EXAMINERS' REPORTS

LEVEL 1 / LEVEL 2 AWARD IN TOURISM

SUMMER 2018

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

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2

Summer 2018

General Comments

The work submitted for moderation was of a similar quality and standard to that submitted last year. However, it was evident that, in many cases, centres had not taken on advice provided in last year's report.

The majority of centres submitted samples which reflected the requirements of the specification. It was evident that in the most cases, centres had adhered to the regulations relating to controlled conditions. However, in a minority of cases, evidence which appeared to have been produced during the preparation stage was submitted. These centres need to be sure that they are aware of the time allocation and other controls relating to the production of evidence to be submitted for moderation.

Generally, samples were well-structured, and moderators were able to navigate them without major problems. Evidence submitted for each Assessment Criteria was in most cases easy to find but centres should encourage candidates to identify the evidence for each Assessment Criteria clearly.

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

Many centres had made good use of learner and centre guidance available from the WJEC website, this is highly recommended. Most 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.

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

In many cases assessment was at or near the correct level; disappointingly, 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*'.

TOURISM

Level 1 / Level 2

Summer 2018

UNIT 1

The majority of centres submitted work which met the criteria and appropriate tourism organisations, 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 – 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 – More candidates this year were able to provide sufficient detail to their descriptions of how customer service differs across different mediums and were able to access the higher grades, but few achieved the Distinction grade. Centres need to encourage candidates to write in more depth and show greater insight if they are attempting to obtain a Distinction grade.

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 which were relevant to the chosen organisation.

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. Some centres produced this had required candidates to produce evidence for this AC in a tabular format. Although this is acceptable for candidates achieving at the lower grades, it is unlikely that the explanations will be of sufficient depth for those aiming for Merit and Distinction

AC 2.3 – Candidates can only achieve a Level 2 Pass for this AC. As last year, 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 a named tourism organisations. The majority of candidates were able to obtain a Level 2 Pass.

AC 3.1 – Centres had not responded to the comments made in last year's report relating to the design of research tools. This is a Merit criterion, but in many cases, it was not easy to identify what research tools had been produced and the award of a
Merit was difficult to justify. As indicated last year, 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.

AC 3.2 – Centres need to ensure that raw data such as questionnaires are not included in the samples submitted for moderation. 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. Again, centres had not acted on the advice provided in last year's report. The requirement is for a research log of secondary sources to be included in the evidence. The AC also requires candidates to analyse and interpret information. These requirements were 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 –Many candidates were able to draw some reasoned conclusions to obtain a Level 2 Pass. However, relatively few candidates were able to achieve a Merit or Distinction grade for this AC. Candidates need to be encouraged to analyse and interpret the results of their research in as much detail as possible and to draw relevant conclusions which relate to the customer experience within their chosen tourism organisation.

LEVEL 1/2 AWARD IN TOURISM

Summer 2018

UNIT 2: THE BUSINESS OF TOURISM

INTRODUCTION

As in previous years it was pleasing to see that the examination catered for the full range of abilities. It was also very encouraging to see some excellent scripts demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of tourism businesses. However, many candidates were lacking the knowledge and understanding of the course contents / terminology.
Distinction - 19%. Merit - 29%. Level 2 Pass – 42%. Level 1 Pass – 84%.
Generally, it appeared that those centres making use of the stipulated 30 GLH to fully cover the specification contents in preparation for the examination fared better.

1. (a)   The great majority of candidates gained one or two marks.   **(AC1.1)**
    (b)(c)(d)The majority of candidates only achieved two marks as they failed to identify and calculate the correct combination for (c).   **(AC3.2)**
    (e)   Very few candidates gained two marks as they either suggested profit or objectives which were not financial.   **(AC1.2)**
    (f)   Many candidates only achieved one or two marks as they failed to see how tourism organisations might work together. Suggestions tended to weak with little development.   **(AC3.3)**
    (g)   The majority of candidates gained three or four marks as they provided realistic impacts with detailed explanations. However, a significant number of candidates failed to develop their answers and gained only one or two marks.
    (AC2.1)

2. (a)   The majority of candidates understood the term PLC but their descriptions lacked clarity and detailed knowledge.   **(AC1.1)**
    (b)   A minority of candidates provided some excellent answers. However, the majority only gained two marks with one sound suggestion.
    (c)   Surprisingly, many candidates only gained 2 marks. It seems they didn't read the factors carefully.   **(AC2.1)**
    (d)   Generally, the candidates provided detailed answers and gained two to four marks. However, many candidates provided little analysis which restricted the marks awarded. Weaker candidates focused only on the problem of litter.
    (AC3.1)
    (e)   The majority of candidates provided realistic suggestions with sufficient outline. Generally, there was some good knowledge and understanding.
    (AC3.3)

3.   (a)   This question was well answered by the majority of candidates.   **(AC1.1)**

    (b)   It was pleasing to see candidate improvement in the knowledge and understanding of employment rights and responsibilities within the tourism industry. As a result many candidates gained four marks or more.   **(AC2.2)**

    (c)   The great majority of candidates only gained one or two marks as their knowledge of marketing initiatives was weak.   **(AC1.3)**

    (d)   Many candidates showed some understanding of the possible effects but failed to develop their explanations sufficiently to achieve three or four marks.   **(AC2.1)**

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 important key terms. E.g. forms of ownership, economic factors and rights and responsibilities.

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 might 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.

3.   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.

Again, 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. Most centres adopted a generic approach, identifying the characteristics of different types of destination. Relatively few candidates were able to consider the appeal of destinations in terms of full range 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. Some centres treated this AC generically whereas some attempted to relate the characteristics of tourists to a selected destination. Either approach is acceptable.

AC 1.3 – This AC should be focused on the chosen destination and this approach was adopted 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. As last year, the majority of 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 centres focus on recent and ongoing developments within their chosen destination. This is good practice since it differentiates the evidence required here from that required in AC 4.1 and 4.2. Most candidates demonstrated an adequate understanding of the concept and were able to achieve a Level 2 pass.

AC 3.1 – Again, 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. It would appear that in many cases candidates were not thoroughly prepared for this section of the assignment. If candidates have an inadequate of the roles of organisations involved in tourism development and the relationships between the organisations, they are unlikely to attract the higher grades in the last two sections of the assignment.

AC 3.2 –Most candidates focused on relationships between organisations within their chosen destination, and this is probably the best approach, although a generic approach is permissible. Generally, candidates were insufficiently aware of the roles and relationships between the wide range of organisations involved in tourism development to be able to access the Merit and Distinction grades.

AC 4.1 – The focus of this AC is to allow candidates to propose strategies for tourism development through which destinations can increase their appeal to different types of tourist. AS indicated above, this is different from AC 2.2 where the focus should be on recent and ongoing 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 Merit grade which is available.

AC 4.2 – Again, those candidates who were unable to suggest realistic or developed improvements relating to their chosen destination, 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. Many candidates were able to achieve the Level 2 Pass grade available.

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