

Moderators' Report/  
Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2011

GCE Leisure Studies (6969)  
Paper 01  
Leisure in Action

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](http://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/>

June 2011

Publications Code UA027393

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## **Unit 4 6969: Leisure in Action**

### **General Comments**

It was pleasing to observe a higher standard of work across most candidates and centres, and throughout all 4 assessment criteria. The administration work from centres was of a high standard with only a few omissions, mainly involving Centre Declaration or Authenticity reports. Optems had been completed accurately and all centres submitted work on time. There is still a lack of assessors' comments on candidates' work. Centres are encouraged to give feedback and guide candidates as to how or where their work achieved marks.

Centres are advised to look at work closely and to award marks as a "best fit". There seemed to be an increase in centres who had "tipped the balance" of marks into a higher mark band when it was clearly not meeting the requirements of that band. Assessors should ensure that all the criteria is met and would be advised to read guidance on pages 45 to 47 of the specification.

It is good to note that for AO1 and AO3, recommendations in previous examiners reports have been acted upon. Consequently the overall marks awarded by centres have increased.

Activities carried out by centres were all within the definition of Leisure Studies. The less ambitious events involving job roles for all the team were often the most successful in terms of arranging, running and calibre of coursework. It was good to see the enthusiasm of candidates coming through in their coursework.

### **Assessment Objectives**

#### **AO1**

The work submitted this year was a vast improvement on previous years. Most candidates produced a clear and workable plan which included all elements listed in the specifications. A more individual approach was evident, possibly as a result of slightly smaller cohorts at some centres. The type of events chosen provided the candidates with the opportunities to achieve good marks. Often work did not move into mark band 3 as it could not be described as being "comprehensive". This was either due to a lack of detail in some areas of the plan, or as a result of timescales and/or contingency plans being omitted.

There were still a small handful of candidates who produced a plan with very little merit or much in the way of evidence to suggest how it could justifiably be followed through to its eventual conclusion. This was particularly evident with sports related events where the suggestion was that you did not need to think the activity through much and that it would just happen.

## **AO2**

There was much implicit evidence of contribution but it was not always clearly identifiable from the submitted work. The keeping of a log or diary is still the best method for many candidates. There is potential in this Assessment Objective for candidates to be gaining marks at the top of mark band 3. This opportunity tends to get missed as logs are either very basic, lack any detail as to what the individual role was, or written retrospectively. The best centres clearly encourage candidates to regularly complete an individual diary or log sheets. These are best if written and checked weekly, and candidates' work is supported in their evidence by the tutor either signing the logbook or providing a witness statement showing the candidates involvement.

Minutes of meetings are fully acceptable, but continue to be on the brief side and are identical for every student. This of course is permissible, but is only of any value when that person has identified and explained their role at the meetings in more detail. Where group work has been submitted centres need to be more clearly guided to ensure that they explicitly demonstrate which work is credited to which learner. It is important that the candidate demonstrates how deadlines were met and problems encountered and dealt with.

## **AO3**

Work submitted showed centres are guiding candidates correctly in order to produce effective findings based on well researched evidence. Most of the research still continues to be primary, and generally relied on questionnaires and brainstorming.

Candidates should be guided to carry out some relevant secondary research. Very few centres had encouraged their candidates to look back at previous year groups and activities and act on their recommendations. Where research was evident it was rarely made clear how it was linked to the final decision making process. It is unnecessary to provide planning information for several activities before narrowing down to one. A record of the discussion and selection in making the choice of activity is more important than detail on more than one.

## **AO4**

Work for this appeared to be similar to previous sessions. The stronger candidates had a clear agenda as to how their evaluation was to be written, and followed assessment guidelines from the specifications. It might be seen necessary for candidates to survey the participants in the activity, but this should only be to form an insight into how the planning went. Candidates are again producing copious questionnaires from competitors or witnesses.

Candidates clearly laid out findings and thoughts on their performance, and that of their colleagues, during the planning stages and at the event. They considered teamwork and appeared to highlight individual strengths and weaknesses. Where recommendations had been made, these were constructive, clearly written and detailed. At the other end of the scale,

candidates are still making flippant comments such as “we could have done better”. These do not warrant awarding of marks in the top band.

## **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>

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](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA027393 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://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

