

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Report on the Units

June 2010

H128/H528/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 report on the Examination provides 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 specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
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
Comments on Moderation	2
G180 Unit 1 – Exploring leisure	3
G181 Unit 2 – Customer service in the leisure industry	4
G182 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice	5
G183 Unit 4 – Event management	8
G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry	9
G185 Unit 6 – Leisure in the outdoors	12

Chief Examiner's Report

Report on the Units/Components taken in June 2010

GCE A Level Leisure Studies, G180, G181, G182, G183, G184 and G185

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

Performance with regard to all four internally assessed units was similar to previous cohorts. Whilst the key issues relating to the interpretation of the evidence requirements have been successfully addressed by the majority of centres, a small number of centres are still experiencing problems interpreting the quality requirements of individual assessment objectives and providing sufficient good quality supporting evidence for the achievement of the more practical elements of the course. 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 individual centre reports in order to develop and improve their performance. Centres are also reminded that OCR offers a free coursework consultation service for clarification on delivery and assessment issues, details of which can be obtained from OCR's website.

Although less of an issue this series, there are still too many centres and candidates relying on out of date statistical data. If candidates are to successfully meet the requirements of Mark Band 3, up to date statistical data must be used. Sources such as LIRC, the General Household Survey and the Office for National Statistics provide relevant up to date statistical data and candidates should be encouraged to access these and not rely too heavily on existing text books.

For the examined units, G182 and G184, it was pleasing to note that both Principal Examiners commented that many candidates demonstrated a good depth of knowledge; however, candidates' ability to effectively apply this knowledge and their ability to demonstrate the analytical and evaluative skills required to access the higher marks, remains an issue for a significant number of candidates. Centres need to continue to spend time developing candidates' examination technique, in particular their analytical and evaluative skills. Centres must also ensure that candidates are able to respond effectively to contextualised references, such as 'for the centre' and 'for the employee', to ensure that the responses which candidates provide actually answer the question asked and allow candidates to access Levels 3 and 4, and in some instances Level 2.

Both Principal Examiners identify areas of the specification which presented problems to candidates, centres are strongly urged to study both Principal Examiner Reports in order to improve levels of performance in future examination sessions.

Comments on Moderation

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 and sections of the specification.

This year, however, there was a significant increase in the number of administrative errors by centres, especially incorrect marks being transferred from Unit Recording Sheets onto the MS1 forms. The use of the Unit Recording Sheet, guiding the moderator to the evidence with the tutor comments, was found to be most useful in most of the work. However, fuller annotation of the coursework, including mark bands would further assist the moderation process.

The majority of candidates were effectively directed as to the requirements of the assessment objectives and it was pleasing to see effective and full coverage of the specification. Many centres produced 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 good quality work, which was well presented and accurately annotated, with many centres effectively supporting their candidates by providing detailed and constructive feedback.

As with previous series, where marks have been outside of the tolerance limits permitted by the board, some centres inappropriately marked candidates' work at the higher marks when insufficient or poor quality evidence was presented in relation to upper Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 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. Depth and breadth of coverage should also be evident.

G180 Unit 1 – Exploring leisure

AO1: The information on **sectors** and **components** was in most cases good to very good. Case studies can be used to illustrate detailed understanding of how the leisure industry operates. This is particularly important when awarding Mark Band 3 marks. A small but significant number of centres continue to award Mark Band 3 marks when candidates show little or no understanding of how sectors and components interrelate and in particular how '**stakeholders and shareholders interrelate**'. Centres are reminded that this is a Mark Band 2 requirement.

Most centres are now providing appropriate European evidence for this assessment objective.

AO2: It was pleasing to see that a significant number of centres are now using comprehensive up to date information which is 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, employment and health and well being', when it is not applied to the assessment objective. Centres are reminded of the need to cover all elements of the assessment criteria, the most common omission being '**health and well being**'.

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. Centres are reminded that failure to include European data is seen as a significant omission and restricts a candidate to Mark Band 2.

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. The specification requires analysis of both, particularly at MB3.

AO4: Centres are reminded that this assessment objective requires the candidate to **evaluate** the impact of the media on the **leisure industry**, not to simply describe it. Candidates should also discuss **current developments** which have occurred within the industry as a result of the involvement of the media and draw justified conclusions as to whether the media has had a positive or negative affect on the industry. This is particularly important when awarding a Mark Band 3 mark.

G181 Unit 2 – Customer service in the leisure industry

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. The majority of candidates responded well in relation to **external** customers, and although there has been an improvement in the quality of responses relating to how the needs of internal customers are met, for a small number of centres this remains a weakness and often results in lenient assessment decisions.

Disappointingly this series has seen an increase in the number of candidates not effectively considering how their chosen organisation attempts to meet the needs of its internal and external customers.

AO2: It was 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 a small but significant number of centres providing insufficient evidence to support the practical requirement of the unit, with too many assessors simply 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 Mark Band 3; witness statements alone are not sufficient. 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.

AO3: The requirements of this assessment objective continue to be misinterpreted by a small number of centres. The assessment grid clearly requires the candidate 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 their chosen organisation. This should be done through 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 on 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. Recommendations for improvement must be given.

G182 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice

General Comments

As with the previous examination sessions, a pre-release case study material had been forwarded to centres. The case study was based on Dunhouse Farm a farm and activity centre located in the north of England. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it had developed to the present point.

The case study material provided a range of topics in order to satisfy the “What You Need To Learn” section of the specification. The question paper was broken down into five questions, all with sub-sections. It gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain a good grade, whilst also offering candidates at the lower range the opportunity to gain a pass. Candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It was clear that many candidates are still struggling to interpret the command words in the questions correctly, and, therefore, failing to answer at an appropriate level. Centres need to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of unit.

Work also needs to be done in relation to command words. 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 in Levels 3 and 4, which seemed to be a reflection of a lack of examination technique rather than a lack of 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. There was limited use of vocational examples studied. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar or confused by technical terms such as qualitative and quantitative data.

It was clear that a number of centres had used relevant case studies as a revision tool. Recent coverage of E Coli in petting farms had been used and this research and learning was clearly shown in the risk assessment question.

The candidates answered the question about the website well. This could be due to additional work, or the age group being much more familiar with ICT systems.

The majority of candidates seem to have had effective time management skills, as on the whole, the majority of candidates completed the questions set. Centres should enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing 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

1a This part of the question was not answered well, with some candidates giving an example of the advantages of IIP for the facility, rather than for the staff – an example of them not reading the question correctly.

1b Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this part of the question, with appropriate advantages given; however, some candidates did tend to use repetition within the answer.

1c Candidates tended to focus on the advantages and disadvantages of the systems, rather than on the factors which needed to be considered prior to selecting a system – as stated in the specification.

1d The majority of candidates were able to identify and describe the benefits and drawbacks of the ICT based systems, but many repeated their answers to part (c).

2a Most candidates displayed an understanding of the Disability Discrimination Act, and the key aspects of it. However, most candidates were unable to link the requirements of the Act to the day to day operations of the facility, and responded generically rather than related to a leisure facility such as Dunhouse Farm.

2b The risk assessment was well answered, with most candidates achieving full or almost full marks. There were good examples given, although often candidates suggested more than one example of who could be injured, consequence, etc. Some candidates failed to be specific enough about a consequence, eg someone would be hurt, illness. Also, often the consequence of death was given, but only a severity of four or below was noted. It was clear that preparation had taken in place, as many candidates were fully aware of recent issues with regards to petting farms and E coli. This shows positive use of case studies and research.

2c The majority of candidates were able to justify the measure put in place in the risk assessment.

2d The majority of candidates were able to identify the responsibilities of the organisation under the Data Protection Act; however, some candidates did repeat the same answer in alternative words.

3a Candidates, in the main, were able to identify relevant examples for the SWOT. However, some mixed up threats and weaknesses – threats being external and weaknesses being internal.

3b This part of the question was generally well answered if the candidates had a knowledge of the marketing mix. Most candidates gave generic answers with some examples taken from the case study. Product and promotion were generally addressed better than price and place.

3c This part of the question was well addressed by most candidates. They looked not only at the design, but also at the use of websites as a promotional medium. Candidates went on to explain how it could be improved

4a Candidates struggled with how budgeting could be used to help Dunhouse Farm. Some candidates made basic attempts, identifying that it would show over and under spends, but failed to state how the results could be used in moving the organisation forward.

4a Most candidates obtained marks on this part of the question giving at least partial answers. Some excellent explanations were given in some cases.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

4b This part of the question was well answered with most candidates being able to give two examples of revenue sources.

4c This part of the question was well answered with many candidates identifying the key purpose of cash flow forecasts – if a little limited in explanation.

5ai Although a straightforward question, candidates often mixed up qualitative and quantitative data. Candidates gave examples of how to collect data – comments cards and surveys, rather than an explanation.

5aia Although a straightforward question, candidates often mixed up qualitative and quantitative data. Candidates often gave examples of how to collect data – comments cards and surveys, rather than explaining what the data is.

5b Candidates were able to come up with a range of ideas of how data collected could be used; however, this was often limited to 'in order to make it better for customers'. Candidates needed to make direct links between the data collected and the improvement made – eg entrance numbers would allow them to ensure they have sufficient staff to ensure high levels of customer service.

G183 Unit 4 – Event management

It was pleasing to note that the majority of centres 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 reminded of the need for the feasibility to be written before, and not after, the event has taken place.

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. When awarding Mark Band 3 it is essential that the candidate provides evidence of the coverage of all of the criteria identified within the assessment grid, namely their ability to perform under pressure, to deal effectively and sympathetically with problems and/or complaints and to show good interpersonal skills. In addition, an assessors' witness statement can be used to support the evidence provided by the candidates in relation to all mark bands and in particular the Mark Band 3 criteria.

AO3: Although a number of centres successfully addressed the requirements of this objective, a number of centres continue to provide group rather than individual evidence. Log books and minutes of group meetings should be used to provide evidence of **individual** research, but candidates should also clearly **index** their sources.

Please note that candidates who do not clearly indicate the sources they have personally accessed and the range of research they have personally undertaken will not be able to successfully meet the requirements of Mark Band 3.

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. This is particularly important when awarding marks within Mark Band 3. As well as making recommendations for the improvement of the event, candidates should also make recommendations relating to team work and personal performance.

Please note that effective use of 'Teamwork Theory' is essential if candidates are to meet the requirements of a 'comprehensive' evaluation of their team's performance and thus achieve marks within Mark Band 3.

G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry

General Comments

This examination focuses on the human resource functions within leisure organisations and centres are continuing their development of their candidates' understanding of the whole specification in general and the examination in particular. A pre-release case study was issued; illustrating the context in which the examination would take place. In this series 'Festival Cinema', a privately owned cinema located in the centre of a small town in north-west England.

The majority of candidates completed all questions, suggesting that centres had covered most of the content of the specification, with a good number of candidates displaying a reasonable depth of knowledge, although still showing a limited ability to analyse and evaluate. Candidates appeared to show an understanding of the assessment objectives, although some still only offered knowledge based responses, lacking the skills necessary to access answers at Level 3.

A number of particular aspects of the specification presented problems to candidates, in terms of a limited and in some cases complete lack of knowledge and understanding, with specific reference to 360° appraisals, psychometric and aptitude tests and how external issues affect human resource planning. Centres are reminded to ensure that their schemes of work fully reflect the whole content of the specification.

Examination technique remains an issue, with candidates misunderstanding command words, such as 'discuss' and 'evaluate', and contextualisation references such as 'the benefits for Festival Cinema' leading to responses not meeting the examination aims, and responses not having the content or level of application and analysis required to achieve Level 3, and in some cases Level 2.

Improved use needs to be made of the pre-release materials by centres, evidenced by its limited reference in the examination by some candidates, limiting their ability to obtain higher level explanation, judgement and evaluation marks. Centres should use the case study in preparing candidates for the examination by discussing possible questions and how the information and data in the case study could be utilised in the examination, and not focus too much on previous series, mock examination papers and ensure complete coverage of the unit specification.

Comments on individual questions

1a This part of the question was mainly well answered. However, where candidates answered incorrectly it was often because they gave examples of 'natural wastage' (possibly due to the term being used as part of the first element of the question) or simply listed reasons to 'sack' employees.

1bi This part of the question was well answered. Those candidates who did not score full marks struggled as a result of repetition of points.

1bii Most candidates scored half marks on this part of the question, mainly due to a confusion between elements of the Sex Discrimination Act and the Equal Pay Act

1c Most candidates failed to access the higher level marks as they used the question as an opportunity to tell the examiner all they knew about one of the acts, therefore the responses lacked discussion and evaluation. On the whole, the responses about the Disability Discrimination Act were better than those on the Sex Discrimination Act.

2a Overall this was a well answered question, with the majority of candidates able to access the higher levels. Those who were prepared less well focused on the benefits to the staff and not to Festival Cinema.

2b This part of the question was very well answered. Candidates appeared to understand the exact nature and direction of the question.

2c Candidates performed well on this part of the question, with some accessing the higher level responses. Where candidates performed less well it was often due to them focusing on the benefits to the employees and not to Festival Cinema, and addressing CV's rather than application forms as required by the question. Centres could focus on the exact requirements of questions which ask candidates to address the merits of one thing over another.

2d Most candidates were able to describe short listing; however, the majority were unable to gain the full mark allocation as they did not indicate on what the short listing process was based. Candidates need to be more aware of how the allocation of marks relates to the expected response in short answer questions.

3a Most candidates accessed the middle of the mark range by discussing the suitability of group interviews, with many providing considerable amounts of knowledge about the interview process, but then failing to analyse and evaluate the appropriateness of the method to Festival Cinema.

3b There was a high number of non-scoring responses, mainly from candidates not attempting the question. Centres need to ensure that all aspects of the unit content are covered within their schemes of work and that candidates are encouraged to attempt all questions as part of their examination technique work. Some candidates were able to access higher level responses by evaluating the suitability of the tests to the specific situation raised in the case study.

4a The majority of candidates scored well on this part of the question, discussing how management style could contribute to the problems identified in the case study. Some candidates were able to provide higher level responses by suggesting alternative methods and an overall evaluation.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

4b Most candidates scored in the middle of the mark range, mainly due to a limited ability to analyse and evaluate the use of 360° appraisals in improving awareness of Amina's management style. Lower level responses were knowledge based only. However, a significant amount of candidates scored no marks for this part of the question as a result of not attempting it.

4c There was a reasonable level of responses to this part of the question, with the majority of candidates placed in the middle of the mark range. Some candidates did drift away from the indicative content meaning that their responses achieved low scores.

5 This question was poorly answered, as candidates failed to adequately address the issue of how location could affect human resource planning. Responses tended to focus on a repetition of the first part of the question and focused on marketing issues and customers, thus failing to address the issues of human resource planning.

G185 Unit 6 – Leisure in the outdoors

Although it was pleasing to see that the majority of centres are now assessing this unit correctly, poor coverage of the specification, with evidence not always focused on the requirements of the assessment objectives has once again resulted in some lenient assessment decisions. Centres are again reminded of the distinction between activities which come under the heading of 'Sports and Physical Recreation' and those **which** come under the heading of 'Outdoor Leisure'. For example, football and golf are classed as sports rather than outdoor leisure activities. If centres are in any doubt about the suitability of an activity or facility, they should seek clarification from the board.

AO1: It is important that candidates stay focused on the requirements of this assessment objective. Candidates are required 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 the majority of candidates were involved in very worthwhile and successful activities, centres are reminded of the need to provide **effective supporting evidence** for this practical requirement. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to provide evidence of **both** planning and participation; and of the need to fully cover **section 6.2.4 of the specification** in order to satisfy the requirements of **Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 for this objective**.

AO3: Centres are reminded that sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 of the specification should be covered within the achievement of this objective. 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 scale of outdoor leisure facilities. A number of centres, however, gave too much credit when candidates simply identified and described the facilities available, rather than analysing the range and scale of outdoor leisure provision in their chosen area. As was the case in previous series, evidence relating to the '**range**' of outdoor leisure facilities was generally stronger than the evidence relating to the '**scale**' of provision. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates effectively analysed 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. As with previous series 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. With regard to this, centres are reminded of the need for candidates to make their **own recommendations** and not just describe measures currently in place.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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; 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 2010