

Examiners' Report January 2007

GCE

GCE Applied Leisure studies (8761/9761)

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.

January 2007

Publications Code UA018627

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2007

Contents

Unit 1: The Leisure Industry	5
Unit 2: Working Practices in Leisure	9
Unit 3: The Leisure Customer	17
Unit 4: Leisure in Action	23
Unit 5: Employment in Leisure	27
Unit 6: Current Issues in Leisure	33
Grade Boundaries	35

Unit 1: The Leisure Industry

General Comments

This moderation series contained many less entries than the summer series. Many centres submitted less than five samples and rarely were ten submitted. The standard of moderation by the centres was higher than in the summer but there was still a tendency to mark generously and adjustments downwards were made for those who awarded mark band 3 throughout. Centres need to refer to previous Principal Moderator reports which clearly state that all aspects of mark band 1 must be covered before mark band 2 can be awarded. Equally where mark band 3 is awarded all criteria for mark band 1 and 2 must be evident. In some cases centres awarded individual marks for each mark band. This process is totally unacceptable.

The portfolios submitted for 6966 were generally well organised and submitted on time. Overall the centres provided only relevant evidence and did not provide excessive amounts of coursework or irrelevant material. 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. This was in evidence in terms of data downloaded and also in terms of AO3 looking at future trends in leisure. It was particularly worrying where assessors had accredited the downloading or in some cases where cut and paste had been used and not been referenced. This is clearly plagiarism and must be removed from the work submitted.

All centres submitted the OPTEMS forms correctly, and followed the administrative instructions for mark submission. Most centres did 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 space for assessor justification of marks awarded. Centres did not always include the justification of marks and these are important in the facilitation of the moderation process. There was some confusion where the work had been internally moderated and marks changed. It was not always clear which marks were finalised and the final marks were not always recorded accurately on the mark sheets and the OPTEMS. Where marks have been changed this should be clearly identified on the front sheets. Again, justification of change of marks should be clearly made in writing. In some cases marks were adjusted upwards or downwards with no justification. All centres also submitted the candidate authentication sheets with the portfolios.

Centres are encouraged to annotate candidate evidence identifying where assessment objectives have been met and where higher mark bands have been awarded. Some portfolios had little 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. 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.

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 3 for this part of the objective. However centres are reminded that this is introductory and it is unnecessary to provide the detail which is then repeated in AO3.

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. However there is still a problem that candidates are using outdated data. The data provided should be at least post 2000, data from the early 1990s is not acceptable. There are instances where data tables are reproduced from text books without references. In many cases explanations and analysis were lacking but assessors accredited these tables. Unreferenced data is plagiarism.

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. Again, learners reproduced basic descriptions from text books demonstrating little understanding and not providing explanations to AS level. For example learners stated that snow sports were popular in Switzerland due to mountains and in Spain snow sports were not popular due to the climate. There was no recognition of mountainous areas in Spain! The majority of learners provided work at mark band 1 for this assessment objective.

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

Learners were required to give an explanation of 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. Equally several candidates produced case studies of inappropriate organisations particularly for the voluntary sector. Organisations such as Cancer Research and Age Concern are clearly not appropriate when there are a full range of voluntary organisations from the National Trust to football clubs that can be used. 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. Candidates must include at least a summary of partnership initiatives and should refer to PPPs and PFIs. To achieve the higher mark bands there must be an extensive account of partnership initiatives. Some candidates did provide local examples however this aspect is still weak and needs assessor guidance. However for this assessment objective there were marks awarded in mark band three that were appropriate.

AO3: Current Developments in the leisure industry.

Learners are 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. More candidates in this series produced bibliographies. The assessors credited the research without any references. It is essential that witness testimonies are provided to support the extent to which research has been 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. 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. However, there were instances where candidates had included downloaded material and this has been accredited. Downloading material does not equate to using a variety of sources and under no circumstances should this work receive accreditation unless the student has presented clear annotation and explanation attached to it.

There were also particular problems with data tables which had been included but not referenced and had been accredited. This can be interpreted as plagiarism and should be removed before the submission for moderation.

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 often failed to supply appropriate data to support their explanations

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. Some 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 tutor assistance in order to fully understand the concepts involved in this area. However in some cases the learners achieved mark band 3 and made what were obviously their own recommendations based on the language used, but these recommendations were realistic even if in cases they were simplistic.

Unit 2: Working Practices in Leisure

General comments

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

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 both series so far, Q2 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 'what you need to learn' section of the unit, although the characteristics of all quality systems were only vaguely known in the majority of cases. They appeared to be familiar with the command verbs as a whole. 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. This paper contained more stimulus material than the previous two and this will be the pattern for the future. This is an 'Applied' GCE and therefore in the longer explain/analyse questions the mere repetition of generic material, however valid, is unlikely to achieve beyond a level 1 response.

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 level of response mark scheme. This will continue in the future so candidates should be made aware how these work.

Q1

Scenario was of Pincton Theatre. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

Q1(a)(i)

Most candidates had a basic understanding of the intent of the act and managed to score at least 1-2 marks. The key ideas most frequently used were those of the maximum working day/week and the need to provide breaks both within and between shifts. There were also many valid comments about the differences for younger workers, many of them evidently drawing from their own experience. In a question such as this it is not necessary for them to provide large amounts of statistical data. The key idea of the length of the working week, for example, is that there is a maximum over which employees cannot be forced to work, rather than the fact that this maximum is exactly 48 hours. In general they seemed to grasp the main concepts well.

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. Some candidates did disadvantage themselves by attempting to relate the act to the given scenario. This is a more difficult skill but is not required here.

Q1(a)(ii)

Most candidates managed to at least identify two possible measures that would ensure the safety of staff, with only a limited number of these measures being unrealistic. A significant minority, however, failed to score any marks because they concerned themselves with measures that would ensure the security of the money taken rather than that of the staff taking it. The most common realistic measures were the positioning of a transparent screen, the installation of alarm buttons for staff and the possible presence of security men. These measures were often described in full but at times this was to the exclusion of explanation as to how/why they operated. This was a case where the command word was not always interpreted correctly. Most of the measures suggested were realistic although there are still candidates who do not consider the context or what might actually be realistic. As in other areas of this paper it is important for them to consider the stimulus material when suggesting possible measures.

Q1(a)(iii)

This question was poorly done, particularly by the weaker candidates. There were two main areas in which they fell down. Firstly, it was evident that some candidates did not read the name of the legislation carefully enough and addressed their response towards the Health and Safety at Work Act. It is unfortunate that the 'First Aid' part appears only in brackets, but that is the correct name of the regulations. It is something worth stressing to candidates when they are being prepared for the external assessment. The second problem was the perennial one of not applying the legislation to the given scenario. This was one of a number of questions where the 'applied' part of the GCE is tested. Many candidates only achieved a level 1 response because they merely outlined the key requirements of the act, often in considerable detail. To achieve level 2 (3-4 marks) it is necessary to explain the possible effects 'on the theatre', perhaps by emphasising that the number of first aiders needed would be proportionate to the size of audience or by relating the need for them to the rate of turnover (need to employ/train more first aiders) or the shift pattern.

Q1b(i) and Q1(b)(ii)

With part (i) candidates had some difficulty in accurately naming a piece of legislation, even though it became evident from their response to part (ii) which one they were talking about. This lack of correct terminology meant that they lost the mark for part (i) but did not jeopardise themselves for part (ii). In particular the Display Screen Equipment Regulations was often missing one of the key words (the 'Act' or 'Regulations' word was not considered key), as was Manual Handling Operations. A wide variety of legislation was suggested with the vast majority having some relevance. Unfortunately, this was again a question in which the acts were often only repeated and not applied. Some candidates did take one or more of the problems given correctly, linking Display Screen Equipment Regs with the given problem of eyestrain and headaches simply to lift their responses to level 2. Some used less obvious legislation such as RIDDOR but managed to link its purpose of reporting accidents with the eventual stopping of them and thus preventing problems such as that of backstage injuries.

The majority of the candidates did not actually refer to the problems given right above the question. It is essential to point out to them in preparing for the exam that this information is given to help them and should be used.

Q1(c)

Many candidates seemed very vague as to what local authorities do in this respect. The fact that much of what they do is similar to that of the HSE was, I feel, a bonus to some candidates, as they appeared to respond from an HSE perspective. This was fine for many although some changed the question to that of the HSE so did not score. The roles of inspecting, and giving out sanctions if the facility was not within the law, were the ones most often quoted, but few seemed to be aware of the wider roles such as instruction and advisory capacities. For a simple AO1 question this was rather poorly answered and emphasises the need to cover the whole of the specification in preparation for the external assessment.

Q1(e)

As in January 2006 and June 2006, 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. There were very few unrealistic suggestions for measures to minimise risk compared to the previous series, although the balance of their severity and likelihood was often too extreme. Although it is obviously possible for a fire that causes death to staff and/or customers to occur, the likelihood of it occurring is not high and candidates must appreciate that they have to assess the possible score for each in this way. Theatres that were highly likely to have a fire that killed customers would not, I feel, last long. 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. 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 phrase/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. There were some very simple lists of equipment - fire buckets, fire blankets, fire extinguishers - that in themselves only represent a measure to put out a fire once it has started. There was a wide variety of good suggestions, however, with a good number being directly related to the theatre environment - these included control of capacity, no smoking auditorium, regular checks on backstage electrical equipment. Only a few suggestions were made from

the customer point of view this series ('don't smoke at the theatre') compared to the last one.

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.

Q2

A second venue, Pincton Swimming Pool, was introduced here.

As in both previous series this whole question was the weakest for the majority of candidates.

Q2(a)(i) - Q2(a)(iii)

The first question gave them the opportunity to use whichever one they wanted, apart from IIP, but there was a lack of real knowledge of what these systems are. A small number of candidates could not name one quality system and a further significant minority could not identify any of the characteristics of their chosen system. Many of the responses for Quest really only dealt with the fact that it is designed to be a customer service tool primarily, but this was often the only detail forthcoming. Quest was the one chosen most often although each of the 3 smaller - Clubmark, Charter Mark and ISO 9001 - could be used. As with Quest, it was rare for candidates to score more than 2 on part (ii) which really is a knowledge based question only. Many candidates tried to be too complicated in their response to part (iii). The simple reason why Quest (for example) is suitable is that it is for sports facilities and a swimming pool is a sports facility. Many responses tried to analyse the benefits of a facility gaining the quality system instead.

The knowledge of quality systems is an area of the specification that has caused problems in all 3 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.

Q2(b)(i) and Q2(b)(ii)

As in Q2(a) this elicited some rather weak responses. Responses for Quest tended to be better than those for other systems. As this forms a more central part of the specification, this is to be expected.

For part (i) few candidates were able to specify actual types of evidence in terms of the documentation or interviews with staff, although there was some improvement from June's paper here. 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.

Part (ii) was poorly understood. Evidence for a quality system is needed so that the assessor can judge the facility/organisation against the criteria and thus decide if they merit the award. For example the evidence of cleaning rotas is required to judge the facility operations area. Straightforward linkage such as this is all that is required for this response. Most candidates did not appreciate that the evidence was for this and returned to justifying it in terms of customer service only.

Q2(c)

There was some knowledge of the basic purpose of improving staff systems here but overall the process was known only rather vaguely. Again this is only an AO1 knowledge question and most candidates at the E grade level scored 1 or less on this question when 2 marks should be the norm. The characteristics and the process of achievement of these quality systems will always be fundamental to comprehension of the use of systems as well as providing a chance for weaker candidates to gain accessible marks.

Q2(d)

As in previous series, there is still a considerable body of candidates who know a great deal about the generic benefits and disadvantages of these quality systems but who then fail to apply their knowledge. This means that responses that, on the surface, appear to be at a sophisticated level, do not lift out of level 1.

There were many candidates, however, who did manage to make the links between the given system, liP, and Pincton theatre. Some candidates returned to the information in the opening stimulus and suggested that better training and communication with staff would mean happier staff and this would reduce the level of turnover with associated benefits. Others returned to the stimulus for Q1(b) and linked the benefits of training to a reduction in backstage accidents. The key elements in any question such as this are the specific goals of the given quality system and the specific characteristics of the scenario. A response such as 'liP means that more people will be attracted to the theatre and therefore it will make more money' addresses neither of these. 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. Once again it is the 'applied' part of the GCE that is being tested here.

Q3(a)

Whilst some candidates manage to cite an example of at least one of these, the basic concept of what they were was weak. Many referred to fixed costs being those known in advance and variable being ones that crop up unexpected. Many candidates did not appear to realise that they were separate from the building costs, despite the stimulus material before it. Again, careful reading of this would have provided clues as to how to proceed. A number of candidates confused the concept of costs with that of price for customers.

Q3(b)(i)-Q3(b)(iii)

The calculation question did not require any great numeracy skills, especially as use of calculators is allowed, but the proportion of candidates getting parts (i) and (ii) correct was small.

The calculation for part (ii) was simply a matter of taking one figure from another. The calculation for part (i) needed the correct figures to be selected and multiplied together. The most common mistake here was to ignore the fact that the theatre puts on 300 shows per year, not just one.

Most candidates managed a simple correct evaluation of their responses for part (iii), although even here it was evident that for some the concepts of costs and income were not fully understood and responses where income was given as significantly higher than extra costs were deemed not to be worthwhile. A significant minority did gain level 2 here by using their financial information to work out exactly how long it would take to recoup the building costs and thus make a reasoned judgement.

The key to this question is often logical selection and working through of financial figures rather than mathematical skills and candidates should be given a chance to practise this in preparation for the assessment. Candidates must also be reminded that they should have a calculator for the examination.

Q3(c)

There was a large number of rather weak responses here, with the boundaries between a project plan and a feasibility study being rather muddled. At its widest interpretation the latter is a very small part of the former. Many candidates only managed a level 1 response with comments about making sure it did not cost too much/go over the estimate. From a small minority of candidates there was some good evaluation of its benefits linked to the specific scenario. Some indicated the need to work safely as customers would still be attending, as the theatre was not closing. Others stressed the need to ensure it is finished on time so the theatre can plan and book the seats, as well as the possible impact on customer confidence in the theatre. Project planning is an important aspect of financial systems and it is particularly beneficial for candidates who move on to the A2 modules as it has a major role in unit 4. This should give a double incentive to ensure that it is fully understood by candidates here.

Q3(d)

Most candidates managed to suggest at least one benefit here, although this was at times spoilt by a concentration on the benefits to the customer rather than the theatre. For example, reduction of queues if electronic tickets were used in turnstiles was seen as an advantage for the customer - which it is - but the focus of the answer was incorrect. Many did correctly point out that this would mean less staff needed and therefore it might save the theatre money in the long run. The other main benefit suggested was that tickets could therefore be bought over the Internet, although again the benefits in a minority of cases were outlined for the customer.

A notable problem seemed to be that candidates had been well prepared for a question on membership systems, as in the first two papers of the series, and used this question as an opportunity to show what they had learnt. All too often this led to considerable irrelevancy with benefits being seen in terms of being able to tell which times of day were popular so they would put on more shows than, somewhat unrealistic and incorrect. Good responses could be achieved by suggesting that an electronic ticketing system could be linked to a membership scheme but on its own these benefits would not accrue.

Q3(e)

There were many thoughtful responses to this question, with many candidates achieving level 2 and beyond. Most put forward at least the basic idea that electronic systems such as this are beneficial to large organisations and therefore it would suit the theatre with 300 shows per year. This was often contrasted well with information that the swimming pool only has 2 galas per year. Better responses developed this further by contrasting the potential costs of installation and training with the likely returns. Some good responses went further to suggest that as the club members sold the tickets the pool's electronic system would not be used anyway, pointing out that selling by members was more personal and would perhaps elicit a better response than having to go to (perhaps) the pool for them. The characteristics of the theatre in terms of the need to book precise seats compared to just 'general swimming' was also considered as a major factor for some.

Unit 3: The Leisure Customer

General Comments

This was the second series of moderation for this internally assessed unit. Comments relate to the marking from the January 2007 series.

Most centres had correctly utilised the mark record sheets which 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. This was a marked improvement on the previous series. Inaccurate calculations of candidate point scores was also much improved.

Annotation by assessors throughout the candidate evidence is very useful in assisting the internal and external moderation process, although some centres are continuing to submit evidence with no annotations at all. Candidates and assessors who paginate portfolios and identify where they judge individual grading criteria to be covered, greatly assist the moderation process, particularly when evidence covering assessment outcomes is not presented as discrete tasks.

The choice of leisure organisations for candidates to apply their skills and knowledge was mainly appropriate, although some 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.

Pages of unreferenced information downloaded from the internet which has not been analysed or integrated clearly into learner evidence, is still being submitted as evidence. This generally does not demonstrate understanding and could be interpreted as plagiarism. Centres are advised to ensure candidates at this level, are referencing external information sources and should be encouraged to complete bibliographies.

It would be beneficial for some centres to scrutinise the 'what you need to learn' 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 2 and 3.

AO1: The leisure customer.

This task addresses AO1 - *demonstrate knowledge, skills and understanding of the specified content of leisure studies in a range of vocationally-related contexts.*

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.

Marks awarded for this outcome were generally too generous. Some centres had awarded in mark bands 2 and 3 where evidence was not from a *range* of organisations, related to a *range* of different customers. To access mark band 2, 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 1.

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 candidates were still 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. A significant number of candidates were still not referencing information downloaded from the internet.

Candidates should be encouraged to make comments on how the organisation's relevant policies impact on the customer service provided. For example, a leisure centre may have a customer feedback procedure in place, such as a comment card system, in order to capture information on areas that may need to be improved, in order to provide a higher level of customer service to visitors. If the service is improved through the recommendations made by visitors themselves, this may lead to greater customer satisfaction, more repeat visits, more sales and profits etc.

If candidates have visited a leisure organisation, they may be able to continue to provide real examples of how some specific policies and procedures have positively impacted on the customer service provision.

Although generously marked in many cases, 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 relevant policies and procedures.

AO4: Operational aspects related to the leisure customer.

This task addresses AO4 - *evaluate evidence, draw conclusions and make recommendations for improvement in a range of vocationally-related contexts.*

The marking criteria require candidates to present information related to customer service provided by a leisure organisation, gained through a 'mystery visit'. Some evidence seen in this series did not actually include details of a mystery visit undertaken, such as a visit report form. Candidates need to undertake a mystery visit at an appropriate leisure organisation and record the details of their findings. Candidates should then provide examples of customer service gained from the visit undertaken, together with details of the range of information available to customers and a description of the products or services provided by the leisure organisation. Candidates could be encouraged to discuss and design their own mystery visit recording form to capture the information required, focusing on a range of customer service aspects, for example: cleanliness; staffing; range of facilities; information available to customers; health and safety; provision for visitors with specific needs etc.

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

A03: Marketing activities and the leisure customer.

This task addresses A03 - *use appropriate research methods to obtain information from a range of sources to analyse leisure industry vocationally-related issues.*

To complete evidenced for this outcome, candidates should research a **range** of marketing activities used in the leisure industry, at least THREE different activities. These activities should be applied to specific products and services from leisure organisations.

For example, candidates may wish to research the range of different marketing activities used by one specific leisure provider (perhaps one already investigated for A01 or A02). Each activity should be linked to the products and services they relate to.

For example, a leisure centre may produce a brochure to promote its range of children's birthday party options or teenager's summer activity programme. A theme park may use a promotional website to increase awareness of a special event or corporate team-building activity packages. A small, local sports club may use a monthly newsletter or email bulletin to inform members of upcoming matches and social events. A global sports brand may use a comprehensive television advertising campaign to launch a new range of equipment or clothing. Comments can be made to the suitability of different marketing activities to appeal to and engage different leisure customer types.

To access mark band 3, 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.

Much evidence however for this series was still 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. Candidates should ensure that underpinning knowledge evidence is applied to relevant leisure industry examples and linked to specific products and services, not just general, theoretical descriptions.

A02: Dealing with leisure customers.

This task addresses A02 - *apply knowledge, skills and understanding of the specified content of leisure studies in a range of industry vocationally-related issues.*

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.

The majority of centres are still awarding very generously for this outcome with very little supporting evidence. Detailed, candidate specific and targeted observation records and witness statements should be used to provide evidence of competency. Detailed assessor comments should reflect the candidates' ability to work independently and to reflect the different customer types and situations dealt with.

In order to access mark band 2, evidence should reflect that the candidate has competently provided customer service to a *range* of different customer types, at least THREE, in a *range* of different situations, at least THREE different situations.

This could be achieved by dealing with a customer complaint, face-to-face, in a fitness centre; a customer sales enquiry, over the telephone, for a cinema and responding to a customer information request to a local squash club, by email. Candidates should also be able to effectively deliver customer service working independently most of the time.

To access mark band 3, 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 least FOUR situations, in a variety of ways. At this level, learners will show the ability to 'go the extra mile' when dealing with customers.

If candidates are not demonstrating their customer service skills in a variety of ways (dealing with customers face-to-face, over the telephone, by letter, email, fax etc.) then marks are limited to mark band 2. If candidates are not providing customer service to at least three different customers in at least three different situations, then marks are limited to mark band 1.

Individual observation records, for each scenario, should reflect the range of customer types and situations dealt with, the different methods used in dealing with leisure customers and the level of independence demonstrated. Each record should be 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.

Some candidates for this series had used 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 a range of different *leisure* customers. Including a work experience log book or diary does not demonstrate the necessary competency required for this assessment outcome.

Some candidates had presented witness statements completed by their employer, supervisor, work experience provider, customers or colleagues. This evidence is acceptable as supporting evidence but great care should be taken to ensure that forms completed by non-assessors are appropriate and ALSO 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

Please note that Onscreen Support for Centre Assessors (OSCA) is available through Edexcel Online. OSCA is an Edexcel system which allows centres to develop understanding, receive feedback and demonstrate an ability to assess accurately. Successful participation in OSCA activities enables Programme Leaders/Department Heads to become accredited. More information on OSCA can be found at Edexcel Online.

Unit 4: Leisure in Action

General Comments

This was the first sitting of this A2 unit and entries were very low. The portfolios submitted were well organised and contained material clearly linked to the assessment objectives. The portfolios clearly identified the event that was organised but were less clear in how the event was chosen. It is absolutely essential that the students choose an appropriate event that enables them to make decisions and to take roles of responsibility. The students must organise and carry out an event where each team member has a distinctive role. The event must have a leisure focus. It is not therefore appropriate for the students to be helping to organise a teacher led event where all responsibility is taken by the teacher and the students are not responsible for such areas as finance, physical resource needs and administration systems. Equally it is not appropriate for the event to be a trip for their own group or residential for their own group. In these cases the learners are unable to demonstrate successful marketing of the event.

Centres are reminded that this is an A2 unit and that there should be evidence of the knowledge gained from AS units in addition to the breadth and depth required for A2. Simplistic statements without the depth of analysis cannot attract the higher mark bands.

It is equally essential that there is clear evidence of individual work by each team member. Students are encouraged to keep diaries/logs of their contributions but these should clearly be kept throughout the event and not presented in a written up format. Where minutes are included they must be of professional and business standard and reflect the A2 level of this unit.

This unit requires the support of witness testimonies. The testimonies should be clearly linked to the assessment objectives and the mark bands but should indicate clearly the individual contribution. Many witness testimonies were similar for all candidates and did not identify individual contributions particularly to the event itself. In some instances the candidates have written their own testimonies which have been signed by the assessor. Whilst this can be acceptable in some circumstances it is not applicable to this unit where one assessment objective refers to evaluation.

Centres are encouraged to annotate throughout the portfolios clearly identifying where assessment objectives/mark bands are being applied. Written comments in addition to the identification of the assessment objectives and mark bands would be helpful to the moderation process. Centres tended to be generous in awarding higher mark bands where the written evidence did not warrant the application of the higher mark bands. This maybe due to assessor involvement and knowledge of the event and reflects the importance of both the addition of annotation and witness testimonies.

All centres submitted OPTEMS forms accurately and authenticity sheets were included for all candidates. The mark sheets did not always have clear reference to evidence location or justification of mark bands awarded. There was confusion in many cases where the work had been internally moderated and marks had been changed which did not reflect the front sheets or the OPTEMS. It is essential that centres clearly reconcile these so that the mark sheets show final marks awarded.

AO1: The Plan of the Event.

Most of the plans submitted were realistic and in all cases the event did happen, although in some cases the original event planned was changed. The events chosen had limited scope and therefore the aims and objectives were limited. The major challenge was that candidates from the same centre produced identical plans and it was not possible therefore to clearly identify individual work. Candidates should be encouraged to submit their own interpretation of the plan. Candidates should include all aspects of the plan as identified on page 40 of the specification. Particular weaknesses were in customer needs, staffing for the event clearly identifying strengths and weaknesses of each member of team and how this relates to role allocation. Risk assessments were often provided rather than researched. Risk assessments were covered in AS units and therefore candidates should be confident in carrying them out.

Financial aspects of the event must include budgeting. This was often absent and income projected and handling payments was often quite weak. Contingency plans were usually mentioned and in the case of some events used. The plan often lacked detail of evaluation and review of the event. This is clearly important in order to enable an in depth evaluation.

In general, event timescales were realistic and it was particularly interesting to see students use a variety of diagrammatic planning tools. This is to be encouraged. This unit benefits from relatively short timescales of approximately 12 weeks. A plan achieving mark band 3 will be comprehensive and include all aspects included in the specification and is clearly the work of the individual candidate. The aims and objectives will be clear and this enables a comprehensive evaluation needed in AO4.

AO2: Individual contributions.

This outcome was generously assessed by nearly all centres and assessors. The marks awarded were based on witness testimonies and observation records but these lacked the detail needed to reflect the demands of an A2 unit.

The candidates had to provide evidence/records of their contribution to the event. It is suggested that learners have diaries or individual logs that reflect this individual contribution. It is not acceptable to provide a group log/diary and they must be written at the time rather than reflectively after the event. In too many cases the teams provided identical evidence and it was not possible to determine each candidate's contribution.

A basic log/diary will be awarded mark band 1. For higher mark bands, there must be evidence of consistent involvement throughout the event. To achieve the higher mark bands, candidates must demonstrate that they have solved problems. In many cases minutes of meetings demonstrated that attendance by candidates was patchy and yet mark band 3 was awarded.

Minutes are also a useful tool to provide evidence of contribution but if included assessors must ensure that the minutes meet a business standard. Witness testimonies and tutor observations are particularly useful in the assessment of this assessment objective. These could reflect learner contributions to meetings, attendance and consistency throughout the project as well contribution to the running of the event itself.

AO3: Research and Feasibility of the Event.

Research was weak and rarely referenced. There was little evidence of primary and secondary sources. Where learners attempted to present alternative events they did not provide research to demonstrate why the chosen event had greater strengths than the others. In many cases it was learners voting for their favourite event. The most successful research was where there was clear market research on target markets or the learners were able to use previous events that learners had held for other assessment purposes. The strong candidates did provide a clear analysis but the majority needed much clearer guidance from their tutors both on the meaning of feasibility studies and how to carry them out using research.

Detailed recommendations must be made in order to achieve the higher mark bands. Learners should be encouraged to attend and research local leisure events. Learner visits and case studies would support this assessment objective.

The feasibility study should address all the main aspects of the plan and for the highest marks each aspect will be backed by referenced research. The feasibility studies can be presentations by the learners. If presentations are used there must be clear identification of individual contribution to the presentation. The most successful centre was where each student presented an in-depth feasibility study as a presentation and the presentations were discussed in a minuted meeting. There was also support in the form of detailed observation records from assessors that followed the mark band statements. It is essential that the presentations however are individual. There were examples of three names on a presentation and this then cannot be attributed to one student and for moderation purposes is not accredited with any marks.

AO4: Evaluation of the Event.

A starting point for the evaluations should be consideration of the extent to which the aims and objectives of the team have been met. In addition all learners should evaluate the extent to which they and individual team members met deadlines. The planning process should be analysed to assess the extent to which the planning enabled a successful event to be mounted. All candidates assessed whether the event had been successful but most judged that holding the event was a success in itself and there was a lack of evaluation of the success of marketing/attracting customers which in most cases was not a success.

All candidates provided evaluations of their performance but as part of the event team and individuality were often absent. All learners were required to assess not only their own performance but also that of their team. The learners appeared to find peer evaluation difficult and it is recommended that tutors give clear guidance on this aspect.

The evaluation must include both during the planning and the running of the event for both themselves and the team. For mark band 3 the evaluations must be comprehensive and detailed for both themselves and members of the team. The evaluations will include analysis of strengths and weaknesses and the consequences of these. The strengths and weaknesses will be accurate and this will be confirmed by witness testimonies or observations.

It is important that learners can identify how working as part of a team was a positive or negative experience. It would be useful for candidates to give feedback to each of their team members and also to receive it and use it as part of their evaluation.

It is essential that there are clear recommendations for improvement. These were rarely in depth. In some cases recommendations were lacking. The recommendations are an essential part even of mark band 1. Weaker candidates need guidance on this aspect.

Assessors must ensure that marks are based on all aspects of the mark bands. There is a tendency to give teams similar marks regardless of the evidence provided.

Unit 5: Employment in Leisure

General Comments

This was the first sitting of this A2 paper. The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates, with only one or two areas in which candidate performance was notably weak.

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, although many candidates did struggle to achieve the higher levels in extended responses. Almost all candidates answered all questions.

Candidates were able to use information taken from the 'What you need to learn' section of the unit, although the characteristics grievance procedures and understanding of the term 'remuneration' were noticeably weak. The requirements of some of the command words were not well known by a sizeable proportion of the candidates and this limited their ability to access the upper regions of the mark range in longer questions. In particular the term 'analyse' often was responded to with simple explanatory points or, worse still, with a series of (bullet) points. Candidates appeared to manage their time effectively. Most did not produce lengthy passages of irrelevant information, although the discursive nature of this paper does mean that candidates should focus carefully on what the question is really asking for before starting to write. A few questions - notably Q1d - were characterised by many candidates describing the terms used in the question and leaving little time/room to actually answer the question. 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. This is an 'Applied' GCE and candidates must be prepared for this!

At times many candidates produced very simplistic responses, which limited their success. At A2 level candidates must be able to provide evaluation and analysis. However, most candidates were able to offer realistic and appropriate answers, demonstrating their understanding of employment 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 levels of response mark scheme. This will continue in the future so candidates should be made aware of how these work.

Q1

Scenario was of Reedlam Manor, a public house with restaurant. This appeared very accessible to the candidates.

Q1(a)

In theory this should be a very straightforward question but many candidates seemed to have little idea of what a job analysis involves or the purpose to which it is put. Later responses on the paper produced a sound understanding of job descriptions and person specifications, so in theory, as the first stage of the process this should have been covered. Many candidates merely seemed to try to reword the information that the stimulus gave them, with little success, although this tended to lead them to the conclusion that a job analysis was an analysis of the whole organisation. A substantial minority of the candidates did understand its role in deciding whether the job was needed, whether someone within the organisation could take over the role and what its roles and responsibilities were. It is evidently a term that requires some reinforcement for the majority of candidates, however.

Q1(b)

Most candidates scored well on this question, with sound knowledge of what should be included. Some candidates were disadvantaged through not appreciating what a checklist was. This only requires single word or phrase responses and certainly does not require any explanation of their decisions. A minority of candidates gave only 3 items for possible inclusion together with a (often good) justification for their inclusion. There is no credit for such explanation in a question such as this so some apparently good candidates lost marks unnecessarily. What command verbs and associated terms such as this require the candidate to do will be an essential part of the preparation of candidates for this assessment.

Q1(c)

The basics of the person specification were well known by the majority of candidates and most scored at least 3 by being able to identify 3 possible headings for it. This was achieved either through generic titles or by identifying those characteristics which would actually be sought. The explanatory marks were for the applied nature of the question, needing the linkage to the actual post, and candidates found this more difficult. It is insufficient to justify the inclusion of 'personality' by stating that it is because 'they would need to know what her personality is like'. Some distinct trait - perhaps 'firm but friendly' - could be linked to the needs of the job - 'getting the best out of staff under them'. It was also at this point that it became evident, as it did in Q1(d) that a substantial minority of candidates were a little confused as to who writes a person spec - the employer or the employee. It needs to be made clear that it is not something that the prospective employee concocts in order to advertise their abilities to the employer.

Q1(d)

This was a question in which exam technique let many of the candidates down. A considerable proportion of them spent much time describing what both terms were and what should be included in them, with evident repetition from the previous question in some cases. This left them little time/space in which to analyse their use in the selection process which was generally not well attempted. It is important that candidates are aware of the meaning of command words such as 'analyse'. There were some that suggested the job description allowed the jobseeker to see what the job was before they applied, but this was often as far as it got so there was no real analysis as to why this is advantageous to anyone in the process. Similarly, even when the person spec was understood, few got further than saying that people could see whether they are suitable. The idea that the PS is produced from the JD was rarely seen, although there were a few very thoughtful responses that evidently fully understood their role in saving time for the Manor by only having suitable applications or in their role in the shortlisting and interview processes.

Q1(e)

In this question the candidates seemed to be well aware of the characteristics of at least one of the documents and its basic advantages/disadvantages. There was a natural tendency to see the use of a CV as a great advantage, although some candidates did question this and produced some good analysis in terms of the ease of use, and thus time saving, of an application form where the information is more carefully targeted and set out in a manner that is easier to compare. Some candidates did consider the savings to be made by the Manor in not having to pay for application forms to be printed, but perhaps the factor that once again kept many candidates to lower levels was that of failure to apply the information to the scenario. The type of establishment and the post being offered were rarely considered, limiting the level of achievement. There was also a tendency amongst many candidates to simply list advantages without even the simplest explanation. The most common example was that 'you can lie on a CV', which, without further development/explanation, is somewhat disconcerting. Even small items of explanation do not become analysis. At times the emphasis of 'advantages/disadvantages to the Manor' as opposed to the candidates was also in danger of becoming lost.

Q2(a)(i)

Most candidates had a reasonable idea of the relevance of the DDA although there was a tendency amongst weaker candidates simply to provide a précis of the stimulus material. Level 1 response concentrated on the basics of the act in that Andy should be treated fairly and that the Manor should employ disabled people such as him if he could do the job properly. Level 2 candidates linked these theoretical ideas to the given scenario of the fact that he could obviously do the job OK as he was working there and had worked elsewhere. Other factors were brought in, such as his experience compared to Melanie's, to try to establish whether the decision had been taken fairly in accordance with the act, which is the crux of this particular question.

Q2(a)(ii)

Candidates in general were very unsure as to what a grievance procedure actually is. A large proportion of them simply rearranged the ideas from the stimulus material in an 'it's what happens when someone has been wronged' style of response. Some had a vague idea that it had to be put in writing, but the concept of a set series of stages to go through, yet alone what they were, was foreign to most. Many also saw it as an external procedure involving instant passage through the courts, suing the company. There was also some confusion with disciplinary procedures, with the emphasis on finding someone responsible at the end. There was also the inevitable minority who thought it was when you had time off because someone had died or similar! The AO1 marks on this paper will tend to be achieved through knowledge of technical terms such as this and it is important that candidates appreciate this.

Q2(a)(iii)

As would be expected from the poor response to the previous question, candidates were uncertain as to how Andy might prove his case. Most came up with a list of reasons why he should not have been ignored, but rarely was there any proof offered. Some came close with suggestions that they should check whether they were asked the same questions in the interview, but there seemed to be an absence of real understanding of the type of evidence that is gathered in any recruitment process for situations such as this. It is imperative that candidates have an overview of the whole process with regard to issues such as this, not to consider the sections of the specification as mutually exclusive. This was also the first time in the paper where there were some unrealistic ideas. Some candidates seemed to take sides rather unfortunately at this point and even suggested that Melanie should be asked to provide evidence to back up his claims.

Q2(b)(i) and Q2(b)(ii)

Candidates had little problem with the definition of jobshare, although the impression was given by some that both employees would do it at the same time, so the split of time/roles/responsibilities/income did not really come through in their response.

The clear idea of principles came through in part (ii) also and there was some development into reasoning, although rarely at high levels. Most saw the advantages as fairly generic in terms of having another member of staff available for possible cover if one was off, or as an advantage because they might have more enthusiasm as they were working less. Some also picked up that it might be the type of job that parents could do at lunchtimes if they had children at school. The main disadvantages were those of perhaps some confusion for other staff if the job sharers worked in different ways and perhaps the cost of recruiting, inducting and training two staff rather than one. As stated, however, much of the material was often generic and application to the scenario in terms of the type of job or the type of person who might be available to do this *rather than a full-time* was limited. Some unrealistic suggestions showed lack of basic understanding by suggesting that two people would do the job more quickly and thus save the Manor money.

Q2(c)

Most candidates were able to score well at level 1 with descriptive comments as to what might be included. Many did limit their potential to gain marks at the higher level as the command word 'explain' was not responded to. At the weaker end of responses some candidates merely gave lists (often in bullet points). Some candidates added brief elements of explanation 'as it's the law', 'to help her to settle in' which could just lift the response into level 2. The most successful candidates addressed both the reasons for including the given items in the induction in full, as well as relating the explanation/items to the given position. A response such as 'she would need to be shown how to operate appliances/machinery such as coffee machines as she will need to use this during service when there will not be time to demonstrate it to her' would be along the right lines to cover both aspects of the application and explanation.

Q3(a)

This was the weakest of the longer analytical/evaluative questions. The poor quality largely hinging on the lack of knowledge of what remuneration is. A considerable minority of candidates seemed to think that it meant all types of motivation and gave one sentence on each. Of those who did appreciate its correct meaning, most produced very simplistic responses with the broad assumption that giving Andy more money would automatically be a very good idea and that this would make him work harder. A few sound responses did then link this to the fact that his wife had been made redundant and that giving him extra money was therefore a good idea. Very few candidates considered the requirement to analyse the use of it, however, and there was little dissent from the notion that it was a good idea. A few candidates did say that 'it might seem like they are bribing him having not been dealt with fairly' but few were apparently aware of the limited potential of remuneration for long term motivation. It is important that they can consider all sides of the question in a response such as this.

Q3(b)(i) and Q3(b)(ii)

Most candidates could successfully explain what annual leave was.

For part (ii) there was a wide range of sound ideas proposed, although responses tended to be a little disjointed and the responses remained 'ideas' rather than an explanatory approach. Candidates dealt with the problem in two ways. Some saw it as a need to rectify the present situation and suggestions such as carrying it over to next year, taking extra pay in lieu or even closing the restaurant for refurbishment so they could all take their leave, appeared. This was a slightly limited approach. The better responses tried to give some idea of what could be set up as a policy, such as a rota for leave with some management guidance as to when it could be taken. This led many candidates into level 2 but the lack of explanation as to how it would operate in practice meant that level 3 was rarely achieved.

Q3(c)

Candidates found the techniques of training and appraisal much more accessible than that of remuneration. Most understood soundly how each one worked, although appraisals were occasionally confused with 'praise' and candidates gave the impression that they were only about telling the employee how good she was. Most, however, explained the generic benefits of appraisals well, with occasional links to Melanie, particularly that she was new in her job role and would therefore value feedback and the chance to input her own ideas. Similarly, the generic benefits of management training were well expressed, with the concepts of her wanting to put new ideas into practice being the most used. Many candidates then developed Melanie's possible future 'she will think they see her as management material for the future' without considering that she may need skills of this sort in her present role. The concept of management training perhaps needs more careful direction for candidates. The actual scenario links to Melanie as a fairly inexperienced employee, and thus benefiting from training, were unfortunately missed. As in other questions, it was the real application that meant that most candidates were left in level 2 rather than progressing further.

Unit 6: Current Issues in Leisure

General Comments

The number of centres submitting portfolios for this first series was small. Centres submitted portfolios in an acceptable format - in one plastic wallet. Centres are advised that surplus material taken from internet sites must be removed but must be sourced as part of the bibliography and referencing. This also requires an endorsement from the assessor.

All centres correctly utilised the mark record sheets providing centre name and candidate name and number. It was clear to see where the assessor had made the assessment decision and where the internal verifier had verified the work. Only one set of front sheets is required to be sent in for moderation. Multiple sheets tend to be confusing. Comments made by assessors varied considerably in depth. Comments must relate to the mark band as well as the assessment criteria. Reference to page numbers greatly assisted the moderation process.

The calculation of point scores and the use of the OPTEMS were generally executed correctly.

Annotation was evident and assisted the moderation process. However, some annotation lacked depth in terms of relevant comments. Some centres need to develop annotation skills to assist candidates and moderators.

Appropriate topic titles were chosen which clearly focused on the identification of a current issue in leisure. The topic titles allowed candidates to develop the research project. Where proposals moved away from the topic title, candidates were not able to access full marks throughout.

Candidates must be guided by assessors on how to process information taken from secondary sources. Downloaded pages from websites if used in an applied way and linked to the project title are acceptable. These require referencing to show authentication. Some information presented by candidates was clearly not their own and could fall into plagiarism.

There was some evidence to show that candidates had accessed other research projects and used these as their own. This is not acceptable and falls into plagiarism.

Context of the unit

Centres are reminded that this is an A2 unit and requires the candidate to reflect on the knowledge that they have gained from the AS examination and portfolio units. Candidates are required to choose an issue that is leisure orientated; this can extend into the area of sport/recreation industry. It is essential that all research meets appropriate ethical guidelines, including permission being granted before 'real life' examples are included.

It is suggested that between two and four thousand words would be appropriate for a 'written' project.

A01: A research proposal that identifies the research topic together with the project aims and methodology.

Learners are required to identify an area of research and to organise how the research is to be carried out. Few candidates were able to demonstrate a clear progression of how the project aims will promote worthwhile research. Candidates had difficulty in demonstrating organisational skills that are involved in research, produce and submit their project to meet deadlines. Where a checklist approach was developed by centres this guided the candidates well. Proposals took the format of a series of intended questions to be answered. Some candidates included feasibility studies. Plans were highlighted against timescales with some more detailed than others. It was apparent that these plans were never focused on in the evaluation section and were not applied within the unit.

A02: Research that includes references related to the sport.

Learners are required to research the chosen subject area and possible methods of data collection. Learners should be able to reference text and include quotations. When candidates were able to compare findings from previous research in order to establish the relevance of current information this was acceptable within the research and was rewarded. Candidates generally had difficulty in extracting the relevant information from other sources for their projects. There was a tendency to download information with very little processing and application.

A03: A completed research project.

Learners are required to organise the collection and analysis of data and to complete the research project. Most projects were completed however some proposals had not been addressed and information had not been in a format to make judgements. Some conclusions were presented in statement format and in bullet points. Candidates must include explanations of intended aims, methodology, analysis and conclusions that acknowledge formal structures. The leisure industry discussed in the research must clearly reflect the project aims. Results must be presented in a variety of formats where findings can be drawn from. It was evident that centres did not provide appropriate guidance here. Some candidates had included all the raw questionnaires carried out as evidence. It is the processing of the questionnaires that is more important.

A04: An evaluation of the research project.

Learners are required to review their completed project and identify areas where improvements can be made. These suggestions must be relevant and realistic. Learners had attempted to evaluate the research project in relation to their proposals. Evaluations were brief statements and descriptive accounts. Evaluations must consider the intended research proposal as well as the methodology that has been used. Candidates should be able to put forward other recommendations on how the proposal could have been improved if research has been focused in a completely different way. Some conclusions given did not demonstrate that the learners had understood the chosen issue.

Grade Boundaries - January 2007

Unit	Grade Boundaries				
	A	B	C	D	E
Unit 1: The Leisure Industry (6966)	47	40	33	27	21
Unit 2: Working Practices in Leisure (6967)	65	57	49	41	33
Unit 3: The Leisure Customer (6968)	46	40	34	28	23
Unit 4: Leisure in Action (6969)	48	42	36	30	24
Unit 5: Employment in Leisure (6970)	68	59	51	43	35
Unit 6: Current Issues in Leisure (6971)	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform Boundary Mark	80	70	60	50	40

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 UG018753 January 2007

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