

GCE

Travel and Tourism

Advanced GCE A2 **H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H189, H389**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2014

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Travel and Tourism (H589)

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Travel and Tourism (H189)

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

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G720 Unit 1 – Introducing travel and tourism	1
G728 Tourism Development	5
G721/22/29/30/31/32/33 Travel Destinations/ Customer Service/Event Management/ Guided Tour/Adventure Tourism/ Ecotourism/ Cultural Tourism	8

G720 Unit 1 – Introducing travel and tourism

General Comments

The pre-released case study materials were used effectively by centres and their candidates. All documents in the case study were accessed appropriately by candidates and used well in their answers. The Travel and Tourism industry is dynamic; this was illustrated in the pre-released case study materials, as between setting the exam and the publication of the materials the helicopter service run by British International Helicopters between Penzance, Tresco and St Mary's had been withdrawn. It is important that candidates use the information provided in the case study materials presented to them in order to respond appropriately to questions.

Many of the general comments below have been made in reports on previous examinations.

There were a number of questions which asked candidates to identify from the case study materials. This command word requires the responses to be extracted accurately from the text. In travel and tourism accuracy of data is vital, so it is a necessary vocational specific skill. There were a considerable number of responses where identification was not made correctly from the pre-released materials. One way in which to assist candidates to prepare for the examination is to prepare a 'quiz' to be used in lessons in which the candidates practice identification of details and data.

Some responses also demonstrated a lack of understanding of terms within the case study. Again good preparation prior to the examination is necessary; extracting all the terms from the case study and ensuring definitions are accurate would prepare candidates fully. A glossary of terms could be a solution. The questions which asked for definitions or meaning of travel and tourism terminology are all extracted from the case study, so candidates should be aware of all the terms prior to the examination. Two marks are awarded for the correct definition or meaning of these terms. A vague response would be worthy of only one mark; the named example was only credited with a second mark if there was demonstration of a full understanding of the term.

There was evidence that centres are not preparing candidates fully for the extended level of response questions. The lack of a concluding comment often restricted the candidates' marks. This is an exam technique which should be developed in centres. Detailed responses are required which demonstrate thorough and accurate knowledge and understanding of the issue in order to reach the top of the upper level.

It is also necessary for centres to teach the entire specification. Although the questions are based on the case study material, they may come from any area of the unit content. The main aim of the examination is for candidates to demonstrate vocational skills related to the travel and tourism industry, in particular selecting and interpreting appropriate data, problem solving and applying industry-related terminology.

When using additional pages, it is imperative that the correct question number is included on the additional pages.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question Number

1(a) The vast majority of candidates identified correctly. In such questions accuracy of the answer is important, so the length of adopted highways on St Mary's had to be 'nine (or 9) miles' and the ferry had to be 'Scillonian III'.

1(b)

A straightforward question which required the description of three travel and tourism terms taken from the case study.. Unfortunately many candidates were awarded low marks, as the answers were considered vague and did not describe in sufficient detail..

Shoulder period was not fully understood as being the period in tourism between the peak and the low season. Responses which stated ‘when tourism is low’ could not be credited, as this could also be a description of the off-peak season. There was little indication that candidates understood that shoulder period was where there is less, but not the lowest demand, for the tourism product.

Long stay visitor was frequently answered by a misunderstanding of the question, a response which stated ‘a visitor who stays a long time’ was not creditworthy. The accepted definition in travel and tourism is a tourist who stays longer than four nights in a destination.

Heliports were not always differentiated from helicopter landing pads. The fact that there are some terminal facilities for travellers was needed in the answer to gain the full two marks.

1(c)

Identification and explanation generally well answered. Most candidates selected the ‘Walk Scilly Festival’ and ‘promotion of winter breaks’ accurately. The explanation was not always in sufficient detail to gain the second mark in each example.

1(d)

Generally well answered. Candidates could easily identify the transport methods between the Isles of Scilly and the mainland. Unfortunately, a large number of responses used the incorrect data in the answer, using the per annum statistics for the ferry, fixed wing plane and helicopter services. Few candidates acknowledged the fact that business visitors could also be day visitors, who would prefer a quicker method of transport such as air. Credit was awarded for answers which explained that the intangible experience of the sea journey, allowing leisure visitors to view the islands and the sea life, was an important aspect of the suitability of the ferry as a method of travel. Candidates who failed to refer to ‘day visitors’ in their answer were awarded low marks. A minority of candidates misinterpreted ‘suitability’ for ‘sustainability’ and gave detailed answers about the carbon footprint of the different transport methods; these responses gained little credit.

2(a)

Heritage Coast and Scheduled Ancient Monuments were identified clearly in Document 2. As there are few major built tourist attractions on the Isles of Scilly, and the majority of visitors travel there for the exceptional environment, it would be expected that centres prepare candidates fully by teaching about the types of attractions which do draw visitors. Credit was given for answers which demonstrated understanding of the protected status of both heritage Coasts and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Very few candidates demonstrated knowledge of the designation of Ancient Monuments by English Heritage, and there was evidence that many candidates misunderstood the term ‘scheduled’ and believed that this was a way in which visitor management could take place, rather than the fact that these were listed sites. There were many weak definitions of ‘heritage coast’ where heritage was mistakenly understood as something old rather than requiring protection.

2(b)

A straightforward question requiring the selection and description of the three travel and tourism businesses which employed people, taken directly from the case study materials. The question

was generally well answered. A frequent error, which limited the marks awarded in the description section of the answer grid, was that candidates described the type of employment in hotels, retail and restaurants, rather than a description of the business itself.

2(c)

The statistics were very easily accessed by the candidates, who had obviously been prepared well for this question using the pre-released materials. In responses which purely stated what these statistics were, a Level 1 mark was awarded, explanation of the trends was necessary to get to Level 2. The question asked for trends to be discussed, so it was necessary that the statistics were analysed over a period of time. Many responses identified the highest numbers without relating them to the period of time/years or simply described seasonality from Fig. 2e. Candidates did tend to make sweeping statements about the reasons for the overall decline in tourism to the Isles of Scilly – with the recession being the most common explanation provided. This was obviously an accurate answer, but to get beyond Level 2, into the evaluative comments required for Level 3 some extension of the concept was needed. For example, although the ‘staycation’ had become more popular during the recession hit years, because of the expense of transport to the Isles of Scilly, there are more accessible and less expensive destinations within the UK. There were also sweeping statements made about the reasons for the increase in the percentage of the 65+ age group visiting the Isles of Scilly. Good discussions focused on the increasing affluence of the grey market in comparison to those still economically active with dependents or the fact that the activities on the Isles of Scilly were more suited to this age group.

3(a)

Generally well answered. In many responses Visit England was solely described as the organisation which assesses the quality of accommodation and awards star ratings, rather than its roles as a National Tourist Board. Consequently this achieved only one of the two marks allocated. Many candidates also thought that a ‘guesthouse’ was self-catering, rather than serviced accommodation.

3(b)

Generally well answered, although some candidates assessed their importance to the visitor, rather than the accommodation provider, of quality standard accreditation. There were many good answers which explained that accreditation could lead to a growth in business, as customers felt they could trust the opinions of independent assessors. Other good responses demonstrated the benefits of developmental feedback provided by the independent assessors and competitive advantage obtained by accommodation providers through the accreditation. It should be noted that Trip Adviser is not an independent review body of accommodation, but is made up of the comments of customers, consequently it is not an ‘accreditation organisation’.

3(c)

The style of this question should now be fully familiar to centres and candidates. This was a straightforward compare / contrast of two different types of accommodation. It was generally well answered, with good interpretation of the case study materials. In order for a candidate to score the full 10 marks comparison and contrast of product, service and facilities is necessary. Product can be the type of attraction – so both are accommodation providers for a comparison; the contrast of the product is that one [Star Castle Hotel] is serviced and the other [Seaways Farm Holiday Homes] are non serviced holiday cottages. Candidates could be fully prepared for this question by developing a wide range of vocabulary which are synonymous with the words ‘compare’ and ‘contrast’ – such as ‘the same as’, ‘similarly’, ‘also has’ and ‘different from’, ‘whereas’, ‘unlike’.

Some responses compared or contrasted only, which restricted marks considerably to the lower end of Level 2; a comparison or contrast needs to be of a like product, facility or service e.g. both Star Castle Hotel and Seaways Farm Holiday Homes have ground which the visitor can explore – Star Castle Hotel is situated in 4 acres of secluded gardens, and Seaways is on a flower farm. Although differences may be easier to identify, the question requires candidates to find both differences and similarities.

A significant number of responses evaluated the services, facilities and products in relation to a specific customer group, this is not necessary in the answer. Candidates should be advised just to focus on the comparison and contrast of the products, services and facilities.

4(a)

Answered well. The question required identification of self catering and half board / DB&B from the case study with an explanation of what these terms meant.

4(b)

Answered well; but there was evidence that many candidates relied on the wrong source document and hence used incorrect information in their answer. The focus of the answer needed to be on groups – if this was not discussed the candidate scored few, if any marks. There was a need to look at both the advantages and the disadvantages in order to move into Level 2 of the marks. Some candidates identified a feature but then failed to show how it is an advantage or a disadvantage.

4(c)

All inclusive as a type of holiday was well understood by the candidates. Assessment of the advantages was identified fully in the vast majority of answers, with the candidates explaining that everything was included in the price, and hence this made it easier for the traveller, as well as more cost effective. There were few candidates who managed to extend their answer to include protection by the EU Package Travel Directive, which obviously gives additional peace of mind to the traveller. It was this level of analysis which was needed to reach the top of Level 2.

5

As this was the QWC question centres need to ensure that candidates can write proper essay style answers in examination conditions. A Level 3 response needs to contain well structured sentences which directly answer the question, and contain few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling. Seasonality, a major underpinning concept in travel and tourism, was understood and fully explained by the majority of candidates. Good answers focussed on the need for businesses to maximise profits in the peak season; the impact of seasonal employment and the general impact on the economy of a holiday destination as well as social and environmental impacts. Some candidates purely concentrated on the seasonal impacts of climate, which restricted the marks to mid Level 2.

G728 Tourism Development

General Comments

This examination continues to attract some excellent candidates with sound knowledge of tourism development. There were eight extended answers to this paper, with a few exceptions timing did not appear to be an issue and it was obvious that many responses had benefitted with past paper practice. What was evident in this series was the number who had used additional pages to write their extended answers and in 9 times out of 10 this was due to unnecessary introduction/re-writing of question at the beginning of the response. This is not only costly in terms of time but candidates need to know that no marks are awarded for unnecessary paragraphs at the start. Spelling and handwriting continue to be a major issue; if the answers are illegible they cannot be credited and as mentioned previously, if candidates have extremely poor handwriting then centres should address this and arrange for a scribe or word process their responses.

Section 1 and 3 of the paper were answered particularly well with section 2 not as well answered. Centres must **stress** to their candidates the need to use the evidence in the case studies and to refer to it at all times when responding to ALL questions. There are still many examples of responses giving generic answers without any references to the resource booklet. The standard definitions of GDP; social and cultural objectives; AONB; and identification of sectors were unclear in many cases.

There will always be questions at the end of each section that require an extended written answer. These questions will require the responses to assess, analyse or evaluate a particular issue. There were many responses with really good extended answers but could not get beyond Level 2 as they did not give clear analysis of the evidence presented in the case studies; or lacked the ability to conclude the findings with an opinion of the evidence presented.

The major weakness of this paper were questions 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e)(ii); typical responses gave negative economic impacts for 2(c) instead of political, thus making the answer to 2(d) difficult (which asked for economic). The impacts of successful destination management seem to pose the greatest difficulty on the paper.

Finally, as in previous series underlining the command verb and key terms or writing small notes above the question is very good examination practice and shows that centres are taking on-board the comments given in past reports.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question Number

1 SHROPSHIRE - THE CHURCH STRETTON AND SHROPSHIRE HILLS TOURISM STRATEGY

- (a) This was a comprehensive case study with clearly identified key points. Candidates who spent time in careful reading of the stimulus material were better prepared when it came to analysis and evaluation of questions.

The answer to 1(a) was particularly well answered with the majority of candidates making excellent use of the figures in the resource booklet.

- (b) Responses indicated that there is still confusion when identifying organisations from the private, public and voluntary sectors. Many candidates gave businesses and individuals as a private sector organisation. This was not credited as it was not an identification of an actual organisation.
- (c) Many candidates were unable to give two objectives of an AONB (Area of outstanding natural beauty) many deferred to the objectives of the Shropshire Hills tourism objectives.
- (d) Generally good responses of the benefits to tourism providers of becoming members of Shropshire Tourism. The candidates who gave benefits to **visitors** or to **Shropshire** did not gain any marks.
- (e) EIA's (environmental impact assessments) presented a challenge to candidates who tended to write about the economic benefits to Shropshire of looking after the countryside. There was little evidence of what an EIA actually does, or why they are necessary
- (f) There were 5 objectives identified in the resource booklet. Some candidates **identified** or **described** all 5 and as a consequence did not achieve a Level 3 response. Other candidates chose to **evaluate** two or three objectives in detail and these candidates were able to achieve the highest marks. This was the QWC question so other factors were taken into consideration when grading this question.

2) ZIMBABWE Case Study

- (a) The definition of GDP was not given in many cases. This is a standard abbreviation that is commonly used when teaching and learning about the value of tourism.
- (b) The roles of National Tourist organisations was answered in the most part accurately, however many confused it with TIC's or with economic objectives.
- (c & d) A significant number of responses did not recognise this as a question on political influences, although the appropriate quote was extensively used but not developed. The majority of candidates did not use the evidence in the case study and wrote extensively about negative economic impacts. As a result this led to many candidates being unable to answer the next question which was about negative economic impacts. This resulted in Question 2(c) and Question 2(d) scoring quite low marks in the majority of cases. Fig 2b in the resource booklet clearly stated political and economic impact and candidates were unable to differentiate between the two.
- (ei) The answer to this was tourists and agents of tourism development. Most responses were accurate; however some candidates did not attempt this or gave incorrect responses.

- (eii) This question followed on from the above and therefore it was expected that candidates would be able to discuss the triangular relationship between hosts, tourists and agents of tourism development, using some of the information in fig2c. There were many theoretical responses using the key points from the syllabus e.g. maximising visitor spending; investing income; staff training and widening access to facilities etc. These responses were credited in full although many were out of context e.g. quoting the Disability Discrimination Act and the difference it would make in Zimbabwe. Candidates should be reminded at all times that they must respond in context with the geographical location of the scenarios.

3) FIJI

- (a) This was very well attempted and sometimes lengthy which was unnecessary. Excellent use of the information in the resource booklet and an easy 6 marks if used effectively.
- (b) This would appear to be relatively easy at first glance as the answer could have been generic in this case. It was disappointing to see that many candidates again slipped into the economic objectives route discussing jobs and income.
- (c) This was very well attempted and general sometimes lengthy definitions were given of an eco-lodge. The majority gave the response that it was accommodation which offered energy saving options.
- (d) This was very well answered with candidates being able to give benefits to the tourist and not to the host population. Many quoted examples from Fig.3b and gave reasoned discussions.
- (e) Considering this was the last question on the paper, it was answered particularly well with many candidates gaining maximum marks. There was excellent interpretation of the information in Fig.3c and very good evaluative comments made.

G721/22/29/30/31/32/33 Travel Destinations/ Customer Service/Event Management/Guided Tour/Adventure Tourism/Ecotourism/Cultural Tourism

General Comments

The standard of evidence and quality of assessment this series was good at A2 level and mixed at AS level. There were some very good samples submitted for moderation where candidates had interpreted the requirements of the unit well and assessment had been accurate. The candidates had provided clear, comprehensive applied evidence which displayed understanding, in line with the learning and application requirements of the assessment grid. However, there were some candidates who fell down on the nature of the evidence. They had tended to be descriptive where an evaluation or an analytical response was required. The ability to evaluate and make realistic recommendations was a difficulty displayed in candidates' evidence at both AS and A2 level. This was particularly relevant to AO3 and AO4 of the units where analysis, research and evaluation are required. This had sometimes been misinterpreted by assessors and over marking occurred.

Candidates had carried out primary research where they provided a questionnaire, survey, and interview. Some candidates used this as a basis for a good analysis, evaluation and conclusion. However, other candidates provided the answers to the questions as narrative text with no real analysis or evaluation to support the findings. This would not be sufficient to provide a good analytical and evaluative response at both AS and A2 level. This was particularly evident in G721 Customer Service, G722 Travel destinations, G729 Event Management, G730, The Guided Tour, G731 Adventure Tourism, G733 Cultural Tourism

Some portfolio work had been presented in a well organised manner with some evidence of extensive research. Candidates had clearly used both primary and secondary sources and were referencing within their work. In several cases candidates had clearly applied their knowledge to the requirements of the unit. However, this session, there were a number of candidates who failed to reference, source and provide bibliography. Where some problems occurred, it was mainly due to too much theoretical content rather than applied evidence. Some assessors had equated marks for theoretical content when application of knowledge to show understanding was required. In some cases candidates were unable to provide enough evidence of applied knowledge and understanding because their research has been too narrow. This was particularly evident in G721 Customer Service, G722 Travel destinations, G732 Ecotourism. G733 Cultural Tourism.

In many cases assessors had carried out administrative procedures well. Where problems existed, it was due to inaccuracies in recording candidate marks and lack of annotation within the work to show the moderator where the assessor considers the mark to have been partially or fully met.

In several cases centres had displayed good assessment practices and had responded well to previous support and advice on moderator reports. There were occasions of over marking, but the reason for adjustment has been clearly highlighted on the report to centre, in order to provide advice for future cohorts. In several cases assessment by centre was consistent amongst the samples. In other cases there was inconsistency in assessment where candidates in the higher level had been over marked but in the lower level under-marked.

This series, there were cases where an outlier or rogue sample appeared amongst otherwise well assessed samples. This meant that a candidate had been greatly over marked or under marked yet all other samples were accurate. This has been highlighted on the report to centre. There were also times when some candidates' work was better or in line with the mark awarded but another candidate had been awarded the same mark, yet evidence was not as good. Centres do need to consider the rank order of marks for their cohorts to ensure consistency.

Comments on Individual Units

AS Units

Unit G721-Customer Service

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this series with a good response. There was some evidence of leniency in assessment but holistically there were also some excellent examples which were thorough and appropriate. This unit was approached well this session and work was applied to appropriate organisations following a visit.

AO1 Candidates clearly identified the needs of internal and external customers and made a reasonable attempt to evidence how their needs are met. Candidates appropriately addressed different types of customers. Where candidates displayed difficulties it was because they had looked at the needs of the customers rather than how the needs are met. It is important to consider communication here too. Some candidates were thorough in their interpretation of meeting needs for external customers but not as thorough in relation to internal customers. Candidates tended to consider the basic benefits 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 two to three situations to evidence the variety of customers. At least one of these needs to be face-to-face. 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. There was some evidence of over marking here this series. There was an improvement this series in the quality of evidence for this AO. In most cases candidates had not used scripts to perform particular role plays, as this would have been considered as insufficient evidence of effective customer service. Centre has clearly moved away from this format which demonstrated better practice.

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.

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. 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 and how well they thought the organisation met the needs making some judgements but tended to miss out recommendations.

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. In many cases this was the unit which was less well performed at AS level.

Candidates need guiding here as to the suitability of the destinations, e.g. not two cities. They also need to be able to consider their own choice of destinations within the remit rather than the whole cohort studying the same destinations and resources provided by the deliverer.

AO1. In some cases this was addressed well, but in several other cases there was a lack of evidence and understanding to warrant the mark awarded. This was the main cause of leniency in assessment, as candidates annotated maps incorrectly and were unable to give a clear description but level 2 and 3 marks had been 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. Candidates needed 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 a local map, as a part of the series of maps, and comment in relation to distribution of features for the convenience of the tourist.

AO2. 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 the destination appeals to particular customers. There was, for example, very little reference to business appeal/customers, short and long breaks, the range of customers. Some candidates had analysed well but several candidates had not fully addressed this aspect of the assessment objective. Content of evidence was sometimes overdone and they merely provided a lot of information which detracted from the actual appeal and analysis.

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 this AO must be assessed in terms of the content of the work itself. Sources were well referenced in the text by some candidates. Some candidates had been well assessed but others leniently.

AO4 was generally well assessed and some candidates had good evidence considering more recent trends and the problems envisaged due to an economic downturn... 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. Higher marked candidates performed this AO well whereas the lower marked candidates had displayed difficulty in analysing.

A2 Units

Unit G729-Event Management

There was a large submission for this unit this series with a good response. Some candidates had interlinked the Event Management Unit to the guided Tour which is not acceptable. In many cases, this caused some difficulties for candidates in relation to the amount of evidence needed and skills required for their Event, which needed developing further. **It is not recommended that centres interlink 2 units.**

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. There were 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 on personal performance. Where problems existed during moderation this series, it was due to centres awarding all their candidates the same mark, particularly Mark Band 2/3, 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. In some samples candidates had not set out a plan but had tended to produce a report and running commentary which caused them to omit relevant information. This was particularly relevant to the need for clearer aims and objectives, purpose, SMART targets, financial accounts. There was some confusion as to the requirements of a plan and evidence became muddled and difficult to decipher. There should be no theoretical content. Candidates this session had produced their own business plan and it was good to see this session that centres had taken on board comments made in the 2012 session and actually encouraged their candidates to consider legislation such as data protection, health and safety practices, insurance, etc. There was still a need for candidates to provide clear financial accounts. There was some 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 only some evidence of how this was executed and any changes to be made to it – i.e. re-draft flow chart did it work? Some candidates had produced a critical path analysis which was well executed.

AO2. Several candidates were 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 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 sometimes omitted in candidates' evidence.

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

AO4. Some candidates evaluated well, but many showed a tendency to omit reference to aims and objectives. They tended to produce a narrative 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. It is insufficient evidence to answer prompt questions. Candidates can use this as a brief guidance but must produce an evaluative report.

Unit G730-Guided Tour

There was a large submission for this unit this series with a good response. Candidates had provided clear evidence of their guided or virtual tour. There was some leniency in assessment in relation to AO3 and the range of examples to be compared. There were some 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 was a need for candidates to develop the quality of the evaluation rather than producing a commentary of what they did. This unit, however was well assessed this series.

Unit G731-Ecotourism

There were some 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. It is important that candidates consider the unit holistically to ensure that the project they have chosen allows sufficient access to the requirements of the assessment grid. Where some candidates fell down it was because they had not chosen a suitable ecotourism project.

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. Candidates holistically approached this assessment objective with part of AO3.

AO2. Candidates often address 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. Several candidates did approach this well.

AO3 was well evidenced and assessed. Some candidates did omit perceived benefits.

AO4 was generally well evidenced and assessed but some candidates omitted to consider the perceived benefits against the actual benefits. The quality of evaluation sometimes needed enhancing with clear witness statements (AO3).

Unit G733-Cultural Tourism

There were several submissions this series with a mixed response. There were some good samples and candidates work was well assessed.

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. There was a need to source and reference work.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2014

