

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in Leisure Studies (6967)
Paper 01 Working Practices in Leisure

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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

Summer 2015

Publications Code UA040830

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

General Comments

Performance on this paper showed a similar level of response to last year. The paper appeared to be accessible to students.

Most students were able to respond effectively to most questions. There was evidence that most students 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 students answered all questions.

Students were able to use information taken from the WYNTL section of the unit, with better performance in the quality system section than in previous series. They appeared to be familiar with the command verbs as a whole. Students appeared to manage their time effectively and did not produce lengthy passages of irrelevant information. The vast majority of students appeared to complete the paper in the time available, with little evidence of rushed work towards the end.

Students still did not always make full use of the stimulus material, although there was further improvement on past series. 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 students 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 students should be made aware how these work. At the moment most students of E grade and above are reaching the top of Level 1 or even low Level 2 in the 8 mark questions but higher ability students appear unable to lift this mark much further. Students 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

1(a) The requirements of the Health and Safety (First Aid) Regulations were generally well known. Most students were able to outline at least two of the requirements. As in past series, centres should also make it clear to students the difference between key requirements of the act and the measures that facilities might take in order to ensure that the key requirements are met. The key requirements of the act rarely go into specifics of the latter.

1(b) Most students identified at least one realistic measure to ensure security of valuables. As in past series, development of measures was rather vague at times, although there were generally better responses this time. As a further improvement on previous series, there were relatively few unrealistic suggestions and students

seemed to understand well the basic ways in which security could be achieved. The most popular tended to focus on the use of CCTV, screens in front of the receptionists and the sound protocols of removing money from the tills at intervals during the day to reduce the temptation. Students should ensure that a specific measure is identified. A number of responses suggested that more card transactions should be made, but without indicating how the centre might actually put this into practice although the explanations for this were often sound, the method was absent. Centres should ensure that students are used to explaining both how and why the identified measures work, this was often unclear and as a result the third mark for each tended to be elusive.

1(c) There were many sound responses to this question, an improvement on the equivalent questions in past series. The requirements of the Food Safety Act were well known and understood. Students showed that they could use the stimulus material and apply what they knew. However, although many responses achieved middle and upper level 2 marks, at times one key part of the question –how this benefited the leisure complex – was ignored. Similarly, the links to the specific stimulus were often implicit only – the fact that there had been a change to serving more fresh food was seldom considered. However, it was pleasing to see good understanding of customer needs being shown by many students, for example in respect of the possible adverse effects of not labelling correctly for people with allergies. A few responses still just stated what they should do, leaving the requirements of the regulations only implicit but pleasingly these were fewer than in the past

1(d) Most students were aware of at least one aspect of the Workplace Regulations and so scored 1-2 marks, but many left the measure that the organisation would need only implicit. Responses need to directly deal with how this would actually impinge upon the construction of the new building. Often responses were rather vague, such as 'there needs to be enough space' without saying what the space was for.

1(e) Most responses showed a basic comprehension of the role of the Local Authorities' role in supporting health and safety, with their tasks of visiting organisations and potentially applying sanctions being the most common suggestions. Centres should ensure that students are aware of what the local authority is measuring facilities against, which is the laws regarding health and safety, rather than just saying that they ensure that they are following guidelines.

1(f) The risk assessment was generally applied quite well, although measures tended to be rather vague and at times too brief. For example, simply saying 'ratio of staff to children' does not state what the measure is, merely against what it is assessed. Similarly, statements such as 'there should be no sharp edges' do not convey what the organisation needs to do – ie check equipment in the creche regularly for...'. A number of responses were unrealistic in suggesting that children of a creche age can be taught what to do or that there should be signs telling them what to do. As ever, students must take into account the actual situation that they are dealing with, not just produce what might be generic responses for all situations. Although there is still a small proportion of students who did not, most students 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. In considering the potential seriousness of an injury it is vital that

students take into account the specific scenario. Generally the application was realistic, although students 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. As in past series, the use of 'no likelihood' or 'not harmful' is inappropriate as, if this were the case, why would a risk assessment be carried out?

Question 2

2(a) This topic was well known and understood, and students often followed a sound and logical path through it.

2(b)(i) and 2(b)(ii) Most responses could offer one piece of valid evidence, usually centred around staff training records or minutes of meetings. As in the past students find the explanatory part difficult. It should show how the evidence is used to evidence achievement for the award rather than state how it will help the organisation to improve. For example, use of staff training records should be linked to the idea of ensuring that staff development is taking place or that action plans are being followed, rather than stating that it means they will be better at their job role.

2(c) There were a number of pleasing aspects to the answering of this question, although a few old failings also reappeared. Better responses matched the specifics of the chosen system to individual items in the stimulus. Most responses showed that students did appreciate that the thrust of IiP is focussed on staff, although at times the relationship between the system and the organisation was unclear, particularly in suggesting that 'IiP trained staff to....'etc. The key to this type of question is for responses to show how knowledge or understanding of the system can meet the aims and/or stated demands. It is the organisation's efforts needed to gain the quality system that are the key, not some external body insisting on it.

2(d) Most responses showed some appreciation of why Quest might be better, although explanation tended to be implicit. Knowing that Quest 'is customer focussed' is one thing and is a basic correct response, but then explanation is needed to link it to the fact that most of the manager's aims were also customer focussed. Many knew that Quest might be better as it was specific to leisure organisations but did not follow through with reasons why that might make it a better choice.

Question 3

3(a)(i) This showed improvement compared to similar exercises in the past, with more responses indicating that it was the lower of the cost and selling prices that had to be used in the calculation.

3(a)(iii) Most students could identify at least one issue, but the explanation was often weak. In particular many responses tended to go into possible solutions without really explaining what the problem was. Most correct responses focussed on the over ordering of rugby balls or the under ordering of sports bags. However, the focus of stock control was often missed and simply the totals used. The mechanics of stock control – gradually matching the numbers bought to those sold – was only rarely used. It is the principle of keeping on ordering the same amount when different

amounts are being sold that should be the focus, not just the final difference in totals. There was some confusion with tracksuits as many did not appreciate that what they did not sell one month could be sold the next and responses said there must be a mistake as they sold more in March than they bought. Similarly the issue with cereal bars was often identified as the selling price – this is not on its own a stock control problem, but merely potentially the result of one.

3(b) This often showed that students were aware of the basics of electronic systems, but responses tended to wander off on to their benefits rather than staying with the features of the systems themselves. There is a particular need in a question such as this to concentrate on the demand of the command word 'describe' and not be sidetracked.

3(c) The reasons why organisations carry out a stock take were often rather hazy. A few very good responses dealt with the main reasons – that of checking that indeed the system and the amount of stock matched in order to highlight errors or possible theft and to be able to quantify assets for accounting purposes – but often little more was added than would be conveyed by a stock control system itself. Information such as knowing which items are best sellers would be known through the system and not just undertaken once a year. It is this that is the key difference between the system and the stock take process.

3(d) Responses tended to be rather simplistic, with few really developing explanation and, unfortunately, even fewer applying the information given about the organisation. Many simply stated what the feasibility study would include – looking at what it would cost and how long it would take, for example – without saying why they were important. Development even into just a potential balancing of cost against benefits was surprisingly weak overall. Few used the information given to link to its potential use for regional events and hence look at the need for market research to investigate the potential for income. Although a few good responses did deal with potential problems within the complex during building work, these were often implicit only and lacking real development into reasons.

3(e) In many ways this was the most disappointing question on the paper for students. The real crux of the question – that they were considering buying their own system instead of using one run by a third party agency – was often sidelined by generic responses about the potential benefits and problems associated with purchasing a new ticketing system. Issues connected with the latter, such as the potential for people losing their jobs, were largely irrelevant here as the complex did not deal with their own system anyway. Students also ignored the fact that even if an agency produced them the leisure complex would be in charge of deciding what went on them. A few good responses did use the information given in the stimulus and attempted to balance the relatively small number of possible events with perhaps the cost of installing and training staff. Similarly the effects of recent decreases in attendances and the risk of paying out for it whilst also paying for a new stadium were identified and discussed by a few. However, students must be made aware that questions such as this do not require generic responses and that these can only ever achieve the upper end of Level 1 or, at best, the lower end of Level 2, however detailed the response appears to be.

Students should:

- Ensure that benefits/disadvantages are explicit
- Use the stimulus wherever possible – but use it to answer the actual question
- Ensure that measures are realistic to the given situation
- Consider the demand of the command words carefully
- Know the relationship between the quality systems and the organisations.

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>

