



**General Certificate of Education**

**Travel and Tourism**

**8651/8653/8656/8659**

**TT11          Impacts of Tourism**

**Report on the Examination**

*2009 examination - January series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009. AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **GENERIC COMMENTS**

This Paper has Pre-release material available to candidates prior to the examination. The paper is synoptic and so those entered are expected to have experienced a wide coverage of the Specification prior to entry for the unit. There should be adequate preparation for this unit otherwise candidates are likely to be at a disadvantage and marks will suffer as a result.

Most of those entered were able to access the paper fully and thus make positive and creditworthy responses to the questions set. There was evidence that the candidates had been adequately prepared for the examination. Where performance was poor this often reflected a failure to answer the question as set, and/or to answer in general rather than specific terms.

There was clear evidence that centres had prepared candidates for this paper by developing case studies additional to the ones presented to them in the Pre-release material.

### **What was particularly good**

1. There was a general willingness and ability to make reference to the key ideas and concepts relating to this unit and to other units in the specification, including the use of subject-related terminology.
2. In general candidates were able to refer to impacts from a range of different perspectives and group or personal viewpoints.

### **What was not so good**

1. A continuing tendency to answer questions in generic terms rather than in specific terms with detailed examples.
2. There were still some examples of inappropriate case studies being used in the final question. This was usually in the context of the scale of the case study.

## **QUESTION 1**

a) The question related to the appeal of Chester as a tourist destination, and was very accessible to candidates, with a number gaining full marks.

b) Differences in the average daily spend of visitors to Chester formed the basis of this question. Most candidates were able to earn at least two out of the four marks available but a small number misread the data (found in Item E) and suggested that day visitors spent more than staying visitors. Others failed to see the significance of the term 'daily spend' and suggested that staying visitors spent more because they were in Chester for longer. In this context credit could be linked to a 'longer day' for the staying visitor, but not for increased spending over a number of days.

## **QUESTION 2**

This question was concerned with the relative impacts of different types of visitor groups on Chester.

The better candidates did compare the visitor impacts and pointed to both positive and negative effects. They also used appropriate terminology in making reference to economic, environmental and socio-cultural elements.

Weaker candidates made few, if any, comparisons and tended to refer to vague impacts such as 'more money being spent' or 'pollution'. Large coaches crashing into, or at least scraping,

old delicate buildings was a widespread overemphasized idea. The potential socio-cultural impacts of race-goers and school parties were often graphically portrayed.

### **QUESTION 3**

This question was often well-answered. The range of views of local residents was asked for in relation to tourist impacts. Many were able to give appropriate examples of both positive and negative views in the context of economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. The likely seasonality of the tourist trade in Chester was sometimes overemphasized when suggestions were made that most people employed in tourism would lose their jobs in winter.

### **QUESTION 4**

The majority of candidates noted the location of the Zoo on the outskirts of Chester and many were able to make valid suggestions as to why the Zoo might have limited impact on the tourist trade of Chester itself. The fundamental differences in the appeal of the Zoo and the City itself were widely recognised.

However many seemed to think that the Zoo was owned by Chester City Council and so attributed far more weight to what the City itself would be able to do to encourage more Zoo visitors to come into Chester centre. Weaker candidates made vague references to 'advertising' while better candidates developed this idea more with suggestions as to types and location of advertising and promotions. The best candidates recognised that there are a range of stakeholders and that joint action might be the best way forward.

### **QUESTION 5**

Extracts from a report on Chester festivals formed the basis for this question.

- a) The financial turnover and funding of a range of UK festivals had to be compared and in general this question proved very accessible to candidates.
- b) The evaluation of the economic impact of Chester's festivals was well carried out in most cases. A number did attempt to balance the economic gain with the amount of funding put in. However some candidates did wander off into what was looked for in part c).
- c) This required a consideration of what Chester City Council and other stakeholders could do to increase the economic impact of festivals in Chester. A wide range of ideas were suggested, often built around advertising and promotion. Weaker candidates seemed to suggest that nothing was currently being done to promote Chester's festivals. Better candidates picked up on the pre-release information and stressed the need for wider promotion and the building of a national profile. Almost all suggested that greater funding of the festivals would bring increased rewards. Sponsorship was often suggested by those who did consider the range of other stakeholders.

### **QUESTION 6**

Many found this question the most difficult to answer well. The 'Chester City Culture Park' plans had to be evaluated as a means of both attracting tourists and of protecting and enhancing Chester's urban environment. To many this became a list of what the plans involved without clearly demonstrating how these could help achieve their objectives. Evaluation was seen extensively in answer to Question 5b but rarely in answer to this question. Balancing the two objectives was only seen in the answers of the best candidates.

## QUESTION 7

Once again, in this final question, candidates had to choose an example from their own case studies, in this case based on the environmental impacts of tourism in a LEDW destination. In most cases the choices made were appropriate at a destination, region or resort level. There was only one example of a MEDW destination being chosen. There were however some examples which were at too large a scale e.g. at country level, such as India and Kenya. In questions of this type a specific area focus gives candidates the best opportunity to answer at the level of detail required.

Part a) was concerned with describing and explaining the environmental impacts and pointing to how these were being managed. Many of the impacts chosen were described at a very simplistic level. All too often there was little more description than *'litter is left behind and this upsets the locals'* or *'there is a lot of overcrowding and pollution'*. Explanation was often completely lacking. How management of impacts was being carried out was equally simplistic in many cases. There was no evidence that centres had not provided students with case studies but these do need to be well-chosen and detailed. A number of case studies used by candidates were appropriate but still lacked the detail needed at A2 level.

Some case studies lend themselves better than others to providing detail for part b) of the question – evaluating the success of the impact management schemes. Just saying 'it has been successful' is not enough. The candidate's choice of appropriate example is often critical to fully accessing this type of question.

### Suggestions for teachers to prepare future TT01 candidates

1. Candidates need to become very familiar with the pre-release material and be taught to use it in an appropriate way. The material is essential to most of the questions set, and usually very little extra work needs to be done on the areas or topics presented. From time to time the use of a specific phrase or restricted section from the material may be the best way of getting an idea or detail across but candidates should be encouraged to use their own wording. This will ensure that the question set is being answered.
2. A range of well chosen case studies should have been taught in the earlier part of the course, covering the unit content and with examples from both the LEDW and MEDW. There will be opportunities to include material from candidates' own studies in every paper set. Past papers for TT11 can often provide initial case study material.
3. Candidates should be aware of the importance of giving specific detail to support their ideas and help them to show a full understanding of concepts. When technical terms are used they should be explained or qualified in some way to show the candidate's knowledge and understanding of them.
4. Candidates should be taught how to organize their answers in order to successfully address the instruction to 'evaluate'.

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.