Examiner's Report

January 2010

GCE Travel & Tourism (6993/01)

Unit 7 – Responsible Tourism

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

6993: Responsible Tourism

This was the seventh paper for this unit. Questions were set to assess candidates' learning of the content of the specification. Questions were devised to meet the requirements of the Assessment Objectives (AO) which are given on page 155 of the specification. These are summarised below together with the weightings to be applied for this unit.

	Summary of AO	Weightings	Typical requirements of questions
AO1	Knowledge and understanding	20 – 25%	Describe, state, explain, identify, comment on.
AO2	Application of knowledge and understanding	20 – 25%	Explain, suggest, state.
AO3	Research and analysis	25 – 30%	Analyse, 'give an example you have researched', 'give details'
AO4	Evaluation, reasoned conclusions, justified recommendations	25 – 30%	Assess, suggest, 'give your opinion', recommend, justify.

The table also shows the typical requirements of questions designed to address the Assessment Objectives.

There were 90 marks available on this paper.

This report will comment on each question in the paper. It will comment on the general performance of the question and the key strengths and weaknesses in responses. Examples will be given and suggestions for improvement will be included.

Overview

There were two case study destinations in this paper, one from the More Economically Developed World (MEDW) and one overseas destination from the Less Economically Developed World (LEDW). The UK destination was Bournemouth, a seaside resort and the overseas destination, Nepal, a countryside/wilderness area. For this paper, question three focused on the Management of Responsible Tourism and The Impacts of Tourism. Each question was worth 30 marks and within each, the more challenging questions targeting AO4 and AO3 were towards the end of each section.

As in the last series, candidates seemed to engage very well with most aspects of the paper and the majority attempted all questions and were able to demonstrate knowledge and a good understanding of responsible tourism. Poor exam technique was still evident; this series most commonly time management spending too long on some questions and not leaving enough time for those at the end of the paper. This was most often seen in 1e and 2c the analysis and assessment questions where candidates used extra sheets of paper but were then unable to complete question

1

Candidates need to judge how many extra marks they are likely to pick up by writing another page for one question as opposed to how many they could lose by not answering the last two or three questions. Marks cannot be given where the answer is blank. The space provided for answers is designed to give candidates an indication of how much they need to write in relation to the marks. Whilst it is perfectly acceptable to use extra sheets this should not be to the detriment of other questions.

Poor exam technique was also evident where candidates had not recognised the topics being tested and in particular wrote about the principles of responsible tourism across all three questions. However, it was reassuring to see the continued improvements in exam techniques and it was felt that this aided candidate achievement. There was clear evidence that some candidates had planned their responses and this is a good technique which can aid achievement. As seen in the last series some candidates highlighted the command verb in each question to help them focus on what the question required them to do. Also some candidates had guessed the Assessment Objective for each question; this can help focus candidates into understanding what skill they are being tested on for each question. Also noting the topic number as a reminder of the topic being tested. There was continued evidence of improved exam preparation with regards the higher level skill of analysis, good use of linking statements evident. Also sound evaluative skills were in evidence this series with some excellent responses where candidates justified their views and drew conclusions. There was much evidence of past exam papers and mark schemes being accessed and used as case studies, although with varying degrees of success. Some candidates are also clearly checking their answers and ticking off each part of the question to make sure they have covered everything. Others made annotations on the case study text to highlight impacts and other key evidence they may need.

 Overall, the common key areas of weakness were:

- Lack of knowledge of unit content - 1aii), 1bi/ii), 1c), 2ai), 2bi), 2bii), 3ai), 3aii), 3ci), 3cii)
- Not observing the structure of the question paper and change in topics
- Not using information given in the case studies to show application 1e), 2c),
- Giving evidence of research using a destination they had studied - 3b) and 3d).
- Lack of understanding of the term 'tourism development proposal and command 'describe in detail' - 2d). Suggested activities and further guidelines are included in previous Examiner reports.

Lack of knowledge of unit content - 1aii), 1bi/ii), 1c), 2ai), 2bi), 2bii), 3ai), 3aii), 3ci/cii)
This paper directly tested candidates' knowledge and understanding of topics and terms found in the unit specification. Candidates are expected to have a good understanding of the unit content. Candidates should be able to identify or describe the key characteristics of each stage of the TALC model (1aii). They should be able to apply this knowledge using the model and/or information given in

the case study to suggest which stage a destination has reached (1ai). They should be able to give reasons for suggesting a stage. There should be an understanding of the role and objectives/aims of agents of tourism development in each sector. The role and sector of national agents/tourist boards/government bodies etc. should be known – (1bi/ii). They should be able to describe and explain impact of tourism development and be able to use appropriate terminology (1c, 2bii, 3ai/ii). Candidates should be able to describe, state or explain the principles of responsible tourism as detailed in the unit specification (2ai). These types of questions have appeared on past papers and should be familiar. They should understand the difference between an objective of tourism development (2bi) and an impact of tourism development. They should be able to suggest appropriate objectives as detailed in the specification. Candidates should also be able to describe and explain strategies used to manage the impacts of tourism (3ci/cii). They should be able to explain how positive impacts are maximised and how negative impacts are minimised through these strategies.

Not observing the structure of the question paper and change in topics.
As seen in previous series, candidates' responses have often referred to the principles of responsible tourism throughout the paper, in all questions as if for good measure. Some seem unable to distinguish between objectives, impacts and principles and these terms may need clarification in terms of topics. Candidates should be aware that the papers are carefully constructed to have a logical sequence and recognisable format. They should know that knowledge of the principles of responsible tourism is only likely to be tested in a few questions and these questions are likely to be in the same section. So whilst there may be reference to the term 'responsible tourism' (i.e. the unit title) across the paper unless the question asks specifically about the principles candidates do not need to describe them in every question. Whereas the topic '**The impacts of tourism development**' is central to the whole unit of study and tends to be tested across the paper with different emphasis in each question. Once candidates recognise this kind of structure they should know what they need to write about where, and realise that they should not be repeating answers.

Candidates should always read their answers to double check that they have actually answered the question asked. Questions one and two on this paper are designed around the two destinations in the case study. Candidates should be aware that the sub-division of question 1 into 1a, 1b etc indicates a change in topic. These may be sub-divided again into 1ai, 1aii etc which means the questions are all about the same topic and are related. Candidates should be encouraged to pay attention to question numbering as they go through the question paper.

On this paper, the first questions in each section clearly set the scene. Question paper analysis is a useful technique to use in the classroom to disseminate previous papers and observe any patterns.

Q1 - Bournemouth
- Agents involved in tourism development (7.2).
- The stages of the Tourist Area Life Cycle (7.4)
- The Impacts of tourism (7.3)

6993/01 - GCE Travel & Tourism
Examiners' Report January 2010

Q2 – Nepal
- Responsible tourism (7.1)
- The impacts of tourism development (7.3)

Q3 – open/own research
- The management of responsible tourism in destinations (7.5)
- The impacts of tourism (7.3)

Not using information given in the case studies to show application (1e, 2c)
Although many question papers showed evidence of candidates underlining and annotating key pieces of information in the case studies, few used this information in the questions testing the higher level skills. By now candidates should be familiar with the structure of the paper and know these questions appear towards the end of each section. It is particularly crucial that they remember to apply their knowledge and support statements made by including specific information from the case study. For many, this was achieved more successfully in 1e, perhaps the material on Bournemouth was more accessible, but even here candidates would refer to 'more jobs/more money' without picking out the number of jobs to be created, already 1 in 6 employed in tourism, in excess of £500m earned, new high spending surfers i.e. all 'clues' given in the text.

Giving evidence of research using a destination they had studied (Q3b and Q3d)
It is recognised that it is not possible to study all possible destinations; some ideas were well documented in the Examiner's report of the January 2009 series. One key issue this series was the inappropriate choice of destination. It has previously been suggested that candidates should think in terms of three types of destinations – countryside/wilderness; seaside/coastal and tourist towns/cities and whether the destination is in the LEDW or MEDW. If candidates researched one destination for each of the three categories they would soon realise that in the MEDW most of their research will concern impacts on the economy and the environment, whether positive or negative. Consequently management of impacts will focus on these two types. To research socio-cultural impacts the best examples will be found in the LEDW. Classroom and group activities can encourage candidates to think more about why this is to gain a greater understanding. When gathering research candidates could also be encouraged to think 'less is more' it is not necessary to research lots of impacts but to gather detail that can be recalled in an exam situation. Such as place names, project names, statistics etc. It is better to write in specific detail about two or three impacts than write in general about five. In the UK, National Parks provide excellent resources.

Candidate performance

Question one
Question one focuses on the Impacts of Tourism in the UK, a MEDC – economic and environmental impacts. It covers the stages of the Tourist Area Life Cycle model, agents involved in tourism development in the UK and their roles.
Many of the questions in question one have appeared before and should be familiar to candidates.

4

1(a)
This question was about the stages of the Tourist Area Life Cycle.

1(a)(i)
This question was not answered particularly well by many candidates and a wide variety of stages were suggested. Development stage was cited by many who had not read the information closely and noticed that transport and hotel, attractions were developed in 1870 and 1885. Many did gain one mark for involvement or exploration – both stages were accepted.

1(a)(ii)
Results varied. The question was not dependent on 1ai and marks could be gained even if the incorrect stage had been given in 1ai. There was evidence of much guesswork. When answering these questions candidates should give the characteristics that most clearly define the stage. It appeared that knowledge of both exploration and involvement stages is weak. Candidates should be able to identify/describe and/or explain at least four characteristics for each stage of the Tourist Area Life Cycle model and preferably they should study the main or key characteristics that clearly define each stage. Many responses were vague 'developing', 'more tourism', 'no impacts', 'more visitors than last stage'.
Those who knew the characteristics of each stage and gave precise statements often scored full marks.

1(b)
This question tested the topic of the agents involved in tourism development.

1(b)(i)
This required to indicate with a cross the sector that each organization belongs to. Candidates did well and many got scored three marks. Surprisingly, a number did struggle with South West Tourism and indicated it was in the voluntary sector. Knowledge of agents, government bodies and national organizations is fundamental to the study of travel and tourism candidates are expected to recognize the names of the regional tourist bodies and understand their roles. Most have very informative websites with educational pages.

1(b)(ii)
This was answered quite well by most candidates who gained the mark. However it is an example of where candidates did not recognize the topic and some candidates stated one of the principles of responsible tourism and not a role of an agent of tourism development. Some candidates made general reference to 'providing a service' and did not gain any marks. Others stated 'promoting tourism', as on this paper only one mark was available they picked up the mark. Had more marks been available more specific details and application would be expected. The best responses related to Bournemouth and the south west region and/or developing tourism in terms of strategies, analysis advisory and support roles.

1(b)(iii)
This question was answered fairly well by many who gave full and appropriate details of the role of Bournemouth Borough Council in relation to developing tourism and scored 2 marks; many were less successful with the role of Imax and simply referred to making profit which is their. A small minority scored full marks

5

by actually explaining the difference between their roles, and by using the information given on the paper. There was evidence of good technique and use of linking statements 'whereas' 'however', with varying degrees of success. Most popular was that Imax had economic objective but was interested in developing attractions to bring in more tourists to make more money for itself, the company compared to Bournemouth Borough Council's wider role of boosting local economy through tourism development.

1(c)
This is a new topic and is testing knowledge of the impacts of tourism. This was answered well by many candidates. The question required them to explain what is meant by the multiplier effect. Those who clearly knew this economic impact scored full marks with detailed and exemplified responses. Others incorrectly wrote about how to avoid leakage and the principles of responsible tourism 'jobs for locals' and did not focus on the positive economic impact of tourists spending money leading to the benefits of the multiplier effect. A surprising number inexplicably wrote about 'word of mouth'.

An example of a weak response, more about avoiding leakage than explaining the multiplier effect:

"Where tourists bring money into the local community and locals benefit as money stays in the community. The host community spends money in shops who buy from local farmers. The money coming in does not leak out into countries like the USA".

A better response:

"The multiplier effect is when tourists are spending their money in hotels and tourist attractions. Some of this money goes to pay the staff working in the hotels etc. and the money from tourism then circulates throughout the whole of the local economy and benefits non tourism businesses. E.g. the hotel worker spends their money in the butchers shop and the shop earns more money and some of this pays their staff and they spend money elsewhere and so on."

1(d)
This is a different topic and relates back to the TALC model. This question was answered well by many candidates. It required an explanation of how Boscombe had reached the rejuvenation stage. Candidates who used the information provided and referred directly to the characteristics of the stage scored full marks. Some just described the three aspects of the scheme and did not give any reasoning or link to the characteristics of the stage and scored two of the possible four marks. A number misinterpreted the question and wrote about how the resort had reached its peak, stagnated and needed to do something. When answering these types of questions a useful technique is to start the answer by saying -
"The main characteristics of the X stage of the TALC model are ....The destination can be said to have reached this stage because ...." Candidates need to make it clear to the examiner that they know the characteristics of the stage and then apply this knowledge and use the case study. Candidates will not score full marks

6

if they do not clearly link and identify the characteristics of the stage to the case study.

1(e)

A change in topic – impacts of tourism. This was answered fairly well by most candidates. The question required candidates to analyse the likely impacts of the Boscombe Spa Village Scheme. Overall, candidates related well to the case study information and picked out likely impacts. Candidates need to be reminded to follow instructions and read questions more closely. They were instructed to refer to environmental and economic impacts only – and relevant clues were provided in the case study. This instruction was overlooked by some who wrote about socio-cultural impacts e.g. loss of culture, crime, quality of life and these responses were more theoretical rather than applied to Bournemouth area. Many candidates scored marks in Level 2 either for analysis with limited application to the Bournemouth area or for application and limited analysis. Up to 10 marks were available and some excellent high Level 2, Level 3 responses were seen from candidates who produced a balanced analysis of both impacts and developed their ideas to offer a sustained analysis. Success was achieved through good practice, use of case study information, following the instructions, and developing each impact to produce a sustained analysis.

Question Two

Question two covered the topics of Responsible Tourism and also focused on socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism development in Nepal, a LEDC. The destination is a countryside/wilderness area and so environmental impacts are considered. It also looks at appropriate tourism development in such a destination.

2(a)(i)

This question directly tests knowledge of the principles of responsible tourism.
This question saw mixed results. Candidates were asked to describe two principles of responsible tourism. They are expected to know these and they are given in the unit specification. Four marks were available and those candidates who knew the principles scored full marks. As in previous series a surprising number still do not appear to know the principles and gave a variety of suggestions – including impacts, Fair-trade, green tourism.

2(a)(ii)

This is the same topic as it is still 2a.
This question was answered quite well by most candidates although few scored full marks. The question required an explanation of how each principle given in 2ai could be achieved. Whilst many candidates gave valid suggestions few scored the full marks available as they did not offer an explanation. Some explained what the tourists could do and did not score marks, it is about what the developers, agents, providers, tourism planners and local authorities could do. Those who chose 'to minimise negative environmental, economic and socio-cultural impacts' then gave a brief suggestion for each, when full marks could have more easily been achieved by just explaining how one negative impact could be reduced.
An example of a response that scored 2 out of possible 3 marks:

"To minimize negative environmental impact use traffic management and a park and ride scheme. To minimize negative economic impacts employ local people. To minimize negative socio-cultural impacts use a code of conduct".

Here the candidate has listed three appropriate suggestions but does not offer any explanation to get the full marks

A response scoring full marks:

"To promote conservation of natural and cultural heritage – Use laws to create like a national park, so that nothing gets built that would damage natural habitats and disturb wildlife offer guided walks build to educate tourists and raise awareness and funds to help protect the area"

2(b)(i)
This is a different topic, agents of tourism development. As the destination in question two is a LEDC the role of the government as an agent of tourism development is key and candidates should be aware of governmental objectives for tourism development. Past paper analysis will show this type of question often appears in conjunction with a destination in the LEDW.
This question was not well answered by most candidates. Candidates were asked to suggest one socio-cultural objective of tourism the Nepalese government was likely to have. This type of question has appeared before, but, as in past series generated a variety of responses. Some just quoted one of the principles, some gave impacts, some wrote about environmental or economic objectives, some gave objections, some suggested more tourism, others suggested guided tours, educate the tourists. Many wrote too much! Detailed responses are not needed for this question – objective. Candidates should recognise that this type of question requires a clear, concise response stated as an objective. Lots of classroom activities could be developed around the four types of governmental objectives of tourism. They need to think nationally not locally. A small number scored full marks for an appropriate objective. Weaker responses could gained 1 mark for basic ideas about keeping the culture.

An example of a weak response:

"To educate new tourists on the country's rare animals in order to preserve the environment"

An example of a response scoring full marks:
"To promote positive host-tourist interactions through cultural understanding"

2bii
This was answered quite well by some candidates. The question was testing knowledge of socio-cultural impacts and four marks were available for descriptions. Understanding of socio-cultural impacts is a common weak area. Many responses related to environmental impacts and did not score any marks. Similarly a large number gave 'jobs' which is an economic impact. Full marks were awarded either for detailed descriptions (examples were accepted as detail) or for precision/terminology. A number of candidates with a good understanding gained

maximum marks and some excellent responses were seen. The majority however scored just 1 or 2 marks 'loss of culture' being the most popular.

An example of a response scoring full marks:

"1. The demonstration effect - local people see the 'rich' tourists and aspire to be like them and have what they have. This leads to a dilution of their culture as locals imitate tourists.

2. Displacement - local people have to move away from their ancestral homes and land to make way for tourism developments".

2c
This question was answered fairly well by many candidates. The question required candidates to make an assessment - to what extent they agreed with the view that the proposed development would bring mainly negative impacts. Most candidates reacted well to this question and the information in the case study. Good practice/exam technique was evident in those responses that opened with -

'*In my opinion....*' '*I think..*'

These responses also tended to offer a conclusion summing up their thoughts. Many were at level 2.

Application to the Annapurna region was limited at times as some candidates did not make the best use of the information provided, especially with regard environmental impacts. Lots of clues about wildlife and the forest and lowlands were given in the case study. Candidates should use all the information provided.

The majority considered the impacts on the local people in some detail and produced good assessments using the information and wrote about the local teahouses, and their subsistence lifestyle. For balance assessment and application, they should also have picked up on the clues given with regards the environment and named the rare animals rather than referring generally to 'wildlife' and instead of 'loss of habitat' could have referred to the 'Terai' lowlands and forests.

Assessment was present in the majority of cases although at times, this was quite superficial, many candidates were able to produce responses with some assessment and some application and gain level 2 marks. Once again, those who managed to produce answers with sustained assessment produced some excellent responses, extending their answers to show their ability to apply and provide detailed and reasoned conclusions. There were many who only had to develop their ideas a little further who would have gained that higher mark at the top end of Level 2 or into Level 3.

2d
This question was not well answered. Candidates did not understand the term 'tourism development proposal', and did not follow the command 'describe in detail'. Overall, scores for this question were low. This type of question has appeared on past papers and guidelines and techniques are given in previous

9

Examiner reports. The question is assessing higher level skills in terms of making recommendations about vocationally related issues or problems.

Candidates were expected to recognise that the information given under the heading 'Golfers threaten Nepal peace' included tourism development proposals. They were asked to describe a proposal for the region that would meet the principles of responsible tourism. For these questions the starting point is 'describe' so first 'identify' what the proposal is e.g. 'eco-lodge', 'safari-holiday', 'elephant-trekking' then describe where it is, and what the tourist would experience. Its appropriateness in terms of being responsible does not need to be explained by candidates, this can be inferred and judged by examiners. Ideas for proposals should be based on the information given in the case study. Proposals could have included a new attraction, new activity, new type of tourism, new facility, accommodation, event etc. Too many either gave no proposal or just explained how to achieve the principles.

It was clear that some candidates had prepared for this question from past papers and many gave a 'standard answer' suggesting a museum – built of local materials, information on the cultural and environmental heritage, interactive displays, employs locals, guided tours etc.

Marks were restricted where there was no clear application or relevance to developing responsible tourism in the Annapurna region a remote, mountainous area in a LEDC. Some candidates gave more creative and appropriate suggestions based on wildlife in the area with safaris, educational tours, nature-based tourism but rather than describing their suggestion explained how it would meet the principles and so marks were again limited.

Question Three

Overall, scores were lower on this question than questions one and two. This was possibly partly due to poor time management and running short of time towards the end of the paper. Question three offers candidates the opportunity to write about destinations studied/researched in terms of impacts and how impacts are managed. The question focuses upon the topic of management strategies to control the impacts of tourism. Scores were lower due to candidates being unable to successfully answer the questions testing their knowledge of the specification in terms of management of strategies. Weaknesses in terms of giving evidence of research also contributed.

3(a)(i)
The question was well answered by many candidates. It required candidates to describe one negative environmental impact of tourism. Two marks were available for detail or precision/terminology. The most popular responses related to describing all types of pollution however if no links were made to tourism full marks were not possible. Candidates who referred to pollution caused by increased visitor numbers or more cars at a tourist destination scored full marks. Some wrote about global warming, carbon dioxide emissions and air travel, however these are not appropriate impacts of tourism in tourist destinations. Many scored full marks

10

for writing about loss of habitat when land is cleared to make way for new hotels etc. Vague references to damaging the environment did not gain marks.

3(a)(ii)

This question was fairly well answered by many. It required candidates to describe one positive socio-cultural impact of tourism for two marks awarded for detail or precision/terminology. As with the other questions testing knowledge of socio cultural impacts, responses were less successful than 3(a)(i) with many referring to jobs and employment. Whilst 'improved quality of life' gained a mark for the full marks it should have been linked to tourism developments improving infrastructure, services and community facilities. Employment is an economic impact.

3(b)

This was not particularly well answered by many. As already observed, understanding of socio cultural impacts on this and past papers has been shown to be a weak area and unsurprisingly candidates did not score particularly well on this question. An explanation of how tourism had led to socio-cultural impacts at a destination researched was required. A relatively significant number wrote about other types of impacts, in particular environmental impacts, rather than socio-cultural. It was expected that candidates would choose a destination in the LEDW as there are many suitable case studies; however, some chose inappropriate destinations such as the Norfolk Broads (destination used on a past paper). Benidorm was another popular choice (also used on a past paper) however responses lacked specific details to show research and related mainly to the loss of culture through the introduction of British pubs, traditional English breakfasts, fish and chips etc. As 8 marks were available, many did gain Level 2 marks for sound explanations but evidence of research tended to be limited and many responses were theoretical. Some excellent responses were seen where candidates were able to give specific detail and offered full explanations, although these were few.

3(c)(i)

3(c)(i) and 3(c)(ii) this type of question has appeared on previous papers. It tested knowledge of the key management strategies used to control the impacts of tourism in terms of minimizing negative impacts and maximizing positive impacts. As reported in both 2009 series this is a key weak area and most candidates appear to have little understanding. These strategies are listed in the unit specification. It is expected that candidates are able to explain all terms detailed in the unit specification in questions testing knowledge and understanding.

Many candidates did not score particularly well on this question. The question required an explanation of how the management strategy 'staff training and development' is used to maximize the positive impacts of tourism. Many incorrectly wrote about how tourists would benefit by better service and would return to the destination bringing more money in; others wrote about how locals could promote their culture; some who clearly used guesswork separated the strategy into 'staff training' to teach them about the culture and 'development' to build a museum, or new attractions. Full marks were gained by a small number of candidates who clearly understood the strategy and gave a full explanation related

11

to benefits to the local people in terms of improving skills, able to get better paid jobs and improved quality of life.

An example of a good response scoring full marks:

"With staff training and development the local people can be more educated and have the possibility of promotion in their jobs. This will increase their income and so their quality of life and standard of living will improve".

3(c)(ii)

This was not well answered by the majority of candidates who did not seem to have any understanding of the term whatsoever. The question required candidates to explain how the management strategy 'planning control' can be used to minimise negative environmental impacts. Many wrote about the planning stage in terms of environmental impact assessments (a different strategy) or the impacts of pollution and overcrowding and visitor/traffic management (another strategy) e.g. park and ride. Only a small number obtained more than 2 marks for explaining about legislation and regulation used to control what is built and where. Even those candidates who had some idea of the strategy seemed unable to link it to specific negative environmental impacts and could not give any details beyond '*reduce negative environmental impacts*'.

An example of a good response scoring full marks:

"*Planning control can improve the aesthetics of an area. For instance if the height of new buildings was restricted to two stories it would reduce eye-sores that uncontrolled tourism development creates. Laws that mean local and natural materials have to be used in construction will ensure that new buildings will blend in with their surroundings and it will look nicer. Setting aside conservation areas can help protect wildlife"*

3(d)

This question was not answered particularly well by the majority. As in 3b, candidates were required to write about a destination they had researched or studied. Fewer marks were available for this question which required an explanation of how the impacts of tourism had been managed.   There was lots of scope to write about all sorts of destinations and any type of impact, positive or negative. It was clear that some candidates had not prepared for these types of questions and some papers showed indecisiveness in terms of which destination to use. As in 3b, many gave destinations used on past paper. However, to be successful in these types of questions requires specific detail and explanation candidates therefore need to do more research of these destinations if they intend to use them in the exam. Overall, evidence of research was varied, and many responses were generalised and theoretical. Some incorrectly wrote about how to achieve the principles of responsible tourism and did not clearly focus on explaining how impacts of tourism had been managed.   Some wrote about The Eden Project, other gave hotels that used solar panels - these are not appropriate. The question is not about being 'environmentally friendly'. Some candidates gave details of the congestion charge in London; this is not managing the impacts of tourism it is controlling traffic and reducing pollution in a major city.

Candidates could adopt a more organized, selective and methodical approach for these types of questions:

1. Set the scene - offer a brief description of the destination – countryside, coastal, town, MEDC/LEDC including specifics such as place names/size.

2. Clearly identify what the impacts of tourism are in terms of positive/negative and economic, environmental or socio-cultural again with specific details. They do NOT need to write about lots of different impacts only those which have been managed.

3. Explain how the named impacts have been managed.

The most successful responses included examples of UK National Parks where specific locations and projects were named and explained, also the Grand Canyon was an interesting and successful choice.

Example of a good response:

Peak District National Park
"The Peak District is a countryside area, protected as a National Park. The main impacts in the Peak District are from the high volumes of tourists resulting in negative environmental impacts such as erosion of footpaths and loss of habitats.
A technique called zoning has been used to reduce these impacts. There is a 'Natural Zone' – no development is allowed, there no facilities for tourists such as toilets, cafes and shops, it's just wild open countryside and so few tourists go. It is not 'promoted' and visitors discover it for themselves. Then there are zones 1 and 2 that have a little development such as small car parks. Zone 3 has more intense recreation and development such as larger car parks and tourist facilities, information centers, and cafes. This is really where tourists are 'encouraged' into what is called a honey-pot area that can cope with the high volumes and so everything they need is found here. It allows more sensitive areas to be protected and stay 'natural' without destroying or disturbing the habitats for rare plants and animals."
Details such as the names of the places zoned as natural, or zones1, 2 and 3 and numbers of visitors would have provided a little more convincing evidence of research. This was one of the better responses seen and it is clear the candidate has studied the Peak District – there is an explanation and an appropriate method so Level 2 marks.

3(e)
This question was quite well answered by some, although few scored full marks. A similar question has appeared in the past. Candidates were required to suggest ways that tour operators could help destinations achieve responsible tourism. This is testing higher level skills.

As in 1d, explanations and descriptions of the principles of responsible tourism are not required. Suggestions are asked for and appropriateness in terms of responsible tourism will be judged by examiners as candidates have not been asked on this occasion to 'justify' or 'give reasons' for their suggestions.

13

Many of the candidates lost out on marks because they failed to develop their suggestions with detail. Those who gained higher marks provided more than two ways and developed their ideas with some detail. Many of the responses focused on 'the local people' and were unrealistic. A small number did develop the idea of donation schemes, awards for ethical tourism, green taxes, conservation projects however, these were very few.

An example of a response scoring full marks:

"*Tour operators could do this by giving their customers leaflet with their holiday confirmation, so they can read before they go. These could include information on the local culture, how to dress appropriately, shopping locally. They could employ local people as transfer reps to take holidaymakers from the airport to the hotels. Part of their profits could support an education or healthcare programme for local people.*"

14

GCE Travel & Tourism Grade Boundaries
Series - January 2010

Unit 1: The Travel and Tourism Industry (6987)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	62	55	48	41	35
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 2: The Travel and Tourism Customer (6988)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 3: Destination Europe (6989)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 4: Destination Britain (6990)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	45	39	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 5: Travelling Safely (6991)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	62	54	47	40	33
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 6: Resort Operation (6992)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	46	40	35	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 7: Responsible Tourism (6993)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	63	56	49	42	35
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 8: Current Issues in Travel and Tourism (6994)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 9: Working in Travel and Tourism (6995)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	48	42	36	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 10: Promotion and Sales in Travel and Tourism (6996)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	63	55	47	40	33
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 11: Special Interest Holidays (6997)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 12: Travel Organistions (6998 01)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	80	70	60	50	40

Notes

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

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

16