



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 1 / LEVEL 2 AWARD IN
TOURISM**

SUMMER 2016

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

	Page
Unit 1	1
Unit 2	3
Unit 3	5
Unit 4	7

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2 Award in Tourism

Summer 2016

UNIT 1: CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

The majority of centres submitted samples which reflected the requirements of the specification. Generally, samples were well-structured and moderators were able to navigate without any problems. In most cases, evidence submitted for each Assessment Criteria was fairly easy to find.

Good use had been made of the performance record sheets by most centres and in many cases assessor comments were helpful and appropriate.

Many centres had made good use of learner and centre guidance provided.

The majority of samples contained a good range of appropriate tasks which enabled candidates to develop appropriate evidence.

In some cases centres had devised tasks which combined two or more Assessment Criteria. Generally, this is not seen as good practice but there are occasions where it may be appropriate.

There was evidence that some centres had internally moderated work. This is considered to be good practice, particularly where a team of assessors are involved in the delivery of the specification.

Although in many cases assessment was at or near the correct level, some centres had marked work too generously. It is the nature of the specification that all assessment decisions are subjective and that there is often no clear boundary between one level of performance and the next. Assessors need to be clear about their interpretations of the descriptors provided in the assessment grids. Consideration needs to be given to the 'command words' such as explain or describe.

In particular, assessors need to be as clear as they can be about awarding a Level 2 as opposed to a Level 1 pass. A Level 2 pass implies that the work has been assessed at a level broadly equivalent to a 'good' GCSE grade of C. There were a number of cases where the award of a Level 2 pass was over-generous and that a Level 1 pass would have been more appropriate.

The vast majority of centres submitted work which met the criteria and in most cases, appropriate tourism organisations, such as attractions, had been selected upon which to base the assignment.

AC 1.1 - Most candidates approached this correctly by applying their knowledge of principles of customer service outlined in the content of the specification to a named tourism organisation.

AC 1.2 – Again, many candidates were able to apply their knowledge of customer service situations to their chosen tourism organisation. To access the Merit criteria, a wide range of situations, covering most of those identified in the content, should be discussed in some detail.

AC 1.3 – Most candidates were unable to provide sufficient detail to their descriptions of how customer service differs across different mediums to be able to access the higher grades and few achieved the Distinction grade. Some centres considered customer service delivery in a named organisation, others adopted a generic approach. Either is acceptable.

AC 2.1 – The majority of candidates were able to describe the various needs of different customers using the content as a starting point. Better candidates who achieved a Merit grade covered most of the customer groups identified in some detail.

AC 2.2 – Some centres combined this AC with AC 2.1. Although in some ways this is understandable, it made the identification and awarding of the Distinction grade more difficult. Unlike previous ACs, an explanation of how tourism organisations meet expectations of different types of customer is required. Most centres used a specific tourism organisation on which to base the evidence and this would appear to have assisted candidates in the development of their evidence. There were relatively few candidates who provided sufficiently well-reasoned explanations covering the expectations of a range of customers.

AC 2.3 – Candidates can only achieve a Level 2 Pass for this AC. Many candidates produced their evidence in a tabular format or used a series of bullet points to explain the positive and negative impacts of customer service on tourism organisations. The majority of candidates were able to obtain a Level 2 Pass.

AC 3.1 – In some cases it was not easy for moderators to identify the research tools which had been designed by candidates. It might be worthwhile centres suggesting to candidates that they include a brief note to identify which tools had been designed and a very brief explanation of the design process. In general, candidates were able to design appropriate research tools.

AC 3.2 – It is not necessary to include all of the results obtained from questionnaires and other research tools. Samples are sufficient. This AC involves a number of stages including the recording of information from primary and secondary sources. Often secondary sources were missing or under-represented. The AC also requires candidates to analyse and interpret information. This requirement was sometimes overlooked.

AC 3.3 – Information was presented using a range of appropriate graphs, charts and images. In some cases AC 3.2 and 3.3 had been merged. This worked where assessors had provided clear, supportive, comments when marking the work.

AC 3.4 – Relatively few candidates were able to achieve a Distinction grade for this AC. However, many were able to draw some reasoned conclusions to obtain a Level 2 Pass.

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2 Award in Tourism

Summer 2016

UNIT 2: THE BUSINESS OF TOURISM

INTRODUCTION

In only the second examination of this new course it was pleasing to see that it catered for the full range of abilities. Generally, it appeared that those centres that had used the full 30 GLH to prepare the candidates for the examination gained the higher marks.

Nearly 25% achieved a Distinction, Merit 40%, Level 2 Pass 56% and Level 1 Pass 89%. The results are very encouraging as they show a good improvement on last year's results. Although entries are still too few to provide a true analysis it was pleasing to see a significant increase in entries and positive feedback from centres.

1.
 - (a) The majority of candidates only gained one mark as their descriptions lacked detail. **(AC1.1)**
 - (b) The majority of candidates only gained two marks as they only outlined one valid benefit. **(AC3.3)**
 - (c) The great majority of candidates understood the term 'disposable income' but many only gained between one and three marks as they failed to develop their explanations. **(AC2.1)**
 - (d)
 - (i) The great majority of candidates answered this question correctly. **(AC3.2)**
 - (ii) This was question proved difficult for many candidates as they were failed to apply their knowledge and understanding of the topic. **(AC2.1)**
 - (e) The majority of candidates showed some understanding of the impacts of tourism on the environment and were able to provide at least one valid method to reduce negative impacts. **(AC1.3)**
2.
 - (a) This question was well answered by the great majority of candidates. **(AC1.1)**
 - (b) The majority of candidates showed some understanding and gained at least two marks. **(AC2.1)**
 - (c) The majority of candidates only gained two or three marks as they only failed to provide sufficient detail in their explanations. Candidates who gained five or six marks made excellent use of the scenario. **(AC1.3)**
 - (d)
 - (i) The great majority of candidates demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of the possible negative environmental impacts and often gained three or four marks. However, only a minority provided sufficient analysis required for five or six marks. **(AC3.1)**

- (ii) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates. **(AC3.1)**
- 3. (a) (i) This question was well answered by the great majority of candidates. However, a significant minority failed to develop their answers. **(AC3.3)**
- (ii) This question was well answered by the great majority of candidates. **(AC3.3)**
- (b) The majority of candidates had some knowledge and understanding of employment rights and responsibilities but explanations often lacked clarity. **(AC2.2)**
- (c) (i) The majority of candidates gained three or four marks. **(AC1.2)**
- (ii) Many candidates are not able to carry out simple calculations. **(AC3.2)**
 - (iii) The majority of candidates gained three or four marks as they were able to explain at least two impacts. However, many answers lacked a sufficiently clear analysis required for the higher marks. **(AC3.1)**

Recommendations to centres:

1. The candidates need to know the terminology in the specification as there was a general lack of knowledge and understanding of key terms.
2. Candidates from centres who had clearly studied different tourism businesses in their locality often gained higher marks as they were able to apply their knowledge and understanding. A number of case studies could suffice in covering this unit of work. This holistic approach is encouraged as it can provide comprehensive preparation for the examination as well as candidate motivation and engagement.
4. Good examination techniques are worth centres exploring. A good number of candidates fail to read questions carefully, exemplify their answers, develop their answers and analyse/evaluate. Command words such as explain, describe, analyse and evaluate might be worth exploring.
5. It was notable that many candidates provided too little detail for Merit / Distinction tasks and sometimes too much detail for a Level 2 Pass. Mock answers illustrating the detail required for Merit / Distinction is another strategy which many candidates may benefit from – use relevant examples and/or experiment with peer marking. Is the answer basic or is it detailed / developed? Does it answer the question? Is there evidence of analysis?

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2 Award in Tourism

Summer 2016

UNIT 3: DEVELOPING UK TOURIST DESTINATIONS

The majority of centres submitted samples which reflected the requirements of the specification. Generally, samples were well-structured and moderators were able to navigate without any problems. In most cases, evidence submitted for each Assessment Criteria was fairly easy to find.

Good use had been made of the performance record sheets by most centres and in many cases assessor comments were helpful and appropriate.

Many centres had made good use of learner and centre guidance provided.

The majority of samples contained a good range of appropriate tasks which enabled candidates to develop appropriate evidence.

In some cases centres had devised tasks which combined two or more Assessment Criteria. Generally, this is not seen as good practice but there are occasions where it may be appropriate.

There was evidence that some centres had internally moderated work. This is considered to be good practice, particularly where a team of assessors are involved in the delivery of the specification.

Although in many cases assessment was at or near the correct level, some centres had marked work too generously. It is the nature of the specification that all assessment decisions are subjective and that there is often no clear boundary between one level of performance and the next. Assessors need to be clear about their interpretations of the descriptors provided in the assessment grids. Consideration needs to be given to the 'command words' such as explain or describe.

In particular, assessors need to be as clear as they can be about awarding a Level 2 as opposed to a Level 1 pass. A Level 2 pass implies that the work has been assessed at a level broadly equivalent to a 'good' GCSE grade of C. There were a number of cases where the award of a Level 2 pass was over-generous and that a Level 1 pass would have been more appropriate.

Candidates found this unit more challenging, perhaps because of the complexity of the concepts involved or that centres had not given sufficient time to allow candidates to develop the knowledge required and understanding of the concepts. Centres would be advised to guide candidates to focus on the ACs within the specification where a Merit or Distinction grade is available. There was evidence that this had not been fully appreciated by many centres.

AC 1.1 – This should be seen as an introductory component. Many centres attempted to apply the content of the unit to the destination they had chosen to focus on. However, a more generic approach, adopted by a few centres might be more beneficial to candidates. Relatively few candidates were able to consider the appeal of destinations in terms of all of the features listed in the specification.

AC 1.2 - More candidates were able to achieve a Level 2 pass on this AC by using the characteristics listed in the specification to describe different types of tourist. Again, some centres treated this AC generically whereas some attempted to relate the characteristics of tourists to a selected destination.

AC 1.3 – This AC should be focused on the chosen destination and this approach was taken by the majority of centres. Since this is an AC in which a Distinction is available, centres should ensure that candidates spend sufficient time to demonstrate how the features of the chosen destination appeal to different types of tourists. Most candidates did not provide sufficiently detailed explanations to access the higher grades.

AC 2.1 – This is another example of an AC in which a Distinction grade is available and therefore should be given greater focus by centres and candidates. As in AC1.3, many candidates did not provide sufficient explanation relating to how a range of factors influence a tourist's decision to visit a particular destination.

AC 2.2 – Although it only attracts a Level 2 pass, this AC is important because it introduces the concept of tourism development through the continued enhancement of features and facilities. Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the concept with some being able to achieve a Level 2 pass.

AC 3.1 – Some centres adopted a generic approach to this AC while others focused on the chosen destination. Either approach is acceptable, however perhaps a generic approach might be more manageable for most candidates.

AC 3.2 – This is another AC that requires a good level of knowledge and understanding of key concepts in order to achieve the higher grades. Most candidates focused on relationships between organisations within their chosen destination, and this is probably the best approach. Some candidates adopted a tabular format in which to present their evidence. This was probably beneficial to weaker candidates, but those aiming for higher grades would be better advised to present their evidence as extended writing.

AC 4.1 - For some centres there was some confusion between this AC and AC 2.2. The difference is that AC 2.2 should focus on enhancements to the destination which have already taken place whereas for this AC candidates should consider possible future developments. Most candidates were able to propose some options for how the chosen destination could increase its appeal to tourists, but these were often not realistic or sufficiently developed to warrant the higher grades.

Ac 4.2 – Most candidates who were unable to suggest realistic or developed improvements were also unable to justify their decisions. As with other ACs where a Distinction grade is achievable, candidates did not have the sufficient depth of knowledge and understanding to develop their responses sufficiently.

AC 4.3 – The majority of candidates were able to produce some form of a presentation, mainly using PowerPoint or other suitable formats. Generally, there was insufficient focus on the suggestions and proposals discussed in the previous sections.

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2 Award in Tourism

Summer 2016

UNIT 4: EUROPEAN TOURISM DESTINATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In only the second assessment of Unit 4 it was pleasing to see that it catered for the full range of abilities. Generally, the evidence produced was neatly presented and well organised and candidate responses to the different ACs were easy to identify.

As per last year the assignment seemed to motivate the learners to produce detailed and interesting reports of a good standard. However, many candidates provided ample detail (sometimes too much!) for ACs with a maximum grade of Level 2 Pass but minimal detail for Merit / Distinction ACs – a consideration for centres when preparing their candidates for the this external assessment.

TASK 1:

AC1.1 – the majority of candidates only gained Level 2 Pass as their descriptions lacked the necessary detail required for a Merit or Distinction. The choice of coastal destination sometimes restricted the candidates' responses.

AC1.3 – The great majority of candidates identified two appropriate types of tourists. However, many responses were largely descriptive which resulted in a Level 1 or 2 Pass being awarded.

TASK 2:

AC3.1 – the majority of candidates only gained Level 1 or 2 Pass as their explanations were largely descriptive and lacked the necessary reasoning and detail required for Merit or Distinction.

TASK 3:

AC2.2 – the great majority of candidates identified three factors as given in the specification content. However, many candidates failed to use their knowledge and provided explanations which lacked detail.

AC2.1 – many candidates only gained a Level 1 Pass as their knowledge of the chosen coastal destination's forms of transport was basic.

AC2.3 – the majority of candidates only gained Level 1 / 2 Pass grades as their answers were simple outlines with little analysis.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk