

GCE

Edexcel GCE

Leisure Studies 8761

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication code: UA018350

Summer 2006

advancing learning, changing lives

Principal Examiner
Feedback

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

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

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

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA018350

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Content

6966	The Leisure Industry	Page 4
6967	Working practices in Leisure	Page 10
6968	The leisure customer	Page 18
	Statistics	Page 24

6966

The Leisure Industry

GCE Leisure Studies Unit 1: The Leisure Industry Summer 2006

General Comments

The portfolios submitted for 6966 were generally well organised and submitted to time. Overall the centres provided only relevant evidence and did not provide excessive amounts of coursework or irrelevant material. There were in a few instances draft copies included and these should be removed in future since inclusion only serves to obscure moderation. Centres should avoid the inclusion of downloaded material that has not been referenced since this cannot be accredited to the candidate or as evidence towards the assessment objectives.

Whilst nearly all centres submitted the optems forms correctly, many centres did not follow administrative instructions for mark submission. Several centres did not use the Edexcel mark record sheets, including candidate details as well as centre details. This sheet also details the points awarded for each assessment outcome against which the work is moderated and has room for assessor justification of marks awarded. Centres must include these sheets in the future in order to facilitate the moderation process. Centres must also complete the total point scores for each candidate on these record sheets. Centres also failed to submit candidate authentication sheets with the portfolios. The work cannot be moderated without proof of authenticity from the centre.

Centres are encouraged to annotate candidate evidence identifying where assessment objectives have been met and where higher mark bands have been awarded. Several portfolios had no evidence of marking on the student work. In examples of best practice, the front sheets gave reference page numbers indicating the evidence and this was then supported by annotation throughout the student work. All portfolios should clearly have page numbers that can be referenced. The better candidates provided not only page numbers but an index of evidence. This was obviously best demonstrated where there were clear tasks linking to each assessment objective. The majority of centres provided work that followed a sequence of Assessment objectives 1,2,3,4 but some did not. It is advised that all centres follow this format for ease of centre assessment.

There were inconsistencies in the assessment of evidence. This was commonly related to excessive credit being given particularly in the first assessment objective where the evidence did not sufficient depth or breath to achieve higher mark bands. In general the application of mark bands tended towards generosity when in many cases not all the evidence for the assessment objective was produced and only one part was at higher levels. In these instances lower marks must be awarded. Centres are advised to follow closely the assessment evidence required if devising assignments. Some centres devised assignments which did not follow the assessment guidance and therefore evidence was omitted and the higher mark bands could not be obtained. Centres should clearly identify the evidence required for each mark band and ensure that candidates are directed to source all evidence if tasks / assignments are being set that do not closely follow the assessment criteria. Many centres used local case studies that did not allow for full exploration of the topics.

AO1- The range ,scale, and importance of the leisure industry in the UK and Europe.

This assessment objective requires learners to be able to describe what the leisure industry is . The assessment guidance requires reference to active, passive and home-based leisure in the description. This part of the assessment objective was addressed well and learners clearly demonstrated understanding with examples . Several learners produced evidence that satisfied mark band 2 or 3 for this part of objective. However centres are reminded that this is introductory and several candidates produced excessive detail including surveys of their activities and case-studies of the categories.

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

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

Finally learners had to identify regional variations in leisure participation . Some candidates covered this well for both the UK and Europe, whilst others made very broad generalisations about activities in the north and South of England. Some candidates did not even refer to examples set out in the assessment guidance referring to Rugby League. In order to achieve higher mark bands there had to be accurate data and descriptions or explanations for mark band 3. The higher mark bands were often awarded where there was no data or explanations.

AO2- Commercial and non-commercial sectors of the industry.

Learners were required to give an explanation as to the differences between the commercial and non-commercial sectors covering the differences in aims, methods of funding, different partnership arrangements and methods of marketing. The majority of candidates clearly understood the difference between public, private and voluntary sectors and their aims and their funding. However many centres encouraged candidates to produce lists of organisations and case studies of individual organisations and did not directly address the evidence requirements. The majority of learners were less confident in their analysis of the non-commercial sector.

Reference to marketing strategies was limited and centres are directed to the assessment guidance and evidence requirements for the mark bands for clarification. Different partnership arrangements were generally poorly addressed and in many cases omitted altogether. Nevertheless candidates were awarded marks in mark band 3. Candidates must include at least a summary of partnership initiatives and should refer to PPPs, PFIs, . To achieve the higher mark bands there must be an extensive account of partnership initiatives. Some candidates did provide local examples and the stronger candidates gave extensive examples from the UK and from Europe.

AO3- Current Developments in the leisure industry.

Learners were required to research current developments in the leisure industry. It is essential that the research is referenced and is up-to-date. There was a general trend by learners to fail to explicitly credit the reference sources used. Very few candidates produced bibliographies. The assessors credited the research without any references and did not provide witness testimonies to state the research undertaken. Without this evidence it was not possible to award above mark band 1. Mark band 2 requires appropriate sources and without bibliography or references this cannot be assessed. Many assessors awarded mark band 3 which required comprehensive research.

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

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

AO4 - Customers of the leisure industry.

Learners were required to identify the factors which influence participation and non-participation in the leisure . The factors are clearly identified in the specifications in the section covering assessment guidance as well as in the what you need to learn section. Each of these factors required analysis and support from data. In order to achieve mark band 2 it was essential that explanations were clear and supported by data. Candidates generally provided sound data for demographic changes , changes in disposable income and health statistics.

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

Learners found barriers and the recommendations a challenge and there were only limited explanations to demonstrate how barriers to participation might be overcome. Many candidates related this part of the assessment objective purely to disability and therefore this tended to be other people's suggestions rather than their own. Many candidates require assessor assistance in order to fully understand the concepts involved in this area. Even where recommendations were identified the learners could not clearly show the relevance of their suggestions.

6967

Working Practices in Leisure

GCE Leisure Studies Unit 2: Working practices in Leisure Summer 2006

General comments

Performance on this paper showed a marked improvement from the first paper in January. The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates and although there were still one or two areas that were particularly weak, there were less disappointing areas than in January.

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

Candidates were able to use information taken from the WYNTL section of the unit, although the characteristics of both Quest and Chartermark were poorly known in many cases. They appeared to be familiar with the command verbs as a whole, with less attempting to explain when they had only been asked to describe compared to January. Candidates appeared to manage their time effectively and did not produce lengthy passages of irrelevant information. The vast majority of candidates appeared to complete the paper in the time available, with little evidence of rushed work towards the end.

Candidates did not always make full use of the stimulus material. The emphasis in this paper will inevitably be on the application of their knowledge to a variety of practical situations and the higher marks, particularly in levels of response questions, will always be characterised by the ability to demonstrate application rather than theory. It will be important for candidates to have practice in doing this in their preparation for the assessment. The amount of stimulus material is likely to increase slightly in the future compared to this paper to encourage this in candidates.

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

Exam technique is an aspect that requires improvement, particularly in the longer questions. There will always be a considerable number of questions on this paper that have a levels of response mark scheme. This will continue in the future so candidates should be made aware how these work.

Question 1

Scenario was of Fitaway, a privately owned leisure centre with fitness suite, small café and a swimming pool. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

(a) Outline the key requirements of the health and Safety at Work Act

Most candidates had a basic understanding of the intent of the act. The majority of responses, however, tended to be in rather general terms so that although candidates picked up 1-2 marks only a small proportion accessed higher marks. In this act the emphasis must be on the 'at work' part of it, i.e. for employees rather than customers. Too many responses tended to give either measures that were intended to keep customers rather than staff safe or focussed on the day-to-day operations of leisure centres. A considerable percentage of candidates included information from other acts which were not relevant, with confusion with the Health and Safety (First Aid) Regulations being the most notable. Many candidates did comment on the need to keep employees safe and that they are trained to use equipment properly. These are perhaps the two most general requirements of the act. Very few candidates seemed to know the brief but direct requirements such as the need for a written safety plan or safety officer.

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

(b) Identify and explain two measures that could be introduced to improve safety for staff at the centre

Although most candidates managed to identify at least one measure here, answers were often rather vague and explanations very general. Most candidates focussed specifically on trying to identify measures to address the problems given in the stimulus material although there was no particular requirement to do so in this case. The most common responses involved the use of extra training for the staff or maintenance procedures to ensure that damaged equipment was not available. Candidates should be made aware of the necessity to identify an actual measure in a question such as this. Merely stating that 'equipment should be put away' does not fulfil this criterion and then makes it very difficult to achieve the explanation marks as well. A simple 'maintenance procedure should be in place' is an identification and followed by 'this should be done at regular intervals and should ensure that faulty equipment can be identified and removed from use before causing an accident' would be sufficient an explanation for 2 further marks'.

(c) Explain two possible actions the Health and Safety Executive could take if the accidents continue at Fitaway.

Despite the range of options available, most candidates went down the route of suggesting various sanctions that the HSE could impose on Fitaway. Whilst in itself this is not a problem, candidates must bear in mind the context of the given scenario when suggesting sanctions. For relatively minor problems such as this it is not realistic to shut the facility down. Indeed, there were many candidates who suggested that it should be 'shut down and then revisited in a couple of months to see if there was any improvement'. It is always necessary to stress the importance of

being realistic to candidates. The most successful responses were those that suggested they could give advice or suggest training for staff, although minor sanctions such as a fine were perfectly acceptable. Others suggested a warning could be given followed by another visit to check improvements had been carried out. The latter response followed by 'if there was no improvement then it might be shut down' would be the only type of answer where 'close it down' was appropriate. The explanation in a question such as this would be for reasoning as to why the sanction would be used.

(d) Explain how following the requirements of RIDDOR could improve safety at Fitaway.

Candidates did not seem to know the basic requirements of the act very well, although most managed to access at least two marks through logical extension of its title. At the lower level this often appeared, as 'accidents need to be reported so that management can see what has happened and try to put measures in place to prevent it happening again'. More able candidates were able to suggest that written evidence means that some analysis of past accidents can take place to establish any possible patterns in their occurrence. This could then be followed up to identify areas in the facility that were the most accident-prone or members of staff who were involved regularly and who might therefore need further training. In a question such as this the best marks will always be achieved by the candidates who can relate their responses specifically to the scenario that have been given. The application of the theory to the given scenario will always be a key feature of this part of the paper - it is an applied subject and candidates should be given plenty of practice in applying the requirements of the WYNTL acts to different situations both in the initial teaching of the subject and in their exam preparation.

(e) Using the table below, complete a risk assessment for a customer suffering from illness through over-exercise in the fitness suite.

As in January this question was well answered by the majority of candidates. Almost all of them understood the basic premise on which a risk assessment is carried out and were able to produce simple scales for likelihood and severity, although a little more care was needed in places to ensure that the steps within it are in a logical and consistent sequence. Given the nature of the hazard required in the question candidates did tend to be a little extreme at times in their assessment of the likelihood and severity in the top line. Although it is possible for a customer to be severely injured by a hazard of this sort it is not at all likely. Risk assessments are not built on worst case scenarios and candidates should be given practice in assessing likely levels of risk in a number of different types of situation. It is likely here that illness could happen but the likelihood of more severe damage is not great. Most candidates managed to identify 2 or more correct measures to minimise the risk, although some tended to miss out on possible credit by being too brief - a short sentence is what is really required and although it can be done in less the risks of not making the answer clear are correspondingly greater. Some candidates did not appreciate in this section that a risk assessment must be from the organisation's point of view and suggested measures such as 'only go to the gym once a week' 'eat healthily' etc. Others tended to be unrealistic in terms of the amount of control a leisure facility can have on its customers 'monitor them carefully and only let them go twice a week if you think they're overdoing it'.

It is envisaged that the basic format of the risk assessment will appear on the question paper as it has on this one (or in a very similar format) so it would be useful for candidates to be made familiar with this so that they can concentrate on the task

of applying the risk assessment correctly in future. To this end candidates need to have scales for both severity and likelihood that can lead to the application of a logical risk rating.

Question 2

(a) There are three stages required to achieve the Quest quality system. Describe each stage.

Quest was poorly known by all but a minority of candidates. The knowledge of quality systems is an area of the specification that has caused problems in both series so far. It forms a significant part of the requirements for the assessment and candidates must ensure that they know the main quality systems outlined in the specification. If the basics of the systems are poorly known then the questions based on their application will be more difficult to access as well. The most successful stage was the second one where most candidates were aware that the organisation had to be visited by someone from outside, although where the assessor came from was often a mystery. Many left it as 'someone from outside', others 'someone from another organisation' whilst a number thought it would be a visit from the HSE. The possibility of a mystery visit was also known by a number of candidates. The self-assessment tended to be credited for the purpose it was carried out - i.e. to identify areas for improvement etc - rather than for the method. Maintenance assessment was poorly known, most attributing it to an assessment of the state of the building or equipment.

(b) Explain the types of evidence that Fitaway will need to have in place to satisfy the Quest Assessor during the assessment visit.

As in 2a this elicited some rather weak responses. Very few candidates were able to specify actual types of evidence in terms of the documentation or interviews with staff etc. Most suggested the types of area that the assessor would look at - ensuring the facilities were clean, equipment was well-maintained, action plan was being carried out. Whilst this could gain them marks at level 1, without specific evidence types, and some justification as to how that would help the assessor, it was not possible to get into level 2

(c) Analyses the advantages and disadvantages for Fitaway of achieving Quest.

This question showed a marked improvement on the responses met in January on the similar questions, with the majority of candidates managing to lift their answer into level 2. The lack of real understanding as to what Quest was prevented many going further but there were some good attempts to relate the quality system to Fitaway itself. This will always be the key to this type of question. As Quest is a customer service focussed award this is where the focus needs to be to gain the higher marks. Specifics relating to both the award and to the given situation are needed to achieve level 3. Responses that focussed mainly on the results of training staff will inevitably be disadvantaged as this is a small part of the Quest award.

Many responses focussed on the financial aspects, with the achievement of a quality system being seen as an attraction to customers. In itself this is a basic response and candidates should be encouraged to explore the real links between the achievement of the award and the increase in profits. The stimulus given suggested that it wasn't well known and the better candidates linked this by suggesting the achievement of Quest could be used in a local advertising campaign/local newspaper feature to attract more members. Disadvantages were often seen to be financial, with good

qualification that it would not show results quickly and members might already be upset at the running of the centre. The effects on staff of new working practices were also a commonly cited problem

(d)(i) Hentmere Borough Leisure Centre can be awarded Chartermark whilst Fitaway cannot. Explain why.

(ii) Outline the key features of Chartermark

Most candidates had some idea that Chartermark was available to the public sector and gained at least one mark. The failure to say why Fitaway could not - i.e. it is privately owned - was the common cause of a failure to gain both marks.

The key features of Chartermark were unknown to all but a small handful of candidates. The vast majority of candidates gave the possible advantages of using it, which tended to be a watered-down version of the answer to 2c. There is a need to know at least the basics of all the quality systems in the specification.

Question 3

a) Outline a quality system that could be used for the processing of cash and cheques taken at the café.

As in January many candidates found an apparently simple task difficult. Most were able to suggest possible parts of a system - 'counted and recorded at the end of the day' 'receipts issued to customers'- but there were few responses that managed to describe a coherent system. A number of candidates merely explained the advantages and disadvantages of electronic money transfer systems.

(b) Analyse the benefits of offering members a discount for the payment of an annual fee

The majority of candidates managed to achieve at least a solid level 1 or low level 2 response here, although some only considered the benefits from the customer's point of view, and the benefits here are rather restricted. . It should be stressed that if an organisation tries to induce you to pay by a different means, even though it is cheaper for you they must get some benefit as well! Most candidates who did this appreciated that by paying for a year in advance that the customer was guaranteed for that year. Good candidates spelt out that those who paid by monthly were able to leave at any time. The benefits of having the money 'up front' - able to plan expenditure, buy equipment now to attract new customers - were explained well by a significant minority. A common problem was that the discount was seen to be an unrealistically large incentive to join the organisation to begin with and there were a number of responses that went into great detail about attracting family and friends because the member had got a discount. Candidates must try to keep a sense of perspective in questions such as this. A small number of candidates confused the idea with that of the benefits of membership, as had been the question in January

(c) (i) Showing your calculations in the space below, calculate the percentage of trial customers who became members.

The majority of candidates were able to complete the calculation correctly, although it is evident from some of the incorrect attempts - and the calculations shown - that many candidates are not taking a calculator into the examination. It is important to remind them that these are permitted as this is meant to be an exercise in use of statistical information rather than pure mathematical ability.

(c) (ii) Complete the table to show the income Fitaway received in April and May from their campaign

This was quite a taxing exercise in sorting out the information that should be used and it produced a wide spread of marks. It was accepted that there was an element of uncertainty as to which information might be needed for some of the answers and the mark scheme accepted all those responses that indicated correct use of the information in principle

(d) Analyse the advantages and disadvantages of introducing a swipe card system

This question proved to be accessible to the vast majority of candidates and showed some thoughtful responses. Almost all were able to at least state the basic advantages - quicker entry, knowing who is there - and disadvantages such as the cost of its introduction and the problems if it breaks down. Many went on to sound analysis, developing the ideas of needing less staff at the entrance, hence saving money, and the reasons for wanting to know exactly who is using the facility. These were linked to possible marketing advantages, the need to account for everyone in emergencies and their ability to adjust their facility according to the needs of users. Disadvantages were seen to be the cost of cards, equipment and training staff and effects of possible breakdown of the system, although real analysis in these was less forthcoming. Some good responses also noted that in a 'people' industry the reduction in contact between staff and customers might be detrimental. It is important for candidates to realise that in order to access the top marks real analysis and explanation is required. Merely to state that if the system breaks down customers would leave is not enough.

Some common problems in responses centred around the confusion of swipe cards with credit cards or identity cards - i.e. that they would store a great deal of information that other people might be able to steal. Also it was suggested that Fitaway would have more information on them if they had a swipe card, but there is no justification for this assumption. The problem of people using others' cards was often dealt with at length but at a rather superficial level - those that did it well tended to bring analysis in by stating that this could be a problem 'if the card did not contain a photo of the member'

6968

The Leisure Customer

GCE Leisure Studies Unit 3: The Leisure Customer Summer 2006

General Comments

It was encouraging to note that centres were generally presenting evidence for moderation appropriately; without bulky folders and large amounts of plastic wallets. Centres are advised that surplus material such as draft copies, course work notes, operational manuals and large amounts of brochures and leaflets should be removed prior to despatch. These could be sourced and referenced in an appropriate way and endorsed by the assessor.

Most centres had correctly utilised the mark record sheets which should include details of the candidate name and number, centre name and number, points awarded by the assessor for each assessment outcome and general assessor comments relating to each outcome and its location within the sample.

Some centres had not used appropriate mark record documentation and this can hinder the moderation process. Some centres had incorrectly calculated the total points awarded for candidates on the record sheets and this was often transferred to Optems forms. Centres are reminded to ensure all calculations are correct when submitting final point scores.

Annotation by assessors throughout the candidate evidence is very useful but often lacked detail. Candidates and assessors who paginate portfolios and identify where they judge individual grading criteria to be covered, greatly assist the moderation process for both the internal and external moderator, particularly when evidence covering assessment outcomes is not presented as discrete tasks.

Centres should ensure that candidates do not choose inappropriate examples of leisure providers. Appropriate examples will allow all the requirements of all the grading criteria to be achieved. If candidates do not choose appropriate examples of leisure organisations on which to apply their evidence, they risk not being able to access the full range of marks available.

Candidates should be discouraged from presenting pages of information downloaded from the internet which has not been referenced, analysed or integrated clearly into learner evidence as this generally does not demonstrate understanding and could be interpreted as plagiarism.

Centres should note that candidate authentication sheets should be included with work dispatched for moderation. Evidence from the highest and lowest scoring candidate should always be included with the sample, even if not highlighted on the Optems form.

It would be beneficial for some centres to scrutinise the WYNTL and assessment guidance sections of the specification for further information on how to meet all the grading criteria and to award marks within the appropriate mark bands. Centres should also note that a Teacher's Guide is also available at Edexcel Online which provides examples of annotated candidate evidence to illustrate the depth and breadth of evidence required at mark band two and three.

AO1 - The leisure customer

This assessment outcome requires candidates to explore how the leisure customer is viewed by leisure organisations and to understand the importance of the customer and customer service to the industry, supported through the review of appropriate policies and procedures.

The appropriateness of marks awarded for this outcome varied with some centres being overly lenient and some too severe.

Some candidates had not chosen appropriate leisure organisations and therefore evidence did not always relate to the importance of the customer to the leisure industry. Candidates could be encouraged to examine how leisure centres, gymnasiums, theme parks, visitor attractions, sports clubs etc. view customers supported and illustrated by a review of their customer service policies and procedures.

Some centres had awarded in mark bands two and three where evidence was not from a range of organisations, related to a range of different customers. To access mark band two, evidence from at least three different leisure organisations should be presented, related to at least three different customer types. Evidence relating to one or two organisations should be awarded in mark band one.

Some candidates were not linking leisure organisational policy and procedure to customer service and evidence sometimes simply relied on downloaded policies from the internet without evidence of knowledge and understanding.

Evidence from some centres was excellent, where candidates had explored three contrasting leisure organisations and comprehensively explained how they viewed a range of different customers with clear, accurate and appropriate links to policies and procedures.

AO4 - Operational aspects related to the leisure customer

The marking criteria require candidates to present information related to customer service provided by a leisure organisation, gained through a 'mystery visit'. Marks awarded by assessors were generally within the correct mark band, although a small minority of candidates had not chosen a suitable *leisure* organisation for their visit.

Most candidates however, were able to give examples of several aspects of customer service they had received, including information on the product or service and information available to customers and therefore accessed mark band two. Centres should note that to achieve the highest marks in this band, candidates should be evaluating the success of the provider in satisfying customer needs and be able to comment on the tangible methods the provider has in place to measure standards. It was disappointing that more candidates did not include and evaluate examples of these methods within the evidence presented.

To access the highest marks in band three, candidates are required to be able to "...comprehensively review a series of operational documents such as policies, statements, forms, training manuals and make detailed comment on their effectiveness and suitability. This should include comments on language, layout, fitness for purpose etc." Few candidates presented evidence to this standard.

Candidates need only focus on the customer service provided by one leisure organisation to access all the marks available for this outcome. Some candidates had

completed mystery visits on more than one organisation and this often reduced the level of depth and detail required to access the higher points.

AO3 - Marketing activities and the leisure customer

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

Many centres however, had awarded generously for this outcome with many candidates' evidence very theoretical with little or no application to activities used within the leisure industry or by specific leisure organisations. These responses are limited to the lower mark band. Care should be taken to ensure that evidence includes information regarding the products and services each marketing activity relates to.

To access mark band three, candidates need to investigate at least four contrasting marketing activities used within the leisure industry. These activities can be chosen from the same leisure organisation but care must be taken to ensure that the activities are sufficiently contrasting. Candidates may find access to the higher marks easier if a range of marketing activities from different leisure organisations are explored.

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

AO2 - Dealing with leisure customers

This assessment outcome should demonstrate candidates' ability to provide effective customer service to leisure customers. The outcome lends itself to practical activities such as customer service role-plays; face-to-face, over the telephone, responding to customer letters and emails, or through technological or visual means; giving presentations, creating displays etc.

Many centres were awarding very generous marks for this outcome with very little supporting evidence. Where observation records and witness statements had been used, these often lacked detail and information regarding the candidates' ability to work independently.

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

To access mark band three, candidates should have demonstrated skill and expertise in the provision of customer service to at least three different leisure customer types, in a *wide* range of *contrasting* situations. At this level, learners will show the ability to 'go the extra mile' when dealing with customers.

Evidence of practical situations should be supported via detailed, individual observation records, completed, signed and dated by the assessor. Each different

situation for each individual candidate should be accompanied by its own observation record, in order to highlight how the candidate has met the marking criteria, in the necessary detail. Observation records can be supported by other evidence such as audio/visual recordings, photographs, presentation notes etc.

Some candidates had presented evidence from part-time jobs and work experience placements. Care should be taken to ensure that evidence used from these sources demonstrates the candidates' ability to provide effective customer care to leisure customers. Some candidates had included evidence from work at a non-leisure organisation which did not demonstrate their ability to deal with a variety of leisure customer enquiries as required.

Some candidates had presented witness statements completed by their employer, supervisor or colleague. This evidence is acceptable but great care should be taken to ensure that forms completed by non-assessors are appropriate and include detailed comments from an assessor indicating how they have confirmed authenticity and sufficiency of evidence, and how this evidence has been used to make assessment judgements and decisions. The form should be dated, and signed by the witness, the candidate and the assessor.

A range of example scenarios and documentation templates are available in the Teacher's Guide available to all centres at Edexcel Online www.edexcel.org.uk

8761 Applied GCE Leisure Studies Statistics Summer 2006

6966: The Leisure Industry

Grade	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw boundary mark	47	40	33	27	21	15	0
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

6967: Working practices in Leisure

Grade	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw boundary mark	62	54	46	38	31	24	0
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

6968: The Leisure Customer

Grade	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw boundary mark	46	40	34	28	23	18	0
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code Summer 2006 UA018350

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

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