

GCE

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H528**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H128**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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 2015

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G180 Investigating the Leisure Industry	4
G181 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry	5
G182: Leisure Industry Practice	6
G183 Event Management	9
G184: Human Resources in the Leisure Industry	11
G185 Leisure in the Outdoors	13

G180 Investigating the Leisure Industry

General Comments:

It was very pleasing to note that the vast majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst this series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series. It is also essential that candidates use relevant up to date statistics when presenting data to support their work. Some candidates from some centres continue to submit work with statistics that are more than ten years old which significantly impacts on their ability to successfully meet the assessment criteria particularly at Mark Band 3

On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, 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 the Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

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 an issue for some centres and some candidates.

The majority of centres now effectively address the European element of this assessment objective although some candidates continue to submit 'International' instead of 'European' examples.

AO2: The majority of centres are now using comprehensive up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, a small number of centres are still using out of date statistics and 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.

AO3: Generally well done. There are, however 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 then effectively cover the 'key factors' as identified in the specification or vice versa. The specification requires analysis of both, this is particularly important when awarding higher marks.

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

G181 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

General Comments:

It was very pleasing to note that the vast majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst this series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series. It is also essential that candidates use relevant up to date statistics when presenting data to support their work. Some candidates from some centres continue to submit work with statistics that are more than ten years old which significantly impacts on their ability to successfully meet the assessment criteria particularly at Mark Band 3

On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, 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 the Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

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 are now addressing the requirements of the specification in relation to both internal and external customers.

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

AO3: Whilst the majority of candidates are now responding appropriately to the requirements of this assessment objective, there remain a small number of centres who continue to misinterpret the requirements of the objective and give credit when candidates analyse 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 these 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: The majority of centres continue to respond well to the requirements of this objective, with some comprehensive evaluations submitted this series.

G182: Leisure Industry Practice

General Comments

As with the previous exam sessions, a pre-release case study material had been forwarded to the centres. The case study was based on a Livery stable and riding school – Blaxters.

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 six questions, all with sub sections. It gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain a high 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 candidates understanding and use of command words had improved substantially in some cases. There has been great progress in this area, where candidates are including both sides of a discussion, and adding evaluative comments and conclusions where necessary. This has allowed the stronger candidates to achieve level three marks, and higher grades. On occasions the presentation of these answers has seemed to be a little prescriptive, and formulaic. However this strategy has allowed candidates to clearly show evaluation and therefore access higher level marks.

This continues to emphasise the need for centres to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of the 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. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar or confused with specific areas such as quality standards with a large number of candidates having little knowledge of customer charters.

The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well, although many continue to put more than one answer in each box. Many also failed to look at the severity rating, giving an inappropriate consequence which failed to be specific enough to the hazard identified, using terms such as ‘injury’ rather than a specific injury caused, linked to the ratings.

The majority of 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 the students to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace. Candidates also would benefit from sessions on exam preparation that include the use of command words, and further developed use of the pre release material.

Comments on individual questions

- 1a** Generally well answered with many candidates able to identify and then to explain an advantage of a customer charter.
- 1b** Few candidates achieved full marks. Many repeated points shown in the previous question. Few candidates were able to state actual standards that could be included in a charter for the organisation.

- 2a** Most students understood the price element of the marketing mix. Many were able to evaluate the pricing strategies in place as well as consider the benefits of the proposed new discount pricing. A number of candidates listed different strategies in a factual manner without any application, restricting marks to the lower mark bands.
- 2b** As the question linked to social media, this question was well answered by many students, with evaluative comments and conclusions shown.
- 2c** The SWOT analysis was well answered in the main. Students often mixed up weaknesses and threats, misunderstanding the internal and external sides of the SWOT.
- 3a** The candidates were able to show an understanding of the positives and negatives of using both an IT based system and a paper based system. Candidates were able to select what they deemed to be the most appropriate method, paper based or IT based, and support this with suitable justifications.
- 3b** Most candidates were able to list the key elements of the data protection act as factual statements, however only a limited number of candidates then moved on to show the responsibilities that Blaxter's then faced due to these elements. .
- 4a** Most students were able to identify the basic functions of a cash flow forecast.
- 4b** The students had clearly been prepared well, with many of them being able to identify the factors which were causing the cash flow problems for Blaxter. The more able ones then went on to suggest ways in which these could be addressed with some excellent examples of activities that Blaxter could implement at the quieter points in the year.
- 5a** Both of the questions relating to Health and safety were well answered. The candidates were able to identify responsibilities under the HASWA, however some of these were a little generic, and could have been more closely linked to the act.
- 5b** Most students gained full marks on this section, being able to show what the impact of poor working practices would be on the organisation. Answers ranged from injury, to public image and the impact on recruitment, showing candidates had a full understanding of the area.
- 5c** The Children Act was a question that many struggled to express themselves well. Some candidates were able to state key elements such as the need for CRB checks, the limits on photographs and staff ratio levels. They were then able to go on and make direct links between these and the organisation in terms of cost and time etc. Other candidates talked generically about children and safety, but often this was a link to health and safety legislation rather than specifically the Children Act.
- 5d** The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well, although many continue to put more than one answer in each box., Many also failed to look at the severity rating, giving an inappropriate consequence which failed to be specific enough to the hazard identified, using terms such as 'injury' rather than identifying a specific injury which had been linked to the ratings.
- 6a** This question was generally well answered where the students understood the difference between the methods. Many students mixed up qualitative and quantitative resulting in incorrect answers.

- 6b** Although two promotional techniques were shown in the stem of the question; public relations and direct marketing, a number of students failed to discuss these types and discussed their own choices, resulting in no marks. A number of candidates failed to show an understanding of public relations, and therefore limiting the marks that could be awarded. Stronger candidates explained and evaluated both methods, coming to a conclusion about the most appropriate one for Baxter's

G183 Event Management

General Comments:

It was very pleasing to note that the vast majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst this series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series. It is also essential that candidates use relevant up to date statistics when presenting data to support their work. Some candidates from some centres continue to submit work with statistics that are more than ten years old. This significantly impacts on their ability to successfully meet the assessment criteria particularly at Mark Band 3

On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, 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 the Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

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 study to be written before, not after, the event has taken place.

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. 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 and in particular the Mark Band 3 criteria.

AO3: The quality of supporting evidence provided by candidates for the achievement of this assessment objective has improved this series. 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: Whilst the majority of the work submitted by candidates was accurately assessed, a small 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 fully cover the specification 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 Band3.

G184: Human Resources in the Leisure Industry

General Comments

This examination focuses on the human resource functions within leisure organisations. The pre-release case study illustrated the context in which the examination would be based; in this series at Full Sail – a sailing school located on the south coast of England.

Most candidates completed all questions. A good number of candidates were able to display a sound depth of knowledge and understanding; with some candidates going on to demonstrate the ability to analyse, evaluate and draw conclusions.

Knowledge and understanding was demonstrated by candidates with appropriate responses to questions on the Working Time Directive, recruitment and interviewing methods, types of employment and motivating staff.

Where candidates did not perform well, they lacked knowledge and/or the understanding to respond to questions on the induction process, the appraisal process and human resource planning.

In general candidates showed a good understanding of the assessment objectives with some demonstrating the analytical skills necessary to access answers at level 3 across a broader range of their responses.

Some candidates overlooked command words, such as 'justify your answer'; and contextualisation references, in particular relating to the suitability of carrying out appraisals at Full Sail, which lead to responses not meeting the examination aims, and lacking the correct level of explanation to achieve level 2, and the analysis to achieve level 3.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a)** Most gained full marks. Marks lost due to a lack of an example, vague or incorrect description
- 1(b)** Most gained full marks. Marks lost due to a lack of examples of how a person could be discriminated against
- 1(c)** On the whole well answered, better responses provided a clear description of the working time regulations, analysed the impact of these on Full Sail and provided an evaluation of the impact. Weaker answers were simple or incorrect descriptions of the regulations.
- 2(a)** Well answered, better responses were clear about the advantages and disadvantages of the method of advertising and provided a supported statement of suitability for both seasonal and full time positions at Full Sail
- 2(b)** Relatively well answered, better responses analysed both the CV and application form and make a supported judgement of suitability for Full Sail
- 2(c)** Mark dropped because of a lack of what the shortlisting process compared in order to produce the shortlist
- 2(d)** Well answered on the whole, good understanding of seasonal employment and the advantages, better answers assessed the disadvantages and discussed having a range of employment types being advisable for Full Sail.

- 3(a)** Reasonably well answered, most were able to describe the contents of an induction programme, with stronger candidates going to assess the impact of the induction on Full Sail and make a judgement.
- 3(b)** Most candidates gained full marks. Lost marks were often due to the question not being answered..
- 3(c)** Stronger candidates were able to explain the advantages and disadvantages of both training and development, and make a judgement about the suitability of both for Full Sail.
- 4(a)** Better answers assessed the suitability of remuneration to the various types of staff at Full Sail, and were able to make a reasoned supported conclusion. Poorer answers were generally very descriptive.
- 4(b)** Not well answered. Candidates misinterpreted the questions and evaluated the dismissal of Janette and not the effectiveness of the appraisal process
- 4(c)** Most candidates gained full marks. However some outlined the process of dismissal rather than the consequences of not doing it properly.
- 5** Good descriptions of local and/or national economic issues and how they affect people in general and Full Sail. The better responses were able to assess and analyse the impact on human resource planning.

G185 Leisure in the Outdoors

General Comments:

It was very pleasing to note that the vast majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst this series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address the issue for the next series. It is also essential that candidates use relevant up to date statistics when presenting data to support their work. Some candidates from some centres continue to submit work with statistics that are more than ten years old which significantly impacts on their ability to successfully meet the assessment criteria particularly at Mark Band 3

On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, 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 the Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

AO1: The majority of centres are now effectively addressing the requirements of this assessment objective.

AO2: Whilst the majority of candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; 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. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to provide a 'plan' that 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 continue to give too much credit when candidates simply identify and describe the facilities available rather than analyse the range and scale of outdoor leisure provision in their chosen area.

AO4: The majority of candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this objective. The area chosen was once again crucial. 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. A small number of centres submitted work that incorrectly evaluated the 'impact of tourism' on their chosen area and not the 'impact of outdoor leisure' as required by the specification.

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 2015

