

Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCE

GCE Leisure Studies (8761/9761)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2007

Publications Code UA 018937

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2007

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Chief Examiner's Report | 1 |
| 2. Unit 1 The Leisure Industry | 3 |
| 3. Unit 2 Working practices in Leisure | 7 |
| 4. Unit 3 The Leisure Customer | 13 |
| 5. Unit 4 Leisure in action | 17 |
| 6. Unit 5 Employment in Leisure | 21 |
| 7. Unit 6 Current issues in Leisure | 25 |
| 8. GCE Leisure Studies Grade Boundaries | 29 |

Chief Examiner's Report

The qualification has been running for two years, four sessions for the AS and two sessions for the A2. Although there is evidence of continual improvement by many centres there is one area in particular that is preventing candidates from achieving in both the internally and externally assessed units. This is the lack of 'application' in the candidates' work. Obviously for an Applied GCE this is a major omission and consideration should be given to the following ideas.

In the external assessments at both levels many of the questions require candidates to relate their knowledge of the leisure industry to the specific organisations described in the stimulus material. This will mean that, in order to gain the higher mark levels, candidates will need to use the stimulus information and relate it specifically to the theoretical or learnt idea that forms the basis of the question. In the AS paper this summer this could be the use of the given information about DEF bowling to answer 3d, or in the A2 paper the information above Q1(a) to answer Q1(a)(ii). Where generic responses only are offered, i.e. they could relate to any organisation, candidates will not be able to score marks above level 1 in the mark scheme, however comprehensive their list of possible benefits, advantages, disadvantages etc.

In the internally assessed units there are a large number of candidates who are producing assessments that are of a theoretical nature. In many cases this consists of a mere précis of one or more textbooks, perhaps mixed in with some downloaded material. This again does not fulfil the requirements of an applied subject. Candidates should be encouraged to seek information from real organisations and then to use this material in an applied way to demonstrate the skills that the assessment criteria demand. In many cases the candidates do have the necessary information in their coursework but have not applied it and therefore are providing descriptions only at best.

This is an applied subject and, in order to allow candidates to access the higher grades, centres should ensure that their approach is practical rather than theoretical. There are two other broad concerns in the internal units.

In some internal units there are occasions where candidates will undertake work as part of a group. This is particularly evident in Unit 4 but occurs elsewhere also. In this case centres should ensure that the evidence produced by each candidate shows their individual contribution. Without this it is difficult to award the higher mark bands to candidates.

Whilst we are keeping our definition of leisure as wide as possible at all times, it is vital that candidates do take their evidence from organisations in the leisure sector and that the basis for Units 4 and 6 is leisure oriented. One particular area of concern is the use of part-time jobs for the customer service (AO2) of Unit 3. It is not acceptable to use non-leisure examples, however well they show the skills required.

Unit 1 The Leisure Industry 6966/01

General Comments

This moderation series contained more entries than the January series. The portfolios submitted for 6966 were generally well organised and submitted to time. Overall the centres provided only relevant evidence and did not provide excessive amounts of coursework or irrelevant material. However in a minority of cases centres included drafts and remarks. This makes the moderation process extremely difficult and disadvantages the candidates. The Centre should only include the final marked copy of the student work.

Centres should avoid the inclusion of downloaded material that has not been referenced since this cannot be accredited to the candidate or as evidence towards the assessment objectives. This was in evidence in terms of data downloaded and also in terms of AO3 looking at future trends in leisure. It was particularly worrying where assessors had accredited the downloading or in some cases where cut and paste had been used and not been referenced. This is clearly plagiarism and must be removed from the work submitted. Tables were also used from textbooks and were not referenced. It is also important that data is current. Data from the 1990s is dated and is not relevant to trends in this century.

The majority of centres submitted the OPTEMS forms correctly, and followed the administrative instructions for mark submission. However there were mistakes in transcription and where internal moderation had taken place marks were not always changed and it was difficult to ascertain the final centre decision. This is detailed below. Most centres did use the Edexcel mark record sheets, including candidate details as well as centre details. This sheet also details the points awarded for each assessment outcome against which the work is moderated and has room for assessor justification of marks awarded. Centres did not always include the justification of marks and these are important in the facilitation of the moderation process. There was some confusion where the work had been internally moderated and marks changed. It was not always clear which marks were finalised and the final marks were not always recorded accurately on the mark sheets and the OPTEMS. Where marks have been changed this should be clearly identified on the front sheets. Again justification of change of marks should be clearly made in writing in some cases marks were adjusted upwards or downwards with no justification. The majority of centres also submitted the candidate authentication sheets with the portfolios.

Centres are encouraged to annotate candidate evidence identifying where assessment objectives have been met and where higher mark bands have been awarded. Some portfolios had little evidence of marking on the student work. In examples of best practice, the front sheets gave reference page numbers indicating the evidence and this was then supported by annotation throughout the student work. All portfolios should clearly have page numbers that can be referenced. The better candidates provided not only page numbers but an index of evidence. This was obviously best demonstrated where there were clear tasks linking to each assessment objective. Centres are advised to follow closely the assessment evidence required if devising assignments. Some centres devised assignments which did not follow the assessment guidance and therefore evidence was omitted and the higher mark bands could not be obtained. However this has diminished since the previous series and tasks now clearly follow the assessment criteria. Centres should clearly identify the evidence required for each mark band and ensure that candidates are directed to source all evidence.

A01- The range, scale, and importance of the leisure industry in the UK and Europe.

This assessment objective requires learners to be able to describe what the leisure industry is. The assessment guidance requires reference to active, passive and home-based leisure in the description. This part of the assessment objective was addressed well and learners clearly demonstrated understanding with examples. Several learners produced evidence that satisfied mark band 3 for this part of objective. However centres are reminded that this is introductory and it is unnecessary to provide the detail which is then repeated in A03.

The assessment objective then requires information relating to participation rates, employment numbers and consumer spending in the UK and Europe. In order to satisfy the criteria for mark band 1 there must be information on each category and from the UK and Europe. In order to satisfy mark band 2 there must be predominantly accurate information and accurate information for mark band 3. Where there are omissions then the higher mark bands cannot be awarded.

Data and statistics are stronger for the UK than Europe. However where Eurostat had been used the European data was good also. Several centres misinterpreted the employment aspect and accredited candidates producing generalised statistics on employment rather than specific statistics relating to employment in leisure. Consumer spending was generally well covered, particularly for the UK. There were also good examples of this for Europe. Data and examples were provided for Europe, particularly where individual countries had been used and compared with the UK.

Participation in leisure was attempted well by most centres and did include both the UK and Europe. The data was quite current for this sector and many learners looked at participation rates in different European countries.

However there is still a problem that candidates are using outdated data. The data provided should be at least post 2000, data from the early 1990s is not acceptable. There are instances where data tables are reproduced from text books without references. In many cases explanations and analysis were lacking but assessors have accredited these tables. Unreferenced data is plagiarism.

Finally learners had to identify regional variations in leisure participation. Some candidates covered this well for both the UK and Europe, whilst others made very broad generalisations about activities in the North and South of England. Some candidates did not even refer to examples set out in the assessment guidance referring to Rugby League. In order to achieve higher mark bands there had to be accurate data and descriptions or explanations for mark band 3. The higher mark bands were often awarded where there was no data or explanations. Again learners reproduced basic descriptions from text books demonstrating little understanding and not providing explanations to AS level. Many learners refer to surfing occurring in the South West because this is where the beaches are and that surfing does not occur in the North East. This is too simplistic as well as inaccurate. There must be basic explanations.

A02- Commercial and non-commercial sectors of the industry.

Learners are required to give an explanation of the differences between the commercial and non-commercial sectors covering the differences in aims, methods of funding, different partnership arrangements and methods of marketing. The majority of candidates clearly understood the difference between public, private and voluntary sectors and their aims and their funding. Unfortunately many centres allowed candidates just to describe what commercial/non-commercial organisations are, giving examples, without clarifying the differences.

In addition many centres encouraged candidates to produce lists of organisations and case studies of individual organisations and did not directly address the evidence requirements. Equally several candidates produced case studies of inappropriate organisations particularly for the voluntary sector. Organisations such as Cancer

Research, and Age Concern are clearly not appropriate when there is a full range of voluntary organisations from the National Trust to football clubs that can be used. Equally inappropriate organisations were used for the commercial sector. The examples used should be from the leisure industry exclusively rather than general businesses. The majority of learners were less confident in their analysis of the non-commercial sector. In some cases candidates confused funding and revenue or considered to be the same. The differences must be clear.

Reference to marketing strategies was limited and indeed reference was limited to promotional strategies rather than strategies and centres are directed to the assessment guidance and evidence requirements for the mark bands for clarification.

Candidates must include at least a summary of partnership initiatives and should refer to PPPs and PFIs. To achieve the higher mark bands there must be an extensive account of partnership initiatives. Some candidates did provide local examples, however this aspect is still weak and needs assessor guidance. For this assessment objective there were marks awarded in mark band 3 that were appropriate.

Unfortunately many centres allowed candidates just to describe what commercial/non-commercial organisations are, giving examples, without clarifying the differences.

A03- Current Developments in the leisure industry.

Learners are required to research current developments in the leisure industry. It is essential that the research is referenced and is up-to-date. There was a general trend by learners to fail to explicitly credit the reference sources used.

More candidates are now starting to produce bibliographies to support this assessment objective. However a list of web-sites does not reflect a variety of sources. Candidates are also using google as reference rather than a specific web-site and this has been accredited. The best candidates produced comprehensive research.

The assessors have credited the research without any references. It is essential that witness testimonies are provided to support the extent to which research has been undertaken. Without this evidence it was not possible to award above mark band 1. Mark band 2 requires appropriate sources and without bibliography or references this cannot be assessed.

However candidates did seem to enjoy this task producing extensive accounts of extreme sports. Learners also covered the increasing use of technology well and were clearly aware of the influence of the media on leisure. There were clear improvements in research for this area.

Candidates who produced work that met the requirements of mark band 3 produced detailed bibliographies, data from sources such as mintel and the general household survey, and sound proposals for the future direction of the leisure industry.

However there were instances where candidates had included downloaded material and this has been accredited. Downloading material does not equate to using a variety of sources and under no circumstances should this work receive accreditation unless the student has presented clear annotation and explanation attached to it.

There were also particular problems with data tables which had been included but not referenced and had been accredited. This can be interpreted as plagiarism and should be removed before the submission for moderation.

A04 - Customers of the leisure industry.

Learners were required to identify the factors which influence participation and non-participation in the leisure. The factors are clearly identified in the specifications in the section covering assessment guidance as well as in the what you need to learn section. Each of these factors required analysis and support from data. In order to achieve mark band 2 it was essential that explanations were clear and supported by data. Candidates often failed to supply appropriate data to support their explanations. Data was often dated and therefore was not relevant. Equally data was not used to support the impacts of factors but was merely presented. At AS level there must be explanations even if these are limited or inaccurate.

Candidates were required to identify barriers to participation and to make recommendations on how to overcome the barriers. Recommendations were required even at mark band 1 and the recommendations had to be realistic to achieve mark band 2.

Learners found barriers and the recommendations a challenge and there were only limited explanations to demonstrate how barriers to participation might be overcome. However most candidates attempted to make recommendations on how barriers might be overcome. The recommendations tended to be simplistic. Some candidates related this part of the assessment objective purely to disability and therefore this tended to be other people's suggestions rather than their own.

Many candidates require tutor assistance in order to fully understand the concepts involved in this area. However in some cases the learners achieved mark band 3 and made what were obviously their own recommendations based on the language used but these recommendations were realistic even if in cases they were simplistic.

Unit 2 Working practices in Leisure 6967/01

General comments

Performance on this paper showed a slight deterioration compared to last June. The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates, although there were still one or two areas that were weak.

Most candidates were able to respond effectively to most questions. There was evidence that most candidates had been effectively prepared, with the majority responding positively to the tasks set, offering valid answers, though at times without the depth needed to achieve the higher grades at AS level. Almost all candidates answered all questions. As in all series so far, Question 2 tended to produce the weakest responses overall, both in the simpler descriptive and more advanced analytical questions.

Candidates were able to use information taken from the WYNTL section of the unit, although the characteristics of all quality systems were only vaguely known in the majority of cases. They appeared to be familiar with the command verbs as a whole. Candidates appeared to manage their time effectively and did not produce lengthy passages of irrelevant information. The vast majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper in the time available, with little evidence of rushed work towards the end.

Candidates did not always make full use of the stimulus material. The emphasis in this paper will inevitably be on the application of their knowledge to a variety of practical situations and the higher marks, particularly in levels of response questions, will always be characterised by the ability to demonstrate application rather than theory. It will be important for candidates to have practice in doing this in their preparation for the assessment. This paper contained more stimulus material than the previous two and this will be the pattern for the future. This is an 'Applied' GCE and therefore in the longer explain/analyse questions the mere repetition of generic material, however valid, is unlikely to achieve beyond a Level 1 response.

At times many candidates produced very simplistic responses, which limited their success. At AS level candidates must be able to provide some simple evaluation and analysis. However, most candidates were able to offer realistic and appropriate answers, demonstrating their understanding of working practices in leisure.

Exam technique is an aspect that requires improvement, particularly in the longer questions.

Question 1

Scenario was of Wye Wanderers Football Club. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

(a) Most candidates managed to identify two acceptable measures although development beyond this was below expectations. Many of the measures that were put forward by candidates were rather vague, or the explanation as to how/why they were there was rather vague. Most centred around the possibility of 'extra stewards/police', or more vaguely 'have extra security' but reasons for their presence were indistinct. 'To control crowds/stop fighting' was the most common but how they were to accomplish this seemed unknown. Considering how many candidates will have attended sports fixtures - one assumes - their lack of practical appreciation at times was surprising. A number of candidates suggested measures that involved either adaptations to the

stadium that would already be in place or that would not be feasible for one match. The most common was 'to put in turnstiles' which would be there already for a 10000 capacity stadium.

(b)(i) Most candidates had a basic understanding of the intent of the act and managed to score at least 2 marks. Most were well aware of the main points of the act. It was pleasing to see that candidates did stick to outlining the key requirements of the act whereas in the past some have tried to relate this type of question to the scenario, a more difficult skill that is not required here.

A question of this type is assessing Assessment Objective 1 and requires only the theory of the act to be stated. Helping candidates to recognise what a question of this nature requires of them is an important part of preparing candidates for the assessment. Candidates will not be required to know the acts in detail but to know at the most 4-5 of the key requirements.

(b) (ii) It was pleasing to see that a larger proportion of candidates than in the past appeared to know what sanctions are. There is still an issue of application, however, as a considerable proportion of these suggested that closure of the stadium would be appropriate. In order to prepare candidates for this assessment candidates should be given the opportunity to understand that there are degrees of seriousness and that the reaction to any given situation has to be realistic. A good proportion did, however, manage to select a less serious one such as improvement order, fine or warning, and go on to describe its operation together with a reason why it was appropriate, although the latter were often rather poorly articulated.

(c) The majority of candidates had a sound basic knowledge of the requirements of the act but rarely were able to access the higher ranges in the mark bands as they failed to apply it and/or explain it. Explanation in a question such as this requires the candidate to suggest how and why the requirements that they are articulating will effect the design/running of the ground. They tended to deal in simple statements such as 'it will need fire extinguishers' 'it will have to have an evacuation plan/safety certificate' without explaining their importance. Similarly there was a reluctance to try to use the stimulus material in order to apply the act directly. A simple linkage of the given capacity to the need for certificates for stands over 500 capacity lifts a standard level 1 response into level 2 immediately. It is this type of exercise that candidates need in the preparation for the assessment.

(e) As in past series this question was well answered by the majority of candidates. Almost all of them understood the basic premise on which a risk assessment is carried out and were able to produce simple scales for likelihood and severity, although a little more care was needed in places to ensure that the steps within it are in a logical and consistent sequence. There were very few unrealistic suggestions for measures to minimise risk compared to the previous series, although the balance of their severity and likelihood was often too extreme. Although it is obviously possible for overcrowding to result in death to members of the crowd and or stadium officials, the likelihood of it occurring is not high and candidates must appreciate that they have to assess the possible score for each in this way. The effect of the Hillsborough disaster in altering legislation etc was well known to many candidates in 1c so perhaps they could have been expected to realise that these incidents were not common. Risk assessments are not built on worst case scenarios and candidates should be given practice in assessing likely levels of risk in a number of different types of situation. Most candidates managed to identify 2 or more correct measures to minimise the risk, although some tended to miss out on possible credit by being too brief - a short phrase/sentence is what is really required and although it can be done in less, the risks of not making the answer clear

are correspondingly greater. Candidates were perhaps weaker on these than in past series which, considering the proportion who are likely to have attended large scale events, seemed surprising and again underlined the need to try to get students to link their own experiences to the requirements of this course and apply it rather than adopt a theoretical approach.

It is envisaged that the basic format of the risk assessment will appear on the question paper as it has on this one (or in a very similar format) so it would be useful for candidates to be made familiar with this so that they can concentrate on the task of applying the risk assessment correctly in future. To this end candidates need to have scales for both severity and likelihood that can lead to the application of a logical risk rating.

Question 2

As in both previous series this whole question was the weakest for the majority of candidates. For part (a) candidates were required to select either Quest or Clubmark.

(a)(i) and(a)(ii) There was still a lack of real knowledge of what these systems are. A significant minority could not identify any of the characteristics of their chosen system. Many of the responses for Quest really only dealt with the fact that it is designed to be a customer service tool primarily, but this was often the only detail forthcoming. Overall those who chose Clubmark were weaker in their responses. There were very few adequate responses to part (ii) for Clubmark, but Quest was more successful. Some had evidently learnt the accreditation system well, with the 3 stages and the scoring system well described. Many others were aware that there could be an element of self assessment in addition to the visit of an assessor/mystery guest. It was evident that the term 'accreditation' caused problems with some candidates. It is an integral part of any quality system and candidates should have a sound understanding of what it means.

The knowledge of quality systems is an area of the specification that has caused problems in all series so far. It forms a significant part of the requirements for the assessment and candidates must ensure that they know the main quality systems outlined in the specification. If the basics of the systems are poorly known then the questions based on their application will be more difficult to access as well.

(b) As stated in previous reports, we have moved towards a paper where there is rather more stimulus material in order to give candidates the chance to apply their knowledge well. This question in particular was one where there was plenty of material and there was some evidence of candidates using it, although many were hampered by an apparent lack of knowledge of what liP really did for an organisation. It is not sufficient for candidates to say that 'having liP will help to attract sponsors' - this could be any quality system - or 'people will recognise it and come to the ground'. It is unlikely that any football fan would attend a match because the club had liP. It is necessary to link the purpose of liP - improved staff procedures, communication and training - to these aims to achieve real application. Simple links such as 'better trained stewards will allow crowd entry to be less problematical so they will enjoy their experience more and return' is basic application of liP. This could be followed by 'this keeps attendances up, which may attract sponsors' which still develops from liP in this way, producing a focused level 2 response. Most candidates could achieve the top of level 1 with generic comment as to the benefits of a quality system but it will be useful in future if they can be more focused on the need to relate to the given situation.

(c) Most candidates were aware of two basic problems involved in the introduction of quality systems. These tended to focus around the problems of the time and cost needed in order to achieve it and the fact that it might not be universally popular with

the staff as their routines were upset. The former idea was often linked quite well with the fact that results would not be seen and that it might be better to spend money on other things if attracting crowds was the key. There was evidence of better application here, with references to spending on players being more important, a valid idea.

Question 3

This question introduced a new organisation, DEF bowling. This appeared to be accessible to candidates.

(a) Most candidates had some idea of what stock count was, although many then erroneously linked it to decisions on what was popular with customers. Valuation of stock was less successful, although about half of the candidates were able to specify that it referred to the 'worth' of the stock'.

(b)(i), (b)(ii), (b)(iii) The lack of real comprehension of valuation of stock for many was evident here, with only a small minority scoring 3 for b(i). B(ii) was more successful, with the majority gaining both marks. Candidates showed better use of the financial statistics in this question than in January, with most being able to suggest two possible problems with the stock system. The most common of these were the excess of bowling balls at the end of the accounting period and the lack of bags. The price of crisps was also a concern and although this gained the first mark, candidates were unable to make the link to *stock control* i.e that they had too many and had to sell them off. More often than not development centred around putting the price up or sourcing them more cheaply. Developments to the bags/balls ideas were better, with many pointing out that for the bags they were losing potential sales and that the balls were tying up capital/store room space.

The key to this question is often logical selection and working through the financial figures rather than mathematical skills and candidates should be given a chance to practise this in preparation for the assessment. Candidates must also be reminded that they should have a calculator for the examination.

(c)(i) Disappointingly few candidates appeared to have knowledge of any electronic system. Although a few could quote a name such as Accord and describe it accurately, many of the rest scored only 1 or 2 marks with references to bar coding/scanning. Many of them soon went off to explain the advantages of the systems, which was not required here.

(c)(ii) Most candidates were able to put forward some advantages of an electronic system and many reached the top of L1. Once again it was the ability to apply the information to the given situation that was lacking in their responses. Whilst many indicated that it would be quicker to see what to reorder, the benefits to DEF were unclear. There was a plenty of stimulus material to work with, both above Q1ci and in the problems that they had identified in 3biii. It will be beneficial for candidates to be directed towards using this material in preparation for the examination. The main ones used were those that developed the bullet points opposite to suggest that customer service would be improved if they didn't have to wait while staff went to look for stock, as the stock room would be less likely to be so full.

Whilst it is important in analysis to look at both sides, the predominance of negative impacts in some responses was disappointing. The first comments of many were that these systems always break down so you would need backup, and they often continued to more exaggerated extremes that it would cause the entire business to collapse.

There will be concerns of cost and staff training etc with the introduction of these systems but these must be kept realistic. If they are so bad then why do we have them?

(d) Again the generic benefits of membership systems are well known by a majority of candidates, but the application of them is weak. The stimulus material gave the candidates enough to really work with, but it tended to get only a passing mention. The other problem was that the nature of the business was not considered, so candidates tended to refer to benefits that other types of business might gain but that DEF would not. There was also confusion as to benefits of a membership system and those of a swipe card entry system. For example, a benefit was seen to be that they would know when people came and what activities they did - the latter is relevant to a gym/swipe card system but not to DEF bowling. Some candidates did pick up on the links well. The better ones linked the regularity of income to being able to plan cash flows for the extension, and that people might be encouraged to come more regularly if they were paying a set fee so might go to the bar/restaurant more often. Specific links to the monthly programme of events were less successful, despite many candidates getting halfway there by suggesting that membership schemes meant they had names and addresses so could do targeted mail shots - a generic point which doesn't make the final link to DEF's programme.

Unit 3 The Leisure Customer 6968/01

This was the third series of this unit and it was encouraging to note that many centres were beginning to follow the available guidance more closely.

Some centres had still not guided candidates towards appropriate leisure organisations and this limited marks in some cases, although there was noticeable improvement from the previous series. More centres had presented appropriate witness statement and observation record evidence for practical outcomes, but this is still an area for development.

There was a wide variety of approach from centres in the quality of feedback and annotation. Where annotation was linked clearly to assessment objectives and mark bands, external moderation was greatly facilitated.

The large majority of centres had completed accurate mark record sheets for all candidates and some also included separate candidate authentication statements.

Some candidates' evidence continued to include large amounts of downloaded, unreferenced information from the internet - particularly in respect of AO1; policies and procedures, although there was a slight improvement from last summer series.

The majority of candidates were now exploring three contrasting organisations for AO1 but some centres were still guiding candidates to complete three mystery visits and this again limited the depth of evidence required. Some centres were still misinterpreting the explicit requirements of AO2 and awarding MB3 without the range required.

AO1 - The leisure customer

Some candidates were not linking leisure organisational policy and procedure to customer service and evidence sometimes simply relied on downloaded policies from the internet without evidence of knowledge and understanding. This still remains an issue for some centres, although a slight improvement is noted from the previous series.

AO2 - Dealing with leisure customers

This outcome again saw a very mixed response from centres. Some had consulted the specification and Principal's report to include detailed observation records and witness statement, in support of practical demonstration of customer care skills. Many centres however were still submitting generic, brief or grouped documents, which did not include a clear assessment judgement or include authentication of the candidate's ability to work independently.

In order to access mark band 2, evidence should reflect that the candidate has competently provided customer service to a range of different customers, at least three, in a range of different situations, at least three different ways. This could be achieved by dealing with a customer complaint face-to-face, a customer enquiry over the telephone and responding to a customer request by email. Candidates should also be able to effectively deliver customer service working independently most of the time.

To access mark band 3, candidates should have demonstrated skill and expertise in the provision of customer service to at least three different leisure customer types, in a *wide* range of *contrasting* situations. At this level, learners will show the ability to 'go the extra mile' when dealing with customers. Many Centres were still not encouraging candidates to demonstrate their skills in different ways and relied on face-to-face situations, and therefore limited the marks available.

Some candidates had again presented evidence from part-time jobs and work experience placements, although in some cases, this was still not supported by detailed witness statements from the candidate's line manager, including authentication from the assessor. Although it is encouraging to note that some centres had included the required evidence to support valuable work placement evidence. This is a slight improvement.

Centres still require further guidance on the evidencing of practical tasks and the completion of detailed and appropriate witness statements and observation records.

A03 - Marketing activities and the leisure customer

Some centres had again interpreted the requirements of this assessment outcome well, with candidates investigating a wide range of contrasting marketing activities with accurate and informative information given regarding the products and services each activity relates to.

Many centres however, are still awarding too generously for this outcome with many candidates' evidence very theoretical with little or no application to activities used within the leisure industry or by specific leisure organisations. These responses are limited to the lower mark band.

Some candidates had carefully included visual examples of a variety of marketing examples within their evidence, although this was the minority. This often also related to other marketing activities such as market research and multi-media applications and not just promotional activities.

A04 - Operational aspects related to the leisure customer

Generally well approached, some centres were still guiding candidates however, to complete three separate mystery visits and this results in brief evidence produced. Candidates would be better advised to focus on one appropriate visit in more depth. A few candidates were also choosing inappropriate organisations which were not in the leisure industry.

Some candidates are also losing marks as they are not describing the products and services available to customers or including details of the information provided by the organisation.

Almost no candidates are able to "...comprehensively review a series of operational documents such as policies, statements, forms, training manuals and make detailed comment on their effectiveness and suitability", in order to access the very top marks.

Overall, there was a slight improvement in the standard of learner performance, although there is still considerable room for improvement in interpreting the unit evidence requirements by centre assessors.

The majority of centres had used the correct paperwork, completed accurately. This is a marked improvement on June 2006 series.

The accurate calculation of candidate's overall unit marks was also improved, possibly due to greater compliance of completing mark record sheets. Consequently, the accuracy of OPTEMS was also improved.

The vast majority of centres were presenting evidence for moderation appropriately; without bulky folders and large amounts of plastic wallets.

Annotation by assessors throughout the candidate evidence was still very variable.

Unit 4 Leisure in action 6969/01

General Comments

This was the second sitting of this A2 unit and entries were still quite low. The portfolios submitted were well organised and contained material clearly linked to the assessment objectives. The portfolios clearly identified the event in the majority of cases. It is absolutely essential that the students choose an appropriate event that enables them to make decisions and to take roles of responsibility. The students must organise and carry out an event where each team member has a distinctive role. Therefore the size of group is a crucial factor to allow each member to take responsibility and develop skills. The event must also achieve the appropriate level of complexity.

The event must have a leisure focus. It is not therefore appropriate for the students to be helping to organise a teacher led event where all responsibility is taken by the teacher and the students are not responsible for such areas as finance, physical resource needs and administration systems. Equally it is not appropriate for the event to be a trip for their own group or residential for their own group. In these cases the learners are unable to demonstrate successful marketing of the event. It is essential that care is taken if groups are merged with other subject areas and the leisure focus is lost. Centres also need to take care if they repeat a previous event such as a sponsored walk which involves the whole centre and therefore does not give the candidates the opportunity to plan/market /organise the finance because these are centre rather than course organised.

Centres are reminded that this is an A2 unit and that there should be evidence of the knowledge gained from AS units in addition to the breadth and depth required for A2. Simplistic statements without the depth of analysis cannot attract the higher mark bands.

A major focus of this unit as an A2 unit is the evaluation of the event and recommendations for the future. This was weak throughout and did not receive the prominence that it has in the specifications and for grade determination.

It is equally essential that there is clear evidence of individual work by each team member. Students are encouraged to keep diaries/logs of their contributions but these should clearly be kept throughout the event and not presented in a written up format. Where minutes are included they must be of professional and business standard and reflect the A2 level of this unit. There must be evidence that the student has individually contributed to the research for the event as well as the planning. Centres accredited too much generic material such as the plans.

This unit requires the support of witness testimonies. The testimonies should be clearly linked to the assessment objectives and the mark bands but should indicate clearly the individual contribution. Many witness testimonies were similar for all candidates and did not identify individual contributions particularly to the event itself. In some instances the candidates have written their own testimonies which have been signed by the assessor. Whilst this can be acceptable in some circumstances it is not applicable to this unit where one assessment objective refers to evaluation. All witness testimonies must be signed and dated. Common statements are not encouraged. Assessor should also give individual and comprehensive endorsements.

Centres are encouraged to annotate throughout the portfolios clearly identifying where assessment objectives/mark bands are being applied. Written comments in addition to the identification of the assessment objectives and mark bands would be helpful to the moderation process. Centres tended to be generous in awarding higher mark bands where the written evidence did not warrant the application of the higher mark bands. This maybe due to assessor involvement and knowledge of the event and reflects the importance of both the addition of annotation and witness testimonies. In one case the centre included draft material which had been initially marked. This should be excluded. Only relevant material that has contributed to the marking process should be included and therefore excess appendices should be excluded.

All centres submitted OPTEMS forms accurately and authenticity sheets were included for all candidates. The mark sheets did not always have clear reference to evidence, location or justification of mark bands awarded. There was confusion in many cases where the work had been internally moderated and marks had been changed which did not reflect the front sheets or the OPTEMS. It is essential that centres clearly reconcile these so that the mark sheets show final marks awarded.

AO1 - The Plan of the Event.

Most of the plans submitted were realistic and in all cases the event did happen, although in some cases the original event planned was changed. Many of the events chosen had limited scope and therefore the aims and objectives were limited. The major challenge was that candidates from the same centre produced identical plans and it was not possible therefore to clearly identify individual work. Candidates should be encouraged to submit their own interpretation of the plan. Candidates should include all aspects of the plan as identified on page 40 of the specification. Particular weaknesses were in customer needs, staffing for the event clearly, identifying strengths and weaknesses of each member of team and how this relates to role allocation. Risk assessments were often provided rather than researched. Risk assessments were covered in AS units and therefore candidates should be confident in carrying them out.

Financial aspects of the event must include budgeting. This was often absent and income projected and handling payments was often quite weak. In many cases the finance was organised by the centre. In many cases the students had no budget and the finance was provided by the centre. This does not enable the students to develop these skills and must be evident.

Contingency plans were usually mentioned and in the case of some, events used. The plan often lacked detail of evaluation and review of the event. This is clearly important in order to enable an in depth evaluation.

In general event timescales were realistic and it was particularly interesting to see students use a variety of diagrammatic planning tools. This is to be encouraged. This unit benefits from relatively short timescales of approximately 12 weeks. However in some cases the timescales were too short or inappropriate.

A plan achieving mark band 3 will be comprehensive and include all aspects included in the specification and is clearly the work of the individual candidate. The aims and objectives will be clear and this enables a comprehensive evaluation needed in AO4. There will be clear endorsement from the assessor of the individual contribution to the plan.

The weaker candidates did not understand the planning process and plans lacked detail.

Where day trips were organised, it was sometimes difficult to cover all aspects of the planning process with appropriate responsibility undertaken.

A02 Individual contributions.

This outcome was generously assessed by nearly all centres and assessors. The marks awarded were based on witness testimonies and observation records but these lacked the detail needed to reflect the demands of an A2 unit.

The candidates had to provide evidence/records of their contribution to the event. It is suggested that learners have diaries or individual logs that reflect this individual contribution. It is not acceptable to provide a group log/diary and they must be written at the time rather than reflectively after the event. In too many cases the teams provided identical evidence and it was not possible to determine each candidates' contribution. A basic log/diary will be awarded mark band 1. For higher mark bands there must be evidence of consistent involvement throughout the event. To achieve the higher mark bands the candidate must demonstrate that they have solved problems. In many cases minutes of meetings demonstrated that attendance by candidates was patchy and yet mark band 3 was awarded.

Minutes are also a useful tool to provide evidence of contribution but if included assessors must ensure that the minutes meet a business standard. Minutes were generally of a poor standard.

Witness testimonies and tutor observations are particularly useful in the assessment of this assessment objective. These could reflect learner contributions to meetings, attendance and consistency throughout the project as well as contribution to the running of the event itself. Annotation throughout would also aid the identification of where this has been awarded. In many cases it would appear the assessor has assumed the contribution rather than identifying the evidence. For moderation purposes there must be written evidence to support the mark band awarded. Assessors/tutors can also endorse logbooks.

A03- Research and Feasibility of the Event

Research was often weak and rarely referenced and there was little evidence of primary and secondary sources. Where learners attempted to present alternative events they did not provide research to demonstrate why the chosen event had greater strengths than the others. Often the event chosen had been pre-selected as it had been previously held but this was not referred to. In several cases the event was a visit for the group that had been pre-arranged as part of the curriculum and therefore is not acceptable. Much theory was included which was not relevant. In very few cases the research was used to clearly influence the running of the event or indeed how it was linked to the final decision making process. This is a requirement for Mark Band 3.

In many cases it was learners voting for their favourite event. The most successful research was where there was clear market research on target markets or the learners were able to use previous events that learners had held for other assessment purposes. The strong candidates did provide a clear analysis but the majority needed much clearer guidance from their tutors both on the meaning of feasibility studies and how to carry them out using research. Where the research was missing there were often major problems with the event particularly where other group involvement was essential for sales but research had not been carried out appropriately.

Detailed recommendations must be made in order to achieve the higher mark bands. Learners should be encouraged to attend and research local leisure events. Learner visits and case studies would support this assessment objective.

The feasibility study should address all the main aspects of the plan and for the highest marks each aspect will be backed by referenced research.

The feasibility studies can be presentations by the learners. If presentations are used there must be clear identification of individual contribution to the presentation.

The most successful was where each student presented an in-depth feasibility study as a presentation and the presentations were discussed in a minuted meeting. There was also support in the form of detailed observation records from assessors that followed the mark band statements. It is essential that the presentations however are individual. There were examples of three names on a presentation and this then cannot be attributed to one student and for moderation purposes is not accredited with any marks.

AO4 - Evaluation of the Event

Few evaluations contained detailed evaluations of individual or peer performance to the level required by A2. The opportunity to present this analysis was limited by the events chosen and the roles undertaken which were often too simplistic. Equally many of the events gave limited scope for detailed recommendations for improvements. The best evidence was produced by candidates who recognised problems and aimed to solve them.

The evaluations should be consideration of the extent to which the aims and objectives of the team and themselves individually have been met. These must be clearly stated. In addition all learners should evaluate the extent to which they and individual team members met deadlines.

The planning process should be analysed to assess the extent to which the planning enabled a successful event to be mounted. All candidates assessed whether the event had been successful but most judged that holding the event was a success in itself and there was a lack of evaluation of the success of marketing/attracting customers which in most cases was not a success. This is where recommendations should have been made.

All candidates provided evaluations of their performance but as part of the event team was often absent. All learners were required to assess not only their own performance but also that of their team. The learners appeared to find peer evaluation difficult and it is recommended that tutors give clear guidance on this aspect.

The evaluation must include both during the planning and the running of the event for both themselves and the team. For mark band 3 the evaluations must be comprehensive and detailed for both themselves and members of the team. The evaluations will include analysis of strengths and weaknesses and the consequences of these. The strengths and weaknesses will be accurate and this will be confirmed by witness testimonies or observations.

It is important that learners can identify how working as part of a team was a positive or negative experience. It would be useful for candidates to give feedback to each of their team members and also to receive it and use it as part of their evaluation.

It is essential that there are clear recommendations for improvement. These were rarely in depth. In some cases recommendations were lacking. The recommendations are an essential part even of mark band 1. Weaker candidates need guidance on this aspect.

Assessors must ensure that marks are based on all aspects of the mark bands. There is a tendency to give teams similar marks regardless of the evidence provided. The assessors often appear to allocate mark bands based on contribution for this assessment objective rather than evaluation. This reflects that an event was held rather than the degree of success.

This whole assessment objective is pivotal to the A2 and it is recommended that assessors provide detailed guidance to candidates in evaluation techniques and in how to make sound recommendations.

Unit 5 Current issues in Leisure 6970/01

General comments

This was the second sitting of this A2 paper. The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates and there was an improvement in candidate performance in comparison to the January series.

Most candidates were able to respond effectively to most questions. There was evidence that most candidates had been effectively prepared, with the majority responding positively to the tasks set, offering valid answers, although many candidates did struggle to achieve the higher levels in extended responses. Almost all candidates answered all questions.

Candidates were able to use information taken from the WYNTL section of the unit, although the characteristics grievance procedures and understanding of the term 'remuneration' were noticeably weak. The requirements of some of the command words were not well known by a sizeable proportion of the candidates and this limited their ability to access the upper regions of the mark range in longer questions. Far fewer responded to the longer questions with simple explanatory points or, worse still, with a series of (bullet) points. Candidates appeared to manage their time effectively. Most did not produce lengthy passages of irrelevant information, although the discursive nature of this paper does mean that candidates should focus carefully on what the question is really asking for before starting to write. The vast majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper in the time available, with little evidence of rushed work towards the end.

Candidates did not always make full use of the stimulus material. The emphasis in this paper will inevitably be on the application of their knowledge to a variety of practical situations and the higher marks, particularly in levels of response questions, will always be characterised by the ability to demonstrate application rather than theory. It will be important for candidates to have practice in doing this in their preparation for the assessment. This paper had slightly more stimulus material than the January paper so there was more chance for candidates to do this, but it was still an omission by many. This is an 'Applied' GCE and candidates must be prepared for this!

At times many candidates produced very simplistic responses, which limited their success. At A2 level candidates must be able to provide evaluation and analysis. However, most candidates were able to offer realistic and appropriate answers, demonstrating their understanding of employment in leisure.

Exam technique is an aspect that requires improvement, particularly in the longer questions.

Question 1

Scenario was of Halston, a centre for indoor and outdoor pursuits. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

1(a)(i) Most candidates had a sound basic idea of the term, indicating that these were staff that were not on set hours and called in when the organisation was busy/at peak times. Most gained 2 marks at least.

1(a)(ii) Most candidates achieved the top of level 1 or the lower level 2. The characteristics of self employment and salaried staff were well-known for most, but it was the application of these to the given scenario that limited the marks. A number of candidates explained them in reference to the self employed staff rather than Halston - it is important that they read the actual question carefully and not just see the key words and set off! Most level 2 candidates achieved it through some development as to benefits to Halston, although the lack of use of the stimulus material was rather disappointing. Businesses that have peaks and troughs, run specialist courses and cater for different age groups are ideal for this type of employment, but candidates did not seem to realise that this information was put there for a purpose in the examination paper. Many candidates did realise that the key benefit was not having to employ them when there was not much for them to do so they would save money compared to salaried staff, but the final link to the scenario - the 'applied' bit - was not there. There were some radical misconceptions about self-employed workers also - in particular that they wouldn't care about the work as it wasn't their organisation!

1(b)(i) Many candidates did notice that it was a relatively specialist post and that therefore a trade magazine or similar would be an appropriate place. These suggestions were often accompanied by good explanation as to the likely suitability of the candidates attracted through this medium. The other common correct response was the use of newspapers, particularly national ones, in order to reach a large target audience as there would not be many people who were actually qualified/able to take on such a role. These were in marked contrast to those who did not use the 'application' part and relate it to a head of department. A large number of candidates suggested the use of local papers or even flyers and posters round the centre itself. Whilst the latter might be suitable for temporary/casual posts, it is important that candidates consider the nature of the post offered before deciding on their choice. There were a number of suggestions that posters at colleges to attract new graduates would be suitable, which was the extreme version of the 'non-applied' approach!

1(b)(i) Many candidates scored all 6 marks here with correct identifications and simple explanations for their inclusion. The most common problem was to confuse job description with the person specification, so although these candidates could score some marks for the original identifications, as there are items that will appear on both, they could go no further. Hence the suggestion of 'experience needed' would gain the mark, but an explanation such as 'as they would need to have some experience of outdoor pursuits before taking on a head of department role first' would not be relevant to the job description whereas 'candidates could see whether they might have enough experience to do the job' would.

1(c) Most candidates seemed to have a sound understanding of the process, indicating that all applications would be looked at and compared in some way in order to try to select the best few for interview. Pleasingly, many appreciated that this was not an ad hoc procedure and that the organisation would actually identify criteria that they would use to compare them with, although the idea of actually scoring candidates against them was rarely seen. Some candidates gave basic reasons as to why this was done, pointing out that it would be too unwieldy or expensive to interview everyone who applied.

1(d) Most candidates were able to suggest one question that would be suitable, although it was often put in fairly basic terms. A key to gaining the higher marks here is to try to give some sort of true application/vocationality to the question rather than perhaps a 'student' style question! The biggest single fault was to suggest questions that could be answered from studying the application form/CV. 'What are your qualifications' or 'what experience have you got' are unrealistic questions, although the latter could easily be adapted to 'how will your previous experience help you if you are offered this post at Halston?'

Explanation should centre on how the reply would help to differentiate between the candidates.

Question 2

2(e) Candidates in general were able to give a basic outline of the process. Many were only at the 2 marks level, suggesting that they would all be considered and that the chosen one would then be told the good news. The unsuccessful candidates were then often ignored. There was a good proportion of responses that gained 4-5 marks with a sound idea of the stages of the process together with the correct order. A common misconception with the order was that the unsuccessful candidates would be told first rather than vice versa. A number of candidates thought that the appointment process was connected with coming for their induction, i.e. an 'appointment' to see someone.

2(f) Responses to this question were rather vague, with few candidates really attempting to apply the information that they had been given and a large number that took a rather unrealistic view of the situation. Quite often it was thought that the consequences of the action would be terminal for the organisation with customers leaving, staff leaving and the full weight of the UK's justice system being brought to bear. It is an area where realities appear a little distorted at present. Some of the better responses did suggest that it would lead to the wrong candidate being chosen and that as a head of department this could have serious effects for the running of Halston's. Few candidates were able accurately to relate the stimulus material to the problem, although a few did suggest that if the internal candidate was treated unfairly this might have negative motivational effects when he/she returned to the workplace.

2(a) This was also rather weak in response by most candidates. The majority of them seemed unaware of the potential differences and, indeed, rather hazy on what an induction might contain anyway. Some did point out that the induction for the new post would be longer and more detailed. There were few attempts to point out material differences, however. A few candidates did seem to appreciate that organisations such as this were in fact dynamic and that laws - especially health and safety - did change and that not everyone would always be up-to-date. This approach was usually very fruitful. Some candidates unfortunately fastened on to the indoor/outdoor difference which, in terms of an induction, has little effect. It did tend to push them into very simplistic responses such as 'they will meet different people'.

2(b)(i) Most candidates were aware of what notice period was and were able to gain 2-3 marks. A pleasing number were able to give an idea of the differences in length between posts. Only a few thought that it was when you had to give notice of time off, holidays etc.

2(b)(ii) Candidates were well informed as to the requirements of the Working Time Regulations and accurately identified both its key requirements and the fact that Alan was being treated poorly. The path of events from then onwards was rather vague. The most common one was that of taking them to court but candidates should be aware that there are other, less extreme, courses of action that would be taken before matters came to this. Although candidates were aware of this basic possible outcome for Halston, any effect on Alan tended to be ignored.

Question 3

3(c) Most candidates were aware of what maternity leave was, but much of the focus at times tended to be on what it meant for Suraya rather than for Halston. There was little attempt to link it to Halston specifically, although those that did point out the implications of her being away when Louise was new lifted their responses well into the top of level 2/low level 3. Much of the analysis focused on the cost of paying 2 people for the same job or of recruiting someone who would probably only be temporary. There were also some fairly general attempts to suggest the effects on the workforce if someone else was not appointed, although these rather quickly became a little extreme and unrealistic.

3(a) Most candidates explained job rotation, although some were confused with job share. Most were able to offer some benefits to Ray in terms of new skills, new friends, and more motivation, although this was at a rather simplistic level. Some said that he would add to his CV, get more qualifications, feel valued, but links to actual motivation tended to be left unwritten and thus candidates were limited to top L1 or low L2. Few candidates looked at the implications for Halston although a few candidates did state that he could then be used to cover other roles. A few also suggested that it might be a bad idea as it might be difficult to get another qualified lifeguard to cover for Ray. Very few focused on his qualifications or the other stimulus material, which limited their marks as this is where the real application begins. In fact most of those who mentioned qualifications said, "he only has 6 GCSEs so he isn't very clever" which seemed an interesting comment on students' perception of our education system!

3b(i) and (ii) Candidates found it easier to identify a job where PFP would not be appropriate than one where it would. The most common choices for the former were lifeguard or receptionist, although explanation was rather vague. The key thing here is that there is nothing to really measure their performance by rather than the fact that, for the lifeguard, people don't get into trouble regularly enough. Those candidates who did choose an appropriate choice for (i), of which membership salespeople were the most common, tended to explain in terms of measurement 'more pay for the more they sell' but the concept of targets for their performance was rather ignored, limiting the credit.

Unit 6 Current issues in Leisure 6971/01

General Comments

This was the second series of moderation for this internally assessed unit. Comments relate to the moderation from the June 2007 series and include comments made from the January 2007 series.

There was a marked improvement in the performance of this cohort of learners and projects showed that learners had applied knowledge gained from the other units.

Most centres had correctly completed the mark record sheets providing centre name and candidate name and number. It was clear to see where the assessor had made the assessment decision and where the internal verifier had verified the work. Some centres had not internally verified the work and had shown no evidence of standardisation. Where centres are using more than one assessor it is necessary to standardise the work. All work should be internally verified after the assessment decision has been made by the assessor. This is to ensure that there is consistency in the approach to each part of the assessment criteria.

Centres did submit evidence in an acceptable format - in one plastic wallet. There still appears to be too much downloaded/additional material placed in the appendices. Centres are required to guide learners on the role the appendices play in the context of this unit. Downloaded material and often completed research projects taken from websites were placed at the back of work submitted with little reference made to the material. Any material added to this unit must be processed and analysed and be reflected in the relevant part of the report. The use of the evaluation at A04 can include this material in an evaluative way. Reasons for use or non use can be reflected in relation to the project title. If there is no reference made to the additional material then it should be removed prior to submission. Copies of completed questionnaires carried out as primary research should not be added to the appendices. These should be analysed from the graphical presentations produced. One copy of the questionnaire can be included as part of A02.

The use of annotation and comments made by assessors showed marked improvement. Annotation should include the mark bands and evaluative comments on the performance provided by the learners against the mark band evidence. Some annotation still lacked depth in terms of relevant comments and showed that very little guidance, support and monitoring had been provided throughout the project. Monitoring is advised during all the stages of the development of the assessment criteria.

Some research projects showed that a presentation had taken place. This was presenting the evidence that had been gathered to an audience. The format used was in the style of a power point. When this style of presentation is adopted a witness statement by the assessor is required to endorse the validity and accuracy of the information presented. Slides alone cannot be used as evidence if annotation and a witness statement have not been included. The witness statement should be linked to the assessment criteria and the mark bands.

Topic titles showed a range had been covered and included the following:

- range of leisure activities for example blood sports, sports
- lifestyle and health related issues for example obesity, eating disorders
- equality and diversity for example the inclusion of all people in society in leisure
- events, festivals and traditions for example the 2012 Olympics

Topics provided as guidance in the specifications that were not covered in either of the series to date included the following:

- Government policy for example initiatives
- Media and commercial aspects for example newspapers
- Technology for example the development of new sports equipment

Topics chosen outside the guidelines were suitable and allowed learners to move through the stages in terms of the 'what' 'why' and 'how' of the project. Chosen topics did reflect current issues that have some proven accessible research. Where research projects fell apart was when the scope of intent of the research had not been addressed or followed through. Some learners still went off at a tangent with their projects and this reflected that the centre had not provided suitable guidance or monitoring.

There was evidence to show that learners has accessed other research projects and used these as their own. Furthermore when other projects have **not** been acknowledged, sourced or referenced accordingly this is regarded as plagiarism.

Context of the unit.

Centres are reminded that this is an A2 unit and requires the learner to reflect on the knowledge that is gained from the other examination and portfolio units. Learners are required to choose an issue that is leisure orientated: this can extend into the area of the sport/recreation industry. It is essential that all research meets appropriate ethical guidelines, including permission being granted before 'real life' examples are included. This was not included by many centres. It is suggested that between two and four thousand words would be appropriate for a written project. This word count guideline appears not to have been applied by some centres.

A01: A research proposal that identifies the research topic together with the project aims and methodology.

Learners are required to identify an area of research and to organise how the research is to be carried out. Few learners were able to demonstrate a clear progression of how the project aims will promote worthwhile research. Learners had difficulty in demonstrating organisational skills that are involved in research i.e. to produce and submit their project to meet deadlines set out in advance of the research. Where a checklist approach was developed by centres, this guided the learners well. Proposals took the format of a series of intended questions to be answered. Some learners included feasibility studies. Plans were highlighted against timescales with some more detailed than others. It was apparent that these plans were never focused on in the evaluation section and were not applied within the unit. Some centres had allowed learners to produce their planning retrospectively. This is not in the spirit of research projects. There was generally little understanding demonstrated on the purpose and extent of planning.

A03: Research that includes references related to the project.

Learners are required to research the chosen subject area and possible methods of data collection. Learners should be able to reference text and include quotations. When learners were able to compare findings from previous research in order to establish the relevance of current information, this was acceptable within the research and was rewarded. Learners generally had difficulty in extracting the relevant information from other sources for their projects. There was a tendency to download information with very little processing and application. Centres are reminded to guide learners to other sources of information other than the internet. Learners need to be guided towards completing a 'literary review' of the topic within the scope and parameters that cover the issues and the word count.

A02: A completed research project.

Learners are required to organise the collection and analysis of data and to complete the research project. Most projects were completed however some proposals had not been addressed and information had not been in a format to make judgements. Some conclusions were presented in statement format and in bullet points. Learners must include explanations of intended aims, methodology, analysis and conclusions that acknowledge formal structures. The leisure topic discussed in the research must clearly reflect the project aims. Results must be presented in a variety of formats where findings can be drawn from. It was evident that centres did not provide appropriate guidance here. Some learners had included all the 'raw' questionnaires carried out as evidence. It is the processing of the questionnaires that is more important. There was clear evidence that centres had guided the learner towards including both primary and secondary research. It is important that at all stages of data collection and analysis that evaluative comments on the validity of evidence in the context of the topic title is analysed. This can be in a constructive/critical way. This should include for example the validity of the sample size. When secondary research had been used predominantly this was followed too closely and not comparatively. Methods of data presentation were appropriate and demonstrated some excellent skills within the unit.

A04: An evaluation of the research project.

Learners are required to review their completed project and identify areas where improvements can be made. These suggestions must be relevant and realistic. Learners had attempted to evaluate the research project in relation to their proposals; however evaluations were often brief statements and descriptive accounts. Evaluations must consider the intended research proposal as well as the validity of the methodology that has been used. Learners should be able to put forward other recommendations on how the proposal could have been improved if research has been focused in a completely different way. Some conclusions given did not demonstrate that learners had understood the chosen issue.

Plagiarism within this unit is common. It is important that centres address this and not reward it in the marks allocated. Annotation should clearly highlight to learners where this is evident. The cutting and pasting of information without any analysis or referencing is also regarded as plagiarism.

GCE Leisure Studies Grade Boundaries

Unit 1: The Leisure Industry (6966)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 47 | 40 | 33 | 27 | 21 | 15 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 |
| Cum % | 3.5 | 11.0 | 24.0 | 42.9 | 65.0 | 86.0 |

Unit 2: Working Practices in Leisure (6967)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 60 | 52 | 44 | 37 | 30 | 23 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 |
| Cum % | 0.3 | 4.0 | 16.0 | 39.4 | 69.6 | 89.2 |

Unit 3: The Leisure Customer (6968)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 47 | 41 | 35 | 29 | 23 | 17 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 |
| Cum % | 6.3 | 17.1 | 34.1 | 52.7 | 73.9 | 88.1 |

Unit 4: Leisure in Action (6969)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 48 | 42 | 36 | 30 | 24 | 18 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 |
| Cum % | 10.6 | 26.4 | 43.0 | 61.5 | 79.0 | 92.1 |

Unit 5: Employment in Leisure (6970)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 68 | 59 | 51 | 43 | 35 | 27 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 27 |
| Cum % | 0.0 | 0.1 | 9.2 | 34.2 | 72.1 | 91.9 |

Unit 6: Current Issues in Leisure (6971)

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|----------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw mark | 47 | 41 | 35 | 29 | 24 | 19 |
| UMS | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 |
| Cum % | 7.3 | 16.4 | 33.9 | 54.4 | 72.7 | 83.4 |

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA 018937 Summer 2007

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH