

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

Report on the Units

June 2009

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, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabuses 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 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 2009

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
Principal Moderator's 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	7
G184/01 Human Resources in the Leisure Industry	8
G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors	10
Grade Thresholds	11

Chief Examiner Report

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, 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 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, 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 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 identified 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.

As with previous years, time management was not an issue for the majority of candidates.

Principal Moderator's Report

General Comments:

It was very pleasing to note that the vast 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.

As in previous series, 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.

On those occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed to bring them in line with the national standard, the main reason for the adjustment was due to candidates' work being awarded higher level 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.

G180/01 Exploring Leisure

AO1: Generally well done. 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 Mark Band 2 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 require 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 Mark Band 2.

AO3: Generally well done. However, there are a very small number of Centres where 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 Mark Band 3.

AO4: Centres are reminded that this assessment objective requires the candidate to evaluate the impact of the media on the leisure industry, not simply to describe it. As in previous series, some Centres credited candidates for simple descriptions rather than evaluations. Candidates should also discuss current developments which have occurred within the industry.

G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

AO1: As with previous series, 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 are now responding well in relation to both internal and external customers; however, there remain a small number of candidates who still do not clearly focus on HOW their chosen leisure organisation meets their customers' needs.

AO2: The majority of Centres continue to provide 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 a small number of assessors still 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 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.

AO3: Whilst the majority of candidates are now responding appropriately to the requirements of this assessment objective, there remain a small number of Centres which misinterpret the requirements and credit analysis of the quality of customer service, rather than analyse the methods used by the organisation to assess its customer service. Centres are reminded that 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 on how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed.

AO4: It is pleasing to note that 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 an open air museum 'Holbeck'. 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. 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, failed to answer at an appropriate level. Many candidates described and explained when they should be discussing or analysing, thus limiting the grade they could achieve. There was limited development of answers into Levels 3 and 4, which seemed to be a reflection of examination technique rather than ability.

Previous papers had been used as a revision tool; however, some candidates failed to apply the knowledge and skills gained to the new case study, answering questions that related to the old case study, rather than the new. Centres need to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of unit. Candidates also would benefit from sessions on examination preparation which include the use of command words.

Centres need to make full use of the pre-release case study material by extracting and developing the 'What You Need To Learn' section, and to try to set questions within this context, or getting candidates to identify questions which could be drawn from the case study.

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 could enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing the candidates to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace, which would also provide vocationally relevant examples to refer to in the examination paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

1a	This part of the question was not answered well, with some candidates giving the advantages of IIP to the facility, rather than the key principles
1b	Most candidates made a reasonable attempt of this part of the question, with most identifying staffing and resource allocation as major difficulties.
1c	Most candidates were able to identify advantages of an electronic stock control and were able to go on and explain why they were advantages.
2a	Most candidates obtained full marks on this part of the question by being able to explain the terms risk and hazard effectively.
2b	Although a different format to the pre-set risk assessment – the majority of candidates were able to identify four stages of the risk assessment progress – many in detail.

Report on the Units taken in June 2009

2c	The majority of candidates were able to identify the key of the function Health and Safety at Work Act. Many identified the responsibilities of the employer, although they failed then to go on to account for the impact of the Act in areas such as cost of implementation, monitoring and the impact if not complied with.
2d	As with the Health and Safety at Work Act, the majority of candidates were able to identify the key of the function Data Protection Act. Although many candidates were able to identify the main elements of the Act, these were often just listed. To move through the mark levels, the candidates needed to evaluate the implications of these areas on leisure organisations.
3a	The majority of candidates were able to identify two weaknesses, opportunities and strengths; 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.
3b	Candidates grasped the marketing mix of Holbeck in varying levels. Many had a good generic overview and were able to state the four elements which make up the marketing mix. Candidates struggled to place these within the context of Holbeck – with price and promotion being the weakest of the four elements. There were many factual statements made about the mix – but with little discussion of the positive and negative elements.
4a	Candidates, however, seemed to cope fairly well with basics of how the budget could be used to help Holbeck in its financial planning. There were many examples of sound knowledge of different types of budget. 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 in planning for the future.
4b(i)	This part of the question was well addressed by most candidates with the majority knowing that it allowed expenditure and income to be calculated and would identify where problems may occur.
4b(ii)	Most candidates made an effort to answer this part of the question with answers focusing on seasonality and the present state of the economy. Many useful suggestions were made as to how improvements to this could be made – although many of these would prove unrealistic due to the resources needed to carry them out; such as place the whole facility under cover – ie. cost may be prohibitive.
5a	Many candidates addressed the question but failed to look at it correctly – attracting repeat customers. In doing so they came up with suggestions of how to attract repeat customers, rather than to evaluate what Holbeck was already doing in terms of price to bring in repeat custom. Those candidates who did focus on this classed the facility as over-priced, although further investigation of other similar facilities during the build up to the examination could show where it lay in terms of price, when compared to other similar facilities.
5b	This part of the question was generally well answered with candidates showing greatest understanding of advertising. Sponsorship was looked at but often from the perspective of Holbeck sponsoring rather than the facility being sponsored.
5c	There was limited understanding of the different market research techniques which could be used. Candidates often focused solely on surveys, with little or no reference to secondary research.

G183/01 Event Management

The majority of Centres continue to successfully address 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.

AO1: The evidence provided by the majority of candidates was strong, effectively covering the evidence requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are once again reminded of the need for the feasibility to be written before, not after, the event has taken place.

AO2: It was pleasing to note 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. Centres are, however, reminded that 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 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 Mark Band 3 criteria.

AO3: This series saw a significant improvement in the quality of evidence provided for this assessment objective. A small number of Centres, however, 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 Mark Band 3.

AO4: As with previous series, there was evidence of some comprehensive evaluations; however, a number of Centres continue to give 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 their team's performance; this is particularly important when awarding marks within Mark Band 3. 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.

G184/01 Human Resources in the Leisure Industry

General Comments

The examination focuses on the human resources function within leisure organisations, and Centres are continuing to develop their understanding of the specification and the examination. A pre-release case study was issued highlighting the context the examination would take, in this series 'Cherry Tree Hall', a family owned leisure complex which had been taken over by 'Pan-European Leisure'.

On the whole the majority of candidates completed all questions, further evidence that centres had covered most of the content of the specification, with high numbers of candidates displaying a depth of knowledge, albeit with a limited level of analysis and evaluation. Greater numbers of candidates displayed a clearer understanding of the assessment objectives with fewer candidates simply offering only knowledge based responses, although there was still a lack of candidates displaying the skills necessary to access answers at Levels 3 and 4.

A number of aspects of the specification, as with previous series, appeared to present problems to candidates, in terms of a limited and, in some cases, complete lack of knowledge and understanding, with specific reference to human resource planning, recruitment methods, external issues and in particular appraisals.

Centres are reminded to ensure that their schemes of work fully reflect the whole content of the specification; particular reference should be made to the numbers of candidates who demonstrated a total lack of understanding of appraisals.

Examination technique remains an issue, with candidates misinterpreting command words, such as 'discuss' and 'evaluate', and contextualisation references such as 'for the centre' and 'for the employee' leading to responses not meeting the examination aims, and their responses not having the content or level of application and analysis to achieve Levels 3 and 4 and, in some cases, Level 2 – this was due mainly to responses not being specifically about 'Cherry Tree Hall/Pan-European Leisure' when required.

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 access application marks. Centres should focus on using 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 and mock examination papers. It has been evident that some candidate's responses are more akin to previous examination series.

Comments on Individual Questions

1a	Most candidates achieved full marks for identifying reasons for a person's contract of employment ending.
1b	Most candidates achieved full marks for explaining the disadvantages of employing seasonal staff, although some did not explain their initial point and there was some repetition.

Report on the Units taken in June 2009

1c	On the whole there was a basic understanding of the benefits of appointing a new manager on a full-time permanent contract; however, there was a limited amount of analysis and very few conclusions drawn on its suitability. This question also saw a number of misinterpretations of the question, with a number of candidates seeing the question to be about appointing 'new' staff and not about 'full-time permanent contact' as a method of employment.
2a(i)	The vast majority of candidates achieved the mark. Those who did not identified an internal issue.
2a(ii)	Clear knowledge of the external issue was shown, with application to the case study. However, there was very little analysis and evaluation of the effects of the issue on human resource planning, meaning candidates were unable to achieve scores in Levels 3 and 4.
2b	Again, the vast majority of candidates displayed a basic understanding of high staff turnover; however, there was limited analysis and evaluation of affects of the issue on human resource planning focusing on general issues at Cherry Tree Hall.
3a	Most candidates achieved full marks for the identification of suitable methods of recruitment; however, the focus was on general employment and not suitable methods of appointing management positions. Some candidates failed to explain their points to access the second level of marks.
3b	Reasonable levels of knowledge and application were shown by most candidates; however, there was limited analysis of the suitability. Several candidates misinterpreted the question to be the disadvantages to Cherry Tree Hall and not the applicants.
3c	There was a fair amount of repetition of the content of the process from the case study, highlighting a good level of knowledge, but levels of analysis and evaluation of the recruitment process were very limited.
3d	Knowledge of the consequences of not following the Working Time Directive was apparent, although some candidates displayed a poor level of specific knowledge with a significant amount of repetition, a failure to explain their points and incorrect information.
4a	Candidates displayed a limited understanding of methods of appraisal, with some linking the question to motivation techniques, rather than appraisal methods and others were repeated or were too similar to the example given in the question, leading to more incorrect responses than correct ones.
4b	The majority of candidates displayed a good level of understanding of how to judge the success of the training schemes and applied mainly to Pan-European Leisure. Again, although many candidates were able to analyse their responses at a basic level, few were able to offer any evaluative statements or draw conclusions.
5a	This part of the question polarised responses from candidates, with them being either very clear and concise or totally incorrect. Centres need to ensure that all the content of the specification is covered in their schemes of work.
5b	It was pleasing to see a good understanding of management by objectives from most candidates and its application to the Cherry Tree Hall; however, there was still a lack of analysis and evaluation shown and, hence, limited access to Levels 3 and 4.
5c	Focus in candidates responses was mainly on the positive aspects of non-financial rewards, with some application shown and limited analysis. Very few candidates looked at the positives and negatives of non-financial rewards, but those who did were able to access the higher Level 3 and 4 responses.

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

Whilst the majority of Centres provided appropriate evidence in the achievement of this unit, Centres are again reminded of the distinction between activities which 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 was pleasing to note that in this series the evidence presented by the majority of Centres was more clearly focused on the requirements of the assessment objective.

AO2: Overall, the majority of candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; however coverage of the legal requirements of their chosen activity was not always provided 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 Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 for this objective. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to provide a 'plan' which covers all of the key requirements as outlined in the specification

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: As with previous series, 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 a small number of 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 2009 Examination Series

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G180	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G181	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G183	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G185	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	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	82	72	62	53	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G184	Raw	100	79	70	61	52	44	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
2.28	10.15	33.25	61.42	84.01	100.00
There were 400 candidates aggregating this series.					

Advanced GCE (H528):

A	B	C	D	E	U
1.60	18.80	51.20	81.60	98.40	100.00
There were 253 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 2009

