

Applied Travel and Tourism

Advanced GCE **A2 H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H189, H389**

Report on the Units

June 2010

H189/H589/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 specification 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 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Applied Travel and Tourism (H589, H789)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Applied Travel and Tourism (H189, H389)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

| Unit/Content | Page |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Chief Examiner's Report | 1 |
| Principal Moderator's Report | 2 |
| G720 Introducing travel and tourism | 8 |
| G723 International travel | 12 |
| G728 Tourism development | 16 |
| G734 Marketing in travel and tourism | 19 |

Chief Examiner's Report

The quality of written work evident in both candidate portfolios and in the external assessment scripts was yet again frequently of a good, sometimes quite impressive, standard. Many centres have developed a range of teaching and learning activities and, as a result, candidates are clearly:

- developing an understanding of the scale and importance of the industry;
- starting to fully appreciate the importance of host destinations and communities to the industry and the importance of sustainable development;
- commenting on the positive and negative impacts the industry may have on people, the environment and the economy;
- demonstrating an awareness of the global and dynamic nature of the industry.

One of the advantages of being Chief Examiner for the qualification is to have the opportunity to view candidates' work across all AS and A2 Units. There is no doubt in my mind that those individuals who receive an A* grade are thoroughly deserving of the award. Furthermore, on the basis of the written work which has been produced, many candidates have certainly gained a knowledge and understanding of the travel and tourism industry which is fully appropriate to the needs of an employee working at operational level with direct contact with customers. Indeed, it could be argued that acquisition of such knowledge and understanding will also clearly relate to that required of an employee working at supervisory level. It is very pleasing to be able to report on such a positive trend.

The following Principal Examiner Reports contain further details and offer various pieces of advice to centres. One very important positive trend continues and this is to do with the way in which many centres are preparing candidates for the more extended written answers. The June 2010 scripts contained many well written responses which were properly structured with an introduction, main body of analysis and an evaluative conclusion.

There is still a need for certain basic issues to be addressed in order to ensure that all candidates are able to 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. Centres are, once again, strongly advised to make sure that candidates can fully understand the differences between the command verbs such as describe, explain, discuss, analyse and evaluate. Furthermore, centres are strongly advised to look at the published Mark Schemes in order to familiarise themselves with the level descriptors used when assessing such extended written responses.

Detailed comments about candidate performance and the June papers are provided in the following sections of this document. 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 improvements in overall candidate performance will continue during subsequent examination sessions and that centres will give appropriate emphasis to the vocational nature of the qualification by encouraging their candidates to:

- develop and sustain an interest in the issues affecting the industry and their potential effect on employment opportunities;
- appreciate the importance of the customer to the industry;
- develop practical and technical skills relevant to the industry;
- appreciate how the industry responds to change;
- appreciate the impact of ICT on the industry;
- develop their own values and attitudes in relation to industry issues.

Centres are thus once again advised to follow the guidance offered in the following reports and to seek clarification through the Qualification Manager, if appropriate.

Principal Moderator's Report

GCE Travel and Tourism

H189/389 AS level, H589/789 A2 level

Standards

It was pleasing to see the positive response made by centres to the changes in the specification and requirements for some units of the award. Centres had well prepared their candidates for AS and A2 level this series. The content and standard of evidence by candidates and the assessment of some AS and A2 units was good. Many accredited centres were externally moderated this session and, in many cases, showed accuracy in the assessment of their candidates' portfolios. In some cases a problem of inconsistency in assessment existed as centres had assessors new to the award and different to those considered at the time of accreditation. It is important that centres inform OCR of the changes made to those monitoring internal assessment and that there is clear evidence of internal moderation. In some cases, inconsistency in assessment resulted in adjustment to marks being made.

Candidates had again clearly enjoyed working on their portfolios and generally applied their research to the assessment objectives and mark bands. There was some clear evidence provided of **primary research** being carried out and a wider use of secondary research to supplement the candidates' evidence. This was better than previous sessions but there is still a need to encourage the use of different sources of information and to provide clear referencing and sourcing.

There were instances where some candidates had worked to the old specification and centres had marked the work using the old URS sheet. Some consideration was given for this session only. **Some centres had not recognised the changes; particularly in relation to Unit G721 – Customer Service and some G729 – Event Management.**

Administration

Some centres had taken the opportunity to use the OCR Repository and submit candidates' work online. Some difficulty was experienced in moderating the samples due to a lack of any annotation on the work and a clear URS sheet which informs the moderator where and why the assessor considers the marks to have been met.

There was a large submission of entries for the single unit award at AS level. At A2 level, due to a choice for the second unit, all units had a number of submissions.

Assessment

It was pleasing again this session to see that centres had generally acted upon advice, training and moderator reports to develop good assessment practices. As a consequence, there was some good centre assessment practices shown and portfolio work by candidates was well organised and thorough. Where adjustment to marks have been made it was usually because of **inconsistency** in assessment. There were occasions where candidates had produced similar or better quality of evidence for a mark band than another candidate but had been awarded less marks or vice versa. Sometimes there were a number of assessors and **no internal standardisation** by the centre. In some cases adjustments were made because centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the key elements of the mark band.

This was particularly relevant where candidates has struggled to compare, analyse, evaluate and draw conclusions or make realistic recommendations at both AS and A2 level.

AS Units

Unit G721 – Customer Service

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this series. There was generally a good response, particularly to the changes made and the quality of evidence. Centres are now providing clear evidence of a number of customer service situations for AO3 and the skills shown. Witness statements do need to be signed by the assessor.

There were some excellent examples which were thorough and appropriate.

For 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 sometimes descriptive in nature. There was, however, a lack of consideration of **communication** methods in relation to the needs of the customers and giving information. Many candidates had considered different customer types and how their needs are met by the organisation. There were occasions, however, where the different types had not been considered and evidence became very general rather than applied to the chosen organisation.

Candidates tended to consider the basic benefits rather than the more **complex benefits** which relate to how needs are met, eg time efficiency.

For AO3, candidates generally showed some good research into how the organisation assesses the effectiveness of its customer service and the methods the organisation uses. The 2009 specification emphasises that candidates should research the methods and provide analysis. Some candidates had made a good attempt at analysing these methods in terms of their appropriateness and effectiveness. Candidates did struggle, sometimes, with analysis in terms of what the organisation had done to make improvements, etc. As an example, candidates rarely considered the number of complaints, how these are recorded and their content as a method of measuring effectiveness. Analysis could include what the organisation has done to prevent further complaints, etc. Another aspect could be how the methods are distributed and the information recorded leading to whether the candidate considers this to be appropriate and cost effective. Again, the advantages and disadvantages of using the method need to be considered, etc.

For AO4, candidates need to evaluate the organisation's customer service and how effective they think it is, and provide some 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 evaluate products and services well but not to consider personal qualities and communication, as well as different customer types.

Some candidates produced an evaluation but there was still a lack of evidence as to how they had found 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, for example, a mystery shopper activity, observation activity, survey, etc.

Unit G722 – Travel Destinations

There was a large submission this series with a mixed response.

There were still cases where candidates had not considered two very **different/contrasting** destinations and thus candidates were restricted in the scope of analysis in terms of customer types for AO2/3. Candidates need guiding here as to the suitability of the destinations, eg not two cities.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

In some cases AO1 was addressed well and in others there was a lack of evidence and understanding to warrant the mark awarded. Downloaded maps must be annotated, sourced/referenced and be linked to a description. There was a tendency for candidates to omit annotating maps and reference the source with the map. There should be a world map and candidates need to consider how clear the maps are in relation to the possibility of giving it to a tourist and pointing out aspects a tourist might need to know. There should also be the inclusion of an local map, as a part of the series of maps, and comment in relation to distribution of features relating to AO2 as well as, for example, analysis such as the location of the destination in relation to climate, season, accessibility, etc.

For AO2, 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 destinations with particular reference to who and why and provide specific features. There was 'for example' very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, etc, different types of customers. Another example was different types of accommodation and cost against appeal to different types of customers/visitors. Some candidates had analysed well but many had not fully addressed this aspect of the assessment objective.

AO3 requires candidates to show evidence of resources and sources of information used. In some cases there was no bibliography evidenced and no analysis of resources, eg what would or would not be useful for Mark Band 3. Many candidates had only used websites, as their main source of research and they need encouraging to consider other sources. Part of the analysis marks for Mark Band 3 must be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This is well done by higher grade candidates. Sources were well referenced in the text by some candidates but very poorly by others with too much downloading/copying.

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had done this well. It was, however, very clear again this series that candidates were not considering more up-to-date issues and trends. There was, in some cases, little evidence of any statistical data to assist with candidate's reasoning. 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. Beyond Mark Band 1, it is expected that trends are analysed and that realistic future predictions are provided. Candidates, this series, found this assessment objective difficult and rarely considered the possible effects, for example, of the recession and of an increase in prices.

Unit G724 – Tourist Attractions

There were several submissions for moderation of this unit this series with a good response. This generally relates to an appropriate choice of attractions to cover all the criteria and the availability of information. There were cases where centres and candidates had misinterpreted the requirements of the unit and recorded irrelevant or inaccurate 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.

Candidates considered technological features well but need to develop their analysis in terms of **how** these enhance the customer, and also the staff experience. There is also a need to consider how new technology is used to promote the attractions' features (page 54 of the guidance).

Unit G725 – Organising Travel

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

For AO1, candidates still tend to omit the role of the organisers in **the chain of distribution**. AO2 was well addressed.

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

For AO4, candidates need to consider two separate complex itineraries which meet the needs of different customers. Candidates tended to produce unclear itineraries or a PowerPoint presentation.

Unit G726 – Hospitality

There were several submissions for moderation of this unit this series with, on the whole, a mixed response. This related to the amount of research undertaken by the candidates and the appropriateness of the organisation. There was, however, evidence of downloaded material and a lack of clear examples.

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 several submissions for moderation of this unit this series with a mixed response.

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

For AO2, there were some good examples. However, some candidates listed information rather than considering 'the importance of...'

AO3 requires candidates to research both administrative and **operational** practices. The latter was not well evidenced in candidates' work again this series.

A2 Units

Unit G729 – Event Management

There was a large submission for this unit this series with a mixed response.

Again 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 carried out. There were again this session occasions where candidates had carried out a pre-determined event and had little evidence to support their own organisational skills.

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. Again where problems existed during moderation this series, it was due to centres awarding all their candidates the same mark, particularly in Mark Band 2, with little evidence to support individuality, specific skills, team working, customer service and communication.

For AO1, with reference to the business plan, some candidates had been methodical in approach, whilst others had been repetitive and unclear. This was the cause of some adjustment to marks again this series. 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 was a tendency for candidates, again this session, to omit legislation such as data protection, health and safety practices, insurance, etc. There is also a need for candidates to provide clear financial accounts. There was little evidence of how the team was going to assess the success of the event or the plan.

There should be clear evidence of **project planning techniques** and roles and responsibilities. Again this session, where candidates had done a Gantt Chart, for example, there was little evidence of how this was executed and any changes to be made to it – ie re-draft, flow chart, did it work?, etc.

For AO2, candidates were not always clear on what they precisely contributed; for example, 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 were, however, some excellent examples amongst centre submissions here, too. There is a need, however, for higher grade candidates to **develop the project planning techniques**. There was a need for candidates to address problems/difficulties. This was often omitted in candidates' evidence this series.

AO3 was well covered. Though most candidates had considered risk assessment, contingency plan, there was, however, some lack of evidence of market research, SWOT, or a record of other ideas and reasons for the final choice.

For AO4, some candidates evaluated well, but many showed a tendency to omit reference to **aims and objectives and use of evaluative tools**.

There was also a lack of evaluative language used for this assessment objective and analysis of customer feedback. Future improvements also need to be considered further as candidates tend to omit this aspect.

Unit G730 – Guided Tour

There were several submissions with a good response.

Where difficulty occurred it was due to the need for a clear plan, for example 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.

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

There is a need for candidates to develop the **quality of the evaluation**, rather than producing a commentary of what they did.

Unit G731 – Ecotourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response

Some 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 tendency for candidates to become too general in nature and off the point, rather than more 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 also to be aware of those of the stakeholders. This was not always well evidenced by candidates again this series.

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

Unit G732 – Adventure Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response.

AO1 was generally well addressed but candidates showed a need to develop the reasons for growth of ATAs, as this was often 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 holistically approached this assessment objective with part of AO3.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

For AO2, candidates often 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 activities.

For 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 frequently a lack of sourcing and referencing in candidates' work.

Unit G733 – Cultural Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response.

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).

Where candidates had difficulty it was because inappropriate destinations had been chosen and work was downloaded. These destinations gave candidates little scope to develop their understanding of cultural tourism. There was a need to consider diversity.

Again, 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 is a need to source and reference work.

Unit G735 – Human Resources

There were some submissions this series 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 a lack of comparison/contrast. There is also a need to use information appropriately for understanding rather than simply repeating and downloading.

Candidates showed difficulty in understanding the requirements and components of a needs analysis again this series.

Assessment objectives were generally well done in relation to the mark awarded this series.

G720 Introducing travel and tourism

General comments

There were some high quality scripts seen, with examples of candidates achieving full marks for some questions. Compared with previous years there was evidence of improvement in the following areas.

Candidates were far better at reading the question. The numbers not attempting questions at all was reduced.

Candidates were better at not copying large sections out of the case study and they are using their own words.

There was a great improvement in reading and interpreting statistics.

The pre-released case study materials were used effectively by centres and their candidates. All documents in the case study were accessed appropriately by the majority of candidates and used well in their answers. As part of the preparation for the examination it would be useful for candidates to undertake additional research into the locations in the case study. This would give them an in-depth understanding of the destination. There were some pleasing comments which did show this had been undertaken, such as reference to Liverpool One as a reason why people would go on a special shopping trip; or an understanding that Tate Liverpool exhibits contemporary art. Such research would also help clarify the similarities, rather than the differences, between the audio guides at The Beatles Story and The Birthplace of the Beatles. It was interesting to see comments about Liverpool as the European Capital of Culture; this was in 2008 and did not, therefore, impact on any increase in visitor numbers or expenditure between 2005 and 2006.

One issue relates to answers seen to Question 2(c), many candidates considered that audio tours were only for those with sight impairment. Audio tours are now generally available for all visitors at attractions, and give an in-depth account of what is available to see.

Candidates also need to be fully prepared to understand the language in the case study. In the example of the Mini Mersey Ferries, many misunderstood the term 'take the helm' and assumed that you could actually ride on the model boats.

There was evidence that centres are preparing candidates fully for the extended questions. Many well written responses were seen with an introduction, main body of analysis and a conclusion. This is the necessary format required in order to access Level 3 of the mark scheme. It is suggested that centres look carefully at the very detailed mark scheme available for this paper. This will assist teachers in guiding candidates to the expected style and length of answers, especially in the extended questions marked as 'levels of response'.

It is important to remind candidates to read the question carefully. No marks are credited for good comments which bear no relation to the question. Many candidates limited their mark, in for example Question 3(d), by not discussing factors as the question asked, many good responses were seen but only one valid factor was discussed. The same comment is also true in respect of Questions 3(c) and 4(d), where the question asked for methods and advantages.

With some short answer questions, candidates need to identify specific details from the case study material. In these instances it is important that the candidates do extract correctly and carefully from the relevant document. There was a common error where candidates stated 'none of the above' was the attraction most likely to be visited in Liverpool.

Comments on individual questions

1(a)

This part of the question was well answered. Non-serviced accommodation was the better response in general, but candidates still repeated the question with statements such as 'accommodation with no services'. This did not receive credit unless the answer was extended with a description of services, such as housekeeping or catering, or a suitable example.

Direct employment was a weaker answer. Although many candidates gave good examples of employment in travel and tourism, such as resort representatives or cabin crew, the direct aspect of the question was not well explained. Again many candidates tried to repeat part of the question 'working directly for an organisation' was not a creditworthy answer. Explanations and examples should be related to Travel and Tourism, such as a travel agent or hotel manager.

1(b)

This part of the question was well answered well. Most candidates could identify three different types of serviced accommodation, but the descriptions were frequently repetitive. A hotel provides services such as housekeeping and catering; but so do a motel, guest house and B&B. The descriptions needed to demonstrate that the candidates understood the differences in the establishments. A hotel is a large accommodation outlet which will offer services such as room service; a motel is situated on a major road transport route; a guest house is a small establishment, often owner run. Bed and breakfast needs more description than 'providing bed and breakfast'. Some candidates misread the question as referring to the type of board rather than the type of serviced accommodation. Cruise ships were seen frequently as an incorrect answer.

1(c)

This part of the question required the use of statistics about visitor expenditure in Liverpool. It was answered well, with the majority of candidates selecting the correct statistics. Accuracy was needed in the use of the statistics in order to move up the mark bands. A common error was to leave out the units (£ and millions). Candidates also tended to write about statistics which were not related to expenditure, without linking the figures to the conclusions they were drawing. Discussion about the sectors in which there is travel and tourism employment could not be credited unless it was linked to expenditure, such as the increase in expenditure on accommodation between 2005 and 2006 which could lead to an increase in employment in this sector. Some candidates referred to the recession as an explanation for the drop in recreation expenditure. This was not valid for these statistics as they relate to 2005 -2006. A common error was for candidates to state that day visitors spent more than staying visitors. There are significantly more day visitors but they do not spend more per visitor. Candidates need to ensure they explain their conclusions accurately in order to gain higher level marks.

2(a)

A straightforward question which required a description of three travel and tourism terms taken from the case study materials. Unfortunately ,some candidates interpreted this question as asking for explanations of the public/private/voluntary sectors rather than definitions of the terms. In order to prepare candidates for these types of questions, which appear in every paper, centres could produce a glossary for each likely term from the pre-released material. Candidates should be encouraged to produce detailed definitions that do not repeat the words in the term, as well as a realistic example.

If candidates were familiar with the National Trust as an organisation this was answered well, with descriptions relating to the voluntary sector and illustrated with examples taken from the case study.

Country Parks were sometimes confused with National Parks or just open areas of rural land. Country parks are generally situated close to large urban areas with a primary function of leisure

activities for the visitor. Answers should aim to differentiate between other types of park, rather than a vague answer.

Safari Parks were sometimes described as game reserves; credit was awarded for making reference to animals in open areas to differentiate from zoos.

2(b)

This part of the question was well answered, although some candidates referred to built attractions outside of Liverpool, and were, therefore, not credited. The identification of the appeal of the attraction needed to link with the travel and tourism industry; so going to watch football at Anfield was not credited. The attraction is the museum and stadium tour, so answers needed to refer to those visitors interested in the history of Liverpool FC, or football in general. Attractions which were free and, hence, suitable for visiting school groups were a clear identification of appeal. This could only be credited once, so repeating the same appeal for all three built attractions only achieved one mark. Frequent repetition of the appeal of the attraction was seen, the Walker Art Gallery – for people who like to view art. This received only one mark out of a possible two. Some candidates misread this question and tried to produce a list of potential target markets instead of simply describing the nature of the appeal.

2(c)

The style of this question should now be familiar to centres and candidates. Some candidates did not extract information correctly from the pre-released materials, and this limited the marks they could achieve. Candidates were required to both compare and contrast in order to access the higher mark band. Some of the best answers were seen when candidates had been advised to carefully structure their answer. A good format to follow is to look at the products of each attraction, ie type of attraction and then compare/contrast this; then the services of each, such as the provision of educational resources and to compare/contrast these and finally the facilities available at each such as toilet facilities and parking and to compare/contrast these aspects. To access the top range of marks, candidates needed to both compare and contrast, as the question required, and they also needed to look at the facilities, products and services. In order to prepare candidates for this in advance, centres should ensure that they dissect the case study materials in order to classify products, services and facilities. Many candidates discussed the benefits to the organisation of having these facilities, products and services; this was not required and wasted examination time and allocated space. Some candidates compared and contrasted the quality of the leaflets rather than the attraction. This is a marketing communication aspect and is not part of the specification for this unit. There are still some candidates who, having made a comparison or contrast, then labour the point for half a page without gaining any extra marks. This is a problem with examination technique.

3(a)

This part of the question was well answered. The main error was by candidates stating that the attraction most likely to be visited was 'none of these'.

3(b)

This part of the question was well answered. The reasons for visits to Liverpool were accurately identified from the document. Some candidates did restrict the marks they achieved by repeating the explanation, so 'going to see an attraction' was given as a reason for 'day trip from home' and 'holiday in district'.

3(c)

This part of the question was well answered, with some good discussions on the way in which business visitors require fast and reliable transport methods. The better answers referred to air travel (for both domestic and inbound business travellers) using John Lennon Airport and demonstrated understanding of the suitability of different methods, eg train would be suitable as business visitors can work during the journey. Answers needed to have some specific reference to business visitors to be awarded marks.

3(d)

A wide range of marks were awarded to candidates on this part of the question. Unfortunately, a substantial number of candidates achieved a mark of zero, as they did not understand what was meant by socio-economic factors. Socio-economic factors are clearly identified in the specification for G720 as: increase in car ownership; increase in leisure time; increase in disposable income and the national economy – boom or recession.

For those candidates who could correctly identify these factors and discuss the impact they have on, specifically domestic, tourism to Liverpool there were some good marks awarded. An overall conclusion was needed to access the full eight marks. Many candidates confused the socio-economic factors with external factors (such as crime) affecting tourism. Some candidates also only discussed one factor when the question referred to ‘factors’; this limited their marks to Level 1 of the mark scheme.

4(a)

This part of the question needed candidates to identify from Document 6. Unfortunately, many candidates did not identify, but tried to describe providing some general descriptions instead of specific answers. This was especially true for ‘a canal’ with descriptions of waterways, without any mention of the Manchester Ship Canal.

4(b)

This part of the question was very well answered. Candidates could easily select examples such as Planet Play’s soft play area or Sci Fi at the Movies exhibition.

4(c)

This part of the question was not well answered. This was the least well answered question on the paper. Tourism development and promotion is identified in the specification for this examined unit. The role of VisitBritain should be a core area of teaching in any travel and tourism course. The answers should have related to the roles of the provision of information, through the network of Tourist Information Centres; the collection and collation of statistics and data relating to tourism; the production of advertisements, brochures and leaflets promoting regions; quality assurance of accommodation and attractions (VAQAS was clearly identified in the case study, with both Mersey Ferries and the Williamson Tunnels achieving this), as well as the advisory role to local and national government. The vast majority of candidates purely repeated the word promotion, and frequently wrote about private sector organisations such as travel agencies and tour operators or attempted to use their knowledge of marketing by discussing various promotional methods.

4(d)

This was a relatively straightforward question, but many responses were often descriptive (reduced rate for groups, special opening times, educational activities) without demonstrating how these are beneficial to groups. Some candidates also misinterpreted the question as the benefits to the Williamson Tunnels of having group visits. Good answers referred to the parking available (suitable for coaches, which is how most groups travel to tourist attractions).

5

There were many lengthy and extended answers to this question, with the vast majority of candidates achieving a reasonable mark. The importance of events to UK tourist destinations has been on previous papers, and most candidates could fully describe and explain the main economic benefits. Good use of specialist travel and tourism terminology was seen in the top quality answers, with reference made to repeat visits, secondary spend and the multiplier effect. Good answers also recognised the positive public relations benefits which events brought to Liverpool.

As this was the quality of written communication question centres need to ensure that candidates can write proper essay style answers in examination conditions. A Level 3 response needs to contain well structured sentences which directly answer the question, and contain few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

G723 International travel

General comments

There was the usual sized entry for this examination session and it was pleasing to note that candidate performance continues to clearly reflect the advice given to centres in previous reports. The pieces of stimulus material tend to be very well used and interpreted by the majority of candidates. However, several issues remain a source of some concern.

There are still many instances of candidates ignoring the precise wording of individual questions and more specific comments will be made in the following sections. Some candidates still appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions and centres are, yet again, encouraged to make the following “**Key Word**” definitions part of their examination preparation sessions.

| Key Words | Meaning/expectation |
|--|--|
| Explain | Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details. |
| Discuss (includes the ability to analyse) | Provide evidence or opinions about something arriving at a balanced conclusion. The candidate is being asked to consider an issue and is thus expected to present arguments and evidence to support particular points of view and to come to a conclusion . |
| Evaluate/Assess (this also includes the ability to analyse) | To judge from available evidence and arrive at a reasoned conclusion . The candidate is expected to present a number of factors or issues and then weigh up their relative significance or importance. |

Candidates who are unable to respond in an appropriate way to the higher order command verbs will always have difficulty in accessing the higher mark bands for questions which are assessed by means of ‘Levels of Response’ criteria.

There was very clear evidence that many candidates are now making an effort to end their answers to the last part of each of the four questions with some form of **conclusion**. This is to be further encouraged because 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 (7-9 marks). Centres should encourage their candidates to consider the following approach when attempting these more open questions:

- has there been an explanation/analysis/comparison of more than one point?
- has there been an evaluation/judgement made with or without an overall conclusion being reached?
- is there an overall supporting judgement clearly indicating the most important or significant aspect?

Most candidates were able to answer all four questions within the time available.

Comments on individual questions

1(a)

This part of the question was very well answered with most candidates achieving full marks for matching each photo with the appropriate type of UK leisure traveller.

1(b)

The vast majority of candidates were able to identify and explain appropriate ancillary services with insurance, car hire and transfers being popular combinations. However, a large minority of candidates lost the chance of full marks by including inappropriate choices such as holiday accommodation or in-flight meals.

1(c)

This part of the question tended to be quite well answered in terms of knowledge about the FCO but the majority of candidates found it quite difficult to provide much discussion. The “know before you go” campaign was well understood but there were few attempts made, for example, to match particular aspects of this to the needs of different types of traveller and so conclusions tended to be limited or non-existent.

1(d)

This part of the question was very poorly attempted and most candidates were unaware of the reasons for the increasing popularity of ecotourism package holidays. Most candidates did not appreciate that ecotourism, responsible tourism and sustainable development have become prevalent concepts since the late 1980s, and that ecotourism has experienced arguably the fastest growth of all sub-sectors in the tourism industry. The reasons for the popularity of such packages are:

- a change in tourist perceptions
- increased environmental awareness
- a desire to explore natural environments.

Weaker candidates wrote about the advantages of package holidays but only a minority of answers attempted to address the central issue.

2(a)

The Fig. 2 stimulus material was very well interpreted and the vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by correctly identifying Spain, the Netherlands, Australia and Indonesia.

2(b)

The topic of holiday homes is familiar and most candidates were able to provide a variety of valid reasons for ownership. Better answers considered a range of factors including cost, investment/rental income, accessibility via low cost flights and the weather. However, the amount of reasoning provided tended to be rather variable but most candidates were able to score quite well.

2(c)

Airport safety and security issues are also well known and understood. However, few candidates were able to **justify** the particular measures which they considered. Only a minority of candidates were able to comment about fitness for purpose and this tended to reduce the amount of credit which could be awarded. However, it was pleasing to read comments about the new ‘body scanners’ and many candidates were clearly able to draw upon their own personal experiences.

2(d)

There were some very good answers to this part of the question and most candidates were fully aware of the ways in which the needs of business travellers are met on long haul flights. However, the question asked for an assessment to be made and this was not always done. Few candidates were able to clearly point out what they considered were the most significant advantages of flying in business class and this limited their progress into Level 3. To help clarify matters, the following account would have warranted a mark in Level 3.

Virgin Atlantic offers a range of options for business travellers. It offers complimentary chauffeur driven car service to and from your flight. If you arrive at Heathrow, Gatwick or Johannesburg by car your chauffeur will check you in at the unique 'Drive Thru Check In' so you can bypass the terminal and head straight for the Clubhouse. If you make your own way to the airport, there is an efficient and friendly dedicated Upper Class check in area. In the air, Virgin business passengers also enjoy many facilities. At the touch of a button the seat flips over to become the biggest fully flat bed in any business class. Every seat has aisle access so there is no stepping over your neighbour. In Upper Class there are no set meal times and a passenger can eat what they like, when they like. Your choice from the "Freedom menu" will be individually and freshly prepared to your order and served in style on fine china. However, the most important aspect is probably the ability to do work. Every Suite is fitted with laptop power access and a large table with plenty of room to spread out or have an informal meeting. This is particularly convenient for colleagues travelling together.

3(a)

Candidates used Fig. 3 well and many candidates scored full marks for a valid explanation of convenience and accessibility issues. However, others did equally well considering issues such as cost and using their knowledge and understanding of coach holidays in general. There were some very good accounts.

3(b)

The Fig. 3 stimulus material was not very well used in this instance and most candidates were not able to score full marks. The part of the question asked for types of passenger **transport** which used the **port** of Dover and the correct answers itemised in Fig. 3 were cars, ferries and cruise ships.

3(c)

There was almost a total misunderstanding of the question and candidates did **not** offer reasons for going on trips to France. Most answers contained reasons for going by coach! This was an unfortunate mistake to make. Those candidates who made fleeting reference to visiting Disneyland, learning French or a field trip were suitably rewarded.

3(d)

The Fig. 3 stimulus material helped candidates and many correctly commented about accessibility (via London airports and motorway links) and proximity to cruise circuits. Fewer answers mentioned the size of the vessel and the need for suitable port infrastructure. The idea of market potential/level of demand was virtually neglected. Many candidates were unable to develop their reasons and there was quite a lot of repetition which tended to limit the overall mark.

3(e)

A large minority of candidates missed the central point of the question and there was a lack of focus as to why passengers going from London to Paris travel by Eurostar rather than by scheduled flights. Essentially, candidates were expected to consider some of the advantages/disadvantages of both methods. Weaker candidates wrote about ferries versus rail or air and were thus only awarded limited credit. Better answers clearly pointed out that some travellers are very time sensitive and Eurostar offers a direct city centre to city centre journey of less than 2.5 hours. Furthermore, there is less chance of take-off delay or lost baggage. There were quite

a few very positive attempts to answer this part of the question, although very few candidates managed to access a Level 3 mark.

4(a)

There were some very thorough answers to this part of the question and the information contained in Fig. 4 was generally very appropriately used. However, a number of candidates seemed unaware of the components of an inclusive tour. The question was intended to reflect the conditions of the EU Package Travel Regulations and so candidates were expected to comment on two of these components: **transportation, accommodation, other tourist service** which form a significant proportion of the package (eg excursions, entertainment).

4(b)

Candidates tended to do this part of the question quite well and many were able to use the information from Fig. 4 to very good effect. However, as with other questions, the level of explanation offered was rather variable and the nature of the appeal was not always made clear. Some candidates were able to write very clearly and readily obtained full marks.

4(c)

There were usually one or two major problems with answers to this part of the question. Firstly, services were confused with facilities. The question clearly asked for services which are provided on an in-room basis, ie brought into the room. Far too many candidates seemed unaware of this. Appropriate services included 24/7 food and beverage service, housekeeping, laundry, message delivery, etc. The second issue was with the amount of description provided. Only a minority of candidates described what each service involved or how it operated.

4(d)

There were many quite thoughtful answers to this part of the question and it was particularly pleasing to see reference being made to issues such as the Icelandic ash cloud and other current events. Many candidates seemed to be aware that each and every year brings uncertainties and new challenges for the UK tourism industry. Terrorism, wars, exchange rate and oil price fluctuations, economic downturns, safety and security issues are just some of the risks facing the industry in the short, medium and longer terms. There were some very good answers and candidates seemed to clearly understand the types of factor which can negatively impact on the UK's volume of inbound tourism.

G728 Tourism development

General comments

The examined paper for unit 9, Tourism Development, consists of three questions and is based on stimulus material/case study 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. Centres should note that in this examination candidates will be issued with a separate resource booklet and will be required to write their answers in a combined question paper/answer booklet. What was evident from this series was that candidates made better use of the evidence in the case studies and were able to analyse their answers much better. Most candidates were able to access the majority of questions and there were far less unanswered questions than in previous examinations. There were very few candidates who were unable to complete all the questions.

Overall, Question 1 was answered to a good standard; however, many candidates gave generic responses to parts (d) and (e) and, as a result, they were not able to achieve the higher mark band. Question 2 was generally well answered, particularly parts (a), (b) and (c). Part (d) caused problems with candidates misunderstanding the 'importance to the host population'. There was also evidence of candidates not being able to distinguish between the measures on part (e) – confusing impacts of and not measures to reduce impacts and, therefore, losing marks as they had not read the question or could not differentiate between these appropriately. There was also more evidence this time of candidates not reading the question carefully enough with irrelevant responses – for example on Questions 1(b), 1(d), and 3(d).

Overall this was a straightforward paper; however, what was disappointing was the lack of knowledge of commonly examined specification content, such as the sectors to which organisations belong, the components of good destination management, socio-cultural impacts and the multiplier effect. In addition, candidates who were clearly able to construct good answers hampered themselves by failing to answer the question set in context.

Comments on individual questions

Dorset and the New Forest Case Study

1(a)

This part of the question was well answered well but in too much detail, with too much time spent on extended answers when only four marks were available. This is a common feature of the first question.

1(b)

This part of the question was poorly answered with little knowledge of the 'multiplier effect'. This was disappointing as many candidates gave very inaccurate interpretations of the term. It was clear that some candidates understood the multiplier effect but few were able to provide two clear explanations of how it would impact Dorset. A number of candidates incorrectly explained leakages as a negative impact of the multiplier effect.

1(c)

There was far too much emphasis spent on economic and socio-cultural impacts, but, in the main, this part of the question was answered well.

1(d)(i)

Many candidates were able to identify sectors, ie public, private and voluntary but did not identify particular agents from the case study. A straightforward three marks, if identification and use of the case study was applied.

1(d)(ii)

Some candidates referred to 'partnership' inappropriately, rather than the Dorset & New Forest Tourism Partnership as a body and did not always refer to the specific benefits and how they benefit **the tourist**. Many candidates gave the benefits to the members and then realised in the next question that they had answered this one incorrectly. This was an example of candidates not reading the question.

1(e)

There was evidence of confusion between the private and public sectors. Some candidates talked about aims and objectives and based their response on pre-learned knowledge of the three sectors. A small number of candidates just answered with a generic triangular partnership answer, with no reference to the actual members from the case.

Few candidates were able to **evaluate** the benefits of becoming members of the New Forest Tourism Association and gave far too many generic answers instead of looking for evidence in the case study. Candidates should be aware of the fact that, in order to evaluate at the higher mark band, they must base their finding on the evidence given in the case studies.

Libya Case Study

2(a)

This part of the question was well answered. The majority of candidates were able to give the correct definition.

2(b)

Many candidates tended to look at developments needed in Libya, rather than at the main economic objectives of the government in terms of foreign exchange, increasing visitor numbers and spending.

2(c)

Apart from 'profit', there were many candidates who did not understand the role of a development company.

2(d)

This part of the question was generally very well answered with airports and services, telecommunications and accommodation the most popular responses.

2(e)

There were far too many generic responses without reference to the case study and a lot of answers related purely to noise and litter types of pollution, rather than the effect on the specific wildlife in the area. The case study gave many examples of negative environmental impacts and, therefore, candidates who did not identify these in context could not access all of the marks.

2(f)

This was the most inconsistently answered part of the question with many candidates describing negative impacts as a result of visitors, rather than considering the planning which needed to be done before tourism starts in earnest. Few candidates could comment on political issues, but many did recognise the difference between Libyan culture and western culture and recognised that language barriers needed to be broken down, as well as mutual understanding promoted. The majority of candidates made broad references to social and cultural changes (though some

candidates referred to these after the tourists arrived, rather than the preparation before tourism takes place) with only few candidates realising the political changes needed (image of Libya, security and terrorist, visa processes, etc), or the cultural in terms of religious beliefs/customs, and social in terms of tourism training, language skills, etc. There was a lot of reference to tourists wanting bars and clubs and alcohol, but little reasoning as to how changes could be prepared for. This was generally not very well assessed and it was a good discriminator in the marks as candidates who achieved the higher mark band had obviously considered the question well and read the case study to make their response. This part of the question was either answered very well or very poorly.

Tourism development in Ibiza Case Study

3(a)

There were many excellent identifications by way of a response to this part of the question.

3(b)

The most common answer to this part of the question was the reputation of the clubbing scene followed by attracting different markets. Many candidates scored a maximum of four marks, not six as their responses were too brief and lacked explanation.

3(c)(i)

Almost as many candidates gave the public sector as did the private sector. There is still a lack of knowledge and awareness of the sectors and the agents of tourism development.

3(c)(ii)

Many candidates related their responses to Thomas Cook's objectives, which were quite acceptable, providing they had responded to part (c)(i) correctly (many had given 'public sector' here which meant their responses to part (c)(ii) were incorrect).

3(d)

Some candidates related their responses to the effects on other tourists of negative socio-cultural impacts, rather than the locals themselves which was the aim of the question. Many candidates seemed to spend time writing about the effects of sex and drugs in various guises! The better candidates answers related to identity, culture and the need to maintain its uniqueness.

3(e)

As with some other questions there was some misinterpretation of the question. Instead of evaluating the measures needed, many candidates discussed the negative impacts, either economic or environmental. Better candidates referred to Butler's model and the principles of sustainable tourism. Many used evidence from the case study including good interpretation of the role of commercial operators (Thomas Cook), UNESCO, World Travel Market, etc.

G734 Marketing in travel and tourism

General comments

The pre-release material sent to centres was a case study based on The Lowry in Manchester – a vibrant arts centre at the heart of urban regeneration in The Quays. The information contained an advertisement, the history of the success of the Lowry and details of marketing, membership and the arts programmes.

A small entry was received. Questions tested the candidates' knowledge of marketing theories and then application to The Lowry and to organisations of a similar nature. It was pleasing to see that the stimulus material was well used by most candidates and good detail was extracted for each question. Questions were designed to be accessible to all candidates and level of response marking was applied for the longer 'essay' style questions. Unfortunately, some of the weaker candidates did not appear to be familiar with some of the key marketing terms – such as 'a marketing audit' and 'variable pricing'.

The majority of candidates were able to attempt all of the questions in the time allowed for the paper, although a fairly high number found it challenging to have to write at length in response to the higher order questions. Short answer questions often ask the candidate to identify from the case study. Some candidates failed to realise that the information must, therefore, be taken directly from the case study and not from brought knowledge.

It would help candidates if centres worked through the pre-release case study material thoroughly by applying marketing criteria to as many different scenarios as possible. Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the many different marketing terms and have a good grounding in the basic marketing principles as outlined in the 'What You Need To Learn' Section of the specification. It was pleasing to see that some centres had clearly worked through case study scenarios on SWOT, PEST and AIDA.

Once again examination preparation seems key to the success for many candidates entering this examination. Centres should aim to provide candidates with definitions of the key command words. Weaker candidates struggle when asked to 'Evaluate', 'Analyse' or 'Assess'. Most of the higher mark questions are marked using a level of response criteria, and it is imperative that candidates are able to demonstrate the skills required. It is preferable that candidates provide some form of judgement or conclusion to gain the higher level marks; however, it should be noted that marks are **not** awarded for irrelevant conclusions or very basic final statements.

Comments on individual questions

1(a)

This part of the question was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to give benefits to The Lowry of having in-house press officers. Popular responses related to the saving on costs whilst others, covered the benefit of having a loyal individual directly on hand to assist with urgent issues.

1(b)

There were some excellent responses to this part of the question. Many candidates were able to demonstrate three benefits to companies of sponsoring The Lowry. On occasions the weaker candidates confused their responses and gave the benefits to The Lowry rather than to individual companies. Candidates should, therefore, take care when reading the question.

1(c)

Some respondents were clearly unfamiliar with the term variable pricing and simply discussed the benefits of having free entry to the centre. The more able candidates were able to explain the benefits of encouraging higher sales, and use at off-peak times ensuring a growth in a new and a different type of customer.

1(d)

Once again this part of the question was generally well answered. However, on occasion, a similar problem occurred for the less able candidates who discussed the benefits to organisations of being a member, rather than the benefits to The Lowry of offering such packages.

2(a)

Better candidates demonstrated excellent understanding of the meaning of a marketing audit. Clearly some candidates were unfamiliar with the term; however, the majority attempted to answer the question.

2(b)

This part of the question was reasonably well answered, although some candidates may have been unfamiliar with the term marketing audit they still attempted to see the benefit of conducting a SWOT analysis and did access some marks.

2(c)

This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates were able to explain two items to include on the marketing plan. Most common responses included the mission statement and marketing mix.

2(d)

It was clear that some candidates were unable to link external marketing to the PEST analysis. The more able candidates accessed this question particularly well and some very good examples were given including the impacts of the economic crisis, the BA strike and new technological influences.

3(a)

This part of the question was well answered. Most candidates were able to identify three customer groups that were currently targeted by The Lowry. As previously explained, candidates were asked to identify from the case study and those who gave other responses were not able to gain credit.

3(b)

This part of the question, once again, was reasonably well answered. The role of the ASA was required and many candidates were able to identify the monitoring role and dealing with complaints.

3(c)

Most candidates made a very good attempt at this part of the question. Many appeared familiar with the advantages and disadvantages of cinema advertising. The type of audience, along with the cost implications, were the most common responses. Higher marks were accessed with a full discussion of both advantages and disadvantages and a reasoned conclusion provided.

3(d)

This part of the question was generally well answered – candidates gave a variety of advertising suggestions appropriate for The Lowry and were able to justify their use in order to increase market share. Suggestions included: newspapers both regional and national, television and billboards.

4(a)

This part of the question was very well answered – most candidates were able to identify the product and the place of The Lowry's marketing mix.

4(b)

This part of the question was generally very well answered. Many candidates had clearly been prepared for an AIDA question – however, some of the weaker candidates failed to explore all aspects of this and simply discussed elements.

4(c)

This part of the question was very well answered. Candidates were able to give other forms of primary market research. In some cases the weaker candidates fell into the trap of repeating the question and gave 'Questionnaire' as a response. Also candidates had to be clear on the actual type of research and those who simply put 'survey' were not credited.

4(d)

Most candidates made a very good attempt at this part of the question. It was clear that candidates were familiar with why organisations need to conduct research. Some of the weaker candidates failed to differentiate between the gathering of primary evidence specific to an organisation and the secondary research already available. Nevertheless, this was a well answered question and many candidates were able to gain good marks.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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