

## **GCE**

### **Travel and Tourism**

Advanced GCE A2 **H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H189, H389**

### **OCR Report to Centres June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2017

## **CONTENTS**

**Advanced GCE Travel and Tourism (H589)**

**Advanced GCE Travel and Tourism (Double Award) (H789)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel and Tourism (H189)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel and Tourism (Double Award) (H389)**

## **OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
G720 Unit 1 – Introducing travel and tourism	4
G728 Tourism Development	8

# G720 Unit 1 – Introducing travel and tourism

## Standards and Assessment

Several Centres had well prepared their candidates for AS and A2 level this series. This was the last series for AS units other than a re-sit opportunity in 2018.

The content and standard of evidence by candidates and assessment of AS and A2 units was good. Some accredited centres were externally moderated this session and, in most cases, showed accuracy in the assessment of their candidates' portfolios.

In some cases a problem of inconsistency in assessment occurred which resulted in adjustments being made. This was mainly due to candidates providing insufficient evidence to support the mark awarded. At both AS level and A2 level in particular, some candidates struggled to provide in depth evaluation and analysis. This is a key element of candidates' skills. **Where candidates had evaluated and analysed, their evidence was of a high standard this series.**

Candidates had 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. There is a need to encourage the use of different sources of information and provide clear referencing and sourcing.

There were instances where candidates provided too much general evidence for the units without sufficient application. This was particularly evident in G722 Travel Destinations, G729 Event Management and G731 Eco Tourism. **Assessment should relate to quality not quantity, with an applied purpose. Where candidates remained specific to the requirements of the unit with completely applied evidence, they performed well .**

There is still a need to ensure that practical units contain clear evidence of participation and how well skills were performed in the form of witness statements and comment by the assessor. Some candidates had been provided with very clear statements and this directly related to a good evaluation. Other candidates lacked the evidence and were unable to evaluate. Their evidence became more of a running commentary of what they did rather than an **evaluation. This was particularly relevant in G721 Customer Service, G729 Event Management and G730 Guided Tour.**

Please refer to previous reports on the OCR website in relation to advice on individual units at A2 for 2018.

### **Unit G721-Customer service in travel and tourism.**

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 and it must be clear what the skills are and how well they were performed.

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 at 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** that relate to how needs are met e.g. time efficiency.

**Unit G721-Customer service in travel and tourism.** For AO3, candidates generally showed some good research into how the organisation assesses its effectiveness of customer service and the methods the organisation uses. The 2009 specification emphasises that 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 etc.

For AO4, candidates need to evaluate the organisation's customer service and how effective they think it is, providing some recommendations. This is likely to require the candidate to carry out, for example, a survey, observation, mystery shopper, etc. (Primary research)

Centres generally carried out and evidenced this well. 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 were some submissions 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 on the scope of analysis in terms of customer types for AO2/3. Candidates need guiding here as to the suitability of the destinations, e.g. not two cities.

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 of 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 specific features. There was, for example, very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, etc. or different types of customers. Another example is different types of accommodation and cost against appeal to different types of

customers/visitors. Some candidates had analysed well but many candidates 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, e.g. what would or would not be useful for Mark Band 3. Many candidates had used websites only as their main source of research and they need to be encouraged to consider other sources. Part of the analysis mark for Mark Band 3 must be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This is well done by higher performing 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 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 increase in prices, the development of the cruise industry, availability of long haul/short haul flights, increase in the short break.

## **A2 Units**

### **Unit G729-Event Management**

There was some 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 Mark Band 2, with little evidence to support individuality, specific skills, team working, customer service and communication.

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 was 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 – i.e. did it work?, re-draft flow chart etc.

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 achieving candidates to **develop their project planning techniques**. There was a need for candidates to address problems/difficulties. This was often omitted in evidence this series.

AO3 This assessment objective 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.

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 improvement also needed to be considered further as candidates tended to omit this aspect**.

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 This 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.

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.

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 the candidates' work and **too much information without application** to the organisations aims for example.

### **Unit G735-Human Resources**

There were a few submissions this series with a mixed response. Where candidates fell down it was usually due to lack of evidence in the management and planning of human resources with a lack of comparison/contrast. There was 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.

## G728 Tourism Development

### General Comments

This examination series was sadly lacking in demonstration of examination technique in the majority of cases. Many responses to questions showed a limited use of the resource booklet and gave generic answers to the questions with little relevance to context or intelligent use of the facts stated in the various case studies. There were seven extended answers to this paper, and with a few exceptions timing did not appear to be an issue. A point of note is that far too many candidates gave positive responses, even when the question asked only for negatives and disadvantages. Poor understanding and direction of the question was too evident this series.

Question (1f) carried 10 marks, and was based on the relationship between the public and private sectors in Brighton. This is a re-occurring theme and features extensively in the specification. Candidates did not answer this at all well; there was confusion with the triangular relationship, voluntary sector and economic benefits and impacts with very little reference to the information provided in the resource booklet. Many responses were totally out of context and did not pass Level one, 4 marks max. Past paper practice continues to be the best examination preparation method as many common themes and terminology continue to be assessed.

Overall, some sections of the paper were answered well with the exception of the following from the 'what you need to learn' section in the specification:

Public/Private sectors and the importance of a relationship between them

The difference between aims and objectives and impacts

Pedestrianisation /planning control/visitor and traffic management

Actual meaning of the 'multiplier effect'

Conservation and preservation as per the specification

Centres must stress to candidates the need to use the evidence in the case studies and to refer to it at all times when answering ALL questions. There are still examples of candidates giving generic answers e.g. Q 1d. *Assess the importance of preservation and conservation to the UK of its historic monuments*; candidates should refer to the case study, however, overwhelmingly the answer was given as generic economic impacts of jobs and income which could apply to anywhere.

Many candidates still see copying text as application, e.g. Question (2d) *Assess the importance to Cuba of preserving traditional culture for tourism purposes*; Many answers did not reach the highest marks by just listing the facts from the case study and not interpreting them to form an opinion of the benefits to Cuba and not to the tourist.

Candidates need to read questions carefully: e.g. 2c which also asked *why training of the host population was important for Cuba*. The majority of responses gave the importance to the tourist and not Cuba. There will always be questions at the end of each section that require an extended written answer. These questions will ask candidates to assess, analyse or evaluate a particular issue. There were many candidates who had written really good extended answers but could not get beyond level 1 or 2 as they were unable to give clear analysis of the evidence

presented in the stimulus material; or lacked the ability to conclude their findings with an opinion of the evidence presented in the case study. Candidates need to be reminded that when answering a UK based question they should not drift into writing extensively of their own knowledge of an overseas destination, likewise, , when writing about an overseas destination they should not refer to a UK based example. Responses should be in context to the geographical destination.

Please note an additional answer page was provided at the end of the booklet and candidates' attention should be drawn to this in future as this will alleviate the need to use a separate 4 page answer booklet for a few lines of extra text.

Q No) **BRIGHTON**

- 1) (a) Easy starter but many lost marks as no reasons given, just identification.
- (b) Understanding of the term 'multiplier effect' was very vague.
- (ci ) Candidates were able to identify funding and sectors in most cases.
- (cii)
- (d) Too many responses focussed on the economic benefits of jobs and income and missed the focus of the question which related to conservation and preservation.
- (e) The majority of candidates answered this question by focussing on negative impacts of pollution and congestion when in fact the question required a discussion on the benefits to stakeholders of pedestrianisation. This was evident in the case study and considerable aspects of the specification relating to destination management.
- (f)

The benefits of a relationship between the public/private sectors aspect was very poorly answered. There was very little reference to the organisations in the case study.

Too many candidates described negative environmental and social impacts that were totally unrelated to the question,

**CUBA**

- 2) (a) Well answered, most candidates scored maximum marks.
- (b) Candidates often gave reasoned responses to this question. Thomas Cook and Hotel chains such as Melia/Sol were the most used but little evidence of the wider implications that were available.
- (c) Tourism training to Cuba was poorly answered. Many focussed on socio/cultural benefits and used examples of Cuban culture from the case study, or, gave benefits to the tourist.

- (d) Poor interpretation of the question which asked for the importance to Cuba of preserving traditional culture. Many gave the benefits to the tourists or slipped into economic objectives. Few candidates achieved Level 2 for this response.
- (e) UNESCO definition was answered well this series.
- (f) Negative impacts on UNESCO sites was generally well answered with the majority choosing negative environmental impacts of footpath erosion and disruption to wildlife in the National Parks. The case study was used quite well and the candidates that focussed on the built environment tended to gain more marks as this was more in context with question dealing with overcrowding and social issues.

Q3

**JAPAN 2020 OLYMPICS**

- (a) Well answered, identifications of four operators.
- (b)

Many candidates lost marks on this question as they referred to the benefits to the infrastructure AFTER the Olympic Games and not before.

- (c) Good responses to this question. Many candidates identified promotion and recommendations and scored well.
- (d) The command of language and grammar supporting correct discussion was taken into account as this was the QWR\* question.

This was the last question on the paper and worth (12) marks. Well answered in the main, although there was extensive evidence of straight copying from the case study.

Evaluate the negative economic impacts was answered quite well, however a great number of candidates slipped into giving POSITIVE solutions and methods to improve. The case study clearly illustrated that economic impacts were negative; however, again this was an example of candidates not interpreting the question and using the evidence in the case study.

There was also reference to terrorist attacks, however the question did state NATURAL disasters and therefore credit was not given for these responses.

For candidates who used an alternative destination full credit was given for evaluative responses.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

