Key Messages

- Read the question carefully and respond in an appropriate manner.
- Clearer and more specific use to be made of information relating to named examples with which candidates are familiar.
- Greater precision required when explaining the significance of particular factors, avoiding unsubstantiated generalisation.
- Closer inspection and more careful interpretation of the stimulus materials provided required.

General Comments

It was pleasing to see the majority of candidates making a very positive attempt to address the issues posed by the various questions. The stimulus materials were accessible and frequently well interpreted. Many candidates tend to quote a range of examples although some are known but somewhat inappropriate examples.

Centres are once again reminded that candidates should make a positive attempt to structure their responses to address the following criteria:

Level 1 (1 to 3 marks) – the candidate identifies/describes some valid types/features/factors

Level 2 (4 to 6 marks) – the candidate offers explanatory or analytical comment about some of the valid types/features/factors that have been identified

Level 3 (7 to 9 marks) – the candidate offers evaluative comment about the valid items that have been identified and explained/analysed i.e. one being more or less important than the other and indicating why this is the case. The best answers will have a reasoned conclusion.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

(a) The Fig. 2 stimulus material was used very well and most candidates were able to identify four valid ways in which waiting staff interact with external customers. Popular choices included greeting guests, showing them to their table, advising guests on the food and drinks available and taking orders.

(b) There were many good responses to this and most candidates had a sound understanding of the issues involved. Answers frequently pointed out that uniforms represent the company’s image and meet customer expectations, clean finger nails are an important hygiene issue in a food and beverage environment and that too much perfume can disturb guests’ enjoyment, particularly if they have an allergy.

(c) Some candidates made the mistake of describing each job function rather than explaining how waiting staff would be likely to interact with each of them. Better responses clearly pointed out, as indicated in Fig. 1, that waiting staff would take dirty linen to the laundry after service and bring fresh supplies as required. Similarly, waiting staff take orders to the kitchen and collect dishes to serve when orders have been filled. The waiting staff will be informed by reception of guest numbers so that correct place settings and special requests can be arranged.
Candidates were aware of several ways in which employees can be monitored and there were many very sound responses. However, very few answers were able to access Level 3 because of the lack of evaluative comment. The question invited candidates to assess the ways in which their chosen travel and tourism job role might be monitored. Which method(s) were the most appropriate and why?

Question 2

(a) Candidates readily interpreted the Fig. 3 stimulus material and correctly identified online, telephone and personal visit as being three ways in which to make bookings for Travel Star Holidays’ products.

(b) There were very few difficulties with this and the vast majority of candidates correctly identified whitewater rafting in New Zealand as being adventure tourism, the Singapore hospital trip as being medical tourism and the Manchester football trip as being sports tourism.

(c) Candidates understood the concept of religious tourism and there were many valid responses. Most candidates offered an appropriate example, with Mecca and Lourdes being popular choices for pilgrimages. However, many individuals had difficulty in expanding their answers sufficiently to warrant the award of all four marks available. The better responses clearly provided a valid example together with details of the trip/itinerary and activities followed by most participants.

(d) Many candidates viewed this question as an opportunity to write about the negative impacts of tourism. However, a more thoughtful response was expected and responses should have attempted to illustrate the main focus of the concept. The carrying capacity is the maximum number of people that may visit a tourist destination at the same time, without causing destruction of the physical, economic, socio-cultural environment and an unacceptable decrease in the quality of visitors’ satisfaction. Apart from overcrowding and congestion, few ideas were developed and only the more able candidates gave emphasis to the idea of decline in visitor satisfaction levels.

(e) The key aspect of this question was the extent to which candidates were able to identify a range of accommodation types present in their chosen destination and then provide an assessment of the ways in which the needs of different visitor types were being met. Some candidates made rather inappropriate choices and this tended to limit the amount of credit that could be awarded. However, there were some excellent reviews of provision at Victoria Falls and it was pleasing to see appropriate coverage being given to both leisure and business hotels, lodges and camp sites. It was a shame that so many candidates thought different types of board and meal plan were types of accommodation.

Question 3

(a) The Fig. 4 stimulus material was very well used and the key markets of Australia, the UK, the USA and China were readily identified by the majority of candidates.

(b) The focus of this question was on the reasons for variations in visitor length of stay and many candidates had difficulty in expanding their answers. Valid reasons offered were purpose of visit and costs involved but these needed developing to warrant the award of full marks. Many candidates were aware that business trips last only a short time, leisure trips are of a fixed duration as per the package itinerary and VFR travel is usually longer, reflecting extended family visits at key holiday seasons. However, such illustrations were rarely provided within the same point. Similarly, cost ideas were not fully illustrated to cover exchange rate differences, the economy achieved by staying with friends and relatives or the fact that camping and caravanning were much cheaper than hotels and were thus associated with extended stays.

(c) Most candidates were able to identify valid changing socio-economic factors that cause increased levels of domestic tourism but these were not always explained properly. For example, increased car ownership was rarely linked with accessibility or mobility to explain domestic travel patterns. Similarly, increased leisure time was not always linked with the convenience and frequency of domestic trips for recreational purposes. However, following on from answers to the previous question, more thoughtful candidates made reference to VFR travel being a solution to the increased costs of overseas travel and the fact that domestic tourism increases in times of financial austerity. Overall, it was pleasing to see that most candidates had a firm grasp of the basic factors influencing this form of tourism.
Answers not quoting actual data had difficulty progressing beyond low Level 2 because candidates were not making appropriate references to New Zealand. Better responses clearly commented on key aspects such as expenditure per type of visit, tourism export earnings, GDP and employment (direct and indirect). To reach Level 3 candidates needed to make evaluative comments.

Question 4

(a) The photographs were usually correctly interpreted in terms of the Butler model with many candidates correctly identifying A as Development and B as Exploration. Furthermore, a lot of the reasoning offered was fully appropriate and it was pleasing to see both photographs being interpreted clearly. In A infrastructure improvement was correctly linked with rising demand and the lack of development in B was correctly linked with a wilderness environment. Many responses were quite perceptive and clearly stated.

(b) The objectives of national parks were frequently well known but the amount of explanation provided was quite variable. Better responses concentrated on conservation/preservation of landscape and wildlife and often linked this with sustainability and environmental awareness programmes. Weaker responses were less well expressed, and only hinted at conservation issues. The weakest answers involved comments about profitability which gained no credit.

(c) It was pleasing to see many valid responses to this and candidates were aware of a variety of funding streams for non-commercial organisations. There was frequent reference to government grants, entry fees, sponsorship, donations, membership subscriptions and retail sales. As with other questions, the amount of explanatory comment was variable but most candidates clearly had some appropriate understanding of the funding issues of such organisations.

(d) Thoughtful answers usually scored well but many individuals did not appreciate the wording of this question. Candidates were expected to comment on the threats to the future tourism development of their chosen destination. Some answers were about the negative impacts of tourism with little comment as to how these various negative conditions might have an effect on the future development of the destination. There were some very good attempts that considered a range of threats such as political uncertainty, inflation, crime rates, poaching and lack of investment. Similarly, other responses commented on destinations as being prone to natural disasters and valid arguments were offered to support a potential decline in visitor numbers. Such responses scored well and it was a shame that more candidates did not make better use of the valid information that was clearly in their possession.
Key messages

Candidates’ written work must be submitted on an individual basis, there should be no collaboration between candidates working as a group.

Centres should submit the correct number of sample portfolios for the size of entry.

Witness statements for all candidates must be included in each portfolio.

More than one feasibility study must be included in each portfolio.

Candidates must make detailed recommendations for future events in order to gain Mark Band 2 at AO4.

General comments

Thanks must be extended to the Centres that submitted portfolios for this November 2012 session on time. Once again, this very much helped with the smooth running of the Moderation process. Several Centres were able to demonstrate interesting and appropriate candidate work that showed well planned and supported activities and events.

In some instances, a small number of Centres were scaled downwards. This scaling was generally applied because a Centre had marked too leniently across the bands and in some instances key evidence was missing. The most common issues leading to scaling were:

- poor evaluation
- no other feasibility studies considered
- poor demonstration of the candidates’ contribution to the planning, preparation and running of the event.

In some instances candidates appear to have written up their portfolios after the event has been conducted. This should be avoided; portfolio work should be completed at the time of planning and preparation. Only the evaluation stages for AO4 should be completed at the end of the work.

It was pleasing to see candidate work submitted by Centres that had clearly followed the guidance notes. These portfolios were generally well structured and presented in a clear and logical format. There were a range of events organised and enthusiastic candidates.

It is imperative that Centres can demonstrate clearly where their candidates pass through each mark band. This must be done to assist with the marking and internal verification processes. Therefore, assessors should ensure that they clearly annotate where the candidate has progressed through the mark bands, to aid with both teacher and Moderator assessment.

AO1 – Some candidates presented clear and logical plans with realistic itineraries and timescales. On occasions, there were omissions from the plans and poor organisational skills such as missing risk assessments and contingency planning.

AO2 – Many candidates were able to demonstrate impressive contributions to the running and preparation of the actual events, particularly in terms of the planning and implementation of set tasks. Assessors should include witness statements for verification of tasks completed, particularly on customer service achieved. Please ensure that if a witness statement is included that it is signed and completed by the assessor and not just included as a blank sheet. It would also help candidates to keep log books or diaries of meetings and scheduled activities.
AO3 – Some candidates failed to consider at least two feasibility studies. In some cases there was little evidence of risk assessments or contingency plans put forward and some candidates did not use a SWOT analysis to aid their reasoning.

AO4 – Generally candidates evaluated their event well. Some candidates needed to evaluate not only their personal performance but also the performance of the group as a whole. On occasion, there were incidences of candidates simply producing a running commentary of what they had done rather than evaluating and drawing conclusions from the results of the customer feedback and offering suitable options/recommendations for improvements. It should be noted that all candidates should include at least one detailed witness statement from an independent observer or participant. This will provide evidence of customer service skills during event planning and implementation. This will help the candidate to further evaluate their performance.

It should be noted that although this assessment is organised as a group assignment, each individual candidate should complete their own work. It is not acceptable for candidates to have exact copies of the written sections of their coursework. Individuals must submit their work independently. Similarly a single portfolio that represents the work of a whole group is unacceptable.

Please note that Teacher Coursework Guidelines are now available for this unit. This contains useful information on the planning and organisation of lessons and exemplars of candidate work. In some instances, it may be appropriate for Centres to ask for a trainer to visit to assist with planning, preparation and Moderation issues.
TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Key Messages

The syllabus requires that candidates study specific named examples of local, national and international business and leisure travel providers, in order to prepare them for the demands of the four scenario-based questions of this module.

Candidates should be encouraged to use the stimulus material provided to identify key information with which to answer the questions. The skills of explanation and analysis are required by all candidates in order to answer the majority of the questions on this type of paper effectively. The higher order skills of evaluation and justification are usually required for the final question in each subset.

General Comments

Candidates appeared to have been well prepared for the type of questions asked and the majority of candidates attempted every question in the time allowed. As is to be expected, questions requiring simple recall or identified knowledge caused the fewest problems; those candidates able to demonstrate the higher order skills of applied understanding, analysis and evaluation scored the best marks, especially within the extended answer type of question. There were some instances where candidates did not attempt the final extended answer question in each subset. Candidates are to be encouraged to attempt these types of questions, even if they do not believe themselves capable of demonstrating the higher order skills of evaluation and justification. Marks are also awarded for the skills of identification, description and explanation for Level 1 and Level 2 responses.

This question paper adopted its standard format, comprising four main questions, each accounting for 25 marks. Each question used a case study approach with a small piece of stimulus and a subset of questions relating to the stimulus. Question 1 took as its focus information about business tourism in Malaysia. Candidates were provided with information about a city sightseeing bus tour in Chicago in Question 2, whilst Question 3 was based on information about passenger rail transport in New South Wales, Australia. Question 4 used information about the Gritti Palace Hotel in Venice.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question used information about business tourism in Malaysia as its focus. The stimulus appeared to be reasonably accessible to the majority of candidates.

(a) The majority of candidates were able to use the stimulus material to identify three reasons for the appeal of Malaysia as a business tourism destination. Better performing candidates were also able to explain in their own words why each of the identified reasons make Malaysia a desirable business destination.

(b) Candidates were less sure about the ways in which organisations such as MYCEB can help conference organisers prepare for international business tourism events. Many responses relied on the wording used in the stimulus; the best answers gave specific examples of how these types of organisations can put conference organisers in touch with local suppliers to get the best deals.
Candidates generally understand the concept of sustainable tourism well and suggested many valid reasons why countries might develop a tree planting scheme. The best answers considered not only the need to fund such a scheme but also the desire to raise environmental awareness about passengers’ carbon footprint each time they board a flight.

At the lower end of performance, candidates relied upon the text to identify reasons why organisations are keen to encourage business tourism. Only the better performing candidates recognised the need here to focus specifically on the reasons why the Chinese business tourism market might be important for a destination such as Malaysia. Candidates need to be encouraged to consider the wider implications of such questions; at the very top end of performance here candidates were able to infer that if Chinese languages are widely spoken in Malaysia, there would be no additional cost associated with having to employ translators in putting together a business tourism programme specifically for the Chinese market.

Question 2

This question used information about the products and services of the Chicago Trolley and Double Decker Bus Company as its source.

Many candidates seemed unsure of the term ‘hop-on, hop-off’, even when used in the context of a sightseeing coach tour.

The majority of candidates appeared confident in their understanding of the term ‘distribution channel’ within this question.

Benefits of using the Internet as a distribution channel were conveyed clearly. Better performing candidates avoided using the phrase ‘quick and easy’ when explaining the benefits of 24 hour availability and there being no need for displacement in accessing the product.

The phrase ‘service provider’ caused some difficulty for candidates in answering this question. Those who understood the question had no difficulty in selecting the three named examples of service providers from the stimulus material.

Many candidates answered this question well. Those who did not score well here misinterpreted the question and answered from the perspective of the customer, rather than from the perspective of the participating organisations as required by the question.

This proved to be one of the more challenging questions on the paper. Some candidates were unfamiliar with the concept of consumer protection. The best responses to this question used information specifically from the text and the question to focus on protecting personal information, the way it is gathered and stored etc. Those candidates who offered a more generic response to discuss the importance of consumer protection in general often found it difficult to go beyond a simple description of the types of incidents in which tourists might become involved and were therefore not always able to access the Level 3 marks for evaluative comments.

Question 3

The stimulus for this question came from information about passenger rail transport provision in New South Wales in Australia.

The majority of candidates were competent in describing the term ‘code of conduct’.

Most candidates were able to identify at least one valid reason why organisations in travel and tourism operate a code of conduct. The best responses made reference to the idea that codes of conduct provide a standardised approach to working with internal and external customers of an organisation.

Candidates were able to use the source material to identify at least one organisational objective for RailCorp. Better performing candidates used their own words to explain what phrases such as ‘increased rail capacity’ meant, whereas less able candidates tended to select inappropriate material about RailCorp’s sister organisation CountryLink when responding to this question.
The reasons why organisations offer ancillary products and services is well understood, with the majority of candidates scoring well for this question.

Many candidates clearly understood the term ‘independent traveller’ and were able to associate characteristics of rail travel which would appeal to this visitor type. The best responses were able to evaluate characteristics of rail travel that would be most appealing; weaker candidates were again often distracted by less relevant information in the stimulus material when composing their responses.

Question 4

The products and services offered by the Gritti Palace Hotel in Venice formed the basis of the case study for this question.

Most candidates were able to extract the relevant information from the provided text, in order to identify three products or services of this hotel targeted at the family market. Better responses were written in the candidates’ own words to explain the reason for the appeal of each of the selected products or services.

Candidates all clearly understood the types of products and services that cater to the specific needs of business tourists, to score well on this question.

There were a number of candidates who did not respond to this question. It was not always clear whether this omission was due to lack of time to complete all the questions - this being the penultimate question on the paper; or whether candidates chose not to answer this question because of their unfamiliarity with the role of the concierge. Where candidates did make a response, many answers confused the duties of the concierge with the duties of the reception staff, housekeeping staff or the bellhop.

Candidates recognised the term ‘loyalty programme’ and many were able to provide a number of excellent examples of how hotel guests may be rewarded through membership schemes. A number of candidates misread this question and instead provided responses about the benefits of membership schemes to the hotel; these could unfortunately not be credited as they did not answer the specific question set here. Please encourage candidates to read the question carefully to avoid making similar mistakes on future papers.
TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Key messages

- Candidates should attempt to answer the question posed which means that a candidate should not write everything they know about a topic but ensure that the answer relates to the specific question.
- Candidates should understand the meaning of each of the following command words – evaluate, analyse, discuss, assess and explain.
- Candidates should be able to distinguish between the economic, social and environmental impacts.
- It is important to read carefully the case studies provided.
- Candidates should use relevant case studies from eco, culture and adventure tourism to practise examination technique.

General comments

This paper followed a similar format to those in previous sessions and contained two case studies for candidates. Question 1 covered information about the Belum Rainforest Resort in Malaysia. Question 2 was based on hiking and trekking in Sweden. Once again candidates were provided with an answer booklet for their responses. Timing does not appear to have been a problem with the majority of candidates answering all questions. Generally, the standard of entry was very pleasing; it was clear that many Centres had studied relevant case studies of eco, adventure and cultural tourism as candidates gave interesting and appropriate examples when requested. Many candidates appear to quote from previous exam case study scenarios.

Some candidates confuse the different types of tourism impacts and consequently this affects their marks in longer style answers. Centres should endeavour to make explicit the meaning of environmental, social-cultural and economic impacts both for the positive and negative. In some instances, candidates confuse the definitions.

It should be noted, that it is not necessary for candidates to repeat the question at the start of their answer, as this will severely limit the space for the written response. Candidates should attempt to keep their answers in the space provided and not continue onto extra sheets. Candidates should try and avoid repetition within answers particularly those relating to the impacts of tourism. Weaker candidates were unable to access the higher marks for extended answers if they were unable to ‘assess’ ‘discuss’ or ‘evaluate’ where asked. It would help candidates if Centres explained the difference between such command words and encouraged candidates to make clear and concise judgements or conclusions. It should be noted that candidates are not credited with marks for weak or over simplistic conclusions. All judgemental statements should be supported by comments made throughout the body of the response. In general the standard this session was very pleasing.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Reasonably well answered, most candidates were able to give reasons why the Belum Rainforest Resort was built to the strict code of Pulau Banding Code. Some candidates did not explain their reasons and consequently were not awarded full marks.

(b) A good response to this question. Candidates were asked to discuss how the Belum Rainforest Resort brings positive economic benefits to the area. There were many good responses given with good detail. Many candidates were able to include details on employment, both direct and indirect, and the value of the multiplier effect.
(c) Reasonably well answered. Candidates were asked to assess the potential conflicts of providing adventure tourist activities in areas of great environmental importance. There were some good responses relating to the different types of pollution that would be associated with adventure tourism. Although there were some good responses it was necessary for candidates to assess their points in order to gain the higher end mark band.

Question 2

(a) Reasonably well answered, many candidates gained good marks here. However, some candidates failed to see the significance of the strict code of conduct and the positive contribution to the environment.

(b) A mixed response to this question. Some candidates were able to explain how the designation of Laponia as a World Heritage Site helps to reduce environmental impacts, however some candidates did not ‘discuss’ and this would not allow them to gain the higher grades. Some candidates were clearly unfamiliar with the World Heritage Site status, which was a pity.

(c) Reasonably well answered, most candidates were able to explain the possible socio-cultural impacts of tourism, however, candidates needed to ‘Assess’ to access higher level marks. It should be noted that it is important that candidates answer the question posed and do not simply write everything they know about a topic. This does not allow full marks to be achieved.