

Travel & Tourism

Advanced GCE A2 H589, H789

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H189, H389

Report on the Units

June 2009

H189/H589/MS/R/09

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

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

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the 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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Travel & Tourism (H589, H789)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel & Tourism (H189, H389)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
PM Report	3
G720 Introducing travel & tourism	10
G723 International travel	13
G728 Tourism development	17
Grade Thresholds	22

Chief Examiner's Report

It is pleasing once again to be able to report on many positive aspects of candidate performance. There were many examples of both AS and A2 work where candidates were able to display a thorough appreciation of the topics under consideration. As was the case in January, there was further evidence to support the view that the qualification is being delivered effectively by the majority of Centres.

As in previous sessions, 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. The recent slight changes made to question paper format appear to have been well received. The increase in the allocation of lines for those questions requiring extended writing were effectively utilised and thus candidates were not inconvenienced by the removal of the additional writing space previously provided at the end of the question paper booklets. Furthermore, it was encouraging to see evidence that Centres are preparing candidates fully for the more extended questions, as many well written responses were seen with an introduction, main body of analysis and an evaluative conclusion.

There is still a need for certain issues to be addressed, however, in order to ensure that candidates achieve the best possible overall grade. All the Principal Examiners make reference to the fact that many individual candidates failed to do themselves full justice in terms of their examination performance. Centres are once again strongly advised to make sure that candidates can fully understand the differences between the command verbs describe, explain, discuss, analyse and evaluate.

It is interesting to note that the Principal Moderator also comments "*in some cases adjustments were made because Centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the key elements of the mark band. This is particularly relevant where candidates struggled to **compare, analyse, evaluate and make conclusions or realistic recommendations** at both AS and A2 level*".

Detailed comments about candidate performance on the June papers are provided in the following sections of this document. Centres are strongly advised to take note of the Principal Moderator's comments and to reflect on the extent to which the findings apply within their own institution.

It is very much hoped that 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 OCR, if appropriate.

IMPORTANT!

As a final point Applied A Levels have been updated for first teaching in September 2009. This will align them with the A Level specifications launched in September 2008.

As changes to the qualifications are minimal, it will be possible to combine units from legacy and new specifications. There are no special transition arrangements for Applied GCEs – unit codes remain the same.

In terms of this specification please note the following:

EXAMINED UNIT G720

There will be a change to the examination length of unit G720 Introducing Travel and Tourism from January 2010. The length of the examination will increase from 1½ hours to 2 hours.

EXAMINED UNIT G728

A change to the layout of unit G728 Tourism Development will be introduced from January 2010.

Currently, candidates write their responses into a combined question paper/answer booklet. Stimulus material is also included within this combined question paper/answer booklet.

From January 2010 onwards candidates will be presented with a separate resource booklet and a combined question paper/answer booklet on the day of the examination. The resource booklet will contain the stimulus material that was originally included within the combined question paper/answer booklet.

In addition to the changes indicated above, there are some minor changes to the specification overall. The revised specification and sample assessment materials are available to download from the OCR website. Centres are advised to consider the updated specification carefully to ensure they are fully aware of these changes.

PM Report

Many Centres had again well prepared their candidates for A2 level but also AS level this series. The content and standard of evidence by candidates and assessment of some AS and A2 units was generally good. It was obvious, in many cases, that candidates had been guided appropriately.

There were some excellent portfolios submitted this series. Candidates had obviously enjoyed working on their portfolios and generally applied their research to the criteria. There is, however, still a need for Centres to encourage the use of **primary research** and a **wider** use of secondary research to supplement the candidates' evidence. There were occasions where candidates' work contained excessive amounts of Internet research without any direct link to the content. This was particularly apparent in Unit G722-Travel Destinations, Unit G727-Working Overseas (AO1), Unit G731-Ecotourism and Unit G733-Cultural Tourism.

It was pleasing to see a rise in the standard of candidates' work this series with particular reference to Unit G721-Customer Service as Centres had recognised the need to apply learning to more appropriate organisations and likewise Unit G725-Human Resources. The standard of Unit G729-Event Management was not, however, as good this series.

In some 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. Although this was better this series there is still a need for Centres to address this area with the candidates.

Administration

It was pleasing to see that, this series, the Centres being moderated had recognised that the moderation of AS and A2 units is conducted separately and the work was forwarded to the correct moderator. This made the moderation of samples a smoother process. There was, however, some confusion by some Centres about **accreditation**. Several Centres were selected for random sampling this series but there were occasions where accredited Centres did not send samples and there had to be a follow up call. This, unfortunately, caused a delay in the moderation process.

Consortium of Centres submitting portfolios had, this series informed OCR of the consortium, so moderators could be allocated appropriately. There was only the odd occasion where confusion occurred over consortium input and the checking of authentication.

In most cases the administrative procedures and the use of the URS form was good but there is still a problem with samples not having the **candidate number** recorded on the URS. Most assessors had annotated the work and where this was not the case the problem has been highlighted on the **report to Centre**.

Assessment

It was pleasing to see that Centres had generally acted upon advice, training, moderator reports provided to develop good assessment practices. As a consequence, there was some improvement in Centre assessment, particularly at AS level, this series. Where adjustment to marks has been made it was usually because of **inconsistency** in assessment and 'rogue' samples appearing. This was mainly due to a number of assessors and **no internal standardisation** by the Centre. In some cases adjustments were made because Centres had marked too leniently across the mark bands and missed the key elements of the mark band.

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

Centres do still need to apply rank ordering of marks for assessment objectives and the overall mark in AS and A2 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.

AS Units

Unit G721-Customer Service

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this series with a better response. There were some excellent examples which were 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 sometimes descriptive in nature. It was pleasing to see that Centres are now guiding candidates appropriately to address different types of customers.

There are still cases where there is little evidence of a comparison for different customer types and internal/external customers in relation to how needs are met. This should then lead into how this would benefit the organisation - **this is a key component of this assessment objective**. Candidates tended to consider the basic benefits only worthy of Mark Band 2 rather than the more **complex benefits** that relate to how needs are met e.g. time efficiency.

AO2 was generally well evidenced with many candidates replying to a complaint by letter. Assessors had provided some clear witness statements which reviewed how well the candidate performed specific skills. Skill application does, however, need addressing in the candidates' evaluation. 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 organisation's complaints procedure/policy. It is expected, at this level, that candidates, if answering by letter; format the letter in a 'business style' and ensure there are no errors, e.g. spelling.

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

AO3 Candidates generally showed some good 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 terms of their appropriateness and effectiveness. Candidates did struggle, sometimes, with analysis in terms of what the organisation had done to make improvements, etc. This would relate to the results found using the different methods.

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

There was a lack of reference to internal customers.

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

Centres generally carried out and evidenced this well with checklists, etc. There was a tendency for candidates to evaluate products and services well but not to consider personal qualities and

skills, e.g. face-to-face communication, etc. Candidates had looked at different types of customers.

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

Unit G722-Travel Destinations.

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

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

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 local map, as a part of the series of maps, and comment in relation to distribution of features relating to AO2 as well as, for example, analysis such as the location of the destination in relation to climate, season, accessibility, etc.

AO2 Care needs to be taken where candidates have evidenced sections of text and websites. With reference to the appeal of their destinations candidates attempted to make a logical explanation but still omitted to fully cover the appeal of their destinations with particular reference to who and why and specific features.. There was 'for example' very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, etc, different types of customers. Another example is different types of accommodation and cost against appeal to different types of customers/visitors. Some candidates had analysed well but many candidates had not fully addressed this aspect of the assessment objective.

AO3 requires candidates to show evidence of resources and sources of information used. In some cases there was no bibliography evidenced and no analysis of resources, e.g. what would or would not be useful for Mark Band 3. Many candidates had used websites only as their main source of research and they need encouraging to consider other sources. Part of the analysis marks for Mark Band 3 must be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. This is well done by higher grade candidates.

Sources were well referenced in the text by some candidates but very poorly by others with too much downloading/copying.

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had done this well. It was, however, very clear this series that candidates were not considering more up-to- date issues and trends. There was, in some cases, little evidence of any statistical data to assist with candidate's reasoning.

For some candidates AO4 was an afterthought but should really be the starting point for research to check the availability of data at international level. Beyond Mark Band 1 it is expected that trends are analysed and that realistic future predictions are provided. Candidates, this series, found this assessment objective difficult

Unit G724-Tourist Attractions

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

Candidates made a good attempt at the criteria but with reference to AO1 there was still a tendency for candidates to omit **comparison** in the work - causing some leniency in assessment.

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

Unit G725-Organising Travel

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

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

AO2 This was well addressed.

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

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

Unit G726-Hospitality.

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

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

Unit G727-Working Overseas.

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

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

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

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

AO4 -This was well done by candidates and they had obviously enjoyed this aspect of the unit. There was clear evidence of witness statements by assessors to support the assessment but candidates tended to omit specific skills used in their evaluation.

A2 Units

Unit G729-Event Management

There was a large submission for this unit this series with a mixed response. There is a need to clearly annotate the work when assessing as the unit is holistic in approach.

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.

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 the same mark, particularly Mark Band 2, with little evidence to support individuality, specific skills, team working, customer service and communication.

AO1 With reference to the business plan, some candidates had been methodical in approach whilst others had been repetitive and unclear. This was the cause of some adjustment to marks this series. In many samples candidates had not set out a plan but had tended to produce a report and running commentary which caused them to omit vital pieces of information. This was particularly relevant to the need for clearer aims and objectives, purpose, SMART targets, financial accounts, etc. There was some confusion as to the requirements of a plan and evidence became muddled and difficult to decipher. It is essential that the plan is produced individually. There was a tendency for candidates to omit legislation such as data protection, health and safety practices, insurance, etc. There was also a need for candidates to provide clear financial accounts. There was little evidence of how the team was going to assess the success of the event or the plan.

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

AO2 Candidates were not always clear on what they precisely contributed; for example use of a log book and evidence highlighted where they had made a major contribution, agendas and minutes of meetings highlighting their contribution, etc. There were, however, some excellent examples amongst Centre submissions here, too. There is a need, however, for higher grade candidates to **develop the project planning techniques**.

There was a need for candidates to address problems/difficulties. This was often omitted in candidates' evidence this series.

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

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

than an evaluation. **There was also a need to appropriately record qualitative and quantitative data from customer feedback, with appropriate analysis.**

Unit G730-Guided Tour

There were several submissions with a good response.

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

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

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

Unit G731-Ecotourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response

Some candidates had approached very different ecotourism projects and where assessment was in the higher bracket had produced extensive evidence of understanding of the project, future development and the nature of ecotourism.

There was a tendency for candidates to become too general in nature and off the point rather than more specific to their project and destination, causing a lack of application of knowledge and understanding. However, this made some good examples for AO4 when considering ecotourism worldwide. It is also important for candidates to support opinions by expressing their own values and attitudes but also to be aware of those of the stakeholders. This was not always well evidenced by candidates again this series.

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

Unit G732-Adventure Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response

AO1 was generally well addressed but candidates showed a need to develop the reasons for growth of ATAs, as this was often disjointed. It is important for candidates to consider that the different organisations addressed in AO1 can have very different values and attitudes for the same activity. Centres holistically approached this assessment objective with part of AO3.

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

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

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

Unit G733-Cultural Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a good response.

This unit was generally addressed well. Where candidates showed weaker evidence it was usually due to a lack of application to the cultural tourist. There was also a lack of primary research such as asking people who had been to the destination in order to form views and opinions (AO2) and motivational theory (AO1).

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

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

There was a need to source and reference work.

Unit G735-Human Resources

There were some submissions this series with a mixed response. Where candidates fell down it was usually due to lack of evidence in the management and planning of human resources with a lack of comparison/contrast. There was also a need to use information appropriately for understanding rather than simply repeating and downloading.

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

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

G720 Introducing travel & tourism

General Comments

There were some high quality scripts seen, with examples of candidates achieving full marks for some questions. It was noticeable that some candidates seemed to have a timing issue with the paper, quite frequently it was Question 4(b) which was completely omitted.

The pre-released case study materials were used effectively by Centres and their candidates. All documents in the case study were accessed appropriately by the majority of candidates and used well in their answers.

There was evidence that Centres are preparing candidates fully for these extended questions. Many well written responses were seen with an introduction, main body of analysis and an evaluative conclusion.

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 by way of 'levels of response'.

It is important to remind candidates to READ the question carefully. No marks are credited for good comments which bear no relation to the question. Candidates should also be advised not to repeat phrases from the question and not to lift phrases precisely from the case study, as this shows limited understanding or knowledge.

Comments on Individual Questions

1a

Most candidates understood exactly what a 'tourist attraction' was, but had difficulty in explaining the term without using the words 'tourist' and 'attract'. This can be regarded as a pure rewrite of the question, and limited marks in some cases. Candidates should be encouraged to give an example.

'Maritime heritage' was not answered well; it was obviously a term which Centres did not highlight this from the case study to candidates when preparing them for the examination.

'Heritage' is usually defined as history but many candidates did not know what 'maritime' meant.

1b

The identification of services provided by the VIC in Portsmouth was a straightforward question, with the services clearly identified directly from the case study, e.g. accommodation booking and the second mark awarded for an explanation of this (for example the book a bed ahead scheme). A considerable number of candidates considered that the provision of signposting was a service provided by VICs. Other errors were to repeat 'providing information' as a service in many different ways; hence, limiting the marks. A number of candidates explained 'foreign exchange facilities' as translation services. Another incorrect answer was 'promotion', with some candidates listing various promotional materials produced.

1c

This part of the question required the use of straightforward statistics about different types of visitor. There were some good answers seen in response to the question. Marks were not allocated for a discussion about the total number of visitors or jobs supported by tourism. One very common error related to Table 5 'Average Length of Stay (nights) by Type of Accommodation.' The title clearly stated what the statistics showed, e.g. in rented self-catering accommodation, the average length of stay in 2002 was 11.9 nights; this was far greater than the overall average length of stay or other forms of accommodation. The misconception by candidates meant that rented self-catering was the most popular form of accommodation used by visitors to Portsmouth. This was incorrect. Another common error was to state that day visitors spent more than staying visitors. There are significantly more day visitors but they do not spend more per visitor. Candidates need to explain their statements in order to gain higher level marks. Some excellent answers, which made evaluative comments to reach Level 3, related to

Report on the Units taken in June 2009

the low percentage of business visitors and language students. Good answers questioned whether there were enough facilities available for these visitor types, and made recommendations about the need for expansion in these areas to increase the amount of high spending visitors to Portsmouth. Many candidates used at least half the space allocated for their answer purely copying out the statistics from the case study; analysis of these statistics is required to get above Level 1.

2a

Very well answered.

2b

Public and private sectors were explained well, although some candidates did confuse the terms with public and private limited companies. There was more difficulty with the public/private partnership. A majority of candidates did acknowledge that this was the two sectors working together, but had difficulty in expanding this answer in order to gain the second mark.

2c

This part of the question was well answered. Candidates could pick out the appeal of Gunwharf Quays to day visitors; although a minority did mention the availability of a hotel, which is obviously for staying visitors.

2d

This part of the question was not well answered. A substantial number of candidates discussed hotels in the answer. As this was given in the stem of the question any reference to hotels was not credited. There was a wide range of accommodation listed in the case study, both serviced and non-serviced. It was anticipated that candidates would use these terms in the discussion of accommodation types, but these references were few and far between. Many candidates just listed the accommodation types, rather than describing or explaining the type of accommodation. Most good answers looked at the VFR aspect, and how this would often be a cheaper form of accommodation, but did not extend to more evaluative comments.

3a

This part of the question was well answered. 'Trafalgar sail' was not a visitor attraction in Portsmouth Historic Dockyard, but an exhibition within the Royal Naval Museum.

3b

This part of the question was not well answered. Document 3a clearly listed the services provided for business visitors at the Portsmouth Historic Dockyard, i.e. functions; corporate events; dinner parties; conferences; team challenges; meetings and product launches. This should have provided plenty of opportunity for candidates to select three which could then be expanded upon in the explanation. There were too many candidates who purely lifted phrases straight from the case study such as 'a unique and magical setting for functions and corporate events' rather than explaining this using their own words. Answers such as discounts, group rates or accessibility are not services and are not business customers specific. Candidates should develop an understanding that business tourism is an important aspect of the travel and tourism industry and that these types of tourists have specific needs.

3c

The style of this question should now be familiar to Centres and candidates. Some candidates do not extract information correctly from the pre-released materials, and this limited the marks they could achieve. Many wrote a great deal about the accessibility by transport of The Royal Marines Museum and Fort Nelson, as this is not a product, service or facility of the attraction no marks could be awarded. Candidates were required to both compare and contrast in order to get to the higher mark band. Looking at only the similarities between the two attractions limited the marks to the bottom of Level 2. The biggest fault in answers is having made a comparison or

contrast; some candidates then laboured the point for half a page - without gaining any extra points. Some of the best answers were seen when candidates had been advised to carefully structure their answer. A good format to follow is to look at the similarities between the attractions, e.g. refreshments available; retail; the fact that they are both tourist attractions with a military/marine themes and then to look at the differences, e.g. entry fee charged at the Royal Marines Museum, free entry at Fort Nelson; better disabled facilities at the Royal Marines Museum compared with Fort Nelson. Many candidates discussed the benefits to the organisation of having these facilities and services; this was not required and wasted examination time and allocated space.

4a

A significant number of candidates answered parts (i) and (ii) the wrong way round, although many corrected their error with arrows. This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates understood the importance of secondary spend to the attractions, and the need to provide high quality customer facilities. The benefits to the customer in terms of meeting their needs also well explained.

4b

This was the part question on which candidates performed worst on this paper. The publicity materials produced by Portsmouth were clearly bullet pointed in Document 1a:

- Official visitor Guide;
- Mini Guide;
- Official Group Travel Guide;
- Conference Brochure;
- Accessible Portsmouth – Guide for Visitors with Disabilities.

It was also clearly stated that the literature is produced in a range of languages, in large print and some are available on tape or in Braille. From this candidates should have been able to draw conclusions as to how well the needs of different groups of people were met. Good answers looked at how the conference brochure would meet the needs of business visitors by providing information about accommodation with suitable work facilities, or places in which conferences could be held (such as Portsmouth Historic Dockyard). A common mistake candidates made was to not look at the specific publicity materials outlined above, but instead at the ways in which information about Portsmouth reached the tourist, i.e. exhibitions, direct mail, e-marketing, etc. Several answers stated that material was produced in 'large print, Braille or on tape' to help those who were blind or deaf. Some candidates interpreted the question as linking attractions to types of visitors, which was clearly incorrect.

4c

This part of the question was generally well answered. Candidates could identify the different methods by which visitors could access Gunwharf Quay. Candidates could also easily identify that accessibility was excellent. Unfortunately, there was a great amount of pure copying from the details given in the case study. In order to obtain the higher mark bands candidates needed to ensure they analysed the reasons as to why the accessibility was good. Answers relating to easy access by road, linking this with the ease of use of the private car, but including the problems with parking, achieved top marks.

5

There were many lengthy and extended answers to this question, with the vast majority of candidates achieving a good mark. Unfortunately, some of these lengthy answers were pure extracts from the case study material, without any analysis of what this meant in respect of tourism in Portsmouth. In such situations candidates could not get beyond Level 1. Most candidates attempted this question. Many candidates found this a difficult question. They would probably have found it easier if they had studied the case study more thoroughly before the examination and had been more aware of Portsmouth as a destination.

G723 International travel

General Comments

There was the usual medium-sized entry for this examination series and it was pleasing to note that, yet again, candidate performance is clearly reflecting the advice given to Centres in previous reports. Candidates are starting to try and clearly demonstrate their understanding of the various issues influencing International Travel to and from the UK. It was again pleasing to see accurate reference being made to a variety of locations and to the individual candidate's own personal travel experiences. There were some outstanding scripts but there continues to be wide variation in terms of the level of candidate performance.

Longstanding issues, however, still remain a source of concern. 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. Some candidates still appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions and Centres are yet again encouraged to make the following '**key word**' definitions part of their examination preparation.

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

Candidates who are unable to respond in an appropriate way to the higher order command verbs will always have difficulty in accessing the higher mark bands for questions that are assessed by means of 'levels of response' criteria. There was very clear evidence that many candidates are now making an effort to end their answers to the last part of each of the four questions with some form of **conclusion**. This is to be further encouraged because a **valid** conclusion, based on the previous points made or considered, is clear evidence of evaluation taking place and will thus usually warrant a score in Level 3 (7-9 marks).

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

Comments on Individual Questions

Q. No.	Comments on candidate response
1 (a)	Very well answered with many candidates achieving full marks as they were able to identify the three features of this flight from the given information in Fig. 1 .
1 (b)	Sometimes there was a very mixed response and many candidates were not familiar with different passenger types and the services offered. Only a minority of answers contained the term 'unescorted minor' and far too many candidates were clearly unaware of what a bassinet would actually be used for.
1 (c)	This part of the question tended to be very well answered and the vast majority of candidates understood the major differences between business and economy.

1 (d)	There was plenty of evidence to suggest that the majority of candidates understood the relative merits of a range of different booking methods. A very good response with many full mark answers.
1 (e)	There were rather mixed responses to this part of the question. Weaker candidates tended to list the range of shops and cafes found in a chosen airport, whereas better performing candidates provided answers with excellent exemplification across a broad range of available products and services, targeted specifically at family groups. However, only a minority of scripts were able to come to a valid conclusion (or even attempted to provide one) and so progress into Level 3 was rather limited.
2 (a)	The Fig. 2 stimulus material was very well interpreted and the vast majority of answers were able to achieve full marks.
2 (b)	<p>It was surprising to note how few candidates really understood the concept of the grey market – many talked of political divides and economic slumps or just copied phrases from Fig. 2. Those candidates who were able to understand this vocationally relevant term, generally produced quite irrelevant answers by just giving a definition. Only the very best candidates seemed to understand this question fully. To help clarify matters for Centres, the following account would have warranted a Level 3 mark.</p> <p><i>The UK has an ageing population and a higher percentage now reaches old age than ever before. This means that many travellers are now likely to be retired and fund their trips abroad out of retirement income. They are likely to have paid for their house and so have disposable income which they can now spend on travel. This is increasingly likely as winter is low season in the Mediterranean, when prices are low, and so the elderly can afford to travel and escape the cold UK weather.</i></p>
2 (c)	<p>There were again mixed responses to this part of the question. At the lower end, candidates were able to identify one aspect of the work of the FCO, relevant to the gap year travel market. Although many candidates could identify a variety of FCO functions, only a small number of answers were able to explain the important role played by this organisation in meeting the needs of gap year travellers. To help clarify what was expected, the following account would have warranted a Level 3 mark.</p> <p><i>The FCO provides help, support and advice for all UK travellers. Gap year travellers will benefit from the 'Know before you go' campaign because they will find out if their destination is safe. They would also need to make use of the replacement passport service if they were to have their own stolen. This is vital if they are to return to the UK and pass through immigration.</i></p>
2 (d)	<p>Most candidates were able to list aspects of a large hotel's product/service mix which would appeal to business customers, although few were able to develop their answers to gain full credit. Thus many answers were simplistic, lacking appropriate analytical comment. It was, however, pleasing to see that many candidates were making reference to a named hotel with which they were familiar. To illustrate the kind of treatment which was expected at this level, the following account would have warranted a score in Level 3.</p> <p><i>The Emirates Palace Hotel in Abu Dhabi boasts an unbroken bubble of wireless Internet access on its 250-acre grounds. This means that business guests can work virtually at will. The Hotel's Conference Centre is the most luxurious and</i></p>

	<p><i>technologically advanced meeting facility in the region and gives it a clear comparative advantage within the local business tourism market. For example, the conference facilities include an auditorium with seating for 1200 guests, a main ballroom which can accommodate up to 2800 persons and an extensive range of 48 meeting rooms including a Media Centre and Business Centre. In addition, six large terraces and a variety of pre-function areas provide many possibilities for use during meeting breaks, cocktail receptions and banquets. Set on areas of beautifully landscaped park with several open lawns, Emirates Palace offers spectacular outdoor venues for gala dinners and creative events. This means that any MICE-related function can be staged at the property. Transfers from Abu Dhabi (AUH) international airport take less than an hour and this makes the venue attractive to the global business travel market because of its accessibility.</i></p>
3 (ai)	<p>It was surprising that few candidates were able to score both marks for this journey time – most were unable to calculate time over a two-day period! Too many individuals found it difficult to identify both the start and finish time as itemised on Fig. 3.</p>
3 (aii)	<p>Far too many candidates quoted the per person price rather than the cost for two people.</p>
3 (b)	<p>The Fig. 3 stimulus material was very well used and most candidates were able to score full marks.</p>
3 (c)	<p>There was heavy reliance on the stimulus material in answers to this part of the question and most candidates tend not to understand what is actually considered luxurious. Therefore, credit tended to be limited. It was important to remember that an identification mark is only awarded for the stating of a valid Orient Express service. The explanation mark is then awarded ONLY if the candidate explains (or makes a valid attempt to clearly indicate) why this was LUXURIOUS.</p>
3 (d)	<p>Many candidates found it difficult to explain aspects of the Data Protection Act although some had a vague understanding of some of its implications. Better answers tended to focus on aspects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer data must be obtained lawfully and held only for lawful purposes – it must not be in unlawful ways; • data must not be excessive – only fit for purpose at hand; • data held only as long as required – should not be stored permanently; • customer right to access – change data if appropriate; • data must be secure – no alterations or unauthorised access.
3 (e)	<p>An inappropriate choice of luxury products hampered candidates here – many chose first class air travel or cruises without actually knowing what these products comprise. Far too many candidates thought that ferries and Eurostar were examples of luxury travel. To illustrate what was expected, the following account would have warranted a score in Level 3.</p> <p><i>Flying Diamond First class on Etihad is a luxury. There is chauffeur service at both ends of your journey, a quick and easy private check-in and personal attention all through your flight. Diamond First Guests have a cabin with more than six feet of space, a luxurious environment, state-of-the-art in-flight entertainment and signature cuisines. Diamond First Suites feature revolutionary seats which rotate 180 degrees — creating a perfect setting for a business meeting or a quiet dinner — and recline into luxurious 6 ft 8-inch flat beds. Each Diamond First Suite has a</i></p>

	<p><i>privacy shell which ensures you get maximum space and direct access to the aisles. Within this space you find a range of facilities, including a coatroom, a mini-bar, a fold-and-swivel meal table, an integrated personal mirror, a magazine rack, a reading light and a desk lamp. These features allow you to personalise private space for the whole flight. However, the greatest sense of luxury comes from the personal service and an in-flight dining experience which comes closest to fine dining in the air. Your individual table service features specially-designed china, exquisite table linen, silver-plated cutlery and quality glassware. The Diamond First class menu is prepared by award-winning international chefs, specialising in a variety of classic cuisines from around the world.</i></p>
4 (a)	<p>Most candidates were able to correctly interpret Fig. 4(a) to identify Malaga, the N340 and the Costa Del Sol.</p>
4 (b)	<p>Candidates received no credit for quoting information from Fig. 4(a). The question clearly stated 'using only information from Fig. 4(b)!' Despite the reference to the photograph, many responses were not linked to what could be seen, e.g. range of water sports described, although only sailing depicted.</p>
4 (c)	<p>Most candidates made a reasonable effort to explain the reasons for overseas property ownership. Many focused on cost/rental opportunities/weather aspects and a more detailed explanation/analysis would have been useful here. Many valid ideas were left undeveloped and so maximum credit was rarely awarded.</p>
4 (d)	<p>It was disappointing to note how few candidates seemed to recognise the need to discuss the decline of mass market destinations here – the majority of responses used today's credit crunch market situation to try to explain the age-old problems of overbuilding, over exploitation, etc. To help clarify matters, the following account would have warranted a score in Level 3.</p> <p><i>Some of the former mass tourism destinations, including the Costa Del Sol, the Balearics and Costa Brava have lost popularity due to shifting consumer tastes. In this context, the excessive building and environmental destruction often associated with traditional 'sun and beach' tourism resorts have contributed to destination saturation and subsequent decline. This appears to be the case with Spain's Costa Brava, a byword for this kind of tourism in the 1980s and 1990s. With only 11% of the Costa Brava now unblemished by low-quality developments, the destination now faces a crisis in its tourist industry. Furthermore, the old 'sun, sea, and sand' mass market has now become fragmented. People want more specialised versions of it, such as 'Club 18 -30', quieter resorts with select hotels, self-catering, etc. It is fair to say that the old 'mass' market has been replaced by a series of 'niche' or interest-based markets. This trend will continue due to the rapid liberalisation and de-regulation of global tourism markets bringing fierce competition based on price, quality and characteristics of the tourism products. These trends will bring profound changes and many destinations will not be able to maintain their market share.</i></p>

G728 Tourism development

General Comments

This particular paper followed the example set in all previous series - the setting of three questions which are based on stimulus material or case studies. This is to promote a range of answers based on the topics covered in the 'What You Need To Learn' section of the specification.

Question 1 was set on the Giants Causeway in Northern Ireland – a UK destination (Question 1 will always be a UK destination). Question 2 was set on the impacts of tourism in Sri Lanka (Question 2 will always be on an overseas destination) and Question 3 was set on the involvement of Thomas Cook in the Gambia (Question 3 will always relate to a current affair in the travel and tourism industry and may be UK or overseas based). The questions set were appropriate to all levels of candidates. This gave candidates at the higher end the opportunity to achieve high marks through the levels of response questions, whilst at the same time these questions gave ample opportunity for candidates at the lower range to achieve a good pass. The general level of performance in this series was quite disappointing, with an unprecedented number of candidates leaving the spaces for responses in their answers blank. Evidence shows that the majority of candidates finished the paper in the allocated time but the leaving out of answers to quite basic questions and the interpretation of travel and tourism terminology was quite surprisingly poor in this examination.

Would Centres please note that it is very important to inform your candidates to write in the allocated spaces and not to squeeze paragraphs in the margins or below the lined space on the paper as these papers are electronically scanned.

A noticeable improvement in this series was the fact that many candidates took heed of the number of marks awarded and lines for answers which prevented them writing far too much for the simple identify and describe type of question.

There was a wide range of answers submitted and it was clear that some candidates had prepared well and were familiar with the underpinning knowledge necessary to answer all aspects of tourism development. These candidates were able to apply aspects of analysis and evaluation to their extended answers. Of particular note to Centres is the fact that unless a candidate is able to conclude their extended response with evaluative comments such as 'it can be seen from the case study that.....' or 'in my opinion it can be seen that.....' or 'compared to such an example which I have studied' etc. then candidates are unlikely to get to the higher levels, e.g. Level 4.

Question 1 was generally answered quite well but there was a surprising lack of knowledge on the aims and objectives of the National Trust or to which sector it belongs. Similarly, the aims/status of UNESCO was poorly answered. Both of these organisations are listed in the first section of the specification under Agents of Tourism Development. Question 1(b)(ii) required candidates to give socio-cultural impacts and the majority gave economic impacts.

Question 2 was based on Sri Lanka and candidates answered the majority of this section well, with the exception of the triangular relationship. This has caused problems on previous papers and it was hoped that the simple diagram would help candidates achieve two marks in a more accessible manner. The responses were extremely poor on this occasion and Centres should ensure that all candidates know the importance of this fundamental structure of host population, tourists and agents of tourism development in order for tourism to be sustainable. Unfortunately, a number of candidates used the events of the Twin Towers in New York for their answer to question 2(e) whereas the question clearly stated NATURAL disaster and, therefore, no marks were awarded.

Question 3 was based on responsible tourism and candidates seemed to like this question as there were some good answers and good use of the case study, with the exception of the final

question. In this case candidates tended to describe the theory of private and voluntary organisations without making use of the case study to embellish their answer. Overall the general consensus is that this series was disappointing in terms of the number of unanswered questions, the lack of fundamental knowledge of key terms and poor use of evidence in the case study.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1 Giant's Causeway

1a This part of the question was well answered, although very few candidates considered the wider context. Most candidates could easily identify and explain the appeal from the case study.

1 bi There were good answers to this part of the question, with jobs or income or the multiplier effect as the main responses.

1bii This part of the question asked for socio-cultural impacts but there were lots of economic answers/regeneration multiplier effect, etc. Also there were a number of negative socio-cultural suggestions too despite positive being in bold in the question. There were some good examples of Irish culture given, e.g. Guinness and dancing.

1ci &ii Most candidates' knew 'public', although many did not know 'voluntary'.

1c iii Very few candidates were clear on the aims of the National Trust which led to many very poor responses - surprisingly quite a few candidates lost marks on this but mentioned sources of funding for National Trust (e.g. memberships, etc) in question 1d. The aims/objectives of National Trust should be accessible to all candidates.

1d Very few candidates recognised that Moyle District Council has no responsibility to maintain the site. Generally, there were some quite good responses, though a number of candidates misinterpreted the question as a request to compare the aims of the two organisations and very few achieved Level 4. They had not highlighted the fact that Moyle District Council car parking fees are used throughout the council's area and some failed to suitably identify a service of each organisation. The majority of candidates did, however, try to compare/contrast the services.

1e There was a lack of understanding of the role of UNESCO. Many candidates took environment to mean business and peoples' way of life, talking about pride in the award and the building of new attractions. Those who did realise that the question was about the natural environment were able to see that more preservation would take place. A number of candidates suggested that there was a downside to UNESCO's protection citing negative environmental (and cultural) impacts. Many focussed on pollution, emissions and most did not fully understand features of a World Heritage Site regarding funding, education of wider audience and environmental auditing.

2a This part of the question was generally well answered with the majority focussed on wider economic objectives (employment, foreign currency earnings, regeneration, etc.) though there was some weakness in understanding the reasons for objectives.

2b Responses generally quite poor - very few candidates named national or international organisations (some even including the National Trust!), with many relating responses to aid.

2ci and ii - Candidates still do not know the parties to the triangular relationship and how it works. Some had put 'agents' in the diagram, but then when looking at part (ii) were talking of travel agents! Responses were very poor to both parts of this question and far too many nil responses.

2d Candidates who drew on the impacts in the case answered this part of the question reasonably well, although a number of candidates gave answers about the general conflict between those sectors which want tourism and those which do not (usually citing the conflict between private and public sectors) and making no reference either to Sri Lanka or to the problems with the Tamil Tigers, (sadly some candidates did think they were of the animal variety). The majority of candidates tended to keep referring back to the tsunami devastation. Very few candidates reached Level 3 on this part of the question.

2e –There were lots of social commentary answers. Better answers drew on stimulus and considered the impacts on Sri Lanka. A small number of candidates considered the impact of tourism on the natural environment, rather than the impact of natural disasters and, therefore, did not address the question set. The majority chose Sri Lanka, but others included Hurricane

Report on the Units taken in June 2009

Katrina, Australian or Californian bush fires, swine flu in Mexico, earthquakes in China, Italy and Pakistan; others chose obscure destinations with no natural disaster, but were marked accordingly as were the candidates who used the Twin Towers as an example of a natural disaster. However, many candidates tended to focus on the negative impacts for locals, rather than tourism in the destination, but there were some insightful analyses and evaluations, with some attempts at positive impacts. Even with all the material provided and prior knowledge, there were many examples of No Response for this part of the question.

3a This part of the question was poorly answered considering it is clearly in the specification

3b Most candidates were able to identify economic benefits, although few made full use of the case study

3c This part of the question was well answered.

3d This part of the question was also reasonably well answered, but in many cases it was not explained in enough detail. Generally, responses tended to lack a clear focus of explanation.

3e Many candidates gave generalised responses on partnerships, without naming any specific private or voluntary organisation or even benefits to The Gambia. Though some candidates had shown Level 3 or Level 4 skills in analysis/evaluation, because they had not given specific organisations or benefits to The Gambia, they could only achieve Level 2 marks. There were a number of shortened/bullet pointed lists to this question suggesting that some candidates had not managed their time well.

G734 Marketing in travel & tourism

General Comments

Candidates received a pre-release case study on 'Visit Chester and Cheshire' - a membership organisation for the promotion and development of the Cheshire area. The information included details of marketing, partnership work, a questionnaire, information on PR activity and a web-based competition. There was a reasonably small entry this summer. The stimulus material was generally well used by most 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 'travel trade', 'direct marketing' and 'familiarisation visit'.

The majority of candidates were able to attempt all of the questions in the time allowed for the paper, although a fairly high number found it challenging to have to write at length in response to the higher order questions.

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 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 in order 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 also 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)(i) Most candidates had some understanding of the term 'niche marketing', although some had difficulty in fully explaining the term.

1(a)(ii) The vast majority of candidates scored both marks in correctly identifying two appropriate niche markets from the text.

1 (b) Most respondents were able to identify and explain the benefits of working with CREATE, although weaker candidates relied heavily on information from the text.

1 (c) Many candidates found this part of the question quite difficult – more responses seemed to refer to public relations activities in a generic sense rather than examining the specific issues concerning working with a public relations agency. Those candidates who did attempt the real question found it difficult to consider advantages or disadvantages other than cost.

1 (d) Better candidates demonstrated excellent understanding of the benefits of this competition; whilst weaker candidates were not even sure who the members were or how they would benefit.

1 (e) Very few candidates recognised a) what is meant by the term sales promotion, with a large number of responses examining the merits of advertising in a generic sense; and b) what the term travel trade meant. Only the very best performing candidates could answer this question in the way it was intended.

2 (a) This part of the question caused no significant problems, although there were one or two interesting responses to the acronym SMART.

2 (b) There was much evidence of heavy reliance on the text to identify the objectives, with weaker candidates doing little more than listing. More able candidates were able to explain the importance of these objectives but there was limited evidence of candidates actually assessing the effectiveness of these by deciding which would be most useful, with reasons why.

2 (c)(i) Most candidates could suggest suitable alternative forms of research.

2 (c)(ii) This part of the question was generally answered well, although some weaker responses focused on a more generic examination of the advantages and disadvantages of research, rather than specifically of online questionnaires.

2 (d) This part of the question was well answered. Candidates were most comfortable discussing the benefits of primary research and many made strong comparisons with the disadvantages of carrying out secondary research.

3 (a) Despite this having been tested previously, it was disappointing to see how few candidates understood the term familiarisation visit. The significant majority of candidates thought that this is a trip you take to make sure you know where you are going!

3 (b) The term 'direct marketing' was not well-understood by many candidates. Those who did know what it meant produced very good answers but weaker candidates used this as an excuse to write everything they knew about promotion and particularly advertising all over again!

3 (c) It was pleasing to see that most candidates could name two appropriate pieces of legislation and had a good notion of their implications to travel and tourism providers. These answers were not always contextualised towards the question and many candidates named Ofcom and ASA without really understanding their role.

3 (d) Most candidates made a good attempt at this part of the question. It was clear that candidates understood the term 'partnership working' (perhaps from the tourism development' context as there was much mention of the public, private and voluntary arrangement). Many responses examined the more obvious benefits of sharing costs and customers, with better candidates recognising the benefits of sharing expertise and experience.

Grade Thresholds

GCE Travel and Tourism (H189/H389/H589/H789)
June 2009 Examination Series

Coursework Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G721	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
G722	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
G724	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
G725	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
G726	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
G727	Raw	50	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30
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	82	72	63	54	45	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G723	Raw	100	78	69	60	52	44	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G728	Raw	100	81	72	63	54	46	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G734	Raw	100	80	71	62	53	44	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
4.15	19.44	44.65	72.52	88.98	100
There were 1604 candidates aggregating in June 2009					

Advanced Subsidiary GCE (Double Award) (H389)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
0.56	3.33	7.78	17.78	34.44	55.00	68.33	77.78	86.67	100
There were 199 candidates aggregating in June 2009									

Advanced GCE (H589)

A	B	C	D	E	U
4.81	22.12	55.94	84.77	97.10	100
There were 1126 candidates aggregating in June 2009					

Advanced GCE (Double Award) (H789)

AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	U
3.83	7.65	15.85	26.78	40.44	55.74	76.50	88.53	95.63	100
There were 188 candidates aggregating in June 2009									

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

© OCR 2009

