GCSE

Leisure and Tourism

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J444**

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

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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**

B181 Understanding the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments:

Candidates are required to answer four questions based around specific areas of the leisure and tourism industries. Candidates are expected to have studied each area of the specification. Questions are designed to allow candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the topics covered in the specification and be able to apply this learned knowledge to the leisure and tourism industries situations before they analyse or evaluate accordingly as each question progresses.

Candidates across the range of centres found 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 areas however the paper highlighted some weak areas that need to be addressed.

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

As with previous papers candidates performed well in the more popular topics that had been covered well, despite over reliance on theme parks as a study topic. Questions covering less tested areas caused greater difficulty as did those questions that had to be carefully read before an answer was attempted.

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

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1   (a)(i) Very few problems with a wide variety of answers being given and accepted.
     a)(ii) Few problems for many candidates but some lacked knowledge and so were very vague in the answers.
     (a)(iii) Well answered with most candidates able to give two different types. Some misread the question and gave names of museums rather than types.

     (b) Where candidates understood the term 'event' there were no problems with many covering re-enactments or medieval banquets having studied castles but also good answers for weddings as an event.

     (c) This question was well answered by those who understood cultural components from the specification. There were candidates who did not answer the question as there were those who did not understand the question but answered incorrectly. Good answers covered topics from the specification using providers such as castles, stately homes and museums there were then well covered visitor groups with many showing that they had school visit experience of this type of attraction.

2   (a) Surprisingly a number of candidates did not get full marks. There were a number who did not know the entertainment component as covered in the specification while the leisure and business components generally caused fewer difficulties.

(b) Some very good answers were seen with many achieving maximum marks however there were candidates who gave the personal qualities and skills required of Gym Instructors and Waiters rather than the job roles.

(c) A wide range of responses were seen with many candidates having studied a theme park hotel or a big brand budget hotel both of which produced really good answers. Good answers stayed focussed on the hotel where weaker answers often described facilities in the theme park. Candidates who failed to read the question correctly often chose a Disneyland Paris hotel and then went on to describe the theme park too.

3   (a)(i) Probably the most surprising answer on the paper with a number of candidates not knowing where Rio de Janiero is located despite the specification list and the current media hype over the 2016 Olympics.

(a)(ii) Generally well answered with few problems other than weaker candidates giving vague generic answers such as sightseeing, weather or walking without any justification linked to the specified destinations.

(b) The question allowed a wide range of options so as to not discriminate on candidates UK location. Good answers were often seen with driving to France and flying to Spain. Some answers were seen with driving to Spain with valid justification and so were credited with maximum marks. Weak answers were often based on poor geographical knowledge of where Spain or France are in the world.

(c) This question was possibly the most challenging for all but the well prepared. Good answers scored full marks and fully understood Human Resources covering functions such as staff planning in an industry that often has a high turnover of staff and seasonality to contend with. Weaker answers and no responses were seen from candidates who were unfamiliar with the term Human Resources. Some gave a more generic answer describing the work of all of the functional areas.

4   (a) Very well answered with most candidates giving correct answers.
(b) Well answered with a number of very valid points made few candidates had difficulties although some were so brief in their answers that they achieved only two of the four marks available despite having some knowledge and understanding. Weaker answers often did not refer to the features of budget hotels listed in Fig. 2.

(c) Good answers correctly identified that they were dealing with budget hotels and not luxury spa hotels. Maximum marks were often gained through covering content such as wifi charges, parking charges and vending machines. Weaker answers described building extensions or offering luxury spa treatments. Weaker answers also focused on discounts and promotions which do not actually generate additional income, rather higher customer numbers.

(d) The key to the question was for candidates to concentrate on the local employment aspect of sustainability. Candidates who did this gave very good answers scoring high marks. These candidates recognised local benefits to the economy and to businesses and were often able to use destinations that they had studied as examples. Weaker answers often did not stick to the question set and talked about general sustainability in both the UK and worldwide.

B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism

General Comments:

Almost all candidates were well prepared for this unit and attempted all tasks. Centres 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 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 annotated, page numbered and page referenced on the URS, and the assessors made good use of the Comments 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 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 or comprehensive) indicate what is expected from the candidate to justify the award of marks at 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 so cannot be assessed for marks.

Comments on Individual Tasks

Centres need to ensure that candidates understand clearly what is required by the different command words used such as 'identify', 'describe', 'explain', 'analyse', 'evaluate' and 'compare'; assessors need to ensure that they 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 candidates included target dates and further aspects such as resources, information sources and possible constraints. It remains the case that only a minority of candidates monitored their action plan and few then noted any changes to their plan. It is intended that the candidate should use the action plan while completing the tasks, 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 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 clear reasoning for these changes.

Task 2

Most candidates included a bibliography and referred at some point to their research and it was clear that Internet based research, usually supplemented by a visit to the facility, was the main approach used. There was a more evidence than in previous years of primary research, which provides 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 the information required for AO1, and the use of subheadings (such as 'Mission and Vision') helped candidates to avoid the omission of one or more of the aspects that 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) or 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 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 and general, rather than based on research evidence.

Task 4

This task was answered well by candidates. It was pleasing that almost all candidates made, as indicated by the criterion, very good use of their SWOT 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 candidates need to make use of comparative language, such as 'better', 'however' etc. and two separate paragraphs, each about one suggestion, does not 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. 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. Analysis by candidates of their chosen method of promotion for AO3 was often 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'; for example, by researching the printing costs of leaflets or posters and the comparative costs of other promotional methods. Furthermore, for AO3, a minority of candidates focused on analysing the impact of their piece of promotional material (by the use of AIDA, for example) rather than justifying their chosen promotional method. It was pleasing that some candidates had chosen to create websites and other on-line materials, which were almost all of a high standard.