OCR

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

Leisure and Tourism

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J444**

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

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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

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, section 3.1, in preparation for the examination. 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 analyse or evaluate accordingly.

Candidates appeared to find all 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 learning content and to apply some of the knowledge to given situations.

Candidates in general performed well in these questions although knowledge of cruise lines was quite weak.

Candidates performed well in the more challenging analysis part (d) questions on this paper with many candidates being able to access the lower order knowledge marks even where their analysis or evaluation skills were not developed.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1(a)(i)   Candidates were able to provide appropriate events that may take place in a concert venue. The best responses were those where specific examples were given, e.g. 'boxing match' rather than the more generic 'sports'.

1(a)(ii)   Candidates generally had a good grasp of different visitor groups. The answers not gaining marks were often very vague without actual group identification or simply answering with 'groups'.

1(b)   The majority of candidates gave good exemplification of well known venues, showing good knowledge in this area by contrasting different venue types such as small local and very large nationally known. Some candidates would benefit by being less generic with their descriptions.

1(c)   This question differentiated well. Some excellent answers offered detailed discussion of the appeal to different groups of people breaking down the question into clearly definable areas. Weaker responses needed to break the question down further into more detailed visitor groups and avoid stereotyping large sectors of the population.

2(a)   Some candidates showed good knowledge having clearly learned a range of operators in this area of the specification which is all that was required of the question. A proportion of candidates were less prepared for the question and often could not differentiate between a cruise line and a travel agent or tour operator.

2(b)   Candidates answered this question well with good knowledge and understanding shown. Many were able to describe two learned job roles and applied these well to the cruise line industry.

2(c)   Candidates have a reasonable understanding of activities that might take place to meet customer needs on a cruise ship. Good answers were current with recent developments in provision on the new larger ships. Weaker candidates described some generic activities using examples from their own locality.

2(d)   Candidates often had a good approach to this question by breaking down the groups into age bands; this helped those who achieved higher marks with their analysis. Other candidates could have improved their answers with some differentiation of the group and to move away from simplistic answers such as arcades or television. Overall this question differentiated well at the most able end of the candidature.

3(a)(i)   Candidates who had learned the specification had no problems. A common problem was in identifying locations that were not countries, as asked for in the question. Many could not locate Machu Picchu and some were unable to locate Earls Court.

3(a)(ii)   The majority of candidates were confident with Paris giving a variety of reasons beyond Disneyland Paris. Whistler was also dealt with competently by many but often caused less well prepared candidates to give generic answers such as sightseeing thus losing marks on this less difficult question.

3(b)   Candidates were able to identify many duties associated with the job role of a travel agent with only a few confusing the term with a tour operator or holiday rep. Hotel conference manager caused more problems for many candidates. There were good answers that recognised the specific roles within this key job; others gave incorrect answers such as responsibility for the whole hotel. The answers clearly showed the candidates that had learned this part of the specification.

3(c)   The best responses split up the answer covering areas such as administrative function, security and bookings. Answers that needed improvement often created little more than a sentence based list of what ICT can do. This question caused problems for far too many candidates who did not have the required knowledge as laid out in the specification

4(a)   Many candidates were familiar with these impacts on the environment. Good answers detailed well thought out answers that were clearly environment based. Weaker candidates often struggled to apply the environment part of the question.

4(b)   Good answers clearly understood the whole question with good focus on the elements that required a UK based destination to be considered along with transport impacts. Answers that were less good often used a theme park destination, which was allowed, although difficult to develop fully, or one that was not in the UK.

4(c)   Many responses to this question were really good and based on the key ideas such as energy-saving light bulbs or water saving devices. Weaker answers showed poor understanding of the topic area with candidates focusing only on bins and litter and recycling.

4(d)   The key to the question was discussing the importance to the destination. Good answers developed the benefits of long term prosperity for the area and increasing the value of tourism to the local economy. Many good destinations were considered such as Masai Mara and Machu Picchu. Weaker answers often considered destinations in the UK such as a theme park or football stadium destination where candidates experienced difficulty in providing exemplified answers.

B182 Moving forward in leisure and tourism

General Comments

The large majority of 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 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

Almost all 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 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 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 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). 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.

B183 Working in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments

This question paper comprised four main questions, each based on one of the specified eight job roles from the specification. The majority of candidates demonstrated a good level of knowledge and understanding of each of the examined job roles. Most candidates were able to use key vocational terminology effectively and had a good grasp of those working practices affecting the way in which employees within certain job roles must operate.

The best answers came from those candidates who were able to use specific examples from organisations studied as part of the course; for example, where the question asks about practices affecting ticket sellers, the best responses were often those applied to the context of a named cinema.

Candidates continue to find training requirements within the Leisure and Tourism industries challenging. Candidates often confused the phrase 'types of training' here to mean the course content i.e. First Aid, ICT, Money Handling etc, rather than the way in which training may be delivered e.g. on the job, one day refresher etc.

Most candidates performed well in the recall and short answer questions. Questions requiring the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation acted as an effective discriminator; these types of questions allowed the more able to write extended answers, whilst weaker candidates gained access to the lower level marks for responses which identified and explained.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

Q1 (a) (i) Candidates were confident in identifying personal qualities associated with the job role of cabin crew. This question was answered well by all candidates.

Q1 (a) (ii) Most candidates understood the term 'working time'; the best answers here were applied to the specific context of cabin crew, with clear distinctions made between cabin crew on short haul flights compared with the working time of those rostered on long haul flights.

Q1 (b) A broad range of duties of cabin crew was cited in answer to this question, proving that most candidates have good knowledge of exactly what this job role entails.

Q1 (c) This question acted as a good discriminator; candidates are expected to be familiar with the complaints procedures of Leisure and Tourism organisations such as an airline company. The best answers were those where candidates considered the question from three different perspectives; the customer's, the employee's and the employer's perspective. It would have been beneficial if answers could have been more specific; even at the top end, candidates tended to write generically rather than within the applied context of an airline.

Question No. 2

Q2 (a) (i) Most candidates were accurate in giving a definition of the term 'part-time', and relevant examples were often given.

Q2 (a) (ii) As mentioned in the general comments section, this question on types of training proved to be the most challenging on the paper. It is important that candidates steer away from content based answers here; they are expected to be familiar with different types of training (i.e. how the training may be delivered), not on the content base of the training (i.e. not what it is about). This caused most candidates to lose marks for their answers here.

Q2 (a) (iii) Candidates were asked to complete the table to indicate which statements were most applicable to the working conditions of a ticket seller. This type of question often works well as it did here; candidates showed good knowledge about specific working conditions.

Q2 (b) This question differentiated well between candidates. The best answers were those, where candidates considered the importance of keeping sales records from the organisation's and the customer's perspective; weaker candidates tended to consider why sales records would be helpful to the employee.

Question No. 3

Q3 (a) The vocational skill of completing forms accurately is an important one for the Leisure and Tourism industries. Candidates were able to extract relevant information to complete the accident report with the appropriate information, with few errors or omissions.

Q3 (b) Most candidates understand the importance of accident records; the best answers were those which considered safeguarding the organisation for its role in health and safety, rather than the weaker responses which focused only on the right to sue.

Q3 (c) Candidates were asked to complete a table to show the practical application of health and safety measures that the manager of a health club might take. This question proved quite challenging for some candidates. It is important that specific duties under health and safety are considered; the poorest answers were generic and repetitive, whereas the best answers gave named examples of how these duties might be performed. For example, compare the more vague answer 'check the equipment in the gym', with the much more vocationally specific answer 'clean and carry out a visual safety check on each piece of gym equipment at the start and the end of each day'.

Question No. 4

Q4 (a) Candidates appeared to be familiar with this question format, where they are required to select the most suitable applicant for an advertised job role and must give reasons for their selection. At the lower end, responses tend to rely heavily on repeated information from the stimulus; the best answers are those where candidates are able to draw their own conclusions about the suitability of an applicant; for example weighing up whether more years of experience in unrelated fields in the hospitality industry is more important than less time worked in a hotel but in the same job role as the advertised vacancy.

Q4 (b) This question allowed candidates to demonstrate applied vocational skills associated with the job role of receptionist. Most candidates scored really well here, and have a good understanding of the importance of customer service skills.

Q4 (c) The importance of check-in and check-out processes was well understood; candidates seem particularly conscious of the health and safety reasons for many procedures in Leisure and Tourism. It would be useful if they could consider other functional areas in such roles, for example the marketing benefits of holding customer information.

Q4 (d) Evacuation procedures are a familiar concept for candidates as most have participated in fire drills at school; many were able to use this knowledge to evaluate the strengths and areas for improvement in the policy document presented. The best answers focused on the lack of information about fire alarms, instructions to try to control the fire and carrying the hotel register out of the building. At the lower end, answers tended to be descriptive, whereas the best answers clearly analysed the strengths and presented concise recommendations on how to improve the policy for greater efficiency in evacuating a busy building.

B184 Meeting customer needs in the leisure and tourism industries

General Comments:

There was only a small entry for the double unit, B184, this session. The centres had prepared their candidates well for controlled assessment and there were some good examples. In only a very few cases were there examples where tasks had been omitted, misinterpreted or lacked sufficient applied evidence for the mark awarded, by the assessor. In relation to Task 7 and 8, where candidates were able to provide an evaluative response, they performed well, but some candidates struggled to analyse and evaluate. In several cases centres had assessed work clearly and provided information on how they had arrived at the mark with informative comments, good annotation and page referencing. There was also evidence of comprehensive research by candidates which had been clearly utilised.

Throughout the unit, candidates are expected to provide evidence that matches the needs of the chosen customers. In some cases, there was some good application of knowledge demonstrated by the candidates and assessment was marked in relation to the quality of work and the candidates understanding. There were a few 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. Some candidates again this session, did tend to provide general evidence that did not relate to the customer brief. They had struggled to provide evidence to a required level and depth of application.

Comments on Individual Tasks

Task 1
Most 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 who had no clear view of what they needed to do. Again this session, candidates considered dates for completing the work but few candidates considered what needed to be changed in their planning because of unforeseen circumstances. This prevented access to full marks.

Task 3
This was attempted by all candidates with a mixed response. Most candidates were able to identify some needs but some evidence was underdeveloped and repeated the brief. This was not always well assessed. Where candidates considered the bullet points and areas such as type of accommodation, long haul or short haul, cost etc. they performed well.

Task 4
AO1 –This assessment objective demonstrated a mixed response by candidates. Some candidates omitted to consider a number of options to, within and back home. Some candidates did provide a comprehensive range of suitable options but then failed to develop their evidence for AO2. There were however, some very good examples this session.
AO2—some candidates provided only half a plan/itinerary such as the flight times to the destination and omitted when they should set off, in what transport, when and how do they return? Others provided comprehensive and accurate responses to the task achieving high marks.

Task 5
AO1—several 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 candidates had demonstrated a good understanding of the task. Candidates had provided a well formatted appropriate proposal and had access to higher marks.

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. Some candidates did not consider the value of the source and made no appropriate judgement. This was however clearly identified by the assessor and marked appropriately.

Task 7 and 8
Most candidates attempted this task 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 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.

NOTICE TO CENTRES
Assessment advice can be found on the OCR web-site in previous PM reports such as June 2012.