

Examiners' Report/  
Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2012

GCE LEISURE STUDIES (6967)  
Paper 01

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

January 2012

Publications Code UA030153

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

## **General comments**

Performance on this paper was at a similar level to last year. The paper appeared to be accessible to all candidates.

Candidates were able to use information taken from the 'What You Need To Learn' section of the unit, although the characteristics of quality systems still showed weakness and some disappointing gaps in knowledge for the HSE also. Candidates were familiar with the command verbs as a whole. Candidates appeared to manage their time effectively. The vast majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper in the time available, with little evidence of rushed work towards the end.

Candidates still did not always make full use of the stimulus material. The emphasis in this paper is on the application of their knowledge to a variety of practical situations. Higher marks 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 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. Candidates must be able to use the stimulus material (the 'applied' bit) if they are to access the higher marks with ease, rather than repeat pre-learnt generic responses

## **Word processed scripts**

This January series saw a significant increase in the number of candidates presenting their work as word processed documents. Whilst this is a perfectly acceptable format, there was evidence of candidates being disadvantaged by this.

The exam paper is set out in a structured format to help candidates. Where a questions such as 1b asks for two measures to be identified and explained we then set the answer lines out to reflect this. A number of candidates who word processed their responses did a larger number of measures but in less detail, limiting themselves to the marks for the best two. A number of candidates also wrote a large amount on early questions but then missed out later ones or wrote very little – an unstructured document allows this to happen more than the set exam paper and centres should ensure that candidates have practice in this specific exam technique if they are going to be answering in this format.

Some candidates typed out the question before answering it or typed out all the figures from the boxes in questions 3ai and 3aii. Some answers to 3aii were written in full sentences – 'the number of tracksuits that were left at the end of December was...'. All this unnecessarily wastes time and candidates should be advised not to do this. As long as the question number is there, all we need is the answer!

## Question 1

The scenario for the whole paper was that of Runfar, an athletics stadium.

### 1a)

Most candidates had a basic knowledge of the COSHH regulations and could identify at least one key requirement. However, they then often repeated different versions of the same requirement, for example references to 'storing chemicals safely' might be followed by 'keep them out of the way of customers'. Responses should be careful to distinguish between what are requirements of the act and would be done on the ground to comply with the act. Many of these were a long way from the act, for example 'put a lock on the door'.

### 1b)

Responses could mostly suggest realistic measures, although the usual rather extreme suggestions relating to police and security guard presence occurred a little too frequently. There were many good suggestions, however, development was rather weak – for 3 marks there should be 2 further ideas that are concerned with how/why the measure operates. All too often this was expressed as 'this will help to keep them safe' without any idea of how.

Many dealt with the need for supervision, although again becoming vague rather than suggesting that there is more chance of better behaviour, and therefore reduced risk of injury, if children are in small groups. Checks on equipment were also well dealt with, but 'introducing rules for children' tended to be just stating one rule rather than picking a general point and then illustrating it. For a question that requires two measures, candidates should ensure they only select two and develop them rather than produce 3 or 4 separate ideas.

### 1c)

As with the similar questions on this paper in the past, the responses tended to wander into the negative effects of what they were doing rather than concentrating on what they should be doing in order to implement the act.

For example, 'they should not send emails to past members as they will get annoyed and if they share data/allow temporary staff to access it this would endanger children' – not addressing the question and not always realistic. Development also tended to focus on what they were doing wrong, rather than what they needed to do 'they should not...because...'.

Good responses picked on appropriate parts of the act and then dealt with what needed to be done to follow it. For example 'they can't share information without permission so they need to ask members to sign to say they can use their information when they join' or 'temporary staff need training and perhaps access limited through the use of passwords etc'.

Another tendency of weak responses is to simply say what they should do without reference to the act, for example 'they should put in a firewall and update their database regularly'. In order to achieve application responses need to refer to the knowledge they have of the act and then explain how it will affect the organisation – so they have linked their knowledge to the new situation that has been put in front of them.

#### **1d)**

For a straightforward question there were rather too many weak responses that indicated that candidates only had a very general idea of the role of the HSE. Often there was confusion as to whether the HSE operated from within an organisation and responses tended to deal with what health and safety representative in an organisation would do – 'HSE would check this, check that etc'.

The most common correct responses were linked to inspections, but often the negative side then came immediately to the fore with sanctions. This often then leapt straight to possibly closing them down! The more positive roles of offering advice on training and other health and safety matters were rarely discussed – the HSE seems to have a rather negative image to candidates and a greater emphasis on their positive aspects would be really beneficial to their understanding of how they worked.

#### **1e)**

As in past series this question was well answered by the majority of candidates. Almost all 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.

Measure to minimise risk were more variable than in some past series. Far too many candidates seem to see the actual football match would be of great danger to the crowd and suggested screens, barriers etc between the crowd and the pitch. It is difficult to believe that many of these candidates will have been to matches the previous week where this was undoubtedly not in place. Candidates should also be reminded that the occasional outbreaks of crowd violence that appear in the news are the exception rather than the rule – the fact that it would not have involved home and away supporters in this case was missed by the majority of candidates. Again it is important that they read the scenario carefully.

The applied top line of the risk assessment was more realistic than many have been and most candidates were able to correctly able to calculate the risk rating. A mix of numbers and words still hampered a few.

## **Question 2**

### **2ai)**

Most candidates could identify at least one piece of evidence but linkage to how it was used was often vague. A few candidates did realise that, for example, the condition of the building would be used for the facility assessment. Many candidates unfortunately are under the impression that it is a negative assessment – interviewing staff merely to find out the truth about where the problems are.

### **2aii)**

Quality systems were a weak point for many candidates as in past series. There was rather weak understanding of what Quest is overall in responses to this question. To many candidates it seemed as if Quest was somebody that actually made all the improvements or provided the finance for them.

Many responses went along the lines of 'Quest would do it all for them .... They would improve the changing rooms.....Quest puts money into the organisation...Quest would make them clean the changing rooms'.

Other responses were rather generic and could have applied to any quality system.

As in question 1c, candidates need to show that they have knowledge of the Quest system 'Quest has a facility management checklist..' and then apply that to the given situation '...so this would mean that regular maintenance inspections would take place, identifying the issues with broken equipment etc'. Without this type of approach candidates are rarely going to score beyond level 1.

### **2b)**

Positive suggestions often centred on ensuring that changes were well signposted to staff to ensure they understood their roles. This was often accompanied by suggestions that training might be offered. Speed of change was also seen as important, although candidates did not seem to link these with the problems that possibly might be caused by rapid change (not knowing their role, changes to set practices) that have been answered well in questions in past series that have asked for this information to be stated. Candidates should always try to ensure that they develop points so that a real explanation is achieved. In dealing with customers all too often candidates wandered from the point, which was that the issue was of introducing something different – the quality system - rather than just attracting customers. The focus was often not on present, but future, customers. Responses were made challenging for candidates by lack of real understanding of the quality system, as they seemed to think in a number of cases that the club would be seeing wholesale physical changes so customers might not to be able to use them.

## **2c)**

Most candidates could offer some generic quality system benefit of 'attracting more customers' but again knowledge of the basics of the system was a hurdle and these responses tended only to score 1 mark, particularly as the system is aimed at children so the comment is only true in a rather generic fashion. The fact it is for children and doesn't involve material changes meant that a number of responses were unrealistic. Many were aware that it might encourage greater participation through the safeguards and quality of training and pleasingly some candidates were aware of the funding opportunities that might be provided.

## **Question 3**

### **3aii)**

Candidates had a tendency to give a solution to an identified problem rather than explain fully what the problem was. For example, 'they are running out of junior tracksuits so they should ensure that they order more of them' rather than being specific on what the problem was - 'they are running out of junior tracksuits because they sell out each month and therefore could probably sell more than they are'. Or 'they are selling the energy bars at a loss: they have lots of them so probably they are selling them at a loss because they ordered too many and can't get rid of them'. In the latter case in particular there was rarely any direct reference to a stock control problem merely that they should sell them for more.

### **3b)**

Many candidates dealt with the benefits to customers rather than the shop. Often the issues were seen only as those involved after the transaction had taken place – money going straight to the account for credit cards, or cheques having to be paid in (the mechanics of this were rarely considered though) and taking time to clear. The effects in the shop were often confused. Some candidates thought cheques were quicker than using cash. There were also comments that it would mean less change in the till, forgetting that most customers need change and that the reverse is true in most cases. Many did appreciate the benefits gained by not keeping cash – reducing the risk of robbery or mistakes in the till, showing sound working knowledge of processes. Also for credit cards many saw that there were extra costs involved – set up, staff training and the extra charge from the credit card company. There was some confusion with the customer here as well, suggesting that the company would have to wait until the end of the month for payment. Candidates generally were a little too obsessed with cards not working and cheques bouncing, which are both minimal issues.

### **3(c)**

Candidates tackled this question with sound background knowledge and some effective application to the scenario. At the lower achievement end, responses tended to be undeveloped comments such as 'they will need to know how much it will cost' or 'they need to know whether they can afford it'. Good use of the stimulus also appeared in considering that they would have to find somewhere else for the administrative staff to work while the work was going on. Better responses tended to develop and link these ideas – especially in realising that finding somewhere else for their work would have further cost implications. Wider ideas such as the need for planning permission were suggested, as well as dealing with cost in a more complex way – whether it would actually be worth the money in terms of increased profitability. Other sound application was offered in considering that there might be disruption to the stadium generally and that therefore timing – perhaps off season – might be important.

### **3di)**

Candidates generally had a sound knowledge of some of the benefits of electronic ticketing systems, but their analysis of them – and in part their application of them to the scenario – was less certain. As in all the applied questions, it is the linking of knowledge about ticketing systems with the information in the stimulus in order to address the question that is the key to achievement here. For many candidates, the benefits were often left too implicit, with a typical assertive 'they would make queues shorter' without any indication of how this would actually happen, or even of how this might be a benefit to the club. Some did develop this idea further by suggesting the implications for customer satisfaction or even those they would get into the ground earlier and have time to buy merchandise or food, so boosting profits. The link between such a system and the internet was occasionally left out, but the obvious benefits of the internet were stated and analysed – there was often sound link to the stimulus here, with the suggestion that this would enable a wider audience to be reached.

### **3dii)**

Many of the responses here were rather vague and generic. Candidates are reminded that just because information is not right above the particular question does not mean that it cannot be used. A key idea here should have been that as yet there was no proven long term demand for these events and that they were only in the planning stage – therefore investing in a new system on this basis might be flawed. Very few candidates saw this, however, and much centred on the lack of need to train staff or buy the system. The fact that they would have to pay the external agency was often conveniently ignored however. The main benefit that was developed by candidates was that of the ability of the specialist agency to reach a wider audience through their contacts or their web site 'people



who haven't been before will visit their web site and perhaps see their advert/tickets on sale.

### **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link: <http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA030153 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

