



External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	Selling Overseas Tourist Destinations
Level	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

Most candidates performed well, with better results in 'Comparisons' on the whole this year, although 'Recommendations' again were not completed satisfactorily.

The 'Evaluation' section, as usual, was not completed well, with around one third of candidates failing to achieve half marks. Candidates should cover all the points given in the specification — some parts were omitted, resulting in loss of marks.

Another part where candidates ignored instructions was linking research findings to their choice of destinations.

Areas in which candidates performed well

The Research Report overall was completed very well, with more than one quarter of the candidates scoring 30 or more marks out of the 40 allocated for this area. The standard of the Case Study Research was also high.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Planning

Time-planning should include dates potential completion dates — some candidates had clearly completed this section at the end of the project and wrote **what they had completed**.

Research Based Report

- 1 As mentioned in the General Comments, candidates ignored instructions on linking research findings to their choice of destinations. 'Written responses to tasks set relating to researched material' (page 9 of specification): this part was disregarded by most candidates, resulting in a loss of marks for this section. Issues from the Case Studies found in the research, ie Wedding Regulations etc, should have been given here.
- 2 Egypt as a suitable destination was, in a few cases, given in the long haul section of the destinations instead of the European and Mediterranean Area section.
- 3 In one case, six European destinations were given instead of a choice between Longhaul and European.
- 4 In a few cases an unsuitable final destination was chosen eg Florida for Case Study 4.
- 5 Selected brochure pages or internet pages were not included to show evidence of where final destinations were chosen from.

- 6 Maps, if printed from the internet, should be annotated with 'extras', eg areas where skiing destinations are etc.
- 7 A lot of candidates clearly did not know how to lay out a contents page. Some did not have any page numbering at all, making the contents page meaningless.

Evaluation

Make sure all points are covered in this section to gain maximum marks.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

General

- 1 Make sure that the correct box is ticked on the reverse side of the flysheet accompanying each project, showing the amount of help given in the planning.
- 2 Students should be shown how to set out a contents page as a separate exercise during the year.
- 3 Maps should be drawn by hand, a blank computer map, or one taken from a suitable website. All should have annotations relating to the case study chosen. It would be helpful if the country/island was shown in relation to the world/Europe, as a map of an island on its own does not show its location in relation to other places.
- 4 Make sure that students remember which case study they are completing and that they make references to wedding regulations, disabled access, vegetarian food and speciality wine, or availability of different types of activities. Some do not mention anything relating to the case study throughout.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	71
------------------------------------	----

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

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 200				
A	10.9%	10.9%	7	140
B	25.0%	35.9%	16	120
C	28.1%	64.1%	18	100
D	9.4%	73.4%	6	90
No award	26.6%	100.0%	17	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that 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, though, very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA 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 Head of Service 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.