

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

H128/H528/R/11

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 2011

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)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
Comments on Moderation	2
G182 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice	7
G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry	9

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

Portfolio Units

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 June cohorts.

It is pleasing to report that the internal assessment decisions of the majority of centres were in line with the national standard. For those centres whose assessment decisions were not in line with the national standard, it is strongly advised that they consult the exemplar material published by the Board as guidance and take on board the comments made in both the Principal Moderator's Report and their own centre report. 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 the OCR website.

Examined Units

For both the examined Units, G182 and G184, it was disappointing to note that a number of the issues identified and highlighted in previous Principal Examiners' reports remained this series. For both AS and A2, the Principal Examiners reported that, although the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of most sections of the specification, a number were unable to progress to the higher level skills. For both G182 and G184 examination technique remains an issue for some candidates, with them continuing to misunderstand command words such as 'discuss' and 'assess' and, as a result, not demonstrating sufficient application, analysis and evaluative judgement in their responses in order to access Level 3. Nonetheless, it was pleasing to note that some centres had spent time working on the command words with conclusions being included more often, and balanced arguments presented.

Centres are strongly urged to study the Principal Examiners' Reports in order to improve levels of performance on the examined units.

Comments on Moderation

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 objectives.

Whilst the majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work, with appropriate documentation (such as the Unit Recording Sheet) completed accurately, there remain a small number of 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 assessors 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 good 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. 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'** was poor in the work submitted by some centres.

The majority of centres now effectively address the European element of this objective; with a wide range of appropriate examples included in candidate work. However, centres are reminded of the need to demonstrate a clear understanding of how the leisure industry operates in Europe in order to gain mid to upper MB3 marks, European examples alone are not sufficient for top end marks.

AO2: It is pleasing to see that a significant number of centres are now using comprehensive 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. Centres are also reminded of the need to use relevant up-to-date information, some candidates are referring to data which is now more than ten years old.

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 **'key factors'** but did not effectively cover **'barriers and access'**, 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 that the media has had on the industry, centres are reminded that candidates must evaluate whether these impacts have had a positive or negative impact on the industry. They should discuss **current developments** which have occurred within the industry as a result of the involvement of the media and draw conclusions, which are justified as to whether the media has had a positive or negative effect on the industry, using an extensive range of examples to back up their arguments. For MB3 marks it is expected that the leisure industry as a whole is considered and not just the sport and physical recreation component.

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 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.

AO1: The majority of centres effectively met the requirements of this objective by effectively describing **HOW** their chosen organisation meets the needs of BOTH internal and external customers. Although for a small number of centres evidence specific to internal customers remains weaker than external customers.

AO2: 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. Centres are strongly advised to refer to this exemplar material prior to assessing this unit.

AO3: It was pleasing to note that the majority of centres are now effectively meeting the requirements of this assessment objective, providing clear analysis of the **methods** used by their chosen organisation to assess the quality of customer care provided. Centres are reminded that in order to meet the requirements of a critical analysis (for MB3) 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

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 extremely 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: As with previous series, a small number of 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

AO1: It was pleasing to note that the majority of candidates submitted work which was clearly focused on the requirements of this objective. However, centres are reminded of the need to fully cover the evidence requirements of both the assessment objective and the content of the WYNTL section of the specification.

AO2: Whilst most centres provided comprehensive evidence of their candidates' involvement in appropriate outdoor leisure activities, a number of candidates did not provide the '**detailed plan**' required of the MB3 marks awarded by their assessors. 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. Overall, analysis of the **range** of provision was better than analysis of the **scale**. Centres are reminded that both elements need to be effectively analysed in order to achieve higher MB3 marks.

AO4: It was pleasing to note that the majority of candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this assessment objective. The selection of an appropriate area was once again 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 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice

General Comments

As with previous examination sessions, a pre-release case study material had been forwarded to the centres. The case study was based on 'The Fun Factory' an indoor play area for children. The material included general information on The Fun Factory, 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. 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 still struggling to interpret the command words in the questions correctly, and, therefore, the majority failed to answer in an appropriate level. However, it was clear that some centres had spent time working on the command words with conclusions being included more often, and balanced arguments presented.

This allowed candidates to structure their response more clearly and, although a little prescriptive in format, it allowed candidates to clearly show evaluation and therefore access higher level marks. This emphasises the need for centres to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of this unit.

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, unfortunately, limited use of vocational examples studied. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with or confused by specific aspects such as quality systems and also technical terms such as primary and secondary research.

It was clear that a number of centres had used relevant case studies as a revision tool, although some candidates addressed previous case studies in their answers. Although past papers are a good revision tool, candidates must address the questions in relation to the present one, and on a few occasions these had become mixed.

The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well; although the question relating to PEST still caused issues with some candidates – many of them mixing up the different elements.

The majority of candidates seem to have demonstrated 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 students 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 as many candidates struggled to name three quality systems.
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 in the answer.
1c	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 their answer, or gave advantages to the organisation rather than to the customer. Links to the benefits in terms of storage were limited and caused lower marks to be awarded.
2a	The risk assessment was 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 the consequence, eg someone would be hurt, illness.
2b	Most candidates had a good awareness of the Children Act and could identify and describe some of the key elements of it. Impacts were often limited to the need to get all staff CRB checked.
2c	Most candidates scored full marks on this part of the question relating to the impacts of safe working practices.
2d	The impacts of the Data Protection Act were shown but were somewhat limited. Many candidates failed to highlight more than two of the key requirements.
3a	PEST – although some candidates clearly understood this technique, many struggled with the actual PEST analysis often putting a suitable answer in the wrong section. Many also included answers which would have better suited a SWOT analysis.
3b	The candidates in the main had a good understanding of location as an element of the marketing mix. The focus, however, remained with the physical location.
4a	Candidates either understood cash flow fully and gained full marks or confused the concept with other financial documents and provided incorrect answers.
4b	Although many factors causing cash flow problems were highlighted in the case study, candidates failed to give a solid overview of these, often focusing on only one factor.
4c	Most candidates gave three suitable answers; however, in some cases the word 'card' was used on its own thus making the response inappropriate. Candidates should have referred explicitly to a credit card or a debit card.
5a	Although a straightforward question, candidates often mixed up primary and secondary research. Candidates frequently gave examples of how to collect data – comments cards and surveys rather than explaining what was the research method.
5b	Candidates were able to come up with a range of ideas as to how to carry out, monitor and evaluate activities. Candidates, however, tended to concentrate on the information collected from customers rather than any numerical data available.
5c	Although the candidates were given two promotional techniques to evaluate in terms of suitability, many failed to read the question correctly and evaluated techniques which they had selected themselves, or concentrated only on one technique.

G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry

General Comments

This examination centres on human resource functions within leisure organisations. A pre-release case study was issued which illustrated the context in which the examination would take place. In this examination series the focus was *T-4-2* a small family owned and operated café situated in a visitors centre in the town of Wellsburg on the south coast of England.

The majority of candidates completed all questions, with a good number of them displaying a sound depth of knowledge, although with a limited level of analysis and evaluation. Candidates used their knowledge and skills to appropriately respond to questions on types of employment, the recruitment and selection process and customer services. However, there were a number of aspects on which candidates did not perform well. It appeared that candidates did not have the knowledge, skills or understanding to respond to questions on motivational techniques, management structures and human resource planning

In general, candidates appeared to show a reasonable understanding of the assessment objectives, although some only offered knowledge based responses, lacking the skills necessary to provide answers at Level 3, and in some cases, used questions to demonstrate their entire knowledge of a topic.

Examination technique remains somewhat of an issue, with candidates misunderstanding command words, such as 'discuss' and 'evaluate', and contextualisation references such as 'the benefits for *T-4-2*' leading to responses not meeting the examination's aims, and their responses not having the content or level of application and analysis necessary to achieve Level 3.

Comments on individual questions

1	Mostly full marks were gained on this part of the question. Where marks were not awarded it was due to a lack of detail in the explanation of the types of employment and inappropriate or no examples given of each type of employment.
2a	Most candidates gained full marks on this part of the question Where marks were not awarded it was due to an incorrect description of recruitment.
2b	Good knowledge was shown of the recruitment and selection process, often accessing Level 2 marks. However, candidates lost marks by not being able to apply the knowledge to the impact on <i>T-4-2</i> , with a number of them focusing on the impact on employees.
2c	This part of the question was well answered, with a good understanding of the impact of poorly performing employees shown. Many responses obtained marks in Level 2.
3a	A reasonable understanding of job enrichment was shown, although a number of responses were about general motivation techniques and were more suited to question 3(b).
3b	This was a poorly answered question, with candidates showing little knowledge of the indicative content and motivational techniques. Where suitable responses were offered, they were at a basic level and were not analysed.
4a	Many responses focused on management styles rather than management structures. In some cases the management structures were not recognised structures. In places candidates used the question to tell the examiner all they knew about management structures and were, therefore, not able to offer any analysis or evaluation. A number of candidates did not correctly use the pre-release case study material, confusing the most suitable structure with one <i>T-4-2</i> already used which was highlighted as ineffective.

4b	On the whole this part of the question was well answered, with a number of candidates accessing higher level scores by analysing the impact and correctly applying it to the impact on <i>T-4-2</i> .
4c	This was a poorly answered question with only a basic knowledge of the Working Time Directive demonstrated by candidates, and, in some cases, no knowledge shown. There were also a number of no responses. Analysis was limited to a simple observation of the impact on employees and very little on the impact on <i>T-4-2</i> .
5a	Too many responses focused on the general impacts on <i>T-4-2</i> and employees and not specifically on human resource planning. There were issues with what are considered external issues and there was generally a poor understanding of human resources planning. This remains a problem aspect of this examination.
5b	This part of the question was, on the whole, well answered with many candidates gaining full marks. Where marks were not awarded it was due to the examples given not being internal issues.

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 2011