Examiners' Report

Summer 2010

GCSE Travel & Tourism (6993)
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/

Unit 7   Responsible Tourism   6993   June 2010

General Comments

This was the eighth paper for this unit. Questions were set to assess candidates' learning of the content of the specification given in the 'what you need to learn section'. Questions were devised to meet the requirements of the Assessment Objectives (AO) which are given on page 167 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	Demonstration of knowledge, understanding and skills	20 – 25%	Describe, state, explain, identify, comment on.
AO2	Application of knowledge, understanding and skills	20 – 25%	Explain, suggest, state.
AO3	Research and analysis	25 – 30%	Analyse, 'give an example you have researched', 'give details'
AO4	Evaluations, make judgements, draw reasoned conclusions, make recommendations about vocationally related problems and issues	25 – 30%	Assess, evaluate, suggest ways, '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.

Overview
There were two case study destinations in this paper, both from the More Economically Developed World (MEDW) one destination in the UK and one overseas destination. The UK destination was the Yorkshire Dales National Park a countryside area and the overseas destination, Ibiza. As seen in previous series, 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 question, the more challenging questions targeting AO4 and AO3 were towards the end of each section.

The majority of candidates seemed to engage well with most aspects of the paper and were able to demonstrate knowledge and a good understanding of responsible tourism. Poor exam technique was still evident. As seen in the last series most commonly time management, spending too long on some questions and not leaving enough time for

those at the end of the question paper. Candidates are advised to keep an eye on the time as they work through the paper, they could allocate a maximum time allowance for each question based on the fact that there are 90 questions, 90 marks and 90 minutes so one mark per minute. If they exceed their time, they should move onto the next question and plan to return and complete the question at the end, if there is time. There was evidence to suggest that some candidates did in fact do this. Also, they could read the whole question paper quickly first and decide which question (1, 2 or 3) to start with - this should be the one they are most confident about. Candidates need to be reminded that marks cannot be given where a question is left unanswered, even jotting down bullet points could pick up an odd mark. On the whole, it was reassuring to see the continued improvements in exam techniques that 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. There was continued evidence of improved exam preparation with regards the higher level skill of analysis, good use of linking statements evident. It was noted this series that candidates made much better use of the information given in the case studies to show evidence of application to access higher marks. As in the last series, there was also evidence of past exam papers and mark schemes being used, 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 (1a), (1bi/ii), (2a), (2b), (3a), (3bi), (3bii)
- Confusion over 'impacts of tourism' and advantages/benefits to tourists (1d), (1fi), (2d)
- Lack of understanding of the term 'tourism development proposal and the command 'describe in detail' (2c)
- Giving evidence of research (1e), (Q3c)

Lack of knowledge of unit content (1a), (1bi/ii), (2ai/ii), (2b), (3a), (3bi), (3bii)

As in past series, 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. There should be an understanding of the role and objectives/aims of agents of tourism development in each sector (1a), (1bi/ii). Candidates should be able to describe state or explain the principles of responsible tourism as detailed in the unit specification (2ai/ii). These types of questions have appeared on past papers and should be familiar. They should be able to describe (3a) and explain impacts of tourism. Candidates should also be able to describe and explain strategies used to manage the impacts of tourism (3bi/bii). They should be able to explain how positive impacts are maximised and how negative impacts are minimised through these strategies and give examples if asked. Candidates could

scrutinise the most recent question papers to identify 'commonly asked questions' that test knowledge to help them prepare for the exam.

Question paper analysis is also a useful technique to use in the classroom to disseminate previous papers to observe any patterns in topic coverage.

Q1 – Yorkshire Dales

- Agents involved in tourism development (7.2).
- The Impacts of tourism/tourism development (7.3)

Q2 – Ibiza

- Responsible tourism (7.1)
- The impacts of tourism/tourism development (7.3)
- The stages of the Tourist Area Life Cycle (7.4)

Q3 – open/own research

- The impacts of tourism/tourism development (7.3)
- The management of responsible tourism in destinations (7.5)

Confusion over 'impacts of tourism/tourism development' and advantages/benefits to tourists (1d), (1fi), (2d)

A number of candidates misinterpreted the requirements to explain/analyse the impacts of tourism/tourism developments and wrote instead about how the activity/development would benefit the tourists or be an advantage to them. For instance in 1f they wrote about how rock climbing was good to relieve stress. When analysing explaining impacts of tourism activities, or specific tourism developments in a destination they need to focus on the impacts to the destination. They should write about how the activity, development or the tourists have an impact on the environment of the destination, on its economy or socio-cultural impacts as directed by the instructions of the questions.

Lack of understanding of the term 'tourism development proposal and command 'describe in detail'

(2c)

This question has appeared on past papers and should be familiar to candidates. For some candidates, there seems to be confusion over what a tourism development proposal is. It is a question that candidates can prepare for in the classroom although adaptation to the scenario on the question paper would be required during the exam.

Candidates could be given a list of suggestions. Here are some ideas from past series:

1. 6* luxury hotel
2. Promote on TV
3. Eco-lodge
4. Zoning
5. Advertise in a brochure
6. Planning rules
7. Special offers
8. Guided tour
9. Water park
10. Exhibition
11. Festival

Candidates should pick out the 'proposals' that are 'tourism developments'. Correct answers – 1, 3, 8, 9, 10 and11. These suggestions include what tourists can do, or where they can stay whilst on holiday and are developments that resort planners might introduce to an area for different reasons to achieve various aims. The other suggestions are not tourism developments they are marketing and promotion methods or management strategies.

Candidates might find it easier to think in terms of 'developments for tourists'. When sitting the exam candidates would need to adjust their 'development' according to the requirements of the paper. It could be to help conserve the natural heritage, to attract new customers, to increase revenue etc. The proposal should be appropriate in terms of the type of destination (MEDW/LEDW), seaside/coastal, countryside/wilderness, town/city; scale and to meet the aims/objectives. It should also be something that does not already exist there.

Such questions require description so this should be what is it, where is it, what does it look like, what can tourists do there, who will go there. The description needs to be applied to the case study. On this paper there should be some reference to the 'clues' given in the stimulus i.e.

- cultural heritage - Dalt Vila walls, the Romans, handicrafts such as pottery, traditional food such as tapas,
- natural heritage – coastline, coral reefs, monk seal, Ses Salinas.

Giving evidence of research (Q1e and Q3c).
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.

Candidate performance

Question one
Question one focuses on the agents of tourism development in the UK and their roles, and the Impacts of tourism in a National Park.

1(a)
This question was answered fairly well by the majority of candidates who picked up two marks for appropriate aims.

1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii)
1(b)(i) required candidates to indicate with a cross the sector the Forestry Commission belongs to. It was clear that knowledge of this agent of tourism development is not well known and many did not know the organization is in the public sector. Few candidates scored well when asked to describe the role in 1(b)(ii). Knowledge of agents, government bodies and national organizations is fundamental to the study of travel and tourism.

1(b)(ii) An example of a good response worth full marks:
"Their role is to look after the country's forests and to promote the forests as tourist attractions, encouraging visitors to enjoy them. To develop activities and events such as musical concerts, mountain bike rides and national events such as in Dalby Forest"

1(c)
This was answered quite well by most candidates who gained a mark for correctly identifying an agent in the voluntary sector, most also picked up a mark for its role. However, some gave aims unrelated to tourism/tourism development.

1(d)
This question was answered very well by most candidates who were able to explain the positive impacts of the 'Red Squirrel Trail'. The majority scored at least four out of the possible six marks here.

1(e)
This was a new style of question offering candidates a choice of A - details of how partnerships can resolve conflicts between agents or B - how partnerships maximize the benefits of tourism. The majority (over 70%) chose B. Offering a choice seemed to work well and for both options over 60% of candidates scored at least two marks.

For 1eA although there were some sound answers which clearly stated the organisations involved in the partnership, the evidence of partnerships was often weak with vague and unspecified references to "local authorities", "voluntary organisations" etc. In some cases there was no case study evidence, with responses consisting of theory only. Many chose case studies from previous series, but where Blackpool was selected information was outdated and inaccurate and it was not always clear what the nature of the conflict was.

For 1eB the detail of partnerships was often vague, and in some cases only one organisation was named (e.g. Visit Britain), and the account was clearly not about a partnership. Some wrote about partnership as a type of business, whilst others wrote confused accounts about different parts of the same organisation (e.g. Thomson and TUI). In many cases there was little or no evidence of specific research, responses being vague and generalised.

Overall, few candidates achieved full marks as responses lacked sufficient detail of the nature of the partnership and little evidence of research.
Here is an example of a response worth full marks:

B- Maximise the benefits
The partnership I have researched is the Newcastle Gateshead Initiative formed in 2003. The three main stakeholders are Newcastle Council, Gateshead Counci, the Arts Council, Northern Rock and OneNortheast. This partnership has worked together to re-brand and transform the area with the development of high class restaurants, more shops, luxury hotels such as the Hilton NewcastleGateshead and cultural attractions such as the Baltic Centre. With more reasons to visit and high standards of accommodation the area has been more attractive to tourists and visitor numbers have increased bringing more money to the area and creating jobs for local people who have had more money to spend boosting the local economy through the benefits of the multiplier effect.

1(f)(i)
This question focused on tourism activities at Malham Cove and their environmental impacts. It was evident that the vast majority of candidates engaged particularly well with the stimulus material as most responses scored at least 4 marks for some analysis and some application, Level 2. Where responses were in more depth and the analysis was sustained some candidates achieved marks within Level 3. These also reflected a high standard of written communication (QWC) that was also assessed here. Weaker candidates wrote about other impacts and did not focus solely on environmental; some gave suggestions of the advantages to tourists.

1(f)(ii)

This question was answered well by most candidates who would have picked up one mark for each suggestion. The question required candidates to 'suggest two ways' the negative impacts could be reduced and the answer booklet was laid out for Suggestion 1 and Suggestion 2. Two marks were available for each suggestion. The second mark was for detail and many candidates lost out on the extra mark because they tended to give a number of possible suggestions and did not offer sufficient detail for one way. Litter bins were a popular suggestion but candidates should be aware that many tourist destinations in remote, rural areas have a 'no bins policy'.

An example of a good response scoring full marks:
1. Negative impacts of picnicking could be reduced by having a designated picnic area this will encourage people to eat here where rubbish can easily be dealt with if litter bins are provided.
2. Negative impacts of rock climbing could be reduced by charging for permits to climb the Cove. This would reduce the numbers and allow monitoring of how many are climbing. It would mean only serious climbers would pay and they are more likely to treat the rock with respect.

Question Two

Question two covered the topics of Responsible Tourism, the stages of the Tourist Area Life Cycle model and the impacts of rejuvenation. It also looks at appropriate tourism development in such a destination.

2(a)(i) and 2(a)(ii)

This question directly tests knowledge (AO1) of the principles of responsible tourism. Candidates were asked to state two principles of responsible tourism. They are expected to know these and they are given in the unit specification. One mark was available for each principle and those candidates who knew the principles and expressed their response as a principle 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 - and gained no marks.

2(a)(ii)

This question has appeared before and 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, this question 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.

Here is an example of a response scoring full marks:
P1: To promote respect between tourists and locals.
P2: To create economic benefits for local people and improve their quality of life.
E1: To promote respect; local people could be employed as tour guides to take people around cultural and historical attractions to share their culture with visitors.
E2: Tourism developers and hotels should employ local people and offer a decent wage to give locals some form of income so they have money to spend on their families.

2(b)(i) and 2(b)(ii)

The majority of candidates scored one mark for correctly identifying the development stage of the TALC model. In 2(b)(ii) most scored at least two out of the possible three marks for identifying appropriate characteristics. This question has appeared before and candidates can prepare for it by looking at the main characteristics that distinguish each stage. Candidates are also advised when answering such questions to separate characteristics and use the layout of the answer booklet one characteristic per line 1, 2, 3; some candidates merged characteristics when only one mark could be awarded per line and essentially 'lost' marks.

2(c)

This question has appeared on past papers and traditionally is not particularly well answered. Candidates were asked to suggest two tourism development proposals for Ibiza that would meet the principle of responsible tourism to "conserve the natural/cultural heritage' and to describe each principle in detail. This series there were mixed results. There was evidence of some good preparation for this type of question and a significant number scored high marks of four or five out of a possible six for each proposal by offering appropriate suggestions and detailed descriptions using the stimulus material. Many other candidates scored three out of the possible six marks for each. The question is testing the higher level skill, AO4 – making recommendations - and does tend to divide candidates in terms of ability. As mentioned earlier, weaker candidates do not seem to understand the term 'tourism development proposal', and do not follow the command 'describe in detail'. Weaker candidates offered methods such as zoning and then explained how it would conserve the natural heritage/ environment. Candidates need to be reminded that they only need to describe their proposal. In future they may be required to justify their suggestions and in this case an explanation would be appropriate. Ideas for proposals should be based on the information given in the stimulus/case study. Marks are restricted if there is no relevance or application to the destination/stimulus. Some ideas are given in an earlier section of this report and on reports of previous exam papers.

An example of a good response worth full marks:
Proposal – A Museum of Ibizan Culture
This museum would be near the Sa Caleta ruins and be all about Ibiza's history and culture. Visitors could go and see displays showing how people lived in Roman and Phoenician times.   Guided tours of the cemetery of Puig des Molins would be offered by local historians who know all about the early residents of the island. There will be a shop in the museum selling locally made souvenirs such as pottery and leather goods as well as local wines and foods. They could have a workshop where local

craftspeople work and show their traditional skils such as embroidery. A restaurant selling tapas would encourage people to stay longer and spend more money.

2d

This question was answered well by most candidates and there were many sound responses to this question, the majority scoring marks in Level 2, indeed fewer than 10% of candidates scored Level 1 marks. Rejuvenation was a well understood stage of the TALC. Candidates seemed to be helped by the guidance in the question which prompted them to address all three types of impact. Most candidates successfully linked the information provided to the rejuvenation stage and were able to analyse the positive economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts Weaker responses tended to be superficial, with no real analysis or application making few references to the information provided in the stimulus material. Quality of written communication was assessed in this question.

Question Three

Some of the questions in this section were unanswered and 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 used to control the impacts of tourism/tourism development. Many candidates did not score well overall in question 3, being unable to successfully answer the questions testing their knowledge of the specification; weaknesses in terms of giving evidence of research also contributed as did poor time management. Candidates could whilst doing 'practice papers' try tackling question 3 first and see if that helps performance. Marks cannot be awarded for blank responses!

3(a)

This question tested AO1 – knowledge and understanding of the impacts of tourism/tourism development. In each case two marks were available for the description of one impact, the second mark was awarded for detail or examples.

3(a)(i)

The question was answered well by many candidates who scored full marks. It required candidates to describe one positive economic impact of tourism. Two marks were available for detail or precision/terminology. Popular responses referred to employment creation or the multiplier effect.

3(a)(ii)

This was largely well answered and required candidates to describe one negative environmental impact of tourism. The most popular responses related to describe all possible types of pollution however if no links were made to tourism full marks were not possible. Where candidates just listed different types of pollution they missed out on the second mark for detail. Some wrote about global warming, carbon dioxide emissions and air travel, however these are not appropriate impacts of tourism in tourist destinations. The most successful responses described 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)(iii)

This question was not particularly well answered and understanding of positive environmental impacts was quite weak. Many gave socio-cultural impacts related to quality of life. Others did not attempt the question. The most successful responses related to regenerating rundown areas, education and conservation.

3(b)(i)

As in 1e, a choice was offered for 3(b)(i) and this worked well as candidates were able to choose the method they knew best. 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 maximising positive impacts. There has been an improvement in performance on these types of questions for many. However some candidates still struggle with the concept of some of these management strategies. 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.

Method A – 'retention of visitor spending' over 70% scored at least two out of the possible four marks for explaining this method. However, responses tended to focus on leakage (a negative economic impact) and quality of life (a positive socio-cultural impact) rather than positive economic impacts - tourist revenue and spending. Marks were restricted and few scored full marks. Some appropriate examples were given though, and these were credited. Few responses referred to the strategy of encouraging visitors to stay longer and most focused on keeping money within the destination.

Method B – 'training and employment of local people' this was chosen by over 70% of the candidates, and over 85% scored 2 marks or more. The better responses referred to improved skills, greater employability leading to a better job with more pay linked to the positive economic impact – the multiplier effect. Weaker responses referred to improved quality of life (socio-cultural impact) and marks were restricted.
An example of a good response worth full marks (method B):
By training local people it means they will have the necessary skills to carry out jobs in the tourism industry. This means people can earn a wage and if they take up more training can get a better job paying more money. This method will keep money in the local area and contribute to the economic multiplier effect – providing other people with wages. The more money people can earn the more they can spend on goods and services boosting the local economy.

3(b)(ii)

Again a choice was offered and this question tested understanding of methods used to minimise negative environmental impacts.

Method C –Planning Control was the most popular and was chosen by over 87% of the candidates. 50% of candidates scored more than two marks. There were many weak answers showing a lack of understanding of the strategy, with some focusing just on the word "planning" and then attempting to explain how various aspects of the travel and tourism industry might be planned. Many answers contained little reference to planning control in a tourism context. Less than 6% scored full marks.

Method D – Implementing the results of environmental impact assessment. This was selected by very few candidates and results were disappointing, less than 30% scored more than two marks. Many wrote about environmental audits and understanding was weak. A few did however explain that an EIA takes place before planning permission is granted.

3(c)(i) and (ii)
This question offered candidates the opportunity to write about a destination they had studied.
For many candidates time pressure may have played a part in the number of brief, hurried and blank responses. Candidates did not score particularly well on this question although 3(c)(i) has appeared before and can be planned for. The question required an explanation of how the impacts of tourism had been managed at a destination. As mentioned earlier, to be successful in these types of questions requires specific detail and explanation. Overall, evidence of research was varied, and many responses were generalised and theoretical. Reference to the impacts being managed was not always clear. Some ideas of how candidates can prepare for such a question are given in the report for the January 2010 exam. The most successful responses included examples that gave specific locations and projects were named and explained.   When done well many scored at least four out of the possible six marks.

3(c)(ii)
This question was not answered particularly well by the majority. Few responses were seen at Level 2 as few candidates considered 'the extent to which' and just gave explanations of why a principle was met. The more able candidates were more likely to give an evaluation of why some of the principles were not met.

3(d)
This question was well answered by some, 65% achieved at least two out of the possible four marks and many scored full marks. A similar question has appeared in the past. Here, candidates were required to suggest four statements to be included in a 'Hotel Good Practice Guide' for hotel chains operating in the LEDW to support the principles of responsible tourism. This is testing higher level skills and good responses related to use of local labour, fair wages, saving water etc. It was however frustrating to see so many candidates essentially lose out on marks because they failed to grasp that the statements should relate to a hotel chain; or had not read the question carefully. Many gave four good suggestions for a Visitor Code (which has appeared before) and suggested what tourists should do – 'ask before taking a photograph'. A number of candidates completely misunderstood and wrote about Health & Safety or Customer Service. The question successfully divided candidates in terms of ability.

An example of a response scoring full marks:
1. *Build the hotel using local materials.*
2. *Make sure you give jobs to the local people and offer training.*
3. *Use local suppliers for food in the restaurant, furniture etc.*
4. *Do not waste water, use grey water to water gardens.*

Travel and Tourism

Unit 1 The Travel and Tourism Industry

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	62	55	48	41	35
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 2 The Travel and Tourism Customer

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 3 Destination Europe

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 4 Destination Britain

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	39	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 5 Travelling Safely

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	64	56	48	41	34
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 6 Resort Operations

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	35	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 7 Responsible Tourism

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	60	52	45	38	31
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 8 Current Issues in Travel and Tourism

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 9 Working in Travel and Tourism

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 10 Promotion and Sales in Travel and Tourism

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	63	55	48	41	34
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 11 Special Interest Holidays

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 12 Travel Organisations

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	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.
Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject, depending on the demands of the question paper.