

Applied Leisure and Tourism (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1495**

Report on the Units

June 2008

1495/MS/R/08

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 2008

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 Report	1
4875 Investigating Leisure and Tourism	3
4876 Marketing in Leisure and Tourism	5
4877 Customer Service in Leisure and Tourism	8
Grade Thresholds	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Chief Examiner Report

Candidates performed across the mark ranges with the statistics showing that the mark spread produced a very good distribution curve around a mean mark of 49 for the examined unit. The portfolio units produced better performance with both scoring a mean of around 28. Evidence suggests that the candidates entered for those units clearly responded well to portfolio work.

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 which require in- depth research, analysis and judgement. The quality of written work seen in both the portfolio work and in the examination scripts, was frequently of a good standard and sometimes exceptional. Hopefully this improvement will continue in the remaining sessions for this qualification. However, delivery of the specification is still causing problems and some issues regarding the vocational elements of the course need to be addressed in advance of the forthcoming series of assessments in order to enable candidates to achieve the best possible overall grade.

Many examples of examination answers showed continuing signs of promise, especially in relation to the demonstration of the higher order skills on the examination unit in comparison with previous sessions. It was very pleasing to see that the specification material is being delivered effectively by the majority of Centres. However, there are a number of general points that still apply. The following have been noted on many occasions both in this session and in previous sessions.

- Some candidates do not read the questions carefully enough. Key words are often missed with candidates appearing to answer the question they would like to answer, rather than the actual question on the examination paper. Candidates often lose many marks through this careless approach. This remains the biggest problem for many candidates.
- Many candidates are failing to notice command words. The main problem is still with the command word 'describe'. This requires more than a basic outline or just an identification.

It is evident from the Principal Examiners' report that many candidates had not learned enough of the specification to enable high overall marks to be achieved. Limiting a candidates learning to a reduced range of topics is likely to lead to the candidate gaining an overall mark which is lower than their ability suggests. There was a lot of evidence to suggest that candidates do well on two or three questions but rarely on all four and, therefore, tend to achieve a grade 'd' rather than a grade 'c'. This observation ties in with the fact that teacher predictions are generally higher than candidates' actual performance.

All of the questions were answered well by some candidates – and there were some excellent answers. This suggests that the examination was accessible to the candidates entered.

It was pleasing to read the Principal Moderator's report which suggests that Centres are page numbering and referencing candidates' work, thus making the moderation process run smoothly. Annotation of work, however, is still weak in some Centres and this suggests that internal standardisation is weak. In the portfolio work there was clear evidence to show that where Centres had visited organisations and spoken to management, candidates were able to produce more informed and perceptive portfolios than those relying on secondary research for their investigations. There do, however, appear to be continued weaknesses in that some Centres continue to choose organisations which are too large for a thorough investigation to be undertaken. This does, unfortunately, limit the access of candidates to the appropriate information and the higher mark bands.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

Where Centres are unsure of any particular aspect of the specification, they are strongly advised to follow the guidance offered in the Principal Examiners' report, the Principal Moderator's report, attend training seminars and, where appropriate, to seek clarification from OCR.

4875 Investigating Leisure and Tourism

General Comments

As in previous sessions there was a real mix of ability amongst the candidates entered for this examination. Some very accessible questions were misunderstood by many candidates but marked in a positive manner by examiners. Some literacy skills were notably lacking as handwriting was often difficult to read and there was very poor spelling of commonly used words.

Candidates still struggle with the higher order skills, i.e., the ability to analyse and evaluate. There was generally quite a good response with many candidates scoring mid range marks and quite a few high grades. The question paper seemed appropriate for the candidature taking the examination, with the vast majority completing in the time allocated and very few no response answers. Candidates made good use of the stimulus material given.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1a This part of the question was generally well done. Some candidates are still mixing up components or using incorrect terminology from that given in the specification.
- 1b This part of the question was well answered. The mark scheme was very flexible as candidates often gave descriptions in place of identification and vice versa. Examiners gave an extension mark for an example or a description to ensure fairness to candidates.
- 1c There were reasonable responses to this part of the question although not all candidates explained using customer types as asked and so their marks were capped. Candidates were credited with some vague answers as they were probably not old enough to have experience the range of products and services offered.
- 1d Libraries – candidates again failed to grasp the concept of development with many responses being based around the idea that ‘now you can borrow books’. Nevertheless, there were some good responses, including the use of technology and dvd type answers. The very best candidates recognised the changes to the ambiance and furniture, as well as the loanable items.

- 2a Again, for those candidates who had been taught components, this was a straightforward four marks. The component which troubled most was ‘sport and physical recreation’. This component appeared in many guises which were not credited. Candidates must use the correct terminology to score marks on such straightforward questions.
- 2b There were one or two problems with this part of the question, particularly with the improved transport section. Candidates were rarely able to explain how improved transport links can help increase the use and growth of the leisure industry. Many tried to discuss profit for transport providers rather than accessibility for various user groups. The other two sections were generally dealt with competently.
- 2c Links questions are now better answered. Quite a few candidates answered using one destination example – this usually worked very well. Many candidates tried to use a theme park which was quite successful - especially now the on-site hotels have been developed. Some candidates tried to use their local leisure centre as the destination, although this did not always allow for good responses.
- 2d This part of the question generated some awful generalisations and some terrible stereotyping. On the whole, however, quite a few good marks were gained here as many candidates referred to the active lifestyle element. Weaker candidates often failed to give any activity examples or gave two lists of possible activities.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 3a This part of the question was very well answered by many candidates. However some were confused by the question and answered by giving answers such as B& B, half-board or 'all-inclusive'.
- 3b This part of the question was very well answered as most knew the definitions and gained full marks.
- 3c Some weaker candidates got mixed up, but generally most knew the role of the travel agent and guessed for the tour operator. Many of the weaker answers explained the role of a resort representative instead of a tour operator.
- 3d Key features of a package holiday should be an accessible question for many candidates given the nature of the specification and candidates' own experiences. However, many scored Level 1 marks. Much confusion still exists with all inclusive holidays and/or lone travellers on a backpacking adventure. This type of definition should be a distinct part of the candidate's learning.
- 4a This part of the question was very well answered, with very few candidates not scoring maximum marks.
- 4b Some candidates just repeated the question in their answer. Better candidates clearly identified each term and gave an answer with an example.
- 4c Some reasonable answers to this part of the question. Many candidates used the quick, safe, cheap type of response, quite a few scoring full marks.
- 4d Many candidates discussed travel and accommodation elements. Few were able to consider the real needs of a conference attendee. Too many candidates did not really understand the term conference and felt that this would be a low budget 'do it on a shoestring' type event. The other major problem was that candidates failed to consider the two day element. Again, 'discuss' was a skill not all candidates could demonstrate.

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 chosen 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. Some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a tour company) which meant that they had to complete a disproportionate amount of work to access full marks for a2. 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 (c)).

The majority of Centres submitted portfolios which 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 10 January or 15 May, as appropriate) and 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 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 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 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 mark band 1 is in general a prerequisite for award of marks in mark band 2, etc., but also that the statements in mark 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 (CCS160) with their portfolios, only a relatively small number of 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. 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.

Comments on Individual Strands

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 zoo, whilst only briefly mentioning the animals.

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, differential pricing for high and low seasons 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 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 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 – 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 criterion 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 requires 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 chosen 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. Some candidates had chosen large organisations (such as a 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 which 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 10 January or 15 May, as appropriate) and 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 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 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 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 mark band 1 is in general a prerequisite for award of marks in mark band 2, etc., but also that the statements in mark 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 (CCS160) with their portfolios, only a small number of 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.

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.

Comments on Individual Strands

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 which 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. 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 the information provided by the organisation or conducted their own research. Analysis of the complaints procedure could 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 which the organisation provides for its customers.

c3 – This was 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 which 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 criterion 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 leisure and tourism industries; 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 than 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 customer (such as individuals of different ages, families, business people, customers with specific needs, etc) seeking three different types of customer service (such as information, advice, seeking to buy, wanting to change a booking, etc).

e2 – This was met by relatively few candidates, due partly to a lack of supporting evidence.

e3 – This was met by relatively few candidates, due partly to a 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, a 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)
June 2008 Examination Series**

Component Threshold Marks

Unit		Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4875	Raw	100	94	85	76	67	59	51	43	35	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	2713
4876	2915
4877	3001

Specification Aggregation Results

Grade	A*A*	A*A	AA	AB	BB	BC
UMS	270	255	240	225	210	195
Cum %	0.33	1.30	3.68	7.81	13.76	22.37

Grade	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG	U
UMS	180	165	150	135	120	105	90	75	60	0
Cum %	32.07	42.54	51.90	60.62	67.81	75.12	81.40	87.48	92.07	100

There were 3280 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