

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
Moderation report on G180/01 G181/01 G183/01 G185/01	3
G182 – Leisure industry practice	6
G184 – Human resources in the leisure industry	9

Overview

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 series and centres are strongly advised to refer to this report for guidance on the development of candidates' work.

Performance with regard to all four internally assessed units was similar to previous cohorts, although entry levels have fallen for all four units. While it is pleasing to note that the key issues relating to the interpretation of the evidence requirements have been successfully addressed by the majority of centres, a very small number of centres are still experiencing problems interpreting the quality requirements of individual assessment objectives and providing sufficient good quality evidence for the achievement of the higher mark bands. 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. In addition these centres are strongly advised to consult the exemplar material published by OCR as guidance.

The Principal Examiners have submitted detailed reports on the issues identified by examiners on the two externally assessed units (G182 and G184) and centres are strongly advised to refer to these reports for guidance on how to improve levels of performance in future examination series.

On unit G182, while it was noted that some candidates were still struggling to interpret the command words in the questions correctly (and, therefore, answer at an appropriate level), the Principal Examiner did comment that there has been substantial progress in relation to this element, with many candidates now including both sides of a discussion, and adding conclusions, where necessary, allowing the stronger candidates to achieve Level 3 marks, and, hence, higher grades.

On unit G184 it was pleasing to note that many candidates are now displaying a reasonable understanding of the assessment objectives with sound knowledge based responses and reasonable analysis, with some candidates accessing Level 3 responses.

On both examined the candidates need to ensure that they answer the question set and not a similar question which has not been set. Centres must ensure that their candidates are able to respond effectively to contextualised references, such as 'for the leisure organisation', 'for the customer' and 'for the employee', as the indicative content for each of these perspectives is likely to be significantly different. Candidates must ensure that they answer from the correct perspective as no marks will be awarded for answering from an alternative perspective.

Both Principal Examiners identified areas of the specification which indicated problems for some of the candidates and centres are strongly urged to study both Principal Examiner Reports in order to improve levels of performance in future examination series.

As in previous years, time management was not an issue for the majority of the candidates. Centres may also find the following sources of use to them in helping to build upon good practice:

- Principal Moderator's report
- individual centre reports on moderation
- Principal Examiners' reports

OCR Report to Centres – June 2013

- past examination papers
- previous examination series reports
- OCR Community – OCR website
- sample schemes of work and lesson plans – OCR website
- further guidance for teachers – OCR website

Moderation report on G180/01 G181/01 G183/01 G185/01

General Comments

In relation to the work viewed during moderation it was 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 criteria. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work, with appropriate documentation (such as the Unit Recording Sheet) completed accurately, this aided the moderation process considerably. A small proportion of the centres did not complete all aspects of the Unit Recording Sheet and some centres provided little or no annotations to assist the identification of evidence within the portfolio work – where this was the case moderation was hindered. A larger than average proportion of the centres submitted marks which had to be amended due to administrative errors.

Those centres not assessing in line with national standards are reminded that the quality of the work and coverage of the specification must be carefully considered, particularly when awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks. Centres must ensure that the evidence presented effectively addresses all of the evidence requirements of the assessment objective, and for Mark Band 3 that there is full coverage of the specification content.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage their candidates to effectively reference their sources. Once again this series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this; however, it is still a weakness for a number of the centres which need to address this issue for the next series, particularly as this can negatively impact on the marks achieved for AO3 for all portfolio units.

G180/01 Exploring Leisure

AO1: This was generally well done. Centres continue to demonstrate a sound understanding of how sectors and components interrelate in order to provide an effective service. Understanding of how ‘stakeholders and shareholders interrelate’ remains an issue for some centres and some candidates.

The majority of centres now effectively address the European element of this assessment objective.

AO2: The majority of the centres are now using comprehensive up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, a small proportion of the centres are still giving too much credit to candidates who simply describe data relating to ‘consumer spending, participation trends, employment and health and well-being’, rather than applying the data to the requirements of the assessment objective.

As with AO1, the specification clearly requires the consideration of European data. It was pleasing to note that the majority of the centres are now effectively addressing this requirement with a wide range of relevant European data evident.

AO3: This was generally well done, with no real issues identified this series.

AO4: The majority of the centres provided good evaluative evidence for the achievement of this objective. However, some centres are still giving too much credit for evidence which is descriptive rather than evaluative. Centres are also reminded that their candidates also need to discuss current developments which have occurred within the industry.

G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

AO1: The majority of the candidates showed a clear understanding of the customer service principles and demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service. It was pleasing to note that the majority of candidates are now addressing the requirements of the specification in relation to both internal and external customers; however, there remain a small proportion of the centres which still do not clearly focus on **how** the chosen leisure organisation meets the customers' different needs.

AO2: Most of the centres provided strong supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions.

Unfortunately, there were still some centres whose candidates provided insufficient evidence to support the practical requirement of the unit, with some centres still relying on simplistic witness statements to confirm the candidate's involvement within a variety of customer service situations. Supporting evidence needs 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 the 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: While the majority of the candidates are now responding appropriately to the requirements of this assessment objective, there remain a small proportion of the centres which misinterpret the requirements and credit analysis of the quality of customer service, rather than an analysis the methods used by the organisation to assess its customer service. Centres are reminded that to effectively meet the requirements of this assessment objective, the candidates must identify and then analyse the methods used by their chosen organisation. This should be done through a detailed consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the methods used in relation to the needs of the organisation. For higher marks, recommendations for improvements on how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also required.

AO4: The majority of the centres continued to respond well to the requirements of this objective, with some excellent detailed evaluations evident.

G183/01 Event Management

There were significantly fewer entries for this unit than in previous summer series.

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, and 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. Nonetheless, centres are 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, it is strongly recommended that an assessor's witness statement is used to support the evidence provided by the candidates in relation to all mark bands but in particular the Mark Band 3 criteria.

AO3: This series saw a significant improvement in the quality of the evidence provided for this assessment objective. A small proportion of the centres still provide group rather than individual evidence. It is recommended that log books and minutes of group meetings are used to provide evidence of individual research, candidates should also clearly index their sources. Candidates who do not clearly indicate the sources which they have personally accessed and the range of research which 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 proportion of the centres continued 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 their candidates to fully cover the specification when awarding marks within Mark Band 3 – effective use of ‘Teamwork Theory’ is essential if the candidates are to meet the requirements of a ‘comprehensive’ evaluation of their team’s performance and, thus, achieve marks within Mark Band 3.

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

There were very few entries for this unit this series.

AO1: It was pleasing to note that the majority of centres are now effectively addressing the requirements of this assessment objective. Although some centres are reminded of the need to ensure that the candidates relate their comments to the requirements of the assessment objective in relation to how the events outlined in the specification have influenced the development of the outdoor as a leisure resource.

AO2: While the majority of the candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; Centres are reminded of the need for their 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 their 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 proportion of the centres however, gave too much credit when their candidates simply identified and described the facilities available, rather than analysing the range and scale of outdoor leisure provision in their chosen area. As was the case in previous series, evidence relating to the range of outdoor leisure facilities was generally stronger than the evidence relating to the ‘scale’ of provision. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates are now effectively analysing the current issues affecting the provision of outdoor leisure facilities.

AO4: The majority of the candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this objective. The selection of an appropriate area is, once again, crucial. As with previous series, the weakest evidence was in relation to how the identified impacts could be managed, with a small proportion of the candidates failing to address this essential requirement of the objective.

G182 – Leisure industry practice

The pre-release case study this series was based on a dance studio, “Dance yourself Dizzy”.

The material included general information on the leisure facility, and outlined how it had developed its products up to the present point, where competition in the market was having an effect on the business.

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

It was clear that some candidates were still struggling to interpret the command words in the questions correctly, and, therefore, failed to answer at an appropriate level, although often knowledge was present if not expressed well. However, there has been substantial progress in relation to this element, with many candidates now including both sides of a discussion, and adding conclusions where necessary. This has allowed the stronger candidates to achieve Level 3 marks, and, hence, higher grades. On occasions the presentation of these answers has seemed to be a little prescriptive, and almost to a preset format. However, it has still allowed some 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 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 of the specification. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar and confused by specific elements such as finance, with a large number of candidates being unable to give definitions of specific technical terms.

It was clear that a number of centres had used relevant case studies as a revision tool. Although past papers are a good revision tool, candidates must still address the questions in relation to the present one, and on a few occasions some candidates answered the question they expected to be asked, rather than the question in front of them.

The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well, although many continue to put more than one answer in each box, including a range of grades and consequences. Many also failed to look at the severity rating, giving an inappropriate consequence which failed to be specific enough to the hazard identified.

The majority of the candidates seem to have had effective time management skills, as on the whole, the majority of candidates completed the questions set.

Centres should enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing 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

- 1ai This part of the question was generally answered well, with most candidates being able to give two areas for the customer charter, although some of these were not expressed as well as they could be.
- 1a ii Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this part of the question, with appropriate advantages given for a customer charter in relation to customers rather than the organisation.
- 1b Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this part of the question, with the majority using IIP as the selected quality system. The better candidates were able to be specific about how this system would enhance staff development. Some candidates who failed to achieve any marks referred to staff development generically and failed to link to a quality system.
- 2a Most candidates had a good awareness of a SWOT analysis and were able to make a reasonable attempt at this part of the question. Some candidates still place elements into the wrong section of the SWOT.
- 2b The candidates could identify some benefits of a SWOT, however many went on to repeat their response to the previous part of the question rather than indicating how it could be used to aid decision making.
- 2c This part of the question allowed the candidates to express both viewpoints, which some candidates did well. Most were able to express why the inclusion of a Zumba class would be beneficial to the dance studio.
- 2d Most candidates were able to show a definition of sponsorship as a two way process – funding in the return for coverage.
- 3a Candidates either identified two financial documents and gained full marks, or failed to gain any marks at all by simply identifying any financial terms of which they were aware. Candidates are still using the old terms such as a balance sheet, rather than statement of financial position.
- 3b Candidates generally understood what the cash flow problems were within the organisation; however, few understood why a cash flow forecast could be useful in helping plan the finances of the business.
- 3c Few candidates could give an accurate definition of the technical terms –cash surplus and gross profit. Those who did obtain gave a partial definition which missed out a key element of the definition.
- 4a Many of the candidates were able to show how either a paper based or an ICT based system would be useful to the organisation. Many included the advantages and disadvantages of an IT based system compared to a paper based system, and the stronger candidates came to a conclusion and opted for one or the other system.
- 4b The candidates were required to give data formats – although many were able to list items of data, some failed to show the specific formats of paper, electronic or video based data.
- 4c This part of the question was fairly well addressed by the candidates with many giving appropriate ways in which the Internet could be used effectively by Dance yourself Dizzy. The stronger candidates went on to identify other elements of the Internet such as email, texting, and social networks.

- 5a Candidates were able to show an understanding of the Children Act, identifying some key requirements of the Act. However, many of these proved to be descriptive without the candidates developing their responses to identify which of these elements would have the greatest impact on Dance yourself Dizzy.
- 5b The risk assessment was, in the main, well answered. Some candidates failed to take into account the severity number – producing consequences which were inappropriate. Candidates continue to give more than one answer in each box. Some actions or consequences were lacking in sufficient detail to gain marks, eg injury/signs.
- 6a A large number of candidates were able to give clear definitions of the two types of data. Some candidates confused the two definitions giving a perfect definition but for the wrong type of data.
- 6b A large number of candidates were unable to give examples of the different types of data.
- 6c Candidates were able to come up with a range of ideas of pricing strategies for Dance yourself Dizzy. Many considered competitive pricing which was appropriate; however, many went with price skimming, for which although marks were given if justified, was not the most appropriate pricing strategy. Many candidates expressed more than one strategy, and justified why a range of ideas should be used, thus accessing the higher band marks.

G184 – Human resources in the leisure industry

The examination focuses on human resource functions within leisure organisations and, in the case of this examination series specifically, on the 'GPX Arena' – a multi-purpose area located on the outskirts of the city of Whallington. A pre-release case study was issued which outlined details of the Arena and the internal and external issues which affect it.

The majority of the candidates completed all of the questions, with many candidates displaying a sound depth of knowledge; some candidates were also able to provide analysis and evaluation allowing access to the higher grade marks.

Candidates demonstrated their knowledge and skills appropriately responding to questions on types of employment, flexible work-force, in-house training and management styles. The question on human resource planning was well answered by most candidates, possibly due to the question providing the contextualisation of the issues affecting human resource planning rather than as the case in previous series the candidates being required to provide this themselves. They were able to demonstrate a sound grasp of the effects of staff turnover on human resource planning, with some candidates providing good analysis and evaluation.

Where candidates did not perform as well, this appeared to be a result of either a descriptive approach to answering the question or to a lack of understanding of the question – for example needs analysis and formal grievance procedures were either correct or incorrect.

In some aspects of the specification, such as motivational techniques and the induction process, candidates displayed a sound descriptive knowledge by describing every method of motivation which they knew and each step of the induction process, but were unable to provide any analysis or assessment of their suitability to the scenario in the case study.

The candidates displayed a reasonable understanding of the assessment objectives with sound knowledge based responses, reasonable analysis with some candidates accessing Level 3 responses. Examination technique was less of an issue in this series; however, some candidates still missed the contextualisation of the question; for example, when asked to "Assess the advantages and disadvantages to the GPX Arena of employing full-time staff on a permanent contract" some candidates actually assessed the advantages and disadvantages to the employee – missing the chance to access higher level marks.

Comments on individual questions

- 1 (a) On the whole the candidates gained full marks on this part of the question; however when marks were lost this was due to the candidates not knowing how many hours a full-time employee works.
- 1 (b) This was a reasonably well answered part of the question. The candidates were able to access the advantages and disadvantages of full-time employees for GPX. Better candidates were then able to suggest and support a range of employment types. Lower marks were generally the result of a simple description of a range of employment types without any analysis.
- 2 (a) The candidates mainly scored maximum marks on this part of the question. Marks were lost because the purpose was not linked to employment and/or the description of a needs analysis was incorrect.
- 2 (b) On the whole this part of the question was well answered, with the stronger candidates providing a logical analysis of the method and a reasoned conclusion of its suitability. Weaker candidates either simply described a range of methods of advertising jobs or were incorrect in their claims regarding the use of local newspapers as a method of advertising.
- 2 (c) This part of the question was either well answered, with an overall conclusion or it was incorrectly answered. Lower marks were the result of a straightforward description of the process, without any analysis or reasoned conclusions being drawn.
- 3 (a) The majority of the candidates answered this part of the question well – providing correct knowledge which progressed into an analysis of the suitability of the training method.
- 3 (b) This part of the question was mostly well answered, with an analysis of both sides of the argument which, in some cases, was supported with a logical conclusion. Again lower marks were the result of (quite correct) description of an induction programme.
- 3 (c) Most candidates gained full marks on this part of the question – when a mark was lost this was due to a non-modern or non-suitable method of communication.
- 3 (d) Most candidates gained full marks on this part of the question; however marks were lost because the impact of the acts on the recruitment process was not explained.
- 4 (a) Lower scores were the result of the simple description of a range of management styles. Better scores were due to both management styles being clearly analysed and linked to staff turnover with an overall conclusion.
- 4 (b) Lower scores were due to candidates providing a general description of a series of motivational techniques without assessing their suitability to GPX. On the other hand the higher scoring candidates were able to analyse and evaluate a smaller range of techniques and provide a sensible and reasoned conclusion regarding suitability.
- 5 (a) Most candidates gained full marks on this part of the question – when marks were lost this was due to a variation of dismissal being provided.
- 5 (b) For the most part this part of the question was well answered with supporting information, each perspective analysed and an overall conclusion drawn. Lower scores were due to a limited ability to analyse points and too much general description of the appraisal process, with some candidates simply describing each type of appraisal.

- 5 (c) (i) Most candidates gained full marks on this part of the question.
- 5 (c) (ii) Most candidates gained at least one mark on this part of the question – when a mark was lost this was because the issue was not linked to human resource planning.
- 5 (d) This part of the question was fairly well answered, with good analysis of the impact of staff turnover and how it impacts human resource planning. Lower scores were due to candidates evaluating the impact of staff turnover on employees or GPX in general.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

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 2013

