

Applied Leisure and Tourism (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1495**

Report on the Units

January 2009

1495/MS/R/09J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Applied GCSE Leisure and Tourism (1495)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
4875 Investigating Leisure and Tourism	2
4876 Marketing in Leisure and Tourism	4
4877 Customer Service in Leisure and Tourism	7
Grade Thresholds	10

Chief Examiner's Report

Candidates performed across the mark ranges with data showing that the mark spread produced a very good distribution curve around an increased mean mark of 52 for the examined unit. The portfolio units also saw increasing performance levels with mean marks of 30. As with previous sessions, candidates performed better in the portfolio units than on the examined unit.

The January question paper 4875 was found to have no questions which disadvantaged candidates. The questions, in the majority of cases, were answered to a good standard, providing clear evidence of the acquisition of knowledge which was applied to the situations given. In general, candidates were well prepared for the examination and their answers often indicated a good degree of preparatory work.

A significant number of answers did, however, indicate the candidates' lack of understanding of a particular part of the specification and, occasionally, they failed to respond to specific parts of a question notably questions 3(c), 3(d) and 4(d).

There was a notable lack of understanding around visitor appeal, future trends and, surprisingly the term 'independent holiday'. It is strongly recommended that candidates are familiar with these important aspects of the specification.

Another example of where candidates show a lack of understanding is in the use and understanding of correct terminology. This must be understood and used when answering questions. The examination follows terminology which is often used in the specification, so candidates should be familiar with all of that terminology.

Some candidates do not perform as well as expected because they do not read the questions carefully before answering. This problem needs to be addressed if candidates are to achieve at the level expected.

Time management for candidates is important and was well managed by the vast majority of candidates with very little evidence on incomplete papers.

The portfolio units performed at a slightly higher level than in the last session, however, there remains a problem with Centres not carrying out effective internal standardisation and also marking work too leniently.

Portfolio work continues to cause difficulties where work has not been marked with good annotation. Centres should be mindful that moderators do not re-mark work, but assess the markers' grading decision. It follows, therefore, that the more signposts created by the markers' annotation the more likely that the moderator's decisions will be in agreement with the Centre.

The Principal Moderator has noted that candidates who are given the opportunity to carry out relevant primary research often perform well on the portfolios, as they take a greater degree of ownership than those reliant purely on secondary evidence. Some of the well prepared work does show evidence of challenging targets being set for candidates and evidence of considerable independent work. This all helps the candidate to achieve higher standards in the final preparation of their work.

Overall, the qualification performed appropriately. The quality of written work seen in both the portfolio work and in the examined unit scripts was frequently of a good standard and sometimes exceptional with far less evidence of very low quality work.

4875 Investigating Leisure and Tourism

This January session involved fewer candidates than in previous sessions and it was noticed that the cohort involved contained less 'weak' candidates, a trend which has continued from the previous two sessions. There seemed to be few candidates who did not attempt all questions and the majority of candidates completed the paper in the time given.

Candidates often showed a higher level of knowledge than in previous sessions but the ability to analyse and evaluate remains an issue as few candidates could achieve Level 3 marks on the part (d) questions. Generally, some very good responses were marked, with some clearly outstanding papers. Candidates seem to have improved their use of the stimulus material given using it to score many lower level marks. There were far fewer answers taken from general knowledge than in the past. There seemed to be a good balance of answers across all questions. This is pleasing as candidates seem to be learning both the leisure and tourism parts of the course.

1(a) – Virtually all candidates answered correctly with responses being drawn from the stimulus given.

1(b) – Most candidates scored well on this part of the question demonstrating that they knew the difference between a leisure assistant and a fitness instructor. The main problem causing a loss of marks arose when candidates thought that lifeguards taught swimming lessons. They may well do this but it is not part of their lifeguard role.

1(c) - On the whole candidates answered appropriately. However, several discussed the importance of providing a range of products and services to the organisation, rather than how the range meets the needs of customers. At the upper end of the mark scheme, few candidates managed to break the question down into the different customer types which would have enhanced their answers.

1(d) – This part of the question was answered to a reasonable standard with the majority of candidates demonstrating some understanding of disposable income. However, for many this was a direct link to earning more, rather than a full understanding of disposable income. Where disposable income theory was explained at the start of an answer candidate tended to give a very clear answer. Those who only had a vague understanding were not able to expand the answer or apply their knowledge.

2(a) – A very well answered part of the question with answers taken directly from the stimulus as required.

2(b) – Overall this part of the question was well answered. However, many candidates only scored four of the six marks available as they failed to offer a description to each part of the answer. Of note was the impression that many candidates described the adult element, but could not do so for teenagers or children under five years of age.

2(c) - Some candidates failed to answer the question asked and discussed or identified the range of services at a visitor attraction or explained the benefits to the customer of those services, rather than explaining the importance to the organisation. This meant that many candidates failed to reach Level 2 in the mark scheme and so were awarded no more than three out of the six marks available.

2(d) – Many candidates understood the question and made a reasonable attempt. Those at the upper end of the mark band showed the skills of analysis but at the lower end many candidates merely gave a list of the factors to consider. There were, however, some excellent answers

Report on the Units taken in January 2009

which considered a range of factors and were able to analyse these considerations in some detail.

3(a) Virtually all candidates managed to score four marks on this part of the question demonstrating the knowledge required by the question.

3(b) Two services were often explained well; however, the Guides speaking a foreign language was interpreted in many ways such as audio guides, translators who would translate documents while in the TIC and guides who deal with your needs in another language suggesting they were holiday representatives.

3(c) Candidates on the whole answered by identifying all the historical features and what the attraction had to offer, again they failed to link this to why the features might appeal to adult visitors. Some candidates did not choose appropriate places and discussed areas such as London, shopping and sport venues.

3(d) Candidates discussed the recession (credit crunch) and its effect. The main answer for the majority of them was centred around cost and individuals not having enough money. Some candidates considered terrorism and a few considered the impact of the Olympics, but these tended to be at the top end of the mark band and so were addressed by too few candidates.

4(a) Many candidates scored maximum marks. Where they failed to score well was generally when they answered with names of online organisations such as Expedia, rather than the service provided.

4(b) The majority of candidates scored very well on this part of the question, however the descriptions of the term low cost airline were often weak. Candidates often understood low cost airlines to have poor safety, poor customer service or poor or unsafe aircraft, which is somewhat mis-guided.

4(c) There remains too much confusion between a package 'holiday' and an 'all-inclusive' holiday. Many candidates mixed the two terms completely and so could not receive full marks.

4(d) Some candidates did not understand what an independent holiday involved and a small cohort discussed and confused their answer with online booking. Others briefly discussed an independent holiday and then focused on a package holiday. Where candidates were familiar with the term, they focussed on points such as choice of accommodation, airport transfer issues and overall cost. The weakest candidates simply talked about the cost being higher than a package.

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 and were able to apply it to the requirements of the assessment criteria. These candidates, who had visited their chosen organisation and had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for students), generally produced more informed and perceptive portfolios than the few centres where candidates had relied on secondary research; their work was generally characterized by a lack of 'ownership' of the information. Some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a coach tour company) which meant that they had to complete a disproportionate amount of work to access full marks for a2 and b2. Centres should also ensure that the organisation chosen 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 that had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also used 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 this causes delays to the moderation process, as does the late submission of marks to moderators (after January 10th or May 15th, as appropriate) and that consequently there is the possibility that the publication of candidates' results might be delayed.

It still 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 they had presented; too often, evidence that 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 some 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 assessment 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 in general 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 some centres still do not encourage candidates to acknowledge 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.

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, that is included should be worked on by the candidate in some way, by highlighting or annotation, for example.

a3 – it was encouraging that a number of candidates were able to analyse at the required level and to relate the products/services to the pricing structure, by considering, for example, cost plus pricing, differential pricing for high and low seasons or the reasons for providing a family ticket; however a number of candidates still 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 strand d.

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, although many do.

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 still 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 most 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 number of 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 + 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 – most candidates attempted this criterion and 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 'better' 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 address this criterion successfully

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 so 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. These candidates had often had the opportunity to talk with the management (many organisations provide tailored talks for students) and generally produced more informed and perceptive portfolios than those who relied on secondary research; this work was generally characterized by a lack of 'ownership' of the information. Some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a coach tour company) which meant that they had to complete a disproportionate amount of work to access full marks for strand b. Centres should ensure that the organisation chosen 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 that had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also used 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 this causes delays to the moderation process, as does the late submission of marks to moderators (after January 10th or May 15th, as appropriate) and that consequently there is the possibility that the publication of candidates' results might be delayed.

It still 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 they had presented; too often, evidence that 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 some 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 assessment 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 in general 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; most centres submitted a Centre Authentication form with their portfolios and most candidates acknowledged their information sources, although some still failed to do this. 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.

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 short 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 just give 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 b 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; there is still much confusion about what an internal customer is and how the organisation meets their needs. The complaints procedure must also be explained.

b3 – relatively few candidates were able to evaluate the way their organisation met its customers' needs; those that did made good 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 – this was met by the majority of candidates. The description must make reference to the organisation for 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 provide evidence both this criterion and d2.

d2 – this was met by many 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.

Some of the evidence provided for this was still 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 than rely on the general and often bland comments that may be 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
Leisure & Tourism (Specification Code 1495)
January 2009 Examination Series

Component Threshold Marks

Unit		Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4875	Raw	100	91	82	73	65	58	51	44	37	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4876	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	18	14	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4877	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	18	14	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

Entry Information

Unit	Total Entry
4875	1366
4876	276
4877	209

Specification Aggregation Results

Grade	A*A*	A*A	AA	AB	BB	BC
UMS	270	255	240	225	210	195
Cum %	0	0	0	0	0	0

Grade	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG	U
UMS	180	165	150	135	120	105	90	75	60	0
Cum %	0	0	3.23	9.68	22.58	25.81	38.71	54.84	67.74	100

There were 147 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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2009