

GCE

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H528**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H128**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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 2016

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	6
G182: Leisure Industry Practice	7
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 pleasing to note that the 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.

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.

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.

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

G180/01 Exploring Leisure

AO1: Generally done well. Centres continue to demonstrate a sound understanding of how sectors and components interrelate, 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: Most centres are now using comprehensive, up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, some 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 to illustrate the importance of the industry.

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 pleasing to note that the 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.

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.

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.

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

G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

AO1: The majority of candidates showed a clear understanding of the customer service principles and demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service. The majority of candidates are now addressing the requirements of the specification in relation to both internal and external customers and are being specific as to how the chosen organisation meets the needs of all customer types.

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 series a pre-release case study had been forwarded to the centres. The case study was based on an open air swimming pool – Open Swim

The case study 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 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.

This continues to emphasise the need for centres to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of unit, as some candidates did not attempt some questions at all.

Again centres need to make full use of the prerelease 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 the PEST analysis with answers being placed in the wrong section.

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, in this case level 5 and death.

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:

- 1(a) Generally well answered with many candidates able to identify what COSHH stood for.
- 1(b) 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 in this case 5 = death. Some also 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.

- 1(c) The students showed an understanding of COSHH and the impact on a leisure organisation such as safe storage and staff training, the stronger candidates went on to develop the impact of the areas identified.
- 2(a) Most students were able to identify the correct stage of the Product life cycle.
- 2(b) Those who identified the correct stage were able to give the key characteristics of that stage.
- 2(c) PEST carried out by most candidates. The economic section was completed more fully. Often the candidates included factors that would have been better suited to a SWOT analysis.
- 3(a) Most candidates were able to list the key elements of the Price element of the 4P's. The majority of students were focused on the physical location; others developed this further by covering the e location of the facility.
- 3(b) Most students were able to identify the basic definitions of qualitative and quantitative methods. The stronger candidates went on to look at both types, and identify and justify which were most appropriate for Open Swim and why.
- 3(c) The candidates had a good understanding of the Product, however many purely focused on the pool, rather than the whole offer. Stronger answers included the use of unique selling point – that of being open air. Others went on to use the PLC and explain where the product was situated and the impact of this on sales etc.
- 3(d) The candidates were able to show an understanding of the positive and negatives of using both an IT based system and a paper based system. Students were able to select what they deemed to be the most appropriate whether paper based or IT based, and support this with suitable justifications.
- 4(a) 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 Open Swim. The more able ones then went on to suggest ways in which these could be addressed with some excellent examples of activities that Open Swim could implement at the quieter points in the year.
- 4(b) Basic definitions of profit and loss accounts given, with most candidates failing to move on any further than definitions.
- 4(c) Budgeting was understood by many as a way of trying to control the use of money. Many candidates made the positive link between the need for budgeting and the limited income that Open Swim had.
- 5(a) Most candidates were able to define a quality system; some however gave advantages and disadvantages rather than the definition.
- 5(b) A well answered question with most being able to give two examples of quality systems.
- 5(c) Although the benefits of quality systems were clearly understood, a number of students failed to read the question and muddled up the benefits to the customer and the organisation.

G183 Event Management

General Comments:

It was pleasing to note that the 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.

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.

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.

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

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 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, with a pre-release case study illustrating the context in which the examination would be based – Rockcliffe Racing, a ruraly located racing circuit in the North West of England.

Most candidates completed all questions, although there were a number of no response answers to some of the higher mark 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 make supported judgements

Knowledge and understanding was demonstrated by candidates with appropriate responses to questions on the staffing levels, training and development; and human resource planning issues. Where candidates did not perform well, they lacked knowledge and the understanding to respond to questions on staff motivation, benefits of different types of staff, the Equality Act 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 ‘assess the impact on’; and contextualisation references, such as the advantages and disadvantages to Rockcliffe Racing [not to the applicants] of using on-line applications, which resulted in responses not meeting the examination aims, and lacking the content to access the higher mark bands.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- 1(a) Most gained full marks. Marks lost due to incorrect understanding of context ‘natural wastage’
- 1(b) On the whole well answered, better responses provided justification and evaluation of their thoughts on the standard of the job advert. Weaker answers were simple identification of positive and negative points of the advert
- 1(c) On the whole well answered, better responses justified and supported evaluative comments on the suitability of on-line applications. Weaker answers were simple identification of positive and negative points of application forms in general or missed the context reference to Rockcliffe Racing focusing on the suitability to the applicants
- 2(a) In general well answered with better answers outlining the benefits and drawbacks of both part-time and seasonal staff compared to full-time staff to Rockcliffe Racing. Weaker answers focused on only one of the employment types and were limited to simple strengths and weaknesses
- 2(b) Well answered by most, weaker answers were limited to either identification of negatives or were completely out of context

- 2(c) On the whole well answered with better answers demonstrating a clear understanding of Justin's background when evaluating suitable motivational techniques and justifying their recommendations. Weaker answers suggested methods that are not motivational techniques and that they had not read the case study fully
- 3(a) Most gained full marks. Marks lost due to only one point being defined [rather than two]
- 3(b) Well answered by most, with sound points made and justified, weaker answers were limited to simple identifications which lacked further explanation
- 3(c) One of the weaker higher mark questions, when it was well answered points made and impacts were justified, weaker answers lack understanding of the Equality Act or repeated simple definitions
- 4(a) On the whole well answered with better answers demonstrating a clear understanding of functional structures, the associated advantages and disadvantages and how suitable it is to Rockcliffe Racing. Weaker answers lacked understanding of the organisational structures or were limited to simple advantages and disadvantages
- 4(b) On the whole a well answered question, with better answers clearly evaluating the benefits and importance of a flexible work force to Rockcliffe Racing. Weaker answers were again limited to simple points
- 5(a) Reasonable attempts were made at the question with sound explanations of human resource planning and how Rockcliffe Racing are affected by it, weaker answers did not understand what human resource planning was and/or did not discuss how it was affected by seasonality
- 5(b) Most gained full marks. Marks were lost due to issues being too similar or not being internal

G185 Leisure in the Outdoors

General Comments:

It was pleasing to note that the 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.

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.

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.

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

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

AO1: The majority of centres are now effectively addressing the requirements of this assessment objective. Although Centres are reminded of the need to ensure candidates address the requirements of the assessment objectives in relation to how the events and organisations listed in the specification have influenced and contributed towards the development of the outdoors as a leisure resource, and not simply describe the events and organisations.

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 2016

