

# **Leisure Studies**

Advanced GCE A2 H528

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H128

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

**H128/H528/MS/R/07**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 syllabus 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 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

#### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
	Principal Moderator's Report (G180/1/3/5)	2
G182	Leisure industry practice	7
G184	Human resources in the leisure industry	11
*	Grade Thresholds	13



## **Chief Examiner's Report**

### **General Comments**

The Principal Moderator has submitted a detailed report on the issues identified by moderators for the four internally assessed portfolio units (G180, G181, G183 and G185) this session and Centres are strongly advised to refer to this for guidance on the development of candidates' work.

It was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres resubmitting work from the January session had successfully addressed the issues identified by moderators. Some Centres, however, are still experiencing problems interpreting the quality requirements of individual assessment objectives. These Centres are strongly advised to consult the exemplar material published by the board as guidance. In addition, it is essential that these Centres take on board the comments made in the Principal Moderator's Report and individual Centre reports in order to develop and improve their performance. Centres are also reminded that OCR offers a coursework consultation service for clarification on delivery and assessment issues, details can be obtained on OCR's website.

Performance with regard to the AS units, G180 and G181, was similar to previous cohorts. However, this series saw a more varied response to the A2 units, G183 and G185. Although the majority of Centres used relevant industry based activities to facilitate the requirements of the individual assessment objectives, some Centres did not effectively cover all aspects of the specification as highlighted under 'What You Need to Learn'. Centres are reminded of the need to cover the specification when addressing the requirements of individual assessment objectives. The Exemplar material published by the board will provide effective guidance with regard to this issue.

As with previous examination series, some Centres continued to mark candidates' work at the higher marks, when significant elements of the assessment criteria within the mark band were either missing or lacked the depth and detail required of the higher level. There was also evidence that some candidates were misdirected in relation to aspects of the qualification. Centres are once again reminded of the need to use and effectively reference up to date sources and of the importance of clear and detailed annotation of candidate work.

For the examined units, G182 and G184, it was disappointing to note that issues identified and highlighted in previous Principal Examiners' reports remained for this session. In particular, there was significant evidence that some candidates had been entered for the examinations without thorough examination preparation. Despite pre-released case studies, many candidates appeared unfamiliar with their content and in particular their reflection of the key elements of each specification. Although it was felt that the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of most sections of the specification, a significant number were unable to progress to the higher level skills. As with previous examination series, both Principal Examiner's reports include comments which imply candidates were not able to effectively respond to command words such as 'analyse', 'discuss', etc. and that their understanding of some of the technical terms included in each specification was poor. Centres clearly need to spend some time developing candidates' examination technique; in particular their analytical and evaluative skills, if they are to pick up the higher level marks from the mark scheme. Centres are strongly urged to study both Principal Examiner reports in order to improve levels of performance in future examination sessions.

## **Principal Moderator's Report**

### **General comments:**

It was very pleasing to note that the majority of Centres submitted work which was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment grids and sections of the specification.

The majority of Centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work, with the relevant documentation completed accurately and within the deadlines specified by the board. However, there continues to be an identifiable correlation between Centres which submitted work late, those that do not carry out effective annotation and administration and those Centres awarding marks outside of the tolerance limits allowed by the board.

Although there was less evidence this series, on occasions candidates were misdirected in relation to some aspects of the qualification. Centres uncertain of any aspect of the specification should seek clarification via the **coursework consultancy service** and reference to the **exemplar material** published by the Board.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. This series we have seen some exemplar work with respect to this; however, it is still a weakness for a number of Centres which need to address this issue for the next series.

As with previous series, some Centres inappropriately marked candidates work at the higher marks when insufficient or poor quality evidence was presented in relation to the upper Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top MB2 and MB3 marks the quality of the work must be 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. Depth and breadth of coverage should also be evident.

Those Centres which had taken on board the guidance and support provided by OCR, did produce some excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. These were a pleasure to moderate and were commented on as such by moderators in their reports to Centres. There was evidence of quality work, which was well presented and accurately annotated. Many Centres effectively supported their candidates by providing detailed and constructive feedback.

## G180/01 Exploring Leisure

**AO1:** The information on **sectors** and **components** was in most cases good to very good; however, candidates should be encouraged to be more selective about the information they gather from their investigations when displaying an understanding of the organisations' operations. Case studies can and should be used to illustrate detailed understanding of how the leisure industry operates, this is particularly important when awarding MB3 marks.

Centres continue to demonstrate a sound understanding of how sectors and components interrelate in order to provide an effective service. However, understanding of the **'Interrelationships between stakeholders and shareholders'** remained poor, with few candidates effectively addressing this MB2 requirement.

The European element of this assessment objective remains an issue for a small number of Centres which are reminded that the assessment criteria for AO1, across all mark bands, clearly require candidates to provide a summary of sectors and components within the leisure industry in the UK and **Europe**. For the higher mark bands we would expect the candidate to show an understanding of how leisure organisations, in Europe as well as the UK, operate. Some Centres continue to inappropriately award MB3 when candidates have not shown a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the industry in terms of its structure and operation both in the UK **and** Europe. Examples need to be described rather than just identified, if they are to clarify and demonstrate a candidate's **thorough** understanding.

**AO2:** It is pleasing to see that a significant number of Centres are now using comprehensive up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, some Centres are still giving too much credit to candidates for simply **describing** data relating to 'consumer spending, participation trends, employment and health and well being', when it was not applied to the assessment objective. Centres are reminded of the need to cover all elements of the assessment criteria, the most common omission being **'health and well being'**.

As with AO1, the specification clearly requires the consideration of **European** data. The majority of Centres are now effectively addressing this requirement with a wide range of relevant European data evident. However, the European element of this objective remains an issue for a number of Centres which failed to include any European data in their response to the requirements of this assessment objective. Failure to include European data is seen as a significant omission and restricts a candidate to MB2.

**AO3:** The requirements of this assessment objective continue to be effectively addressed by the majority of Centres. However, there are a small number of Centres whose candidates did not cover **all** of the relevant criteria, as identified in the specification. For example, a number of candidates provided good quality evidence relating to **barriers and access**, but did not effectively cover the **'key factors'** as identified in the specification and vice versa.

**AO4:** This assessment objective requires the candidate to **evaluate** the impact of the media on the leisure industry not simply describe it. As in previous series, some Centres credited candidates for simple descriptions rather than evaluations. Having identified the various impacts which the media has had on the industry, Centres are reminded that candidates must evaluate whether these impacts have had a positive or negative impact on the industry. They should discuss **current developments** which have occurred within the industry as a result of the involvement of the media and draw justified conclusions as to whether the media has had a positive or negative affect on the industry. Candidates should use an extensive range of examples to back up their arguments.

## G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

The overall response to the requirements of this unit was pleasing. The majority of Centres used relevant industry based examples in order to effectively facilitate the requirements of individual assessment objectives.

**AO1:** The majority of candidates showed a clear understanding of **customer service principles** and demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service. The majority of candidates continue to respond well in relation to **external** customers, providing detailed comprehensive accounts; but, as with previous series, the evidence relating to **internal** customers was not of the same quality resulting, on occasions, in lenient assessment decisions.

**AO2:** It is pleasing to see that the majority of Centres are now providing strong supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions. Unfortunately, there are still some Centres providing insufficient evidence to support the practical requirement of the unit, with too many assessors simply relying on simplistic witness statements to confirm the candidate's involvement within a variety of customer service situations.

Centres are reminded of the need for **supporting evidence** to be **thorough** in order to achieve MB3; witness statements alone are not sufficient to do this. As good practice it is recommended that candidates consider in **detail** their performance in a variety of appropriate situations, commenting on their strengths and weaknesses and how they could improve their performance.

The Board has provided examples of exemplar **witness statements**, showing the **detailed** commentary required **and appropriate supporting evidence**, on its web page supporting this qualification. Centres are strongly advised to refer to this exemplar material prior to assessing this unit.

Centres are asked to note that although any industry based qualification is to be encouraged, 'Welcome Host' is only a Level 1 qualification and thus any Centre using this as a mechanism through which to achieve AO2, **must** provide sufficient supporting evidence to justify the marks awarded by the Centre. It is **not** sufficient to just include a copy of the certificate.

**AO3:** Although less of an issue this series, the requirements of this assessment objective continue to be misinterpreted by a number of Centres. The assessment grid clearly requires the candidate to analyse the **methods** used by the chosen organisation to assess the effectiveness of the customer service it provides. To effectively meet the requirements of this objective, candidates must identify and then analyse the **methods** used by their chosen organisation. This should be done via a **detailed** consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the methods used in relation to the needs of the organisation. For higher marks, recommendations for improvements as to how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed. A number of Centres continue to incorrectly credit candidates when they are 'assessing' the quality of customer service provided, rather than analysing the methods used. This evidence is more relevant to AO4 than AO3.

**AO4:** The majority of Centres continue to respond well to the requirements of this objective, with some excellent detailed evaluations evident. Centres are, however, reminded that as well as evaluating the general quality of service provided, they should also consider the **customer service principles** and the **quality criteria** as identified in the specification.



### **G183/01 Event Management**

The quality of the portfolios provided in response to this unit varied. It was pleasing to note that a significant number of Centres successfully addressed the requirements of the assessment objectives, planning and running a series of relevant leisure based events with a significant amount of success. However, other Centres, although clearly managing a successful event, did not provide sufficient portfolio evidence to support the marks awarded. Centres are reminded that it is the quality of evidence and not the success of the event which determines the marks awarded.

**AO1:** The evidence provided by the majority of candidates was strong, effectively covering the evidence requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are, however, reminded of the need for the feasibility study to be an **individual** report and not a group one and for it to be produced before and not after the event takes place.

**AO2:** Centres are reminded of the need to provide effective supporting evidence in order to clearly show the level at which the candidate contributed to the planning and running of the event. Log books should refer to the candidates' **individual** contributions rather than describing the actions of the group, which are more appropriately recorded in the minutes of group meetings. When awarding MB3 it is essential that the candidate provides evidence of the coverage of all of the criteria identified within the assessment grid, namely their ability to perform under pressure, to deal effectively and sympathetically with problems and/or complaints and to show good interpersonal skills. In addition, an assessor's witness statement can be used to support the evidence provided by the candidates in relation to all mark bands and in particular the MB3 criteria. The assessor could give detailed accounts of candidates demonstrating the skills required by the AO – these statements must be individual to the candidate and specific to his/her performance, we would also expect to see supporting evidence within the candidates' logs and their minutes of group meetings to award top MB3. The assessor's comments on the URS are useful, but these do not and can not replace an effective witness statement.

**AO3:** Although the majority of candidates provided evidence of extensive group research, it was not always clear what research had been undertaken by **individual candidates** as sources and individual contributions were not effectively indexed. Log books and minutes of group meetings could be used to provide evidence of **individual** research, but candidates should also clearly **index** their sources. As well as providing details in their logs, candidates may find a bibliography/sources of information sheet useful. However if used, candidates must clearly indicate which sources they accessed and the research to which **they** contributed.

**AO4:** Although there was evidence of some comprehensive evaluations, a significant number of Centres gave too much credit to candidates who simply described in detail their role and that of their team members. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to consider **section 4.2.2** of the specification when evaluating how effectively they worked as a team in achieving their objectives; this is particularly important when awarding marks within MB3. Where there was evidence of leniency, evaluations tended to concentrate on whether or not the event was a success. Although this is an important consideration, the AO requires a detailed personal and team evaluation. As well as making recommendations for the improvement of the event, candidates should also make recommendations relating to team work and personal performance.

### **G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors**

As with G183, the quality of evidence presented in response to this unit was varied. Although a number of Centres provided appropriate evidence which effectively met the evidence requirements, others did not. There was evidence of poor coverage of the specification, with evidence not always focused on the requirements of the assessment objectives. Centres are reminded of the distinction between activities which come under the heading of 'Sports and

Physical Recreation' and those which come under the heading of 'Outdoor Leisure'; for example football and golf are classed as sports rather than outdoor leisure activities. If Centres are in any doubt about the suitability of an activity or facility they should seek clarification from the Board.

**AO1:** Candidates did not always stay focused on the requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are reminded of the need to give an account of the **development** of the outdoors as a leisure resource and not just describe the contents of the specification. For example, candidates should explain how the establishment of the national parks contributed to the development of outdoor leisure, rather than simply describing national parks.

**AO2:** Although candidates were involved in some very worthwhile and successful activities, Centres are reminded of the need to provide effective supporting evidence for this practical requirement. Overall, a large number of candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; however, there were a number of Centres which did not effectively cover the **legal requirements** of their chosen activity. Some candidates provided detailed evidence of their involvement in the planning of an appropriate activity, but not their active participation in the activity and vice versa. Centres are reminded of the need for candidates to provide evidence of **both** planning and participation. Centres are also reminded of the need for full coverage of section 6.2.4 of the specification in order to satisfy the requirements of MB2 and MB3 for this objective.

**AO3:** Centres are reminded that sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 of the specification should be covered within the achievement of this objective. The selection of a suitable 'area' is critical to the successful achievement of this objective. Those candidates choosing appropriate areas were able to provide extensive accounts of the range and scale of outdoor leisure facilities. A number of Centres, however, gave too much credit when candidates simply identified and described the facilities available rather than analysing the range and scale of outdoor leisure provision in their chosen area. Evidence relating to the **range** of outdoor leisure facilities was generally stronger than the evidence relating to the 'scale' of provision, and a weakness identified in the work of a number of candidates was their analysis of the **current issues** affecting the provision of outdoor leisure facilities. Centres are also reminded that within section 6.2.2 there is a requirement for candidates to show an understanding of the 'reasons why people choose to visit the outdoors in increasing numbers'. This provides an excellent opportunity for candidates to conduct some **focused** primary research and to analyse the results - an opportunity of which only a small number of Centres took advantage.

**AO4:** The majority of candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this objective. Again, the selection of an appropriate area was critical. Centres are reminded, however, that the focus of the evaluation should be on the positive and negative impacts of **outdoor leisure** and not tourism. The weakest evidence was in relation to how the identified impacts could be managed; with some candidates failing to address this essential requirement of the objective.

## **G182 Principal Examiner's Report**

### **General Comments**

As with previous examination sessions, the pre-release case study material had been forwarded to the Centres. The case study was based on C C Cinemas. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it has developed to the present point in time, and included an extract from a quarterly budget and a section of the organisational structure. 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 five questions, all with sub sections. It gave candidates at the higher end of the ability range the opportunity to gain a good mark, whilst also offering candidates at the lower end of the range the opportunity to gain a pass. Candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It was clear that many candidates were ill prepared for the examination, with only a limited number completing the paper to a high standard. It was apparent that many candidates failed to read the questions correctly and, therefore, failed to answer in an appropriate manner, answering questions which they had worked on within the Centre, rather than what was asked in the question paper thus showing a lack of application. Centres need to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of this unit. Work also needs to be done in relation to command words. Many candidates are describing and explaining when they should be discussing or analysing, thus limiting the mark which they can achieve. A limited development of answers into levels 3 and 4 seemed to be a reflection of a lack of examination technique rather than ability.

The candidates tackled the sections on marketing and Health and Safety well; however, it was clear that the underpinning knowledge for both business systems and finance needs greater attention by Centres. 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. Limited use was made of the vocational examples included. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with technical terms such as turnover, depreciation, direct marketing and capital. Again this highlights the need for a greater development of the underpinning knowledge of the business systems and finance aspects of the unit specification.

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 their candidates to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace. Candidates also would benefit from sessions on examination preparation which include the use of command words, and further developed use of the pre-release material.

**Comments on individual questions**

1a	Not well answered, with a large number of candidates listing benefits rather than features of the IIP award.
1b	Candidates struggled with this part of the question and either achieved four marks or no marks, with many listing other sections of the syllabus such as SWOT/PEST/4 Ps as answers.
1c	The majority of candidates identified types of information systems but with only a limited attempt at how these systems could assist in decision-making. Candidates limited themselves to the lower levels through a lack of consideration of the command word 'discuss'.
1d	Well answered, with the majority of candidates being able to identify advantages of the EPOS system; although some failed to explain the benefits, limiting them to one mark.
2a	Candidates in the main had a good understanding of the Working Time Regulations, although some of the answers were general, i.e. limits the number of hours an individual can work in a week, rather than limits the number of hours worked in a week to 48 hours.
2b	Candidates, in the main, had a limited understanding of the main features of the Act and focussed mainly on points which could be drawn from general knowledge. The impact of the Act on operation was limited; however, those candidates who did answer well applied it to both elements of the AAE.
2c	The risk assessment was very well answered, with most candidates achieving full marks. Good examples were given, although often candidates suggested more than one example of who could be injured, consequence, etc. Some candidates failed to be specific enough about the hazard or included hazards which were not appropriate such as theft.
3a (i)	The majority of candidates were able to identify what the product life cycle was and the place of AAE in relation to concept.
3a (ii)	Candidates were able to identify the purpose of competitive pricing, explain it and make links between AAE and other cinemas, etc.
3a (iii)	Candidates were able to identify direct marketing and who it was aimed at and why it was used.
3b	Reasonably well answered. Many candidates, however, focussed on carrying out a SWOT analysis rather than discussing the usefulness of using a SWOT analysis. A large number of candidates used the grid method, which in general moved them towards shorter and more limited answers.
3c	Very well answered by the majority of candidates with two examples of advertising given.
4a (i)	Generally a poor response, with many candidates lacking a basic understanding of the make up of a budget, and with a large number of candidates using answers already provided in the case study.
4a (ii)	Candidates struggled with how the budget could be used to monitor its financial performance. Some candidates attempted basic calculations with the figures provided but failed to say how the results could be used.
4b (i)	Candidates were able to give a basic definition of turnover, but many failed to make the link to sales. A number of candidates also mixed up this type of turnover with the turnover of staff.
4b (ii)	Candidates in the main struggled with an explanation of profit and many mixed it up with turnover.
4b (iii)	Candidates who answered well made the link between use and lowering in the value of an item; however, a number mixed up value and price.
4b (iv)	This was generally well answered with candidates identifying it as cash which is invested in an organisation.
5a	A wide variety of special events were given.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

5b	In the main very well answered with the majority of candidates being able to identify two appropriate sources of revenue
5c	Candidates made a good effort to gain marks here, and suggested answers which looked at both qualitative and quantitative measures - both of which were appropriate
5d	Most candidates were able to come up with a range of items within the PEST and make links between them and the area in which they live. A number of candidates used the grid method which in general moved them towards shorter and more limited responses.



## **G184 Principal Examiner's Report**

### **General Comments**

Once again it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates attempted all the questions. There was no evidence that any one question or part of a question was inaccessible to candidates. In addition, there was no evidence of the pressure of time on candidates.

Centres should be reminded of the need for candidates to refer to the information given in the pre-release case study, not merely to repeat sections of it in their answers, but to apply the particular circumstances of the organisation to the question being asked. A significant number of marks in this examination relate to the skill of application. An example of this could have been demonstrated in Question 3(b) which required candidates to evaluate the benefits of performance management to Dalehead Aqua Park. Candidates could have referred to the fact that it used self-employed staff and so performance management may not have helped with the motivation of this part of the workforce. Centres should use the pre-release case study in order to put candidate's knowledge and understanding in a specific context.

As an A2 unit, many of the questions require the candidates to analyse and evaluate, not merely present their extensive knowledge. Centres should ensure that candidates are able to recognise what is required from an individual question in terms of the skills which are being assessed. Command words such as 'evaluate' and 'discuss' require the candidate to analyse and make judgments relating to their analysis.

The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the content of the specification but were often unable to progress to the higher level skills. However, a significant number of candidates appeared to be unaware of the content of the unit. Centres should ensure that candidates have a good understanding of the specification, as given in the 'What You Need To Learn' section of the specification.

### **Comments on Individual Questions**

- 1(a)(i)** Candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of why leisure organisations might need to recruit staff.
- 1(a)(ii)** The majority of candidates were able to provide the different stages of a dismissal procedure and so gain full marks.
- 1(a)(iii)** The majority of candidates identified two reasons for fair dismissal, but were then unable to explain why these were relevant to Dalehead Aqua Park.
- 1(b)** This was less well answered; weaker candidates described the contents of a job description and offered a simplistic analysis of how it could be used. Better candidates were able to apply their knowledge to the case study and then go on to make judgments about the extent to which the two parties could make use of it during the process.
- 1(c)** Many candidates showed a lack of understanding as to what a person specification was and, therefore, could not access the majority of the marks. Better candidates, who clearly knew the contents of a person specification, were able to explain how the organisation could make use of it.
- 1(d)** Overall it was pleasing to see that most candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and then go on to analyse the consequences of failing to follow the legal and ethical responsibilities. Few, if any, candidates offered a judgment as to the extent to which Dalehead Aqua Park may have been affected by these responsibilities. It is worth

remembering that a judgment that it may not have been affected would be rewarded, if the candidate supported this conclusion with appropriate analysis.

- 2(a)** This part of the question highlighted candidates inability to access the higher skills required in an A2 examination. Weaker candidates simply gave a detailed account of a typical induction programme with no attempt at justifying why it should be included. Better candidate were able to explain why the training was included in the induction.
- 2(b)** This part of the question displayed the greatest range of responses. Weaker candidates described the characteristics of each type of employment opportunity. Better candidates were able to analyse the benefits and limitations of each type within the context of the case study. Few, however, were able to make judgments relating to their analysis.
- 3(a)(i)**
- 3(a)(ii)** These questions required candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of key terms which appear within the specification. Those candidates who recognised this term achieved well, but often candidate responses showed a gap in knowledge.
- 3(a)(iii)** Many candidates failed to recognise that this part of the question referred to 'in-house' training and not to training in general. Better candidates were able to make judgments about the effectiveness of in-house training to Dalehead Aqua Park.
- 3(b)** This part of the question differentiated well between the weaker and more able candidates. Those with a good understanding were able to analyse and evaluate, but few were able to apply this to the specific circumstances of Dalehead Aqua Park.
- 4(a)(i)** A straightforward knowledge question. Unfortunately, as in the January 2007 examination, a significant number of candidates were unable to give to rewardable responses - despite this being a key topic within the unit specification.
- 4(a)(ii)** As in January 2007, this was the least well answered question. Human resource planning is a key topic within the unit specification and will continue to be assessed. Centres should examine this topic within a national and local context. Better candidates were able to analyse the issues within the context of Dalehead Aqua Park; for example, the remote location, and went on to make valid judgments about how this issue might affect the organisation.
- 4(b)** Those candidates who recognised the link between HRM and ICT gave appropriate uses. Those who only read 'ICT' often gave general uses, often related to marketing and customer services.



**GCE Leisure Studies (H128/H528)  
June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Coursework Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G180</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G181</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G183</b>	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G185</b>	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**Examined Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G182</b>	Raw	100	71	62	53	44	35	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G184</b>	Raw	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Uniform marks correspond to overall grades as follows.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H128):**

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
<b>UMS (max 300)</b>	240	210	180	150	120

**Advanced GCE (H528):**

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
<b>UMS (max 600)</b>	480	420	360	300	240

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

**Cumulative Percentage in Grade**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H128):

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
1.10	10.75	29.39	51.10	73.68	100
There were 496 candidates aggregating in June 2007.					

Advanced GCE (H528):

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
2.06	15.88	41.47	71.47	89.12	100
There were 346 candidates aggregating in June 2007.					

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam\\_system/understand\\_ums.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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