

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Report on the Units

June 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 Subsidiary GCE in Leisure Studies (H128)

Advanced GCE in Leisure Studies (H528)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
Principal Moderator Report	2
G180/01 Exploring Leisure	3
G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry	4
G182/01 Leisure Industry Practice	5
G183/01 Event Management	8
G184/01 Human Resources in the Leisure Industry	9
G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors	11
Grade Thresholds	12

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. Whilst the key issues relating to the interpretation of the evidence requirements have been successfully addressed by the majority of Centres, some Centres 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 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 can be obtained from OCR's website.

Of growing concern is the number of 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 the majority of candidates demonstrated effective time management skills and were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of most sections of the specification. However, 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 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.

Principal Moderator 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 and sections of the specification.

Most Centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work, with the relevant documentation completed accurately and within the deadlines specified by the board. However, there remains an identifiable correlation between Centres which submit work late, those that do not carry out effective annotation and administration and those Centres awarding marks outside of the tolerance limits allowed by the board.

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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. This series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this; however, it is still a weakness for a number of Centres which need to address this issue for the next series.

As with previous series, 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 (MB2) and Mark Band 3 (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. Depth and breadth of coverage should also be evident. This was the main reason for Centre marks being adjusted this series.

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 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 how '**stakeholders and shareholders interrelate**' remains poor, with few candidates effectively 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**.

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, employment and health and well being', when it was 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. However, the European element of this objective remains an issue for a number of Centres which failed to include any European data in their response to the requirements of this assessment objective. 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. The specification requires analysis of both, particularly at MB3.

AO4: Centres are reminded 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. Candidates should also discuss **current developments** that 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.

G181/01 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 number of Centres this remains a weakness and often results 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 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**, on its web page supporting this qualification.

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 via a **detailed** considered 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 as to how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed. A number of Centres continue to incorrectly credit candidates when they are 'assessing' the quality of customer service provided, rather than analysing the methods used. This evidence is more relevant to AO4 than AO3.

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. Recommendations for improvement must be given.

G182/01 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 Extreme Adventure an outdoor pursuits centre, based in a national park. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it had developed to the present, and included a sample of its 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 in the lower range the opportunity to gain a pass. Candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It is clear that many candidates are still struggling to interpret the command words in the questions correctly, and, therefore, fail to answer in an appropriate level. It is clear that a number of Centres have used previous papers as a revision tool; however, some candidates still fail to apply the knowledge and skills gained to the new case study, answering questions which they had worked on within the Centre, rather than what is 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 considerable evidence of limited development of answers into Levels 3 and 4, which seemed to be a reflection of 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 or confused between technical terms such as revenue and net profit.

The majority of candidates seem to have had effective time management skills; as, on the whole, the majority of them completed the questions set. Centres should enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing their candidates to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace. Candidates would also 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

- 1ai This part of the question was not answered well, with some candidates giving the advantages of IIP to the facility rather than to the staff – ie not reading the question correctly.
- 1aai Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this part of the question, with appropriate advantages given; however, some candidates did tend to use repetition in the answer.
- 1b Candidates limited themselves to the lower levels through their lack of use of the command word 'analyse'. Many candidates could identify factors which could be classed as advantages, but failed to analyse or evaluate why IT systems would be more beneficial or costly.
- 1c The majority of candidates were able to identify and describe how information collected from a selected system could be beneficial in decision making. Some candidates failed to read the question and included systems which were not included in the selection given.
- 2a Most candidates displayed an understanding of the DDA, and the key areas of it. However, most candidates were unable to link the requirements of the Act to the day to day operations of the facility, and did it more generically rather than related to a leisure facility such as Extreme Adventure.
- 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 a consequence eg someone would be hurt. Also, often the consequence of death or drowning was given, but only a severity of 4 or below.
- 2c(i) The majority of candidates were able to identify the responsibilities of the employees, although some did confuse this with the responsibility of the employer.
- 2c (ii) The majority of candidates were able to identify the responsibilities of the employer.
- 3a(i) Candidates either knew the correct terminology and applied it correctly or provided irrelevant responses, eg stating the 4P's to show a complete lack of knowledge.
- 3a(ii) Generally well answered if candidates had knowledge of the product life cycle.
- 3b This part of the question was well addressed by most candidates; however, a large number of them provided suitable answers, but 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.
- 3c Most candidates made an effort to answer this part of the question with answers focusing on discount pricing, but expressed more as BOGOF. There was little analysis of the impact of the strategy given.
- 4a Most candidates obtained marks on this part of the question giving at least partial answers. Some excellent explanations were given in some cases.
- 4b Candidates struggled with how budgeting could be used to help Extreme Adventure. Some made basic attempts identifying that it would show over and under spends, but failed to say how the results could be used in moving the organisation forward.
- 4c This part of the question was well answered with many candidates identifying the key reasons for cash flow problems.
- 5a Although a straightforward question, candidates often mixed up qualitative and quantitative data.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 5b Candidates made an effort to gain marks here; however, many suggested answers which focused mainly on sales promotion, in terms of reduced prices. Limited numbers of candidates made the link to improvements to off peak times.
- 5c Most candidates were able to come up with a range of aspects which the Children Act affected, with a smaller number going onto show the impact.

G183/01 Event Management

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. A small number of Centres, however, although clearly managing a success event, did not provide sufficient portfolio evidence to support the marks awarded. Centres are reminded that it is the quality of evidence and not the success of the event which determines the marks awarded.

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, 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 MB3 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 assessor's witness statement can be used to support the evidence provided by the candidates in relation to all mark bands and in particular the MB3 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. **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 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 MB3. Where there was evidence of leniency, evaluations tended to concentrate on whether or not the event was a success, although this an important consideration the AO requires a detailed personal and team evaluation. As well as making recommendations for the improvement of the event, candidates should also make recommendations relating to team work and personal performance. **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.**

G184/01 Human Resources in the Leisure Industry

General comments

This examination focuses on the human resources function within leisure organisations and it remains clear that Centres are continuing to develop their understanding of the requirements of both the specification and the examination.

It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates completed all the questions. There was more evidence that Centres had covered the complete range of the specification, with more candidates also demonstrating a depth of knowledge. More candidates displayed an understanding of the assessment objectives, with a fewer number just offering knowledge based responses.

As in previous series, one or two aspects of the specification appeared to cause problems for candidates in terms of a lack of knowledge and understanding. Centres, as ever, should ensure the full specification is covered in their schemes of work. Human resource planning continues to be a problem; in this series a number of candidates were unable to gain marks for the question on how changing market demand might affect human resource planning. There were a significant number of candidates who demonstrated a complete lack of understanding of management styles.

The pre-release material was again under-used in candidate responses. This limits the candidate's ability to access marks for application. Application is a key assessment objective and Centres should make use of the case study when preparing candidates for the examination.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a)(i) Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of why leisure organisations might need to recruit staff.
- 1(a)(ii) The majority of candidates were able to explain effectively the term maternity benefits.
- 1(b) Human resource planning questions continue to trouble candidates. More candidates were able to analyse how changing demand for leisure might affect the Leisure Services Department, but few were able to make judgments about the issue. Some candidates did answer the question well, but not from the viewpoint of human resource management.
- 1(c) Overall it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of labour turnover and were able to analyse how it might affect the organisation. Unfortunately, few candidates then went on to offer judgements.
- 2(a) The majority of candidates were able to offer to valid methods of recruitment, but some were unable to explain why the method would be suitable for the post in question.
- 2(b) This part of the question produced some pleasing responses, with some imaginative benefits being provided. Some candidates, however, assumed that an on-line recruitment procedure would replace interviews. Candidates should be able to distinguish between recruitment and selection.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 2(c) This part of the question highlighted candidate's inability to access the high level skill of evaluation, which is essential for this A2 examination. The vast majority of candidates were able to provide advantages and disadvantages of internal recruitment, often in the context of the case study. However, as with other evaluative questions on this paper, they were then unable to offer valid judgements alongside their analysis.
- 2(d) As with the previous part of the question, most candidates were able to offer imaginative impacts but were then unable to develop their answers and access the marks for evaluation.
- 3(a) This part of the question was answered well by the majority of candidates. Many used the case study to highlight appropriate methods for the organisation, including the use of the appraisal system.
- 3(b) This was perhaps, the question which differentiated most between candidates. Many had no knowledge of management styles; some who did merely provided knowledge based answers; whilst the stronger candidates were able to make judgements about how the different styles might resolve the specific issues.
- 4(a) Candidates were able to define training well; but many were unable to offer a valid explanation of the term development.
- 4(b) It was pleasing to see that candidates were able to develop answers around the specific issues of leisure organisations with which they were familiar. Those candidates who referred to specific leisure organisations were rewarded for their application and often went on to analyse in detail the benefits and limitations of training and development.
- 4(c) Responses to this part of the question were generally very good.

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

The quality of evidence presented in response to this unit was varied. Although the majority of Centres are now providing appropriate evidence which effectively meets the evidence requirements, some Centres are not - poor coverage of the specification, with evidence not always focused on the requirements of the assessment objectives resulted in some lenient assessment decisions for some Centres. Centres are again reminded of the distinction between activities that come under the heading of 'Sports and Physical Recreation' and those that 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. Overall, a large number of candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; however, coverage of the **le.g.al requirements** of their chosen activity was not always covered in sufficient detail to justify the marks awarded. Centres are 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 **MB2 and MB3 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 Centres are now effectively analysing 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. 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.

Grade Thresholds

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

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G180	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G181	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G183	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G185	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	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	72	64	56	48	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G184	Raw	100	81	71	61	52	43	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
1.94	11.65	31.31	52.67	75.00	100
There were 468 candidates aggregating this series.					

Advanced GCE (H528):

A	B	C	D	E	U
2.72	18.68	45.91	72.37	93.39	100
There were 294 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

