

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Report on the Units

January 2008

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.

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 syllabus 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 2008

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 Report	1
PM Report	2
G182	6
G184	9
Grade Thresholds	11

Chief Examiner Report

General Comments

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 for guidance on the development of candidates' work.

Performance with regard to all four internally assessed units was similar to previous cohorts. It was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres resubmitting work from previous 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. 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.

For the examined units, G182 and G184, it was disappointing to note that the key issues identified and highlighted in previous Principal Examiners' reports remained for this series. In particular, there was significant evidence that some candidates had been entered for this examination series without thorough examination preparation. Despite pre-released case studies, many candidates failed to effectively apply their answers and gain the application marks allocated to particular questions. Principal Examiners reported that the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of most sections of the specification, but importantly a significant number were unable to progress to the higher level skills. As with previous examination series, both Principal Examiner's Reports include comments which imply that 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 within the mark scheme. The use of past examination papers is very much encouraged as part of this process. However, it is essential that candidates are able to apply their knowledge and understanding to the current case study and the actual questions on the examination paper. There were a number of instances where candidates provided 'good quality answers' but not to the question asked, meaning the marks on the mark scheme could not be effectively accessed.

Centres are strongly urged to study both Principal Examiner Reports in order to improve levels of performance in future examination sessions.

PM Report

General Comments:

This was a relatively small entry in comparison with the summer series. Nonetheless, it was very pleasing to note that the majority of Centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment objectives.

Whilst 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, there remain some Centres where unit recording sheets are not completed accurately and where there is little referencing of the evidence in the achievement of specific assessment and mark bands. Effective annotation within the body of the candidates' portfolio work, in line with OCR guidelines, is essential. Centres are reminded that exemplar material exists to give clear guidance and direction with regard to this issue.

It was very pleasing to note that there were very few occasions on which candidates were misdirected in relation to aspects of the qualification. Nonetheless, Centres uncertain of any aspect of the specification should seek clarification via the coursework consultancy service and reference to the exemplar material published by the Board.

On those occasions when Centre marks had to be adjusted to bring them in line with national standards, the main reason for the adjustments was Centres inappropriately marking candidates' work at the higher marks when there was insufficient or poor quality evidence in relation to the upper MB2 and MB3 criteria. When awarding top MB2 and MB3 marks the quality of the work must be carefully 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.

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.

G180/01 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 effectively addressing this MB2 requirement.

The majority of Centres now effectively address the European element of this objective; with a wide range of appropriate examples included in candidate work.

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 – 'health and well being' continues to be the least effectively covered criterion.

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 relevant 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 describe it. As in previous series, some Centres credited candidates for simple descriptions rather than evaluations. Having identified the various impacts which 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** that 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 affect on the industry, using an extensive range of examples to back up their arguments.

G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

As with previous series, 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 and it was pleasing to note the effective use of work placements as a mechanism for the achievement of the practical element of this unit. Centres are, however, reminded that they only need to investigate one leisure organisation with regard AO1, AO3 and AO4.

AO1: The majority of Centres are now effectively meeting the requirements of this objective by effectively describing **HOW** their chosen organisation meets the needs of **BOTH** internal and external customers.

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 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 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. The Board has provided examples of exemplar **witness statements**, showing the **detailed** commentary required **and appropriate supporting evidence** needed. Centres are strongly advised to refer to this exemplar material prior to assessing this unit.

AO3: It was pleasing to note that far fewer Centres misinterpreted the requirements of this assessment objective and provided clear analysis of the **methods** used by their chosen organisation to assess the quality of customer care provided. Centres are reminded that for higher marks a **detailed** consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the methods used is needed, together with recommendations for improvements.

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, they should also consider the **customer service principles** and the **quality criteria** as identified in the specification.

G183/01 Event Management

As with previous series, 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: The majority of Centres provided strong supporting evidence for the achievement of this objective, enabling moderators to support assessor decisions in the majority of cases. Centres are reminded of the need for log books to refer to the candidates' individual contributions, rather than describing the actions of the group, which should be 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 by the candidate. 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. **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 MB3.**

AO4: Although less of an issue than in previous series, some Centres continued to give too much credit to candidates who simply described 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. **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 MB3.**

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

There were only a small number of entries for this unit for this series.

AO1: It was pleasing to note that the work that was submitted was more clearly focused on the requirements of this objective than in previous series. Centres are reminded, however, of the need to fully cover the requirements of both the assessment objectives and the 'What You Need To Learn' section of the specification.

AO2: The majority of Centres provided comprehensive evidence of their candidates' involvement in appropriate outdoor leisure activities. However, a number of candidates did not provide the '**detailed plan**' required of the MB3 marks awarded by their assessor. Centres are reminded of the need to fully cover the requirements of both the assessment criteria and the content of the specification.

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.

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 assessment criteria.

G182

General Comments

As with the previous examinations series, a pre-release case study material had been forwarded to Centres. The case study was based on CLC, a leisure centre based in the centre of Wayford city centre. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it had developed to the present point, and included a template used to draw up CLC's cash flow forecast. 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 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 were ill prepared for the examination, with a limited number completing the paper to a high standard. It was apparent that many candidates failed to interpret the command words in the questions correctly, and, therefore, failed to answer in an appropriate level. It was clear that a number of Centres had used previous papers as a revision tool; however, some candidates failed to apply the knowledge and skills gained to the new case study, answering questions that they had worked on within the Centre, rather than what was asked in the paper, thus showing a lack of application. 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 many answers into levels 3 and 4, which seemed to be a reflection on a lack 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. There was limited use of vocational examples studied. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with or confused by technical terms such as qualitative and quantitative.

The majority of candidates seemed 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 the candidates to see 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	Not well answered, with a large number of candidates listing benefits rather than the criteria of the Charter Mark quality standard.
1b	Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this question, with appropriate impacts of the limited storage facilities identified and discussed at varying levels.
1c	Candidates limited themselves to the lower levels through the lack of use the command word 'discuss'. Many candidates could identify factors that could be considered prior to obtaining a new stock control system, but failed to discuss why these factors needed consideration
2a	The majority of candidates were able to explain the term duty of care, although some limited this duty to staff or customers rather than both.
2b	Risk assessment well answered, with most candidates achieving full or almost full marks. Good examples were given, although often candidates suggested more than one example of who could be injured, consequence, etc. Some candidates failed to be specific enough about consequence, e.g. someone would be hurt.
2c	Most candidates displayed an understanding of the Data Protection 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.
3a(i)	The majority of candidates were able to identify what the term product branding meant, but some were unable to explain the term in relation to CLC, so achieved only one mark.
3a(ii)	Many candidates mixed up the term 'direct marketing' with 'advertising' and, therefore, did not achieve full marks
3a(iii)	The majority of candidates were able to identify what sponsorship was, but some were unable to explain the term in relation to CLC, with many offering examples relating directly to live examples such as football teams.
3b	Reasonably well answered; however, the focus fell on carrying out a SWOT analysis rather than discussing the usefulness of a SWOT analysis in order to improve marketing strategy. A number of candidates used a grid method, which in general moves them towards shorter and more limited answers.
3c	This part of the question was well addressed by most candidates; however, a large number of them provided suitable answers, but then placed them in the incorrect section. Often candidates gave one answer but expressed it in different terms, making the same point, and, therefore, obtaining only one mark.
4a	Generally a very well answered question part, with candidates often offering more than two suitable answers
4b	Most candidates were able to identify both the positives and negatives to CLC of recording all payments and customer information. Most candidates made a basic link between this and the use of this information in direct marketing, but did not always develop their answer.

Report on the Units taken in January 2008

4c	Candidates struggled with how the cash flow forecast could be used to help make decisions at CLC. Some made basic attempts identifying that it would show high and lows, but failed to say how the results could be used in moving the organisation forward.
5a (i)	Although a straightforward question part, candidates often mixed up qualitative and quantitative data.
5a(ii)	Although a straightforward question part, candidates often mixed up qualitative and quantitative data.
5b	Candidates made an effort to gain marks but suggested answers focused mainly on qualitative measures in terms of customers' views and the use of surveys. A number of candidates used both quantitative and qualitative aspects to provide a more balance answer.
5c	Most candidates were able to come up with a range of factors which affected the PLACE element of the marketing mix of CLC. A large number highlighted both the positive and negative impacts of specific examples from a CLC in context.

G184

This examination focuses on the human resources function within leisure organisations and it is clear that Centres are now beginning to follow the specification and the assessment objectives much more closely than in previous series. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were able to attempt all questions. In addition, there appeared no evidence of candidates being under pressure to complete the paper in the required time.

As in previous series, one or two aspects of the specification appeared to cause significant problems for candidates in terms of a lack of knowledge and understanding. Without this candidates are unable to access the marks for some questions. Centres should ensure that the full contents of the specification are covered in their schemes of work and that candidates can define the key terms. Human resource planning remains an issue. There was an improvement in the number of candidates who demonstrated an understanding of this aspect, but a significant number were unable to gain any marks through a lack of knowledge.

The pre release case study is intended to allow candidates to apply their knowledge and understanding to a specific leisure organisation. As in previous examinations, the vast majority of candidates were unable to apply their knowledge and understanding to the particular circumstances of GOactive. Application is a key assessment objective and Centres should make full use of the case study when preparing candidates for the examination.

As an A2 unit, this examination assesses candidates' ability to analyse and evaluate. Whilst most candidates were able to recognise the command words, few were able to effectively analyse and evaluate their responses.

1(a) This part of the question was answered well by the vast majority of candidates, with only a few outlining the process for dismissal.

1(b) The vast majority of candidates were able to offer two valid reasons why GOactive might need to recruit staff and were able to go on and explain why.

1(c) Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of different job roles in the leisure industry and were able to analyse the benefits and limitations of the different types of employment for the employees.

2(a) Human resource planning remains a problem aspect for candidates. More candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of the economy as an issue for human resource planning. However, of these many were unable to link their knowledge of the economy to the effects on the human resource planning function and fewer still were able to apply it to the case study. Those who were able to apply their knowledge gained good marks for this question.

2(b) This question differentiated effectively between candidates. A significant number appeared to have no knowledge of organisational structures. Where candidates had an understanding of them, they were able to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of a different structure to the case study.

3(a) For this part of the question, candidates were able to gain marks for knowledge and understanding by referring to appropriate documentation. Many then went on to describe in detail the contents of the documentation without addressing the requirements of the question. Better candidates were able to explain why the documentation would be useful, but few candidates were able to evaluate how useful the documentation would be in the appointment of suitable staff.

Report on the Units taken in January 2008

3(b) Those candidates who recognised that the purpose of the process was to shortlist candidates were able to gain full marks. Weaker candidates offered a process that involved both the recruitment and selection of candidates.

3(c) Responses to this part of the question were generally good with candidates offering a range of benefits to both parties. As with other questions requiring an evaluative response, few candidates were able to make judgements relating to their analysis of the benefits.

4(a) Candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of training with many going on to explain the importance of training and development to leisure organisations. The better candidates were able to make judgements about the importance within the context of the leisure industry, with some candidates offering the opinion that for many jobs it might not be important. These candidates were rewarded highly for such judgments.

4(b) Candidates offered the full range of motivational approaches in response to part (ii) including some very practical ideas which were rewarded. As with other evaluative questions, few candidates progressed to the higher levels of response, merely stating the benefits and limitations of their approach.

Grade Thresholds

GCE Leisure Studies (H128/H528)
January 2008 Examination Series

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G180	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G181	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G183	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G185	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	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	79	69	59	49	39	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

Advanced GCE (H528):

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
UMS (max 600)	480	420	360	300	240

Cumulative Percentage in Grade

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H128):

A	B	C	D	E	U
0	10	50	80	100	100
There were 10 candidates aggregating this series.					

Advanced GCE (H528):

There were 0 candidates aggregating this series.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.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

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 2008

