

## **GCE**

### **Travel and Tourism**

Advanced GCE A2 **H589, H789**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H189, H389**

### **OCR Report to Centres June 2015**

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 2015

## **CONTENTS**

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

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

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

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

## **OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

| <b>Content</b>                               | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| G720 Unit 1 – Introducing travel and tourism | 4           |
| G728 Tourism Development                     | 8           |
| Moderated AS and A2 Units                    | 10          |

## 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. One exception to this is Document 2, The Volume and Value of Tourism – Staying Visitors in Norfolk.

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 vocationally specific skill. 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 / meaning of travel and tourism terminology are all extracted from the case study, so candidates should have been aware of all the terms prior to the examination. Two marks are awarded for the correct definition / meaning of these terms. A vague response would be worthy of only one mark; the named example is only credited with a second mark if there was demonstration of 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 was also noted that some candidates get into the habit of writing extensively on a single point, thus restricting their time to make further valid points that would gain them more marks in their answers.

When using additional pages, it is imperative that the correct question number is included on the additional pages. **In this examination there was excessive use of additional pages, even for some of the short answer questions.** Sufficient space is allocated in the answer booklet for these types of questions.

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.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1a A straightforward question requiring the description of three travel and tourism terms taken from the case study materials.

Scheduled flight was the one which was answered the weakest by candidates. A scheduled flight runs to a published timetable on specific routes, they are committed to operate even if the load

factor is low. Credit was not given if the answer just stated that it was a flight which went at a certain time, as this also applies to charter flights. The concept of a timetable was needed in the answer, obviously bus, train and coach services can also be scheduled.

A seaside resort also caused some candidates to obtain only one of the two marks available. A resort, in this context, is a town or city, such as Great Yarmouth which contains many elements of the tourism industry such as accommodation, catering, entertainment and leisure facilities. It was important in the answer that 'by the sea' or a coastal location was included.

Overnight visitor was answered well, with candidates fully understanding the concept of staying in accommodation. Many candidates considered that overnight meant only one night; this is not the case.

1b The vast majority of candidates identified correctly and accurately. Very well answered.

1c The data interpretation question was not answered well by the majority of candidates. It was clear that domestic tourism was understood, but the data was not always used accurately. The first point is that the statistics are for the whole of Norfolk, not just Great Yarmouth, so conclusions drawn about domestic staying visitors to Great Yarmouth were incorrect. In the explanation of staying visitors it also clearly states that *paying guest refers to overseas visitors staying in private houses, primarily language school students*. Hence reference to paying guest statistics was not creditworthy in answers, as they did not relate to domestic tourism. The data in Figs 1, 2 and 3 were in 000s [trips, nights and £s respectively], if candidates did not use the correct units in their answer their marks were limited to Level 1 – a maximum of 4 marks. Some candidates did not use the correct units, but accurately discussed the percentage in each accommodation; this meant that marks could extend beyond Level 1. Fig. 1 of Document 2 was Trips by Accommodation type. This is the number of trips taken **not** the total number of staying visitors, this was the most common error made in the analysis of the statistics. Fig 4 was solely about day visitors to Norfolk, so no credit was given for answers which included reference to this data.

It is important that candidates are thoroughly prepared for this question by analysing and interpreting the data in the pre released case study prior to sitting the examination. It was obviously that some centres had done this effectively, and should be commended. There were some excellent answers in which candidates had worked out the average number of nights spend per trip and drew valid conclusions that short breaks were in serviced accommodation, possibly due to the expense [which was a level 3 comment], or that more nights were spent in static vans / holiday centres, often because of the nature of the booking means that 3 nights is frequently the minimum stay allowed when booking.

2a A straightforward question requiring the meaning of three travel and tourism terms taken directly from the case study materials.

The weakest answer related to 'maritime museum'. A large proportion of candidates just copied from Document 1 stating that it was a redeveloped museum in Great Yarmouth. Credit was given for demonstrating that maritime referred to the sea, and also that a museum is a built tourist attraction.

'Self-catering' and 'overseas visitor' were well answered by candidates.

2b A straightforward question requiring the identification and description of the three sources of income, taken directly from the case study materials. This was answered very well.

2c 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. 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'.

One issue which was evident in answers relating to the Hadleigh Gables Hotel was the lack of interpretation of the key. A large number of candidates assumed that the hotel had a swimming pool and a sauna on site – these were in the key to the facilities symbols but not in the banner below the hotel name which was the list of the actual facilities at the Hadleigh Gables. Candidates should avoid comments relating to products, services, facilities which are not evidenced in the case study; for example, the availability of a lift at Hadleigh Gables is in the case study, because a lift it not mentioned in the Fawltly Towers document is cannot be assumed it does not have one. Although it should be fairly obvious that a hotel of that size, will not have a lift, because it is not in the pre-released case study credit cannot be given if this was a comparison or contrast selected by the candidates.

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 hotels have provision for the less mobile customer. Fawltly Towers has some ground floor rooms available, the same as Hadleigh Gables Hotel; but the facilities at Hadleigh Gables are more extensive with scooter charging available. 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. Some candidates included details that they had researched from the websites of the two hotels or TripAdvisor. Although this is a valuable skill to learn, information from these sources cannot be credited in the examination if they are not in the case study.

3a Generally well answered. Services provided by Great Yarmouth TIC were accurately extracted from the case study. To extend the marks for each section an explanation of the service was required, copying from the case study was not credited as an explanation as the candidate needed to demonstrate understanding of the service provided. Good answers, for example, stated that the TIC acted as a ticket agent, not only for National Express but also a number of local attractions in Great Yarmouth. This would be awarded the identification mark, but in order to gain more marks the candidates needed to explain that this would be a good service to visitors as they would be able to purchase attraction tickets all in one place, rather than have to queue at each attraction, and hence save time and have a more enjoyable holiday.

3b Generally well answered. Benefits of the availability of beach wheelchairs to the disabled visitor were accurately extracted from the case study. Again explanation was needed of each point made to gain more than one mark; valid answers included the ability to participate in beach activities with the rest of their party, and hence not feel left out were acceptable answers.

3c Well answered. The vast majority of candidates could pick out a wide range of benefits to families of holidaying at Haven Seashore. Good answers referred to the proximity of the park to Great Yarmouth's other attractions, so families would not have to spend money on transport as they were within walking distance, or that the closeness would not overtire young children when visiting them.

4a Answered well. The majority of candidates looked at off- peak in the sense of seasonality, which was an acceptable answer, explaining that this was the time when reports such as Great Yarmouth were less busy, often in the winter period.

4b Answered well; candidates fully understood why VFR is a popular form of tourism.

4c Accurate identification was made by the majority of candidates.

4d The question was answered reasonably by candidates. The private hospitality on race days at Great Yarmouth race course was not acceptable in the answer, as that does not refer to a group holding an event. The focus needed to be on the venue on non-race days and what could be provided, such as free Wi-Fi which is obviously especially important for corporate events. Good answers also looked at the accessibility of the venue and the availability of free parking, which is a major plus for events attracting large numbers of participants who have travelled by private car. Good responses extended this to level 3 by stating that it would be easier for attendees to find parking and not having to worry about being charged for it.

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. There were some very good responses to this question which demonstrated full understanding of the role of the public sector in tourism. This included the provision of facilities such as the Time and Tide Museum and the Norfolk Broads National Park; planning consent for The Edge; refurbishment of Great Yarmouth Railway Station and promotion of tourism through the funding of the TIC. Good answers also extended the public sector's role into the maintenance of Great Yarmouth's cleanliness and accessibility, discussing street and beach cleaning as well as the provision of services such as car parking and public toilets. The vast majority of candidates fully understood that the public sector was encouraging tourism to increase visitor numbers to Great Yarmouth and the associated positive economic impacts this brings. Good answers used a wide range of specialist terminology such as secondary spend and the multiplier effect.

## G728 Tourism Development

### General Comments:

There were six 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. In addition centres should be reminded that candidates should not write outside the lines provided on the answer booklet, again an increasing number of candidates used areas outside the indicated area.

There was an increase in the number of candidates this session that did not make full use of the source material, and misread questions / failed to address the question set. The style of the paper has not changed and despite this issue being raised previously the trend continued. Candidates are directed to the source material but seem unable to select the correct source for the question. Some candidates still see copying from the case as application, and many good answers did not reach the highest marks by giving generic answers rather than using the stimulus material provided, or not coming to a reasoned conclusion.

There was some disappointing evidence in the lack of learning of the syllabus content. E.g. Political objectives that were widely not known by candidates and centres should be reminded that an applied paper requires full knowledge of all the syllabus content.

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.

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 weaknesses of this paper were Q1d Agents of Tourism Development were not identified; 2b: responses were land based and not water based and 2e: typical responses gave all economic benefits to a destination and not the locals thus losing a possible 6 marks.

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

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question No.1 CASE STUDY WARWICK

1a) Many candidates identified benefits to Warwick rather than the tourist but generally the role of TIC well understood. Extended economic benefits were often given and thus negated the possibility for gaining marks for the next question.



1b) This was very well answered, although many candidates lost marks by not using evidence from the source material. The question did state ‘identify and explain’

1c) Candidates were often unable to link the specification of an “Attract Brand” to the evidence provided about Warwick and so many candidates scored poorly. The ones that fully understood the case study scored maximum marks.

1d) Good knowledge of partnerships between the sectors was evident. The major weakness identified in the responses to this question were; a lack of awareness as to who is in which sector and / or use of the case study to identify organisations and / or failure to recognise that the question was about promotion of Warwick between the sectors and not about partnerships in general.

1e) This question prompted some very good responses and good use of the case study but many candidates failed to recognise that the question related to impacts **on Warwick** and not Warwick Castle only. Many candidates gave generic responses and gave both positive and negative impacts. The question did not ask for negative impacts, however when these were used in an evaluative manner they were credited. Some candidates gave a long negative environmental impact answer to this question which was not relevant. Candidates must be careful to read the question and answer appropriately.

## **QUESTION 2 CASE STUDY ALASKA**

2a) Well answered although many candidates lost marks by not using evidence from the source material, or by cramming too much evidence in the first part instead of giving three simple answers. This is a lack of exam technique.

2b) Many candidates did not realise that the question was about cruise companies (who visit Alaska) not Alaska and so failed to apply the question to possible impacts on the ocean if they did not adopt responsible practices.

2c) Generally well answered, simple identifications from the case study.

2d) Generally well answered with good use of the stimulus material, however this question was worth 8 marks and many candidates did not score above 5 level 2 as they only identified/described some methods. The question asked to ‘assess the methods’.

2e) Very few candidates recognised that benefits to host populations relate to socio-cultural benefits such as preservation of customs / aiding of understanding etc which limited access to the full range of marks. The majority of responses related to full economic benefits to Alaska e.g. multiplier effect, GDP, balance of payments etc. Although economic benefit in context was accepted, the main focus of this answer should have related to the socio cultural benefit on the LOCAL population.

3a) Very poorly answered –Political objectives are clearly on the syllabus. A significant number of candidates did not know them.

3b) Well answered with information from the stimulus material, although the candidates who had used this response for the previous question lost out on marks.

3c) The vast majority of candidates did not know that ABTA is a private sector organisation. Linked to 1d) there was a general lack of understanding of the sectors in which agents of tourism development operate.

3d) Well answered, with good use of the stimulus material, the candidates who did not score maximum marks were the ones who only identified quotes from the case study.

3e) Most candidates could clearly identify the negative impacts, but again access to marks was limited by a lack of use of the statistics provided and hence many generic answers were seen.

## Moderated AS and A2 Units

### General Comments

The standard of evidence and quality of assessment this series was mainly good at both AS level and A2 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 and was sometimes where lenient marking had taken place. This was particularly relevant to AO3 and AO4 of the units where analysis, research and evaluation are required.

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, and G733 Cultural Tourism. In relation to Event Management G729, candidates particularly provided narrative text: commentary of what they had done but without evaluative reasoning.

**This session—2015, there was a need for centres to consider the nature of the evidence provided where practical performance took place. This was particularly relevant to G721 Customer Service where assessors did not provide any signed witness testimonies considering what skills were demonstrated for AO2 and how well. This was also relevant to units G729 Event Management and team working skills, G730 carrying out the guided tour for AO2, G732 Adventure Tourism. In some cases candidates had received very high marks but there was insufficient evidence to support the mark awarded. However, some centres did provide comprehensive evidence.**

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. **There was sometimes difficulty in identifying the candidate number as this had not been recorded on the URS sheet. Centres did provide useful comments to support the evidence.**

**The following information relates to previous series but still applies to this series and therefore is worthy of recording. There are some alterations in relation to this series.**

#### AS Units

##### Unit G721-Customer Service

There were many submissions for moderation of this unit this series with a mixed response. Where candidates had considered an organisation where they visit and have access to the required information they performed well and carried out primary research for AO4. **There were some centres where the organisation chosen had not given sufficient access for the candidates to achieve higher marks.**

AO; 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; where centres had provided sufficient evidence of a candidates performance candidates performed well. 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. As highlighted earlier in the report there was some evidence of leniency in assessment this session.

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. Some candidates had difficulty accessing the information and became general rather than applied in comment.

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.

Again this session, candidates needed guiding here as to the suitability of the destinations, e.g. not two cities.

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 mixed response. Some candidates had interlinked the Event Management Unit to the guided Tour or Adventure Tourism 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 some 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.

Unit G735-Human Resources

There were few submissions this series with a good response.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2015

