annotation to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response)
  - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
  - OR if there is a comment which does not in anyway relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
  - OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the questionNote: Award 0 marks - for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question)
8. Assistant Examiners will email a brief report on the performance of candidates to your Team Leader (Supervisor) by the end of the marking period. Your report should contain notes on particular strength displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

9. For answers marked by levels of response:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
  - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Award mark</b>
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

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

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

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Surveys</b></p> <p><b>MAX ONE ADVANTAGE FROM:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• easy to conduct</li> <li>• able to gather large samples / amount of data</li> <li>• people are used to them so willing to complete</li> <li>• can be sent out via e-mail / computer based systems – saving time, effort and costs / easy to distribute</li> <li>• can provide both qualitative and quantitative data</li> <li>• use of Likert scales / scaled responses</li> <li>• anonymity</li> <li>• faster</li> <li>• cheap to administer</li> <li>• easy to generate contact lists</li> <li>• target appropriate participants</li> <li>• easier to analyse</li> </ul> <p><b>MAX ONE DISADVANTAGE FROM:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• respondents may not give honest responses or accurate answers</li> <li>• can not verify participants</li> <li>• socially desirable answers / Hawthorn effect</li> <li>• questions can be poorly worded / confusing / misunderstood</li> <li>• patients may not have a computer / access to e mails / lack of accessibility</li> <li>• low response rate</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p>(2x1)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPT</b> other appropriate examples</p> <p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to validity or reliability</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><b>(b)*</b></p> <p><b>Random sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate if randomly sampling from elderly patients</li> <li>• selects participants from larger group</li> <li>• individuals chosen by chance</li> <li>• each individual has equal chance of being included in survey e.g. survey sent to all elderly patients</li> </ul> <p><b>Stratified sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• form of random sampling</li> <li>• population divided into groups</li> <li>• should be representative of the population</li> <li>• results can be generalised to the population</li> <li>• prevents a biased result if the selection is accurate</li> <li>• small samples can 'skew' the results</li> <li>• groups called strata</li> <li>• groups have common characteristics e.g. survey sent to patients of similar age</li> </ul> <p><b>Opportunity sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sample from individuals available</li> <li>• at time of survey</li> <li>• patients willing to take part / engaged in the process</li> <li>• fit criteria e.g. patients who have visited health centre that week would be sent survey to complete</li> <li>• may not be able to make generalisations</li> </ul> <p><b>Snowball sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• existing participants provide referrals / enrol others</li> <li>• non probability sampling method</li> </ul> <p><b>Systematic sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• probability sampling method</li> <li>• selection of participants of population at regular intervals – statistical method</li> <li>• simple random sampling</li> </ul>	6	<p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> <b>Detailed description of <u>two different</u> sampling strategies.</b></p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> <b>Sound description of <u>two different</u> sampling strategies.</b> <b>OR Sub max of 3 for one done well</b></p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> <b>Limited or basic description of sampling strategies. Answers may be list like.</b></p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <p><b>If the sampling method is incorrectly stated then the answer must be marked as wrong.</b></p>



Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Self-selecting ( volunteer)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• non probability sampling technique</li> <li>• volunteer to take part – asked directly or responding to advert / chosen to take part</li> <li>• volunteers could have a strong opinion re the survey content</li> </ul> <p><b>Purposive sampling ( judgemental)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• selective or subjective sampling</li> </ul> <p><b>Non probability sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researchers rely on their own judgement when choosing participants</li> </ul> <p><b>Convenience sampling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No probability sampling technique</li> <li>• Samples are due to convenience</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not accept - Whole population</b></p>		<p><b>If the description does not match the sampling method then the answer must be marked as wrong.</b></p> <p>If more than two sampling methods have been included – only mark the first two:</p> <p>Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	(i)	<p>Establishing whether there is a need to provide a child care facility. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Establishing whether there is a need to increase the number of seats in the waiting-room. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Establishing whether there is a need to increase the Information made available on health conditions for patients visiting the health care centre <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	1 (1x1)	If more than 1 tick is used then only assess the first tick, working from top to bottom
1	(c)	(ii)	<p><b>ANY TWO FROM:</b> <b>Ways to <u>improve</u> health care practices for elderly patients:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide specialist nurse / elderly care nurse ✓</li> <li>• Provide physiotherapy ✓</li> <li>• Reduce waiting time for appointments ✓</li> <li>• Have support worker available ✓</li> <li>• Provide follow-up appointments ✓</li> <li>• Create more appointments ✓</li> <li>• Lengthen the time of appointments ✓</li> <li>• Have other health specialists available e.g. dentists, pharmacists ✓</li> <li>• Enhanced coordination of staff involved with the elderly Communication skills <b>training</b> for the staff ✓ <b>TRAINING NEEDS TO BE QUALIFIED</b></li> <li>• Producing leaflets in different languages on health conditions ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Accept any other valid answer linked to improving health care practices</b></p>	2 (2x1)	<p><b>ACCEPT:</b> other appropriate ways.</p> <p><b>Answers should be relevant to health care.</b></p> <p><b>Do not accept:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to physical accessibility of the building</li> <li>• The development of policies</li> <li>• Professional expectations of staff, i.e. patience, calling patients by their preferred name</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance								
1	(d)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Example</th> <th>Methodology</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Data collected by a researcher asking open-ended questions during an interview.</td> <td>qualitative</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data collected using a video to record a family in their home.</td> <td>qualitative / quantitative multi-methodology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data collected by measuring the heart rates of ten participants.</td> <td>quantitative</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Example	Methodology	Data collected by a researcher asking open-ended questions during an interview.	qualitative	Data collected using a video to record a family in their home.	qualitative / quantitative multi-methodology	Data collected by measuring the heart rates of ten participants.	quantitative	3 (3x1)	If more than one answer is given in the box no mark should be awarded.
Example	Methodology											
Data collected by a researcher asking open-ended questions during an interview.	qualitative											
Data collected using a video to record a family in their home.	qualitative / quantitative multi-methodology											
Data collected by measuring the heart rates of ten participants.	quantitative											

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1 (e)*	<p><b>The use of government statistics to help produce survey questions:</b></p> <p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should be freely available, with no cost implications</li> <li>• trustworthy source</li> <li>• accurate</li> <li>• questions will have been drafted by professional researchers and so should be valid and sound</li> <li>• are likely to have been based upon large samples and so their findings are likely to be representative and reliable</li> <li>• less time-consuming to <b>analyse</b> / research already completed</li> <li>• high generalisability – depend on type of data</li> <li>• statistics can give clear patterns / correlations</li> <li>• from a government source, content can be reused</li> <li>• up to date</li> <li>• credible</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may be difficult to check validity using official channels</li> <li>• questions and data could be misunderstood or misinterpreted</li> <li>• researcher bias is possible e.g. as governmental source, political bias is a possibility</li> <li>• data bases and the number of surveys available could be vast and complex, meaning they may be confusing, liable to be misunderstood</li> <li>• data may be out of date</li> <li>• low generalisability – due to a narrow focus / will only focus on a specific issue</li> <li>• Social desirability answers</li> <li>• Due to bias may be untrustworthy</li> </ul>	6	<p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b>  <b>Detailed discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the use of government statistics to help produce survey questions. Specific links made to producing survey questions to gain 6 marks</b></p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>  <b>Sound discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the use of government statistics to help produce survey questions</b></p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Sub-max of 3</b> if only advantages <b>OR</b> disadvantages.  <b>Sub max of 4</b> if there is an imbalance between advantages and disadvantages</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>  <b>Basic or limited discussion. Answers may be list like.</b></p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b>Factors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• manageable ✓</li><li>• original / interesting ✓</li><li>• answerable ✓</li><li>• clearly expressed / clear / avoiding jargon and slang ✓</li><li>• relevant ✓</li></ul>	3 (3x1)	<b>ACCEPT:</b> Alternative wording is acceptable

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)*	<p><b>Well structured</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• includes introduction</li> <li>• includes conclusion</li> <li>• written with clarity</li> <li>• link of secondary research ideas/key themes to own findings</li> <li>• includes research question /hypotheses</li> <li>• related to the article chosen (from pre-release)</li> <li>• <b>presenting findings</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Justification of appropriateness of your chosen secondary sources with regard to research methods they use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• secondary sources which used a variety of research methods</li> </ul> <p>e.g. case study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• providing in depth detail on one or a small group of individuals or a situation/setting e.g. action research</li> <li>• evaluative, investigative, and analytical research methods</li> <li>• designed to diagnose problems or weaknesses and help develop practical solutions.</li> <li>• e.g. literature review:</li> <li>• relevant to a particular issue, area of research, or theory, providing a description, summary, and critical evaluation</li> <li>• some evaluation of research methods</li> </ul> <p><b>Comparisons and contrasts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compares and contrasts methods, e.g. both quantitative data gathered / both used interviews</li> <li>• compares and contrasts findings</li> <li>• compares and contrasts sampling methods</li> <li>• compares and contrasts results</li> <li>• considers how secondary sources contributed to own findings</li> </ul>	10	<p><b>Source A: OT and stroke</b>  <b>Source B: Oral collagen and arthritis</b>  <b>Source C: Outdoor play and autism</b></p> <p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (8-10 marks)</b>  <b>Detailed presentation of secondary research which is <u>well structured</u>, has <u>justified the sources used (research methods)</u> and makes <u>comparisons and contrasts</u></b></p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2 (5-7 marks)</b>  <b>Sound presentation of secondary research which shows <u>sound structure</u>, has a <u>sound justification</u> of the sources used (research methods) and has made <u>sound comparisons and contrasts</u></b></p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Sub-max of 5</b> if only one from justification of secondary sources <u>OR</u> compares/contrasts</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b>  <b>Basic or limited presentation of secondary research. Answers may be list like.</b>  <i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2 (c)*	<p><b>Library searches:</b> journals / articles</p> <p><b>Positives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• written by subject experts</li> <li>• factual documented information</li> <li>• go through a "peer-review" process</li> <li>• checked by academics / experts</li> <li>• information is reliable</li> <li>• can include reports of current research</li> <li>• can include topic-specific information.</li> <li>• original research on a topic</li> </ul> <p><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they are not the best sources for general interest topics</li> <li>• wording may be difficult to understand</li> <li>• they may not have up-to-date information</li> <li>• may have to pay for information</li> </ul> <p><b>Library searches:</b> books</p> <p><b>Positives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contain historical data</li> <li>• comprehensive detail</li> <li>• contain background information</li> <li>• contain in-depth information</li> <li>• contain views of experts</li> <li>• authoritative information</li> </ul> <p><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they may not have up-to-date information.</li> <li>• could show bias</li> </ul> <p><b>Internet searches:</b> google / named website, e.g. NHS / <b>google scholar</b> / <b>JSTOR</b></p>	6	<p><b>Source A: OT and stroke</b>  <b>Source B: Oral collagen and arthritis</b>  <b>Source C: Outdoor play and autism</b></p> <p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b>  <b>Detailed evaluation of methods of locating secondary research and will include both positive and negative points.</b>  <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>  <b>Sound evaluation of one or more methods of locating secondary research including both positives and negatives.</b>  <i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Sub-max of 3</b> if only one method evaluated well.  <b>NOTE:</b> e.g. books and journals would count as two different methods of library searches <u>OR</u> only +ve or -ve</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>  <b>Basic or limited evaluation of methods of locating secondary research. Answers may be list like.</b>  <i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Positives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide up-to-date news and information</li> <li>• current events or trends</li> <li>• information on controversial topics</li> <li>• contain government publications</li> <li>• e.g. current reports</li> <li>• e.g. current statistics</li> <li>• e.g. current legislation</li> <li>• may have interviews</li> <li>• newspaper articles</li> <li>• research reports</li> <li>• usually no cost</li> <li>• peer reviewed – <b>linked to academic websites</b></li> <li>• Trustworthy - <b>linked to academic websites</b></li> <li>• Reliable- <b>linked to academic websites</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anyone can publish anything</li> <li>• website information may be inaccurate</li> <li>• information may be biased</li> <li>• information may be outdated</li> <li>• limited scholarly information available</li> <li>• access issues / locked - <b>linked to academic websites</b></li> <li>• complex and difficult to understand - <b>linked to academic websites</b></li> </ul>		<p><b>0 marks</b> <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><b>Use of key terms:</b></p> <p><b>Positives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevant to topic</li> <li>• allows quick search</li> <li>• lots of relevant articles found quickly</li> </ul> <p><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• terms may be unfamiliar</li> <li>• need to take care with spelling</li> <li>• may bring up irrelevant articles</li> </ul> </div>



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(d)	<p><b>ANY ONE FROM:</b></p> <p>Methods of ensuring that selected secondary source material is trustworthy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• chose sources that are unbiased ✓</li> <li>• avoided own confirmation bias in selecting sources of evidence /research. ✓</li> <li>• checked websites/ evidence for claims used. ✓</li> <li>• use of academic sources of information / academic search engines ✓</li> <li>• used sources that had been peer-reviewed✓</li> <li>• CARS method – credibility, accuracy, responsibility and support✓</li> <li>• sources used are verifiable ✓</li> <li>• produced by a reputable author or organisation ✓</li> <li>• peer reviewed✓</li> </ul>	<p><b>1</b> (1x1)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPT:</b> other appropriate methods</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(e)	<p><b>Important considerations in note-taking:</b></p> <p><b>Avoid plagiarism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• put notes in own words</li> <li>• not to directly copy unless it is a quotation</li> </ul> <p><b>Make accurate notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• record facts accurately / main points noted</li> <li>• accurate spelling of key terms / accurate dates</li> <li>• underlining key points / highlighting key points</li> </ul> <p><b>Acknowledge sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use citations</li> <li>• use referencing</li> <li>• record data used</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to presentation rather than accuracy, e.g. clear and easy to read</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b> (2x2)</p>	<p><b>For each outline:</b></p> <p><b>Two marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a sound outline of an appropriate consideration</li> <li>• detail that shows understanding and is relevant</li> </ul> <p><b>One mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a consideration identified</li> <li>• limited or no outline provided</li> </ul> <p>Candidates can gain points linked to their own research.</p> <p><b>ACCEPT:</b> other appropriate points</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2	<p data-bbox="264 244 315 276">(f)*</p> <p data-bbox="344 244 577 276"><b>Generalisability:</b></p> <p data-bbox="344 312 479 344"><b>Positives</b></p> <ul data-bbox="344 347 1021 483" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• large sample size</li> <li>• representative groups</li> <li>• variety of sample used appropriate for chosen topic, e.g. males / females / different age ranges</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="344 520 488 552"><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul data-bbox="344 555 667 659" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small samples</li> <li>• bias sample / groups</li> <li>• cultural differences</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="344 695 461 727"><b>Validity:</b></p> <p data-bbox="344 764 479 796"><b>Positives</b></p> <ul data-bbox="344 799 981 1078" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• measure what was intended to measure</li> <li>• variables were controlled</li> <li>• clear objective measures</li> <li>• peer reviewed</li> <li>• non biased source/ researcher</li> <li>• data presented in source was gathered using appropriate methodology</li> <li>• evidence to support findings</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="344 1115 488 1147"><b>Negatives</b></p> <ul data-bbox="344 1150 1055 1286" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• socially desirable answers/ demand characteristics</li> <li>• bias of researcher /publication</li> <li>• lack of objective measures</li> <li>• conformation bias</li> </ul> <div data-bbox="707 533 1016 743" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-left: 20px;"> <p>Allow repeats when evaluating different sources</p> </div>	10	<p data-bbox="1216 244 1727 339"><b>Source A: OT and stroke</b> <b>Source B: Oral collagen and arthritis</b> <b>Source C: Outdoor play and autism</b></p> <p data-bbox="1216 376 2024 440">Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p data-bbox="1216 480 1944 616"><b>Level 3 (8-10 marks)</b> <b>Detailed evaluation of secondary research. Points in evaluating are factually accurate and relevant. <u>Good balance between generalisability and validity</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="1216 647 2018 743"><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p data-bbox="1216 783 1968 887"><b>Level 2 (5-7 marks)</b> <b>Sound evaluation of secondary research. <u>Covers both generalisability and validity</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="1216 919 2040 1015"><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p data-bbox="1216 1054 2056 1118"><b>Sub-max of 5</b> if only one aspect evaluated well <u>OR</u> either +ve or -ve</p> <p data-bbox="1216 1158 1951 1222"><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b> <b>Basic or limited evaluation. Answers may be list like.</b></p> <p data-bbox="1216 1254 2051 1318"><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p data-bbox="1216 1358 1800 1422"><b>0 marks</b> <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2 (g)*	<p>Ways in which further research could be carried out:</p> <p><b>Questions that have not been answered</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions may not have been answered – to give an example</li> <li>• Further questions need to be asked – provide examples</li> <li>• Surveys, interviews etc may need to be carried out on aspects not considered</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas where further evidence is needed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locate / select further sources</li> <li>• Examples of areas where further evidence is needed may be given</li> <li>• Still needs to link to article</li> <li>• Could check any correlation with other data</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative research methods that could be used</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use alternative research methods</li> <li>• e.g. use different websites</li> <li>• e.g. use different books / journals</li> <li>• Cross-match e.g. published statistics from different sources linked to same theme</li> <li>• Increasing the number of participants / having a range of ages / genders / of differing cultures</li> </ul>	6	<p><b>Source A: OT and stroke</b>  <b>Source B: Oral collagen and arthritis</b>  <b>Source C: Outdoor play and autism</b></p> <p>Please refer to the marking instructions on page 4 of this mark scheme for guidance on how to mark this question.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b>  <b>Detailed discussion of possible further research.</b></p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>  <b>Sound discussion of possible further research.</b></p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>  <b>Brief discussion of further research. Answers may be list like.</b></p> <p><i>There is an attempt at a logical structure with a line of reasoning. The information is in the most part relevant.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  <i>No response or no response worthy of credit.</i></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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2022

