

Leisure and Tourism

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J444**

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

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

J444/J488/R/11

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Leisure and Tourism (J444)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Double Award)

Leisure and Tourism (J488)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries	2
B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism	5
B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries	8
B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries.	11

Chief Examiner's Report

The performance of candidates in this, the first session which has covered a full two year teaching period of the new GCSE Leisure and Tourism specification, was most encouraging. There was much evidence of significant positive achievement with candidates demonstrating the ability to perform across the two/four units taken. The work produced in this session often demonstrated high levels of skill in the ability to respond to controlled assessment material as candidates showed that they had engaged well with these applied tasks. Candidates were also well prepared to cope with the applied examination questions, in addition to those which were more theoretical in their nature. It was clear from many candidates responses that centres have successfully engendered an enthusiasm for the whole range of topics covered in this wide area of industry. Unfortunately, as in other years, there are still quite a number of centres which have had to have controlled assessment marks adjusted. As has been noted in previous sessions, it is vital that the moderator's report is read and acted upon in order to avoid such adjustments in the future. Controlled assessments which were well written, however, often lacked evidence of the information required to meet certain criteria and this meant that the higher marks awarded were not, in fact, accessible. The one overriding lesson to be learnt from this session is that the candidates must be prepared to deal with the range of command words used in both the examinations and the controlled assessments.

B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

This question paper proved very accessible to all candidates, with few questions unanswered. More able candidates were given the opportunity to score highly on the final parts of each question, with less able candidates being able to score marks where stimulus and source materials were given and on questions which could be answered through experiential knowledge. Less well prepared candidates tend to achieve reasonably well where they had knowledge of a facility which was the basis of a question. The same candidates found questions based on theory very problematic. Strong candidates were characterised by consistent learning across all aspects of the specification with clear writing skills having been developed enabling them to score well on the more testing part (c) and (d) questions. This was seen clearly in the responses to question 4(d). One aspect still requiring development is the ability to evaluate marketing research methods as required within question 3(d). This is a key element in any aspect of leisure or tourism.

Marks across the entire mark range were awarded for the paper and time was not an issue as the majority of candidates completed all sections. The quality of candidate answers reflected the maturity of the qualification, and centres are clearly using past papers to establish a teaching framework.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

- (a)(i)** This part of the question proved a good introductory question with most candidates correctly identifying four products/services.
- (a)(ii)** There were some excellent answers which considered the services that could be requested before departure such as special meals and assistance for disabled passengers. The question discriminated at the F/G boundary with the most common mistake being to repeat the answer in part (a)(i) or to think of more products.
- (b)** The more able candidates gave very good responses by considering TV advertising and in-flight magazines. Some candidates offered weak answers based around special offers or selling products from the trolley during the flight. Candidates could improve by considering current concepts such as Internet or social media marketing. Centres could help candidates by developing their knowledge of current concepts with which they are familiar with as a part of their lifestyles.
- (c)** The more able candidates gave some excellent answers by discussing speed, safety and problems with large numbers of children in an airport, then giving further clarification by recognising that there may still be a long coach transfer at either end of the journey. Weaker candidates could improve by reading the question carefully as on occasions candidates discussed the merits of skiing, to a school group, rather than air travel. Another common error was to compare air travel to travelling by car with a family. The most surprising assumption was that air travel was a problem because you needed a passport which was not a requirement if you were to go through the Eurotunnel.

Question 2

- (a) For those candidates who knew the difference between a theatre and a cinema, this part of the question was well answered. The main issue with this question was that candidates often answered the question based on a cinema.
- (b) Again where candidates knew what a theatre was there were many very good answers covering a whole range of possibilities but mostly focussing on ramps, lifts, seating near to the front and some with Braille provision.
- (c) Stronger candidates had no problems with answers to this part of the question including using the computerised booking system, issuing tickets, taking phone calls and making reservations. Weaker candidates gave answers such as to collect tickets on the way into cinema, or showing people to their seats and even selling ice cream.
- (d) This part of the question discriminated at the A/B end of the mark range with good answers recognising that a clear structure and allocation of tasks within the structure was the key to efficiency. Some candidates considered delegation down the chain of command and many were also able to identify the key functional areas of security, marketing, finance and customer service, thus showing some excellent knowledge of the industry. Weaker candidates often only identified one or two functional areas and their explanations showed that this was by chance rather than by understanding the question.

Question 3

- (a) Generally most candidates scored full marks on this part of the question with most sports being allowed within the mark scheme. Some less able candidates included sports which were not suitable such as horse racing or made generalisations such as 'the Olympics'.
- (b) Most candidates at the C/D boundary and above managed to complete this part of the question well without problems; while lower level candidates identified one or two, and some left the question unanswered.
- (c) More able candidates had no difficulty in identifying tasks such as monitoring budgets, creating targets, paying staff wages and preparing profit and loss accounts. There were some very simplistic answers given such as 'money' or 'bills' – this type of response is considered too vague to show any subject knowledge.
- (d) This part of the question produced answers which gave some very good technical descriptions of market research methods such as focus groups and on-line surveys. In order to further improve their answers such candidates need to analyse or evaluate the methods of research considered. Weaker candidates did not understand the term 'market research' and instead explained marketing methods such as posters, billboards or advertisements in newspapers. Some candidates tried to explain the 4'P's of marketing. Candidates also took note of the last line of the question and then discussed how a football club could improve sales through discounts and special offers on tickets.

Question 4

- (a) This part of the question was well answered with most candidates being able to give some form of description.
- (b) There were some good answers to this part of the question which considered the recession and the strength of the pound and even some excellent answers which discussed the increased presence of UK resorts through marketing and resort or attraction development. Less able candidates suggested answers based on the UK being wet and cold, while abroad it was hot.

- (c)(i)** Good candidates were well prepared on this part of the specification content and had no problems with precise answers. Less successful candidates could not identify the Maldives; however, most, but not all, responded correctly in relation to Warwick.
- (c)(ii)** This part of the question followed part(c)(i) and those candidate who got both answers correct in that part of the question tended to get full marks on this part of the question. This showed clearly that learning had taken place. Weaker candidates guessed, with answers such as 'it is hot and sunny' or because 'there is lots to see and do'.
- (d)** This part of the question was a good discriminator at the A/B border. Strong candidates gave excellent well developed answers referring to conserving resources, recycling and offering the finance to enable good environmental activity to take place. Less able candidates focussed on more litter being created and pollution from cars. Many candidates had moved forward in their understanding of this aspect of the specification which was pleasing to see.

B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism

General Comments

In general candidates had been well prepared for this unit and almost all candidates attempted all tasks. Candidates used a range of appropriate Leisure and Tourism facilities in order 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 of 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 affect the candidate's ability to complete the controlled assessment within the time constraints. Many candidates had chosen a theme park, the complexity of which clearly caused most of 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 generally produced informed and perceptive controlled assessments. In the few centres where candidates had only conducted secondary research, almost exclusively through the Internet, the candidates frequently struggled to satisfy the requirements of many of the assessment criteria.

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.

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 so 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'; assessors also need to ensure that they themselves are able to differentiate clearly and consistently when marking candidates' work since, for example, detailed descriptions are frequently credited as explanations.

Task 1

This was undertaken quite poorly by the majority of candidates. Many action plans consisted of a list of the tasks, and most candidates added target dates; a few considered further aspects such as resources, information sources and possible constraints. It remains the case that very few candidates had monitored their action plan and almost none had made any changes to their plan. It is intended that the candidate should use the 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, rather than the pristine sheet of paper submitted by almost all candidates. Most candidates would have benefited from distinguishing more clearly between the tasks and the actions which they needed to undertake to enable them to carry out the tasks successfully. Relatively 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

Almost all candidates included evidence of their research and it was clear that Internet based research, usually supplemented by a visit to the facility, were used by almost all. However, few candidates appear to have been encouraged to undertake their own research, by, for example, surveying customers or interviewing members of the facility's staff. Some candidates failed to include a bibliography.

Task 3

Candidates need to plan to check that they have covered all the information required for AO1, and if they were encouraged to plan for and use subheadings (such as 'Mission and Vision') it would help them to avoid the omission of one or more of the aspects which are detailed in the level descriptors. For example, a number of 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 the systems which are 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 that 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 tackled 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. Additionally, some candidates had also made considered use of customer comments posted on the Internet.

Task 4

This Task was generally well tackled by candidates; although some 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 a number of candidates then made, as indicated by the criterion, good use of their SWOT analysis by applying it in order to explain their choice of suggested new products or services. Further good practice was shown by some candidates who then used the SWOT technique to help them to compare their suggestions. It was clear that many candidates found it difficult to evaluate the possible impacts of their suggestions, relying on superficial and often sweeping statements. For many, this was another 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

Almost all 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 showed all the information included on a website (rather than a small black and white screen shot of part of the website) should be included in order 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 approach. Analysis by candidates of their chosen method of promotion for AO3 was generally quite weak, limited and subjective; again, many candidates had missed the opportunity of the time provided for research by Task 2 to enable them to write a 'comprehensive justification'. Furthermore, for AO3, candidates tended to focus on their piece of promotional material, rather than on their chosen promotional method.

B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

Assessment of this unit is designed to test candidates' knowledge and understanding of the eight prescribed leisure and tourism job roles from the specification. It also provides the opportunity for candidates to carry out vocationally relevant tasks, linked to at least one of the studied job roles from the leisure and tourism industries, eg producing a job advertisement for the position of Facility Manager.

The paper should have been accessible to candidates of all abilities. It consisted of a series of short answer, factual recall questions and several more demanding questions requiring the skills of comparison and analysis. Candidates were able to gain credit for the demonstration of basic knowledge as well as for the higher order skills of vocational application, analysis and synthesis. Most candidates performed well within the short answer questions about skills, working conditions and personal qualities, where they had good knowledge of all eight of the prescribed job roles. Weaker candidates make generalised comments about daily routines and duties for specific job roles. It is important that candidates know that the daily routine of employees in similar job roles but in different organisations may differ; eg air cabin crew for Virgin Atlantic may have a different daily routine to air cabin crew for RyanAir.

The 'applied' tasks in the second part of the examination were often done well. The majority of candidates successfully produced a job advertisement, although the quality of the language used was not always consistent. Many candidates were also able to complete the sales record for the Blue Badge guide. Candidates were required to transfer relevant details from the diary entry for a tour onto the formal sales record template. Candidates should interrogate the provided information fully, in order to ensure higher levels of accuracy are achieved in completing such tasks.

The majority of candidates attempted all of the questions in the time allowed, although 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) The majority of candidates were able to list an appropriate range of duties for a member of air cabin crew.
- 1 (a) (ii) Different working conditions for air cabin crew were well understood by the majority of candidates. Weaker candidates appeared unsure whether it is possible to work part-time as a member of air cabin crew.
- 1 (b) The majority of candidates used the source material well, in order to correctly identify the information sources about a cabin crew member's next flight.
- 1 (c) Some candidates found this part of the question challenging. Most were able to identify the obvious similarities and differences between the routine of someone working on a long-haul flight and someone working on a short-haul flight. Candidates should have considered the types of duties which might have to be carried out during a flight lasting for more than five hours compared with those duties onboard a much shorter flight.

- 2 (a)(i) Most candidates used the source material to help identify correctly three appropriate qualifications for a ski instructor.
- 2 (a) (ii) Most candidates were also able to identify, using the source material, three appropriate personal qualities for a ski instructor.
- 2 (b) Responses to this part of the question were varied. Some candidates were able to select an appropriate document commonly used by ski instructors and provided the type of information such a document might contain – eg an accident report. Some candidates provided good descriptions of the information contained within a document, without actually naming a relevant document; others used inappropriate examples of documents (Word/Excel/Spreadsheets) and thus limited their access to the marks available for this question.
- 2 (c) Many candidates found this part of the question challenging. The majority of candidates clearly understood the need for first aid training in terms of being able to provide assistance in the case of injury or incident. Candidates needed to consider more carefully how a ski instructor, possessing this relevant skill/qualification, is of benefit/disadvantage to the tour operator.
- 3 (a) This part of the question assessed candidate's quality of written communication. Candidates were required to write concisely and with vocational application in order to produce a job advertisement, typical of the leisure and tourism industry. The quality of vocational language demonstrated here was not always consistent. Better performing candidates were specific but succinct in describing the type of previous experience required, the types of personal qualities and the duties which would be carried out – ie those candidates who wrote 'at least three years previous experience in a management role in a leisure centre or similar environment' scored more marks than a candidate who wrote 'should have been a manager before'.
- 3 (b) The majority of candidates were able to use the summary details of the two job applicants successfully to choose which of them they would appoint to the position of facility manager. It would be beneficial for candidates to use the information to draw conclusions about how the qualifications or experience possessed would help the candidate perform the advertised job role.
- 3 (c) Many candidates provided relevant examples of how the checklist could be used to help maintain health and safety standards at a health club. Candidates should be encouraged to avoid using the same example in every section, eg 'carry out a safety check', as this will limit their access to marks on such tasks.
- 4 (a) The majority of candidates scored well in completing the sales record template provided. It would be beneficial if more candidates made sure that they use each piece of information from the stimulus in such tasks – ie here many candidates overlooked the fact that the tour was requested in another language; that there were 20 members in the tour group; and that the candidate themselves was the Blue Badge Guide.
- 4 (b) This part of the question proved challenging for many candidates. The importance of sales records was considered from a simplistic viewpoint – to keep a record of how many sales were made. Many candidates did not appear to know that a Blue Badge Guide is self-employed and thus make the connection that sales records like this one are evidence of their income for legal purposes.

- 4 (c)** This part of the question also proved challenging for many candidates. Most candidates had a good appreciation of the need for Blue Badge Guides understanding of religious and cultural differences in terms of not causing offence; few, however, were able to demonstrate this understanding within the broader vocational context of taking a group of visitors to tour a place of worship, as per the question context.

B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

Several centres had prepared their candidates well for controlled assessment; a new unit and a new approach. There were some examples of very good portfolios submitted this session and high levels of attainment. Candidates had attempted all the tasks. There were, however, some instances where 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 the other tasks. This therefore, prevented access to marks for Task 8, as candidates had little to compare and evaluate. In some cases there was leniency in assessment here and it was the cause for some adjustments.

In some cases centre's had assessed candidates' work clearly and provided information on how they had arrived at the mark with informative comments, good annotation and page referencing. In most cases candidates had selected their own brief and developed their research. There were occasions where the entire sample had chosen the same brief **but** also the destination, accommodation, etc. This must be discouraged as a controlled piece of work and candidates are expected to carry out their own research and collate their own resources which must be applied to the brief they have chosen from the task sheet.

Throughout the unit candidates are expected to provide evidence which matches the needs of the chosen customers. In some cases there was some good application of knowledge demonstrated and assessment was marked in relation to the **quality** of work rather than the quantity. Where candidates had carried out thorough research using a variety of sources they tended to perform better. Candidates must be aware that all sources of information, pictures, documents, etc must be referenced. Some candidates had justified the use of sources and the appropriateness of the content. There were occasions where candidates had considered how to use the sources such as websites, rather than the content.

Some candidates did tend to provide general evidence which did not relate to the customer brief. They had struggled to provide evidence to a required level and depth of application. In cases where adjustments had been applied, it was usually because centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the key components of a task as well as the depth of application and quality of evidence required to fully cover the higher level.

This also applies to the rank ordering of assessment objectives, and/or tasks. Some candidates had produced similar or better quality of evidence for a task than another candidate but had been awarded lower marks and vice versa. Where centres had followed a clear internal moderation process this problem was less evident.

Some candidates demonstrated good evaluative techniques and analysis within the work and this was a credit to them. In other cases candidates were unable to develop their understanding for Task 7 and 8.

Comment on the performance of individual tasks

Task 1

All candidates attempted this task with a mixed response. Some candidates provided a clear plan of what they needed to do and how they were going to do it, but others provided a repetition of the Task with no clear view of what they needed to do. Very few candidates considered dates or changes which needed to be made to their planning because of unforeseen circumstances.

Level 1 – This would be very basic and give only some information on what the candidate needs 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 get them. The candidate will have included some time element/constraint.

Level 3 – This should be clear, appropriate/logical, 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 clear enough.

It will help the candidates if, for example, they are able to plan some primary research such as visiting a travel agency, asking related customer types where they went and why, etc. They will give them further access to sources of information and then the ability to justify/evaluate in Task 6.

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 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 from 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 will have been stated. These should bear some relevance to the brief for full marks. There will be omissions and there may be inappropriate needs in relation to the customers but the candidate does need to show they know what is needed in order to gain a mark. Candidates should state their chosen destination

Level 2 – The needs stated will relate directly to the brief and bullet points. Candidates will have clearly answered the question –“What would my customers need?” Candidates will have considered most of the bullet points and given a description. Candidates might have mentioned aspects relating to the need for a type of accommodation, consideration of budget, transport, facilities needed, etc. Candidates will have 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 compared needs with what the customers might expect (expectations and

wants). Candidates should be using 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 sight see. 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 – This was not well evidenced. Many candidates failed to consider a number of options. Some candidates did provide a comprehensive range of suitable options but then failed to develop their evidence for AO2.

AO2 – The evidence provided by candidates this session was mainly incomplete. Many candidates provided only half a plan/itinerary, such as the flight times to the destination and omitted when the customers should set off, in what form of transport, when and how they would return, etc.

AO1 –

Level 1 – Candidates will have stated some methods of transport which might relate to the needs. They might also consider how the customer can get around the destination.

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

AO2 – This assessment objective 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 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 from home to destination.

Level 2 – The proposal is accurate, clear and easy for the **customer** to follow. There are no omissions for full marks. Candidates might have considered details such as: the length of time for journeys and overall length of time to get there; where to, for example. park car; and how get to the airport, station, etc; how get to the hotel, etc.

Task 5

AO1 – Many candidates incorporated this into their proposal. This resulted in some candidates not considering all the options available for their chosen customers.

AO2 – This was generally well evidenced and assessed. Candidates had generally provided a formatted proposal. Where the marks awarded 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, which must be suitable for the particular customer type chosen in the brief.

Level 1 – There are some relevant ideas but they are brief.

Level 2 – There is a range of experiences. etc, with some clear description.

Level 3 – Appropriate and comprehensive choices have been made.

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 visit, for example, a museum or a festival. All information should be relevant to the customers and their needs/wants. Candidates need to consider the suitability of the format so that it is clear to the customers and it could be used as a guide, etc. This can take the form of a diary or itinerary, PowerPoint, etc.

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

Level 2 – There is a clear proposal which the customers could use. There are a range of appropriate suggestions, but 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 was attempted by all candidates with a mixed response. Where Candidates had provided a clear bibliography and commented on the appropriateness of the content of the source, it was well done. Other candidates did not consider the value of the source and made no appropriate judgement.

Candidates must provide evidence of their research. They must also, for example, source pictures, if used. They should provide a bibliography, list of sources and state their usefulness/appropriateness. **Not all the candidates' sources will have been used in the work but if the candidates have actually stated why they abandoned that method of research or use or source then that is evidence of excellent practice.** There might be some relevance to the action plan here where candidates have changed their research. Candidates could, for example, use a chart which states the source(s) used in one column and then gives reason(s) for use and/or how useful were those source(s) in another column. It is also appropriate to consider/carry out primary research.

Level 1 – There are some sources stated but there are no reasons for use or appropriateness.

Level 2 – There is clear reference to the usefulness of the sources and why they were used/not used.

Level 3 – Comprehensive detail on the reasons for use. Primary research and its use might be evident here. A variety of sources have been used.

Tasks 7 and 8

Most candidates attempted these tasks with a mixed response. In some cases candidates had omitted to actually compare their proposal with that of the last minute deal. Other candidates were unable to provide an evaluative comment. Some candidates had used the last minute deal as part of their previous evidence which hindered analytical comment. In some cases there were some excellent evaluations and candidates had showed strong evidence of the judgements made with reasons and a conclusion. This was a creditable attempt by these candidates and this provided access to Level 3 communication marks.

The answers to these tasks need to evaluate, be comparative and demonstrate good communication (written, text). The evidence must relate to the customers types and their needs/wants. For example, not how beautiful one destination is against the other in the alternative, or how much one has got against another unless the candidate has related to 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 for their chosen destination. There may be little relevance to meeting the customer needs/wants.

There is a reason for choosing the destination or the alternative in relation to the specific customers. There is lack of a leisure and tourism terminology but some communication is clear and acceptable.

Level 2 – There are a number of reasons for the choice of destination and experiences judged against how the needs would be met at the chosen destination.

There is some comparison of how the needs have been met against how they could have been met if an alternative had been chosen. The candidate would, therefore, give some reference to which destination they would recommend and why. The communication is clear and appropriate. Candidates should have considered the strengths and weaknesses of the destination in terms of matching the needs. 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 customers. The reasons for suitability will be comprehensive and appropriate. Strengths/weaknesses are fully considered. There will be a comparison of meeting the needs of both destinations which leads into clarification of which choice the candidate would make and why.

Candidates will have used evaluative language and there is likely to be some leisure and tourism terminology. There will be very few errors.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2011