



**General Certificate of Education**

**Travel and Tourism**

**8651/8653/8656/8657/8659**

**TT11          Impacts of Tourism**

**Report on the Examination**

*2010 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 © 2010. 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.

## **General Comments**

This Paper has Pre-Release Material available to candidates prior to the examination. The PRM was based on New Zealand and Antarctica (in particular the Ross Dependency which is under New Zealand guardianship).

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, but not necessarily a prior study of the areas covered in the PRM. There should be adequate preparation for this unit otherwise candidates are likely to be at a disadvantage and marks will suffer as a result.

The majority of candidates were able to access the paper fully and thus make positive and creditworthy responses to the questions set. All questions in the paper were to be attempted and very few questions were left unanswered. There was evidence that the majority of 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. Such shortcomings have been commented upon in previous reports on this unit.

There was clear evidence that centres had prepared candidates appropriately for this paper by developing case studies additional to the one presented to them in the Pre-Release Material. This does not, however, mean that candidates always made the best use of these preparatory case studies.

## **What was particularly good**

1. Again 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 accurate and appropriate use of subject-related terminology.
2. Candidates generally performed well in questions 1(a), 1(b) and 2(a). These questions related to tabulated and graphed statistics presented in the PRM. This was in marked contrast to performances in similar questions in previous examinations. This is a very welcome improvement.
3. There were fewer examples of inappropriate case studies being used in the final question than had been the case in previous examination series. Generally the scale of the alternative case studies presented by candidates was more appropriate, with fewer candidates choosing areas which were too large to allow a clear and detailed focus to be developed.

## **What was not so good**

1. There is still a tendency for candidates to answer questions in general terms rather than in the context of detailed examples, whether drawn from the PRM or from candidates' own knowledge. This has been a weakness which has been identified in previous reports.
2. A lack of balance and sophistication in questions inviting discussion or assessment is often characteristic of weaker candidates. Impacts are seen as being completely negative or positive when this is rarely the case.

### **Question 1**

Part (a) was related to Item C in the Pre-Release Material which presented graphed information of monthly visitor numbers to New Zealand, by purpose of visit, for 2007/2008. The question was answered very well by the majority of candidates who were able to recognise seasonal trends and general characteristics, supported by accurate reading from the graphs. Some were able to manipulate the figures in a meaningful way by making comparisons and simple calculations based on the data presented.

Part (b) asked for a reason for the pattern described in (a) in relation to each of the visit purposes - holiday, visiting friends and relatives, and business. The question tested understanding and knowledge application. Many candidates gained all three marks. It was particularly pleasing to see candidates recognising the southern hemisphere summer season. However those who thought that a quick February half term break to New Zealand was likely were less convincing.

### **Question 2**

Part (a) asked why visitors from the UK are important to the New Zealand tourism industry. Most candidates tackled this well and were able to use data from the PRM to support their answers. Most gained at least two marks out of the four available.

Reasons for the lack of mass tourism in New Zealand were sought in part (b). Many did recognise the problems associated with distance from the UK and other potential sources of visitors. Some candidates were also able to use material embedded in the PRM to refer to New Zealand's views on sustainable tourism.

### **Question 3**

This question was built around information in the PRM relating to an eco-friendly tourist accommodation facility in North Island.

In part (a) candidates were asked to justify the claim made by the Knapdale Eco-Lodge that it was designed and constructed to be eco-friendly. Material from the PRM was well used by candidates to justify the claim made. Better candidates used the specific detail available in the PRM but also set it in a broader context of sustainability.

Part (b) was a straightforward question requiring candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'sustainable tourism'. Most were able to gain at least two of the three marks available.

Part (c) was not so straightforward in asking for a discussion of the extent to which activities undertaken by tourists staying at Knapdale and the area around it reflected New Zealand's aim to encourage sustainable tourism. Some candidates merely quoted some of the activities available and so gained minimal credit. A small number did set the activities in context and were able to show how they could be considered sustainable and appropriate, e.g. reducing travelling, on foot tours etc.

### **Question 4**

This question focussed on the Maori. Candidates were asked to discuss the likely economic and socio-cultural impacts of tourism development on the Maori. Despite leads being given in the PRM this question was not answered well. Most answers were stereotypical comments on socio-cultural impacts and almost exclusively negative. Often the comments were along the lines of 'the Maori might see westerners smoking, swearing and drinking alcohol and decide to

do the same themselves'. The economic impacts described were often unsubstantiated references to 'more jobs' or 'just seasonal jobs'. Inappropriate references to 'leakage' were often made without any kind of exemplification. There was very little real discussion of the impacts. Few were able to refer to the Maori view of 'guardianship' (kaitiakitanga).

### **Question 5**

This question focussed on Antarctica.

Part (a) focussed on the current and potential impacts of tourism development in Antarctica. There was ample material in the PRM. Many of the impacts were recognised by candidates although few managed to explain as well as describe, e.g. what the problems of alien species might be. Perhaps many felt some of the impacts, actual or potential, were so obvious there was no need to give any explanation.

Consideration of management problems in Antarctica was the focus of part (b) of the question. Answers were rarely full and balanced, although some were able to demonstrate isolated examples of what is being done or could be done. Some did refer to the Antarctic Treaty and the IATO agreement. A few managed to pick up on the special problems of sovereignty/ownership and how this would make overall management especially demanding.

Part (c) asked for a personal view with arguments to justify the view taken. The issue was whether the New Zealand authorities should support the expansion of tourism in Antarctica. Candidates entered into the spirit of the question and almost all chose to restrict expansion, with many giving good reasons for the stance taken. Perhaps Item H in the PRM had a strong influence here. Not many saw the potential economic and environmental benefits of a carefully managed expansion of tourism. Many saw expansion as inevitably leading to environmental disaster, a valid view if properly justified. Many were confused about ownership/guardianship of Antarctica and some simply suggested that since Antarctica was not a sovereign territory with no permanent inhabitants, there was no-one to benefit in an economic sense.

### **Question 6**

Once again, in this final question, candidates had to choose one specific example from their own case studies from within the Less Economically Developed World. 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 the case studies used by candidates were appropriate but still lacked the detail needed at A2 level. For the first time there was evidence that centres had used the Pre Release Material from earlier examinations as bases for their own studies. Such examples were from Kenya and Barbados.

Part (a) was concerned with describing the range of impacts of tourism development on their chosen area/destination. This was well answered by the stronger candidates but less successful candidates tended to make very simplistic generic points lacking in specific and located detail. Some candidates never got beyond litter, pollution and unsubstantiated economic leakage, even in the middle of the Masai Mara.

Some case studies lend themselves better than others to providing detail for part (b) of the question – impact management. This question was very straightforward and did not ask for any evaluation of schemes implemented or actions taken. Despite this, answers were again generally superficial and rarely seen as part of an overall management plan. Simple 'management' responses such as 'provide litter bins' are hardly A2 level responses.

## **Suggestions for teachers to prepare future TT11 candidates**

1. Candidates need to become very familiar and comfortable with the Pre-Release Material. It is essential to most of the questions set, and usually very little extra work needs to be done on the areas or topics presented.  
Detailed suggestions relating to the PRM were given in the Report on the June 2009 examination and teachers are referred to these.
2. Students should practise writing answers to previous papers, both for individual questions and complete papers. Attention should be given to the command words used in the questions set, particularly when a question carries more than one command word, e.g. 'describe and explain', or when a wide response is required as with 'discuss'.
3. When technical terms are used they should be explained or qualified in some way to show the candidate's knowledge and understanding of them. Very rarely will credit be given for simply quoting a technical term.
4. Make sure that case studies considered in teaching this unit have strong impact management elements built into them.

## **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

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