

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2013

GCE Leisure Studies (6967)
Paper 01 Working Practices In Leisure

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2013

Publications Code UA034235 *

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

General comments

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. 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. 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 levels of response mark schemes. 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 Q01(a)

The requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act were not generally well known. There was considerable confusion with the First Aid Regulations, as there had been in reverse in the June paper. Candidates should be made well aware of the apparent similarity of their titles but that they are very different. Very few candidates scored maximum marks on this straightforward question. Many knew that risk assessments were involved and a considerable number of responses contained vague phrases concerning training. In the end though, this is a basic recall question and candidates should know the key requirements of all the legislation in this part of the specification.

Question Q01(b)

Although most candidates identified at least one correct measure many of the responses were rather vague as to how they would work. This lack of precision meant that marks for explanation were missed. There were very few unrealistic suggestions, unlike in past series, but some candidates did not read the question carefully enough to appreciate that it was measures inside the stadium that were required. The role of stewards and the potential for CCTV to identify flashpoints and perhaps individuals was well known. Many candidates evidently drew on their own experiences. Centres should ensure that candidates are prepared to develop their responses both in terms of detail of how the measures operate and what they do to ensure safety – commonly candidates score 2 for each but there was not enough depth for 3 marks.

Question Q01(c)

Knowledge of the basics of the act was sound, although there were inevitably some claims that it was concerned with the issues of wooden stands. Candidates were able to apply their knowledge in terms of the employees needing to be updated and trained and for there to be practice evacuation plans, but it was careful explanation of these ideas that was lacking. Many candidates achieved a low level 2 response but did not develop their ideas to show how this would affect the running of the stadium.

Question Q01(d)

The basics of RIDDOR were well known and most candidates could link these to one way in which it helped to keep staff and/or customers safe. A little more precision was needed at times – when the name of the act includes 'reporting' it needs more than just repeating this to gain marks. The key to this was to identify how accidents are reported – although a few candidates were precise in indicating that there would be an accident book, these tended to be the exceptions rather than the rule.

Question Q01(e)

Most candidates had sound scales, although some failed to gain full marks as they gave them rather random numbering, perhaps just giving a description of the criteria for 1,5 and 10. There should be a description for each number of the scale so if it is a 1-5 scale there should be 5 descriptions as well. Generally the application was realistic, although candidates should ensure that it is relevant to their scale descriptions. A value of '2' in the application may be relevant if the likelihood scale 2 is 'unlikely' but not where it is likely and the severity is a serious injury. In

considering the potential seriousness of an injury it is vital that candidates take into account the specific scenario. The measures to minimise risk were generally well done – the requirements of COSSH were well documented and this produced some sound risk assessments overall. Candidates should also be made aware that 'have a risk assessment' is not a measure to minimise risk for a risk assessment!

Question Q02(a)

The accreditation process for Quest showed sound evidence of knowledge and understanding from most candidates. Although there was often some slight confusion about the order and/or the relationship between the internal and external assessments, there was often considerable detail.

Question Q02(b)

As in past series, candidates had difficulty linking the features of quality systems with possible improvements that they could bring about. Most candidates chose to use Quest rather than IiP, citing the fact that it related to the facility as well as the staff and that many of the issues were those concerning the facility. However, the mechanism through which it occurs was poorly understood. Many candidates simply stated that the quality system would make the changes or even invest money into the stadium in order to facilitate the change. The fact that it is the changes the organisation has to make in order to achieve the system that actually would deal with the issues was rarely explicit.

Question Q02(c)

Most candidates managed to identify at least one way in which the effects of the quality system could be evaluated. This tended to be by possible increases in income or customer satisfaction. However, the mechanism by which this could be achieved was often left implicit only – how could the organisation get the customer service feedback and what the new figures could be compared with were often left unexplained. As with questions such as Question Q01(b), candidates need to be encouraged to develop their ideas in order to score the higher marks where it is evident from the mark allocation that there are 2 or 3 marks available for each response.

Question Q02(d)

The response to this question showed improvement over responses to Clubmark questions in previous series, although there are still a significant number of candidates who have little idea of what it is about. Although a relatively minor quality system, centres should ensure that all parts of the specification are covered. It was generally understood that it was a scheme aimed at young people and supported by Sport England. However,

responses tended to drift towards the benefits of the system once these had been established, again underlying the need for candidates to read the questions carefully before attempting them.

Question Q03(b)

Most candidates put forward at least one valid idea here, usually concerned with the fact that the predictions were based on the stand being full for each game. Many correctly stated that there was no guarantee of this, either because the increase in price might stop people attending or that as the stadium wasn't full for football fixtures anyway then the chances of more people coming to fill the extra 3000 seats were slim at best. More sophisticated responses dealt with the fact that for a larger stand overheads were quite likely to be higher and therefore the profit would not be as high as the income might suggest. The area of error for many was to bring in the cost of building the stand. The question was not concerned with its viability but simply whether the income from each match would increase – again the need to read the question carefully was illustrated here.

Question Q03(c)

This question elicited some very good ideas from many candidates who were well aware of the possible effects and produced some well applied responses. Many suggested that the increase in size/status could mean that it could be used for other events or even for important football matches for other clubs. The possible benefits of a newer look attracting sponsors or good publicity was also popular. Unfortunately many also simply said that it would attract more people to the matches, but this was irrelevant as the question had asked for benefits other than that from entry fees.

Question Q03(d)(i)

Most candidates had a general idea of what a feasibility study was but did not always get the real purpose – to decide whether a project is worthwhile. Most responses tended to centre on its role in sorting out finances, whether it was how much it would cost or how they would pay for it. There was confusion with the project plan at times.

Question Q03(d)(ii)

This was rather disappointing in terms of its application to the scenario in responses. Candidates tended to talk generically about the need to know what everyone was doing and to build it accurately but linkage to the scenario was rare. Occasionally the need to finish on time as the start of the season would be disrupted anyway, and the need to be able to plan where fixtures would take place were considered, but this tended to be an

exception. Responses tended to concentrate on the plan being just a building plan rather than an overall project.

Question Q03(e)(i)

Responses here were rather weak with candidates concentrating on stating the advantages of electronic systems rather than their features.

Question Q03(e)(ii)

Responses here were rather disappointing. Many candidates were well aware of the generic benefits of electronic ticketing systems but failed to get more than a level 1 response because they did not apply them to this organisation. The question signposted candidates back to specific pages where relevant information could be found. Although a number of candidates dealt with the issue of queues into the stadium and the effect that such a system would have, links to the building of the new stand, increase in ground capacity and even the weak economic climate were only rarely dealt with. As stated above, generic response are not appropriate for the longer questions – and some of the shorter – on this paper and centres should ensure that candidates are given plenty of practice in applying their learning to specific organisations and/or situations.

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481
Email publication.orders@edexcel.com
Order Code UA034235 January 2013

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

