

GCE

Leisure Studies

Advanced GCE **A2 H528**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H128**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

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

© OCR 2017

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Leisure Studies (H528)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Leisure Studies (H128)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G180 Investigating the Leisure Industry	4
G181 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry	5
G182: Leisure Industry Practice	6
G183 Event Management	8
G184: Human Resources in the Leisure Industry	10
G185 Leisure in the Outdoors	12

G180 Investigating the Leisure Industry

General Comments:

As with previous years, the majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

In most cases candidates were effectively directed as to the requirements of the assessment objectives and it was pleasing to see effective and full coverage of the specification. Many centres produced excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, once again the main reason for the adjustment was due to candidates' work being awarded higher level 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 Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst again this series we have seen some exemplary work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series.

G180/01 Exploring Leisure

AO1: Generally done well. The majority of centres now effectively address the European element of this assessment objective although some candidates continue to submit 'International' instead of 'European' examples.

Centres continue to demonstrate a sound understanding of how sectors and components interrelate, however understanding of how 'stakeholders and shareholders interrelate' remains an issue for some Centres and some candidates.

AO2: Most centres are now using comprehensive, up to date information effectively applied to the requirements of the assessment objective. Unfortunately, a small number of centres are still using out of date statistics and giving too much credit to candidates who simply describe data relating to 'consumer spending, participation trends, employment and health and well-being', rather than applying the data to the requirements of the assessment objective to illustrate the importance of the industry.

AO3: Generally well done. Centres are reminded of the need to cover all elements of the criteria, as identified in the specification. For example, a number of candidates provided good quality evidence relating to 'barriers' and 'access' but did not then effectively cover the 'key factors' as identified in the specification or vice versa. The specification requires analysis of both, this is particularly important when awarding higher marks.

AO4: The majority of centres provided good evaluative evidence for the achievement of this objective. However a small number of centres continue to give too much credit for evidence that is descriptive rather than evaluative. Centres are also reminded that candidates need to discuss current developments that have occurred within the industry as well as evaluate the impact of the media.

G181 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

General Comments:

As with previous years, the majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

In most cases candidates were effectively directed as to the requirements of the assessment objectives and it was pleasing to see effective and full coverage of the specification. Many centres produced excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, once again the main reason for the adjustment was due to candidates' work being awarded higher level marks when insufficient or poor quality evidence was presented in relation to upper the Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 criteria. When awarding top Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst again this series we have seen some exemplary work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series.

G181/01 Customer Service in the Leisure Industry

AO1: The majority of candidates showed a clear understanding of the customer service principles and demonstrated a very good understanding of the benefits of providing effective customer service. The majority of candidates are now addressing the requirements of the specification in relation to **both** internal and external customers and are being specific as to **how** their chosen organisation meets the needs of all customer types.

AO2: Generally done well. The majority of centres provided strong supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions. Centres are reminded that whilst work experience is encouraged as a means to effectively achieve the requirements of this objective, the placement(s) must be leisure industry related.

AO3: Whilst the majority of candidates are now responding appropriately to the requirements of this assessment objective, there remain a small number of centres who continue to misinterpret the requirements of the objective and give credit when candidates analyse the quality of customer service rather than analyse the **methods used** by the organisation to assess its customer service. Centres are reminded that 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 considered 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 on how their chosen organisation assesses the effectiveness of the customer service provided are also needed.

AO4: Generally done well. The majority of centres continue to respond well to the requirements of this objective, with many comprehensive evaluations submitted this series.

G182: Leisure Industry Practice

As with the previous exam sessions, a pre-release case study material had been forwarded to the centres. The case study was based on Daisy Daisy – an ice cream parlour with leisure facilities.

The case study material provided a range of topics in order to satisfy the “What you need to learn” section. The question paper was broken down into six questions, all with sub sections. It gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain a high grade, whilst also offering candidates at the lower range the opportunity to gain a pass. Candidates were required to answer all questions within an answer booklet.

It was clear that candidates understanding and use of command words had improved substantially in some cases. There has been great progress in this area, where candidates are including both sides of a discussion, and adding evaluative comments and conclusions where necessary. This has allowed the stronger candidates to achieve Level 3 marks,. On occasions, the presentation of these answers has seemed to be a little prescriptive, and formulaic. However, this strategy has allowed candidates to clearly show evaluation and therefore access higher level marks.

This continues to emphasise the need for centres to incorporate a section on examination preparation whilst planning the delivery of unit.

Again, centres need to make full use of the pre-release case study material by extracting and developing the “what you need to learn” section. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar or confused with specific areas such as quality standards with a large number of candidates having little knowledge of customer charters.

The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well, although many as in previous years continue to put more than one answer in each box, including a range of grades and consequences. Many also failed to look at the severity rating, giving an inappropriate consequence, which failed to be specific enough to the hazard, identified, using terms such as injury rather than a specific injury caused which had been linked to the ratings.

The majority of candidates seem to have had effective time management skills as, overall, the majority of candidates completed the questions set.

Quality systems, where the candidates had to make a specific choice based on the case study proved a challenge to some, with many answers not taking into consideration the particular leisure facility and the sector it belonged to.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1a	Generally well answered with many candidates able to identify responsibilities of the HASWA.
1b	The Children Act was a question that many managed well. Some candidates were able to state key elements such as the need for CRB checks, the limits on photographs and staff ratio levels. They were then able to go on and make direct links between these and the organisation in terms of cost and time etc. Other candidates talked generically about children and safety, but often this was a link to health and safety legislation rather than specifically the Children Act.
1c	The candidates answered the question about the risk assessment well, although

	many continue to put more than one answer in each box, including a range of grades and consequences. Many also failed to look at the severity rating, giving an inappropriate consequence which failed to be specific enough to the hazard identified, using terms such as 'injury' rather than identifying a specific injury which had been linked to the ratings. Some also concentrated on the aesthetic impact of the hazard rather than the physical impact.
1d	As the question linked to the risk assessment, this question was well answered by many candidates, with evaluative comments and conclusions shown.
2a	The SWOT analysis was well answered in the main. Candidates in the main carried out the SWOT rather than talk about the usefulness.
2b	The candidates were able to show an understanding of the positives and negatives of using only electronic media. It was clear that candidates were fully aware of advances in technology and their usefulness.
2c	Most candidates were able to explain the product part of the marketing mix. Some were able to make a link to the product lifecycle, and several were able to justify why the product range should not be expanded.
2d	Most candidates were able to identify the basic functions of market research, however they struggled to identify different methods and say why these would be suited to the organisation.
3a	Candidates either understood the different formats and gained full marks or they totally misunderstood and gained zero marks.
3b	Although it was apparent candidates understood what stock control was, many candidates could not give suitable factors to consider when deciding on which system to buy.
3c	Rather than concentrating on the benefits of the just in time process via stock control, the candidates concentrated on the space that would be released by moving from paper to computerised systems. Although some of the points made were suitable and credited, full marks were not achieved unless they mentioned the benefits for the organisation as a whole.
4a	This question was well answered. The candidates understood the purpose of budgets. Many candidates were able to explain the implications of not budgeting correctly, either by over- or underbudgeting.
4b	A question, which the candidates either knew the answer to or not, most could name at least one document.
4c	Answers followed on from the previous question. Many were generic and talked about general financial management rather than being more specific to the document selected.
4d	Although many candidates were aware of quality systems, many did not consider the type and organisation within the case study. The impact of this was that some candidates suggested systems that were inappropriate and gained zero marks. Those who selected appropriate systems were able to make the link to standards in staff development.

G183 Event Management

General Comments:

As with previous years, the majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

In most cases candidates were effectively directed as to the requirements of the assessment objectives and it was pleasing to see effective and full coverage of the specification. Many centres produced excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, once again the main reason for the adjustment was due to candidates' work being awarded higher level 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 Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst again this series we have seen some exemplary work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series.

G183/01 Event Management

AO1: The evidence provided by most candidates was strong, effectively covering the evidence requirements of this assessment objective. Centres are once again reminded of the need for the feasibility study to be written before, not after, the event has taken place.

AO2: The majority of centres continue to provide strong supporting evidence in the assessment of this objective, making it easy for the moderator to support their assessment decisions. Nonetheless, centres are reminded that portfolio evidence 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 Mark Band 3 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. It is strongly recommended that an assessor's witness statement is used to support the evidence provided by the candidates in relation to all mark bands and in particular the Mark Band 3 criteria.

AO3: The quality of supporting evidence provided by candidates for the achievement of this assessment objective has improved this series. A small number of centres continue to provide group rather than individual evidence. Log books and minutes of group meetings should be used to provide evidence of **individual research**, but candidates should also clearly index their sources. It should be noted that candidates who do not clearly indicate the sources they have personally accessed and the range of research they have personally undertaken will not be able to successfully meet the requirements of Mark Band 3.

AO4: There was an improvement in the quality of evaluations submitted this series. Whilst the majority of the work submitted by candidates was accurately assessed, a small number of centres continue to give 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 fully

cover the specification when awarding marks within Mark Band 3 - effective use of 'Teamwork Theory' is essential if candidates are to meet the requirements of a 'comprehensive' evaluation of their team's performance and thus achieve marks within Mark Band 3.

G184: Human Resources in the Leisure Industry

General Comments

This examination focused on human resource functions within leisure organisations. A pre-release case study set the context in which the examination was based – Snap Gate Fishing, a well-established coarse fishing lake complex located in the rural area of Upper Westermere.

Most candidates completed all questions, with the majority of no responses limited to just a few candidates who appeared to have gaps in their knowledge.

A good number of candidates were able to display a good depth of knowledge and understanding; with some going on to demonstrate analysis, evaluation and justified judgements. Knowledge and understanding was demonstrated by candidates with appropriate responses to questions on the types of employment, employment documentation, technology and performance improvement. Where candidates did not perform well, they lacked knowledge and the understanding to respond to questions on NVQs, type of organisational structure and human resource planning.

In general candidates showed a good understanding of the assessment objectives demonstrating the analytical and evaluative skills necessary to access responses at the higher level, and across wider range of responses.

Some candidates overlooked command words, such as ‘assess the impact on/of’; and references which required the response to be specifically about Snap Gate Fishing, which resulted in responses only accessing the lower mark bands.

Comments on individual questions:

Question No.

1a	Most candidates gained full marks; marks were lost mainly in confusion over part-time and seasonal staff.
1b	The majority of candidates answered this question well, being able to assess the advantages and disadvantages of seasonal employees.
2a	On the whole this question was answered at the lower level; with most candidates being able to explain each type of employment document, some candidates were able to assess the usefulness of each to Snap Gate Fishing.
2b	Generally well answered with most gaining full marks; marks were dropped due to unsuitable items being suggested.
2c	The majority of candidates demonstrated a very good descriptive understanding of the intricacies of the Working Time Directive; the stronger candidates were able to assess the likely impact of the Directive on the operations of Snap Gate Fishing.
2d	Generally well answered with most gaining full marks; marks were dropped due to a lack of knowledge of the disciplinary process.
2e	The majority of candidates responded well by assessing the impact of poorly performing employees on Snap Gate Fishing; better responses went on to suggest what action should be taken and the consequences of doing nothing.
3a	Generally a weaker response, either candidates did not know what a NVQ was – with their responses being about training in general - or were unable to suitably assess and analyse the impact of providing NVQs.
3b	The majority of candidates responded well, being able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of motivational techniques. Better responses addressed financial and non-financial techniques and also suggested what would work and why for Snap

	Gate Fishing.
3c	In general this question was not that well answered. Candidates tended to either write very vaguely or incorrectly about the structure in place at Snap Gate Fishing or did not suggest what structure they should use and why.
4a	The majority of candidates gained full marks. Dropped marks were down to some candidates being very vague in their responses.
4b	In general this question was well answered with candidates being able to assess the usefulness to Snap Gate Fishing of conducting performance reviews.
4c	The majority of candidates gained full marks. Dropped marks were due to responses not indicating the reason for the importance or being very vague.
5a	In general this question was well answered demonstrating a very good knowledge of seasonality, with the stronger responses going on to assess the impact on Human Resource Planning at Snap Gate Fishing.
5b	In general this question was well answered, with most candidates being able to assess the impact of the responsibility issues on the operations of Snap Gate Fishing. Stronger responses went on to suggest what action to take and why.
5c	Candidates either gained all marks or none. The latter was due to a lack of knowledge about what a needs analysis is and why it is used.
5d	On the whole most candidates gained full marks. Where marks were dropped this was due to identifying a quality rather than a skill, the skills not being suitable to waiting staff or the explanation not being suitable.

G185 Leisure in the Outdoors

General Comments:

As with previous years, the majority of centres submitted work that was marked to an appropriate standard and which facilitated full coverage of the relevant assessment criteria and sections of the specification. The majority of centres had clearly annotated their centre-assessed work and accurately completed the relevant documentation.

In most cases candidates were effectively directed as to the requirements of the assessment objectives and it was pleasing to see effective and full coverage of the specification. Many centres produced excellent portfolios and the efforts put into the work by candidates and assessors should be congratulated. On the few occasions where adjustments to centre marks were needed, once again the main reason for the adjustment was due to candidates' work being awarded higher level 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 Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 marks, 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.

Centres are asked to continue to encourage candidates to effectively reference their sources. Whilst again this series we have seen some exemplary work with respect to this, it is still a weakness for some centres who need to address this issue for the next series.

G185/01 Leisure in the Outdoors

AO1: The majority of centres are now effectively addressing the requirements of this assessment objective. Nonetheless, centres are reminded of the need to ensure candidates address the requirements of the assessment objectives in relation to **how** the events and organisations listed in the specification have influenced and contributed towards the development of the outdoors as a leisure resource, and not simply describe the events and organisations.

AO2: Whilst the majority of candidates provided good evidence to support the requirements of their project plan; centres are reminded of the need for candidates to provide evidence of **both** planning and participation; and of the need to fully cover section **6.2.4** of the specification in order to satisfy the requirements of MB2 and MB3 for this objective. Centres are also reminded of the need for candidates to provide a 'plan' that covers all of the key requirements as outlined in the specification.

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 analysis of the range and scale of outdoor leisure facilities. A number of centres continue to give too much credit when candidates simply identify and describe the facilities available rather than analyse the range and scale of outdoor leisure provision in their chosen area.

AO4: The majority of candidates responded well to the evaluative requirements of this objective. The area chosen was once again crucial. As with previous series, the weakest evidence was in relation to recommendations as to how the identified impacts could be managed, with a small number of candidates failing to address this essential requirement of the objective. As has been the case with previous series, a small number of centres submitted work in which candidates

incorrectly evaluated the 'impact of tourism' on their chosen area and not the 'impact of outdoor leisure' as required by the specification.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

