

# **Leisure and Tourism**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J444**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Double Award) **J488**

## **OCR Report to Centres**

---

**June 2012**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2012

## **CONTENTS**

### **General Certificate of Secondary Education**

#### **Leisure and Tourism (J444)**

### **General Certificate of Secondary Education (Double Award)**

#### **Leisure and Tourism (J488)**

## **OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Overview	1
B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries	2
B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism	4
B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries	7
B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries	9

## Overview

The Principal Moderators found that centres had prepared their candidates well for this series of controlled assessments and in doing so have covered the requirements of the units in good depth. It was very pleasing to note a rise in the standard of evidence produced across both controlled assessment units. This resulted in a good level of attainment, some of which can be attributed to some very good approaches being taken by candidates in centres.

Candidates have used a range of leisure and tourism facilities in order to satisfy the assessment requirements which is to be applauded; however, centres do need to consider carefully the type and complexity of the facility chosen, ensuring that access to information is available and the complexity of the facility makes it possible to satisfy the criteria within the time frame available. Once again the candidates who had the greatest difficulty were those who chose large theme parks. The complexity of this type of organisation is inevitably going to cause problems at this level of study. When considering work it was good to note that many centres had assessed work clearly, with good annotation, page referencing and reasoning behind the marks given. This approach clearly aids the moderation process.

In both of the examined units the candidates performed well across a number of questions and completed the papers in the time available. The candidates coped better with the more complex tasks this series which is a good indicator that they are being prepared well for all aspects of the specification. On both papers the candidates continued to perform well on the applied questions, the standard of which is showing some very good improvement. On unit B181 the use of examples was often outstanding and showed a clear movement away from the traditional theme park or leisure centre visit. The aspect in need of some development in relation to both papers remains the quality of the evaluative responses. Some candidates did extremely well and scored very high marks on these questions, whilst others still require more consistency in their work.

Overall the improvements seen across both the controlled assessments and the examinations were very pleasing.

# **B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries**

## **General comments**

Candidates performed well across a number of questions, especially the short answer questions requiring the demonstration of knowledge. The paper gave candidates the opportunity to use technical knowledge and those who had learned the terminology did well across such questions, which is key to doing well overall. As with past papers questions requiring the application of specific knowledge highlighted the need for centres to utilise case studies in sufficient detail so that their candidates can apply their knowledge to the given situation. Whilst many candidates had the required knowledge, they often did not perform as well as might have been expected as a result of their answers being less well developed or exemplified than could have been the case.

Pleasingly, the health and safety question was well answered by many candidates even though this type of question can seem peripheral to the core study area. However, the trend question, once again, proved challenging to some candidates, whilst others excelled giving well thought out answers which were a credit to their learning.

Once again the majority of candidates completed all the questions in the time given.

## **Q1**

- (a) This part of the question was well answered by many candidates.
- (b) Good answers to this part of the question considered the age and history of the buildings and gave good examples from stately homes which had been studied. Very good answers often considered the wider appeal of stately home as wedding venues, film shoots and business conferences.
- (c) This part of the question was well answered by many candidates who correctly identified duties rather than skills as required.
- (d) This part of the question produced a wide range of answers. Good answers identified key areas of health and safety legislation and applied this to key features of a stately home. Where the highest marks were achieved, clear judgemental statements had been made, and these were often in the form of a conclusion. Answers which showed no application to a stately home could not be rewarded highly for their knowledge alone.

## **Q2**

- (a) This part of the question was well answered with a wide range of acceptable answers showing good knowledge.
- (b) This part of the question was also well answered with a wide range of facilities covered. There were a number of good descriptions given of play areas, cafe provision and hearing loops; however, candidates must be careful about not writing too much thus using valuable time.

- (c) Again, this part of the question was well answered by many candidates who focussed on the job roles and not the skills required by different jobs. A wide range of jobs were considered and all were equally valid.
- (d) Many candidates showed good knowledge of surveys. The best answers were those which applied this knowledge to the situation of an aquarium. Answers which expressed ideas in a very general way could not be awarded the highest marks. It was pleasing to see that a number of candidates were starting to conclude answers and thus were able to access the higher marks.

**Q3**

- (a)
  - (i) Many correct answers to this part of the question were provided by those candidates who had learned the table in the specification. It was, however, difficult to access marks if learning was not as thorough.
  - (ii) This was a well answered part of the question. When marks were not achieved, the candidates had not gained enough knowledge on this aspect of the specification.
- (b) Some excellent answers to this part of the question with a wide range of ideas for activities identified and supported by good descriptions. Those answers achieving the highest marks often covered Victoria Falls, safari's and visits to local schools.
- (c) Excellent answers to this part of the question were seen when the city had been studied and understood. It was very pleasing to see that many candidates had knowledge of the castle and the festival. Higher marks were available to those candidates who added a conclusion containing some judgement, especially around the compact size of the city and ease of transport. Answers not achieving the highest marks were often too generic in approach.

**Q4**

- (a) This part of the question was well answered by those candidates who recognised key management roles. Those candidates who did not achieve all the marks often appeared to have mis-read the question.
- (b) This part of the question was well answered with many candidates highlighting key points from management roles. Good answers often included; planning, recruitment and staff performance. Candidates were good at description on this part of the question. Marks were only lost when candidates focussed on skills not on responsibilities.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part of the question which clearly explained impact and consequence. Some very good answers recognised the link between structure, communication and performance. Candidates not explaining their points were unable to achieve high marks.
- (d) This part of the question produced a variety of responses. Good answers recognised the impact of the Olympics on London and some also considered the impact of an ageing population. Surprisingly few candidates discussed the impact of the Internet. Candidates could achieve the higher marks if they had more of an understanding of the wider issues in leisure and tourism, so that some good learned knowledge could be clearly applied.

## **B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism**

### **General Comments**

Candidates had been well prepared for this unit and almost all of them attempted all of the tasks. Candidates used a range of appropriate leisure and tourism facilities to satisfy the context requirements. However, centres do need to consider carefully the nature of the facility chosen, not only to ensure that it will allow the candidate to access sufficient information to address all the criteria but also to ensure that the size of the facility, and the detail consequently required to satisfy the assessment criteria for Task 3 AO1, will not have a detrimental effect on the candidate's ability to complete the controlled assessment within the time constraints. This was particularly the case when candidates had chosen a theme park, the complexity of which clearly caused them some problems with regard to Task 3. It was clear that the majority of candidates had visited their facility and that they had both enjoyed the visit and been able to make good use of the information which they had gathered, applying it to the requirements of the assessment grid. These candidates had often had the opportunity to talk with the management (many facilities provide tailored talks for students) and produced informed and perceptive controlled assessments. In the few centres where candidates had conducted only secondary research, almost exclusively through the Internet, candidates lacked sufficient knowledge and insight to satisfy the requirements of the assessment criteria beyond Level 1.

The majority of centres submitted controlled assessments which had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and the assessors had made good use of the Comments boxes on the URS, as well as annotating candidates' work, which helped the moderation process to run smoothly. It was clear that some centres did not have a system of internal standardisation in place. This would have identified and addressed inconsistencies in assessment and ensured that the assessment grid level descriptors had been applied fairly and appropriately. In cases where scaling had to be applied, it was usually because centres had marked too leniently; assessors should bear in mind that the key words for each level descriptor (such as basic, sound and comprehensive) indicate what is expected from the candidate in order to justify the award of marks for that level.

Ensuring the authenticity of candidates' work is important; centres submit a Centre Authentication Form with their candidates' work and most centres ensured that candidates acknowledged their information sources and included a bibliography. Centres need to be aware that the inclusion of photocopied material, Internet pages and/or text clearly copied and pasted from a website, without acknowledgement, constitutes plagiarism. Moreover, unless the candidate refers to such material in the text and/or annotates it, it cannot be considered part of the candidate's work and, therefore, cannot be assessed for marks.

### **Comments on Individual Tasks**

Candidates need to understand clearly what is required by the different command words used such as 'identify', 'describe', 'explain', 'analyse', 'evaluate' and 'compare'; centre assessors also need to ensure that they themselves are able to differentiate clearly and consistently when marking candidates' work; for example, a detailed description is not an explanation.

### **Task 1**

Most candidates completed only basic action plans. All action plans identified a list of the tasks, and most candidates included target dates and further aspects such as resources, information sources and possible constraints. It remains the case that very few candidates monitored their action plan and almost none had made any changes to their plan. It is intended that the candidate should use their action plan and find it of value in helping them to undertake the controlled assessment; hence, if it is to be of use to the candidate, it should be a 'live' and well-used document. Most candidates would have benefited from distinguishing more clearly between the tasks, as written in the specification, and the actions which they needed to undertake to enable them to carry out the tasks successfully. Consequently, few candidates were able to access full marks at Level 3 since most did not monitor their action plan, make changes to it or provide a clear reasoning for these changes.

### **Task 2**

The work of almost all candidates referred at some point to their research and it was clear that Internet based research, usually supplemented by a visit to the facility, was used by almost all of them. A number of candidates had been supported to undertake their own research; by, for example, surveying customers or interviewing members of the facility's staff and made good use of this in their responses to tasks such as Task 3 (AO3) and Task 4 (AO2). Some candidates, unfortunately, failed to include a bibliography.

### **Task 3**

Candidates need to plan to check that they have covered all the information required for AO1, and the use of subheadings (such as 'Mission and Vision') clearly helped some candidates to avoid the omission of one or more of the aspects which are detailed in the level descriptors. For example, some candidates were unable to access the full range of marks available for this Task because they failed to consider their facility's main business systems (such as customer and financial records). These were often confused with the facility's internal business departments and candidates, for example, wrote about the work of the human resources department, instead of identifying the system which the facility used to manage the staff resource, such as a database for leave and work rotas. Candidates who had chosen a complex facility, such as a theme park, frequently failed to meet the requirements for AO1 in sufficient detail. This may be because they ran out of time under the controlled conditions, or because they were overwhelmed by the volume and complexity of the information which they needed to provide. Most candidates tackled AO2 well, with the aid of an annotated diagram of the product life cycle. However, AO3 was often only superficially addressed and few candidates had taken advantage of the research time provided in Task 2 to undertake research into customer needs and how well the needs of the current customers were met; so most judgements were subjective, rather than based on research evidence. Some candidates made considered use of customer comments posted on the Internet.

### **Task 4**

This Task was answered well by most candidates; although a few candidates relied on the SWOT analysis provided by the facility which they had studied, others either amplified this or wrote their own. It was good to see that many candidates then made, as indicated by the criterion, good use of their SWOT by applying it in order to explain and justify their choice of suggested new products or services. Further good practice was shown by those candidates who then used the SWOT technique to help them to compare their suggestions for AO3. The majority of candidates found it difficult to evaluate the possible impacts of their suggestions, relying on

superficial and often sweeping statements. For many of them, this was a missed opportunity to undertake research (see Task 2) and also suggested that this aspect had not been given much attention when the unit content was delivered to the candidates. The quality of written communication was generally of a good standard.

### **Task 5**

Candidates made a creditable attempt at this Task. The actual piece of promotional material (if a leaflet, poster, etc.) or a good quality coloured print copy which clearly shows all the information included on a website (rather than a small black and white screen shot of part of the website) should be included to evidence AO2. If candidates choose to use media such as television or radio then a tape or disc of the finished piece should be included; electronic submission of assessments through the OCR Repository would facilitate this. Analysis by candidates of their chosen method of promotion for AO3 was generally quite weak, limited and subjective; again, many candidates missed the opportunity of the time provided for research by Task 2 to enable them to write a 'comprehensive justification'; for example, by researching the printing costs of leaflets or posters. Furthermore, for AO3, a minority of candidates focused on their piece of promotional material rather than on their chosen promotional method.

# B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries

## General Comments

The questions for this unit focus upon employment opportunities across eight specified job roles within the leisure and tourism industries. Candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of these job roles through a series of applied vocational contexts, including preparing documents similar to those required within these industries.

Questions on this paper proved to be accessible to most candidates. The short answer, knowledge-based questions in the first part of the examination allowed candidates to demonstrate a good understanding of the job requirements of a Facility Manager and for members of cabin crew. Many candidates also coped well with the more challenging questions which required the higher order skills of comparison and analysis.

Candidates generally recognised the range of skills and personal qualities required of employees within these industries. Candidates would benefit from an increased understanding of the working conditions attached to some of the specified job roles, together with the depth of knowledge which comes from detailed research into the actual entry requirements for each role. Candidates achieved high marks across the more 'applied' tasks in the second section of the question paper. The majority of candidates were able to make accurate reservations for theatre tickets and demonstrated the necessary skills required to complete a copy of the accompanying sales record. Most candidates provided the relevant details in compiling an accident report form which was 'fit for purpose' and many recognised the need for a formal response to a letter of complaint. The quality of language used in constructing a suitable reply to this letter was not always consistent.

Most candidates attempted all of the questions in the time allowed. Responses to those questions requiring the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation were not always fully developed.

## Comments on individual questions

### Question No.

- 1(a)(i) Candidates were able to provide an appropriate range of personal qualities desirable for a Facility Manager. There was some confusion between personal qualities and skills.
- 1 (a)(ii) Most candidates correctly identified the likely working conditions of a Facility Manager.
- 1(b) Candidates were expected to focus specifically on the entry requirements for the specified job role. There were many generic answers about typical entry requirements for working within these industries. Candidates should be encouraged to research this aspect of each job role in more detail.
- (c) This part of the question differentiated well. The best answers compared and contrasted the different types of training which employees would undertake as part of their role as a Facility Manager - depending on the scale and funding of the organisation. Candidates needed to focus more specifically on the context of the Facility Manager job role, rather than discussing the training opportunities across the leisure and tourism industries.

- 2(a)(i)** Candidates used the source material to correctly identify the benefits to employees of working for the Eezee-Flytes company.
- 2 (a)(ii)** The term 'fixed term contract' seemed unfamiliar. Candidates are expected to know this and other aspects of the working conditions for employees in this seasonally affected industry.
- 2(a)(iii)** Candidates understood the benefits to both the employer and the employee of living close to a base airport.
- 2(b)** Candidates were comfortable using the jobseeker profiles to select the most appropriate applicant for the vacancy. Comparative language was used effectively in the best responses.
- 3(a)(i)** There was good understanding of the benefits to both the organisation and to the customer of organisations using computerised reservation systems.
- 3(a)(ii)** The majority of candidates were able to use the summary details of a reservation request in order to complete an accurate copy of the seating plan for a theatre.
- 3(a)(iii)** Candidates demonstrated the appropriate skills in using information from a sales transaction in order to complete an accurate copy of a sales record. The ability to pay close attention to detail is an important aspect within such tasks.
- 3(b)** This part of the question tested the spread of ability. Many candidates explained reasons for needing a copy of a sales record from a customer's perspective. The best responses were more fully developed to include the benefits to the organisation of maintaining sales records.
- 4(a)** Candidates were able to complete the accident record form competently, making good use of the client information provided on the booking form.
- 4(b)** This part of the question differentiated candidates ability through the quality of their written communication. Most candidates understood the need to use formal language in constructing a suitable response. Many were familiar with standard letter conventions. Candidates should be encouraged to consider realistic offers of compensation for poor customer service experiences, based on this type of scenario.
- 4(c)** The best responses to this part of the question explained the standard procedures which organisations follow in dealing with customer complaints, as well as the reasons why these procedures are necessary.

# **B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries**

## **General Comments**

Centres had prepared their candidates well for this controlled assessment and the requirements of the unit. It was good to see a rise in the standard of evidence this series. In several cases the content of the portfolios demonstrated some clear knowledge and understanding which had been well applied to the candidate's choice of customer brief and thus demonstrated a good level of attainment. Some candidates demonstrated a very high level of attainment when they had taken a holistic approach; correctly identifying the needs of their customer brief, considering comprehensively their choice of destination, etc, in order to match the needs and finally evaluating how the needs are met by their choice. Most of the candidates had attempted all of the tasks. There were only a few instances this series when candidates had misinterpreted the tasks and taken the destination and experiences described in Task 8 and the last minute deal as their proposal for all of the other tasks. This prevented access to some marks for Task 8, as the candidates had little to compare and evaluate.

In most cases centres had assessed the work clearly and provided information on how they had arrived at the mark – with informative comments, good annotation and page referencing. In all cases candidates had selected their own brief and developed their research. This series it was obvious that centres had considered the quality of the work and encouraged their candidates to be specific rather than awarding high marks for quantity and theoretical content.

Some candidates had carried out thorough research using a variety of sources, including website customer reviews and peoples' opinions/interviews. Where this occurred the candidates tended to perform better, as this provided a basis for their proposal in Task 5 and evaluation and comparison in Tasks 7 and 8. They were also able to demonstrate good evaluative techniques and analysis within the work and this provided evidence of a higher level of attainment. In other cases candidates were unable to develop their understanding for Tasks 7 and 8.

Some candidates provided some good and appropriate travel itineraries for Task 4 (AO2); a few candidates fully addressed Task 4 (AO1) and used a range of methods. This task was done well by some candidates but many of them still struggled to fully consider a variety of transport options.

## **Comments on individual tasks**

### **Task 1**

Most candidates attempted this task with a better response than in previous series. Some of the candidates provided a clear plan of what they needed to do and how they were going to do it, but some only provided a repetition of the task with no clear view of what they needed to do. Most of the candidates considered dates but very few considered any changes which needed to be made to their planning because of unforeseen circumstances, etc.

Level 1 -This tended to be very basic and give only some information on what the candidate needed to do.

Level 2 - This must show evidence of what the candidate needs to do and how they are going to do it. It should include, for example, what resources they are hoping to use and how they are going to access them. There needs to be some reference to any time/element constraint.

Level 3 - This should be clear, appropriate/logical and dated. There should be evidence of changes made to the action plan. Candidates will not be able to do everything as planned and it is likely that they will have to change their plans. An example could be changing a time span or a resource to use because they could not find it or they discovered it was not sufficiently clear. It would help the candidates if, for example, they were able to plan some primary research such as visiting a travel agency, asking related customer types where they went and why, etc. They would give them further access to sources of information and the ability of justify/evaluate in Task 6.

## Task 2

This Task is not assessed.

## Task 3

This Task was attempted by all candidates with a mixed response. Most candidates were able to identify some needs but evidence was often underdeveloped and the brief was repeated. Where candidates considered the bullet points and aspects such as the type of accommodation, long haul or short haul, cost, etc, they performed well.

This Task is specifically related to what are the needs of the customers within a chosen brief. The candidate **must** state which brief they have chosen. They do not need to state here why they have chosen that brief. They will, however, have carried out some research in order to decide on a suitable destination.

Level 1 - One or two customer's needs have been stated. These should bear some relevance to the brief for full marks. There will be omissions and there could be inappropriate needs in relation to the customers but the candidate does need to indicate that they know what is a need in order to achieve a mark. They should clearly state their chosen destination.

Level 2 - The needs stated will relate directly to the brief and the bullet points. The candidates will have clearly answered the question 'What would my customers need?' They will have considered most of the bullet points and given a description. The candidates might have mentioned aspects relating to the need for a type of accommodation, together with a consideration of budget, transport, facilities needed, etc. Candidates will have clearly stated a chosen destination.

An example of some content could be Brief 2:

My customers will need a destination not too far away because they only want to go away for two days and one of the customers has difficulty moving, etc.

Level 3 - Candidates will have provided appropriate detail in their evidence with clear reasoning. They may have considered needs against what the customers might expect (expectations and wants). Candidates should be using appropriate leisure and tourism terminology. They will have covered all the appropriate needs. They will have stated a suitable destination.

An example of some content could be Brief 2:

My customers will need a short haul destination which is accessible and easy to get around because one of the couple has some difficulty moving and they want to sightsee. They would not want to sit on a plane for a long time when they are only going for a short time, etc.

#### **Task 4**

AO1 - Some candidates provided some evidence here but many of them omitted to consider a number of options to the destination, within the destination and by way of the return journey.

AO2 - Candidates' evidence was better this series. Some candidates did, however, only provide only half a plan/itinerary such as the flight times to the destination and omitted when they should set off, which mode of transport, when and how they would return, etc.

The evidence for AO1 and AO2 was sometimes combined by the candidates. The intended audience for AO1 is the teacher/assessor/moderator, whereas in AO2 the intended audience is the customer. The AO2 task should lead the candidate to produce a document which could be given to the customer and should be addressed to them; for Task 4 this would be a travel plan (such as an itinerary or a flow chart).

Level 1 - Candidates will have stated some methods of transport which might relate to the needs in order to achieve marks. They might also have considered how the customer could get around the destination.

Level 2 - Candidates should have considered several options for travelling from home to the destination and back. Their ideas must match the needs. The candidates should consider how the customers can get around the destination. For example - if the customers want to sightsee, what methods of transport could they use?

AO2 - This requires the candidates to select and make a choice as to which methods of transport they specifically want the customers to use. This will be in a plan. The assessment relates to applied knowledge.

Level 1 - There will be a simple plan which shows how the customers will get from home to the destination. Candidates might have produced a simple table or a flow chart which specifies the methods used to travel from home to the destination.

Level 2 - The proposal must be accurate, clear and easy for the customer to follow. There are no omissions for full marks. Candidates might have considered detail such as:

- length of time for the journeys and overall length of time to get there
- where to, for example, park a car and how to get to airport, station, etc.
- how get to the hotel, etc.

#### **Task 5**

AO1 - Many candidates incorporated this into their proposal. Some candidates provided good clear evidence which matched the needs. There were some occasions when candidates had not considered sufficient options in order to be able to provide a good proposal.

AO2 - Candidates had provided a formatted proposal and provided some good evidence. Where marks were low, the candidates had provided a proposal which was not appropriate to their chosen customer needs.

AO1 - This should relate to the variety of suitable experiences for the chosen customers. This can include a choice of accommodation, trips, attractions, food to eat, events, seasonality, etc, all of which should be suitable for the particular customer type chosen in the brief.

Level 1 - some relevant ideas but brief.

Level 2 - a range of experiences, etc, and some clear description.

Level 3 - appropriate choices and comprehensive.

AO2 - This relates to the application of knowledge when the candidates make a specific proposal. The proposal can be evidenced in a variety of formats but it must be clear and specific as to where the customers will stay, what the customers will do and see, etc, where they will go, when they can go and also a visit, for example, a museum or a festival. All of the information should be relevant to the customers and their needs/wants. The candidates need to consider the suitability of the format so that it is clear to the customers and it must be capable of being used as a guide, etc. This can take the form of a diary or itinerary, PowerPoint, etc.

Level 1 - unclear what the customers are going to be doing, etc. There is very little application.

Level 2 - a clear proposal which the customers could use. There is a range of appropriate suggestions. There are some omissions.

Level 3 -the quality of the proposal is interesting, appropriate and specific to the needs of the customer. It is very clear what the customers will experience.

## **Task 6**

This Task was attempted by all of the candidates with a mixed response. Where candidates had provided a clear bibliography and some primary research with comments on the appropriateness of the content of the source, the Task was well done and it was reflected in the content of the candidates' work.

The candidates must provide evidence of their research. They must also, for example, source pictures, if used. They should provide a bibliography, a list of sources and state their usefulness/appropriateness. Not all of the candidates' sources were used in the work but if the candidate had actually stated why they had abandoned that method of research or source, then it is evidence of excellent practice. There might be some relevance to the action plan here; when candidates have changed their research they could, for example, use a chart which gives the source in one column and the reasons for its use and/or how useful in another other column. It is also appropriate to consider/carry out primary research.

Level 1 - there are some sources but reasons for use or appropriateness are not stated.

Level 2 - there is clear reference to the usefulness of the sources and why they have been used/not used.

Level 3 - comprehensive and appropriate content. Primary research and its use might be evident here. A variety of sources have been used

## **Tasks 7 and 8**

The standard of the candidates work for Task 7 was better this series. Some of the candidates had provided good evidence as to how their choices met the customer brief. Other candidates, unfortunately, were unable to provide evaluative comment.

For Task 8 some of the candidates had shown strong judgemental evidence with reasons and a conclusion as to their final choice. There was a creditable attempt by these candidates and they were able to access Level 3 communication marks. There were some candidates, however, who were unable to provide any judgemental comment.

The answers to these tasks need to be evaluative, compare and demonstrate good communication (written, text, etc). The evidence must relate to the customer types and their needs/wants. For example, not how beautiful one destination is against the alternative or the extent of one destination as against another, unless the candidate has related this to their chosen customers needing to see beautiful landscapes or needing plenty to do or see.

Level 1 -there is a reason for how the needs have been met by their chosen destination. There may be little relevance to meeting the customer's needs/wants. There is a reason for choosing the destination or the alternative in relation to the specific customers. There is lack of leisure and tourism terminology but some communication is clear and acceptable.

Level 2 - There is a number of reasons for choice of destination and experiences against how the needs would be met at their chosen destination. There is some comparison of how the needs have been met against how they could have been met if the alternative had been chosen. The candidate should, therefore, give some reference to which destination they would recommend and why. The candidates' communication is clear and appropriate. Candidates are likely to have considered the strengths and weaknesses of the destination in terms of matching to the needs of the customer. There is likely to be some use of leisure and tourism terminology.

Level 3 - candidates have fully considered the reasons for choosing the destination and experiences against the needs and wants of the customer. The reasons for suitability will be comprehensive and appropriate. Strengths/weaknesses are fully considered. There will be a comparison of meeting the needs in relation to both destinations which leads to a clarification of which choice the candidate would make and why. The candidates will have used evaluative language and there is likely to be some leisure and tourism terminology. There are very few errors.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

