

Examiners' Report/  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2013

GCE Travel and Tourism (6993)  
Unit 7: Travelling Safely

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2013

Publications Code UA035413

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwant to/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

## **Paper Introduction**

Questions were set to assess students' learning of the content of the specification given in the 'what you need to learn section'. Questions were devised to meet the requirements of the Assessment Objectives (AO) which are given on page 167 of the specification.

There were 90 marks available on this paper.

Quality of written communication was tested on two questions (1d) and 2b). The paper consisted of matching, short answer and extended writing style questions.

The question paper was divided into three questions. Questions 1 and 2 were based on case studies. Question 1 concerned plans for a new resort in a more economically developed country (MEDC) on a country estate at Pantglas Hall, near the Brecon Beacons National Park in Wales and question 2 focused upon an overseas destination in a less economically developed country (LEDC) Kaziranga National Park, Assam in India. As in previous series question 3 concerned the Impacts and Management of Tourism and Responsible Tourism. Each question was worth 30 marks and within each question, the more challenging questions targeting AO3 and AO4 were towards the end of each section.

## **Summary of Candidate Performance**

### **Improvements**

The question paper worked well in discriminating students. The more able students produced some excellent responses across the paper demonstrating high level skills and sound understanding of the content of the unit specification gaining full marks in some questions. Overall students attempted all of the questions, although there were a few blank responses particularly where knowledge of terms given in the unit specification was tested such as 1a(ii), 3b and 3c. It was pleasing to see the vast majority of students coped well with a slightly different style of questioning provided by 3d. Most students offered detailed responses and clearly engaged well with both case studies in questions 1 and 2. There was evidence of centres accessing guidance offered in previous examiner reports and students demonstrated a range of good exam techniques in terms of planning responses to the questions testing skills and QWC.

### **Key issues**

One recurring factor is that some students simply do not know some of the unit content and terms. This was particularly evident in questions 1a, 3b and 3c where knowledge of the terms in the specification is tested. Whilst most 'had a go', many students did not attempt some questions, leaving the answer space blank.

Another reason some students do not score well is due to the reference to the principles of responsible tourism verbatim across the paper. Students should be aware that knowledge of the principles will only be tested and credited once. On this paper it was tested in Q2a. They should be aware of the structure of the paper and the key focus of each question 1, 2 and 3. Also that if they repeat their answers they have not answered the questions correctly. Many students quoted the principles as objectives in Q1b), impacts Q1d) and Q2b), in the code for tourism in Q2c) and as 'justification' in Q3d). Examiners will only credit understanding of the principles in those questions directly targeting this knowledge.

As reported in previous series not answering the question or following the command was evident again - this was seen most frequently in Q2c(i) and Q3d.

The poor quality of some handwriting is another issue that examiners commented on again this series as some responses were barely legible. Students are also strongly advised to use a black ball point pen and take care with their writing.

## **Candidate Performance**

### **Question 1**

This question looked at agents, objectives and impacts of tourism development; and the tourist area life cycle model.

#### **1a)(i)**

Almost all of the students correctly identified the stage of the TALC model.

#### **1a)(ii)**

This was fairly well answered with around half of students gaining the full three marks. There was a clear difference in performance between those students who had studied the key characteristics of the stages and wrote precisely and those who hadn't. The latter offered vague statements or guessed or else gave characteristics of the Involvement and/or the Consolidation stages.

#### **1b)**

This was not always particularly well answered. Similar questions have been asked previously. On this paper for full marks responses should have been applied to the Welsh government. It seems objectives of tourism development are still not well understood. Many students were not able to write their response as objectives, and they went on to describe or gave lengthy explanations rather than simply offering a succinct statement. Others worded their response as one of the principles of responsible tourism and suggested 'to improve the quality of life' rather than suggesting appropriate economic and political objectives. Care needs to be taken when reading the questions. In such questions students should offer objectives in terms of what governments aim to achieve through developing tourism – economically, politically, culturally or environmentally.

#### **1c)(i)**

Most scored well and gained full marks. Although some thought that Cadw was a voluntary sector organisation.

### 1c)(ii)

Students had clearly engaged well with the scenario and many offered some excellent responses here. Overall half gained five marks or more. It was pleasing to see that many did relate their responses to Pantglas Hall rather than offering generic responses that have been seen in the past. Some students did not describe the roles instead offering explanations and tended to score less well. The roles of Cadw and Carmarthenshire County Council were generally answered well, however with regards to SNTM candidates tended to re-write the case study and did not describe their role as an organisation in the proposed new tourism development at Pantglas Hall. The more able wrote more successful responses about petitions and campaigning. Some students explained what sector each organisation belonged to yet this had been identified in the previous question.

#### **Examiner Tip for learners:**

Make sure you know the different national agents of tourism development in the UK and which sectors they belong to. You should be able to describe these organisations' aims/objectives as well as what their role in tourism and tourism development is.

### 1d)

In general students answered this question well with over two thirds achieving marks at the top of Level 1 up to mid Level 2. QWC was also tested on this question and it proved useful to discriminate between the ability levels of the students. Whilst all students successfully used the information given in the case study in their responses, few students gained marks in Level 3 largely due to a tendency to consider all possible and some theoretical impacts rather than considering the wider impacts and the less obvious ones. For instance, despite it being apparent in the stimulus the locals were against the proposals very few referred to this in Q1d). The more able tended to refer more closely to the stimulus and the less obvious impacts such as 'leakage' due to developers being based in China and the scale in terms of the car park, visual intrusion and impacts on the existing holiday lodge owners. A number of scripts that scored well overall gave evidence of students planning the content and structure of their response to this question through notations made. The less able referred to 'congestion', 'overcrowding', 'destroying peace and quiet/wildlife', '70 jobs for locals' and sometimes included some inappropriate impacts 'loss of culture'. That said, it was very encouraging that no response Level 1 marks were awarded as all students had applied their response and offered some analysis accessing Level 2.

#### **Examiner Tip for learners:**

When faced with such questions you need to **Select** the key pieces of information from the case study, quite often less is more in terms of impacts and more detailed consideration of well selected impacts can gain higher scores than simply including all those you know. **Structure** your response, avoiding disjointed responses, make notes on the paper - are you going to consider all the positives first and then the negatives? Demonstrate your **Skill** – in this case that you can analyse information. So start with an introduction, then apply and make links to the stimulus, use sentences such as - 'this means that'; 'the consequence of this will be that'

and develop your ideas to show you are analysing. Always finish off with a conclusion related to your analysis.

## **Question 2**

This question looked at the principles of responsible tourism and tiger tourism in India.

### **2a)(i)**

This question was in general well answered by many who correctly identified two principles.

### **2a)(ii)**

This question was generally well answered by many. The wording of the question helped many students focus their response on what developers and governments can do and there were fewer explanations relating to what tourists could do than seen in previous series. Some students failed to gain full marks as they did not offer a full explanation, for instance writing about 'educating tourists' but not saying how this would be achieved.

### **2b)**

This was quite well answered by many students, most of whom were able to access marks in Level 2 by demonstrating some basic analysis and applying their responses to the case study information. However few accessed Level 3 marks. Most referred to tigers being protected from poachers by tourists being present, however on the whole many responses were quite simplistic 'jeep safaris causing erosion', 'destroying habitats', 'locals can get a job'. So whilst most considered the park and its people they often gave more generic analysis rather than making greater use of the information provided. The more successful responses were seen where students considered the poverty the local people live in and the importance of their culture as well as the small scale of the tourist accommodation and its local Karbi style. Good responses were also seen from students who considered the problems caused by following tigers and their lack of fear of humans.

### **Examiner Tip for learners:**

The information in case studies such as 'Tiger Tourism in India' is there to be used. Look for clues and then apply it to what you know.

### **2c)(i)**

This question was well answered by those students who had read the question carefully and understood what was required and many scored full marks. It discriminated well between ability levels as intended. The fact that tigers are ferocious wild animals did not appear to have been fully understood by some students who suggested 'do not touch the tigers'. The concept of a nature/tiger reserve was also not always well understood. The less able students often made inappropriate suggestions relating to the local people or what tourists should do e.g. 'buy local'; these were not relevant to protecting the populations of Bengal tigers. It was felt that these less able students had not recognised this was a code for the reserves to protect the

Bengal tiger, not a Code of Conduct for tourists as seen on some past papers. Most did gain two or three marks for ideas focused on limiting the numbers of safaris/tourists, however many gave repeat ideas which did not score. High scores were achieved by students who gave suggestions relating to 'closed seasons', 'exclusion zones', 'being accompanied by guides', 'collecting donations', 'not following tigers', 'needing permits' and so on.

### **2c)(ii)**

Scores in this question very much depended upon the appropriateness of suggestions given in 2ci). Where the suggestions in 2ci) were repetitive, explanations similarly referred simply to the tigers 'not being disturbed' or 'scared' and these may have only picked up 1 mark. Where a range of different ideas and suggestions were provided in 2ci) explanations were well reasoned. Some high scores were achieved here by the most able students who had fully recognised the requirements of the question and thought about the wider issues of tiger reserves protecting the Bengal tiger population.

### **Examiner Tip for learners:**

Read all questions very carefully so that you know exactly what is required. The whole of 2c was worth 12 marks, misreading the question could have proven costly in terms of overall scores. This question may have looked similar to those you may have studied in your revision classes however the focus here was not on what tourists should do, it was about how to manage tiger reserves if tourists are allowed to continue to visit.

## **Question 3**

This question looks at impacts of tourism and how they are managed.

### **3a)**

This was a new type of question and not well answered by the majority. Just under half failed to gain any marks. It did discriminate candidates well however. The less able gave examples of tourist destinations that have been rejuvenated, and perhaps appeared on past papers for example Bournemouth. Again this may have been caused by students not reading the question carefully or due to limited knowledge of this particular impact. The more able students clearly recognised that examiners would be looking for 'derelict areas' and gave appropriate examples including Liverpool Docks, the Eden Project and a range of more local examples. Around one quarter did gain both marks.

### **3b)**

This question generated a good range of marks and over half achieved between four and six marks. Both impacts have appeared on previous papers and where students clearly knew them and understood them well full marks were gained – some excellent responses were seen. Staged Authenticity has not been tested recently however and a significant number of students were not able to answer the question at all. Those that did tended to use examples from past mark schemes such as the Masai Mara or Greek plate smashing and Flamenco dancing to illustrate their answers. Most students were able to explain leakage. The less able had a reasonable



understanding that through 'leakage' money from tourism is somehow lost but the explanations as to why were sometimes unclear and students referred to imports or relied on an example to gain marks.

**Examiner Tip for learners:**

When giving examples use travel and tourism related examples such as all inclusive hotels, international hotel chains, rather than UK based supermarkets or fast food chains. The question referred to impacts in the LEDW and so examples of Scottish bagpipes are also not appropriate.

**3c) (i)**

This strategy has been tested before, however it was not particularly well answered by many, whose responses related to congestion charges and pollution; around one quarter failed to score any marks. Where students seemed more familiar with the term and recognised that planning control is used to protect landscapes scores were better. Again many gave examples - the most popular being coastal resorts that have restricted the height of buildings and national parks that control what is built and where.

**3c) (ii)**

This question was not well answered by many students and just under half did not gain any marks. Many students 'had a go' but most seemed unfamiliar with the term and seemed unaware that this process takes place before development starts. Those that did know the term generally scored well and achieved 3 or 4 marks.

**3d)**

This question was fairly well answered by many and generated a good range of marks and achievement between abilities. In some ways it is a new style of question that required careful reading, but offered a great opportunity to boost overall scores. Similar questions relating to tour operators and hotels have appeared on previous papers but this widened the scope. The most able students recognised what the question required and provided well justified responses. For 'information' responses related to how the information would be passed to holidaymakers, 'welcome meeting', 'websites' and what it would contain – popular ideas related to local culture, what to wear etc. Under 'transfers' the more able referred to employing local people as drivers or guides or the use of energy efficient transport and fewer journeys. However for 'accommodation' many wrote about what a hotel could do rather than considering the tour operator's role, again only the most able suggested that tour operators could support and promote locally owned hotels, not having all inclusive. Some also suggested promoting 'Farmstays' and 'agrotourism' or staying with locals. It was noticeable that the less able (as mentioned previously) provided justifications that simply said 'this will improve their quality of life' with very limited reasoning. The most able related their suggestions more persuasively, for instance in terms of reducing negative impacts. They demonstrated a good understanding of responsible tourism that was implied rather than rewriting the principles that had already been credited in Q2a.

**Examiner Tip for learners:**

Remember you should not need to keep restating the principles of tourism across this paper. Only give the principles as per the unit specification for

example 'promoting respect between locals and tourists' in the question where you are asked to 'identify' or 'describe' the principles, ie in Q2a(i) on this paper. Other questions such as this which refer to responsible tourism are looking at a much wider scope. Justifications could be 'this will allow tourists and locals to interact' or 'by involving local people they are more likely to welcome tourists'. Think of other justifications for each of the four principles so you are prepared for the more general questions on responsible tourism. Stating a principle will not gain you any marks if you have been asked to 'justify'.

## **Summary**

Whilst this paper proved quite a challenge to many it did successfully discriminate between abilities. It was evident that some students were prepared for the exam and utilised good exam techniques to maximise performance. It was pleasing to see some well structured analytical responses where the higher level skills were tested. The weakest areas continue to be where knowledge of the unit terms is tested.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

