

Travel & Tourism

Advanced GCE **A2 H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H189, H389**

Report on the Units

June 2008

H189/H589/MS/R/08

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

CONTENTS

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

Advanced GCE in Travel and Tourism (H589, H789)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit//Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
Principal Moderator Report	2
G720 Introducing Travel and Tourism	9
G723 International Travel	13
G728 Tourism Development	17
G734 Marketing in Travel and Tourism	20
Grade Thresholds	22

Chief Examiner Report

It is pleasing to be able to report that the many positive aspects relating to candidate performance in previous examination sessions of this 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. There was significant evidence to support the view 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, sometimes quite impressive, standard. It is now hoped that these significant improvements will be both maintained and extended in subsequent examination sessions. The new examination format for units G728 (Tourism Development) and G734 (Marketing), requiring candidates to write their answers in lined spaces following the individual questions, seems to have been well received. Further comments on all the examined units are made by the Principal Examiners in the following sections of this document.

However, there will be further slight modifications to all examined units from 2009. Centres are thus given advance notice that in all future examination sessions there will be an increase in the allocation of lines for those questions requiring extended writing. However, the additional space currently provided at the end of the question paper booklets will be discontinued.

There is still a need for significant issues to be addressed in order to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade. All the Principal Examiners make reference to the fact that many individual candidates fail to do themselves full justice in terms of their examination performance. It is, therefore, yet again appropriate to repeat the following advice.

*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*.

However, this is only part of the overall picture and it is again worrying to read certain observations made by the Principal Moderator in the report which follows. Centres are strongly advised to take note of the Principal Moderator's comments and to reflect on the extent to which the findings apply within their own institution.

It is very much hoped that further improvements will be forthcoming during subsequent examination sessions and Centres are strongly advised to follow the guidance offered in the following reports and to seek clarification as and when required.

Principal Moderator Report

This series, as with previous examination series, the moderation of AS and A2 units was conducted separately. This caused some confusion with Centres and, in several cases, the samples were forwarded to the wrong moderator. Where there is a consortium of Centres submitting portfolios separately, it is still necessary for Centres to inform OCR of the existence of the consortium, in order to allocate moderators appropriately.

There was a problem with the collection of authentication forms as several Centres did not submit these with the samples

Many Centres, for this series, had submitted portfolios which had been page numbered and page referenced on the URS and had also made use of the comment boxes on the URS. This was particularly well done on A2 units. It is **important** to ensure the **candidates' number** is also recorded on the URS, as this caused some confusion during the moderation process.

Many Centres had prepared their candidates well for A2 moderation this series. The content and standard of evidence by candidates of all A2 units was good and it was pleasing to see how much candidates had enjoyed working on the units. Centres had made good use of the support materials available to them and taken on board the advice they had been given. It was obvious, in many cases, that candidates had been guided appropriately. In most cases, where scaling took place, this tended to be on a small scale.

AS units were not as well evidenced and in some cases candidates had struggled to provide evidence to the required level and depth of understanding required at this level. In cases where scaling had been applied, it was usually because Centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the **key words**/evidence of a particular mark band as well as the depth of understanding and evidence required to fully cover that particular mark band.

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

For both AS and A2, several units require the application of knowledge and understanding to specific organisations and examples. In cases where Centres had considered the appropriateness of the organisation against the depth of research needed, candidate's performed better. There was, however, some lack of **application of knowledge** evident by candidates throughout the units at both levels. Those candidates who had clearly researched, sourced and applied understanding provided some excellent portfolio evidence worthy of high marks.

In many cases candidates had not acknowledged their information sources. In all units, candidates need to reference work, source quotations, append, acknowledge and make reference to specific materials. Again, in evaluation and analysis data should be sourced.

Unit G721 - Customer Service in Travel and Tourism

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this series with mixed responses. There were some excellent examples which were both thorough and appropriate.

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** for different customer types and internal/external customers **in relation to how the needs are met**. This should then lead into how this would benefit the organisation - this is a key component of this assessment objective.

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

There were cases where there was a lack of clear and detailed witness statements to support the assessment of candidates' performance though some Centres had done this well. The witness statements need to relate more to the specific skills the candidate has performed and in particular how well.

Where candidates had used **scripts** to perform particular role plays, this was considered as **insufficient evidence of effective** customer service.

AO3 It was evident that some Centres had difficulty in interpreting what was required for this mark band. There is a tendency, in most cases, to omit **internal customers** but these must also be considered.

Candidates generally demonstrated some research into how the organisation assesses its effectiveness of customer service and the methods the organisation uses. Candidates had made a good attempt at analysing these methods in relation to their appropriateness and effectiveness. Candidates did, however, struggle with an analysis in terms of what the organisation has done to make improvements, etc. This should relate to the results found using the different methods.

As an example, candidates rarely considered the number of complaints, how these were recorded and their content as a method of measuring effectiveness. Analysis could include what the organisation has done to prevent further complaints, etc.

AO4 Candidates need to evaluate the organisations customer service and how effective they think it is with recommendations. This is likely to require the candidate to carry out, e.g. a survey, observation, mystery shopper, etc.

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

Some candidates produced an evaluation but there was still a lack of evidence as to how they had obtained their results. They had reported on what the organisation had said but not made any personal judgements/opinions and recommendations to support this or used, e.g. a mystery shopper activity, observation activity, survey, etc.

Unit G722 - Travel Destinations

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

There were several cases this series 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 A02/3.

AO1 In some cases this 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 internal map, as part of the series of maps, and comment in relation to the distribution of features relating to AO2.

AO2 was generally well assessed but care needs to be taken where candidates have evidenced sections of text and websites. 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**. There was, for example, very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, etc, 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 had omitted this aspect of the unit.

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 as their only primary source of research and need encouraging to consider other sources. Part of the analysis marks for Mark Band 3 can be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This had been undertaken by higher grade candidates when they had looked at contrasting destinations.

There was evidence this series of primary research taking place where candidates had interviewed people who had been to the destination being studied and looked at customer reviews. This was very pleasing to see and evidence of good practice by Centres.

Sources were well referenced in the text by some candidates.

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had done this well. It was, however, very clear this series that candidates **are not considering some of the latest issues and their effect**. Oil and rising costs of fuel and its effect, for example, were rarely mentioned. 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 an international level. Beyond Mark Band 1 it is expected that trends are analysed and that future predictions are provided. Candidates attempted this, but often had no evidence of visitor numbers.

Unit G724 - Tourist Attractions

There were some 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.

Unit G725 - Organising Travel

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

AO1 Candidates tended to omit the role of the organisers in **the chain of distribution**.

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

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

Unit G726 - Hospitality

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

Again, there was a tendency for candidates to quantify the hospitality provider for AO2, but to only briefly describe a corporate hospitality package **without a review**. Components of the package were not clear and there was a lack of evidence of **marketing strategies**.

Unit G727 - Working Overseas

There were several submissions for moderation of this unit this series, with a good response.

AO1 This criterion was not, on the whole, well addressed. There was a tendency for candidates to omit a variety of examples with reference to different companies offering employment overseas. There was a lack of distinction on the emphasis and skill requirements of particular jobs and how these are applied.

AO2 There was some good examples here. However, some candidates tended to be general in evidence rather than specific to **overseas** working practices and tended to omit a variety of **industry** examples as an illustration.

AO3 This criterion requires candidates to research both administrative and **operational** practices. The latter was not well evidenced in candidate's work. Candidates struggled with this assessment objective this series and many had not researched the requirements well enough

AO4 This was well addressed by candidates and evidenced but Centres tended to omit a witness statement. Candidates tended to provide a commentary of their performance rather than an appropriate evaluation.

Unit G729 - Event Management

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

Candidates had obviously enjoyed doing this unit and learnt, with some understanding, the complexities of organising and carrying out a travel and tourism event as part of a team. It was pleasing to see the range of appropriate events considered and carried out. There were occasions, however, where candidates had not actually carried out the event which severely penalised them. There were also occasions where candidates had carried out a pre-determined event and had little evidence to support their own organisational skills - for example a study experience trip, the school production.

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. Where problems existed during moderation this series, it was due to Centres awarding all their candidates with the same mark, particularly Mark Band 2, with little evidence to support individuality.

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

AO2 Candidates were not always clear on what they precisely contributed, e.g. use of a log book and evidence highlighted where they had made a major contribution, agendas and minutes of meetings highlighting their contribution, etc. There 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 was better addressed this series. There is still evidence, however, that Centres have difficulty in considering the requirements needed. Candidates tended to have some difficulty in evidencing feasibility. Though most candidates had considered risk assessment, contingency plan, etc there was little evidence of market research, SWOT, **record of other ideas and reasons for final choice**, costing and changes made such as change to the time plan, etc as the event was being planned.

AO4 Some candidates evaluated well but many showed a tendency to omit reference to **aims and objectives**. They tended to produce a **running commentary** of what they had done, rather than an evaluation.

Unit G728 – The Guided Tour

There were several submissions, with a good response.

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

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. Candidates had approached very different ecotourism projects and, where assessment was in the higher bracket, had produced extensive evidence of an understanding of the project, future development(s) and the nature of ecotourism.

There was, however, a tendency for candidates to become too general in nature and off the point rather than being 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 their 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 once 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 often showed a need to develop the reasons for growth of Adventure Tourism Association's (ATA's), as this was disjointed. It is important for candidates to consider that the different organisations addressed in AO1 can have very different values and attitudes for the same activity. Centres holistically approached this assessment objective with part of AO3.

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

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

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

Unit G733 - Cultural Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a mixed response.

This unit was generally well addressed. 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).

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

There was a need to source and reference work.

Unit G735 - Human Resources in Travel and Tourism

There were some 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 comparison/contrast.

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

G720 Introducing Travel and Tourism

General comments

There were some high quality scripts seen, with examples of candidates achieving full marks for some questions. In comparison with previous examinations, more candidates attempted all five questions on the paper.

The pre-released case study materials were, on the whole, 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. 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 by the teacher. Some candidates were obviously not that familiar with the case study prior to sitting the examination. Document 4 – Highgate House - was sometimes confused with Canons Ashby (Document 3). This caused some candidates to compare and contrast the wrong facilities, products and services in Question 2(c).

Careful preparation of glossaries of the key terms while preparing candidates for the examination is of great use. In Question 1, explanation of the terms 'waterways holiday' and 'short break' was required. Both of these terms were extracted from Document 1(a). With careful preparation Centres should ensure their candidates can learn definitions from the pre-released materials which can form likely questions in the examination.

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 analysis of the statistics in the pre released materials. This will be a level 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. The last question on the examination requires an extended answer relating to the prose in the case study materials. This normally relates to some issues or problems highlighted in the materials. There was evidence that Centres are now preparing candidates fully for these extended questions. Many well written responses were seen with an introduction, main body of analysis and an evaluative conclusion.

Centres should encourage candidates to write only within the allocated space for an answer. 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'. Reiteration of the command words used in this examination would be a worthwhile exercise for Centres to undertake with their candidates, especially those relating, for example, to the levels of response answers:

Discuss - candidates need to look at different sides of an argument or different points of view. At the end of the discussion, candidates should reach a conclusion relating to what has been discussed.

Evaluate – candidates need to work out the likely outcomes of a particular course of action and express these as precisely as possible, or weigh up a number of possible courses of action and decide which is likely to be best.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a) 'Short break' was answered well, with many candidates providing specific examples, such as a romantic weekend in Paris.

Most candidates understood that 'waterway holidays' referred to inland waterways, although there were some references made to water sports and cruises. Generally well answered.

- 1(b) The identification of non-serviced accommodation was not completed well. Many candidates included B&B and VFR as types of self-catering provision or referred generally to self-catering. There seemed to be an over reliance on the case study for many candidates, who had purely copied out examples and descriptions from Document 1(c). Camping and caravanning was the most common answer extracted from the case study, with the description frequently being a repetition of the identification. Good answers related to hostels, where only a bed in a dormitory is provided or rented cottages, where all food preparation is undertaken by the holidaymakers.

- 1(c) This part of the question required an analysis of visitor expenditure in Northamptonshire. These were illustrated in Documents 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). A departure from previous papers was that the majority of the statistics were presented as bullet points in Document 1(b). There was evidence that many candidates were not familiar enough with this particular document prior to the examination. Generally most candidates managed to draw out some examples of visitor expenditure from the case study, such as the £3 spend per head per trip on waterway holidays, or the £18 per head spend on town visits. There was evidence of basic analysis of these statistics, but little evaluation was evident. Candidates could understand that these figures were low or the lowest; hence basic analysis was achieved, but then could not clearly express conclusions as to why this might be or how to improve them. A common error with using the statistics related to Fig. 1. Many candidates plucked out the low spend in Northamptonshire of £106 million, but then failed to state that this referred only to overnight stay tourism. Unless this was correctly indicated, this was not a creditworthy point. Many candidates correctly noted that local authority expenditure by Northamptonshire was low – marks were only awarded for this data if analytical comments were made relating this to its impact on visitor expenditure.

- 2(a) There were a considerable number of candidates who left their answer to part (i) blank. It is of concern that Travel and Tourism candidates are not aware of what a Tourist Information Centre is.

Public transport was also frequently considered to be provided by the government. There was obviously a misunderstanding of the word 'public' in this context. There were also quite a few answers which just reorganised the words in the question. 'Transport for the public' was not a creditworthy answer. There was also a great deal of copying from the case study, e.g. 'public transport accounts for only 6% of trips' which was not a description of the term.

Day visits were generally well understood, with plenty of examples of where these could take place, such as Alton Towers or the London Eye. Again, rewording of the question 'a visit for a day' was not given credit. More description was required, such as 'only for a day; not staying overnight'.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 2(b) This part of the question was generally very well answered. Candidates are obviously very aware of the benefits brought by special events to tourism destinations, although there was some repetition between the reason and the explanation, such as 'influx of visitors' and 'high visitor numbers'.
- 2(c) The style of this part of the 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 get to the higher mark band. Looking at only the similarities between 78 Derngate and Canons Ashby limited the marks to the bottom of Level 2.
- 3(a) This part of the question was answered well. A form of public transport and the theatre were competently identified by candidates from Document 2.
- 3(b) This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates could clearly state the benefits to the visitor and 78 Derngate of the expansion of the facilities provided. Marks were not awarded for repetition of the stem of the question, i.e. a benefit was not purely 'The Dining Room' but it needed an identification of what was provided, e.g. locally sourced food. A significant number of candidates answered parts (i) and (ii) the wrong way round, although many corrected their error with arrows.
- 3(c) The majority of candidates who answered this part of the question scored in the Level 2 mark band. The facilities available for conference guests were easily taken from Document 4. In order to reach Level 2, an analysis of the advantages was needed. A desk area available in the bedrooms (Level 1) allows delegates to continue work whilst at the conference/meeting (Level 2). Evaluative comments for Level 3 were few and far between; although there were some pertinent comments made in respect of the accessibility of Highgate House.
- 4(a) There was accurate identification from Document 5. The 'reservoir' was the most frequent incorrect answer, maybe indicating that the candidates did not understand the term.
- 4(b) This part of the question was well answered. Candidates clearly identified the outdoor activities, although some found it difficult to explain them. 'French Boules' was the most frequently misunderstood. Also a visitor centre is not an outdoor activity or a place where one can take place.
- 4(c)(i) Most candidates selected public sector organisations from Document 5, showing a depth of understanding and familiarity with the case study.
- 4(c)(ii) This part of the question was not well answered. The roles of the different sectors in travel and tourism should be something all candidates understand, as it is a basic foundation of all units within the qualification. The best answers actually referred to specific public sector organisations, such as Northamptonshire County Council providing funding for residential centres such as the Mackintosh Centre. Centres do need to ensure that the public, private and voluntary sectors are taught thoroughly to ensure that candidates in the future are well prepared for similar types of questions. Some candidates gave a feature of the public sector, e.g. 'not profit making' rather than a role.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 4(d) This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates could clearly pick out the products and services provided for disability groups. Most candidates achieved Level 2 in the mark scheme by expressing the importance of these facilities for disabled people and their carers. There was a sizeable proportion of candidates who commented on the facilities available at Brixworth Country Park (wheelchair and electric buggy hire; sensory garden) rather than those at the Mackintosh Centre. Some good comments were made relating to social inclusion. Unfortunately, there were few evaluative comments made by candidates.
- 5 There were many lengthy and extended answers to this question, with the vast majority of candidates achieving a Level 2 mark. Candidates could easily identify the problems and issues, but did not necessarily extend their answers to explain the reasons or offer solutions. The top end candidates brought the issues and problems right up to date. It was pleasing to see high fuel prices and the credit crunch referred to, especially as they are likely to have a huge effect on the day visitor market which is so important to Northamptonshire's tourism industry. Few candidates achieved the top marks in Level 3 for this question. One reason may be lack of time, as it is the final question on the paper. Some answers to the question were very prophetic, candidates referred to one problem in Northamptonshire being over-reliance on special events and the problems this would cause if the event were no longer continued. During the marking period, for example, it was announced that Silverstone was losing the right to stage the British Grand Prix, meaning a loss of £40 million to the county's economy each year.

G723 International Travel

General comments

There was the usual entry for this examination series and it is pleasing to note that candidate performance is clearly reflecting 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 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 series.

Key Words	Meaning/expectation
Identify	Simply name, state or list – usually extracting from the question paper.
Describe	State the characteristic features of something.
Explain	Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details.
Discuss (includes the ability to analyse)	Provide evidence or opinions about something and arriving at a balanced conclusion. The candidate is being asked to consider an issue and is 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 these command verbs will always have difficulty in obtaining the higher marks for questions that are assessed by means of 'levels of response' mark schemes. There was further 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

- 1(a) This part of the question was very well answered with many candidates achieving full marks. However, there was frequent evidence of candidates including their explanation in with the reason and vice versa.
- 1(b) Many candidates deservedly achieved full marks, though some lost out because they gave 'facilities' for children without expansion into types.
- 1(c) Many candidates missed the point of this part of the question and their marks suffered as result. Indeed many candidates achieved no marks for this question, as they did not understand the role/function of the PSA and confused 'member of PSA' with the idea of bonus benefits gained by membership of a club, etc. To help illustrate what was expected from candidates, the following account would have warranted a Level 3 mark.

The PSA aims to provide a service of excellence to its members and to ensure that the PSA is the recognised industry body for the cruise and ferry sectors. It benefits members for example, by promoting market growth in the passenger shipping industry through public relations campaigns. It also aims to ensure that member companies are aware of best practice and statutory regulations on safety, protection of the environment, health, hygiene and security. It also benefits passengers in the following ways. The PSA currently bonds 17 members for their non-licensable (cruise only) activity under the Package Travel Regulations. This means that if you have booked a cruise only or a ferry package holiday with a bonded member, your money is protected should the company fail for any reason. The PSA's website contains links to PSA member companies and this means that potential customers can find out extra information. Companies such as Brittany Ferries get additional promotion and customers feel more secure.

- 1(d) There were several good answers but scores in Level 3 were comparatively rare because most candidates neglected to provide any clear evaluation. Some candidates seemed unsure as to what was required and answers tended to lack both focus and exemplification. To help illustrate what was expected from candidates, the following account would have warranted a Level 3 mark.

All travel decisions are influenced by such factors as cost, convenience and relative accessibility. Final destination choice and particular travel arrangements are subject to a complex set of inter-relationships. Each international traveller has certain constraints which effectively limit their ability to choose from the full range of alternatives that are currently available to the international travelling public. This explains why the Dover/Calais route is so popular because it offers the shortest crossing point and accessibility (both road and rail). Key influences on the decision-making process include the mass media, brochures, advertisements and promotions, the amount of disposable income, cost of transport in time and money and personal preference. Given the nature of these constraints, most people will act as 'satisficers' rather than 'optimisers' and select the travel package which best fits their personal circumstances.

- 2(a) This part of the question was well done and many candidates obtained full marks.
- 2(b) This part of the question was also well done and most candidates were able to describe services such as child meals, activity packs, bassinets and in-flight entertainment systems.

- 2(c) Most candidates offered valid ideas but the justification for their choice was not always made clear. It was common to see ideas based around meet and greet, taken from check-in by staff, guided through passport control and security, called first for pre-boarding, seated so as to be kept observed and then escorted into arrivals so that the individual is safe at all times.
- 2(d) This part of the question proved to be a good discriminator. The question was clearly stated and candidates were asked to explain **ground** services for business class passengers. Far too many candidates wrote about cabin services thus gaining zero credit. Correct responses included lounge access, quicker check-in and private car transfers.
- 2(e) There tended to be problems with this part of this question and candidates were unsure about the nature of ancillary service provision as stated in Section 4.2.3 on page 38 of the specification. Candidates should have studied at least one UK airport and this question required a consideration of the **land-side** ancillary services currently made available for the convenience of both incoming and out bound leisure and business international travellers. Far too many answers involved duty free, baggage handling, prayer rooms and washrooms, etc for which no credit was awarded. To help illustrate what was required, the following account would have warranted a mark in Level 3.

The arrival and departure halls contain a variety of ancillary service providers including foreign exchange, car hire, hotel booking and different methods of transport. They are of use to both business and leisure travellers. Money exchange is important as a convenience to both arriving and departing travellers but car hire, hotels and local transport tickets are more important services for those arriving in the UK. Many travellers will pre-book a stay at an airport hotel as part of their travel arrangements and may also use the secure car parking. However, business travellers are more likely to use hire cars and this explains why booking, collection and drop-off facilities exist at the terminal.

- 3(a) The majority of candidates were able to easily extract the correct information to achieve all three marks for this part of the question.
- 3(b) Very few candidates failed to suggest at least one or two valid advantages but the level of explanation offered was rather variable. Better answers were frequently based around ideas such as cost (cheaper than public transport), convenience (can go door-to-door) and flexibility (no timetable and can stop on the way).
- 3(c)(i) Not all candidates were able to quote appropriate laws/regulations, such as those itemised within Section 4.2.5 on page 39 of the specification, thus limiting the amount of credit which could be awarded.
- 3(c)(ii) Answers to this part of the question further demonstrated very poor knowledge by candidates, both of laws which affect the operations of English Heritage, and what specific laws stated/required. However, there were some excellent answers about **Health and Safety at Work 1974** stating that organisations must have a health and safety policy and this will involve the use of an accident book, having fire extinguishers, first aid box and adequate toilet and washing facilities, etc.
- 3(d) Most candidates were able to identify a variety of needs but too many of them strayed off the point and gave too much emphasis to the general appeal of English Heritage attractions. Stronger candidates were clearly able to indicate language needs and how these were addressed at selected facilities. To help clarify matters, the following account would have warranted a mark in Level 3.

UK heritage attractions meet the needs of overseas visitors in a variety of ways. The visitor can obtain information in advance by visiting the website and can often pre-book their visit to avoid delays. On arrival, a range of leaflets and books are available, some in foreign languages. Similarly, guided tours will often have a multi-lingual guide for the convenience of overseas visitors. Some attractions have a visitor centre with interactive displays which have a choice of languages and this is clearly the most appropriate way to provide services to foreign visitors.

- 4(a) The vast majority of candidates scored full marks on this part of the question.
- 4(b) This part of the question was generally well answered, although some candidates confused 'all inclusive' with 'package' holidays.
- 4(c) The concept of a luxury service was not always appreciated and far too many candidates tended to copy Fig. 4 material without giving a thought to what they were writing. Sporting provision and chefs were **not** luxury services, whereas a personal butler clearly was.
- 4(d) Most candidates had the correct ideas but weak geographical knowledge tended to invalidate many answers. For example, December is **not** summer in the Caribbean nor is it the time when temperatures are highest, etc. The level of explanation offered was again very variable. However, many candidates were able to score full marks.
- 4(e) There were some very good and perceptive answers to this part of the question and candidates were able to make reference to a variety of valid factors. To some extent there was the potential for overlap with Question 1(d) but credit was awarded for all valid points without restriction. However, only a minority of candidates were able to clearly evaluate the factors which were itemised and so access to the higher marks was yet again comparatively limited. To help illustrate and clarify matters, the following account would have warranted a mark in Level 3.

All travel decisions are influenced by such factors as cost, convenience and relative accessibility. Final destination choice is subject to a complex set of inter-relationships. Each UK traveller has certain constraints which effectively limit their ability to choose from the full range of alternatives that are currently available to the international travelling public. Key influences on the decision-making process include the mass media, for example the travel supplements, brochures, advertisements and promotions, the amount of disposable income, cost of transport in time and money and personal preference. Given the nature of these constraints, most people will act as 'satisficers' rather than 'optimisers' and select the travel package that best fits their personal circumstances. However, the threat of terrorism and the advice provided by the Foreign Commonwealth Office will be the most significant factor in any decision to travel.

G728 Tourism Development

General comments

The examined paper for Unit 9, Tourism Development, consists of three questions and is based on stimulus material/a 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. The questions set were appropriate and accessible to candidates of all levels, i.e. E to A. This gave candidates at the higher range the opportunity to gain an overall high grade, while giving candidates at the lower range the opportunity to pass.

The general level of performance appears to be improving as each series is completed. A majority of candidates scored in the higher range of marks, particularly on the extended answers. This was the first time that answer booklets had been used for this examination and there were a range of issues with this, namely; candidates who ran out of space either wrote in the margins or bottom of pages, or in the spare pages but did not identify this on the question. This involved quite a lot of backtracking for the examiners and as a result will be addressed before the January 2009 examination. The majority of candidates still wrote at some length, even for some of the 'identify', 'describe' and 'explain' type of questions. This is unnecessary in most cases and candidates should be encouraged to learn and recognise the command verbs before writing extended and often repetitive answers.

There was a wide range of responses submitted and it was clear those candidates who had been well prepared and had learned a number of specific case examples were able to apply aspects of analysis and evaluation to their extended answers. However in Question 2(d) the case studies chosen by candidates were often completely out of context with the question and it was a case of writing everything they knew about a destination they had studied without referring to the inference of the question which was based on the infrastructure. Candidates really must try to contextualise the geographical area they are writing about, i.e. China does not have endangered species in Beijing or coral reefs!

Most candidates scored well on Question 1 and found Scotland a relatively easy destination to write about. They coped less well, however, on Questions 2 and 3. Overall, the majority of candidates found the series of questions on China significantly more difficult than those on Scotland and sustainable tourism.

Candidates made good use of the material on the whole, with the exception of Question 2(d) which caused problems for many candidates as the majority wrote about what tourism development would do in the future and not about how the infrastructure had been affected by tourism development. For the candidates who wrote about a UK destination, e.g. the Lake District, London, and Birmingham, etc. no marks were awarded.

In general, the standard this session was quite pleasing and the use of knowledge and/or a recap of tourism development key terms were evident. As always candidates are encouraged to practice past papers.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a) This part of the question was answered well by most candidates who made effective use of the case study.
- 1(b) This part of the question was generally well answered; however, some candidates only achieved four out of six marks as they did not give an example or explain sufficiently.
- 1(c) Many candidates overly repeated themselves on this part of the question as they could not think of two reasons for the preservation of Scottish culture.
- 1(d)(i) Maximum marks were achieved by the majority of candidates.
- 1(d)(ii) There was a very good understanding of the benefits of sponsorship for private sector organisation and many candidates achieved maximum marks. The errors were caused by candidates explaining the aims and objectives of private sector organisations.
- 1(e) This part of the question received the best responses on the paper. Candidates were able to fully justify their answers and many received high marks. There was evidence of analysis and evaluation which took the candidates into Level 4. It helped candidates that the previous questions had given them a good understanding of the benefits of the Commonwealth Games bid, and they were able to make use of this evidence.
- 2(a)(i) Responses here were very varied and candidates confused the role of travel agents in the UK with ones in China. Generally, this part of the question was poorly answered, with little reference to increased commission or profits.
- 2(a)(ii) This part of the question was answered better with many candidates scoring three marks, as they were able to recognise the benefits for hotels. Many wrote about expansion and the recognition of a brand name.
- 2(b) There were some confused responses here due to a lack of geographical knowledge, with many candidates referring to outbound Chinese visitors and not benefits to the Asia/Pacific regions.
- 2(c) Very few candidates covered tourism training from both sides, host and tourist. The majority focussed on training tourists and this was very general with regard to respecting the culture or the hosts learning English. There was limited analysis/evaluation on this part of the question.
- 2(d) This part of the question truly differentiated by outcome – there were several outstanding responses, covering a range of destinations from the Lake District to Puerto Rico. All were acceptable in context, with the exception of UK destinations. At the bottom end, weaker candidates were only able to make a vague reference to the impact that tourism development had on the infrastructure. Whilst a number of candidates attempted to make the judgement required to access Level 4, the methods identified were sometimes unrealistic and often irrelevant to the infrastructure and focussed on social cultural and environmental impacts. Many candidates chose destinations such as The Gambia and safari parks and, as a result, were unable to give an accurate analysis of impacts. The candidates who chose China often strayed from the point and discussed how the wall was crumbling through overuse and that tourism was declining as a result. Coral reef destruction, park and ride schemes/theme parks/loss of culture all appeared.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

The better performing candidates were able to discuss the facts which had been presented in the case study and, therefore, demonstrated the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation.

- 3(a) Very weak definitions were given with very few candidates mentioning 'the future'.
- 3(b) This part of the question was very poorly answered as most candidates described methods to sustain a destination and not factors.
- 3(c)(i) This part of the question was very well answered and most candidates scored well as they could relate to tour operators reasons for providing information.
- 3(c)(ii) This part of the question caused some confusion – not all candidates recognised the methods used, but rather described the role of organisations such as Tourism Concern or any other voluntary sector organisation with which they were familiar. Some weaker candidates believed the role of Tourism Concern was similar to that of a specialist tour operator, recommending specific eco-tourism packages. Many candidates wrote at length about case studies such as prostitution, gambling, break of traditional family values, etc - it was difficult to understand why they had wandered off the point so much. Many other candidates gave a definition of sustainable tourism (in their opinion) or of the aims and objectives of the voluntary sector.
- 3(d) This part of the question was generally very poorly addressed by the majority of candidates as they wrongly identified the parties in the triangle, or had run out of time on the paper. For candidates who described the roles of the public, private and voluntary sectors, no more than Level 1 was achieved.

G734 Marketing in Travel and Tourism

General comments

Candidates received a pre-release case study on 'Vitalise', a holiday organisation for disabled customers and their carers. This incorporated a general background to the organisation, including advertising information, re-branding and examples of primary research methods. The stimulus material was generally well used by many candidates. However, when asked, some candidates were unable to relate examples of marketing activity to the case study. It was also disappointing to see that weaker candidates were unable to refer to other travel and tourism organisations when asked. Many of these weaker candidates appeared unfamiliar with some of the key marketing terms – such as PEST, public relations, market segmentation and re-branding.

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.

Some weaker candidates struggled to complete all the questions. However, the majority of candidates wrote at some length, with many using the continuation sheets at the back of the question paper booklet.

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 preferred 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.

It should be noted that candidates are not required to repeat the question at the start of each answer; this severely limits the space provided in the answer booklet and is completely unnecessary.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a) This part of the question was generally very well answered and illustrated by most candidates.
- 1(b) This part of the question was very well answered.
- 1(c) The EU Package travel directive was not well known by some of the weaker candidates.
- 1(d) Most candidates were able to answer this part of the question on the definition of marketing research and used good examples to illustrate their answer.
- 1(e) Some candidates failed to read the question properly. The focus was on the **benefits** of conducting primary marketing research. This was difficult for many candidates with some clearly not knowing what might be involved. Candidates were not asked to simply explain different methods of primary research.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

- 2(a) This part of the question was very well answered. Most candidates were able to identify both price and promotion.
- 2(b) This part of the question was generally well answered; however, some of the weaker candidates struggled to identify elements of 'place' such as Vitalise centres in the UK, overseas, booking line and shop. Some candidates were able to discuss the meaning of both product and place; however, they did not then discuss this in relation to Vitalise and, therefore, did not score any marks.
- 2(c)(i) Disappointing that not all candidates were able to achieve the full six marks on this part of the question.
- 2(c)(ii) Many candidates suggested 'growth' as the most appropriate stage and many scored more than four marks. Answers would have been improved by pointing out (in terms of the justification) how other stages were not appropriate, backed up by case study illustrations.
- 2(d) There was a mixed response to the PEST analysis question. In some instances PEST was not applied well and answers were superficial and indeed simplistic. Many candidates neglected to express opinions as to which influences were likely to be more/less significant and why.
- 2(e) Some candidates were clearly unable to 'evaluate' and this was a pity as some good ideas were given for the reasons for re-branding.
- 3(a) This part of the question was generally well answered.
- 3(b) Some candidates were clearly very unfamiliar with the role and work of a PR Officer. Once again, the question asked for an evaluation of the benefits and not simply a description of the role of a PR Officer.
- 3(c) This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates were able to consider other forms of advertising appropriate to Vitalise; however, not all were able to 'evaluate' their comments.
- 3(d) Many candidates did not pick up on the travel and tourism organisation aspect here. Some responses included wheelchair and ramp manufacturers advertising which had nothing to do with travel and tourism.

Grade Thresholds

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

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G721	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G722	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G724	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G725	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G726	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G727	Raw	50	42	37	32	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G729	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G730	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G731	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G732	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G733	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G735	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	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	85	76	67	58	49	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G723	Raw	100	81	72	63	54	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G728	Raw	100	83	74	66	58	50	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G734	Raw	100	79	71	63	55	47	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
5.06	20.24	44.39	68.66	87.62	100
There were 1810 candidates aggregating in June 2008.					

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389):

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
2.09	4.19	9.95	20.94	34.56	48.69	62.30	79.06	89.01	100
There were 231 candidates aggregating in June 2008.									

Advanced GCE (H589):

A	B	C	D	E	U
3.45	21.53	52.35	79.52	96.03	100
There were 998 candidates aggregating in June 2008.					

Advanced GCE (Double Award) (H789):

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
2.26	5.09	12.43	24.86	40.68	53.11	69.49	82.49	93.79	100
There were 198 candidates aggregating in June 2008.									

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
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

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