

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Report on the Units

January 2007

H128/H528/MS/R/07J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A- level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are 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.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
G182	Leisure Industry Practise	2
G184	Human Resources in the Leisure Industry	5
*	Principal Moderator's Report	8
*	Grade Thresholds	12

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

The Principal Moderator has submitted a detailed report on the issues identified by moderators for the four portfolio units (G180, G181, G183 and G185) entered this session and Centres are strongly advised to refer to this for guidance on the development of candidates' work.

It was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres resubmitting work from the summer series had successfully addressed the issues identified by moderators. Some Centres however, are still experiencing problems interpreting the quality requirements of individual assessment objectives. These Centres are strongly advised to consult the exemplar material published by the board as guidance. In addition, it is essential that these Centres take on board the comments made in the Principal Moderator's Report and Centre reports in order to develop and improve their performance.

The overall response to the requirements of units G183 and G185 was pleasing, with the majority of Centres using relevant industry based activities to facilitate the requirements of the individual assessment objectives.

In the case of all internally assessed units, one of the main reasons for scaling remains the fact that some Centres marked candidates work at the higher marks, when significant elements of the assessment criteria within the mark band were either missing or lacked the depth and detail required of the higher level. There was also evidence that some candidates were misdirected in relation to aspects of the qualification. Centres are also reminded of the need to use up to date sources and of the importance of clear and detailed annotation of candidate work.

For the examined Units, G182 and G184, there was significant evidence that some candidates had been entered for this examination without thorough examination preparation. Despite pre-released case studies many candidates appeared unfamiliar with their content and in particular their reflection of the key elements of each specification. As with previous examination series, both Principal Examiner's Reports include comments which imply candidates were not able to effectively respond to command words such as 'analyse' 'discuss' etc and that their understanding of some of the technical terms included in each specification was poor. Centres clearly need to spend some time developing candidates' examination technique, in particular their analytical and evaluative skills, if they are to pick up the higher level marks from the mark scheme. Centres are strongly urged to study both Principal Examiner Reports in order to improve levels of performance in future examination sessions.

G182: Leisure Industry Practice (Written Examination)

General Comments

As with previous sessions pre-release case study material had been forwarded to the Centres. The case study was based on Jefford Leisure Centre. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it presently operated. This also included a diagram of a MIS system. The case study material provided a range of topics in order to satisfy the 'What You Need to Learn' section. The question paper was broken down into five questions, all with sub-sections. It gave candidates at the higher end the opportunity to gain a good mark, whilst also offering candidates at the lower end the opportunity to gain a pass. As with the two previous sessions, candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It was clear that many candidates were ill prepared for the examination, with a limited number completing the paper to a high standard. Centres need to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of the unit. Many candidates are describing and explaining when they should be discussing or analysing, thus limiting the grade they can achieve. There was limited development of answers into Levels 3 and 4, which seemed to be a reflection of examination technique rather than ability.

Again, Centres need to make full use of the pre-release case study material by extracting and developing the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the unit 3 specification. There was also a limited use of vocational examples studied.

The majority of candidates seem to have had effective time management skills, as on the whole, they completed the questions set. Centres should enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing the candidates to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace. Candidates also would benefit from sessions on examination preparation which include the use of command words, and further developed use of the pre-release material.

Comments on individual questions

- 1
- (a) Candidates, in the main, stated the benefits of a quality standard rather than the principles.
 - (b)(i) Most candidates were able to state relevant information needed for the work record system to operate.
 - (ii) The majority of candidates focused on the word 'stock', and many did not understand the term 'stock control system'. Answers were often the same point expressed in different ways.
 - (c) Candidates clearly understood the concept of target groups, but focused on this rather than making the link between the information which could be obtained from the systems in order to increase the numbers in these groups. Lack of development limited marks to Level 2.
- 2
- (a)(i) Candidates, in the main, stated the benefits of 'The Children's Act' rather than the requirements of the Act.
 - (ii) Candidates in the main stated the benefits of 'The Disability Discrimination Act' rather than the requirements of the Act.
 - (b) The risk assessment was very well answered, with most candidates achieving full marks. Good examples were given, although often candidates suggested more than one example of who could be injured, consequence, etc.
 - (c) Candidates clearly understood the COSHH regulations, and could state basic actions should be taken to ensure that the Act was enforced correctly. Candidates failed to pick up on the element of the question on management procedures.
 - (d) Well answered with candidates being able to identify ways in which the security of the management information system could be ensured.
- 3
- (a) Some candidates outlined all of the marketing mix, but described rather than evaluated. A number of candidates misinterpreted the question and focused on the word 'marketing' and described this process in relation to JLC. Some candidates only looked at one of the elements of the marketing mix.
 - (b) Well answered with candidates identifying suitable promotional methods for attracting target groups.
 - (c) The SWOT analysis was generally well done with the majority of candidates being able to identify examples for each section. A number of candidates were unable to differentiate between strengths and weaknesses being internal and opportunities being external to the organisation.
 - (d) Well answered, with the majority of candidates achieving full marks. The main mistakes made were a confusion between environmental and economic, and economically instead of economic.
- 4
- (a) There was a limited response, with most candidates focusing on money going in and out of the organisation, but not developing the point any further.

Report on the Units taken in January 2007

- (b) Poor response with few candidates being able to list four items on a balance sheet.
 - (c) Generally a poor response, with many candidates lacking a basic understanding of the make up, purpose or use of a balance sheet. Many candidates confused it with a profit and loss account.
- 5
- (a) Candidates made a good effort to gain marks here, and suggested answers which considered the needs of its target groups. Candidates made best use of facilities studied to support points being made.
 - (b) Generally well answered with candidates being able to suggest appropriate ways in which the organisation can demonstrate it listens.
 - (c) Well answered with most candidates being able to identify ways in which JLC could use electronic technology to communicate with its users.

G184: Human Resources in the Leisure Industry (Written Examination)

General Comments

This was the first examination for this unit and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates attempted all the questions. There was little evidence of the time pressure affecting the performance of candidates, despite the fact that question 4(b) was the least satisfactory in terms of candidate performance.

For this examination candidates are issued with a pre-release case study prior to the examination. Centres and candidates should be reminded that a significant proportion of the marks for this examination relate to the skill of application of knowledge, skills and understanding and that it is through the case study that much of these marks can be accessed. Centres should be encouraged to use the case study with candidates prior to the examination, not to question spot, but apply their knowledge and analysis within a specific context.

As an A2 unit, for many of the questions, the examination requires candidates to evaluate, draw conclusions and make judgments relating to their analysis. Not only is it important for candidates to develop this higher level skill over a period of time, it is imperative that candidates be able to recognise when the question requires them to make judgments and draw conclusions. Centres should ensure candidates are able to identify when a question requires evaluation – key words such as ‘discuss’ and ‘evaluate’.

The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the specified content. However, a significant number of candidates appeared lacking in this respect. Where candidates have a clear understanding of the unit specification, as given in the ‘What You Need to Learn’ section of the specification, they are able to access the marks available for the application, analysis and evaluation of their knowledge.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1
- (a) Candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of the different types of employment opportunities and were able to explain both the advantages and disadvantages of using these within the leisure industry.
 - (b) A significant number of candidates appeared to have little or no knowledge of human resource planning. Many candidates were unable to demonstrate an understanding of competition for job seekers and so were unable to access the marks for analysis and evaluation. Where candidates were able to demonstrate this knowledge, the analysis and application to *Fit4Life* was of a high standard. However, the vast majority of candidates were unable to effectively make reasoned judgments on the extent to which the issues would affect the organisation. A significant number of candidates were unable to identify a valid internal issue which may have affected *Fit4Life*. Centres should be reminded that it is essential that candidates are aware of the 'What You Need To Learn' section of the unit specification. As with the external issue, better candidates were able to apply and analyse but were generally unable to evaluate.
- 2
- (a) Responses to this question were generally good with candidates able to explain why leisure posts might be advertised both internally and externally.
 - (b) This question was less well answered. Better responses were to apply the answer, linking the method of recruitment advertising with the circumstances of the particular post and the organisation. In attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of the advertisement, the better responses demonstrated the principle of 'less is more'. Weaker answers merely listed as many good and bad points of the advertisement as they could and so were limited to marks at Level 1. Better responses attempted to make judgments about the extent of fewer strengths and weaknesses of the advertisement and were, therefore, rewarded at Level 2.
 - (c) For this question, candidates were able to demonstrate their extensive knowledge of CVs, but were unable to explain why this method of application was suitable for the post of General Manager at *Fit4Life* and thus were only rewarded for knowledge and understanding. Better answers were able to analyse why a CV and letter of application might be better for the specific post being advertised and why this method might be a better method for *Fit4Life*, comparing it to the use of other methods of application. A significant number of candidates argued it would be better to interview the applicants, suggesting a lack of understanding of the difference between the recruitment and selection process.
- 3
- (a) It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates were able to explain the term 'management by objectives' with some degree of accuracy. However, a significant proportion of candidates **did not** go on to explain how this might apply to Gareth Jones, instead offering a theoretical response to the benefits of this as a motivational technique. Candidates should be encouraged to read each question carefully before answering.

- (b) Most candidates were able to identify one other motivational technique and were rewarded accordingly. The majority of candidates then went on to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of that method in a purely theoretical manner, ignoring that an analysis of the technique was required within the context of both *Fit4Life* and its application to staff working effectively as a team. Better answers focused on working in teams and job enrichment as relevant motivational techniques. Those candidates who suggested team building days were rewarded but it was much more difficult to reward candidates who suggested pay rises for all staff or individual bonuses without an analysis centred on their effectiveness to get staff, with different methods of employment and working shifts, to work as a team.
 - (c) Candidates had a very good understanding of different appraisal techniques. However, weaker candidates were only able to describe the advantages of appraisals as a method of managing the performance of employees. Better candidates were able to critically analyse their effectiveness within the context of *Fit4Life*, commenting on their effectiveness for the different types of employees at the organisation, stating it was more likely to be effective with full time staff at higher levels of the organisation and less effective with part-time staff or the self employed.
- 4
- (a) Where candidates were aware of the relevant legislation they were able to explain the implications for *Fit4Life*. However, once again, a significant number of candidates demonstrated no knowledge relating to these two pieces of legislation. Centres should be reminded of the need to cover all aspects of the 'What You Need To Learn' in order to prepare candidates for the examination.
 - (b) This was, perhaps, the least well answered question on the paper, but not for reasons of time pressure. Few candidates were able to demonstrate effective knowledge and understanding of the meaning of a flexible workforce, restricting their answers to the benefits of part-time working. Better candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding of a flexible workforce to discuss the issues surrounding core and non-core employees within the context of *Fit4Life* and the issues given within the case study.

Principal Moderator's Report

General comments

It was very pleasing to note that the majority of Centres submitted work which was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment grids.

The majority of Centres had clearly annotated their Centre-assessed work, with appropriate documentation (such as the Unit Recording Sheet) completed accurately and within the deadlines specified by the board. However, there continues to be an identifiable correlation between Centres which submitted work late, those who did not carry out effective annotation and administration and those Centres awarding marks outside of the tolerance limits allowed by the board.

On occasions candidates were misdirected in relation to some aspects of the qualification. Centres uncertain of any aspect of the specification should seek clarification via the coursework consultancy service and reference to the exemplar material published by OCR.

Some Centres inappropriately marked candidates work at the higher marks when insufficient or poor quality evidence was represented in relation to the upper MB2 and MB3 criteria. When awarding top MB2 and MB3 marks the quality of the work must be considered. As well as ensuring the work effectively relates to the assessment objective, full coverage of the criteria, as outlined in the specification, is expected.

Centres are asked to encourage candidates to identify the range of sources they have used by including a detailed bibliography and/or sources of information sheet, as well as acknowledging sources within the body of their portfolios.

Those Centres which had taken on board the guidance and support provided by OCR, did produce some excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. These were a pleasure to moderate and were commented on as such by moderators in their reports to Centres. There was evidence of quality work, which was well presented and accurately annotated. Many Centres effectively supported their candidates by providing detailed and constructive feedback.

G180: Exploring Leisure

AO1: The information on **sectors** and **components** was in most cases good to very good; however, candidates should be encouraged to be more selective about the information they gather from their investigations when displaying an understanding of the organisations' operations. Case studies can and should be used to illustrate detailed understanding of how the leisure industry operates, this is particularly important when awarding MB3 marks.

Centres continue to demonstrate a sound understanding of how sectors and components interrelate in order to provide an effective service. However, understanding of the **'Interrelationships between stakeholders and shareholders'** remained poor, with few candidates affectively addressing this MB2 requirement.

The European element of this assessment objective remains an issue for a small number of Centres which are reminded that the assessment criteria for AO1, across all mark bands, clearly requires candidates to provide a summary of sectors and components within the leisure industry in the UK and **Europe**. Although less evident during this examination series, there are still a number of Centres submitting work in which their candidates have not included any reference to Europe in their summary of the industry. As a minimum requirement we would expect to see at least one European example for each of the six components of the industry, with the possible exception of home-based leisure. For the higher mark bands we would expect the candidate to

show an understanding of how leisure organisations in Europe as well as the UK, operate. Some Centres continue to inappropriately award MB3 when candidates have not shown a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the industry in terms of its structure and operation both in the UK **and** Europe. Examples need to be described if they are to clarify and demonstrate a candidate's **thorough** understanding.

AO2: It is pleasing to see that a significant number of Centres are now using comprehensive up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, some Centres are still giving too much credit to candidates for simply **describing** data relating to 'consumer spending, participation trends and employment when it was not applied to the assessment objective. Centres are reminded of the need to cover all elements of the assessment criteria.

As with AO1, the specification clearly requires the consideration of **European** data. The majority of Centres are now effectively addressing this requirement with a wide range of relevant European data evident. However, the European element of this objective remains an issue for a number of Centres which failed to include any European data in response to the requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are reminded that full coverage of the criteria within the specification is only expected in relation to UK data; however the data must be used to illustrate the **scale, economic** and **social** importance of the industry and there must be some reference to the scale and importance of the leisure industry in **Europe**. Failure to include European data is seen as a significant omission and restricts a candidate to MB2.

AO3: The requirements of this assessment objective continue to be effectively addressed by the majority of Centres. However, there are a small number of Centres whose candidates did not cover **all** of the relevant criteria, as identified in the specification. For example, a number of candidates provided good quality evidence relating to **barriers and access** but did not effectively cover the '**key factors**' as identified in the specification and vice versa.

AO4: This assessment objective requires the candidate to **evaluate** the impact of the media on the leisure industry not simply to describe it. As in previous series, some Centres credited candidates for simple descriptions rather than evaluations. Having identified the various impacts that the media has had on the industry, Centres are reminded that candidates must evaluate whether these impacts have had a positive or negative impact on the industry. They should discuss **current developments** which have occurred within the industry as a result of the involvement of the media and draw conclusions, which are justified as to whether the media has had a positive or negative effect on the industry, using an extensive range of examples to back up their arguments.

G181: Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

The overall response to the requirements of this unit was pleasing. The majority of Centres used relevant industry based examples in order to effectively facilitate the requirements of the individual assessment objectives.

AO1: The majority of candidates showed a clear understanding of the **customer service principles** and demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service. Unfortunately although the majority of candidates responded well in relation to **external** customers providing detailed comprehensive accounts, for a significant number of Centres, the evidence relating to **internal** customers was not of the same quality resulting in lenient assessment decisions.

AO2: It is pleasing to see that the majority of Centres are now providing strong supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions. Unfortunately there are still some Centres providing insufficient evidence to support the practical requirement of the unit, with too many assessors relying on simplistic witness statements to confirm the candidate's involvement within a variety of customer service situations.

Centres are reminded of the need for **supporting evidence** to be **thorough** in order to achieve MB3; witness statements alone are not sufficient to do this. As good practice it is recommended that candidates consider in **detail** their performance in a variety of appropriate situations, commenting on their strengths and weaknesses and how they could improve their performance.

OCR has provided examples of exemplar **witness statements**, showing the **detailed** commentary required **and appropriate supporting evidence**, on their page supporting this qualification. Centres are strongly advised to refer to this exemplar material prior to assessing this unit.

AO3: Although less of an issue this series, the requirements of this assessment objective were still misinterpreted by a number of Centres. The assessment grid clearly requires the candidates to analyse the **methods** used by the chosen organisation to assess the effectiveness of the customer service it provides. To effectively meet the requirements of this objective, candidates must identify and then analyse the **methods** used by the organisation. This should be done via a **detailed** consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the methods used in relation to the needs of the organisation. For higher marks, recommendations for improvements to how the chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed.

AO4: The majority of Centres continue to respond well to the requirements of this objective, with some excellent detailed evaluations evident. Centres are, however, reminded that as well as evaluating the general quality of service provided, candidates should also consider the **customer service principles** and the **quality criteria** as identified in the specification.

G183: Event Management

It was pleasing to note that the majority of Centres submitting work for this unit had successfully addressed the requirements of the assessment objectives, planning and running a series of relevant leisure based events with a significant amount of success.

AO1: The evidence provided by the majority of candidates was strong, effectively covering the evidence requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are, however, reminded of the need for the feasibility to be an **individual** report and not a group one.

AO2: Centres are reminded of the need to provide effective supporting evidence in order to clearly show the level at which the candidate contributed to the planning and running of the event. Log books should refer to the candidates' individual contributions rather than describing the actions of the group, which are more appropriately recorded in the minutes of group meetings. Assessor witness statements are also useful, but should be clearly supported by other evidence, such as log book entries, minutes of group meetings and other relevant documentation.

AO3: Although the majority of candidates provided evidence of extensive research, this was not always effectively indexed. Again, log books and minutes of group meetings could be effectively used to provide evidence of **individual** research, but candidates should also clearly **index** their sources. Centres are reminded that this objective has an analytical as well as research requirement. Thus, candidates should be providing clear evidence of analytical comment in respect of assessing the feasibility of their selected event.

AO4: Although there was evidence of some comprehensive evaluations, a significant number of Centres gave too much credit to candidates who simply described, in detail, their role and that of their team members. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to consider **section 4.2.2** of the specification when evaluating how effectively they worked as a team in achieving their objectives. Before awarding MB3 assessors need to ensure the candidate has made detailed and realistic recommendations for improvement.

G185: Leisure in the Outdoors

The majority of Centres provided appropriate evidence which effectively met the evidence requirements.

AO1: Candidates did not always stay focused on the requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are reminded of the need to give an account of the **development** of the outdoors as a leisure resource and not just describe the contents of the specification. For example, candidates should be explaining how the establishment of the national parks contributed to the development of outdoor leisure, rather than simply describing national parks.

AO2: Although candidates were involved in some very worthwhile and successful activities, Centres are reminded of the need to provide effective supporting evidence for this practical requirement. Overall, candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; however, there were a number of Centres which did not effectively cover the **legal requirements** of the chosen activity.

AO3: The selection of a suitable 'area' is critical to the successful achievement of this objective. Those candidates choosing appropriate areas were able to provide extensive accounts of the range and scope of outdoor leisure facilities. A number of Centres gave too much credit when candidates simply described or explained the range of facilities, rather than **analysing** the scale and scope. A weakness identified in the work of a number of candidates was their analysis of the current issues affecting the provision of outdoor leisure facilities.

AO4: The majority of candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this objective. Again, the selection of an appropriate area was critical. Centres are reminded, however, that the focus of the evaluation should be on the positive and negative impacts of outdoor leisure and **not** tourism. The weakest evidence was in relation to how the identified impacts could be **managed**, with some candidates failing to address this essential requirement of the objective.

**Applied GCE Leisure Studies H128
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G180	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G181	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G183	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G185	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Examined Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G182	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G184	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Uniform marks correspond to overall grades as follows:

Advanced Subsidiary GCE H128:

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
UMS (max 300)	240	210	180	150	120

Cumulative Percentage in Grade

Advanced Subsidiary GCE G128:

A	B	C	D	E	U
0.00	12.50	54.17	91.67	100.0	0

There were 24 candidates aggregating in Jan 2007.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@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; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2007

