GCSE

Applied Leisure and Tourism (Double Award)

Report on the Units

June 2007

CONTENTS

Applied GCSE Leisure and Tourism (1495)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Chief Report

It was evident that in June 2007 this specification performed appropriately as a means of testing candidates' ability to demonstrate the required skills at GCSE level, with a good balance of straightforward opportunities to gain marks for simple identification and description of the core specification content and the more challenging opportunities that require in-depth research, analysis and judgement.

Candidates used a wide range of leisure and tourism organisations throughout the portfolio work and quoted them as examples in the examination. Many Centres had used educational visits to organisations that were able to tailor their talks to the audience at an appropriate level. However Centres must always be aware that some of the large organisations are too complex to use at this level and can create difficulties for candidates when they present their work in both the portfolio and the examination parts of the course. In contrast to this is the organisation that is too small to enable a candidate the opportunity to produce comprehensive work.

There is some evidence throughout the portfolio work that Centres are not annotating work in detail and therefore candidates may not gain full credit for all the work they have completed. This marking process needs to be rigorous with effective internal standardisation also carried out if candidates are to be accurately credited for their work. The role of the moderator is not to re-mark the work submitted, rather to confirm the marks awarded by the assessor. OCR runs various INSET courses that would help Centres with this aspect of the specification.

In the examination many candidates continued to rely on their life experience rather than taught knowledge when answering questions and so found questions outside their experience rather problematic. It was clear that some candidates had significant gaps in their knowledge and examination skills, although their competence in some areas indicated considerable potential. For example the candidate who scores well on 2 out of 4 questions on the examination paper often lacks the subject knowledge in either the leisure or the tourism part of the specification. Coaching in examination technique would help to ensure that candidates perform to the best of their abilities although time management is less of an issue with the majority of candidates completing the examination paper. The art of explanation and discussion needs to be taught as many candidates find it difficult to explain and discuss identified points and so often put their responses in bullet point lists which are correct in knowledge but show none of the skills being tested.

4875

General Comments

In order to achieve a pass grade on this examined unit, candidates need to demonstrate some basic knowledge and understanding of the leisure and tourism industries. To achieve higher grades, candidates are required to demonstrate a higher level of knowledge, explanation and application when referring to specific leisure and tourism situations. At the top end of the mark range candidates must show some basic levels of analysis and reasoning. Nearly all candidates were able to access each section of the paper at some level, and most gained marks on the part (a) and part (b) questions with at least Level 1 on the (c) and (d) parts; the best candidates were able to demonstrate extended answers, especially on the (d) sections. Weaker candidates were hindered by a lack of basic literacy skills resulting in questions not being read carefully and written responses lacking structure with, therefore, limited and sometimes inappropriate responses given. Some candidates who were well prepared with regards to their knowledge of the specification went on to perform less well on the levels of response questions with few Level 3 responses being given by mid ability range candidates. These candidates lack the ability to construct an organised response to extended questions such as those seen in part (d) of each question. Time was generally well used with most scripts being complete, thus showing that candidates are gaining a wider range of knowledge which extends to both the leisure and tourism aspects of the specification.

In preparing candidates for the examination, Centres are reminded to advise candidates to read the questions carefully. Candidates must make sure they follow the instructions of the question, ie identify, describe, explain, discuss. Candidates must also have learned the key areas of vocabulary required of the leisure and tourism specification

Question 1

(a)   Most candidates answered the question with maximum marks, having identified the facilities from Fig. 1. Where candidates did not read the material carefully they showed some confusion between a facility and an activity, i.e. Llama walking given as a facility.

(b)   Many candidates scored full marks; sometimes, however, income was confused with the park generating income, rather than visitors' income, with comments such as 'if the park charge higher prices they will get more income'. Further problems occurred as far too many candidates still interpret 'special needs' as wheelchair users rather than its wider interpretation.

(c)   The mark scheme allowed either the location of the Llama Park or general location answers to gain equal credit; however, too many candidates confused the location of a facility with the location of facilities within the Llama Park. Some discussed how 'nice it was' and what people could do in the Park rather than the issues which may be associated with physical location influencing a decision to take part in a leisure activity.

(d)   Some candidates did not understand the term 'environmental'; others did not realise that the question was looking for impacts as a result of development in general. Many scored Level 1 marks with responses which included basic identification of points such as litter creation, erosion and pollution, but few candidates developed an answer based on application. Many candidates seemed to have a pre-prepared answer which then lacked any form of application based on leisure development.

Question 2

(a)   This part of the question was generally answered well with candidates applying their own experience. Often the weakness was that a similar response was given in part (i) such as McDonalds and Burger King which not only used brand names but also were identical 'types' of take away catering establishment.

(b)   This part of the question caused the same problems as seen in part (a)(i) of the question. Further in part (b)(ii), candidates were vague in terms of identifying a customer type, with answers such as a 'man' or 'worker' often seen. Brand names were often quoted as 'types' but unlike part (a) these 'brands' were not recognisable as national brands.

(c)   Many candidates failed to read the question carefully thus missing the point that it referred to leisure centres. Many answers referred to leisure attractions and very often theme parks. Many candidates answered with reference to general provision rather than catering services. Mid-ability candidates often answered 'why' not 'how' facilities have developed. Good candidates did construct good answers considering all types of services which have been introduced including bars, cafes, restaurants and the most able included services such as children's parties and wedding receptions.

(d)   Most candidates attempted this part of the question but weaker candidates simply described the graph and how provision is now without making any reference to change and, therefore, marks were limited to Level 1. More able candidates answered fully but concentrated on 'why' rather than 'how' provision has changed. The top scoring candidates answered fully with some very well formed reasoning, such as the growth in the teenage market and the development of family oriented catering establishments. Few candidates considered the 'grey' market increasing demand.

Question 3

(a)   Most candidates scored three out of four marks with many not understanding the role of tour operator and choosing business travel agent for that response. Very weak candidates did not choose jobs from Fig. 3 and so often scored zero on a straightforward AO1 question.

(b)   As in part (a), a surprising number of candidates did not understand the role of a tour operator and as such many answers given were incorrect and so did not score. Examples showed that many candidates were confused between a travel agent and a tour operator. Many candidates think they are the same thing. Tourist information services were well described by the majority of candidates. The component of 'guiding services' was poorly understood with many candidates thinking that 'they give directions when you are lost'.

(c)   Some very good answers from candidates who had clearly studied and learned the role of a conference organiser. However, there were some very poor responses which were either very vague showing candidates were not prepared or too often candidates confused 'conference organiser' with 'party planner' or 'wedding planner' and this gave unsuitable responses.

(d)   This was a well answered question with security, safety, confidence, reliability and personal contact all being given as reasons by many candidates, although there was some over reliance on credit card fraud and identity theft. The majority of candidates achieved Level 2 responses, with the best at Level 3 discussing reasons with reference to trends and making reasoned judgements around preference.

Question 4

(a)   Most candidates achieved maximum marks but surprisingly some candidates had no idea what an activity holiday is and some gave names of countries or destinations. The other point of confusion seemed to be distinguishing between an activity and a special interest type holiday. Reference was often made to holidays such as 'painting' or 'wine tasting'.

(b)   The terms were not well understood by weaker candidates. For most candidates self-catering was recognised as meaning 'no food is included' and some knew that catering facilities are included. For the term 'room only', the most prepared candidates realised that neither food nor catering facilities are included. Many candidates could not distinguish between the terms 'room only' and 'self catering'. The weakest confused the term with a hostel where rooms are shared dormitory style. Very few candidates recognised the term 'flight supplement', most thought it was some reference to meal inclusion on flights.

(c)   Well answered by the majority of candidates with few difficulties in achieving full marks. However, some candidates chose coach travel which was not in Fig. 4 and as such did not score any marks. This once again highlights the need to read questions carefully.

(d)   This part of the question was often not well answered and common problems were that many candidates thought skiing holidays are much cheaper than summer sun holidays because as you go in winter it must be 'off peak'. This then developed into the reasoning that skiing is chosen by low income groups as they cannot afford summer holidays. Better candidates recognised that skiing was an alternative holiday which was activity based and may suit families with children. Many also tried to reason that parents need to keep children out of the sun and so skiing was a way of achieving this as the sun never shines on a mountain! There was clearly a problem in that candidates had not learned about winter ski tourism and so only those with direct experience seemed to have answered well.

4876

General Comments

Most candidates had been well prepared for this unit and almost all candidates attempted all criteria. Candidates had used a wide range of Leisure and Tourism organisations and it was clear that most of them had not only enjoyed visiting their organisation, but had also been able to make good use of the information they had gathered, applying it to the requirements of the assessment criteria. Those candidates who had visited their chosen organisation and had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for candidates) generally produced more informed and perceptive portfolios than those who relied on secondary research, whose work was generally characterised by a lack of ownership of the information. Centres are advised to consider carefully the suitability of the choice of organisation: some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a theme park) which meant that they had to complete a disproportionate amount of work to access full marks for A2; other candidates had studied organisations which made it difficult for them to access sufficient information to address all the criteria (see in particular the comments about strand C).

The majority of Centres submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also made use of the Comments boxes on the URS, which helped the moderation process to run smoothly. Most Centres had annotated candidates' work, as detailed on page 17 of the Specification, which is a requirement before moderation can take place. Centres should note that if the front of the URS is incomplete, or work has not been annotated, or the Location column has not been completed on the URS, portfolios are returned to Centres and, in these circumstances, there is the possibility that the publication of candidates' results might be delayed. Centres also need to be aware that the late submission of marks to moderators (after 10 January or 15 May, as appropriate) may also result in a delay in the publication of candidates' results.

It is still the case that many candidates would have benefited from having their work annotated in greater detail, since this would have enabled assessors to give them full credit for all the evidence they had presented; too often, evidence which occurs where the assessor is not expecting it, is neither annotated nor credited. The moderator does not re-mark work but uses the signposts provided by the annotation, page referencing and comments on the URS to consider the assessor's grading decisions. Detailed annotation also helps to ensure that marks are awarded in line with the requirements of the assessment evidence grid.

Despite the requirement on page 17 of the specifications, it was clear that a number of Centres still did not have a system of internal standardisation in place. It is strongly recommended, especially where more than one teacher is delivering the portfolio units, that Centres carrry out internal standardisation, in order to ensure not only that the tasks set will enable candidates to meet the requirements of the criteria, but also that the criteria have 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 not only are the criteria 'nested' and that full achievement in band 1 is a prerequisite for award of marks in band 2, etc., but also that the statements in band 3 describe work which is notionally equivalent to at least grade BB. The key words in each criterion (such as describe, explain and analyse) indicate what is expected from the candidate. Candidates need to understand clearly what is required by the different terms, such as "describe", "explain", "analyse", "evaluate" and "compare". Assessors also need to ensure that they distinguish between these terms when marking candidates' work since, for example, detailed descriptions are frequently credited as explanations.

Ensuring the authenticity of candidates' work is important; although most Centres submitted a Centre Authentication form with their portfolios, only a relatively few candidates acknowledged

their information sources. Centres need to understand that the inclusion of photocopied or Internet pages, 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 Criteria

Moderators find it very helpful if there is a brief introduction to the candidate's chosen organisation, although this is not required by the specification.

A strand – this is concerned with Product and Price from the marketing mix.

A1 – Met by most candidates, although some candidates still persist in ignoring the chief product/service (which is often an experience) provided by an organisation and concentrate instead on the ancillaries: for example, describing in detail the souvenir shops and catering facilities at a theme park, whilst only briefly mentioning the rides.

A2 – It should be noted that a 'detailed description' is required here; any printed material, such as price lists, which is included should be worked on by the candidate in some way, by highlighting or annotation, for example.

A3 – Few candidates were able to analyse, at the required level, and fewer were able to relate the products/services to the pricing structure, by considering, for example, cost plus pricing or the reasons for providing a family ticket; instead, most compared prices with those of another organisation and commented on comparative value for money.

B strand – This is concerned with place from the marketing mix and includes not only location but also the ways in which the place is made available (signage, disabled access, how tickets may be bought, etc.), the placing/timing, etc of promotional materials and activities and, if relevant, the chain of distribution. It is not concerned with the detail of individual marketing materials, which is investigated in the strand d.

B1 – Met by most candidates, who usually identified the location and how tickets could be purchased.

B2 – A full description is required here; candidates often amplified the points made for b1 and also considered how the organisation made its site available and also where advertising material about the organisation was placed, so that potential visitors could find out about it. Some candidates made excellent use of annotated photographs to clarify their descriptions.

B3 – Most of the suggestions made were sensible; but the suggestion needs to be detailed and justified for the candidate to gain maximum marks. Candidates should not give more than one suggestion.

C strand – This is concerned with the actual market research activities carried out by the candidate's chosen organisation, not with the market research activities which it could carry out. It was evident that a number of candidates were unable to access the required information and so were unable to gain marks for this strand. Most other candidates were limited in their achievement by the information which their chosen organisation was prepared to share with them. Centres need to ensure that candidates' choice of organisation will allow them to achieve in this strand.

C1 – Met by some candidates. If a survey is identified, then a copy of it should be included.

C2 – Met by a few candidates. The reference to identifying market segments was often either ignored or not related to the chosen organisation.

C3 – Almost no candidates were able to provide information about the cost effectiveness of the various market research methods (ie the cost of the research and the cost of implementing identified improvements compared with the increase in revenue resulting from the improvements). Many of those who attempted this presumed that telephone and Internet surveys, for example, cost the organisation nothing.

D strand – This is concerned with promotion from the marketing mix. Centres should note that, for d1, candidates should describe either the promotional materials or the marketing mix, but not both.

D1 – Met by most candidates, often using annotated leaflets, web pages, etc.

D2 – A surprisingly large number of candidates did not attempt this criterion. Those who did often had imaginative ideas and suggested techniques other than advertising.

D3 – Met by a number of candidates. Weaker candidates often failed to meet this criterion because they produced a table and left it to the moderator to compare the two organisations.

E strand – This required a SWOT analysis, which almost all candidates were able to complete at some level.

E1 – Met by most candidates.

E2 – Met by a large number of candidates.

E3 – Met by a number of candidates. Candidates need to ensure that their analysis refers back to all the points they have identified in their SWOT analysis.

F strand – This requires candidates to produce a piece of promotional material. Most candidates produced posters or leaflets; if candidates produce artefacts then it is preferable to send the moderator an annotated and authenticated photograph rather than the article itself. Promotional artefacts should be accompanied by a brief outline of how they will be distributed (eg. given away at a trade fair). If candidates design items to be sold, in a souvenir shop, for example, then they have produced merchandise rather than a piece of promotional material and cannot be credited with any marks for this strand. Those candidates who produce presentations need to outline the circumstances in which it will be presented to the target market (eg. a presentation about a National Trust property at a meeting of a town's historical society). Assessors frequently marked this strand very generously.

F1 – Not met by a surprisingly large number of candidates. The test of 'fit for purpose' should be applied to see if sufficient basic information has been included (such as the organisation's name, what is being promoted, date(s) and times as appropriate, price, the location and contact details).

F2 – Met by most candidates who had fully met f1. The piece of promotional material cannot be considered to be 'imaginative' if most of the candidates have produced similar material based on the same idea.

F3 – Met by a few candidates. The evidence for planning needs to be robust. Aims and objectives need to be made explicit and the evaluation should be of the finished piece, related to the identified target market, objective as well as subjective and could contain some statistical analysis to justify full marks.

4877

General Comments

Most candidates had been well prepared for this unit and almost all candidates attempted all criteria. Candidates had used a wide range of Leisure and Tourism organisations and it was clear that most of them had not only enjoyed visiting their organisation, but had also been able to make good use of the information they had gathered, applying it to the requirements of the assessment criteria. Those candidates who had visited their chosen organisation and had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for candidates) generally produced more informed and perceptive portfolios than those who relied on secondary research, whose work was generally characterised by a lack of ownership of the information. Centres are advised to consider carefully the suitability of the choice of organisation: some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a theme park) which meant that they had to complete a disproportionate amount of work to access full marks for strand b, other candidates had studied organisations which made it difficult for them to access sufficient information to address all the criteria (see in particular the comments about strand d).

The majority of Centres submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also made use of the Comments boxes on the URS, which helped the moderation process to run smoothly. Most Centres had annotated candidates' work, as detailed on page 17 of the Specification, which is a requirement before moderation can take place. Centres should note that if the front of the URS is incomplete, or work has not been annotated, or the Location column has not been completed on the URS, portfolios are returned to Centres and, in these circumstances, there is the possibility that the publication of candidates' results might be delayed. Centres also need to be aware that the late submission of marks to moderators (after 10 January or 15 May, as appropriate) may also result in a delay in the publication of candidates' results.

It is still the case that many candidates would have benefited from having their work annotated in greater detail, since this would have enabled assessors to give them full credit for all the evidence they had presented; too often, evidence which occurs where the assessor is not expecting it is neither annotated nor credited. The moderator does not re-mark work but uses the signposts provided by the annotation, page referencing and comments on the URS to consider the assessor's grading decisions. Detailed annotation also helps to ensure that marks are awarded in line with the requirements of the assessment evidence grid.

Despite the requirement on page 17 of the specification, it was clear that a number of Centres still did not have a system of internal standardisation in place. It is strongly recommended, especially where more than one teacher is delivering the portfolio units, that Centres carrry out internal standardisation, in order to ensure not only that the tasks set will enable candidates to meet the requirements of the criteria, but also that the criteria have 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 not only are the criteria 'nested' and that full achievement in band 1 is a prerequisite for award of marks in band 2, etc., but also that the statements in band 3 describe work which is notionally equivalent to at least grade BB. The key words in each criterion (such as describe, explain and analyse) indicate what is expected from the candidate. Candidates need to understand clearly what is required by the different terms, such as "describe", "explain", "analyse", "evaluate" and "compare". Assessors also need to ensure that they distinguish between these terms when marking candidates' work since, for example, detailed descriptions are frequently credited as explanations.

Ensuring the authenticity of candidates' work is important; although most Centres submitted a Centre Authentication form with their portfolios, only a relatively few candidates acknowledged

their information sources. Centres need to understand that the inclusion of photocopied or Internet pages, 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 Criteria

Moderators find it very helpful if there is a brief introduction to the candidate's chosen organisation, although this is not required by the specification.

A strand – This is concerned with the meaning of customer service.

A1 – Met by most candidates, usually with a piece of writing which starts 'Customer service is …'

A2 – Assessors need to ensure that candidates have explained why customer service is important to their chosen organisation, rather than in general. The use of illustrative examples from their organisation is necessary for candidates to gain full marks.

A3 – Few candidates were able to analyse at the required level. This criterion may often be best judged from a holistic view of the candidate's work in strands a to d.

B strand – This is concerned with how the chosen organisation meets the needs of its customers.

B1 – Met by most candidates. Candidates must describe how the needs of 'a variety' - at least three different types - of customer are met and describe how the organisation deals with complaints in order to gain full marks.

B2 – Met by a number of candidates. A full description, illustrated by relevant examples, is required here and candidates must distinguish between internal and external customers. The complaints procedure must also be explained.

B3 – Relatively few candidates were able to evaluate the way their organisation met its customers' needs. Those who did made use of information provided by the company or conducted their own research. Analysis of the complaints procedure can include suggestions for its improvement.

C strand – This is concerned with the benefits of effective customer service and, in the case of stronger candidates, may well overlap with strand a.

C1 – Met by the majority of candidates. The description must make reference to the organisation for marks to be awarded.

C2 – Met by a number of candidates. In assessing this criterion, Centres are advised to follow the Assessment Evidence grid (page 70 of the Specification) rather than the exemplification for c2 (page 75). Candidates also need to ensure that they are referring to customer service procedures, rather than to the services the organisation provides for its customers.

C3 – Met by a number of candidates. In recommending improvements candidates need to clarify the benefits which these would bring to the organisation. Again, candidates need to ensure that they are referring to customer service procedures, rather than to the services the organisation provides for its customers.

D strand – This is concerned with customer service records, such as membership details, ticket booking and records of complaints.

D1 – Met by most candidates; blank copies of the relevant records should be included.

D2 – Met by some candidates. Centres need to endure that the candidate's chosen organisation is able to provide the relevant information.

D3 – Met by a number of candidates. Centres need to be aware that smaller organisations may provide more opportunities to evidence this than larger ones.

E and F strands – Centres need to ensure that all the evidence submitted (including role plays, letters and telephone calls) relates to the Leisure and Tourism industry; details of the components of the Leisure and Tourism industry may be found in the specification for Unit 1.

Much of the evidence provided for this was sparse. Witness statements need to be robust and contain a detailed identification of the situation and the candidate's performance (with explicit reference to the detail in the assessment evidence grid). Supporting evidence, such as videos (which should be indexed), must be included with the portfolios. Moderators need to be provided with sufficient evidence, both of the candidate's performance and in the form of evaluative witness evidence, to be able to accept the mark awarded by the Centre.

The use of work experience is to be commended but assessors need to ensure that it takes place in a Leisure and Tourism organisation and that the witness statements contain the details described above, rather then rely on the general comments made in a work experience report. Assessors should be aware that replies to letters, e- mails and telephone enquiries can be used as well as role plays. Scripted role plays are not an appropriate method of demonstrating that candidates have met the criteria, since they do not allow the candidate to demonstrate that they can 'listen carefully' or 'respond appropriately'.

E strand – This requires candidates to communicate with a variety of customers.

E1 – Met by most candidates. A 'variety of customers' indicates a minimum of three different types of customers (such as individuals of different ages, families, business people, customers with specific needs) seeking three different types of customer service (such as information, advice, seeking to buy, wanting to change a booking).

E2 – Met by relatively few candidates, due partly to the lack of supporting evidence.

E3 – Met by relatively few candidates, due partly to the lack of supporting evidence.

F strand – This requires candidates to deal with a customer complaint.

F1 – Met by most candidates. Assessors should note that candidates are expected to describe how they dealt with a customer complaint. Their account may be corroborated by a witness statement but a witness statement is not a substitute for the account.

F2 – Met by most candidates who had met f1. Assessors need to note that a detailed witness statement is required here, as well as details of the organisation's complaints procedure, if the candidate is to access full marks.

F3 – Met by some candidates. Assessors should note that this criterion refers to the e strand as well as to the f strand. A number of evaluative methods may be used, such as self-evaluation, peer evaluation and feedback from the customer and the witness, and should be objective rather than subjective.

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Applied GCSE Leisure and Tourism (Double Award) 1495
June 2007 Assessment Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4875	Raw	100	87	77	67	57	50	43	36	29	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
4876	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
4877	Raw	50	47	42	36	31	26	21	17	13	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10

Entry Information

Unit	Total Entry
4875	3522
4876	3305
4877	3462

Specification Aggregation Results

GRADE	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	UU
UMS	270	240	210	180	150	120	90	60	0
Cum %	0.31	3.01	13.58	33.04	51.94	68.23	81.41	91.80	100

3724 candidates were entered for aggregation this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication