



External Assessment Report 2012

Subject(s)	Selling Overseas Tourist Destinations
Level(s)	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

This year once again case study 1 'The Family Holiday' and Case Study 2 'The Wedding' were certainly the most popular case studies chosen by the candidates.

Most candidates performed well, with better results in 'Planning' stage on the whole this year. 'Comparisons' were this year relatively well done but, once again, 'Recommendations' were not completed satisfactorily.

There were some candidates who had printed their 'Comparison & Recommendations' and 'Evaluation' stages but had not included their handwritten notes with their completed projects.

The 'Evaluation' section, as usual, was not completed well, with around two thirds of candidates failing to achieve half marks. Candidates should cover all the points illustrated in the specification — some parts were omitted, eg areas like strengths and weaknesses only briefly touched on, which resulted in loss of marks.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Generally the research reports were completed and presented well, gaining the candidates good marks, along with more handwritten and annotated maps being submitted to a high standard in this section.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Planning

The planning section this year was not well answered. Some candidates missed significant pieces of information, resulting in a loss of marks.

Development

The area of linking the written responses to tasks set relating to the researched material, once more, was fully addressed only by the more articulate candidates.

Recommendations did not gain full marks for candidates who completed the Comparisons section but failed to fully address the recommendations area. This resulted in a loss of more than half marks in this section by the majority of candidates this year.

Evaluation

This section was poorly answered — two thirds of the candidates failed to meet half marks in this section. Candidates answered the questions in this area briefly, and this was clearly

shown by the poor results achieved this year. 'Strengths and Weaknesses' and 'Extent responses meet requirements' were the two most poorly answered.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- ◆ Centres should ensure they have a current marking scheme.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that they remind the candidates of which case study they have chosen and to make references to the specific requirements of their customers in their Research based report.
- ◆ Centres should make sure that candidates who submit a word processed piece of invigilated work should also include the candidates original hand written copy and A4 notes for the examiner.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that candidates include evidence of where the actual holidays were found, ie brochure page or internet printout, etc.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2011	64
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2012	38
------------------------------------	----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 100				
A	26.3%	26.3%	10	140
B	18.4%	44.7%	7	120
C	28.9%	73.7%	11	100
D	0.0%	73.7%	0	90
No award	26.3%	100.0%	10	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- ◆ Each year SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.
- ◆ SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.