

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H528**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H128**

Report on the Units

June 2006

H128/H528/MS/R/06

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.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide 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.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	5
	Principal Moderator's Report	6
G180	Exploring Leisure	7
G181	Customer Service in the Leisure Industry	9
G182	Leisure Industry Practice	10
*	Grade Thresholds	12

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

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

A significant number of Centres resubmitted work for unit G180 and it was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres had successfully addressed the issues identified in the January series. Similar issues however were evident in the work of a number of Centres entering candidates for the first time this session. It is essential that these Centres take on board the comments made in the Principal Moderator's Report and Centre reports in order to develop and improve their performance. The overall response to the requirements of unit G181 was pleasing, with the majority of Centres using relevant industry based examples to facilitate the requirements of individual assessment objectives. In the case of both internally assessed units, one of the main reasons for scaling remains the fact that some Centres marked 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 also reminded of the need to use up to date sources and of the importance of clear and detailed annotation of candidate work.

For Unit G182, there was significant evidence that candidates had been entered for this examination without thorough examination preparation. Despite a pre-released case study many candidates appeared unfamiliar with its content and in particular its reflection of the key elements of the specification. As with the January examination, the Principal Examiner's Report includes 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 the specification was poor. Centres clearly need to spend some time developing candidates' examination technique and applying their understanding of the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the specification through industry visits and the effective use of case studies. Centres are strongly urged to study the Principal Examiner's Report in order to improve levels of performance in future examination sessions.

Principal Moderator's Report

General Comments

Still in its first year of the qualification, there were issues with the interpretation of the assessment criteria that resulted in the marks of some Centres being adjusted in order to bring their assessment decisions in line with the national standard for this qualification. It is important, therefore, that Centres note the comments made in this report and the advice given in their own Centre reports prior to making future assessment decisions.

It was very pleasing to note that the majority of Centres involved in the January session had effectively addressed the issues identified, submitting work which was clearly annotated, marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment grids.

The majority of Centres had clearly annotated their Centre-assessed work, with appropriate documentation (such as the Unit Recording Sheet) completed accurately and within the deadlines specified by the Board. However, there continues to be an identifiable correlation between Centres that submitted work late, those that did not carry out effective annotation and administration and those Centres awarding marks outside of the tolerance limits allowed by the Board.

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 advice and guidance offered by the Board through its coursework consultancy service.

Some Centres inappropriately marked candidates work at the higher marks when insufficient or poor quality evidence was represented in relation to the upper Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 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.

Centres are asked to encourage candidates to identify the range of sources they have used by including a detailed bibliography and/or sources of information sheet, as well as acknowledging sources within the body of their portfolios.

Those Centres that had taken on board the guidance and support provided by the Board, 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 - 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.

Improvements were noted in the candidates' 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 Mark Band 2 requirement.

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**. Although less evident during this examination series, there are still a small number of Centres submitting work in which their candidates have not included any reference to Europe in their summary of the industry. As a minimum requirement, we would expect to see at least one European example for each of the six components of the industry, with the possible exception of home-based leisure. 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 inappropriately awarded Mark Band 3 when candidates had 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 if they are to clarify and demonstrate a candidate's **thorough** understanding.

AO2: There was a much better response in this examination series to this assessment objective than in January. However, some Centres are still giving too much credit to candidates for simply describing data relating to 'consumer spending, participation trends and employment', when it was not applied to the assessment objective. Candidates are expected to use the data to demonstrate their understanding of the size and importance of the leisure industry, not just describe it. In order to do this effectively candidates should have explained how the data they are presenting illustrates the size and/or importance of the industry. For example, what was the significance of the figures they were quoting on consumer spending? How do the number of people employed within the industry show its economic significance? How do levels of participation show the potential importance of the industry? Although some candidates gave very good accounts of the importance of the Leisure Industry in relation to the **'Health and well-being'** of the nation, a significant number of candidates omitted this requirement of the specification.

The specification clearly requires the consideration of **European** data in relation to the achievement of this assessment objective. 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. Centres are reminded that full coverage of the criteria within the specification is only expected in relation to UK data; however, the data must be used to illustrate the **scale** and **economic** and **social** importance of the industry and there must be some reference to the scale and importance of the leisure industry in **Europe**. Failure to include European data is seen as a significant omission and restricts a candidate to Mark Band 2.

AO3: This was the least misinterpreted assessment objective for this unit, with a number of candidates providing very good evidence, which was extensive, accurately credited to a range of sources and clearly focused on the AO.

However, there were 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 January, too many Centres credited candidates for simple descriptions rather than evaluations. Having identified the various impacts that the media has had on the industry, candidates must evaluate whether these impacts have had a positive or negative impact on the industry. They should discuss **current developments** that have occurred within the industry as a result of the involvement of the media and draw conclusions, which are justified as to whether the media has had a positive or negative affect on the industry, using an extensive range of examples to back up their arguments. Common errors when addressing this AO included candidates evaluating the various types of media, rather than the media's impact on the industry and describing developments within the media rather than developments within the leisure industry. It is also important to ensure candidates do not base their evaluations solely on the impact the media has had on the 'sports industry' but cover the leisure industry as a whole.

G181 - 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 responded well in relation to **external** customers, providing detailed comprehensive accounts. Unfortunately, in a large number of cases, the evidence relating to **internal** customers was not of the same quality. There is also a requirement to show a clear understanding of the **customer service principles** in relation to the candidate's chosen organisation. This was not always evident in the work submitted, with a large number of candidates solely focusing on the needs of internal and external customers. Whilst the majority of candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service, a significant number of candidates did not effectively relate this knowledge to their chosen organisation.

AO2: A number of Centres provided excellent supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions. Unfortunately, a significant number of Centres provided little 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 importance of providing effective witness testimony for the achievement of this assessment objective. Centres are also reminded of the need for **supporting evidence** to be **thorough** in order to achieve Mark Band 3; 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.

AO3: The requirements of this assessment objective were misinterpreted by a significant 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. A significant number of Centres misinterpreted this to mean that candidate's needed to analyse the effectiveness of the customer service provided.

To effectively meet the requirements of this objective, candidates must identify and then analyse the **methods** used by the 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 to how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed.

AO4: The majority of Centres responded well to the requirements of this objective, with some excellent detailed evaluations evident. Some Centres, however, gave too much credit for brief evaluations that did not consider the **customer service principles** or the **quality criteria** as identified in the specification.

G182 - Leisure Industry Practice (Written Examination)

General Comments

This was the second session for this qualification. Pre-release case study material had been forwarded to Centres prior to the examination. The case study was based on Planet Earth Theme park. The material included general information on the facility, and outlined how it had developed to the present point, and included an extract from the Profit and Loss Account. The case study material provided a range of topics in order to satisfy the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the Specification. The question paper was broken down into five questions, all with sub sections. It gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain a good grade, whilst also offering candidates at the lower range the opportunity to gain a pass. Candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It was clear that many candidates were ill prepared for the examination, with a limited number completing the paper to a high standard. Centres need to incorporate time in their planning of this unit to teach examination preparation and good practice. Work also needs to be done in relation to command words. Many candidates are describing and explaining when they should be analysing or discussing, thus limiting the marks they can achieve. There was limited development of answers into levels three and four, which seemed to be a reflection of examination technique rather than ability. Candidates should also be reminded that there is no need to repeat the question in the answer.

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 of the Specification. There appeared to have been a limited use of vocational examples studied. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with technical terms such as quality standard programmes, master budgets and operational systems.

The majority of candidates seem to have had effective time management skills, as; on the whole, the majority completed the questions. Centres should enhance this unit through the use of industrial visits, allowing the candidates to see the systems and procedures in action in the workplace. Candidates would also benefit from sessions on examination preparation that include the use of command words, and further developed use of the pre-release material.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a)(i) Generally well answered, although some candidates seemed to mix up quality standards and customer service.
- (ii) Candidates showed confusion between quality standards and customer service.
- (b) The majority of candidates focused on finance only, with a limited attempt at how to use this information. Some candidates clearly did not understand the terms administration and operational systems.
- (c) Well answered, with the majority of candidates being able to identify advantages and disadvantages of a computer based system when compared to a paper based system.
- 2(a) Good basic outline provided on three acts, but limited application to practical implementation within the industry or case study.
- (b) Candidates, in the main, had a limited understanding of the main features of the Act and focussed mainly on the use of passwords. Once again candidates failed to analyse and simply stated facts or impacts.
- (c) Risk assessment was very well answered, with most candidates achieving full marks. Good examples given, although often candidates suggested more than one example of who could be injured, consequence, etc.

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

- 3(a) The SWOT analysis was generally well done, with the majority of candidates being able to identify examples for each section. A number of candidates were unable to differentiate between strengths and weaknesses being internal and opportunities and threats being external to the organisation.
- (b) Some candidates outlined all of the marketing mix, and, in general described rather than assessed. A number of candidates misinterpreted the question and focused on the word 'marketing' and described this process in relation to Planet Earth. Some candidates only looked at one of the two elements identified in the question.
- (c) Some candidates did not address all stages of the life cycle. This was generally weak with obvious attempts as opposed to structured answers. Very few candidates moved on from describing the key words given in the question.
- 4(a) This question was reasonably well answered with candidates identifying suitable methods for generating income. Some candidates suggested strategies to improve numbers of customers, and, therefore, improve income rather than specific income generators.
- (b) Limited progression of answers with seasonality identified, but implications on other departments not addressed.
- (c) Generally a poor response, with many candidates lacking a basic understanding of the make up, purpose or use of a profit and loss account.
- 5(a) Candidates made a good effort to gain marks here, and suggested answers that looked at both qualitative and quantitative measures - both of which were appropriate.
- (b) Candidates tended to focus on discounting with little reference to implementation, or justification of choice.
- (c) Descriptive definitions, showing limited knowledge of how these budgets were used. Very few candidates offered their own examples of organisations studied.

**Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H128, H528)
June 2006 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G180	Raw	100	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G181	Raw	100	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G182	Raw	100	83	72	62	52	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H128	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H128	1.45	8.18	22.90	48.67	71.98	100.00	484

484 candidates were entered for aggregation this series

Specification Aggregation Results

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;

www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2006

