

Travel & Tourism

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS (Double Award) H189, H389

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H589, H789

Report on the Units

June 2006

H189/H589/MS/R/06

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

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Travel & Tourism (H589, H789)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel & Tourism (H189, H389)

REPORTS FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
	Chief Examiner's Report	5
G720	Introducing Travel & Tourism	7
G721	Customer Service In Travel And Tourism	11
G722	Travel Destinations	13
G723	International Travel	14
G724	Tourist Attractions	17
G725	Organising Travel	17
G726	Hospitality	17
G727	Working Overseas	17
*	Grade Thresholds	18

Chief Examiner's Report

There were many positive aspects relating to the performance of candidates in this first summer examination session of the new qualification. The entry was quite large and approximately one quarter of the candidates were studying for the double award. The quality of written work evident in both candidate portfolios and in external assessment scripts was very promising and it is very much hoped that this will become the norm in subsequent sessions. There were some quite outstanding individual scripts and it was particularly pleasing to see the good quality portfolio work that many candidates are now producing.

However, delivery of the new specification is in its infancy and there are some very significant issues to be addressed in the near future in order to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade. All examination questions, including those set around pieces of stimulus material, will follow an incline of difficulty and it will be usual to see the following command verb hierarchy in operation:

- Identify/Name/List
- Describe briefly/State
- Describe fully/Explain
- Explain fully
- Compare
- Contrast/Analyse
- Justify/Evaluate/Assess/Discuss

The more open ended questions, inviting candidates to respond to a problem or issue, will be assessed by levels of response criteria. These questions are designed to examine several assessment objectives. Candidates should be made aware that the higher order commands require them not only to analyse information but also to offer some evaluation of the material under consideration and thus come to a conclusion about the issues involved.

Many candidates did not do themselves full justice in the examined units and the Principal Examiners make reference to the fact that the precise instructions for particular questions were frequently not correctly followed. Centres should make every effort to ensure that candidates are fully familiar with question paper styles and layout. The June examinations showed that many individuals were unable to access the higher level mark bands because of their inability to offer appropriate analytical or evaluative comments. Centres should make sure that candidates understand the differences between *describe*, *explain*, *discuss*, *analyse* and *evaluate*. Detailed comments about candidate performance and the June papers are provided in the following sections of this document.

However, this is only part of the overall picture and it is very worrying to read certain observations made by the Principal Moderator in the following report. The areas that Centres should give attention to in an attempt to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade include:

- making sure that advice provided in the Guidance for Teachers sections of the specification are followed;
- assessors should make every effort to make sure that portfolio work is correctly annotated;

Adjustments to marks have to be applied due to inappropriate approaches to meeting unit requirements and/or lack of understanding of the standards required.

Centres are strongly advised to take note of the Principal Moderator's comments and to reflect on the extent to which these findings apply within their Centre.

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

The above represent very serious issues relating to candidate performance. It is very much hoped that improvements will be forthcoming during subsequent examination sessions.

G720 - Introducing Travel and Tourism (Written Examination)

General comments

The pre-released case study stimulus material was well used by the candidates. All documents in the case studies seemed accessible to the candidates and Centres had obviously used the materials well to prepare their candidates for the examination.

Candidates fully comprehended the material and effectively used them to assist in their answers. Some candidates had clearly carried out independent background research into the Channel Islands which further enhanced their understanding. The best candidates used this as part of their analysis, especially in question 1(c) and to evaluate in question 5.

The majority of candidates attempted all five questions, so timing and examination technique has not been an issue with this paper. Weaker candidates did not always complete all sections of the paper, leaving out whole questions they obviously could not answer. Candidates demonstrated valid knowledge and understanding of travel and tourism and were able to apply this to the question paper. Many candidates had learnt definitions of travel and tourism well and could give relevant examples. Some candidates wrote lengthy answers which did not access the higher level skills.

The extended answer questions were all marked on a 'levels of response' mark scheme. A number of candidates could have gained marks by increasing their depth of analysis and evaluation in these questions.

Level 1 answers relate to the lower marks available, these are awarded for simplistic answers, usually easily extracted from the pre-release case study materials. These relate to the requirements of AO1 and AO2 i.e.

AO1 Demonstration of knowledge, understanding and skills

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the specified content, and of related skills, in vocationally-related contexts.

AO2 Application of knowledge, understanding and skills

Candidates apply knowledge and understanding of the specified content and of related skills in vocationally-related contexts.

Level 2 answers require the candidate to analyse the information in the case study. In the majority of answers candidates could achieve this level, which relates directly to AO3, i.e.

AO3 Research and analysis

Candidates use appropriate research techniques to obtain information to analyse vocationally-related issues and problems.

Level 3 answers – the top end of the marks allocated are awarded for evaluative comments and justified and judgemental conclusions. For the top end of this level it is expected that there will be a coherent response to the question, with a well written and structured evaluation. These marks directly relate to AO4, i.e.

AO4 Evaluation

Candidates evaluate information to make judgements, draw conclusions and make recommendations about vocationally-related issues and problems.

Centres need to bear these levels of response criteria in mind when preparing candidates for the examination. It needs to be stressed that answers need to be well written, following a structure which has an introduction, main body and an evaluative conclusion. Because of the constraint of space in the answer booklet, Centres need to ensure that candidates are coached in ways to write succinctly and in a coherent manner.

Comments on individual questions

- 1
- (a) Good explanations of both 'leisure' and 'business' visitors were found in the majority of scripts. Candidates do need to be aware that a rewording of the question, i.e. 'people who visit for business purposes' does not receive credit. Specific examples are awarded marks, as well as a detailed description of the different types of visitors.
 - (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates, although some did give good descriptions of intangibility as opposed to perishability. The majority of answers focused on airline seats which could not be stored for sale once the plane has departed.
 - (c) The types of visitors to Guernsey included leisure, business and VFR visitors; the length of stay of these different types of visitor has also illustrated in the case study materials, as well as the country of origin of the incoming tourist. In the majority of cases candidates easily achieved a Level 1 response by identifying the types of visitor. A common error was for candidates to concentrate on the trends in visitor numbers, and offer an explanation as to the patterns in these trends. That was not the requirement of the question. Centres do need to ensure that they prepare candidates thoroughly in respect of analysing statistical data relating to the scale of the travel and tourism industry. Statistical tables, graphs and charts may relate to any aspect of the 'What You Need to Learn' section in the specification, eg. numbers employed, types of visitor, reasons for travel, seasonality, the growth of the travel and tourism industry, etc. Analysis of the statistics, with judgmental evaluative conclusions, was needed to access the highest mark bands. The majority of candidates could clearly explain that the UK provided the most visitors, and the reasons for France being the second higher in terms of incoming visitors.
- 2
- (a) There were quite often misconceptions from the candidates about the difference between 'scheduled' and 'charter' flights. The better candidates could explain that scheduled flights ran to a regular timetable and gave good examples of major airlines and routes. Better candidates also stated that charter flights were generally run by tour operators for holidaymakers on package tours. A common misconception, relating to charter flights, was that they were low budget airlines such as Ryanair – these do, of course, run to a schedule. Accommodation grading schemes were well explained, although candidates were not awarded credit for just rewording the question i.e. 'grading of accommodation'. The majority of candidates understood that this reflected the quality of the accommodation and there were plenty of examples of organisations which awarded grades, or the actual grades awarded such as stars, diamonds, etc.
 - (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates. There were clear benefits given of travelling by ferry to the Channel Islands; and these were easily extracted from the case study material. An explanation of these benefits was clearly stated by the majority of candidates, but there were many examples of a correct identification of a benefit from the document without further explanation or development, especially relating to duty free shopping on board.

- (c) Very well answered. Centres have established that there will be a question comparing and contrasting two documents within the pre-released case study materials. The candidates could extract the main points about the two different accommodation outlets and were able to easily look at the similarities/differences. The best answers explored the reasons behind the similarities and differences, such as the different quality of the accommodation, and the facilities and services as reflected in the different accommodation grading. This was related to the needs and budgets of the different target markets.
One common misconception was that The Old Government House had a golf course, hired tents, had a snack bar and a children's playground. Centres need to ensure that items such as keys for symbols are fully understood by candidates and that only those relevant to the case study, i.e. the actual products and services available, are used.
- 3 (a) Well answered. 'En suite accommodation' did cause a few problems, with candidates not fully explaining the private facilities that are available. A common error was to include kitchenette facilities, which are in self-catering accommodation.
Answers relating to 'low season' often included the good use of travel and tourism terminology, such as 'off peak', with the use of appropriate examples. Candidates do need to understand that the low season for different types of holidays varies – summer sun destinations have their low season in the winter months, yet winter sports destinations have their low season for these sports in the summer months.
- (b) Not well answered. Many candidates did not fully recognise that a commercial travel and tourism organisation's aim is to make money with the main source of funding from sales. Centres do need to ensure that candidates are fully aware of the importance of the commercial sector in travel and tourism, as the majority of organisations are run on a commercial basis. This also includes voluntary sector organisations (the National Trust, for example, is run as a commercial operation, but the profits are put back into the organisation) and public sector organisations (most TICs, although provided by local authorities, need to be commercially viable in order to stay open).
- (c) Most candidates could state the differences between public and private sector organisations in travel and tourism. To get beyond this basic Level 1 answer candidates needed to analyse the objectives of the public and private sectors. This was not done well by the majority of candidates, who could not achieve the higher levels in the mark scheme as they did not analyse the objectives. The vast majority of candidates stated that the private sector's main objective was to make a profit, but did not extend the answer to discuss the necessity for this (such as keeping the organisation running or dividends to shareholders). Level 3 answers needed to demonstrate evaluative comments relating to the objectives, such as how these can influence the values and attitudes of the organisation. This part of the question was probably the poorest answered on the paper. Centres do need to ensure that the different types of ownership and funding of travel and tourism organisations are thoroughly studied.
- 4 (a)(i) Most candidates clearly understood what was meant by a tourist attraction, but again some candidates reworded the question, i.e. an attraction that attracts tourists.

- (ii) Half board proved more difficult for candidates to explain. Many did not realise it was an accommodation plan involving two meals.
- (iii) Quite a few candidates did not attempt this part of the question. Centres do need to ensure that candidates are aware that transfers refer to the movement of passengers between transport destinations and accommodation, and are generally part of a package holiday.
- (b) Changing consumer needs and expectations are clearly stated in the specification for this unit within the development of the modern travel and tourism industry. Candidates could pick out how the Bay View Guest House provided for different customer groups (such as families) but did not really make evaluative conclusions relating these provisions to changing needs and expectations.
- (c) Generally well answered, with the majority of candidates understanding the importance of events to the economy of the area. Many candidates fully explained how other areas of travel and tourism – such as accommodation and catering services, transport providers and visitor attractions could benefit from the influx of people to events. The better candidates demonstrated understanding of the different target markets for the events that were part of Celebrate 800!

5 Centres should be aware that the last question on the paper asks for an evaluation of the case study material - in this case, the document relating to tourism in Sark. The question will normally be synoptic in style relating to the issues raised in the case study, with the aim that the higher level candidates could bring in aspects of knowledge and understanding from their wider study of the travel and tourism industry. As the materials are pre-released, it would be expected that Centres could prepare their candidates thoroughly, and assist them in understanding the type of tourism to Sark and general issues and problems facing the travel and tourism industry. Most candidates attempted the question and reached Level 1 by extracting the issues and problems facing Sark from the case study. For Levels 2 and 3 to be accessed some analysis and evaluation of these issues and problems, relating to the wider travel and tourism industry was required. This was not attempted by the majority of candidates.

Those candidates who had undertaken additional background research into Sark took into account the uniqueness of the island and made appropriate recommendations which considered the needs of locals, the environment and tourists. A few candidates suggested seeking solutions from organisations such as the National Trust and developing niche market eco-tourism holidays. A top level answer should have an introduction summarising the situation – in this case the fact that although Sark relies on its income from tourism, visitor numbers are dropping, yet island expenditure is increasing. Candidates should have gleaned from the case study materials that much of the infrastructure on Sark (for local inhabitants, as well as tourists) is paid for by the income from tourism (not always directly). The main body of the answer should look at specific issues, such as horse dung in the main Avenue, with the suggestions from the case study as to how this could be remedied (dung sacks), but with some additional analysis and evaluation from the candidate. This may be wider health and safety issues, or the problems of poor image which this creates, leading to fewer visitors. A conclusion should make suggestions as to what Sark could do to try to attract more tourists – promotion, niche marketing, development of attractions, etc. could all be discussed. The better candidates should recognise that the isolation of Sark is part of its appeal, so sustainability issues could be discussed.

Principal Moderator's Report

General Comments

Some Centres had submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the Unit Recording Sheet and had also made use of the comment boxes on the URS. However, there was a lack of specific annotation relating to the criterion and mark bands on the candidates' work to show in what level of the band the assessor considered the evidence to be. There was also a number of arithmetical errors and lack of a URS sheet used for each candidate. This hindered moderation as the moderator had to re-assess the work and as Centres had referenced, eg page 1 to 65 as AO1 and no annotation, this made moderation a lengthy and difficult process.

Assessors should bear in mind that, in most cases, the criteria are 'nested' and that full achievement in mark band 1 is a prerequisite for the award of marks in band 2 and then full coverage of mark band 2 is required before marks in band 3 can be awarded. Some Centres had allocated marks appropriately but there was evidence of leniency as candidates often missed some of the criteria. This was particularly relevant for mark band 2. As a consequence, in cases where scaling had been applied, it was usually because Centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands.

Centres should also consider that 'quantity' does not always mean 'quality'. There was evidence submitted and annotated which did not relate to the criteria of the unit, general in nature and, often, too much of one aspect masked other vital pieces of information which were missing, but required to fully cover the mark band.

G721 - Customer Service

There were a lot of submissions for moderation of this unit this session with mixed responses. Some Centres had addressed this unit well and evidence by some candidates was thorough and appropriate. However, many candidates had submitted work which was general in nature and not relating to the one organisation. In some cases, there had been an inappropriate choice of organisation, eg. not travel and tourism, too small or lacking the information to match the criteria, more than one organisation, etc.

AO1 Candidates clearly identified the needs of internal and external customers and made a reasonable attempt to evidence how their needs are met, but all too often this was descriptive in nature. In many cases, there was little evidence of a comparison which leads into how this would benefit the organisation, eg. the need for complaints to be dealt with appropriately and quickly for external customers linked to the need for employees to be familiar with procedures and have appropriate support, etc.

AO2 was generally well evidenced with many candidates replying to a complaint by letter. It must be made clear in the work what exactly the complaint was and the outcome must be realistic in line with the organisations' complaints procedure/policy. It is expected, at this level, that candidates format the letter correctly. Candidates must deal with a variety of customers which must be clearly evidenced. In some cases it was not clear who the variety of customers were. Several Candidates used or produced scripts to role play customer service. The plan and use of scripts would not provide evidence of effective customer service.

There tended to be a lack of clear and detailed witness statements to support the assessment of candidate performance. When dealing with a situation it can be appropriate to use a situation complex in nature where the candidate has to deal with different types of customers within that situation but not necessarily at the same time.

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

AO3 It was evident that some Centres had difficulty in interpreting what was required for this assessment objective. This should relate to the methods used by the organisation to assess the effectiveness of its customer service and what it does (measures the organisation has taken or is taking) to improve. This requires a lot of enquiry and research by the candidate.

There was a tendency for candidates to record types of quality criteria in general, but not evidence the methods used to assess this criteria within the organisation.

Candidates generally showed some research into how the organisation assesses the effectiveness of its customer service, though they struggled with an analysis in terms of what the organisation has done to make improvements, etc.

As an example, candidates rarely considered the number of complaints and their content as a method of measuring effectiveness. Analysis could include what the organisation has done to prevent further complaints, etc.

Only a few Centres made reference to methods used which included internal customers.

AO4 Candidates need to evaluate the organisation's customer service and how effective they think it is, with recommendations for improvement.

Some Candidates attempted this well within the first two mark bands but had difficulty with mark band 3. Most candidates had undertaken a 'mystery shopper' activity or an observational survey/check list or used a questionnaire.

Some candidates produced an evaluation, but there was lack of evidence as to how they had researched the findings.

G722 - Travel Destinations

There were a lot of submissions for moderation of this unit this session with mixed responses. Some Centres attempted this unit well and were very clear in their assessment.

AO1 was leniently assessed in a lot of cases as candidates rarely demonstrated thorough knowledge, skills and understanding of the location of their chosen destinations. There was a lack of a series of maps, annotation on maps and full description in relation to the destination's position in the world, locational maps which could show distribution of features, etc. Some aspects of AO1, eg. latitude/longitude in relation to climate/seasons could have been linked into AO2. Other aspects such as accessibility, eg. location of the airport, port, etc, on the map and ease of movement around island, city, etc. could have been annotated/described and linked to AO2.

AO2 was generally well assessed but care needs to be taken where candidates had evidenced sections of text and websites. With reference to the appeal of their destinations, candidates attempted to make a logical explanation, but did not always fully cover the appeal of their destination with particular reference to who it appeals to and why. There was, for example, very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, etc. Another example is different types of accommodation and cost against appeal to different types of customers/visitors.

AO3 requires candidates to show evidence of resources and sources of information used. In some cases there was no bibliography evidenced and no analysis of resources, eg. what would or would not be useful for mark band 3. A lot of candidates had only used websites as their primary source of research. Part of the analysis marks for mark band 3 can be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This had been well addressed by some Centres.

Sometimes sources were well referenced in the text.

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had addressed this well. There was, in some cases, little evidence of any statistical data to assist with candidate's reasoning. The criterion does not specify UK tourists but visitors in general. A lot of candidates had considered UK visitors only which prevented the development of evaluation and future predictions.

For some candidates AO4 was an afterthought but it should really be the starting point for research to check the availability of data at an international level. For AO4 it is expected that trends are analysed and that future predictions are provided. Candidates often attempted this but had no evidence of visitor numbers.

G723 - International Travel (Written Examination)

General Comments

There was a medium sized entry for the second session of this examination. It was pointed out in the January 2006 report that all new courses will have resource and curriculum planning implications for Centres and it is again hoped that the following comments will be of a practical use to the individual members of staff delivering the unit content. The examination questions will always be based around pieces of stimulus material, derived from travel and tourism industry sources, which will have been selected solely on the basis of their ability to illustrate key aspects of the unit's 'What You Need to Learn'. The January and June 2006 question papers are thus typical of what Centres can expect.

It is important that candidates understand and appreciate the development of travel and tourism at a variety of scales. This means that they should be aware of developments within their immediate local area, as well as within the UK as a whole. Finally, an international perspective is also required. It should be remembered that candidates will obtain credit for providing specific details about facilities and locations which are appropriate to the particular question. There were too many instances of candidates ignoring the precise wording of individual questions and specific comment is made in the sections that follow.

Many candidates, however, appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions and Centres are advised to make the following '**Key Word**' definitions part of the examination preparation sessions for this unit.

Key Word(s)	Meaning/expectation
Identify	Simply name, state or list.
Describe	Provide information about the characteristic features of something.
Explain	Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details.
Outline	Set out the main characteristics, and describing essentials only.
Discuss (including the ability to analyse)	Provide evidence or opinions about something, arriving at a balanced conclusion. The candidate is being asked to consider an issue and is expected to present arguments and evidence to support particular points of view and to show where they stand in relation to the topic. The candidate is expected to look at different interpretations or approaches to the issue.
Assess (including the ability to evaluate)	To judge from available evidence and arrive at a reasoned conclusion. The candidate is expected to present a number of factors or issues and weigh up or appraise their relative significance or importance.
Compare and contrast	Point out similarities and differences and discuss the variations identified.
Justify	Present a reasoned case to show that an idea or statement is true (or otherwise).

Candidates unable to respond in an appropriate way to these command verbs will have difficulty in obtaining the higher marks for questions that are assessed by means of 'levels of response'.

Comments on individual questions

- 1 Question 1 was set in the context of Gulf Air's passenger services and there were many excellent answers. Most candidates scored full marks in part (a) and the two valid service descriptions were readily found from the stimulus material supplied. It was a similar situation with part (b)(i), although a minority of candidates lost marks for not stating the two routes in full. Answers to part (b)(ii) were also good and most candidates picked up maximum marks for simply stating 'Holiday/Business trip/VFR/relocation'. Part (c) required candidates to 'discuss' booking flights and many candidates simply stated two or three ways, without offering any form of analysis or evaluation of their chosen methods. Those who considered the advantages of booking online versus going to an agent scored very well. Similar problems existed with answers to part (d) and there was a marked lack of **discussion** as per the expectations listed in the earlier 'Key Words' table. Few candidates were able to clearly point out the extent to which service provision varied with class of travel on scheduled long haul flights. There was much use of inappropriate terminology, such as 'second class' and 'third class'. Furthermore, many candidates thought that Business Class was more expensive than First Class. Centres would be well advised to undertake a case study of a major international carrier's services and look at what is provided for customers **both** on the ground and in the air.
- 2 Question 2 was set in the context of an important Liverpool tourist and visitor attraction, The Beatles Story. Part (a) invited candidates to identify and explain two pieces of evidence from the stimulus material which supported the attraction's international visitor appeal. Many candidates readily found appropriate points, but a minority did not explain the international significance of the selected items. This also tended to be the case with part (b). Many candidates misinterpreted this question's requirements and ignored the TIC context, thus obtaining very limited credit. The products/services quoted by candidates were not always explained properly and many individuals did not score as well as they might. Part (c) could be answered with or without reference to Fig. 2, but most candidates relied on the information contained in the stimulus material. Again, this question required candidates to 'discuss' methods of travel and many individuals simply stated one or two ways, without offering any form of analysis or evaluation of their chosen methods. Those who considered the advantages of ferry travel versus flying scored very well, whereas those who simply copied extracts of the stimulus material received more limited credit. Answers to part (d) were rather variable and many candidates chose to write about the advantages of a central location, rather than the ranges of services provided by city centre hotels. However, there were again many vague answers and many inappropriate points. Accessibility was well understood, but many candidates were firmly of the opinion that UK city centres have airports adjacent to them. However, it proved to be very difficult for many candidates to present a number of factors or issues and weigh up or appraise their relative significance or importance. Thus few answers were of Level 3 standard.

- 3 Question 3 tended to be answered quite well and it was pleasing to see most candidates being able to correctly interpret the stimulus material provided about Air France–KLM services to Latin America. There were thus very many full mark answers to both parts (a) and (b). Part (c) was quite well attempted but a minority of candidates made the mistake of talking about the appeal of Latin American destinations rather than the appeal of the Air France–KLM flights. Candidates who wrote about such ideas as convenience, accessibility and cost tended to score very well. There were some excellent answers to part (d) and candidates came up with a range of valid comments. However, the justification was not always done well and very few individuals managed full marks. There was often good reasoning and some very perceptive comment about personal risk in LEDC metropolitan, areas such as Rio de Janeiro and Mexico City. Many candidates were unsure about part (e)'s reference to being *in transit*. Centres are reminded of the need to have made a case study of a UK international airport's airside service provision and candidates were not penalised if they were unfamiliar with the transit lounge concept. However, most answers tended to describe both airside and landside services, but no credit could be awarded for the latter. Low scores tended to be the norm because there was usually very little attempt made to discuss the provisions identified. Even the more obvious points were neglected and candidates rarely bothered to consider the extent to which the needs of the leisure traveller versus those on business or those with small children versus those travelling alone would be met.
- 4 Question 4 was usually poorly attempted and many candidates simply did not read the questions carefully enough. Part (a) asked for candidates to outline two likely reasons why Club Med has introduced the Freestyle concept to the UK market and most answers could not sustain any real reasoning. Very few answers scored more than half marks. Part (b) asked candidates to explain aspects of the Club Med product's appeal to UK families. Features of the Club Med product were readily identified from the stimulus material but the selected features were frequently not explained properly, thus limiting the amount of credit that could be awarded. Some candidates penalised themselves when answering part (c) because of their inability to identify an appropriate risk from either the text or image included on Fig. 4. Three marks could be obtained easily by stating a valid risk or hazard and then making two appropriate comments about how that particular risk might be managed by Club Med. There were, however, some very thorough and perceptive answers which easily scored full marks. Most answers to part (d) were superficial and far too many candidates wrote about Club Med, which was not the question. The candidates were, in fact, being asked to consider the issue of adventure, sport and eco-tourism package provision and they were thus expected to present arguments and evidence to support particular points of view. The candidates were expected to look at different interpretations or approaches to the issue, such as why companies offer them versus why customers want to purchase them and come to some conclusion. Sadly, most answers never really got to grips with these ideas.

G724 - Tourist Attractions

There were some submissions for moderation of this unit this session with a good response. They generally related to an appropriate choice of attractions to cover all the criteria and the availability of information.

Candidates made a good attempt at the criteria but with reference to AO1, they showed a lack of comparison causing some leniency in assessment.

In relation to AO2 candidates should consider the new technology available both within attractions and used to promote attractions. The latter was not well evidenced in many candidates' work.

Within AO4, target markets were often not acknowledged.

G725 - Organising Travel

There were some submissions for moderation of this unit with a mixed response.

AO1 Candidates did attempt a comparison in this unit, but often omitted the role of the organisers in the chain of distribution.

AO3 Candidates were able to record marketing techniques, but showed difficulty in addressing the effectiveness of the techniques used by the two organisers.

G726 - Hospitality

There were some submissions for moderation of this unit this session with, on the whole, a good response. These related to the amount of research undertaken by the candidates and the appropriateness of the organisation.

There was a tendency for candidates to only briefly describe a corporate hospitality package without a review. Components of the package were not clear and there was a lack of evidence of marketing strategies.

AO4 Candidates should only be looking at one locality with reference to hospitality. There was, however, a tendency for candidates to move off the locality and become too general in nature, particularly when making recommendations for improvement.

G727 - Working Overseas

There were a lot of submissions for moderation of this unit this session with a mixed response. There were, however, some very good responses in the upper range.

AO1 This criterion, on the whole, was not well addressed. There was a tendency for candidates to omit a variety of examples with reference to different companies offering employment overseas.

AO2 There were some good examples here. However, some candidates tended to be general in evidence rather than specific to overseas working practices and tended to omit industry examples as an illustration.

AO3 The criterion requires candidates to research both administrative and operational practices. The latter was not well evidenced in much of the work.

AO4 This was well addressed by candidates and well evidenced.

**Advanced GCE Applied Travel and Tourism (H189, H389, H589, H789)
June 2006 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G720	Raw	100	79	69	59	50	41	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G721	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G722	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G723	Raw	100	80	70	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G724	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G725	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G726	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G727	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H189	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

	Maximum Mark	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
H389	600	480	450	420	390	360	330	300	270	240	0

Specification Aggregation Results

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H189	4.88	19.53	42.38	63.67	82.52	100	1008

Report on the Units taken in June 2006

	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U	Total Number of Candidates
H389	2.4	6.2	11.4	20.9	29.9	40.2	50.2	64.5	75.4	100	209

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553