

GCE

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H528**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H128**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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 2014

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G180, G181, G183, G185	1
G182 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice	2
G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry	4

G180, G181, G183, G185

General Comments

Once again this series the majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment objectives. There was evidence of high quality work, which was well presented and accurately annotated. Many centres effectively supported their students by providing detailed and constructive feedback. The efforts of students and teachers alike should be congratulated. These portfolios were a pleasure to moderate and were commented on as such by moderators in their reports to centres.

Whilst the majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work, with appropriate documentation (such as the Unit Recording Sheet) completed accurately, there were a number of centres where Unit Recording Sheets were not completed accurately and where there was little, if any, referencing of the evidence of the achievement of specific assessment objectives and mark bands within the body of the portfolios submitted. Effective annotations, in line with OCR guidelines (eg 'AO3:2' to indicate evidence pertaining to Assessment Objective 3, Mark Band 2), is essential. Centres are reminded that exemplar material exists to give clear guidance and direction with regard to this issue.

There were very few occasions when students were misdirected in relation to aspects of the qualification. Nonetheless, any centres uncertain of any aspect of the specification should seek clarification via OCR's support service and reference to the exemplar material published by the board.

On those occasions when centre marks had to be adjusted to bring them in line with national standards, the main reason for the adjustments was assessors marking students' work at the higher marks when there was insufficient or poor quality evidence in relation to the upper MB2 and MB3 criteria. When awarding top MB2 and MB3 marks the quality of the work must be carefully considered - as well as ensuring the work effectively relates to the assessment objective, full coverage of the criteria, as outlined in the specification, is expected.

G182 Unit 3 – Leisure industry practice

General Comments

As with the previous series, a pre-release case study material was made available to centres. The case study was based on a Go Karting centre – Premier Karting.

The material included general information on the leisure facility, and outlined how it had developed its products up to the present point, where competition into 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. 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.

It was clear that some candidates are 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. There has, however, been substantial progress in this area, where candidates are including both sides of a discussion, and adding 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 in almost a preset format. However it has allowed candidates to clearly show evaluation and therefore access higher level marks.

This emphasises the need for centres to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of 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 being unable to give definitions of specific technical terms.

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, using terms such as injury rather than a specific injury caused which had been 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

- 1(a) Generally poorly answered, the majority of students were unable to show the two strands of the Quest system.
- 1(b) Most candidates made a reasonable attempt with this question, with appropriate advantages given for a Quest in relation to the organisation rather than customers.
- 2(ai) Most students seemed to focus on the health and safety aspect rather than first aid, and hence produce an incorrect answer, with many answers relating to the HASWA.
- 2(b) Many students repeated the answers for both risk and hazard, therefore achieving half marks.
- 2(c) Risk assessment in the main well answered. Some candidates failed to take into account the severity number – producing consequences that 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
- 2(d) The candidates were able to show an understanding of the Data Protection Act, identifying some key requirements of the act. However many of these proved to be descriptive without candidates making the move to identifying which of these elements would have the biggest impact on Premier Karting.
- 3(a) This had two ends of the spectrum, full marks or very limited marks. The candidates who understood PEST well applied it to the case study and gave 8 appropriate answers. Those with little knowledge provided SWOT answers, or placed answers in the wrong area of the analysis.
- 3(b) Most students were able to produce some information in relation to place, many however, focused on the physical location and failed to mention the e-location.
- 3(c) This was well answered however many students failed to identify the first stage, Research and Development, and in doing so allocated the wrong titles to the wrong sections, losing marks.
- 3(d) Many who had failed to answer question 3(c) correctly, were able to gain some marks in this section for descriptions of the decline of Premier Karting.
- 4(a) Candidates generally misunderstood what the income statement was, and producing a generalised budgeting answer.
- 4(b) Of the finance questions this was better, with candidates producing reasons for budgeting, and how it helped with the monitoring of finances.
- 5(a) Many of the candidates were able to show how information could be gained from the online system, and then went on to link this to resources, staffing and maintenance. Some however focused purely on customer feedback, missing out the other key areas.
- 5(b) Generally well answered by candidates with security of systems being maintained through the use of e security, and physical security. Many use the Data Protection Act as a security measure, however this does not secure information from hackers etc.
- 5(c) Generally well answered, with students having clear knowledge of the marketing mix. Some still need to read the questions more carefully, as they included place in the answer.
- 5(d) Well answered if the students understood the difference between the two data types. Many students mixed up the types and produced incorrect answers.

G184 Unit 5 – Human resources in the leisure industry

General Comments

The examination focuses on human resource functions within leisure organisations, a pre-release case study was issued which illustrated the context in which the examination would take place, in the case of this series Wilderness Boot Camp; a fitness centre located in the Lake District.

The majority of candidates completed all questions, with a good number of candidates displaying a sound depth of knowledge and understanding; and some analysis and evaluation.

Knowledge and understanding was demonstrated in appropriate responses to questions on types of employment, the recruitment process, motivation and the economy. Where candidates did not perform well, they lacked knowledge and/or the understanding to respond to questions on human resource planning.

In general candidates showed a good understanding of the assessment objectives with only some offering knowledge based responses which lacked the skills necessary to access answers at Level 3.

Some candidates overlooked command words, such as 'evaluate'; and contextualisation references such as 'how location might affect human resource planning' leading to responses not meeting the examination aims, and lacking the necessary level of application and analysis to achieve Level 3.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a) Mainly full marks awarded, where marks were lost was due to lack of accuracy in descriptions of employment types – such as hours worked.
- 1(b) Mainly full marks awarded, where marks were lost it was due to a lack of knowledge of the purpose of a needs analysis.
- 1(c) Good understanding of types of employment was demonstrated, better answers were able to assess and evaluate the type of employees required by Wilderness Boot Camp.
- 1(d) Most candidates gained full marks for Investors in People (IIP).
- 2(a) Most candidates gained full marks, where marks were lost it was due to responses not being suitable skills or qualities (such as qualifications) and lacked a suitable description of the skill or quality.
- 2(b) Most candidates performed well and demonstrated a good understanding of the importance of quality staff and were able to evaluate the impact of good and poor quality staff on Wilderness Boot Camp. Weaker responses were only able to describe the impact.
- 2(c) The majority of candidates performed well and demonstrated a good understanding of the importance of a job advertisement and were able to evaluate its impact. Weaker candidates tended to describe the contents of a good job advertisement.
- 2(d) Most candidates gained full marks.
- 3(a) Most candidates gained full marks, where marks were lost it was the result of a lack of knowledge of the disciplinary process and/or inaccuracies in some of the names of the stages.
- 3(b) Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the grievance procedure, with better responses being able to evaluate the impacts of not following them correctly. Weaker responses just described the process.
- 3(c) Most candidates gained full marks, some did not attempt the question or repeated responses (such as 'staff email' and 'customer email').
- 4(a) Most candidates performed well and were able to demonstrate a good understanding of motivational techniques. Better responses were able to evaluate a range of techniques and suggest and justify a suitable method for Wilderness Boot Camp.
- 4(b) Most candidates performed well and were able to demonstrate a good understanding of 360° appraisals and appraisals in general, with better responses evaluating a range of techniques and suggested and justified a suitable method for Wilderness Boot Camp.
- 5(a) Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the impact of the economy on Wilderness Boot Camp, with better answers providing an analysis of the impact of the economy on Human Resource Planning at Wilderness Boot Camp.
- 5(b) Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the impact of location, however many focused on the impact on customers and Wilderness Boot Camp in general (such as deliveries) rather than on human resource planning.

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 2014



001