

Leisure and Tourism

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J444**

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

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

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

Content	Page
Overview	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	7
B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries	10

Overview

Centres had prepared their candidates well for this series in terms of both the controlled assessments and the examinations.

In the controlled assessments, centres need to ensure that the assessment tasks are fully understood and considered carefully with regards to the nature of the facility chosen, not only to ensure that it will allow their candidates to access sufficient information to address all of the criteria but also to ensure that the size of the facility, and the detail required to satisfy the assessment criteria is readily available and so will not have a detrimental effect on the candidates' ability to complete the controlled assessment within the time constraints. As with past series the most problematic tasks are those requiring analysis and evaluation and this is, often, made more difficult by the choice of facility. Centres must also ensure that the correct administrative documents are completed with the work and that no copyright material, without acknowledgement, is included.

In both of the examined units the candidates performed well across a number of questions and completed the papers in the time available. On unit B181 the candidates showed good knowledge and understanding of the basics of marketing but seem not to have embraced new technologies such as social media marketing within leisure and tourism. Of concern was a lack of understanding of the basic terms of tourism and some key job roles within the industry. These topics form the basis of the industry at this time and so the candidates need to develop their knowledge of these aspects of this dynamic and fast moving industry. However, where the candidates had embraced change and more up to date industry models there were many excellent answers.

On unit B183 the candidates were generally familiar with the range of skills and personal qualities required of employees within the leisure and tourism industries; however, the candidates would, once again, benefit from a greater depth of understanding of the job roles listed in the specification. Candidates generally perform well on the 'applied' tasks in the second section of the question paper and this was no different in the June 2013 examination series. Most candidates attempted all of the questions in the time allowed.

Overall the improvements seen across both examination papers were evident throughout and this was very pleasing as the qualification moves forward.

B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

Candidates are required to answer four questions based around specific elements of the leisure and tourism industries. Candidates are expected to have studied each area of the specification, Section 3.1. The questions are designed to allow candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the specification topics, be able to apply this knowledge to industry situations and then to analyse or evaluate accordingly.

Candidates appeared to find most of the questions on this paper accessible. The short answer, knowledge-based questions in the first part of each question allowed candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the specification content and to apply some of the knowledge to given aspects; however, the paper highlighted some weak areas/aspects which need to be addressed.

Well prepared candidates found few problems with any of the questions and some excellent responses were seen for each of the questions.

Candidates performed well on the more obvious topics which were covered well. Questions covering less tested aspects of the specification caused greater difficulty. Surprisingly, some of the easier part (a) questions caused problems for some of the candidates who had little knowledge in key elements of the specification.

Most candidates attempted all of the questions in the time allowed with very little evidence of them being rushed.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

- (a) This part of the question was well answered question by many candidates, with most able to identify a range of facilities
- (b) Most of the candidates were able to identify types of visitors, although some answers were quite vague – often giving ‘groups’ as an answer.
- (c)
 - (i) Some candidates related their answers to the four P’s of marketing, while others referred to ensuring that equipment was up to date. Some candidates were able to identify advertising as a role, however, many did not progress beyond making a leaflet or putting up a poster.
 - (ii) There was only a limited understanding of the role of product development demonstrated. Many answers simply related to the health and safety of equipment or to marketing. There was some mention of the product life cycle but very little mention of the actual product.
- (d) Many candidates described reasons why people go to laser quest facilities rather than to the reasons for the increase in demand. The responses were also often seen in bullet point lists, which has not been the case for some examination series and which was rather disappointing.

Question 2

- (a) There were some good answers to this part of the question, although there was some misunderstanding of the services which may be provided. Often candidates gave lists of facilities or confused a holiday letting agency with a holiday centre showing a clear lack of knowledge.
- (b) Where candidates knew what holiday cottages were, then this part of the question was well answered. Some candidates misunderstood holiday cottages to be holiday parks, often using Butlins as an example and, therefore, their answers were not related to the question set. Good answers referred to garden tables and chairs, BBQ's, TV & DVD systems and some to hot tubs, all of which were perfectly correct.
- (c) Some candidates answered this part of the question well but this again depended on their understanding of holiday cottages. Some candidates gave no job name in their answer making it difficult to award full marks. Often identified in acceptable answers were cleaners, receptionists and sales representatives.
- (d) There were some good answers to this part of the question which related to 'staycations' and cost in comparison to going abroad. The key to this part of the question was the word 'increase' which was missed by many candidates and which, therefore, limited the marks that could be awarded. Good answers covered reasons such as: prices, recession, advertising and shorter breaks taken. Weaker answers tended to focus on why visitors come to the UK.

Question 3

- (a) (i) This part of the question was well answered with most candidates knowing both answers.
(ii) A good understanding of both destinations was generally demonstrated, however, there was some confusion over Snowdonia being in Canada and so many answers related to skiing or snowboarding.
- (b) This was a well answered question by many candidates, although some of them thought that cabin crew fly the aircraft too! Tourist Information Centre Assistant was answered well in most cases, however, there was some confusion with travel agents or that as an assistant they only made tea or coffee.
- (c) This part of the question was very well answered by most candidates with some good understanding demonstrated and they were often able to achieve Level 3 through their analysis.

Question 4

- (a) This was a very poorly answered part of the question. There was some misunderstanding between domestic and inbound tourism and many candidates failed to provide a response.
- (b) There were many weak, low level answers which showed limited analysis. Most responses related directly to the information given in the text. Many candidates stated, for example, that people over 35 will be retired and few of them gave any reasoning.
- (c) This part of the question was, on the whole, well answered. Some candidates, however, were confused and answered by year rather than holiday duration periods.

- (d) The quality of the answers to this part of the question varied widely. Some good answers picked up key pieces of information from the data and provided a basic analysis, but still lacked an analysis of the general trends. Such responses could not access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Weaker answers simply restated the data in the chart.

B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism

General Comments

The vast majority of the candidates were well prepared for this unit and attempted all of the tasks. Centres need to carefully consider the nature of the facility chosen, not only to ensure that it will allow the candidate to access sufficient information in order to address all of the assessment 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, such as Thorpe Park, the complexity of which clearly caused them some problems with regard to addressing Task 3, AO1, in sufficient detail and depth to access the higher level mark bands.

Almost all centres submitted controlled assessments which were page numbered and page referenced on the URS, and the assessors made good use of the comment boxes on the URS, 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 were fairly and appropriately applied. 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 or 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 (CCS 160) 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'. Assessors also need to ensure that they themselves are able to differentiate clearly and consistently when marking candidates' work; for example, a detailed description does not constitute an explanation.

Task 1

All action plans identified a list of the tasks, and the 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 noted 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. 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 in order 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

Almost all candidates included a bibliography and referred at some point to their research. It was clear that Internet based research, usually supplemented by a visit to the facility, was the main approach used. There was a general lack of evidence of primary research, which would have provided candidates with evidence for their conclusions to, for example, Task 3, AO3. The research for Task 2 should not be included in the candidates' evidence for the controlled assessment.

Task 3

Candidates need to plan to check that they have covered all of the information required for AO1. The use of subheadings (such as 'Mission and Vision') helped many candidates 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), identify customer types clearly or consider market segmentation. 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.

Almost all candidates tackled AO2 well, with the aid of an annotated diagram of the product life cycle. However, AO3 was frequently only superficially addressed and candidates had not 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 judgements were frequently subjective, rather than based on research evidence.

Task 4

This task was answered well by the candidates. It was pleasing that candidates made, as indicated by the criterion, very good use of their SWOT analysis by applying it to explain and justify their choice of suggested new products or services. In contrast, too many candidates failed to compare their two suggestions; in order to compare suggestions the candidates need to make use of comparative language, such as 'better', 'however', etc. and a table does not, of itself, constitute a comparison. A number of candidates found it difficult to evaluate the possible impacts of their suggestions, and instead made superficial and often sweeping statements. For these candidates this was a missed opportunity to undertake research (see Task 2) and it 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 high standard.

Task 5

Almost every candidate made a creditable attempt at this task. The actual piece of promotional material (if a leaflet, poster, etc.) should be included to evidence AO2. Candidates analysis of their chosen method of promotion for AO3 was often quite weak, limited and subjective. Again, many candidates missed the opportunity of the time provided for research in Task 2 to enable them to write a 'comprehensive justification'; for example, by researching the printing costs of leaflets or posters and the comparative costs of other promotional methods. Furthermore, for AO3, a number of the candidates focused on justifying their piece of promotional material, rather than on their chosen promotional method.

B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

This unit allows the candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and practical skills within the vocational context of working within the leisure and tourism industries and in a range of eight specified job roles.

The question paper this series was accessible to most candidates within the cohort. The candidates seemed well prepared for the short, knowledge based questions in the first half of the question paper, demonstrating excellent knowledge of the specified job roles of a cinema ticket seller and cabin crew. The majority of the candidates also performed well across the more demanding questions which allowed the demonstration of the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation.

The candidates were familiar with the broad range of skills and personal qualities required of employees within the eight job roles which they had studied. Many of the candidates from this cohort would have benefitted, however, from an increased level of understanding of the specific working conditions of a ticket seller and of the job requirements for cabin crew. Whilst most candidates were able to use the stimulus material from the question paper to pick out the identified job requirements, only the more able candidates could explain the reasons for these job requirements in their own words.

As has always been the case in this unit, the majority of the candidates achieve high marks for the ‘applied’ tasks in the second section of the question paper. Most candidates understood the nature of the customer’s complaint from reading the letter provided, and all were able to gain some marks for the response which they made; only those candidates who used industry specific terminology and those who carefully considered the quality of the language they used were able to achieve the Level 3 marks for their written response to the letter. All of the candidates provided most of the relevant details in completing the given accident report form so that it was ‘fit for purpose’.

Most candidates attempted all of the questions in the time allowed.

Comments on individual questions

Question No.

- 1 (a) (i) Most candidates were able to provide relevant examples of the working conditions for a ticket seller. Weaker candidates tended to offer more generic working conditions which could apply to any job role, such as ‘entitlement to breaks’. These were not credited.
- (ii) While many candidates correctly identified the likely rates of pay for a cinema ticket seller, the best answers referred to remuneration being directly related to the number of hours worked.
- (iii) Candidates are expected to know the duties and responsibilities of the specified job role; many of the better performing candidates when responding to this part of the question adapted the duties cited to the specific context of the cinema.

- (b) This part of the question differentiated well. The best answers considered the day-to-day responsibilities carried out by a qualified first aider, rather than listing the main procedures for dealing with a first aid patient.
- 2 (a) (i) Candidates used the source material to correctly identify the central aspects of cabin crew training.
(ii) A good range of appropriate personal qualities were suggested as desirable for members of air cabin crew.
- (b) This part of the question proved to be a good discriminator. Weaker candidates listed the job requirements mentioned in the text; better performing candidates then went on to explain their understanding of why each job requirement is important to the job role, using their own words.
- (c) Candidates generally understood the reasons why sales records are important and the best answers gave specific reasons within the context of sales of in-flight duty-free items.
- 3 (a) There was some confusion over the main stages of a risk assessment. This is a requirement of the specification. It would be beneficial for centres, therefore, to ensure that all of their candidates are able to list the main features of the risk assessment process.
- (b) Although the majority of the candidates were able to give reasons why risk assessments are important there was still a tendency for weaker candidates to over-emphasise the issue of legal action and show less understanding of the other reasons why risk assessments are carried out.
- (c) (i) Candidates were able to identify the main causes of complaint from the letter provided.
(ii) Most candidates were able to identify ways in which the customer could easily be identified.
(iii) This part of the question was a good differentiator. Most candidates understand that organisations need to have a complaints procedure. The best answers were those which could give examples of the positive and negative outcomes for the organisation of having/not having a specific procedure to follow.
(iv) The candidates demonstrated a broad range of language skills in compiling a formal response to a letter of complaint. The best answers used a correct salutation and closing for the letter; adopted a formal tone; understood the need to apologise and made realistic offers of compensation. At the lower end of the mark range the candidates used less formal language, omitted to sign off the letter and/or made over-generous offers of compensation.
- 4 (a) This part of the question acted as a good discriminator. Candidates are required to make value judgements about the suitability of job applicants against advertised criteria. The best answers are from those candidates who recognise that employers look for years of relevant industry experience; those candidates who have higher level qualifications and those who demonstrate a keen interest in something through their leisure activities. At the lower end, candidates often tended to focus on the extraneous information within the stimulus material or found it difficult to select the relevant aspects from a job applicant's profile.

Candidates should be encouraged to practice these types of exercises in order to enhance and develop the necessary skills of comparison for this type of task.

- (b) (i) Most candidates were able to correctly identify the meaning of the three examples of health and safety signage.
- (ii) Candidates should carefully consider the specific types of location within a leisure and tourism context where such signs might be located; weaker candidates chose examples such as a hospital corridor or generic locations such as 'outside'.
- (c) The majority of the candidates completed this accident report template accurately using transcribed information from the stimulus and thereby achieving the maximum mark available.

B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

Some centres had prepared their candidates well for this controlled assessment and there were some very good examples moderated this examination series. There were other examples where tasks had been omitted, misinterpreted or lacked sufficient applied evidence for the mark awarded by the assessor and, therefore, there was a need to adjust the marks. In relation to Tasks 7 and 8, where candidates were able to provide an evaluative response, some performed well, whereas others struggled to analyse and evaluate. There were still some instances this series when candidates had taken the brief described in the last minute deal as their choice for the other tasks. Again this series, this prevented access to marks for Task 8 as candidates had little to compare and evaluate. This was not, however, a cause for over marking as assessors in centres had identified the difficulty and marked accordingly.

In several cases centres had assessed work clearly and provided information as to how they had arrived at the mark with informative comments, good annotation and page referencing. It was pleasing to see this series that many candidates had chosen their own brief and carried out comprehensive research.

Throughout the unit the 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. There were occasions where candidates were unable to identify the needs of their chosen customers from the brief and, therefore, struggled to match this to a proposal. Where candidates had carried out thorough research using a variety of sources they tended to perform better. Several candidates were aware that all sources of information, pictures, documents etc. must be referenced. There were instances where candidates had carried out primary research, asking past tourist's opinions and considering reviews, etc. This was evidence of excellent practice as they had applied the opinions to their evaluation – when considering which deal works best and why. Many candidates had justified the use of sources and the appropriateness of the content. There were still some occasions this series, where candidates had considered how to use the sources such as websites rather than the content.

Some candidates again this series, did tend to provide general evidence which did not relate to the customer brief. They struggled to provide evidence to a required level and depth of application. In cases where adjustments had to be 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 levels.

Comment on performance of tasks

Task 1

All candidates attempted the task with a good response. Some candidates provided a clear plan of what they needed to do and how they were going to do it, but there were still others this series who provided a repetition of the task with no clear view of what they needed to do. Several candidates considered dates or changes, but few candidates considered what needed to be changed in their planning because of unforeseen circumstances.

Task 3

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

Task 4

AO1 – The completion of this assessment objective was improved this series. However, some candidates failed to consider a number of options to and within the destination and back home. Some candidates did provide a comprehensive range of suitable options, but then failed to develop their evidence for AO2.

AO2 – The evidence submitted by candidates this series was, on the whole, better than in previous series. However, some candidates provided only half a plan/itinerary such as the flight times to the destination and omitted when the clients, for example, should set off, in what transport, when and how they would return?

Task 5

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

AO2 – This was generally well evidenced and assessed. Candidates provided a formatted proposal. Where marks were low the candidates had provided a proposal which was inappropriate to their chosen customer needs.

Task 6

This was attempted by all of the candidates with a mixed response. Where candidates 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. Several candidates carried out primary research.

Task 7 and 8

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

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

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 2013

