

Travel & Tourism

Advanced GCE **A2 H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H189, H389**

Report on the Units

June 2007

H189/H589/MS/R/07

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 report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
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)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
G720	Introducing travel & tourism	8
G721	Customer service in travel & tourism	
G722	Travel destinations	
G723	International travel	12
G724	Tourist attractions	
G725	Organising travel	
G726	Hospitality	
G727	Working overseas	
G728	Tourism development	16
G729	Event management	
G730	The guided tour	
G731	Ecotourism	
G732	Adventure tourism	
G733	Culture tourism	
G734	Marketing in travel & tourism	19
G735	Human resources in travel & tourism	
*	Grade thresholds	22

AS/A2 TRAVEL & TOURISM

CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT - JUNE 2007

The many positive aspects relating to candidate performance in the earlier examination sessions of the new qualification appear to have carried on into the June 2007 session. Many examples of A2 work showed continuing signs of promise. The entry was again quite large and the majority of candidates entered were studying for the single award. It is very pleasing to be able to report that the qualification is being delivered effectively by the majority of Centres.

The quality of written work evident in both candidate portfolios and in the external assessment scripts was frequently of a good standard. It is now hoped that this improved standard will be maintained in subsequent examination sessions. However, delivery of the specification is still in its infancy and there remain significant issues to be addressed in the near future in order to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade.

All the Principal Examiners make reference to the fact that many individual candidates failed to do themselves full justice in terms of their examination performance. I thus feel it is appropriate to repeat the following from January's Report to Centres, '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)'.

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 June question 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. There are far too many examples of candidate portfolios which do **not** contain clear annotation to support the assessment decisions being made by Centres.

Key aspects which Centres should give 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;
- refer to and make full use of the various support materials available for all the AS and A2 units;
- 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 the findings apply within their own institution.

It is very much hoped that further improvements will be forthcoming during subsequent examination sessions.

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



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

GCE Travel and Tourism AS/A2 Level

Principal Moderator's Report-June 2007

Many Centres had well prepared their candidates for A2. There were some problems with AS units but there was evidence of improvement in assessment by Centres

Many Centres this session 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. It is **important** to ensure the **candidate's number** is also recorded on the URS, as this failure caused 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 which level of band the assessor considers the evidence to have been addressed/met. This was particularly needed with G722 Travel Destinations (AS) and G729 Event Management (A2) where candidate's work can be holistic in nature.

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 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 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.

This also applies to the rank ordering of assessment objectives and the overall mark. Some candidates who had produced similar or better quality of evidence of a mark band than another candidate but had been awarded less marks and vice versa. Where Centres had followed a clear internal moderation process this problem was less evident.

Several units require the application of knowledge and understanding to specific organisations and examples. In cases where Centres had considered the appropriateness of the organisation against the depth of research needed candidate's performed better. There was, however, some lack of **application of knowledge** evident by candidates throughout the units at both levels. Those candidates who had clearly researched, sourced and applied understanding provided some excellent portfolio evidence worthy of high marks.

Although most Centres submitted an authentication form with the unit portfolios, many candidates did not acknowledge, particularly on A2 units, their information sources. In all units, candidates need to reference work, source quotations, append, acknowledge and make reference to specific materials. Again, in evaluation and analysis data should be sourced.

Unit G721 Customer Service

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this session with mixed responses. There were some excellent, thorough and appropriate examples.

There is still a tendency for candidates to submit information which is general in nature rather than specific to the organisation studied.

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 often descriptive in



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

nature. There are still cases where there is little evidence of a **comparison for different customer types and internal/external customers**. This should then lead 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 and in line with the organisations' complaints procedure/policy. It is expected, at this level, that candidates, if answering by letter, to format the letter in a 'business style' with no errors, e.g. spelling. Candidates must deal with a variety of customers who 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 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 had difficulty in interpreting what was required for this mark band. For this session, this criterion has been better addressed. There is a tendency in most cases to omit **internal customers** here who should 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, e.g. 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 without considering personal qualities and skills, 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 obtained their results. They had reported on what the organisation had said, but had not made any personal judgements/opinions and recommendations to support this or used, e.g. a mystery shopper activity, observation activity, survey, etc.

Unit G722 Travel Destinations

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this session with a mixed response. Centres are taking on board advice and feedback. Where the key words of the criteria had been evidenced, candidates performed well.

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. There was a tendency for candidates to omit annotating maps and not reference the source with the map.



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

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 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, and different types of customers. 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 on 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.

Sources were well referenced in the text by some candidates.

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 availability of data at international level. Beyond mark band 1, it is expected that trends are analysed and that future predictions are provided. Candidates often attempted this but with 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 relates 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 there was still a tendency for candidates to omit **comparison** in the work, causing some leniency in assessment.

Unit G725 Organising Travel

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

AO1 Candidates 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.

AO4 Candidates need to consider two separate complex itineraries which meet the needs of different customers. Candidates tended to produce unclear itineraries.

Unit G726 Hospitality

There were a number of submissions for the moderation of this unit this session with, on the whole, a good response. Performance 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 only briefly describe a corporate hospitality package **without a review**. This often caused leniency in assessment. Components of the package were not clear and there was often a lack of evidence of **marketing strategies**.

Unit G727 Working Overseas

There were several 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. There was a lack of distinction on the emphasis and skill requirements of particular jobs.

AO2 There was some good examples here. However, some candidates tended to be general with their evidence rather than being specific to **overseas** working practices and often 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 the work of many candidates work once again this session, but the former was well done.

AO4 This was well addressed by candidates and well evidenced.

Unit G729 Event Management

There was a larger submission of this unit this session than had been the case in January 2007.

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 pleasing to see the range of appropriate events considered and completed. There were occasions where candidates had not actually carried out the event, which severely penalised them.

It was also good practice to find that Centres had in several cases, differentiated assessments/marks awarded to their candidates together with an individual report and witness statement.

AO1 With reference to the Business Plan, some candidates had been methodical in their approach, whereas others were repetitive and unclear. In many samples, candidates had not set out a plan but had tended to produce a report and running commentary which caused them to omit vital pieces of information. This was particularly relevant to the need for clearer aims and objectives, purpose, SMART targets, financial accounts, etc. There was some confusion as to the requirements of a plan and evidence became muddled and difficult to decipher. It is essential that the plan is produced individually. There were cases where candidates had all done the same plan and assessment had not been differentiated by mark.

AO2 Candidates were not always clear on what they precisely contributed to, e.g. use of a log book and evidence highlighted where they had made a major contribution, with agendas and minutes of meetings highlighting their contribution, etc. There were, however, some excellent examples amongst centre submissions.



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

There is a need for candidates to address problems/difficulties and how they are dealt with. This was often omitted in candidates' evidence.

AO3 This assessment objective was not well addressed as Centres had difficulty in considering the requirements needed. Candidates tended to have some difficulty in evidencing feasibility. Though most candidates had considered risk assessment and a contingency plan, there was little evidence of market research, a record of other ideas, costing and specific reasoning for the final outcome, together with changes made, eg. such as a change to time plan, etc. as the event was being planned.

AO4 Candidates, on the whole, addressed this objective well but there was a tendency to omit any reference to **aims and objectives**. They tended to produce a running commentary of what they had done, rather than an evaluation.

Unit G730 Guided Tour

There were several submissions with a mixed 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 some candidates in the planning of the tour such as timing, costing, a clear itinerary, etc.

Most Centres included at least one detailed witness statement from an independent observer or tour participant as **supporting evidence**.

There was a need for candidates to develop the **quality of the evaluation** rather than producing a commentary of what they had done.

Unit G731 Ecotourism

There were many 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 an understanding of the project, future development and the nature of ecotourism.

There was a tendency for some candidates to become too general in nature and somewhat off the point, rather than being specific to their project and destination - causing a lack of application of knowledge and understanding. 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 to also be aware of those of the stakeholders. This was not always well evidenced by candidates.

There was a tendency for examples and information to lack **sourcing and referencing**

Unit G732 Adventure Tourism

There were several submissions this session with a mixed response

AO1 was generally well addressed but candidates showed a need to develop the reasons for the growth of ATAs, as this was disjointed. It is important for candidates to consider that the different



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

organisations addressed in AO1 can have very different values and attitudes for the same activity. Centres holistically approached this assessment objective with part of AO3.

AO2 Candidates addressed the impact but tended to omit the **benefits** of ATA's in the chosen **destinations**. Where impact was considered, this did not always relate to the chosen destinations.

AO4 Centres need to bear in mind that the evaluation, in terms of personal performance and team performance, relates to the planning and carrying out of the activity itself, rather than personal performance at doing the activity and skill. The quality of evaluation sometimes needed enhancing with clear witness statements (AO3).

There was a lack of sourcing and referencing in the work of many candidates.



RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

Unit G733 Cultural Tourism

There were several submissions this session.

This unit was generally addressed well. Where candidates showed weaker evidence it was usually due to a lack of **application** to the **cultural tourist**. There was also a lack of primary research such as asking people who had been to the destination, in order to form views and opinions (AO2) and motivational theory (AO1). Candidates sometimes compared the religion of the two destinations rather than the interest to the **Cultural Tourist** in terms of custom, etc (AO2).

Few candidates had actually researched and evidenced specific cultural tours which might be available at their destination. This would equate to AO1/AO2/AO3, as well as motivational theory.

There was a need to source and reference work.

Unit G735 Human Resources

There were some submissions this session with a mixed response.

Where candidates fell down it was usually due to a lack of evidence in the management and planning of human resources with any comparison/contrast.

With reference to AO2, the job role should relate to one of the organisations studied in AO1. This was not always the case.

AO3 The evidence should relate to a different job role not considered in AO2. Some candidates had carried out the same analysis in relation to the same job role as AO2.

AO4 This again relates specifically to one of the chosen organisations (AO1).

G720: introducing Travel and Tourism (written examination) June 2007

General comments

The pre-released case study stimulus materials were well used by the Centres and their candidates. All documents in the case studies seemed accessible and Centres had obviously used the materials well to prepare the candidates for the examination. Candidates comprehended the materials and effectively used them to assist in their answers. Some candidates had clearly carried out independent background research which further enhanced their understanding; this was especially the case in answers relating to the Hilton Hotel and the Nevis Range Mountain Experience. This should be encouraged by Centres when preparing candidates for the examination, as it gives candidates an in depth knowledge of the UK destination.

Careful preparation of glossaries of the key terms in the case study, such as independent leisure visitor, would be valuable preparation prior to the examination. Centres should encourage candidates to dissect the case studies to select all the likely travel and tourism terminology which may be in the question paper, and prepare definitions and examples of these terms.

The vast majority of candidates attempted all five questions. Timing and examination technique has improved in comparison to previous examinations. Weaker candidates did not always complete all sections of the paper, leaving out whole questions they obviously could not answer. The actual question missed out varied between Centres.

Candidates demonstrated valid knowledge and understanding of travel and tourism and were able to apply this to the question paper. 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 Question 1(c) where some candidates did not look solely at accommodation in Scotland.

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 are awarded for evaluative comments and justified and judgemental conclusions. For this upper 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. Some Centres had obviously advised candidates to use additional sheets of examination paper rather than the back page of the answer booklet, this practice should not be encouraged.

Comments on individual questions

1a

'Independent leisure visitor' was not always well answered.

Centres need to ensure that candidates understand that a 'leisure visitor' can cover any use of leisure time – such as holidays, day visits to attractions, and is not just confined to leisure centres. The term 'independent' refers to a visitor who makes the arrangements without the assistance; for example, of a travel agent. A common misconception amongst candidates was that an independent visitor was a lone traveller. Good explanations of 'domestic tourism' were found in the majority of scripts, with some interesting and appropriate examples.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

1b

Generally well answered. Some candidates did confuse the components of an all inclusive coach tour with the components of a package holiday. There was also a common incidence of the weaker candidates copying sections from the case study or not extending an answer. This does not allow the candidate to access marks.

1c

In the majority of cases candidates easily achieved at least a Level 1 response by picking out valid statistics relating to visitor spending. Most candidates accessed Level 2 by showing analysis, such as 'expenditure higher in serviced accommodation by domestic tourists than VFR'. Many good top Level 2 answers were written by candidates, but the evaluative comments needed to get to Level 3 were sparser. 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' in the specifications, 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 evaluations, e.g. less spending on accommodation when the majority of visitors stay VFR, as there is no need to pay for the actual accommodation component. Good answers relating to the different needs of overseas visitors were seen, such as 'hotel being most popular as it is their main holiday and they want to stay in luxury'.

2a

'Hostel' was generally well answered, although some candidates did suggest that these were provided for homeless people. This is not a definition of a hostel in the context of travel and tourism.

Candidates either fully understood timeshare, or were obviously not aware of what it meant. This is an example of where Centres can prepare candidates thoroughly by picking out all the relevant travel and tourism terminology in the case study materials.

Seasonality was often confused with peak season or the way companies try to combat seasonality (e.g. seasonal pricing). A candidate who did not explain that it was the 'fluctuations in demand for travel and tourism' could not access the full two marks.

2b

Very well answered by the majority of candidates. There were clear descriptions of different methods of transport overseas tourist are likely to use to travel to and within Scotland. Credit was given for diverse answers such as 'by foot' and 'by bicycle', as these are obviously ways in which overseas visitors can travel within Scotland, and in some cases may be the actual main purpose of their visit. Credit was not given for 'by sea' or 'by road' unless a method of transport was actually stated in the answer.

2c

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 hotels and were able to easily look at the similarities/differences. Some candidates did try to extend their answer beyond the products and services provided by the hotels, giving irrelevant information about the facilities available in the surrounding area.

3a

Well answered. Many candidates understood the benefits to the customer of hotel grading schemes, such as easy recognition of the quality of service and amount of facilities provided, hence allowing comparison between different accommodation outlets.

3b

Not always well answered. The socio-economic factors which have influenced the development of the travel and tourism industry are clearly stated in the specification, i.e. changes in car

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

ownership; increase in leisure time; increase in disposable income and the impact of the national economy. Many candidates concentrated on technological or political development instead of socio-economic factors. Due to the current emphasis on responsible green tourism, this was given credit if candidates explained details of the way in which this could affect tourism in Scotland, such as leaving less of a carbon footprint if using public transport to travel to Scotland rather than flying to other short haul destinations.

3c

This question was generally the one on which candidates performed worst on in the paper. The case study clearly states that coach tours can be booked directly through a tour operator, or through a travel agency. Many candidates purely copied what they perceived to be advantages and disadvantages from the case study. Often candidates confused independent tour operators with direct sell – these are not always the same. There was sometimes an obvious lack of knowledge about direct sell tour operators.

In questions such as this, candidates should be encouraged to clearly lay out their answer so that the advantages and disadvantages are clearly related to the different organisations in the question. Quite often it was a very confused answer with repetition, hence restricting access to Level 3.

4a

Very well answered.

4b

Very well answered.

4c

Well answered. The majority of candidates obviously understood that the main role of the private sector is profit maximisation, and related this to the Nevis Range Mountain Experience.

4d

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 Nevis Range Mountain Experience provided for different customer groups (such as families, and those with a concern for the natural environment) and related these to the actual activities and facilities on offer.

5

Centres should be aware that the last question on the paper asks for an evaluation of the case study materials - in this case the document relating to coach tourism in Scotland. 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 is expected that Centres should prepare their candidates thoroughly, and assist them in understanding coach tourism to Scotland and general issues and problems facing the travel and tourism industry.

Most candidates attempted the question and reached at least Level 1 by extracting the issues and problems facing coach tourism in Scotland from the case study. The majority were clearly stated, such as foot and mouth, 11 September, terrorism attacks and the war in Iraq. 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, more recent terrorism attacks in London and competition from short-haul destinations with more consistently hot weather than Scotland.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

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 the 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 how coach tourism in Scotland could do to try to attract more tourists – promotion, niche marketing, etc. could all be discussed. This question was answered better than in previous sessions.

Principal Examiner's Report G723 June 2007

General Comments

There was a medium sized entry for this examination session and it is very pleasing to note that candidate performance is starting to reflect the advice given to Centres in previous reports. Candidates are starting to demonstrate both an understanding and an appreciation of the development of travel and tourism at a variety of levels. Many candidates were clearly aware of developments within their immediate local areas, as well as within the UK as a whole. Furthermore, the international perspective was also in evidence and candidates are to be congratulated for making frequent reference to their own personal experience(s) of international travel. It should be remembered by all Centres that candidates will obtain credit for providing specific details about facilities and locations which are appropriate to the particular question.

However, there are still too many instances of candidates ignoring the precise wording of individual questions and specific comment will be made in the sections which follow. Some candidates still appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions. I thus make no apology for repeating the following comment from the January report. 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 feature(s) 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 analyse)	Provide evidence or opinions about something and 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.

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 'levels of response'. There was some evidence that an increased number of candidates were making an effort to end their answers with a **conclusion**. A **valid** conclusion, based on the previous points made or considered, is clear evidence of **evaluation** taking place and will thus usually warrant a score in Level 3 (6-9 marks).

Finally, there was quite a lot of evidence to suggest that many candidates had not been able to manage their time very well. Many more individuals are now making use of the extra pages to help develop the longer answers. However, some of the stronger candidates failed to complete Q4(b) and Q4(c) or just gave their answer in point form. This could have been because they had written such extensive responses to the earlier questions, but this is also likely to have been a time issue. Indeed, some candidates had even stopped mid-sentence during Q4, indicating a lack of time to complete. On the other hand, this also suggests that candidates are becoming much better prepared for this unit and Centres are to be congratulated for producing such candidate responses. I very much hope that this very positive trend will be continued.

Comments on the individual Questions

Question 1 was set in the context of overseas package holiday travel and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates were able to make appropriate use of the photograph stimulus material.

1 a(i) This part of the question was well done and most answers clearly related to impacts such as noise, view and dust in the air. There were very many full mark answers.

1 a(ii) Responses to this part of the question were far more variable and candidates were not always able to explain their reasoning and thus possible credit was always going to be limited. The better answers made clear reference to compensation/claims, Trades Description Act/Supply of Goods & Services Act, consumer protection, etc.

1b) This was not as well answered as it might have been, considering the number of package holidays now taken by the British public. Far too many candidates gave features of a holiday rather than the transfer provided on arrival at the destination, i.e. met by representative, coach to hotel, coach to airport on return.

1c) This was answered quite well with many candidates achieving maximum marks for well considered answers. However, many lost possible credit by not explaining their reasoning. Most answers concentrated on cost, location/view, rental potential, etc.

1d) This part of the question was not always answered in an appropriate manner. Far too many candidates referred to **methods of travel** rather than the methods used for making travel arrangements. There was frequent coverage of online/Internet, travel agencies, tour operations direct, with valid advantages and disadvantages, and some conclusions attempted and justified. However, even good candidates misread the question and so lost valuable marks which could have taken them to higher grades.

Question 2 was set in the context of visitors to Orlando and it was again pleasing to see much correct use being made of the stimulus material.

2a) This part of the question was very well answered and most candidates achieved full marks.

2b) This was quite the reverse with very few candidates understanding the purpose of a convention centre as a **business** tourism venue. Most answers gave responses relevant to the visitor centre, thus a large minority of candidates gained no marks for this particular question.

2c) This was well attempted and the vast majority of candidates were fully familiar with appropriate security checks. It was pleasing to see so many valid and justified responses which resulted in many candidates achieving full marks.

2d) It was also pleasing to see some very clear and accurate responses relating to the cost to the airline, though some candidates showed a lack of understanding between scheduled and charter flights. Most answers were worthy of some credit and there were quite a few scoring maximum credit. Furthermore, it was interesting to read the comments made by individual candidates who had actually flown into one of the airports.

2e) This was characterised by a very wide range of responses – most relating to facilities and differentiation between classes, though others demonstrated an awareness of techniques by relating promotion to advertisements/billboards they had seen, or experiences they had personal experience of during their travels. The majority of answers were in Level 2 or Level 3 for this part of the question.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Question 3 was set in the context of the PSA/Ferry transport and most candidates were able to interpret the two pieces of stimulus material supplied.

3a(i) Very simply, those candidates who had read the stimulus correctly achieved full marks, and generally, all candidates achieved some marks here.

3a(ii) This tended to differentiate between good and weak candidates and some clearly found the answer hard to find.

3a(iii) Very few candidates scored marks on this part of the question, as the majority related the Health and Safety Act to on board ships or for members of PSA. Only one/two candidates actually related this to the PSA as an organisation. Whether it was the wording of the question or a lack of understanding of the PSA as an organisation, very few candidates scored marks. Thus, there was little, if any, reference to the accident book, first aid box, fire extinguishers, toilets and other features of a safe working environment.

3b(i) This was answered much better and there were accurate responses by the vast majority of candidates.

3b(ii) This part of the question saw some candidates giving times of departure and arrival rather than stating the time taken. However, the majority achieved the mark with the minimum of fuss.

3b(iii) This saw some candidates losing out by only giving the one-way cost, but the vast majority achieved the mark.

3a(iv) This again saw the majority of candidates respond correctly.

3c) This part of the question saw, generally, satisfactory responses well related to the stimulus material and thus highlighting things such as the need to rest, or taking advantage of a full day following the journey.

3d) A few candidates related responses to airports, not ports, so they lost marks here. The majority covered the needs of leisure travellers with only a few candidates relating facilities to business or commercial (lorries) needs. Responses varied from discussion of port facilities provided for customers, to routes/access/waiting procedures (lines for different vehicles). Conclusions tended to be limited, but the majority of candidates achieved minimum Level 2, if not slightly higher.

Question 4 was set in the context of the work of the WTO and then sports tourism holidays.

4a(i) WTO functions were not always clearly understood but the majority of candidates achieved full marks.

4a(ii) This also saw most candidates achieve the one mark available here.

4a(iii) Good candidates identified four ways without undue difficulty but the weaker candidates listed quality determinants, often as single words, thus only achieving one mark for an almost non-sense approach.

4b) This saw the majority of candidates being focussed on 'sporting events tourism' with valid examples given and an understanding of the demand from those travellers. Stronger candidates also explained 'active sporting tourism' with good examples (skiing, surfing/water sports etc) and named destinations. However, some candidates referred all their responses to sports tourism '**in the UK**' and so failed to achieve much credit.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

4c) This part of the question saw some well reasoned responses, with ancillary products/services being justified. There was often a wide range of these given – from those provided by the travel agency (insurance, car hire, transfers to/rooms at departure airport, etc), to those provided at the venue (e.g. equipment for purchase, booking coaches for large groups to events), but all were considered in the marking if valid and justified. Some candidates achieved Level 3, but there was strong evidence of mismanagement of time by a large number of candidates. Equally, a minority of weaker candidates were unable to write anything (as was also the case with 4(b)).

Principal Examiner's Report G728 June 2007

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 within 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 set in the UK or overseas. The questions set were appropriate and accessible to candidates of all levels, i.e. E to A. These gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain an overall high grade, while giving candidates at the lower range the opportunity to pass.

There were far fewer instances of candidates omitting any questions as in January 2007 and the majority of candidates wrote at some length, even for some of the 'identify', 'describe' and 'explain' type of questions. This is unnecessary in most cases and candidates should be encouraged to learn and recognise the command verbs before writing extended and often repetitive answers.

There were a wide range of responses submitted and it was clear as to which candidates had been well prepared and had learned a number of specific case examples as they were able to apply aspects of analysis and evaluation to their extended answers. In particular, the negative impacts of tourism were answered very well, but on many occasions these were out of context (park and ride in the Sinai Peninsula, for example, was a common error). Candidates really must try to contextualise the geographical area about which they are writing.

Centres are advised to ensure that examination officers issue all candidates with a 12-page booklet for future sessions, instead of an 8-page booklet, to overcome the issue of the significant majority having to use one or more extension pages which is time consuming and distracting to the candidate.

Most candidates scored well on Question 1, with the exception of question part (d) which relates to partnerships between the public and private sectors and less well on Questions 2 and 3. Overall, the majority of candidates found the series of questions on Egypt significantly more difficult than those on York and Morocco.

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

Candidates are still tending to overly repeat themselves on several questions, particularly on those questions which carry the higher number of marks.

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

Question 1 York

1(a) Answered well by most candidates; however, many only achieved two marks as they identified appeal as opposed to providing an explanation.

1 (b) Candidates generally performed much better on this part of the question about the multiplier effect than on previous occasions. There were, however, some whole Centre entries where candidates showed no understanding of this concept and as a consequence lost six marks.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

1 (c) Many candidates overly repeated themselves on this part of the question as they could not think of two reasons for conservation and preservation.

1 (d) (i) Quite a large number of candidates did not score on this part of the question as they used the stock answer of public, private and voluntary sectors, rather than identifying and naming specifics from the case study.

1 (d) (ii) This part of the question caused some difficulty – responses tended to be very generalised and many candidates did not actually give reasons why the public and private sectors work together. There was, instead, some good use of exemplification of how they worked together.

1 (e) Other than promotion as the main response, there was very little evidence of candidates recognising that tourism providers come from both the public and private sectors and they did not pick up the benefits from the case study. Many candidates found it difficult to access Level 4 within this part of the question as their responses lacked evaluative comments.

Question 2 Egypt

2 (a) Responses here were very varied. Candidates tended to fall into two main categories. They either 'lifted' details from the text about the objectives for sustainable tourism, generally limiting their score to a maximum of three marks, or applied the specification definition of economic and environmental objectives, thus scoring more highly.

2 (b) This part of the question caused some difficulty – many candidates adhered too closely to the stimulus material so that their responses got bogged down in the jobs and income type of answer and they did not answer, therefore, the question posed.

2 (c) This part of the question truly differentiated by outcome – there were several outstanding responses, covering the full range of destination management issues in detail. At the bottom end, weaker candidates were only able to make vague reference to the need for consultation.

2 (d) There were very interesting responses and a spread of marks for this part of the question. Whilst a number of candidates attempted to make the judgement required to access Level 4, the methods identified were sometimes unrealistic and often irrelevant to coral reef destinations (i.e. park and ride/theme parks/ban tourists). Many responses described standard methods such as limit dive sites/limit numbers but only the better performing candidates were able to discuss environmental auditing/EIA/use of guides/leaflets in hotels and the use of tour operator videos, etc. and, therefore, demonstrate the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation.

Question 3 Morocco

3 (a) Candidates either knew or did not know LEDC.

3 (bi) (bii) These two parts of the question were very well answered; most candidates were able to extract the information from the case study and provide an explanation.

3 (c) This part of the question caused some confusion – not all candidates recognised the role of Tourism Concern or any other voluntary sector organisation. Some weaker candidates believed the role of Tourism Concern was similar to that of a specialist tour operator, recommending specific eco-tourism packages. It was surprising how few; middle to bottom end candidates picked up on its name in order to give them a clue. There were, however, some excellent responses by better performing candidates.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

3 (d) As with Question 2, the higher order skills of evaluation and conclusion were not always evident. Many candidates scored well at Level 3, using the text with some detailed explanation and there were several instances of a generalised summary of how well Tribes Travel was fulfilling its aim, but sometimes with little evidence to back up these statements. Some candidates had clearly run out of time on this part of the question.

GCE A2 MARKETING IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM EXAM EXAMINER REPORT G734

General Comments

This was the second examination of this qualification. Candidates were issued with a case study as pre-release material. The case study was based on The Deep, an aquatic visitor attraction based in Hull. Details included an organisational chart, marketing and public relations strategies and examples of a press release and questionnaire.

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 ill prepared for the examination and were unsure of some basic travel and tourism terminology such as the definition of PR, channels of distribution, primary/secondary market research and SWOT. Indeed, some candidates failed to appreciate that the external influences on The Deep's marketing environment related to PEST. 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 - Centres should use this as a base for preparing candidates fully before entering them into the examination by working through the case study in detail and applying the marketing criteria to the different elements of the case study provided.

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; thus these answers must be well thought-out and contain some form of evaluation and a concluding statement or a statement of judgement. (It should be noted that the concluding statement must relate to what has been written by the candidate and that marks are not awarded for simplistic and non-relevant conclusions.) 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 of 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 The Deep and other vocational travel and tourism examples was very pleasing.

The length of the examination is two hours and the timing of the examination by candidates did not appear to be a problem as the majority of candidates attempted all of the questions. However, some of the weaker candidates did not complete all sections of each question and some of these candidates appeared to give a hurried response to the final question.

Comments on individual questions

1a(i) Generally well answered; however some of the weaker candidates misunderstood this terminology and thought that PR meant primary research.

1a(ii) Candidates were asked to identify two examples of PR work carried out by The Deep and this was very well answered. Most candidates could easily take the information from the case study.

1a(iii) Reasonable answers were given onto the importance of PR to The Deep during its initial years of operation. However, weaker candidates failed to relate PR to the initial years and discussed PR in a general sense. Very few candidates were able to analyse the different PR methods used by The Deep. In order to gain Level 3, candidates had to evaluate the importance

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

of different PR methods. Many higher-level ability candidates demonstrated good understanding of the success of creating positive links with journalists at a national and international level. However, some candidates failed to gain higher marks as there was no evaluation made.

1b Weaker candidates were unable to identify two channels of distribution used by The Deep. Some misunderstood the terminology; however, the higher level candidates found the information from the questionnaire and the most common responses included the Internet, TIC and Jackson's supermarkets.

1c Generally well answered. Many candidates were able to discuss appropriate pricing policies; however, on occasion the policies were not named correctly. Most common responses included – discounting, market skimming and competitive pricing.

2a Very well answered. Most candidates were able to identify the three visitor types who were attracted to The Deep.

2b(i) Very well answered. Most candidates were able to give examples of open and closed questions from the stimulus.

2b(ii) Very well answered. Many candidates were able to recommend and justify two ways to improve the quality of the questions used in the questionnaire. The most common responses included – using more open questions, offering incentives, avoiding jargon and ambiguous questions. These were very well justified – such as, in order to gain a more detailed response for opinions and attitudes to enable The Deep to successfully meet the needs of its current and prospective customers.

2c Generally well answered. Candidates were asked to evaluate the benefits of using primary rather than secondary research. Some candidates struggled to discuss the benefits of one form rather than another and the weaker candidates simply discussed one type of primary research.

2d (i) A mixed response to this part of the question. Clearly many candidates were unfamiliar with the ASA; however, the higher level candidates were able to gain full marks giving a reason and explanation, such as – advertisements to contain nothing that is likely to cause offence, in terms of race, religion, sex, etc.

2d(ii) Generally well answered. Candidates were able to explain the benefits to The Deep of advertising in national rather than local newspapers. However, in order to gain Level 3 marks they had to assess these benefits. Some candidates failed to appreciate the meaning of “assess” and simply described or explained.

3a Generally well answered. Many candidates were able to explain three possible key marketing objectives for The Deep. The most common responses were – to generate profit by achieving good sales, visitor numbers to rise and to increase the level of spending made by visitors.

3b(i) Generally well answered. Candidates were asked to explain three benefits of a SWOT. Weaker candidates gave too much detail and repeated themselves in Q3b(ii). It should be noted that candidates should read through each question before they commence the paper. This will allow candidates to more understand fully each question set.

3b(ii) Generally well answered. Candidates were able to discuss how The Deep should react to the strengths and weaknesses identified in the SWOT analysis. Higher level candidates easily discussed the information provided in the case study and were able to suggest possible solutions or benefit to The Deep.

3c Higher level candidates understood the need to discuss external influences through PEST – however, candidates were awarded marks if PEST was not mentioned and external influences were discussed from the case study. Many of the weaker candidates could not focus on PEST and tended to write from a SWOT perspective. Very few were able to evaluate the influences on The Deep’s marketing environment. Once again in order to gain Level 3, candidates had to assess the impacts and not simply to identify or describe them – very few were able to do this.

**Applied GCE (Travel and Tourism) (H189/H389/H589/H789)
June 2007 Assessment Series**

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G721	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G722	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G724	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G725	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G726	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G727	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G729	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G730	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G731	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G732	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G733	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G735	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Examined Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
G720	Raw	100	83	73	63	53	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G723	Raw	100	80	71	62	53	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G728	Raw	100	78	69	60	51	43	0

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G734	Raw	100	78	68	58	49	40	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

Advanced GCE (H589)

Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E
UMS (max 600)	480	420	360	300	240

Advanced GCE (Double Award) (H789)

Overall Grade	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE
UMS (max 1200)	960	900	840	780	720	660	600	540	480

Cumulative Percentage in Grade

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H189)

A	B	C	D	E	U
4.1	20.0	45.6	70.6	89.3	100
There were 1447 candidates aggregating in June 2007					

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
2.6	8.2	16.8	27.6	38.3	53.1	70.9	80.1	86.2	100
There were 211 candidates aggregating in June 2007									

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Advanced GCE (H589)

A	B	C	D	E	U
3.5	21.6	50.1	77.6	95.9	100
There were 750 candidates aggregating in June 2007					

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H789)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
3.7	9.5	18.9	30.5	48.4	62.6	75.3	90.0	96.3	100
There were 196 candidates aggregating in June 2007									

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
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: general.qualifications@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