

# **Travel & Tourism**

Advanced GCE **A2 H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H189, H389**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**January 2008**

**1962/MS/R/08J**

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2008

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

## CONTENTS

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

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

### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit//Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner's Report	1
PM Report	3
G720 Introducing travel & tourism	6
G723 International travel	9
G728 Tourism development	12
G734 Marketing in travel & tourism	16
Grade Thresholds	19

## Chief Examiner's Report

The many positive aspects relating to candidate performance in the earlier examination sessions of the new qualification appear to be continuing. There were many examples of both AS and A2 work where candidates were able to display a thorough appreciation of the topics under consideration. However, the entry for this session was not as large as in the summer and the majority of candidates entered were again studying for the single award. It is very pleasing to be able to report that the qualification is being delivered effectively by the majority of Centres.

The quality of written work evident in both candidate portfolios and in the external assessment scripts was frequently of a good standard. It is now hoped that this improving standard will be maintained in subsequent examination sessions. However, delivery of the specification is approaching maturity and there is still a need for significant issues to be addressed in the near future in order to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade. With this in mind, **Centres are given notice that in all future examination sessions units G728 (Tourism Development) and G734 (Marketing) will require candidates to write their answers in lined spaces following the individual questions.** Thus the AS and A2 examined units will now follow the same format.

All the Principal Examiners make reference to the fact that many individual candidates failed to do themselves full justice in terms of their examination performance. I thus feel it is appropriate to repeat the following from last January's Report to Centres. *'Centres should note that in terms of assessing AO4, it is possible, although unlikely, that a candidate treating, however well analysed, only **one** aspect or influence can be awarded the maximum credit available. This is because evaluation/discussion/assessment which has not been cross-referenced with at least one other valid influence is not likely to have been sufficiently developed. Thus, a valid conclusion is unlikely to be reached without a minimum of **two** facts/factors/ influences being properly evaluated (with supporting analysis).'*

Centres are once again strongly advised to make sure that candidates understand the differences between *describe, explain, discuss, analyse* and *evaluate*. Detailed comments about candidate performance and the January papers are provided in the following sections of this document.

However, this is only part of the overall picture and it is still rather worrying to read certain observations made by the Principal Moderator in the following report. There are far too many examples of candidate portfolios which did **not** contain clear annotation to support the assessment decisions being made by Centres.

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

- making sure that the advice provided in the Guidance for Teachers sections of the specification is actually followed;
- referring to and making full use of the various support materials available for all the AS and A2 units;
- assessors making every effort to make sure that portfolio work is correctly annotated.

Negative adjustments to marks were often made because of inappropriate approaches to meeting unit requirements and/or a lack of understanding of the standards required.

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

*Report on the Units taken in January 2008*

It is very much hoped that further improvements will be forthcoming during subsequent examination sessions and Centres are strongly advised to follow the guidance offered in the following reports and to seek clarification via the Subject Officer, if appropriate.

## **PM Report**

Many Centres this session submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the unit recording sheet (URS) and had also made use of the comment boxes on the URS. Most portfolios submitted this session had been clearly annotated which made the moderation process run more smoothly.

### **Generic Overview of Units**

In cases where negative scaling had been applied, it was usually because Centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the key words/evidence of a particular mark band. Where Centres had followed **the guidance** with reference to the depth of study and research/evidence required, the standard of candidates' work was good. There were cases where candidates had moved away from the specific points in the guidance and, therefore, had not addressed the criteria in the unit. Where appropriate research had taken place some candidates had **applied** their findings to the requirements of the unit, whereas others had still found difficulty.

In all units, candidates need to structure their evidence in a **clear, logical and appropriate form**. Where candidates are required to produce a plan and organise their findings the evidence was generally clear and criteria well answered. This was particularly evident in G722 - Travel Destinations, G729 - Event Management and G730 - Guided Tour. In cases where evidence was not organised and structured there were cases of leniency in assessment by Centres.

With reference to assessment of units, in some cases Centres need to consider the rank order of candidate's marks within the assessment objectives and overall score. Some candidates had produced similar or better quality of evidence within a mark band than another candidate, but had been awarded less marks and vice versa. Where Centres had followed a clear internal moderation process, this problem was less evident.

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

**With reference to evaluation, in many cases this session candidates displayed weak evaluative skills, an aspect of evidence required for all units at AS and A2 level.**

**In most units, particularly at AS level, candidates are required to make comparisons. Some candidates evidenced this skill well but there were several cases where this was not apparent.**

**For units G724, G725, G726, G730, G731, G732 and G735 there was a very small submission of these units this session. Please refer to the Principal Moderator's report for the June 2007 examination series for guidance on these units.**

## **Mandatory Units**

### **Unit G721 - Customer Service**

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

AO1. Candidates clearly identified the needs of internal and external customers and made a reasonable attempt to evidence how their needs are met but this was often descriptive in nature. There are still cases where there is little evidence of a **comparison** which leads into how this would benefit the organisation - this is a key component of this assessment objective. Some candidates had considered **different customer types** which represents good understanding but failed to consider this as part of the comparison.

AO2. This was generally well evidenced with many candidates replying to a complaint by letter. Candidates need to look at a minimum of three/four situations to evidence the variety of customers. It still needs to be made clear in the work what exactly the complaint was and the outcome must be realistic in line with the organisations' complaints procedure/policy. It is expected, at this level, that candidates, if answering by letter, to format the letter 'business style' and to include no errors, e.g. spelling. Candidates must deal with a variety of customers which must be clearly evidenced. In some cases it was not clear who were the variety of customers. **It must also be apparent that the other situations are face-to-face and/or phone as evidence of a variety of situations/skills the candidate has demonstrated.**

There was a tendency this session for candidates **to evaluate** by stating what they had done rather than how well and why or suggest improvements. **The evaluations** are a key component of this assessment objective. This was often the cause of leniency in assessment this session.

AO3. There is still a tendency in most cases to omit **internal customers**. Again, many candidates had not considered that the number of complaints and about what, can be used as a method to assess customer service.

Candidates generally showed some research into how the organisation assesses the effectiveness of its customer service, though they struggled with an analysis of how the methods are used and/or what the organisation has done to make improvements.

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

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

### **Unit G722 - Travel Destinations.**

There were several submissions for the moderation of this unit this session with a mixed response

AO1. Centres address this well but there is a need to bear in mind that downloaded maps **must be** annotated, sourced/referenced and be linked to a description. There should be a world map. For mark band 3, candidates should be looking at an internal map which can describe the distribution of features considered in AO2, such as - where is the airport? how close to specific destination? Is accommodation near to attractions?

## *Report on the Units taken in January 2008*

AO2. Care still needs to be taken where candidates had evidenced sections of text and web-sites. With reference to appeal of their destinations, candidates attempted to make a logical explanation but still omitted to fully cover the appeal of their destination with particular reference to **who and why**. This forms part of the analysis required for marks in AO3

Sometimes sources were well referenced in the text.

AO4. This was generally well assessed and some candidates had done this well. There was, in some cases, however, little evidence of any statistical data to assist with candidate's reasoning. The criterion does not specify UK tourists but visitors in general. There was a tendency for candidates to miss commenting on **future trends**.

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

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

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

It was again pleasing to see the range of appropriate events considered and carried out and the enjoyment candidates experienced in working as part of a team.

It is also good practice that Centres differentiate assessments/marks in AO2 awarded to their candidates together with an individual report and witness statement.

AO1. With reference to the business plan, some candidates had been methodical in approach, whereas others had been repetitive and unclear. **There was a distinct lack of structure and clarity to many plans**. Candidates still tend to produce a report and running commentary which cause them to omit vital pieces of information. There was some confusion as to the requirements of a plan and evidence often became muddled and difficult to decipher.

AO2. Candidates were not always clear on their individual contribution. There were, however, some excellent examples amongst Centre submissions.

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

AO3. This assessment objective is still not well addressed as Centres have difficulty in meeting the requirements. Candidates tend to have some difficulty in evidencing feasibility. Though most candidates had considered a risk assessment and a contingency plan, for example, there was little evidence of market research - records of other ideas, SWOT, costing and specific reasoning for the final outcome, together with changes made, e.g. to the time plan, etc as the event was being planned.

AO4. Some candidates addressed this well on the whole but there was a tendency to omit any reference to **aims and objectives and to actually evaluate**. They tended to produce a running commentary of what they had done, rather than an evaluation/conclusion/analysis of the results of customer feedback or to suggest improvements.

## **G720 Introducing travel & tourism**

### **General Comments**

There were some high quality scripts seen, with examples of candidates achieving full marks for some questions.

The pre-released case study materials were used effectively by Centres and their candidates. All documents in the case study were accessed by the majority of candidates and used in their answers. Centres do need to ensure that these pre released materials are seen by the candidates well in advance of the examination, and that each document is explained and analysed.

Careful preparation of glossaries of the key terms, while preparing candidates for the examination, is of great use. In Question 2(b), explanations of the terms AONB, national Park and Heritage Coast were required. All of these terms were extracted from Document 2(b). With careful preparation, Centres can ensure that their candidates learn definitions from the pre-released materials which can form likely questions in the examination. Other terms from Document 2(b) which could have formed questions are: coastal resort, narrow-gauge railway, short break, working farms and maritime city.

The vast majority of candidates attempted all five questions. The layout of the question paper should now be familiar to Centres. There will always be a question requiring an analysis of the statistics in the pre released materials. This will be a levels of response question, with marks awarded at Level 1 for pure extraction from the document; Level 2 for analysis of the statistics and Level 3 for evaluative conclusions. There will be a question requiring analytical comparison of two travel and tourism organisations; in this examination it was the Big Pit and Castell Coch, both attractions. The last question on the examination requires an extended answer relating to the prose in the case study materials. This is normally related to some issues or problems highlighted in the materials. There was evidence that Centres are preparing candidates well for these extended questions. Many well written responses were seen with an introduction, main body of analysis and an evaluative conclusion.

### **Comments on individual questions**

1a

The terms VFR and B&B were located in Document 1. Both were well answered, with candidates demonstrating knowledge of the abbreviations, and having the ability to expand the answer, either with a specific example or by demonstrating more in- depth knowledge of the term.

1b

This part of the question required an understanding of the roles of the Wales Tourist Board. There were a great number of candidates who purely copied from the case study. This limited the marks which could be awarded. The roles of such organisations need to be taught by Centres, especially their important role in promoting destinations, advising and training. Some candidates assumed that the Wales Tourist Board also ran attractions or accommodation outlets. Although Tourist Boards will monitor and assess the quality of such organisations, their responsibility does not lie in the management of them.

1c

This part of the question required an analysis of the trends in tourism to Wales. These were clearly illustrated in Document 1(a), with percentage increases (in inbound tourism) identified in the prose and decreases (in domestic tourism) in the table. Some candidates did not refer to these trends, so consequently did not access Level 1 of the mark scheme. Analysis required candidates to offer some explanation for these trends. Although the impact of foot and mouth is a valid explanation for a decrease in visitors to areas of the UK in 2001, it does not apply to the time frame in this case study. Other external factors such as the rise in budget airlines and poor summer weather in Wales were credit worthy answers. There was considerable evidence that some candidates were undertaking mathematical analysis of the data, e.g. calculating average spend and percentage differences, but were then failing to discuss the results or analyse in words. Some candidates were disadvantaged by using this method as the smallest mathematical error can lead to the candidate achieving no marks. In terms of this examination, it is questionable whether this mathematical analysis is an effective use of examination time. Centres should advise candidates of this. Evaluative conclusions, to achieve Level 3, could have related to the effectiveness of the Wales Tourist Board in promoting Wales overseas, or the spending by business visitors.

2a

Generally answered well.

2b

The quality of answers to this part of the question varied greatly. Designation and protection of the natural environment was the key response required. Many candidates seemed confused by the terms. A frequent error was that National Parks were run by the National Trust (although many National Parks do have areas of land owned by the National Trust, it is the National Park Authorities which actually run the National Parks). Many candidates thought that a Heritage Coast needed to have some castles or built attractions before they were designated.

2c

Well answered.

2d

There was a variable quality of answers. The question part required candidates to demonstrate an understanding of Blue Flag and Seaside Awards. These were identified in Documents 2(a) and 2(b). Candidates who could demonstrate an understanding of these achieved Level 2 marks. The higher marks were awarded for relating the importance of these to Pembrokeshire. It was obvious that many candidates were not aware of the awards, and made comments relating to the quality of the accommodation available, rather than the quality of beaches and water. Few candidates related the significance of these awards to Pembrokeshire, i.e. that they can encourage tourism and, hence, benefit the local economy.

3a

Not well answered. Candidates were required to identify and explain two reasons why the Welsh Assembly Government would support an attraction. Candidates could refer directly to Castell Coch or the Big Pit, or attractions in general. Basically, the question required candidates to explain the reasons why the public sector would offer support; answers relating to education, economic benefits and heritage issues were all credit worthy points. There were few examples of candidates being able to offer full explanations for two reasons.

3b

A varied quality of answers was seen. Many candidates could not identify specific legislation. These are clearly outlined in the specification and Centres do need to ensure that candidates are taught legislation and regulations relevant to the travel and tourism industry in the UK. Many candidates stated the titles of laws incorrectly, e.g. Disability Act rather than the Disability Discrimination Act. Candidates either achieved full marks for this part of the question, as they could clearly identify and explain the legislation, or only a few marks were awarded for general comments relating to health and safety.

3c

The style of this part of the question should now be familiar to Centres and candidates. Some candidates do not extract information correctly from the pre-released materials, and this limits the marks they can achieve. Some candidates extended their answer onto spare paper, or the back of the answer booklet, but still only managed to achieve Level 1 marks. Candidates should be prepared in the necessary writing technique for this type of question in order to maximise their examination time. Overall, the question was generally well answered.

4a

Well answered, although there were some candidates who used the wrong statistics, those in Document 1(a) rather than Document 1(b). Candidates could clearly identify patterns, such as more business tourism in South East Wales. Some candidates linked a low percentage of business tourism in the summer months to hotels being full and very expensive and the high percentage of business tourism in out-of-peak months to special deals in low season. This is not generally the case with business tourism where the company is paying.

4b

Well answered. Candidates could identify the features of the Hilton Cardiff which were suitable for business visitors. This achieved Level 1 of the mark scheme. For Level 2 some analysis was required. The majority of candidates attempted this well, making comments about how access to broadband is essential for business visitors to continue working. Candidates needed to make evaluative comments for Level 3, often these related to the quality of chain hotels such as the Hilton and how these are suitable for business visitors on expenses.

4c

The majority of candidates achieved Level 1 and picked out details of the appeal of the Wyeside Park to leisure visitors. Many candidates did not extend beyond this, as they did not seem to fully understand what was meant by a leisure visitor, i.e. someone on holiday. There was also a lack of understanding the needs of the leisure visitor and especially how Wyeside Park catered for these needs.

5

Some candidates gave rather brief answers to this question. This may be due to poor timing and examination technique. Document 7 clearly stated many facts and figures about active holidays in Wales. If these were taken directly by the candidate without any analysis or interpretation, only Level 1 marks were awarded. The importance of active tourism related to the economy and jobs achieved Level 2. It was pleasing to see that some candidates discussed issues of sustainable tourism in relation to active holidays; it is these sorts of evaluative comments which are needed to achieve the top mark band for this type of question.

## G723 International travel

There was quite a small entry for this examination session and it is pleasing to note that candidate performance is starting to reflect the advice given to Centres in previous reports. Candidates are starting to demonstrate both an understanding and an appreciation of International Travel to and from the UK. It was pleasing to see accurate reference being made to a variety of locations and to the candidate's own personal travel experiences. There were some outstanding scripts but there was a very wide variation between Centres in terms of the level of candidate performance.

There are still far too many instances of candidates ignoring the precise wording of individual questions and more specific comments will be made in the following sections. Many candidates appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions and Centres are now once again encouraged to make the following '**Key Word**' definitions part of their examination preparation sessions.

<b>Key Words</b>	<b>Meaning/expectation</b>
Identify	Simply name, state or list.
Describe	State the characteristic features of something.
Explain	Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details.
Discuss (includes the ability to <b>analyse</b> )	Provide evidence or opinions about something arriving at a balanced conclusion. The candidate is being asked to consider an issue and is thus expected to present arguments and evidence to support particular points of view and to come to a <b>conclusion</b> .
Evaluate/Assess ( this also includes the ability to <b>analyse</b> )	To judge from available evidence and arrive at a reasoned <b>conclusion</b> . 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 these command verbs will always have difficulty in obtaining the higher marks for questions which are assessed by means of 'Levels of Response'. There was some evidence that 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 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).

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

**Comments on Individual Questions**

Q	
1 (a)	Very well answered with most candidates achieving full marks
1 (b)	Valid risks were given by the majority of candidates – many including abduction or kidnap, perhaps reflecting the publicity re: Maddie McCann.
1 (c)	Many candidates missed the point of ‘service environment’ on this question and related it more to convenience and on the beach, as opposed to table service, shade, etc.
1 (d)	Generally appropriate answers were received concerning the trend for well being and guest expectations but very few candidates made valid conclusions about the provision in terms of income generation for the resorts.
1 (e)	Very few answers were able to analyse and evaluate the services provided in 5* hotels which are geared towards the needs of business customers. Better answers explained different types of facility, such as meeting and conference rooms, executive rooms and lounges, secretarial/administrative services and attempted to come to a conclusion as to how needs were being met.
2 (a)	Responses covered busy high streets, access, window displays, convenience, with the majority of candidates achieving three or four marks, though there were also many good responses achieving the maximum six marks.
2 (b)	The majority of candidates gained three marks here, but many included excursions and entertainment which do not form the four major components of a package, and there was confusion between ‘transport’ and ‘transfers’.
2 (c)	Generally well answered, with most candidates including insurance and foreign exchange, although some failed to explain the ancillary service adequately.
2 (d)	This part of the question proved to be a good discriminator – those Centres where the role of ABTA and its affect on customer choice had been thoroughly covered achieved Level 2, if not 3; whereas the work from candidates at other Centres showed little understanding of what the ‘code of conduct’ requires travel agencies to provide and how the two parties relate.
3 (a)	The majority of candidates were able to extract sufficient information to achieve two marks for this part of the question, though the quality of their descriptions varied considerably – seasonality was commented on, as was gradual increase, but the majority just highlighted the peak in June 2005 and trough in March 2005.
3 (bi&ii)	Very few candidates failed to get both marks for these questions.
3 (c)	The majority of candidates reached three marks, though there was some repetition, such as ‘quick’, ‘convenient’, without explanation of why (15 minutes journey time, etc).
3 (d)	Those candidates who fully understood the function of TICs performed well on this part of the question. The majority of candidates achieved at least three marks, though the explanations let some down or were too repetitive.

3 (e)	The majority of candidates were able to give detailed coverage of the measures currently operating in UK airports (with many very up to date). However, many candidates then failed to extend their responses to include information as to 'why' these measures were in place (threat of terrorism, etc.), or suggest which measures were the most appropriate. Thus many answers failed to progress into Level 3.
4 (a)	Though many candidates correctly identified the two low cost airlines (Ryanair and easyJet), not all candidates recognised Jet2.com and gave major international airlines instead.
4 (b)	The responses to this part of the question were sometimes very weak, with confusion between chartered (as many thought they were) and scheduled, and many candidates did not relate their responses to 'service characteristics'. However, many did itemise three valid points.
4 (c)	This part of the question was a good discriminator as very few candidates understood the role of the consular staff, and tended to imply that they would <b>pay</b> for a lawyer or to get the culprit home. Very few candidates achieved full marks. Candidates are expected to know the ways in which the Foreign and Commonwealth Office influences international travel.
4 (d)	There were plenty of relevant examples of types of bad behaviour but only the stronger candidates related to the issues of compensation being limited when personal injuries are caused through one's own fault.
4 (e)	There was quite a wide range of responses to this part of the question. Too many candidates just identified travel products and services which could apply to any customer (cheap flights, insurance, packages, etc) rather than focussing on the products specifically for the younger traveller (e.g. Club 18-30, gap year market, packages for under 25s, etc). Most answers failed to reach even Level 2 lacking an understanding of the growth of this market segment. Some candidates responded quite well in terms of unaccompanied minors (obviously having studied earlier examination papers), and these responses were allowed – with some reaching Level 3. However, there were distinct mark differences for many candidates between those achieved in questions 1-3 and their marks for question 4.

## **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 syllabus. 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 all future examinations for this unit, candidates will be required to write their answers in lined spaces following the question (the same format as the AS examined units); with this in mind it is imperative that candidates are schooled in examination technique so that they can get straight to the heart of the answer. Far too much time is currently being wasted on re-writing the question. The new format will not allow for this and candidates will have difficulty in condensing their responses if this issue is not practised in advance. Most candidates were able to access most questions; although it was evident that a disproportionate amount of time was spent on questions 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), which proved to have an impact later in the paper. Overall, Question 1 was answered to a good standard; however, many candidates gave generic responses to Questions 1(d) and 1(e) and, as a result, were not able to achieve the higher mark band. Question 2 was generally well answered, particularly questions 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c). Question 2(d) caused some problems with candidates understanding of the term 'infrastructure' and the link with long term destination management. There was also evidence of candidates not being able to distinguish between the impacts in question 2(e) – confusing economic with socio-cultural or environmental and, therefore, not accessing marks as they had not read the question or could not differentiate between these impacts. Generally, the lack of candidates' ability to develop their answers with analytical comments and evaluation resulted in them being unable to gain the higher marks on the level of response questions. There will always be a question at the end of each section which requires an extended written answer. This question will ask candidates to assess, analyse or evaluate a particular issue. There were many candidates who had written really good extended answers but could not get beyond Level 2 as they were unable to give a clear analysis of the evidence presented in the stimulus material; or they lacked the ability to conclude their findings with an opinion of the evidence presented in the case study. Unless candidates use this evidence in context as opposed to writing extended 'generic' answers, this problem will continue.

In general, the standard this session was quite pleasing. There were a wide range of abilities and a wide range of answers. The vast majority of candidates found A01/A02 answers very accessible and the use of knowledge and/or recap of tourism development key terms were evident throughout. Future candidates are encouraged to practice past examination papers in full for time management and revision purposes.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Q 1 **Hadrians Wall**

- 1) (a) Answered well but in too much detail, with too much time spent on extended answers when only four marks were possible.
- (b) i Generally well answered with a good range of economic impacts.
- (b) ii Generally good responses, though a few were 'generic' rather than focussing on the material in the case study (i.e. pollution, litter rather than erosion, loss of habitats, etc)
- (c) Some good responses, although a number of candidates also included environmental and economic factors as well or instead. Most were able to relate socio/cultural impacts to Hadrian's Wall, though some candidates gave World Heritage Site examples outside UK.
- (d) Some candidates were able to identify sectors, i.e. public, private and voluntary but did not identify particular agents from the case study. There was evidence of confusion between the private and public sectors. Others talked about aims and objectives in general and based their response on pre-learned knowledge of the three sectors. Although many candidates did not answer in the context of Hadrian's Wall, these were probably the best of the level of response answers on the paper, possibly because candidates were not under time pressure and could clearly identify the roles of the three sectors and the importance of partnerships between them.  
Few candidates were able to **evaluate** the importance of the sectors in terms of future success in the area.

### Q 2 **Cruising in the Mediterranean**

- 2) (a) Surprisingly, many candidates got this relatively simple question wrong by identifying the cruise companies or ships instead of the UK and Germany as cruise markets.
- (b) Responses varied on this part of the question – some candidates gave suitable responses regarding costs and accessibility, changes in trends, new ships and promotion, etc. as in the mark scheme; the majority related to the UK market which was appropriate. A few candidates had not read the question correctly and responded in terms of popularity to the US market which was incorrect.
- (c) Some candidates thought that the Caribbean was further away than the Mediterranean and would, therefore, be more interesting to US passengers and some answered the question as if travellers were more inclined to come to Europe. Most responses related to the exchange rate, though there were references to proximity, fear of flying, achieving two reasons explained simply (therefore, four marks) with few candidates extending their responses to achieve the maximum for both reasons.

- (d) The response to this part of the question was quite disappointing as there was evidence of some misunderstanding of the term 'development of the infrastructure'. Many candidates related their responses to jobs and income and other economic impacts within the area of the port, with very few taking the issue of developing infrastructure beyond the port itself. Too many candidates used the term 'infrastructure' without explaining what it implied, i.e. a lack of reference to roads, communications, wider transport issues such as access for coaches, benefits outside the port areas. There was a wealth of general infrastructure answers about water supplies and sewage which could have been applied to anywhere.
- (e) The answers to this part of the question tended to rely on jobs and income and many candidates included descriptions of socio-cultural or environmental impacts. In some cases either or positives were addressed and, again, few answers were in context of existing Mediterranean destinations or cruise destinations/ports. Responses varied, with some candidates achieving Levels 3 and 4, but the majority failed to address negative economic . Also, the majority of candidates referred to the impacts of more cruise passengers on a particular resort rather than the wider issues of the surrounding areas, though a few did relate their responses to the effects on traditional Mediterranean resorts losing income, etc.

Q 3

**Tourism development in Bimini - Bahamas**

- (a)
  - i Some candidates gave public sector as the answer for Tourism Concern.
  - ii The responses here were very weak indeed, showing little understanding of the aims of organisations such as Tourism Concern – with more reference to roles given.
- (b) The majority of responses related to conflict, crime or loss of traditional employment through land or sea use, with few candidates referring to limited development of infrastructure for locals. Most candidates achieved three or four marks.
- (c) This part of the question was well answered, although some candidates confused the role of private and public. Nearly all candidates took this question to mean a partnership between public, private and voluntary and not host population, agents and tourist. There was some evidence of an understanding of how the triangular relationship works between the host, developer, government and tourist; however, the majority of candidates referred to the sectors.
- (d) This part of the question was generally poorly answered, and in most cases it seemed to be a misreading of the question. Many candidates answered as if the question were 'how would the private sector benefit from tourism development'. Therefore, the majority of responses gave jobs and income to the locals and profit to the private sector organisations. Better answers were able to relate the responses to international hotel groups, including references to customers' previous knowledge of the group, trust in the brand and the group possibly being involved in future projects, but the majority were purely economic in relation to Bimini. There was little evidence of evaluative skills.

- (e) Some candidates who had spent far too much time on Question 1 suffered with time pressure with many resorting to a list of bullets. There was often little more than description of generic environmental factors without reference to the source material, e.g. too many impacts relating to litter and pollution. Better answers could see the wider implications to the developer and locals of the loss of the defence of mangroves. Socio-cultural factors and economic issues were also described. Those candidates who had allowed sufficient time to complete the question showed good analysis and evaluative skills in relation to the case study.

## **G734 Marketing in travel & tourism**

### **General Comments**

A pre-release case study was forwarded to Centres. The case study covered the work and marketing activity of English Heritage. There was a small entry for this examination. There was a significant variation between Centres, indeed it appeared that some candidates were completely unfamiliar with the case study and had not been well prepared. It was disappointing to see that some candidates were unsure of common marketing terminology such as direct marketing, PEST and individual pricing policies. Many of the weaker candidates failed to read and correctly interpret the questions. There was also evidence of too much copying of the case study material. It was a pity to see very little application to the case study or reference to other industry examples – this was a shame, particularly as there is a wealth of travel and tourism organisations for candidates to investigate.

As with previous examinations in this series, extended questions were once again, marked using a level of response criteria. Some of the better candidates failed to gain top marks as they did not always evaluate where asked and simply explained. The responses to these questions require candidates to work through well constructed responses showing a greater depth of analysis or explanation resulting in some form of evaluative or judgemental statement. These statements must be relevant to the question.

Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with all marketing terminology and work steadily through the case study.

It is also important that candidates are guided by the meaning of the command words and given plenty of practice in examination techniques.

The length of the examination did not appear to pose problems for the majority of candidates. Some of the weaker candidates, however, did not always complete all sections of each question.

Centres should note that in all future examinations for this unit, candidates will be required to write their answers in lined spaces following the question (the same format as the AS examined units); with this in mind it is imperative that candidates are schooled in examination technique so that they can get straight to the heart of the answer. Far too much time is currently being wasted on re-writing the question. The new format will not allow for this and candidates will have difficulty in condensing their responses if this issue is not practised in advance.

**Comments on Individual Questions**

Q	
1 ai	The majority of candidates were able to correctly identify the missing SMART criteria.
1 aii	Again, correctly identified by most candidates.
1 b	Many candidates were clearly familiar with mission statements and gave good responses and frequently some additional amplification for both marks.
1 c	Many candidates failed to assess the benefits of publicity programmes and weaker candidates only focused on different methods of publicity programmes. Very few candidates achieved Level 3. Candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully as the inability to discuss the benefits in this question results in the awarding of very few marks.
1 d	Weaker candidates were unable to identify PEST. Of those candidates who were familiar with a PEST analysis, many often made little attempt to relate their points to 'marketing activities'.
2 a	Many candidates were familiar with the term 'target market' and exemplified for both marks.
2 b	A significant number of candidates failed to achieve all four marks for this part of the question. Several candidates simply copied information from the text and repeated categories incorrectly.
2 c	Again, many candidates got one and frequently two marks. A large minority seemed not to understand the question – which asked for the ways in which English Heritage identified potential customers. The answer was clearly in the case study and it was disappointing that some candidates could not locate responses such as acquiring list swaps from other organisations.
2 d	The focus on benefits was difficult for many candidates with some clearly not knowing what direct marketing actually involved. Very few candidates achieved Level 3!
2 e	Many candidates easily identified two partners working with English Heritage.
2 f	Candidates could identify some advantages and disadvantages of joint marketing activities but they were rarely assessed.
3 a	It was very disappointing to see that many candidates were completely unfamiliar with the term 'travel trade'.
3 bi	Many candidates were familiar with discount pricing and this was a generally well answered question part.
3 bii	Many candidates were unfamiliar with other pricing policies and were only able to give examples of discount pricing.
3 c	This part of the question was generally very well answered. Candidates appeared to be particularly well prepared and many weak candidates managed to gain good marks. There were many Level 3 answers.

*Report on the Units taken in January 2008*

3 d	Many candidates were unable to assess and seemed unfamiliar with any laws applying to marketing communications. It is a pity as the Data Protection Act and Trade Descriptions Act might easily have been discussed.
-----	--

## Grade Thresholds

GCE Travel and Tourism (H189/H389/H589/H789)  
January 2008 Examination Series

### Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G721	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G722	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G724	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G725	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G726	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G727	Raw	50	41	36	31	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G729	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G730	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G731	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G732	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G733	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G735	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

### Examined Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G720	Raw	100	81	71	61	51	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G723	Raw	100	81	71	61	52	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G728	Raw	100	83	73	63	54	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G734	Raw	100	78	68	58	48	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Uniform marks correspond to overall grades as follows.

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H189)

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389)

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

Advanced GCE (H589)

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

Advanced GCE (Double Award) (H789)

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

## Cumulative Percentage in Grade

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (H189)

A	B	C	D	E	U
4.88	18.29	45.12	84.15	98.78	100
There were 82 candidates aggregating in January 2008					

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
0	0	5.88	11.77	29.41	47.06	58.82	70.59	82.35	100
There were 17 candidates aggregating in January 2008									

Advanced GCE (H589)

A	B	C	D	E	U
0	33.33	33.33	66.67	66.67	100
There were 3 candidates aggregating in January 2008					

Advanced GCE (Double Award) (H789)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
0	0	0	0	0	0	60.00	80.00	100	100
There were 5 candidates aggregating in January 2008									

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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 2008