GCSE 2004
January Series

AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Report on the Examination

GCSE Leisure & Tourism
(Double Award)

CONTENTS

Specification: Leisure & Tourism Double Award

Leisure and Tourism (Double Award)

3840/1 Investigating Leisure and Tourism

Overall

This was the second paper for this still new award. Indeed, the first award for the qualification is yet to be made (Summer 2004). There was a significant range of marks, similar to that in June 2003. Given that candidates can only have followed the two-year course for a year and a term, it was not too surprising to find few total marks at the upper end of the range, although more high marks may have been hoped for than in June 2003. However, this has not been the case.

The paper was not tiered. Questions were, as in the June 2003 paper, designed to allow all candidates scope to answer according to their ability. Thus, questions were again structured so as to enable weaker candidates to gain credit for showing basic knowledge and understanding, but also to give room for better candidates to develop answers at a higher level to achieve more marks. With the exception of Question 6, each question began by seeking short "sound-bite" answers which were answered satisfactorily by the majority. Questions went on to offer opportunities for candidates to develop higher level responses by using detailed place/facility knowledge, offering clear explanations or demonstrating clear awareness of linkage within the leisure and tourism industries.

There was not much evidence of candidates experiencing time problems, and the majority was able to frame answers that fitted the spaces provided. Few required extra space or supplementary sheets. More able candidates would need to have spent significant time on Question 6 in order to develop higher-level responses sufficient to generate marks at the top of the available range. There was not, however, evidence of widespread inefficient use of time, though equally, little evidence of attempts to write extended answers to Question 6.

Some parts of questions proved more challenging to the majority of candidates than others. In the longer sections, many found it difficult to raise the quality of answer above the basic level. To gain higher-level marks, candidates needed to ensure accurate answering of questions in the terms set. For example, descriptions which were *full*, reasons which were *explained* and answers which conveyed a sense of place as well as directly and closely answering the questions in the terms it was posed, were more likely to score higher marks. It was again an expectation of the paper that candidates would have studied real world cases of leisure and tourism facilities, and of places in which they are provided and where they have impact - as detailed in the Specification. Candidates scoring well were able to show clear evidence of such case study knowledge.

Question 1

In part (a)(i) most candidates were able to answer this adequately, by identifying two products or services shown on Figure 1. The majority scored two marks.

In part (a)(ii) better candidates were able to develop an answer beyond the simple "relax", but many gained 1 mark for that simple point.

Better answers in part (b)(i) were ones where a facility which had been studied was clearly identified. These good answers were ones where it was clear that the candidate had undertaken an actual investigation and where a clear *description* of methods was given. Less able candidates were able to identify one or two approaches such as "*collected leaflets*", "*used the internet*", without further development. Better quality answers also showed some progression, for instance from a class discussion or area survey, to an individual facility visit or to a staff member interview.

AQA

A good answer in part (b)(ii) here was one which had a range of products and services that clearly belonged to the actual facility named in (i), and which went on to explain how the range helped meet the need of various customer types. Less able candidates tended to write generalised answers which were not specific to the named facility, and did not make clear links to identified customer needs.

Question 2

In part (a)(i) all but the least able could identify two activities correctly – usually from Figure 2.

Common correct answers in part (a)(ii) were North Wales or Snowdonia. Weaker answers revealed a lack of location knowledge, which is required by the Specification.

Windsor Park in part (b)(i) was frequently not recognized. A large number of candidates were not able to score all 3 marks on what is specified location knowledge.

More able candidates in part (b)(ii) could demonstrate case study knowledge of a national sports venue and score full marks. Weaker answers tended to give a simple location and straightforward purpose, restricting response quality to Level 1. Good answers were those that went on to *describe*, rather than simply *identify*, location or purpose. A minority chose inappropriate (i.e. not national) venues.

Question 3

Most candidates in part (a)(i) were able to answer this correctly.

In part (a)(ii) many candidates struggled to name the key components using the terminology in the Specification.

In part (b)(i) better candidates scored all 3 marks, and most scored at least 2.

Question (b)(ii) was about *difference*. More able candidates could explain how travel agents and tour operators differ although many, while clear about the role of a travel agency, were unsure of the role of a tour operator.

In part (b)(iii) candidates were asked to describe the *skills* or *qualities* required. Good answers were those where such skills as being able to process bookings using a computer, or such qualities as cheery politeness were described in the specific context of a travel agency. The most able candidates were able to link skills and qualities specifically to the consultant role. Less able candidates typically suggested a skill or quality or two, but then did not go on to describe in context or clarify the significance of these to the role.

Question 4

In part (a)(i) the majority of candidates was able to answer this successfully.

More able candidates could score both marks in part (a)(ii). Less able candidates failed to score by simply copying from the text in Figure 5.

In part (a)(iii) many candidates succeeded in developing the simple point "internet" in some way, either by identifying the website or proposing an alternative method such as telephoning the Tourist Information Office in Edinburgh.

In part (b)(i) the standard of responses varied quite widely here. Candidates with sound location knowledge were able to achieve 3 or 4. Others managed a single successful guess. It was clear that some had learned the locations required by the Specification and picked up marks accordingly while others simply had not.

In part (b)(ii) relatively few candidates produced a place-specific answer to this question. Responses were frequently characterized by generalised suggestions as to how the elderly may be catered for in a tourist town. Less able candidates confused elderly with disabled or else made no reference to a specific group of customers by describing the attractions of their chosen town or city.

Question 5

In part (a)(i) most candidates correctly identified Stonehenge.

Slightly fewer candidates were correct in part (a)(ii), but still the majority. Some missed the mark by omitting "thousands".

More able candidates could develop an answer in part (a)(iii) beyond a simple "*more*", for instance by quoting, or better still, using information from the graph to *compare* the popularity of the Tower of London and Chatsworth. For example, the more able candidates were able to include statements such as "*The popularity of the Tower of London is almost four times as great as Chatsworth*" in their answers.

In part (a)(iv) many candidates restricted themselves to Level 1 (2 marks) by only referring to the Tower. Reasons for *difference* were required to access Level 2.

Many candidates were only able to make one or two basic statements in part (b)(i). More able candidates answered this question well when their answers *describe*d key features and attractions. Such answers revealed good case study knowledge gained by studying one of the sites. Less able candidates were often unable to progress beyond a simple point such as "Buckingham Palace is where the Queen lives".

In part (b)(ii) location knowledge about Stonehenge was not widely shown. Location and purpose of such sites is required by the Specification. Even setting off from London in the right direction was an infrequent response.

Question 6

Question (a)(i) proved challenging for many candidates. Using the knowledge specified in the question was often the issue. Good answers gave correct motorway direction to a seaside town or tourist town or historic site on each day with a visited attraction in each.

In part (a)(ii) better candidates attempted to justify the programme they had put forward in (a)(i) in terms of location, ease of travel and distance between suggested places. Weaker candidates often repeated descriptions of places from (a)(i) rather than offering *explanation*.

Part (a)(iii) was intended to give more able candidates the opportunity to develop an extended answer. It was the only Level 3 question on the paper. Many candidates produced a more restricted response, commonly dealing only with impacts, and often in a generalised rather than place-specific way. Extending the answer to embrace sustainability and developing a sense of place enabled more able candidates to access higher quality level of response. Less able candidates focused on such impacts as pollution, litter, and jobs with little development suggesting actual place knowledge.

AQA

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3840/1	90	90	32.0	11.4

For units which contain only one component, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

3840/1 (2618 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	90	63	56	49	43	37	31	26	21
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidate lie in range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A* is always 90% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade A is 80%, grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50%, grade E is 40%, grade F is 30% and grade G is 20%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and, when subject grades are awarded in 2004, the uniform marks for the units will be added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.