OCR
RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

GCSE

Applied Leisure and Tourism (Double Award)

Report on the Units

January 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

CONTENTS

Applied GCSE Leisure and Tourism (1495)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Chief Examiner's Report

As expected for a January assessment, a relatively small number of candidates entered for the qualification. Overall the qualification 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.

There was evidence of some improvement in performance by candidates when compared to previous examination sessions. However, there are a number of general points which still apply. The following were noted on many occasions this series.

- Some candidates did not read questions carefully enough. Key words were often missed, with candidates appearing to answer the question they would have liked to answer rather, than the actual question on the examination paper. Candidates often lose many marks through this careless approach.

- Many candidates are failing to notice command words. If the command word is 'explain', a purely descriptive answer will not gain access to the higher mark band on offer. 'Explain' involves giving reasons, linking causes and effects, or showing how theory can be applied. Further, the command word 'describe' requires more than a basic outline.

- Candidates had clearly been taught how to answer questions which had appeared on past papers with some very well developed answers where this occurred.

It was evident from a number of responses that many candidates had not revised sufficiently on all aspects of the specification to enable high overall marks to be achieved. Limiting a candidate's learning to a reduced range of topics is very dangerous as, if those topics do not come up on the examination paper, the candidate will not know enough to do well across the whole paper. There is much evidence to suggest that candidates do well on two or three questions but rarely on all four. All of the questions on Unit 4875 were answered well by some candidates – and there were some excellent answers. This suggests that the examination was accessible to the candidates entered.

In the portfolio work there remain some weaknesses, many of which are common weaknesses which occur every session. These are dealt with by the Principal Moderator in the following reports. Candidates work throughout the portfolio units demonstrated that Centres had used real opportunities for candidates to gain vocational experience but Centres should be aware that candidates must do more than merely copy notes as moderators are starting to recognise such 'given' material.

Finally, candidates should take care over their handwriting. While examiners make every effort to decipher every word, marks cannot be awarded if words or phrases are illegible. If an answer is continued on additional sheets at the back of the booklet, the candidate must make it quite clear which question they are answering.

4875 Investigating Leisure and Tourism

General comments

The paper was completed by the majority of candidates, with very few questions which candidates did not attempt. As with previous papers, there was a clear distinction between those Centres which had prepared candidates for the examination and those who seem to use the examination as a part of the summer examination preparation by giving the candidates experience, without delivering all the necessary material. Candidates were, on the whole, well prepared for both the leisure and tourism components of the paper and this has been a most pleasing development. Candidates showed some very pleasing responses to the very vocational elements of the paper, such as the job related questions. These answers showed a marked improvement from previous papers.

The discussion based questions continue to discriminate between candidates who are able to write in continuous prose and those who are limited to making a list of points, however, those who list points are becoming fewer.

Comments on individual questions

1(a) Generally well answered by most candidates who gave enough detail to score marks such as football world cup final. An answer such as 'football' was not enough but was seen on too many occasions.

1(b) Candidates who had learned the names of the leisure components had no problems with this part of the question and often scored maximum marks; many candidates, however, have not learned the components and so could not access the marks. Too many listed tourism components rather than leisure components as required by the question.

1(c) A straightforward links question which the majority of candidates were able to answer well, showing improvement on previous link questions. Some responses are still too vague and do not actually identify the component names.

1(d) Candidates were able to discuss their area in vague terms but often only mentioned one facility in any detail or with a time element involved. Some candidates drifted into an answer explaining how disabled access had been developed over time.

2(a) Well answered by the majority of candidates who were able to generate activities from the stimulus material

2(b) Well answered by many candidates, although a number thought that paragliding and other extreme sports would be suitable for very young children and that over 60's could do nothing more that sit on benches and watch the scenery.

2(c) Some excellent responses to this part of the question where candidates demonstrated knowledge of physically disabled needs such as wide pathways with flat surfaces, a number of weaker candidates focussed on how physically disabled visitors could access paragliding or hang gliding often without thought. Too many candidates thought it was appropriate for the Park to provide personal helpers for all physically disabled visitors.

2(d) A wide range of responses were received, some of which were clearly learned and some from own experience. Generally candidates identified litter clearance and the protection of wildlife at the lower end of the mark scheme, whereas candidates at the top end understood guiding, information giving and general maintenance type roles. The best candidates split the answer to include the skills as well as the roles.

3(a) Well answered by most candidates, although a number only scored three or four marks as they included Statesman Travel Limited in their answer

3(b) Generally not well answered with many problems for candidates who did not understand the term service provider or the role of a tour operator. Many candidates identified tour operators or travel agents in their answers.

3(c) Some excellent responses which considered the skills well. Some candidates identified the job role rather than skills required but generally even weaker candidates covered both skills and role.

3(d) This issue has clearly been covered by many Centres. Candidates often gave very well constructed and comprehensive answers which covered convenience, fraud, and time issues.

4(a) The majority of candidates identified three or four correctly, but many chose Birmingham and/or London which was a little disappointing.

4(b) This part of the question was not fully answered by many candidates with airport transfers generating mixed responses but very few accurate ones. Kids club host was answered well and resort manager was rarely understood.

4(c) Many candidates either did not understand the term 'fully inclusive' or did not read the question carefully. Many responses explained 'package holidays' or 'full board'. Those candidates who did answer correctly scored high marks with very complete answers.

4(d) This part of the question was the most surprising on the paper. Candidates often gave a very negative argument in relation to low cost airlines or were under the misguided view that in order to cut costs safety was compromised. Candidates tried to introduce chartered and scheduled flights into their responses which just created more confusion. The only consistency was that candidates thought that the flights were much cheaper.

4876 Marketing in Leisure and Tourism

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 the candidates 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 had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for students), 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. 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 criteria a2. Centres need to ensure that the organisation used by the candidate will allow 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 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 remains 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 which 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 and page referencing 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 do 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 have such a system in place, 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.

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 as part of the candidate's work and so cannot be assessed for marks.

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

Comments on Individual Criteria

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.

a strand – this is concerned with Product and Price from the marketing mix.
a1 – this was 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 ancillary services: 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 candidates 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 d strand.
b1 – this was met by most candidates.
b2 – a full description is required here. 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 that 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 that 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 – this was met by some candidates. If a survey, questionnaire, etc. is identified then a copy of it should be included; annotating and highlighting relevant points in the survey enabled some candidates to access marks for both c1 and c2.
c2 – this was 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 – this was 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 – this was met by a number of candidates. Weaker candidates often failed to meet this because they produced a table and left it to the moderator to compare the two organisations; candidates need to make use of comparative terms, such as 'similarly' and 'more' when comparing.

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

e1 – this was met by most candidates.

e2 – this was met by a large number of candidates.

e3 – this was 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. Some candidates used an action plan approach to successfully address this criterion

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 – this was 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). Centres also need to remind candidates that spelling, punctuation and grammatical mistakes are not acceptable in a promotional item.

f2 – this was met by most candidates who had fully met **f1.** However, 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 – this was 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 Customer Service in Leisure and Tourism

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 the candidates 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 had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for students), 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. 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. Centres need to ensure that the organisation used by the candidate will allow 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 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 delay in the publication of candidates' results.

It remains 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 which 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 and page referencing 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 do 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 have such a system in place, 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.

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 as part of the candidate's work and so cannot be assessed for marks.

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

Comments on Individual Criteria

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.

a strand – this is concerned with the meaning of customer service.
a1 – this was met by most candidates, usually with a piece of writing that started 'Customer service is …'
a2 – assessors need to ensure that candidates have explained **why** customer service is important to their chosen organisation, rather than a general description of the nature and range of the customer service provided by the organisation. 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. Candidates who had carried out a survey of customer service in their organisation were often able to use it to good effect, not only as evidence for this criterion but also for strands a to d.

b strand – this is concerned with how the chosen organisation meets the needs of its customers.
b1 – this was met by most candidates. Candidates must describe how the needs of 'a variety' - at least three different types - of customers are met and describe how the organisation deals with complaints to gain full marks.
b2 – this was 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 good use of information provided by the business 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 – this was met by the majority of candidates. The description must make reference to the organisation for any marks to be awarded.
c2 – this was 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 – this was met by a number of candidates. In recommending improvements candidates need to clarify the benefits that 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 – this was met by most candidates; blank copies of the relevant records should be included and referred to in the text. Highlighting and annotating these is one way in which the candidates can partly evidence both this criterion and d2.

d2 – this was met by some candidates. Centres need to ensure that the candidate's chosen organisation is able to provide the relevant information.

d3 – this was 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 industries; details of the components of the Leisure and Tourism industry may be found in the specifications 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 and bland comments often 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 – this was 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 – this was met by relatively few candidates, due partly to the lack of supporting evidence.

e3 – this was 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 – this was 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, copy of the letter they wrote, etc, but evidence such as this is not a substitute for the account.

f2 – this was 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 – this was 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 the evaluation should be objective rather than subjective.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
GCSE Leisure and Tourism (Specification Code 1495)
January 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4875	Raw	100	91	81	71	62	54	47	40	33	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4876	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4877	Raw	50	47	42	36	31	26	21	17	13	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

Entry Information

Unit	Total Entry
4875	2357
4876	449
4877	174

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	50	50	100	100	100	100	100	100

There were 2 candidates aggregating this series.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)
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