

# Examiners' Report

## January 2010

GCE

GCE Leisure Studies (6970/01)  
Unit 5 - Employment 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](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/>

January 2010

Publications Code UA022608

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Unit 2 - 6970/01 Employment in Leisure

### General comments

The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates and there was a further improvement in performance compared to last January.

Most candidates were able to respond effectively to most questions. There was evidence that most candidates had been effectively prepared, with the majority responding positively to the tasks set, offering valid answers, although many candidates did struggle to achieve the higher levels in extended responses. Almost all candidates answered all questions.

There is still a tendency for candidates to be able to cope with the demands of the paper comfortably at a basic level without managing to raise their mark beyond the level of grades D and E. although a greater proportion achieved this than in the past. There has been pleasing evidence of improvement in exam technique, with less pure recall given when not required. This was still evident on occasions, the most notable being 1(b), where often a full description of a job specification was included before any attempt was made to explain how it was used, but far less than in previous series.

The applied nature of the GCE is still not fully grasped by candidates, however. The purpose of this GCE is to give learners an applied, work related approach to the leisure industry, involving active learning and the ability to take basic principles and apply them in unfamiliar situations. A few questions will always be aimed at AO1, straightforward recall of knowledge and understanding, but the majority - particularly the longer questions - will require learners to apply this. This is the key skill that they need to tackle this qualification successfully but only a limited proportion are as yet doing so. It involves active use of the stimulus material as indicated in the 'indicative content' parts of the mark scheme for levels based questions. Without this application responses cannot get beyond 3-4 marks out of the 8 available for longer questions, i.e. a grade D/E level.

Whilst in preparing these papers we will always try to keep as much of the information needed for a specific question on the same page, candidates should be aware that for the later questions information from the earlier parts could be useful. The papers are designed to focus candidates on one organisation/person so that they can get a feel for them i.e. a possible real-life situation. Candidates should be made aware of this.

The requirements of some of the command words were generally known by candidates, although many did not manage to access the higher marks in the longer questions as a consideration of terms such as 'analysis' did not show enough depth in response.

It is worth noting that from June 2010 onwards 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, usually the first two that appear on the paper.

## Question 1

Scenario for the whole paper was of Animania Park, a zoo. This appeared accessible to the candidates.

*1(a)* Most candidates could identify at least two or three pieces of information and many all four. A few included elements from the person specification and the distinction between them needs to be made very clear to candidates.

*1(b)* The role of the person specification was better understood than in previous series. Most candidates explained how it was used to advertise the post and a pleasing number could explain its use further along the system in providing criteria both for short listing and as a basis for deciding what questions to ask. Some candidates were handicapped by explaining the purpose of these uses in too much detail and forgetting the 'how' whilst a number made it more difficult to achieve marks by describing in detail what the person specification is.

*1(c)* Candidates seemed to tackle this question with enthusiasm and many were very perceptive in stating its faults. In view of the considerable number of those there were also some fairly generous explanations as to how good it was - stressing the positive in things is a quality to be admired usually, but it did not fit well here! The problem that many candidates had is that they identified the faults but did not continue and use them to answer the question, which was about evaluating 'the effectiveness...for attracting applicants'. Having identified that the spelling mistakes/wrong title looked unprofessional it is but a small step to an evaluative point that this might put potential applicants off working for a company, but all too often this step was missing, leaving candidates in level 1. Similar ideas concerning its appearance in a local newspaper (although some did indicate where it might be better placed with some success) and the lack of contact details meant that this question often did not yield marks commensurate with the effort put in to answer it.

*1(d)* The generic benefits of online applications were well known, with speed, cost implications high on the list. These were not always developed well, however, and there tended to be a little confusion as to what they were comparing it to. Some wandered into the application form versus CV argument that has featured previously. There were some sound applied responses also, with many picking up the 'green' ethos of the zoo and indicating that the reduction in paper would fit with this. It should be indicated in delivery to candidates that production of online material is not totally without cost - a considerable number stated that it was free.

*1(e)* The reasons for contracts were dealt with well with the vast majority knowing what was in them and many able to give valid reasons for its existence. Its use as a legal document in settling disputes was often stated and exemplified with reference to grievance procedures or arguments about holiday entitlement. Many quite correctly stated that they issued them because they had to by law.

## Question 2

*2(a)* candidates had greater success applying the scenario in respect of the pay issue than the safety issues. Many candidates reached level 2 by linking the men's unequal pay but equal responsibilities to one of the appropriate acts, although the names of these acts were often somewhat confused or vague. Application to HASAWA was too often missing any indication of what the act required, just stating that 'the fence being broken means they could be in danger'. Some indication of how the act

protects them (even the general duty of care to staff) would have made the 'third link' that is needed to apply material successfully. The most common success was in using the training element of the act as regards the lifting issue and this issue was also correctly used to illustrate that the Manual Handling Regulations were not being adhered to either.

2(b) Responses here were rather general and focussed almost entirely on customers. The majority of them merely stated that they would get more customers, without real justification as to why, and then went on to the 'therefore more profits etc argument'. The focus of the question was on 'these improvements' and so comments linking it to larger target audiences, or the increase in school groups, perhaps from those with disabled pupils tended to be more successful. A few good candidates saw that it could be an employment issue and dealt with it well in terms of increasing applicants and perhaps even the efficiency of the workforce - but this was a disappointingly small proportion of responses for an employment paper.

2(c) Most candidates managed to identify two reasons, although often only one of these was developed with any great success. The most common response was the benefit of experience on future CVs, often linked to the acquisition of skills that might be relevant for a future job. Other suggestions, such as for social needs or interest, were less successfully developed, with rather vague generalisations given. The more successful attempts related them more specifically to the type of people who might be concerned - retired, students in holidays etc

2(d) this question suffered a little from failure to read the question carefully enough. In the past, this specific question has been used, as has a similar one requiring candidates to explain how different types of employee might be used. In this case the emphasis should have been on the benefits that Animania Park got from the mix of employees rather than just describing how they would be used - unfortunately many candidates did the latter, limiting themselves to Level 1. The benefits, for example, of casual labour in the summer, is not just that they can be used when it is busy (that is the how/when) but that it enables the Park to maintain high standards of service combined with the fact that it is cost saving only employing them for the season - many candidates did point out one or the other of these, but that tended to be the limit of the 'benefits'. Linkage of specialised self employed to the high level course, or even to school parties generally, was all too often ignored in favour of mere generalisations about the self employed - they look after their own tax etc - without dealing with the scenario

### Question 3

3(a) Most candidates scored 1 or more marks, but there were many rather inaccurate generalisations indicating that it was some form of problem that occurs, rather than a term used to describe something quite normal in a business. It is 'when people are away for a too many days in the year and should be talked to' was the typical gist. This was inferred from the stimulus and preparation for the external assessment should include definitions of basic employment terms.

3(b) Rather disappointingly, many candidates saw the suggested course of action as perfectly reasonable and simply concluded that it would give him the kick that he needed or he would lose his job. There is a tendency for candidates to equate disciplinary procedures automatically with punishment and this came through in responses. The lack of use of the applied material limited these types of responses. Those who used the stimulus gave much more thoughtful answers, suggesting

meetings to sort out the possible problem, with the best ones indicating that this would be worthwhile as he obviously could work well so it would benefit the Park. This high level evaluation was in short supply, however, and it was another example of candidates not 'applying' their responses to specific situations.

*3(c)(i)* In pleasing contrast to the previous question, this one saw regular good use of the stimulus to support answers. The drop in visitor numbers led on to the need to reduce costs and the reduction of numbers of animals, many candidates pointed out, would mean that less jobs were needed so people could be released.

*3(c)(ii)* As with similar style questions in the past, candidates seemed unsure as to the technical requirements of a redundancy procedure. Many responses concentrated solely on attempts to 'weed out' the worst employees and boot them out of the company. It should be stressed to candidates that procedures such as these are rather more structured than many seem to believe. There were some sound responses, including the requirement for a meeting and the possibility of offering voluntary redundancy. Many were also aware that some sort of 'pay -off' might be involved. This question was simply testing AO1, but proved more challenging than perhaps it should.

#### Question 4

*4(a)* There was some sound use of the stimulus material here, applying it to the task in hand in different, but valid, ways. Many saw the injustice of rewarding him with more pay for a poor performance, leading to some accurate explanation of the likely demotivational effects on the rest of the workforce or the possibility of it simply reinforcing his poor habits by rewarding him for them. Some candidates suggested valid other possibilities such as appraisals to get to the root of the problem, although those that did that without any consideration of why increased salary was not a good solution tended to leave themselves with little explanatory comment and simply described the methods.

*4(b)* The term 'positive working environment' was not always well understood and in contrast to the previous question, application was once again rather thin on the ground here. Fewer candidates than in the past reverted to the highly generic response of 'it would motivate them more, so customer service, profits etc would increase'. Many only provided a list of what was wrong with the park, limiting themselves to level 1 at best. Others listed various motivational methods in an apparent attempt to 'cover all bases' perhaps through not really understanding what PWE was. There were some sound responses that really did evaluate, however, with some perceptive comments on the possible positives of improving communication to reduce isolation and include productivity, in addition to negative ideas of the workforce not being motivated by seeing the park spending money when some of their colleagues were being made redundant. Overall, responses showed a few elements of rushing, indicating that time management may have been problem for some.

## GCE Leisure Studies Grade Boundaries

### Unit 5 - Employment in Leisure

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw mark	60	53	46	40	34
UMS	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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA022608 January 2010

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

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