

Examiners' Report

Summer 2010

GCSE

GCE Leisure Studies (6967) Working Practices in Leisure

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

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

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

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

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA023501

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Specification change

Please note that from June 2010 the specification has been changed slightly. The only changes are:

- There will be a requirement for Quality of Written Communication (QWC) to be assessed on this paper. The marking criteria for this will be integrated into the level descriptors for two of the 8 mark questions. It is anticipated that this will be for those in questions 1 and 2 on this paper.
- The now obsolete 'Chartermark' has been replaced by 'Customer Service Excellence'.

General comments

Performance on this paper showed a slight decrease compared to last June. The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates.

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 there is still a tendency not to apply their knowledge to the given scenarios. Almost all candidates answered all questions.

Candidates were able to use information taken from the WYNTL section of the unit, although the characteristics of quality systems still showed weakness. 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 still 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. They should also ensure that they apply it in regard to the question actually being posed. For example, candidates in question 1c used the material, but often only saying how the act would have prevented each of the problems - although the question required them to address the benefits of doing so. 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.

Exam technique is an aspect that requires improvement, particularly in the longer questions. There will always be a number of longer 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. At the moment most candidates of E grade and above are reaching the top of level 1 (3 marks) in the 8 mark questions but higher ability

candidates appear unable to lift this mark much further. Candidates must be able to use the stimulus material (the 'applied' bit) if they are to access the higher grades with ease, rather than repeat pre-learnt generic responses.

Question 1

Scenario for all questions was of Parston Golf Club. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

1(a) Most candidates were able to identify at least one measure, although a relatively small number did not read the question carefully enough to appreciate that the measures were for spectators inside the ground. The most common choice was inevitably CCTV and many showed a sound appreciation of how it was used. There is still, however, a tendency merely to state that 'CCTV will catch the guilty parties' rather than giving the mechanism by which this happens. The most sophisticated responses referred to monitoring and being able to direct stewards to trouble spots to end it quickly. Extra stewarding/police was a common response also. As was separation of spectators. There is still a tendency for candidates to use the term 'security' too widely in responses such as 'they would have to hire more security'. In the context of this question this is too vague - the question gives them this word anyway - if they mean stewards/security guards (in a different context) then they should say so.

1(b) Candidate had a better understanding of this act than in the past, with most managing to outline at least two requirements of the act. They should be aware that for this a simple list such as 'fire plan, fire drill, extinguishers..etc' is not enough and that the act does not list all these items in its key requirements. In the case of fire drills, for example, it should be in the form of 'staff are required to practice fire drills'.

1(c) There is still a lack of understanding in candidates as to the role of the HSC. Whilst many responses scored marks for relevant comment on possible action of the HSE, all too often they simply lumped the two organisations together in completing this. There separation into the 'law maker/development' side and the 'enforcer' side was rarely explored. The HSE tends to be well known, but the HSC far less so. Candidates must be made aware of their separate roles.

1(d) The longer applied questions on this paper require the candidates to fulfil a '3 part task'. This is:

- Using learnt knowledge - in this case of HASAWA
- Applying it to the given situation - the problems experienced at Barnston
- Applying it in a way that answers the given question - analyse the benefits

Only making reference to one of these three tasks will automatically limit the candidate to level 1 in the mark scheme, for example, simply saying what they should do to correct the problems. This should be done through the mechanism of applying the act, e.g. 'HASAWA requires there to be a written safety plan so staff would know where to meet up...etc'. the third part is then to develop the point to show how this would be a benefit to the organisation. Two or three points like this done well is enough to achieve level 3. Level 3 cannot be achieved without all three areas being addressed. In this series knowledge of the act was often there and it was applied to the

stimulus more often than has been the case in the past when generic benefits of the act was often the default mode for candidates. It is now the 'benefits' part which is missed out more often than the others and candidates should be aware of this. It is not necessary to use all the information in the stimulus in order to gain level 3 - a range of stimulus is given to allow candidates to apply the parts of the act they have learnt as not all candidate will have covered identical parts.

1(e) As in past series 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 some unrealistic suggestions for measures to minimise risk - the context must be taken into account. The installation of CCTV just for a children's party is not realistic, similarly the employment of security guards. Many candidate did show sound understanding of the types of procedures required for an event such as this, many outlining how the requirements of the Children Act (CRB checks for staff, staff ratios etc) would affect it as well as signing in and similar procedures. The balance of their severity and likelihood was much better than in the past. The need to provide consistent scales was addressed better than in previous series.

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

2(a) Comprehension of Investors in People (IIP) was more evident than in similar questions in the past, although this was often given purely in terms of training needs being met. At the lower end of responses there were still a substantial minority of candidates who simply took the stimulus material and said what should be done about it, dressing it up as IIP driven 'IIP would mean they would have to....etc' without giving any indication of why the existence of IIP should mean this. To get into level 2 of the response candidates must show some comprehension of what IIP is concerned with and link this to part of the stimulus. This was achieved either through reference to training or the 'commitment, planning etc' stages and then linking to the stimulus material - i.e. actually applying it to a new situation. The further step required for a top level 2/level 3 response is to then reference it to the requirement to 'analyse the possible benefits...' showing understanding of how the problems might hold the organisation back and how IIP might help the issues.

2(b) Most candidates scored at least 1-2 marks here for basic comprehension of possible issues involved in introducing a new system. These tended to be outlined in terms of either cost or the possibility of upsetting the established workforce. There was pleasing application to the scenario by many candidates also, recognising that it

could be more of a problem for long serving staff or that Barnston's financial position might make it difficult to undertake the necessary costs.

2(c) Most candidates showed a sound basic understanding of the difference between the two quality systems by identifying correctly the two pieces of evidence required for Quest but not liP. The explanation was less successful as it tended to say what the pieces of evidence were used for 'so they can see what the customer wants changing' rather than what differentiated it from liP 'Quest is customer focussed whereas liP is staff focussed.'

2(d) The basics of the Quest system were soundly known for most candidates. Both internal and external assessments were regularly identified and some detail given. There was some confusion in terms of the order in which the process took place, but there was pleasing detail in terms of the scores needed to achieve the award and the role of the internal assessment in both benchmarking and using it to plan future actions.

Question 3

3(a) Knowledge of these terms was better than in the past and examples were generally well tackled. There was some confusion of liabilities with items that were a problem for the club.

3(b)(ii) Few really understood the reason for this, most suggesting that it was because the club would not actually have the money and therefore it was a type of interest charge. Candidates needed to understand the basics of the business side of payment methods in this section.

3(b)(iii) Most candidates appreciated that there was a benefit to getting money 'up front' but at times the development of this idea was weak. Too many seemed to think that the purpose of the discount was to attract more season ticket holders and that this was why the discount was offered, however, many candidates did develop their reasoning well, outlining the more obvious responses of being able to plan ahead and ensuring customers could not suddenly stop paying the instalments. There were some good applied responses, implying that the money could be used for transfers before the season and that if the team was not playing well people might decide not to carry on paying. Some also went into more financial detail, suggesting that the money could finance loan repayments earlier, reducing interest payments

3(c)(i) Most candidates had a basic understanding of the purpose of a feasibility study, particularly that it was needed to ensure that finances would be available for the project. There were some sound attempts to apply by many candidates, suggesting that they would have to ensure that the extra income would be worth it (from both the Hockey club and not having to postpone fixtures) and that it was possible to carry it out in the close season. This meant that many candidates achieved level 2 on this question, although evaluative comments tended to be limited to 'it would be very important' rather than perhaps developing it and linking to the stated financial limitations of the club etc.

3(b)(ii) The basic benefit of 'money up front' was identified by the majority of candidates, although many got little further in explaining why this was important to the club - indeed many simply repeated the idea 'so they would know they had got the money in'. There were some good attempts to develop it in a number of different ways. Some looked at the 'people might stop paying if they could not afford it/the team was not paying well and hence guaranteed money was better.

3(c)(ii) This was less successful than 3ci as a substantial minority of candidates seemed unsure of the difference between the project plan and the feasibility study. Even some of those who started by saying 'this shows what is to be done and when' then wandered back into feasibility via the 'it would have to be done by the start of the season' route. Although this is a valid line of argument if linked to the concept of a plan - ensuring that it has a timescale etc responses tended to go along the 'it would show whether it was possible to do it in the time and therefore whether it could be carried out. It should be emphasised to candidates that the project plan comes after it has been decided to undertake it rather than as a determinant as to whether it should take place at all.

3(d) There was an attempt by many candidates to apply their knowledge to the given scenario, although for much of the time this was carried out in a rather 'non-analytical' way. 'it would allow them to produce more tickets quickly for matches' was a common response, but does not really either analyse or apply the scenario very specifically. The former was done by some candidates, emphasising the possible links to internet booking and even customers printing their own tickets, hence saving the club time and money. The other means of development was to emphasise the short time span needed when tickets are produced for cup games. A pleasing number of responses linked the electronic system to promotion of the hospitality suite or even being able to book a precise seat as the plan could be viewed. There were still many responses that trotted out rather generic benefits that would be applicable to other types of clubs or those that would be afforded by membership systems rather than ticketing systems. Candidates should be prepared to adapt ideas so that they are truly applying rather than just repeating learnt responses/lists of benefits.

Leisure Studies

Unit 1 - The Leisure Industry

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	40	34	28	22
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 2 - Working Practices in Leisure

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	60	52	45	38	31
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 3 - The Leisure Customer

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	41	35	29	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 4 - Leisure in Action

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 5 - Employment in Leisure

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	60	53	46	40	34
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 6 - Current Issues in Leisure

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Notes

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

Boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject, depending on the demands of the question paper.

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 UA023501 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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