



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 1/2 AWARD AND CERTIFICATE
TOURISM**

SUMMER 2019

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.

Unit	Page
Uni1	1
Unit 2	3
Unit 3	5
Unit 4	7
Unit 5	9
Unit 7	10

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 1

General Comments

There was a significant increase in the number of centres entering candidates this year, and it was pleasing to note that the majority of these centres submitted work that met the requirements of the specification.

It was evident that in most cases, centres had adhered to the regulations relating to controlled conditions. However, in a minority of cases evidence that appeared to have been produced during the preparation stage was also submitted, such evidence is unnecessary. 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 individual Assessment Criteria clearly.

Once more, 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 the learner and centre guidance available. This is highly recommended.

Most samples contained a good range of appropriate tasks that enabled candidates to develop appropriate evidence.

In a minority of cases, centres had devised tasks that combined two or more Assessment Criteria. Generally, this is not seen as good practice but there are occasions where it may be appropriate, such as the investigation in LO3.

Many centres rely too much on data collected through questionnaires conducted by candidates in LO3. This data often produces simplistic and unrepresentative results. Centres should consider alternative ways of collecting data, such as interviews with staff members of the organisation being studied.

Comments on individual questions/sections

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 candidates produced evidence for this AC in a tabular format. Although this format 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 3.1 – Many 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 often difficult to justify. As indicated last year, it might be worthwhile centres suggesting to candidates that they include a brief introduction to indicate which tools, such as questionnaires or preparatory notes for an interview, will be used. A brief explanation of the design process or methodology could also be included.

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 and the research log 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 or underdeveloped.

Summary of key points

- Consider when it is most appropriate to present evidence in tabular as opposed to written format.
- Ensure that the evidence for AC 3.1 is clear, particularly when awarding the Merit grade.
- Consider the methodology used to collect data.
- Ensure that there is evidence of secondary research, which can be analysed and interpreted
- Do not include raw data such as completed questionnaires when submitting portfolios for moderation. An example of one questionnaire is sufficient.

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 2

General Comments

The question paper proved accessible to the candidates as many attempted all of the questions. Overall, 26.4% of candidates gained a Distinction (an increase of 6% from 2018), 44.3% Level 2 Pass (very similar to 2018) and 80% Level 1 Pass (a decrease of nearly 8% from 2018). It was pleasing to see the increase in Distinction grades and stability at Level 2 Pass as this indicates centres are becoming more familiar with the specification requirements.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1 (a) (i) & (ii) These questions were well answered by the great majority of candidates. However, a significant minority of candidates failed to develop their explanations and gained only one or two marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of financial objectives but many failed to consider the business was in its first year.
- (c) Many candidates showed a reasonable understanding of the economic factors. However, very few candidates developed their explanations sufficiently in order to achieve Level 2 marks.
- (d) The majority of candidates produced some very good answers and gained between four and six marks. However, this was another example of how many candidates fail to develop their explanations.
- Q.2 (i) & (ii) surprisingly this question proved difficult for many candidates as they were unable to give named examples of 'not for profit' tourism organisations. Often candidates gave non-tourism organisations such as Oxfam. A minority of candidates showed excellent knowledge and understanding and achieved high marks. This question illustrated the importance of candidates learning named examples.
- (b) The great majority of candidates only gained Level 1 as their suggested methods of promotion didn't always relate to VisitBritain and TICs.
- (c) Generally, the candidates showed some knowledge of two positive economic impacts but outlines often lacked the detail required for the higher marks.
- (d) This question was well answered by the great majority of candidates as many scored at least four marks.
- Q.3 (a) This question proved to be a challenge for the great majority of candidates as they had little knowledge or understanding of the term 'limited company'. This question illustrated the importance of candidates learning the terminology within the specification.

- (b) (i) This question was well answered by many candidates who were able to identify two appropriate advantages and provide detailed explanations.
- (b) (ii) The great majority of candidates understood the risks involved but answers were often lacked detail.
- (c) (i) Many candidates did not have a clear understanding of the term 'pressure group'.
- (c) (ii) The majority of candidates made a good effort and produced detailed discussions. However, their discussions on the advantages and disadvantages sometime lacked clarity and achieved Level 1 marks.

Summary of key points

1 – centres must teach all of the specification as it was clear that some candidates had little or no knowledge of some aspects.

2 – candidates need to learn named examples.

3 – candidates need to have a clear understanding of the command words – explain, assess, etc.

4 – many candidates need some guidance on how to structure their answers with regard to the demands of a question – paragraphs, key points, exemplification, development, etc.

5 – plenty of practice in writing and marking answers is advised – peer work sometimes helps.

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 3

General Comments

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 and to ensure that they have a sufficient level of knowledge and understanding.

Comments on individual questions/sections

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 the full range of features as listed in the specification. The use of PowerPoint to produce evidence for this AC is not recommended. It was evident that a significant number of candidates had spent too much time producing presentations rather than summarising the features of different types of destination. Centres should be aware that only a Level 2 Pass can be awarded for this AC.

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 3.2 – 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. Some evidence was submitted in a tabular format. Although this is entirely acceptable to access the lower grades, it was usually the case that candidates were unable to provide sufficient detail and depth in their tables to access the higher 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. 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 that is available. Centres need to provide candidates with a clear understanding of the nature of the destination being studied to ensure that unrealistic suggestions for its development are not proposed. E.g. a theme park in the centre of Bath is not a realistic proposal.

Summary of key points

- Consider carefully how much time candidates should spend on the production of evidence for each AC.
- PowerPoint is only appropriate for the development of evidence in AC 4.3, for which the maximum grade is a Level 2 Pass.
- Understand the requirements for AC 2.2, which should focus on recent and ongoing tourism development in the chosen destination.
- Ensure that candidates appreciate what type of tourism development would be realistic within their chosen destination (AC 4.1 & 4.2).

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 4

General Comments

INTRODUCTION: Although there was only a small number of entries it was pleasing to see many of the candidates gain a Level 2 Pass or higher. Generally, the work produced was neatly presented and well organised and candidate responses to the different ACs were easy to identify.

As in previous years the assignment seemed to motivate the candidates to produce some detailed and interesting reports as well as catering for the full range of abilities.

Comments on individual questions/sections

TASK 1:

AC1.1 – The great majority of candidates gained a Level 1 or Level 2 Pass. The Level 1 descriptions lacked the necessary detail required and were quite basic. All candidates selected appropriate attractions.

AC1.3 – The majority of candidates focused on four tourist types. N.B. centres need to keep to the assignment brief. Many assessments were too brief and gained only a Level 1 Pass.

TASK 2:

AC3.1 - The majority of candidates demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of marketing techniques, but few were able to explain how they might influence tourists' choice of destination.

TASK 3:

AC3.2 – It was pleasing to see that a good number of candidates clearly understood how lifestyles might affect choice of destination.

TASK 4:

AC2.2– The majority of candidates only gained a Level 1 Pass. Although candidates identified factors affecting a tourist's choice of transport to, and within, the suggested destination, answers were often descriptive and lacked explanations.

AC2.3 – The majority of candidates lacked the necessary knowledge and understanding of possible impacts on the suggested destination. Many responses were simple outlines which lacked any analysis.

Summary of key points

Overall, the candidates made a good effort to cover all the ACs. Candidates should be further encouraged to provide detailed descriptions/explanations in order to gain a Level 2 Pass or higher as many responses were far too brief. Centres might also ensure that the candidates are taught the full contents section in the specification.

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 5

General Comments

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.

Comments on individual questions/sections

AC 1.1 – Many candidates described with some exemplification different types of events.

AC 1.2 – Most candidates were able to explain objectives of event tourism, referring to relevant examples.

AC 1.3 – Most candidates could explain the requirements for different types of event.

AC 1.4 – Most candidates could describe how organisations provide requirements for tourism events.

AC 2.1 – Many candidates explained costs to a destination of hosting events. However often the explanations had limited reasoning and were mainly descriptive.

AC 2.2 – It was pleasing to see the majority of candidates assess benefits of hosting events in a mainly well-reasoned way.

AC 3.1 and 3.2 – The reports were mainly well written using language appropriate to purpose and audience with a clear and logical structure.

Summary of key points

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 more appropriate.

Level 1 / Level 2 Tourism

Summer 2019

UNIT 7

General Comments

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.

Comments on individual questions/sections

AC 1.1 – Many candidates described with some exemplification the principles of sustainable tourism.

AC 1.2 – Most candidates were able to explain different ways of encouraging responsible tourism

AC 1.3 – Most candidates could explain how different types of destination achieve sustainable tourism. Explanations were mainly well-reasoned.

AC 2.1 and 2.2 – Many candidates assessed at least some impacts of tourism on a destination and communities.

AC 2.3 – It was pleasing to see the majority of candidates explain how different strategies are used to maximise positive impacts of tourism. Many explanations were well-reasoned.

AC 3.1 and 3.2 – Most candidates could explain how key stakeholders applied the principles of sustainable tourism and how stakeholder objectives impact on tourism development. Explanations showed some reasoning.

Summary of key points

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.

I2-tourism-report-summer-2019-e



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