TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Paper 0471/01
Written Paper

General comments

There was quite a large entry for this examination session and it is pleasing to note that candidate performance is starting to reflect the advice given to Centres in previous reports. Candidates are starting to demonstrate both an understanding and an appreciation of the international Travel and Tourism industry at a variety of scales. It was pleasing to see accurate reference being made to developments in a variety of locations, particularly the candidate's own local area. There were some outstanding scripts but there was a very wide variation between Centres in terms of the level of candidate performance.

There are still far too many instances of candidates ignoring the precise wording of individual questions and more specific comments will be made in the following sections. Many candidates appear to struggle with the actual requirements of particular questions and Centres are now once again encouraged to make the following **"Key Word"** definitions part of their examination preparation sessions.

Key Words	Meaning/expectation
Identify	Simply name, state or list.
Describe	State the characteristic features of something.
Explain	Make the meaning of something clear by providing appropriate valid details.
Discuss (includes the ability to *analyse*)	Provide evidence or opinions about something arriving at a balanced conclusion. The candidate is being asked to consider an issue and is thus expected to present arguments and evidence to support particular points of view and to come to a **conclusion**.
Evaluate (this also includes the ability to *analyse*)	To judge from available evidence and arrive at a reasoned **conclusion**. The candidate is expected to present a number of factors or issues and then weigh up their relative significance or importance.

Candidates who are unable to respond in an appropriate way to these command verbs will always have difficulty in obtaining the higher marks for questions that are assessed by means of 'Levels of Response'. There was very little evidence that candidates were attempting to end their answers to the last part of each of the four questions with any form of **conclusion**. A **valid** conclusion, based on the previous points made or considered, is clear evidence of evaluation taking place and will thus usually warrant a score in Level 3 (5-6 marks).

Most candidates were able to answer all four questions within the time available.

Comments on the individual questions

Comments on candidate response

Question 1

(a) (i) The interpretation of the photograph produced a clear differentiation, with some candidates failing to spot obvious features. For example, the shaded children's pool was frequently identified as a Jacuzzi.

(ii) Most candidates correctly talked about the pollution associated with boats but fewer made reference to the small size of the beach.

(b) Many candidates made little reference to monitoring and it was only the minority of answers that gave any consideration to the use of surveys, questionnaires, complaint analysis or direct observation by managers.

(c) Many sound answers, but too many candidates do not understand the term **ancillary service**. Only the better candidates referred to foreign exchange, tour desk, car hire, theatre reservations and concierge advice etc.

(d) Many candidates achieved either Level 1 or Level 2 by identifying and explaining key socio-cultural impacts. However, far too many individuals tended to list as many impacts as they could think of rather that trying to discuss which were most significant and why. Weaker answers tended to include irrelevant economic and environmental information.

Question 2

(a) Very straightforward and most answers scored full marks.

(b) Too many answers relied on copying from Figure 2, using the ideas of clubs and cultural events which tended to show a lack of understanding. There were some very perceptive comments from other candidates that mentioned cost and walking being better suited to younger visitors that gained the appropriate credit.

(c) Most candidates missed the significance of the tour starting outside a central Prague attraction and ideas of an accessible, well known, central location were never really well explained.

(d) This was much better attempted and candidates were able to supply a range of appropriate skills and qualities.

(e) This question could have been done a lot better and many candidates tended to ignore the word *before* and almost all candidates did __not__ attempt to **evaluate** the sources of information that were identified. Clearly, this question was asking which source is most useful and why.

Question 3

(a)(i) The vast majority of candidates were able to correctly identify the price.

(ii) The correct answer was the Airbus 340-500 and a large minority of candidates were unable to state this in full.

(iii) There were some excellent answers based on fixed timetables and ticket flexibility. However, far too many candidates offered vague statements about taking off on time and comments about cost/price that could apply to any air service.

(b)(i) Many candidates were able to suggest shopping as being the activity shown on Figure 3.

(ii) The advantages of using taxis for tourist-related activities were quite well understood and there were frequent references to flexibility and door-to-door travel etc.

(c)(i) There were many good responses to this but weaker candidates tended to ignore the idea of business passengers. Furthermore, a significant minority tended to copy phrases from Figure 3 that did not really make much sense. Better responses focused on features of business class air travel mentioning check-in speed, lounge access and cabin services appropriate to business travel needs.

(ii) Frequent valid reference to conference facilities and support services saw many candidates score well in this section. However, other candidates seemed unaware of such services.

(d)   This tended to be very poorly attempted and candidates were quite unfamiliar with the concept of an airport being accessible to the urban area in which it is located. Few answers were able to progress beyond Level 1 because road/rail links were not given much emphasis. Far too many candidates concentrated on air services and the airport's international accessibility – this was not the question. The more able candidates were able to reflect on their local airport and provide some detail as to how travellers were able to make their way there. However, there was little indication as to the relative significance of the methods mentioned and thus Level 3 could not be awarded.

Question 4

(a) (i)   Comparatively few candidates were able to identify the Straits of Malacca from Figure 4.

(ii)   This was correctly answered by the vast majority of candidates.

(iii)   This was also correctly answered by most candidates.

(b)   There were some excellent responses and most candidates were able to correctly identify appropriate facilities and services. However, the level of explanation offered was rather variable.

(c)   There were many full mark answers and most candidates had little difficulty in finding the correct accommodation types. However, some candidates did not really understand the term accommodation and listed general features of the cruise ship.

(d)   There were very few full mark answers and most candidates were unable to talk about the different stages of the booking process as itemised in the syllabus document.

(e)   This tended to be very poorly attempted and few candidates had precise knowledge about a destination that was a cruise ship port of call. Even when an area such as the Caribbean or Mediterranean was correctly identified as a cruise circuit, specific detail of the area's appeal was **not** supplied. Furthermore, even better candidates could not comment about the relative importance/significance of the factors that were identified. This made it difficult for many candidates to progress above Level 1, let alone approach Level 3.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

| Paper 0471/02 |
| Alternative to Coursework |

General comments

The cohort for this examination was, on the whole, able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the principles of marketing and promotion within a travel and tourism context and had been adequately prepared for the demands of the examination paper.

The examination, as is always the case, was divided into 4 questions, each worth 25 marks. Each sub-set of questions within the four main questions is based upon a case study scenario. **Question 1** used the cruise market as a focus. **Question 2** examined communication issues within the marketing process, whilst tourism development in Hong Kong formed the basis for **Question 3**. **Question 4** tested candidates' understanding of the price and place elements of the marketing mix.

There was some evidence to show that candidates were able to transfer knowledge acquired in the classroom with better performing candidates being able to use it in an applied manner through these case study type questions. Most candidates had sufficient time in which to answer all of the questions within the examination as well as being able to use the space provided in the question paper for their answers, without needing to continue on additional pages.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

The scenario for this set of questions related specifically to the cruise market. Candidates were provided with a graph as stimulus material.

(a) (i) Candidates were asked to identify the way in which the market had been segmented from the data from the table. A good proportion of responses were able to use the correct terminology for the type of segmentation used, although weaker candidates named the dominant segment rather than the segmentation method.

(ii) This question required candidates to suggest ways in which the information about different target segments could be used by cruise operators.

(b) (i) Many candidates were able to identify market research techniques, but only a relatively small number were able to describe the techniques they chose.

(ii) The responses here varied significantly – many candidates merely listed characteristics of any research technique, with only the better performing candidates being able to clearly reference specific advantages of one chosen technique.

(c) Most responses correctly identified that the cruise market is in growth or maturity, with many answers clearly demonstrating an understanding of popularity as a factor of growth.

(d) Few candidates achieved maximum marks. Weaker candidates confused the term 'product/service mix' with the term 'marketing mix' and produced lengthy descriptions of the 4 P's. These responses could not be credited, as they did not answer the question. Some candidates provided detailed descriptions of the characteristics of products and services but were unable to apply this within the context of the product/service mix of the cruise industry. These responses were awarded low-level marks. There was only a small number of instances amongst those who did understand the question, in which more than an extended list of products and services was

submitted. The key verb 'discuss' required a more detailed and analytical approach to this question.

(e) This level of response question is similar to ones regularly appearing on examination papers for this module. However, this was no guarantee of high quality answers. Many candidates continue to list the reasons for marketing and promotion being important to the travel and tourism industries, in the same format as they appear in the assessment objectives for the unit. There is very limited evidence to show that candidates understand what they are writing, and even less evidence of candidates being able to apply this understanding to a specific travel and tourism context such as the cruise industry.

Question 2

The series of questions within this sub-set were based around the concept of marketing communications and the promotion element of the marketing mix.

(a) (i) Very few candidates understood what 'public relations' are. Most responses were vague – 'relating to the public', which scored no marks. This concept forms an integral part of the specification and requires greater teaching, to ensure that more candidates are familiar with this particular marketing tool.

(ii) Inevitably, because of the difficulties encountered by most candidates in their understanding of the term public relations, many were unable to score marks here by providing accurate examples of PR exercises. Better performing candidates understood the connection between PR and the media, but were not always able to articulate this in an appropriate manner.

(b) Printed publicity materials were understood by the majority of candidates, but relatively few provided good quality answers to this question. At the top end, candidates were able to identify and explain the benefits of printed publicity materials. In the middle range, responses tended to be very general and did not consider why the T&T industry use so many leaflets as a main means of communicating with customers.

(c) Candidates were offered an opportunity to score 8 marks for their application of the AIDA principle. There were many candidates who were able to score maximum marks for this exercise, but equally there were many candidates who scored only 4 marks out of 8 for the identification of what the acronym AIDA stands for.

(d) Many candidates answered this question on brand image in a generic fashion, talking more about marketing and advertising of airline companies, rather than focusing on the specific ways in which brand image can play its part e.g. through the use of logos, company uniforms etc.

Question 3

This question used the Hong Kong Tourism Authority as a focus, requiring candidates to consider SWOT and PEST analyses within a real context, as well as looking at the marketing mix for a given tourism product. The final sub-question in this series examined the characteristics of the total tourism product, which makes it unique from other products.

(a) The majority of candidates scored maximum marks for this question, which required them to identify the four sections of a PEST analysis.

(b) This question proved to be the most challenging of all on the question paper for the majority of candidates. It was expected that candidates would select either the weakness or the opportunity from the given stimulus as a priority, however many chose the threat of bird flu and subsequently struggled to answer the question from a marketing and promotion perspective. Of those candidates who did select an appropriate priority, many of the responses were well written in terms of what tourism providers could do to improve tourism provision, but only the better performing candidates were able to consider the issue of partnership working, in order to access the higher grades in Level 3.

(c) This question required candidates to develop a marketing mix for a chosen product from those identified by the Hong Kong Tourism Authority. It was disappointing to note only a small number of candidates achieving maximum marks for this question – many either identified the four elements of the marketing mix correctly but did not then go on to apply these to their chosen product, or wrote in detail about the product and forgot to mention the other elements of the marketing mix.

(d)(i) Most candidates were able to correctly identify the characteristics of intangibility, to score either one or two marks out of two for this question.

(ii) This question posed some difficulty for candidates. It required them to explain why products and services of the travel and tourism industry are difficult to describe – many focused only on the intangibility aspect to repeat their answer from the previous question.

Question 4

This question was unlike the others for this paper, as it did not have an industry scenario as a focus. Instead, candidates were required to discuss aspects of the price and place elements of the marketing mix.

(a)(i) Better performing candidates correctly identified the pricing policy as the going-rate, but many seemed to name any pricing policy they were familiar with e.g. prestige pricing, market skimming etc.

(ii) Responses to this question varied. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a basic level of understanding that discount pricing is used to attract more customers, but few went on to elaborate the reason why discount pricing usually occurs in the travel and tourism industry – i.e. when a product has failed to perform well in the market and is close to expiry.

(b) As has often been the case with this type of question, many responses about external factors affecting the pricing policies used in the travel industry were in basic list format or comprised of many internal factors such as funding, target market etc. There were however, several examples of excellent responses which considered a wide mix of the factors that influenced the pricing decisions of travel providers.

(c)(i) With only one or two exceptions, candidates did not use the stimulus before this question effectively to explain the most common chain of distribution for package holidays, developed to respond to the changing needs of customers – i.e. the Internet and online booking systems. Instead, the majority of candidates provided details of the traditional chain of distribution, involving tour operators and travel agents. (These were not always accurately in sequence) with rarely a mention of direct selling. Marks were still awarded for a traditional chain of distribution.

(ii) The flow diagram should have had the Internet as the medium through which direct selling is achieved, but was rarely in evidence. Instead, the majority of responses showed the chain involving tour operators and travel agents – often replicating exactly what had been written in the preceding answer. The expectation was that **Question 4 (c) (i)** would obtain a description of direct selling, and **Question 4 (c) (ii)** would show the process as a flow diagram. The reality was that sometimes duplicate responses were made in both sub-questions.

(d) This last question on the paper offered candidates a chance to demonstrate their knowledge of locational factors within an applied context. As has often been the case in the past, the majority of responses listed the factors almost directly from the assessment objectives, with few examples of application in evidence. This inevitably restricts the marks that candidates can achieve for a question asking them to 'evaluate' – a priority of factors is expected, with justification and reasoning – much more than a basic list.