

# **Travel & Tourism**

Advanced GCE **A2 H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H189, H389**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**January 2007**

**H189/H589/MS/R/07J**

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.

The mark schemes are 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.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

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

© OCR 2007

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**CONTENTS**

**Advanced GCE Travel & Tourism (H589, H789)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel & Tourism (H189, H389)**

**REPORTS ON THE UNITS**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	3
G720	Introducing travel & tourism	5
G723	International travel	9
G728	Tourism development	12
G734	Marketing in travel & tourism	15
*	Principal Moderator's Report	18
*	Grade thresholds	23



## Chief Examiner's Report

The many positive aspects relating to candidate performance in the first examination sessions of this new qualification appear to have been carried over to the January 2007 session. The first examples of A2 work showed signs of distinct promise. The majority of candidates entered were studying for the single award. It is pleasing to see that there were further signs that the qualification is being delivered effectively by Centres.

The quality of written work evident in both candidate portfolios and in the external assessment scripts was again very promising. It is very much hoped that this improving standard will be maintained in all subsequent examination sessions. There were some quite outstanding individual scripts and portfolios. It was particularly pleasing to see that good quality portfolio work has been carried over into the new A2 units.

However, delivery of the new specification is still in its infancy and there are still 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 level 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 some type of conclusion about the issues involved.

In particular, Centres should note that in terms of assessing AO4, it is possible although unlikely that a candidate treating, however well analysed, only **one** aspect or influence can be awarded the maximum credit available. This is because evaluation/discussion/assessment which has not been cross-referenced with at least one other valid influence is not likely to have been sufficiently developed. Thus, a valid conclusion is unlikely to be reached without a minimum of **two** facts/factors/influences being properly evaluated (with supporting analysis).

Many candidates did not do themselves full justice in the January 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 lay out. The January examinations showed once again that many individuals were unable to access the higher level mark bands because of their inability to offer appropriate analytical or evaluative comment. Centres are strongly advised to make sure that candidates understand the differences between *describe*, *explain*, *discuss*, *analyse* and *evaluate*. Detailed comments about candidate performance and the January papers are provided in the following sections of this document.

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

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. There are too many examples of candidate portfolios that do **not** contain clear annotation to support the assessment decisions being made. Thus, it was very difficult to judge progression through the Mark Bands when a candidate presented over 200 pages of information. Candidates would be well advised to avoid such mammoth efforts as much material tends to be not directly relevant to the particular aspect under consideration.

Key aspects that Centres should give proper attention to in an attempt to ensure that their candidates achieve the best possible overall grade include:

- making sure that advice provided in the Guidance for Teachers sections of the specification are actually 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 institution.**

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

**Centres are strongly advised to follow the guidance offered in the following reports and to seek clarification via the Subject Officer if appropriate.**

## **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 study seemed accessible to the candidates; and Centres, in the majority of cases, had obviously used the material well to prepare candidates for the examination. Candidates comprehended the material and effectively used it to assist in their answers. Some candidates had clearly carried out independent background research which further enhanced their understanding. This should be encouraged by Centres when preparing candidates for the examination.

There were some examples of individual candidates, or whole Centres, which had not used the pre-released material effectively to prepare for the examination. Centres should ensure that the pre-released material is handed to candidates in plenty of time, and that the candidates are encouraged to dissect the material. Careful preparation of glossaries of the key terms in the case study, such as room occupancy, would be valuable preparation prior to the examination.

The majority of candidates attempted all five questions. Timing and examination technique could be improved in many cases. If candidates are totally familiar with the case study material there is sufficient time in the examination for all five questions to be answered. Weaker candidates, however, did not always complete all sections of the paper, leaving out whole questions they obviously could not answer. In many cases this was question five.

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.

Centres do need to ensure that candidates are constantly reminded during the preparation for the examination of the necessity to read the question carefully. This was especially evident with questions 1c (where candidates did not look solely at spending) and 3c where candidates did not specifically appeal to Yorkshire.

As in previous examinations, the extended answer questions were all marked based on a 'levels of response' mark scheme. A number of candidates could have gained marks by increasing their depth of analysis and evaluation on these questions. The top end of the marks allocated is 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.

Centres need to bear this 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 descriptions of both 'serviced accommodation' and 'room occupancy' were found in the majority of scripts. Candidates do need to be aware that a rewording of the question, i.e. 'accommodation that is serviced' does not receive credit. Specific examples are awarded marks, as well as a detailed description of the terms.  
The description of 'room occupancy' was sometimes weak, with a lot of answers just stating 'the number of beds in a room'.
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates. The majority of answers picked out the organisations involved in the partnership, with the YTB and the activities the YTB undertakes with and on behalf of these partners. A few candidates did assume that the question asked for an explanation of partnership as a type of business ownership, unfortunately this was not what was required but the question.
- (c) In the majority of cases candidates easily achieved at least a Level 1 response by picking out valid statistics relating to visitor spending. Many good top Level 2 answers were written by candidates, but the evaluative comments needed to get to Level 3 were sparse. A common error was for candidates to try to look at all aspects of the statistics in the case study, such as purpose of visit, without relating these to spending. 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 related to any aspect of the 'What You Need to Learn' in the specification, e.g. visitor spending, numbers employed, types of visitors, reasons for travel, seasonality, the growth of the travel and tourism industry, etc. Analysis of the statistics with judgmental evaluative conclusions is needed to get to the higher mark bands. Many candidates could offer reasoned analysis, e.g. less spending on accommodation when the majority of visitors stay VFR, but there is greater spending on other activities in these instances.
- 2 (a) 'Peak season' and 'day trip' visitor were generally clearly explained. It was more difficult for candidates to achieve the full two marks for the explanation of 'conference tourism'. Most candidates did realise it related to business tourism, but could not gain the second mark by an accurate example (which can be found in the pre-released case study relating to Bradford).
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates. There were clear descriptions of different methods of transportation to Bradford – all of which were clearly identified in the case study material.

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

- (c) Very well answered. Centres have established that there will be a question comparing and contrasting two documents within the pre-released case study material. The candidates could extract the main points about the two different attractions and were able to easily look at the similarities/differences. A common mistake, which limited some candidates, was misinterpretation of the symbols. In both examples the full range of symbols used in the guidebooks were included, but these were not those at the attractions. Candidates should also realise that audio guides at Scarborough Castle are not specifically for the sight or hearing impaired as some candidates suggested. 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. The skills of comparing and contrasting do need to be improved to ensure that there are linkages demonstrated between the two organisations.
- 3 (a) Well answered.
- (b) Well answered.
- (c) Most candidates could explain the general appeal of National Parks and National Trails. To get to the top end of Level 1 candidates needed to relate this specifically to Yorkshire. The majority of candidates accessed Level 2 by analysing the appeal of different aspects to different groups. Some sweeping stereotypical statements were made e.g. only old people are interested in the appeal of the natural environment; teenagers would not like the area as there are no clubs, etc. Level 3 answers needed to demonstrate evaluative comments relating to both National Parks and National Trails in Yorkshire. Apparently there are many naturists who like the area.
- 4 (a) Most candidates understood the three main components of a package holiday, and could describe each. There was some confusion between an all inclusive holiday and the package holiday (otherwise known as an inclusive tour).
- (b) Very well answered.
- (c) 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 Flamingoland's Holiday Village provided for different customer groups (such as families) but did not really make evaluative conclusions relating this provision to the changing needs and expectations. Expected answers should have related to the development of technology, such as the availability of Internet booking.

- 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 Bradford. 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 areas 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 Bradford 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 Bradford has faced 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; for example, competition from short-haul destinations abroad. This was not attempted by the majority of candidates. A top level answer should have an introduction summarising the situation from the case study. The main body of the answer should look at specific issues, with suggestions from the case study as to how this can be remedied, but with some additional analysis and evaluation from the candidate. A conclusion could make suggestions as to what Bradford could do to try to attract more tourists – promotion, niche marketing, development of attractions, etc. - could all be discussed.

## G723: International Travel (Written Examination)

### General Comments

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

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 will be made in the sections which follow.

Many candidates appear to struggle, as was the case in both 2006 examinations, with the actual requirements of particular questions. Centres are **again** 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	State the characteristic features of something.
Explain	Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details.
Outline	Set out the main characteristics describing essentials only.
Discuss (including the ability to <b>analyse</b> )	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 topic. The candidate is expected to look at different interpretations or approaches to the issue.
Assess (including the ability to <b>evaluate</b> )	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.

Candidates unable to respond in an appropriate way to these command verbs will always have difficulty in obtaining the higher marks for questions which are assessed by means of a 'Level of Response' mark scheme.

### Comments on the individual Questions

- 1
- (a) This question was set in the context of North American visits to the UK. These parts were the source of much confusion. Many candidates thought, for example, that Edinburgh, Stonehenge or Brussels were English town and city destinations!
  - (i)
- (a) Similarly, in this part of the question the majority of candidates were unable to clearly offer two reasons to explain London being a good base for visiting Europe, even though Fig. 1 gave clues about the three airports and also Eurostar.
- (ii)
- (b) Answers to part (b) were better and most candidates were able to make reference to valid points to do with the value of the falling value of the US Dollar and the fact that discounts were available.
  - (c) This required some thought. The question asked for an explanation of two identified differences. Valid differences were readily identified but the expected explanatory development was not always provided and so candidates tended to miss out on maximum marks.
  - (d) Responses were quite varied and there was a marked lack of any real attempt to provide an assessment. Few answers were able to clearly point out the extent to which service provision at the chosen airport actually met particular passenger needs. Very few individuals were able to make reasoned evaluative comments about two or more aspects of the airport's service provision and come to a conclusion about the extent to which both leisure and business travellers, both inbound and outbound, were having their international travel needs met.
- 2
- (a) Question 2 was set in the context of the sale of travel insurance and both (ai) and (aii) were done well, with many candidates scoring full marks.
  - (i)
- and
- (ii)
  - (b) Similarly, the services provided by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office were clearly understood and the vast majority of candidates were able to answer this part of the question in at least a satisfactory manner.
  - (c) However, this part proved difficult for many individuals and the main terms of both The Consumer Protection Act and The Data Protection Act were not well known.
  - (d) Few candidates were able to do part (d) well and there were very few higher scoring answers. Candidates are expected to have made a study of an ancillary service provision and in this instance they were required to **evaluate** the range available in TICs and large UK city centre hotels. The range of acceptable services was quite large (as indicated in the WYNTL) but the candidate had to make sure that the ones chosen were stated in a valid context. It was very rare to see any attempt being made to provide reasoned evaluative comments about the wider range of hotel service provision (such as business-related services) and comparing them, for example, with the TIC's leisure focus.
- 3
- (a) 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 visitors to Bali, at least in terms of part (a).

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

- (b) Far too many candidates tended to repeat the same three countries by way of an answer to part (b), thus indicating their inability to interpret the information correctly. The data in Fig. 3(a) clearly shows that only three countries had increased their visitor numbers to Bali between 2001 and 2003.
  - (c) There were also problems with this part of the question. Although Fig. 3(b) was readily interpreted by most candidates, there were few full mark answers because the stated leisure traveller appeal was not always explained. For example, many correctly identified that the airport was 9 km away but did not provide an explanatory comment as to why this might be appealing to the leisure traveller.
  - (d) There were, however, some very good answers to part (d) and it was pleasing to see reference being made to a variety of factors. Better answers usually contained precise references to negative influences such as terrorism (9/11 and USA visits), war (Iraq and Middle East), natural disasters (Tsunami and Katrina) as well as more general influences such as fashion/trends, seasonality and stage in life cycle. These were sometimes further supported by references to the staging of special events, such as the World Cup/Olympics, stimulating demand for particular destinations.
- 4
- (a) Question 4 was usually quite well attempted. Part (a) asked candidates to describe the nature and appeal of desert adventure activities and most candidates chose to interpret Fig. 4. Few could manage full marks but there were plenty of valid suggestions including: off road driving, use of 4x4 vehicles over rough terrain. It would appeal to 'adrenaline junkies' because of excitement, varied scenery, the challenge and danger, etc.
  - (b) Some candidates did not gain full credit in part (b) because the hazards they suggested were not properly contextualised in terms of Fig. 4 and the use of one or two word answers (crash, getting stuck, etc.) were not really good enough. However, those who identified crashing into exposed rocks or getting stuck in sand or deep water were correctly interpreting the stimulus material.
  - (c) The vast majority of candidates had little difficulty in obtaining full marks for this part of the examination paper.
  - (d) Answers to part (d) were more varied and candidates were frequently unable to address both the operational and organisational aspects, thus limiting the amount of credit that could be awarded. This question required a consideration of **both** what is included in the tour (itinerary) and how a tour is managed/put together, i.e. what the customer experiences versus how it is made available. Surprisingly few candidates made direct reference to their own experiences of a tour during a holiday.
  - (e) Answers to part (e) were sometimes over-generalised but there was a good understanding of cruise ship features/facilities, etc. However, the identified features were not always linked with reasons for appeal to specific customer types.

## **G728: Tourism Development (Written Examination)**

### **General Comments**

The examined paper for unit 9, Tourism Development consists of three questions and is based on stimulus case study material to promote answers on a range of topics covered by the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the specification. Question 1, will be set on a destination in the UK. Question 2, will be set on an overseas destination and Question 3 will be based on a current affairs article, which could be in the UK or overseas. The questions set were appropriate and accessible to candidates of all levels, i.e. E to A. This gave candidates at the higher end of the marks the opportunity to gain an overall high grade, while giving candidates at the lower end the opportunity to pass. Most candidates were able to access most questions; the earlier questions were better answered, although it was evident that a disproportionate amount of time was spent on 1(a) and 1(b), which proved to have an impact later in the paper. Overall, Question 1 was answered to a satisfactory standard; however, many candidates confused economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts with objectives. These are fundamental principles of tourism development and it is important that candidates continually refresh their understanding of these terms. In particular, question 1(e) which was based on accommodation classification systems was answered very well.

Question 2 was probably the best answered with many candidates having a good understanding of the majority of the parts.

Question 3 was generally answered the least well due to a combination of not having the requisite knowledge for 3(a) and misreading 3(b). 3(e) tended to suffer due to poor time management. 3(d) asked candidates to evaluate the methods that Poland and Hungary could use to promote the principles of sustainable tourism. This was by far the least well answered question, with most candidates writing about the negative aspects of the decline of traditional industries. Generally, the lack of candidates' ability to develop their answers with analytical comments and evaluation resulted in them being unable to access the higher marks on the level of response questions. There will always be a sub-question at the end of each question which requires an extended written answer. This question will ask candidates to assess, analyse or evaluate a particular issue. There were many candidates who had written really good extended answers but who could not get beyond level 2 as they were unable to give clear analysis of the evidence presented in the stimulus material, or lacked the ability to conclude their findings with an opinion on the evidence presented in the case study.

Candidates made good use of the material on the whole; however, their interpretation of the differences between social, economic and environmental impacts/objectives bore little resemblance to the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the specification.

Candidates are tending to overly repeat themselves in several questions, e.g. jobs, income, appear to be the answer to many questions without consideration to the destination or command word used in the question. Many candidates came to the examination with pre-learned case studies to illustrate answers. Some of these were highly illustrative, particularly where similar resorts to Blackpool were used to suggest objectives or methods used by agents of tourism in increasing visitor numbers. In many cases, however, these were inappropriate to the question, either because the circumstance was different or the examples came from a part of the world removed from the area in question. Common examples were the Spanish Costas for overdevelopment, cultural problems in Goa and the difficulties with all inclusive holidays in the Gambia.

In general, the standard this session was quite pleasing and the use of knowledge and/or recap of tourism development key terms were evident. Future candidates are encouraged to practice past examinations papers for revision purposes.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1
- (a) Generally well answered with most candidates achieving maximum marks. The most common responses were growth of cheap flight/holidays and climate. Many candidates gave extended answers which were too detailed for four marks.
  - (b) Generally well answered with a good range of economic objectives stated.
    - (i)
    - (b) Well answered, although some candidates offered more economic factors or gave environmental impacts and not objectives. Better answers suggested, for example, cleaning or preservation of Blackpool Tower or piers; more general answers suggested protection of wildlife/flora and fauna without exemplification.
    - (ii)
  - (c) Although most candidates offered an increase in gambling addiction many could not suggest the particular impact that this might have on Blackpool. There were many stock answers (loss of culture – without recognising the specific culture of a UK seaside resort, and the resulting break-up of families, a general improvement of “quality of life”). This suggested that candidates had learned some socio-cultural factors but that they were unable to apply these to a UK destination in context. Many candidates offered economic factors again in response to this question.
  - (d) Some candidates were able to identify methods, but did not identify particular agents. A number of candidates were able to identify the three sectors but this seemed mainly to be from the source material. Others talked about policies in general and based their response on pre-learned knowledge of different and unrelated areas. This question prompted a large number of candidates to quote wholesale from the source without demonstrating any particular application or understanding. Better answers identified particular agents, the sectors to which they belonged and, in a number of cases, specific methods and policies which candidates identified from their own experience / locality.  
  
Very few candidates were able to **evaluate** the policies and/or methods from the case study.
- 2
- (a) Well answered, maximum marks were awarded to most candidates.
  - (b) Most candidates were able to explain, at length, economic benefits and this question enabled candidates to achieve high marks.
  - (c) The preservation of culture and the reason for appeal were generally identified as reasons without exemplification.
  - (d) This question asked candidates to discuss the **advantages** of the partnership between the sectors identified in the case study. Many candidates identified **how** they would work together but were not able to offer specific advantages. Better answers identified the sources of funding, the involvement of the community and the support/expertise of the private sector. The very best answers identified that a successful partnership would reduce the reliance on aid agencies for the local population.

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

- (e) It was pleasing to see how well this part of the question was answered. Many candidates brought into their answers aspects of customer service and marketing. Candidates had clearly learned, understood and applied both the general importance of classification, and in particular, the importance to attract tourists to LEDC's. There was very good evidence of the difference between the needs of clients from MEDC's and what LEDC's could generally offer.
- 3 (a) Even candidates who had correctly answered (i) struggled to answer this part of the question correctly, however a large number earned one mark from the two available. Common misconceptions were the confusion with GNP, the suggestion that the D was development and that GDP was money earned from the development of tourism, or that it represented the average amount of money each person in the country had.
- (i)
- (ii)
- (b) This was generally poorly answered, and in most cases it seemed to be a misreading of the question. Many candidates answered as if the question were "how would tourism benefit from increased investment". Better answers identified investment in roads/airports and subsequent accessibility. Only the very best identified that such investment could be used to build/improve tourist attractions.
- (c) Generally well answered although a few candidates suggested that the new visitors may in fact be terrorists or illegal immigrants.
- (d) This question asked for social and cultural impacts and the responses rarely matched the question. Many gave economic followed by environmental impacts and these were mainly negative, e.g. jobs, income and infrastructure as opposed to positive. Those who were able to understand the question gave mainly negative social impacts with little amplification. Very few candidates were able to give any positive impacts, such as preservation of Maori culture and improvement of the relationship and understanding between cultures. Very few candidates achieved Level 3 for this question.
- (e) Very few candidates understood the concept of sustainable tourism. A common response was – "tourism that keeps going" or definitions of ecotourism. The question invited candidates to use an example they had previously studied. There were many references to the banning of 'all-inclusives' but without substance or understanding. In addition, quite a few candidates wrote about saving turtles eggs and the negative impact of pollution on wildlife. The majority of candidates chose a destination in the UK such as shopping centres, theme parks or other tourist attractions. These were not credited. Candidates should be able to understand the concept of sustainable tourism and be able to quote an example.

This question suffered from poor time management with many candidates not attempting it or writing only a sentence or two. Those who did fully attempt it often fell into the inappropriate answer of either using tourism to regenerate the failing traditional industries or an ecotourism based answer.

## **G734: Marketing in Travel and Tourism (Written Examination)**

### **General Comments**

This was the first examination of this series. Candidates were issued with pre-release material. The case study was based on Center Parcs with details on its UK and European sites. There was also an advertisement, press release and general marketing detail concerning Center Parcs.

The timing of the examination by candidates did not appear to be an issue as the majority of candidates attempted all of the questions. However, some of the weaker candidates did not complete all sections of each question. Centres should advise candidates that it is not necessary to re-write the question before they attempt their answers.

The stimulus materials were generally well used by the candidates. Some Centres had clearly worked through the case study and appeared to have thoroughly prepared their candidates. However, several weaker candidates appeared unsure of some basic travel and tourism terminology such as PEST and AIDA. Centres should attempt to prepare candidates fully before entering them into examinations. Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the glossary of terms and have a good grounding in the basic marketing principles as outlined in the structure of the 'What You Need to Learn' criteria. Clearly, some candidates were ill prepared and confused marketing research methods with marketing communication methods. Examination preparation would also help candidates, particularly with the definitions of specific 'command' words – some weaker candidates struggle with terms such as 'evaluate' and 'assess'. Questions aimed at the higher evaluative levels are marked using a level of response system; these answers must be well thought-out and contain some form of evaluation and a concluding statement or a statement of judgement. Where candidates simply 'describe' or 'state' answers, they will be unable to attain the higher marks. Centres should also draw candidates' attention to the mark allocation on questions. Some candidates overlook the relevance of the marks and spend too long giving detailed responses when these are not required.

Generally, higher level candidates utilised the stimulus well. It was clear that some Centres had made a very good effort to research and disseminate the case study material. Some candidates were very familiar with all levels of the stimulus and the detail with which they wrote about both Center Parcs and other vocational travel and tourism examples was very pleasing.

### **Comments on individual questions**

- 1 (a) This first question on the paper was generally well answered by candidates. To gain the full four marks candidates were required to explain two benefits to Center Parcs of having a mission statement. Weaker candidates were only able to explain one – giving 'setting out aims and objectives' as a common response. However, the higher level candidates could expand upon the 'vision and values' and 'public relations' benefits.
- (b)(i) This question was generally well answered. Candidates were asked to explain and both qualitative and quantitative terms. However, some of the weaker candidates confused the terminology giving the wrong response to each one.
- (ii)

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

- (c) Candidates were asked to state three requirements from the Data Protection Act which Center Parcs must meet. This was generally well answered with most candidates appearing familiar with the Act. Many candidates gained good marks here; however, some of the weaker candidates repeated their responses, e.g., Information must be kept confidential; information must not be left open for people to read. These are clearly the same point.
  - (d) This question concerned forms of primary marketing research which Center Parcs could use. Candidates were asked to evaluate three forms of primary marketing research. This was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to comment on focus groups, observations, telephone surveys, mystery shoppers. However, the weaker candidates did confuse market research with market communications and some discussed different types of advertising and direct marketing techniques.  
Once again this question was marked as a level of response and only those candidates who could evaluate three forms of primary research were able to gain the higher marks.
  - (e)(i) Candidates were asked to describe the characteristics of empty nesters. This was generally very well answered. The most common responses included: older couples, whose children have grown up and left home, leaving them with more disposable income.
  - (ii) Candidates were asked to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages to Center Parcs of market segmentation. Some candidates struggled with the concept of market segmentation. The weaker candidates mainly discussed the type of facilities which Center Parcs contains and related this to families. The higher level candidates were able to discuss market segmentation in more detail giving answers such as – advantages - ensuring marketing was aimed at the correct target market (with examples); allowed Center Parcs to establish and retain market position and staying customer focussed. The disadvantages appeared more difficult to access for most candidates. The most common responses included 'costs' and 'losing out on other markets'.
- 2
- (a) Question two was generally well answered. Candidates were asked to explain one way in which the acquisition of Oasis had altered the marketing mix of Center Parcs. Candidates could comment on any one of the 4 P's – however, the most accessible answers came from the change in the Product type and Place.
  - (b)(i) This question asked candidates to explain the term branding. This was generally very well answered.
  - (ii) Candidates were asked to assess the advantages to Center Parcs of being promoted under the Cresta brand. This question was generally very well answered. Most candidates could clearly see the benefits of working under the banner of Cresta and the link to MyTravel, with its associated benefits to the family market and extended advertising. Some candidates were not able to gain higher level marks because they could 'assess' clearly the advantages.
  - (c) This question asked candidates to assess the effectiveness of the AIDA model of Fig 7. It was pleasing to see that most Centres had clearly studied AIDA and had used the case study material for that purpose. There were some excellent responses to this question and many candidates were able to gain very high marks for their clear and well structured responses.

*Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

- (d) Candidates were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of advertising media used by Center Parcs. Many candidates were able to gain good marks here. The question required candidates to discuss the media currently used by Center Parcs – given in the stimulus material. Some weaker candidates seemed unfamiliar with this part of the text and wrote generally about media and its benefits. Nevertheless, higher level candidates who were able to evaluate the different types of media – brochure, tv, teletext, Cresta brochure and direct marketing were able to gain very good marks.
- 3 (a) Candidates were asked to compare and contrast the effectiveness of sales promotion and themed breaks. This was generally well answered. Candidates were able to consider the types of breaks outlined in the stimulus and compare their effectiveness to discounts, BOGOFs, etc. Once again this was a level of response question and those candidates who were able to evaluate their answers were able to gain marks in the range of nine to twelve.
- (b)(i) Candidates were asked to draw and label a product life cycle diagram. This was generally very well answered by all candidates. Marks were not deducted for poor diagrams.
- (ii) With the product life cycle diagram drawn, candidates were asked to justify at which stage they would place Center Parcs. There were generally some good responses to this question. Higher level candidates were able to justify responses by reflecting on the movement to work with Cresta and the MyTravel brand and the type and success of visitors related to market segmentation currently used.
- (c) The final question on the paper concerned a PEST analysis. It was pleasing to see that many Centres had worked on this feature using the stimulus and candidates were able to access good marks. It was a pity that the E of PEST was misunderstood by several candidates as they used the term ‘economical’ instead of ‘economic’, indeed in some instances candidates confused this E with ‘environmental’!

## Principal Moderator's Report

The overall impression for this session is that there was an improvement in the standard of assessment and quality of candidate's work, in particular at AS level.

With reference to A2, the overall first impression is good. It is pleasing to see Centres making use of support material available through OCR and advice given through training sessions and consultancy.

Many Centres this session had submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also made use of the comment boxes on the URS. It is important to ensure the candidate's number is also recorded on the URS as this caused some confusion during the moderation process. There is still, with some Centres, a lack of specific annotation relating to the criterion and mark bands on the candidate's work to show what level of the band the assessor considers the evidence to have been addressed/met. This is particularly needed with G722 - **Travel Destinations** (AS) and G729 - **Event Management** (A2).

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 some evidence of leniency as candidates often missed some of a mark band. 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 and missed the key words/evidence of a particular mark band.

### Unit G721: Customer Service

There were several submissions for the moderation of this unit this session with mixed responses.

There was an improvement in assessment and quality of evidence this session. Centres need to tick the URS sheet in the box when candidates work is submitted as a re-sit.

There is still a tendency for candidates to submit information which is general in nature rather than specific to the organisation and there are still cases of candidates looking at more than one organisation. In some cases there had been an inappropriate choice of organisation. There was, however, some very thorough and appropriate evidence by candidates submitted for moderation this session.

AO1 candidates clearly identified the needs of internal and external customers and made a reasonable attempt to evidence how their needs are met, but this was descriptive in nature. There are still cases where there is little evidence of a **comparison** leading into how this would benefit the organisation - this is a key component of this assessment objective.

AO2 was generally well evidenced with many candidates replying to a complaint by letter. Candidates need to look at a minimum of three situations to evidence the variety of customers. It still needs to 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, if answering by letter, to format the letter 'business style' with no errors, e.g. spelling. Candidates must deal with a variety of customers which must be clearly evidenced. In some cases it was not clear who were the variety of customers.

There tended to be a lack of clear and detailed witness statements to support the assessment of candidate's performance though some Centres had done this well. The

## *Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

witness statements need to relate more to the specific skills the candidate has performed and in particular how well.

AO3 It has been evident that some Centres have had difficulty in interpreting what is required for this mark band. This session this criterion has been better addressed. There is a tendency in most cases to omit **internal customers** which must also be considered, e.g. meetings, etc.

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. This would relate to the results found using the different methods.

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.

AO4. Candidates need to evaluate the organisation's customer service and how effective they think it is with recommendations. This is likely to require the candidate to carry out for example, a survey, observation, mystery shopper etc.

Centres generally carried out and evidenced this well with checklists etc. **There was a tendency for candidates to look at and evaluate products and services but not to consider personal qualities, e.g. face-to-face communication, etc.**

Some candidates produced an evaluation but there was still a lack of evidence as to how they had found the findings. They had reported on what the organisation had said but not made any personal judgements/opinions and recommendations to support this.

### **Unit G722: Travel Destinations.**

There were several submissions for moderation of this unit this session with, on the whole, a good response. Some Centres are taking on board advice and feedback.

AO1 Centres are starting to address this well but please bear in mind that downloaded maps must be annotated, sourced/referenced and be linked to a description.

AO2 was generally well assessed but care needs to be taken where candidates have evidenced sections of text and websites. With reference to the appeal of their destinations, candidates attempted to make a logical explanation but still omitted to fully cover the appeal of their destination with particular reference to **who 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. This aspect of the assessment was the main cause of scaling in this unit this session.

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 e.g. what would or would not be useful for mark band 3. Many candidates had used only websites as their primary source of research and need encouraging to consider other sources. Part of the analysis marks for mark band 3 can be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This had, again, this session been well addressed by higher grade candidates.

Sometimes sources were well referenced in the text.

### *Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had done 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.

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

#### **Unit G724: Tourist Attractions**

There were some submissions for moderation of this unit this session with a good response. This 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, candidates again, showed a lack of **comparison** causing some leniency in assessment.

#### **Unit G725: Organising Travel**

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

AO1 Candidates again did not fully attempt a **comparison** and tended to omit 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.

#### **Unit G726: Hospitality.**

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

Again there was a tendency for candidates to quantify the hospitality provider for AO2, but 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.

#### **Unit G727: Working Overseas.**

There were few submissions for moderation of this unit this session with a good response.

AO1 This criterion was not well addressed on the whole. There was a tendency for candidates to omit a variety of examples with reference to different companies offering employment overseas. Candidates need to emphasis skill requirements of particular jobs and concentrate on the qualities needed to develop an individual's ability to carry out a job efficiently. This tended to be the source for scaling of this unit.

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

AO3 This criterion requires candidates to research both administrative and operational practices. The latter was not well evidenced in candidate's work once again this session.

AO4 This was well addressed by candidates and evidenced.

### **Unit G729: Event Management**

There were several submissions of this unit this session with generally a good response.

Candidates had obviously enjoyed doing this unit and learnt, with some understanding, the complexities of organising and carrying out a travel and tourism event, as part of a team. It was very pleasing to see the range of appropriate events considered and attempted/carried out.

It was also pleasing to see that Centres had in several cases, differentiated assessments/marks awarded to their candidates together with an individual report.

With reference to the Business Plan, this should be clear and precise. Some candidates had been methodical in approach, whereas others had been repetitive and unclear. This was particularly relevant to the need for clearer aims and objectives, the need for a contingency plan, time plan and alterations to the time plan as the event progresses, risk assessment, financial accounts, etc. There was some confusion as to the requirements of a Plan and evidence became muddled and difficult to decipher.

Candidates need to be clear on what they precisely contributed to, e.g. use of a log book and evidence highlighted where they had made a major contribution, agendas and minutes of meetings highlighting their contribution, etc.

There was sometimes a need for the Centre to produce a short report/witness statement relating to the candidates performance. There was also a need for candidates to address problems/difficulties and how these were dealt with. This was often omitted in candidate's evidence.

With reference to feasibility, market research can play a part here. Some Centres had done extensive market research, in some cases, more than needed but others had not considered this aspect.

### **Unit G730: Guided Tour**

There were some submissions with a good response.

Where difficulty occurred it was due to the need for a clear plan, e.g. purpose, target market, clear aims, resources, etc. There were omissions by candidates in the planning of the tour such as timing, costing, a clear itinerary etc.

It is important to include at least one detailed witness statement from an independent observer or tour participant as **supporting evidence**.

### **Unit G731: Ecotourism**

There were some submissions this session with a good response. Candidates had approached very different ecotourism projects and, where assessment was in the higher bracket, had produced extensive evidence of understanding of the project, future development and the nature of ecotourism.

There was a slight tendency for candidates to become too general in nature and off the point rather than more specific to their project and destination. However, this made some good examples for AO4 when considering ecotourism worldwide. It is also important for candidates to support opinions by expressing their own values and attitudes but also to be aware of those of the stakeholders. This was not always well evidenced by candidates.

### *Report on the Units taken in January 2007*

It was pleasing to see that candidates had referenced work and contacted the destination and 'project developers/administrators' electronically and in other ways to find some of the information.

#### **Unit G732: Adventure Tourism**

There was a small submission this session with a good response

Candidates need to develop the reasons for growth of ATAs, as this was disjointed. It is important for candidates to consider that the different organisations addressed in AO1 can have very different values and attitudes for the same activity.

Centres need to bear in mind that the evaluation, in terms of personal performance and team performance for AO4, relates to the planning and carrying out of the activity itself rather than personal performance in doing the activity and skill.

#### **Unit G733: Cultural Tourism**

There were some submissions this session with a good response.

It was particularly pleasing to see that all Centres who had submitted candidates work for this unit had made good use of the support material produced through OCR. Assessment was good and candidates had looked at the diversity of their destinations with comparison in terms of culture and tourism well.

It needs noting that candidates can talk to/interview people who have been to their destinations in order to form opinions AO2. It is also good practice to encourage candidates to research and evidence specific cultural tours which are available at their destination. This would equate to AO1/AO2/AO3.

#### **Unit G734: Human Resources**

There were some submissions this session with a generally good response.

For AO1 it is important that candidates compare and contrast the management and planning of human resources within both organisations, rather than treat each organisation as a separate entity.

With reference to AO2, the job role should relate to one of the organisations studied in AO1. AO3 can be any related to any travel and tourism job role but AO4, again, relates specifically to one of the chosen organisations within AO1.

**Applied GCE Travel and Tourism H189  
January 2007 Assessment Series**

**Coursework Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G721</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G722</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G724</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G725</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G726</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G727</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**Examined Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G720</b>	Raw	100	79	69	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G723</b>	Raw	100	80	70	60	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**Applied GCE Travel and Tourism H389  
January 2007 Assessment Series**

**Coursework Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G729</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G730</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G731</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G732</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G733</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G735</b>	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

**Examined Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>G728</b>	Raw	100	74	64	54	45	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
<b>G734</b>	Raw	100	75	65	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Uniform marks correspond to overall grades as follows.

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H189):

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
UMS (max 300)	240	210	180	150	120

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389):

Overall Grade	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE
UMS (max 600)	480	450	420	390	360	330	300	270	240

### Cumulative Percentage in Grade

#### Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H189):

A	B	C	D	E	U
2.44	19.51	48.78	87.81	100.0	100.0

There were 41 candidates aggregating in Jan 2007.

#### Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389):

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
6.25	6.25	12.5	43.75	50.00	62.50	75.00	100.0	100.0	100.0

There were 16 candidates aggregating in Jan 2007.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam\\_system/understand\\_ums.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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**

© OCR 2007

