



General Certificate of Education

Travel and Tourism 8651/8653

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- Advanced Subsidiary Single Award
- Advanced Subsidiary Double Award

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2006 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

Contents

GCE Travel and Tourism

TT01 Inside Travel and Tourism 5

TT05 Marketing in Travel and Tourism 7

Principal Moderator’s Report 10

Mark Range and Award of Grades 17

This page has been left intentionally blank

TT01 – Inside Travel and Tourism

General comments

This was the second operational paper for this specification. Although there was some overall improvement in the level of performance in comparison with the January paper, this improvement was only marginal. Many candidates were still not confident in their use and understanding of key terms and concepts and they found it extremely difficult to apply their knowledge and understanding to vocationally relevant situations. Additionally, many candidates were unable to express themselves sufficiently clearly to access the higher levels of marks.

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to identify two reasons why the Blue Lagoon is a popular attraction and the majority made good use of the resource provided. Weaker candidates quoted inappropriately from the resource.
- (b) Although most candidates correctly identified two other categories of visitor attraction, some were confused between purpose-built and man-made. Some candidates included examples of attractions, which were not required.
- (c) Most candidates were able to identify at least one positive economic impact of increasing visitor numbers to the Blue Lagoon. Many failed to develop their answer sufficiently to score all of the available marks and some overstated the benefits, suggesting that increased visitor numbers would solve all of Iceland's economic problems.
- (d) Although the majority of candidates were able to access Level 1 on this question, many were unable to develop their answers sufficiently to access Level 2. In particular, case study examples were poorly described, with many candidates describing how theme parks increased the number of rides rather than considering the developments at destinations.

Question 2

- (a) Disappointingly, many candidates seemed unaware of the significance of holiday camps in the development of the travel and tourism industry and appeared to be unaware of their importance in making holidays accessible to more and more people.
- (b) Although most candidates were aware of the changing needs and expectations of the customers of holiday camps/centres, they could not exemplify these with sufficient clarity to access the higher levels of marks. Only a minority of candidates were able to develop the concept of competition, both from destinations outside the UK and from new organisations providing similar products.

Question 3

The majority of candidates did not pay enough attention to the words “such as” in the question and confined their answer to the event covered in the resource. Those candidates writing more expansively about the need to consider factors such as access and congestion, the availability of suitable accommodation, and the wider impacts on the destination such as the nature of the event, were able to access higher marks.

Question 4

- (a) The majority of candidates, although by no means all, were able to identify three services provided by travel agents and scored well on this question.
- (b) Most were able to offer some form of explanation of the key differences between independent and multiple travel agents and were able to offer examples of each type to exemplify their answer. However, it did appear that a minority of candidates had no knowledge of the differences between the two and in some cases discussed the differences between independent travellers and those taking package holidays!
- (c) Many candidates focused on how new technologies are being used by customers, and went on to discuss the consequences for travel agents. What was required was a clear understanding of the ways in which travel agents are making use of a range of new technologies in their operations.

Question 5

- (a) This question illustrated a lack of understanding of the differences between commercial and non-commercial organisations. Many candidates could not apply any understanding they had about commercial organisations to the resource and the precise question. Some were able to discuss the provision of catering and accommodation along the trails, the provision of maps and guides, the provision of specialist equipment and the development of transport options relating to accessing the trails.
- (b) Very few candidates were able to correctly identify three tourism products which have been developed in recent years. Many felt that providing the names of three attractions would be a correct answer to the question.
- (c) Some candidates failed to mention any organisation in their answer or focused on an organisation from the commercial sector. Better answers offered some explanation of the role of the organisation but few could offer any form of evaluation of the role it plays. Some of the best answers attempted to outline and evaluate the roles of organisations such as VisitBritain or the National Trust.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates were able to offer reasonable suggestions for the growth in winter sports holidays and scored at least one mark for this question.
- (b) The majority of answers to this question made no reference to areas where winter sports holidays are taken, with most candidates producing only generic answers about increasing employment opportunities or conflict.
- (c) Again, candidates could not apply their knowledge of external pressures on the travel and tourism industry to the precise question. Most were able to identify at least one external pressure, but the majority were not able to consider potential external pressures in relation to winter sports destinations. Even the concept that global warming might lead to less snowfall and a decline in visitors was only mentioned by a relatively small number of candidates.

Question 7

The majority of candidates, although by no means all, were able to offer simplistic definitions of responsible and eco-tourism. Far less were able to consider the precise demands of the question and explain why tour operators are offering more of this type of holiday. Hardly any candidates considered different types of operator, from mass-market operators to specialist and niche operators and their response to the trend towards responsible tourism.

TT05 – Marketing in Travel and Tourism

General Comments

Candidates needed sufficient time before sitting the examination to work on the content of the pre-release material. They should not be expected to understand it all for themselves but need to be led through it and provided with an interpretation in the context of marketing. Many candidates evidently needed advice on the significance of certain sections of the pre-release material, since they gave too much weight to, for example, the website, and safety issues at the expense of marketing activities and the SWOT analysis. Candidates also need to have the implications of the material explained to them; for example, the fact that the whole Causeway Coast area is marketed because the Giant's Causeway alone is an attraction with a short 'dwell time'.

Candidates also need sufficient teaching time on marketing in general. Some candidates entered the exam unable to show that they knew the meaning of, for example, market segments, PEST, promotion, AIDA, etc., or lacked specific knowledge of promotional activities in their chosen travel and tourism organisations.

Question 1

- (a) Candidates who were unable to provide the simple terms 'marketing mix' or 'the 4 Ps' may well be those who were not yet sufficiently prepared to enter this examination.
- (b) The 'product' can mean literally what the visitors come to see (the hexagonal stones), with secondary attractions such as the teashop and audio visual presentation. Candidates wrote lists of these which varied in comprehensiveness and detail. However, it was hoped that they would also consider which aspects of the product have appeal for potential customers, and which have therefore been identified for promotional campaigns. Examples include the legend, mystery, wildness and grandeur of the area, and the intangible experience of standing on a unique geological phenomenon.

Furthermore, the Giant's Causeway is the major attraction that draws in visitors to see other attractions in the district and indeed the whole of Northern Ireland (which, as it happened, was being marketed on television at the time of the examination, using images of the Causeway with great visual appeal).

- (c) A number of candidates adopted an unexpected approach to this question, focusing on how the product could be marketed through travel trade exhibitions, leaflets, websites and TV adverts, etc, and discussing the strengths and weaknesses of employing those techniques. Instead, they needed to explain factors, such as its remoteness within the UK or its striking visual appearance, which make the Causeway simultaneously difficult and easy to market. The command word was 'explain', so candidates needed to do more than state factors but should provide reasons in their answer as to why the Causeway is either easy or difficult to market.

Question 2

- (a) For the most part, candidates interpreted the scarcity of four-star accommodation as an inconvenience for customers. However, the emphasis of the SWOT is upon the conditions in which organisations in the Causeway Coast area have to market themselves to visitors, so the question was about the scarcity of four-star accommodation as a weakness for *them*; thus, the region would be less equipped to attract high-spend visitors or benefit from their secondary spending and the multiplier effect.
- (b) These two answers could be simply derived from the SWOT analysis.
- (c) Candidates fell into two groups: firstly, those who had little idea that this section of a PEST analysis describes the economic background against which a travel and tourism organisation operates; and, secondly, those who did recognise that the currency exchange rate, rate of inflation, Government funding, price of fuel, etc, are the economic conditions which have an important indirect effect on the operation of attractions such as the Giant's Causeway. Hence, those who scored marks tended to score highly.
- (d) This question required candidates to look at other travel and tourism organisations, so answers about the Giant's Causeway or other **leisure** organisations (fitness gyms, leisure centres) were not appropriate. Some answers explained very clearly how computerised booking, the availability of information and automated feedback on customer behaviour are a boon to organisations operating online. Indeed, the majority of answers focused on the impact of the internet on marketing. Significant though this is, there were other possible approaches to the answer. Candidates who wrote about technological changes to the product - updating a museum by using technology to make it more interactive, for example, or renewing a theme park ride - needed to remain relevant by relating to marketing, showing how the appeal was renewed to attract new and return customers.
- (e) Candidates needed to identify not just visitor types but also the other organisations (such as coach and cruise companies) to whom the Causeway is marketed, and compare these with the key market segments for an organisation of their own choice. It seemed that a small number of candidates did not yet know the meaning of the term 'market segments' and wrote instead about other aspects of their chosen organisation that were not relevant, including those who interpreted 'segment' as meaning the share of the tourism market.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were asked to find *patterns* rather than isolated facts from the tables, and needed to write about *coach* arrivals, rather than cars or numbers of visitors.
- (b) This question, unlike the last, was about *coach visitors* rather than coaches or coach companies for which information had already been given in the tables. Candidates needed to show what could be done with the information that would be useful in marketing, rather than simply elaborate on the nature of the information gathered. For example, whilst finding out the origin of its visitors does enable the Giant's Causeway to know its catchment area, the candidate should go on to say why this is useful information. A simple match would have sufficed between a type of information and a clear explanation of its usefulness.
- (c) Candidates needed to write a brief outline describing each method they chose, before weighing up the strengths or lack of them for each method. In order to evaluate, candidates should have given an idea of the importance of the strengths and weaknesses they described and whether overall the method was a strong one. As in question 3(b), candidates often wasted time, writing up to five lines which re-stated the question, before naming their first method.

Question 4

- (a) It was expected that most candidates would make use of the AIDA technique, which is in the specification, in order to analyse the two publicity leaflets, but relatively few did so. Candidates should not write about whether they personally find each leaflet effective but answer from the perspective of the customer type to which the leaflet is aimed.
- (b) A significant number of candidates scored low marks on this question. There were only three marketing activities aimed at coach tour operators and mostly it appeared that candidates had not been taught what these entailed. Some thought, for example, that the general public would read coach trade journals or would attend the coach operators' trade fair. Relatively few candidates understood that familiarisation coach tours for the press may lead to published articles which the public will read and so be encouraged to book a coach tour to the Giant's Causeway. The key way in which the activities help to achieve the objectives is when coach companies add the Giant's Causeway to their itinerary but there was much else that could also be explained.
- (c) Any organisation's website gives it worldwide reach and a website is potentially an almost limitless source of information for customers, so the question looked for candidates to go further than this.
- (d) Some candidates described a good range of promotional activities from their chosen organisation but could not find differences from, or similarities to, those of the Giant's Causeway. There was an overemphasis on advertising campaigns whereas promotional activities can also include brochures containing sales promotions such as incentives, competitions, special offers, coupons, discounts, events and so on. Many candidates had not yet learned about specific promotional methods used by their chosen organisation.

Principal Moderator's Report

General Comments

2006 saw the first moderation for GCE Travel and Tourism at AS level. Centres submitted work from the three mandatory Single Award units and, for the Double Award, the mandatory Unit 4 (Working in Travel and Tourism) and either Unit 6 (Tourism in the UK) or Unit 7 (Overseas Destinations Study). Approximately 26% of centres entered candidates for the Double Award and about 2/3 of these opted for Unit 7 in preference to Unit 6.

GCE Travel and Tourism portfolio units (at AS and A2 levels) each require the completion of four tasks specified in the banner across the top of each Assessment Criteria grid. Candidates scored better when they produced work for a unit that was clearly distinct for each task and which responded exactly to its demands. Marks were lost and assessments adjusted when submitted work did not closely match task requirements. Instances relevant to individual units are highlighted in the unit-by-unit discussion below. It is strongly recommended that teachers set work which follows the banner tasks and monitor candidates to ensure that their work remains firmly “on track” as it develops.

Each task relates directly to one of four assessment objectives (AOs). Every unit follows the following pattern of AO-led tasks:

AO1 – a task enabling candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of travel and tourism

AO2 – an application task

AO3 – a research and analysis task

AO4 – an evaluation task.

Successful candidates had been set work in which each of the above AOs was separately addressed and which enabled them to display appropriate capabilities. For example, for Unit 3 AO2 (application), presenting a genuine welcome meeting **script** and for AO3 throughout the units, evidence of varied **research** (techniques and sources) to discover information they then went on to **analyse**. Where candidates failed to address the AO by not following the banner tasks, moderated marks were lower and some substantial downward adjustments resulted. For example, where an illustrated written report was produced instead of a welcome meeting script for TT03 AO2, or where research techniques and sources were not evidenced for moderators to see. Individual unit sections of this report (see below) exemplify good practice in responding to banner tasks and point out approaches that were less successful in generating marks.

For all AS units except Unit 6, the set banner tasks (A to D) are in the order AO1, 2, 3 and 4. However, in TT06, Task B addresses AO3 and Task C addresses AO2. This is pointed out in the *AQA Teachers Guide to GCE Travel and Tourism* and was emphasised at Teacher Support meetings. Unfortunately, it was clear that some centres did not pick up on this variation and some candidates regrettably lost marks as a consequence because they sometimes did not approach the task from the correct angle – not evidencing their research sufficiently for Task B (AO3), for example. Where the wording of the tasks was correctly followed and that of the relevant Mark Band descriptors borne in mind, candidates were still able to access the full range of marks even if the wrong AO was identified in their work.

It was not uncommon amongst centres where marking was found to be outside tolerance (4 marks on either side of the correct mark) to find that one or two assessors and units were out of step with the rest. Centres are encouraged to ensure that proper internal standardising procedures are undertaken so that such inconsistencies can be ironed out before work is presented for external moderation.

Where there was serious misinterpretation of the standard, centres are required to attend one of the forthcoming AS teacher standardisation meetings. One of three main factors tended to come into play

here. Firstly, the wording of tasks. For example, Unit 2 Task A is about the induction procedures and training provided by a chosen travel and tourism organisation. Candidates did well when they made induction and training the explicit focus of their review, and less well if they took a more generic approach to either induction and training in general or customer service as a broad concept. Similarly, higher marks were scored when command words such as *compare*, *evaluate*, or *analyse* were satisfied.

The second factor frequently contributing to mark differences was the assessed level of response. Across the AS units, Mark Band (MB) 1 responses, at the low end of the spectrum, were characterised by *basic* work, MB2 work was *clear* and MB3 and MB4 responses *detailed* and *developed* respectively. Some centres awarded marks at a higher mark band level than was appropriate. For example, MB2 quality work (clear) was given a mark in the MB3 range for which a more detailed response was needed. Correct application of the “best-fit” approach by centres allowed weaknesses in, say, a candidate’s work on one destination for TT03 to be compensated by achievement at a higher mark band’s quality level. For example, a basic account of location, climate and landscape of the chosen European destination (in itself of MB1 quality) for AO1 might be balanced by detailed description (MB3) of the chosen North American destination.

Candidates mostly submitted portfolios composed of relevant evidence. In some cases there were pages of downloaded material from the Internet that were not annotated or referred to in the body of the work and that were therefore irrelevant and should not have been submitted. Centres and candidates are reminded of the imperative to guard against plagiarism. Candidates must learn to acknowledge their sources, not least because to do so helps provide evidence that scores marks in AO3 tasks.

Administratively, most centres enclosed correct documentation with marks and samples. This was appreciated and facilitated the moderating process. The completion of Candidate Record Forms is a requirement, without which it is not possible to verify that the work is indeed that of the candidate. These were correctly completed in the vast majority of cases. Where the work of candidates was clearly structured by candidates, using appropriate headings and sub-headings, and where it was also clearly annotated by teachers, evidence to support centre assessments could be more readily tracked by moderators. Such clarities exhibit good practice and centres are reminded that guidance on annotating portfolios is given in the *AQA Teachers’ Guide to Travel and Tourism*.

In general, it was clear that whilst some centres and candidates responded directly and well to the set tasks and judged the standard required accurately; in the light of the support provided, others found the course and its assessment more challenging. Teachers seeking to raise candidate attainment are urged to bear the following in mind:

1. All AO3 tasks are research and analysis tasks, and evidence of research is absolutely essential
2. The four tasks specified by the banner must be responded to directly and in all their parts (these are the questions)
3. Marks awarded have to be justifiable in terms of the mark band descriptors (these are the mark scheme) and each descriptor must be fully achieved to award a mark at the top of its range.

TT02 – Travel and Tourism – a People Industry

Candidates are required to produce a portfolio based on an investigation of customer service provided by a chosen travel and tourism organisation. The same organisation must be used throughout the unit, and it was in the majority of cases. Appropriate organisations chosen included hotels, travel agents, visitor attractions and tourist information offices. The chosen organisation must belong to the travel and tourism industry. The few candidates who chose an organisation belonging to another industry were not able to score marks. It should be noted that catering is not a sector of the travel and tourism industry as far as this specification is concerned and, as a consequence, fast food chain outlets are not appropriate choices. Relevant sectors of the travel and tourism industry are given by the specification (pages 33-34) and

centres in any doubt are advised to consult their Portfolio Adviser about the appropriateness of an organisation.

As in the other units, candidates scored well when they responded directly to the four discrete tasks set by the Assessment Criteria grid banner. For AO1, successful candidates produced a review clearly focused on the chosen travel and tourism organisation's induction procedures and the training they provide for their staff. Where such reviews were fully detailed and fully met the remaining wording of the Mark Band 3 descriptor, candidates were able to score at the top of that range. As with all mark band descriptors, candidates whose work most appropriately matched its wording – rather than that of a lower or higher mark band – but without fully satisfying every one of its requirements were awarded a lower mark in the range. Strong candidates, who were able to develop their answers by reviewing the appropriateness of induction and training procedures and their benefits to customers as well as to the organisation itself, scored in the MB4 range.

Task B (AO2) requires a record of customer service role-plays. Successful candidates had taken part in a range of customer service role-plays set firmly in the context of their chosen organisation, including face-to-face situations, telephone dialogues, e-mailing and letter writing. Varying the mode of service allowed these candidates to demonstrate the range of different skills required at MB2 and above, and records of several (at least three, but often four or five) situations enabled the application of such skills to dealings with different customer groups.

Records scoring higher marks incorporated clear qualitative as well as quantitative assessment by the teacher. Witness statements (one for each role-play) were valuable tools for moderators to use to judge the quality of the customer service that candidates had provided. Good witness statements made use of the Mark Band criteria themselves – referring to the detail, effectiveness and appropriateness of candidates' service for example – and provided justifications of assessments that had been made. The *AQA Teachers' Guide for GCE Travel and Tourism* includes a witness statement proforma that centres may choose to use.

Where moderators were able to see exactly what customer service had taken place and how good it had been judged to be by the teacher (and why), centre assessments for AO2 could be accepted. Where that was not the case, marks were adjusted to the mark band which most closely matched the evidence actually provided.

Some centres provided video evidence on tape or DVD. This was welcomed by moderators as part of the role-play record. Audio evidence (tape or CD) is also permissible. Such recordings were useful where the running order was clear to moderators, and when moderators could readily access the recording of any named candidate's customer service. In addition, teachers had provided clear assessments of customer service quality.

The highest achieving upper MB4 candidates scored 17 or 18 marks for AO2 by additionally evidencing the successful meeting of customer needs through well developed responses in unfamiliar situations. Unfamiliar situations were ones which the job-holder being role-played would find unfamiliar. The simulation of such unfamiliarity was achieved in role-play through scenarios such as the sudden need to cover for a colleague with a different role and/or to cope with a customer behaving in an unexpected way. To score full marks candidates needed to have evidenced the appropriate level of developed responses in a range of situations (typically four different ones), at least two of which were unfamiliar.

Task C (like all AO3 tasks) is a research and analysis task. Candidates are required to research the product knowledge that the organisation's employees need to have and to analyse their findings. Candidates scoring at MB2 and above provided evidence of appropriate research techniques in the plural – for instance questioning a manager, interviewing staff, observing customer service in practice, abstracting from staff training manuals and referring where appropriate to other secondary sources such

as text books. Candidates not providing any explicit evidence of undertaking research by more than one means were liable to have portfolios assessed as best matching the MB1 descriptor (*limited research techniques*). Stronger candidates analysed (rather than just described) the results of their research and drew clear conclusions about how the organisation's induction and training provided employees with the product knowledge needed to deliver good customer service. The weakest work made little or no mention of product knowledge and scored few, if any, marks.

Similarly for the Task D evaluation, stronger performances came from candidates who responded directly by evaluating the importance of the interpersonal and technical skills of the chosen organisation's employees, whilst the weakest performances were from those candidates who did not address either the evaluative nature of the set task or the nature of the skills to be evaluated, though these were in the minority. Marks in upper Mark Band 3 and in Mark Band 4 were awarded only to candidates who included evaluation of the appropriateness of their own evidence (in line with the descriptors on the Assessment Grid).

TT03 – Travel Destinations

For this unit, all but a few candidates made legitimate choices of destinations. Such choices were one destination from Europe (beyond the UK, as defined by the specification map) and one from North America (also as defined by the specification map). Candidates performed better where chosen destinations were at the scale of a resort, city or well-defined countryside region. Whole countries, US states or entire developed islands (such as Mallorca) proved to be too large in scale for candidates to produce the necessary detail to access MB3.

Task A requires information about location, climate and landscape. These three were very much the foci of the successful response. Some candidates wasted time and energy on much unnecessary material related to the attractions of, and range of available accommodation in, their chosen destinations. The task is not an invitation to present an illustrated descriptive guide to the resort. Candidates did best when they concentrated firmly on the three foci, presenting detailed information on all three for both destinations, developing into Mark Band 4 quality by building, on top of detail, relevance to travel and tourism such as how the climate influences patterns of UK tourist flow. Candidates used maps effectively when these were annotated. Maps simply downloaded from the internet without any further adaptation or comment were not creditworthy.

Task B is to write the scripts of two welcome meetings (one for each of the chosen destinations). Most candidates responded properly to this applied task, but a minority did not and simply presented descriptive and illustrated accounts scoring few marks, if any. High scoring scripts were written as a resort representative would speak, with greetings at the beginning, thanks at the end, and references to issues such as health and safety and the range of excursions available in between. They were definitely located in a named destination hotel, at a declared time of year, or on a specified date with a realistic audience to whom the script was explicitly addressed. Marks were scored when detailed links between facilities and attractions offered by the destination were made with different customer types in the audience.

Task C is the research and analysis task. Successful candidates presented clear evidence of the research they had done. By contrast, others did not achieve the marks they may have done because they did not make clear what sources and research techniques they had used. Simple reference to websites is only one technique, but several clear techniques are required above MB1. Candidates who scored well made reference to other forms of secondary research using brochures, travel guides and atlases, and primary methods such as interviewing and questioning travel professionals and/or consumers.

Analysis was of travel choices, not only between the UK and the destination, but also within the destination and within the UK. Successful candidates focused on the needs of different customer types travelling between a UK starting point such as their home town and the chosen destinations, examining

what their options were (from an appropriately wide range) and which would suit which group best, and why. They included options for travel around the destination as well.

Task D is about evaluating the appeal and future potential of the destination and making recommendations to a variety of different customers. Successful candidates had a clearly structured approach, evaluating a wide range of aspects of their chosen destinations' appeal on the basis of which they were able to make clear and appropriate recommendations to several different customer types. Then they went on to consider the likely future for their destinations which, in the cases of the best work, moved away from generic factors, such as the global terrorist threat, onto influences specific to the destinations. Weaker responses tended to either begin to evaluate appeal without making clear recommendations to a range of customer types, or else to jump straight into making asserted recommendations (perhaps to the general tourist) without a platform of considered appeal evaluation. Some candidates mistakenly tended to refer to the present and recent past under the heading of the future, sometimes in quite some detail, without actually dealing at all with what is more and less likely to come.

TT04 – Working in Travel and Tourism

This was a unit completed by all Double Award candidates. Candidates had to investigate **one** travel and tourism job – the same job for all four Assessment Objectives. Efficiencies were achieved by those centres and candidates who chose a job in the same organisation used for Unit 2.

For Task A, candidates had to report on all seven key areas (at least in basic terms) for a mark at the top end of MB1 to be awarded. More highly achieving candidates scored up to MB3 by providing a detailed report coupled with evidence that they had used *a range of appropriate sources*. It is stressed to centres that candidates must evidence the sources they have used if marks are to be awarded. The strongest candidates succeeded at MB4 by additionally including the following well-developed elements in their report:

- links to practical experiences of their own in work-shadowing or observation of practice
- comments showing clear appreciation of what the chosen job's unwritten demands are
- clear understanding of the job-holder's need to respond to situations that are unfamiliar.

Insofar as Task B was concerned, successful candidates and their teachers recognised that the relevant skills and qualities were the communication and professional skills and the professional qualities reported on for Task A. Further, they clearly understood that the focus of the task was the interaction of these with the roles of other job-holders in the organisation. Exemplification of the skills and qualities of a travel and tourism manager in liaising with, leading and delegating to other job-holders in actual situations was one productive approach here.

Task C was focused on the sources of information the candidate had used. A number of candidates did not score well here because they failed to provide evidence of either linking their desk research to practice they themselves had experienced or observed, or of clearly exercising choice over the selection of sources. Simple lists of secondary sources were restricted to marks within, and not at the top of, MB1 (1–3 marks). Detailed commentaries were provided by higher scoring candidates, showing insightful use of valid and current primary (field research) and secondary (desk research) sources and of the usefulness and limitations of those sources.

The evaluation task (Task D, AO4) involved self-assessment. How well did the candidate match the requirements of the chosen job? What were their relative strengths and weaknesses as applied to the job's demands? Well developed evaluations scored at MB4, but the less successful candidates sometimes gave largely descriptive accounts of what the job entailed with little real thought about their own plus points and shortcomings in relation to it.

TT06 – Tourism in the UK

Double Award candidates opted to complete either Unit 6 or Unit 7. Unit 6 is based on an investigation into tourism in the UK. Uniquely among the AS units, TT06 addresses AO3 (research and analysis) through Task B and AO2 (application) via Task C. It was clear that significant numbers of centres had not realised this and that candidates had been set less than completely appropriate tasks as a result. Where this led to evidence that did not closely match the mark band descriptors, candidates did not gain as many marks as they might well have done otherwise.

Task A is about factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK. It was not appropriate to simply provide descriptive accounts of attractions, for example. What was required was an understanding of the degree of effect they have. The more successful candidates went on to show how the factors interact with each other, scoring marks of at least MB3 level where their report was either detailed or well developed. However, by the same token, candidates who dealt with factors as discrete sub-sections with superficial, if any, understanding of interactions demonstrated, often scored at MB2 level.

Task B is the research and analysis (AO3) task for Unit 6. As with all AO3 tasks, it was evidence of research that limited some candidates to relatively low marks. In a number of cases, the bibliography specified in the task instruction was simply not presented. For Task B, the most successful candidates provided evidence of both a variety of research skills and a variety of sources – a range of listed internet sites may be the latter but is not the former. Centres are strongly recommended to insist that candidates evidence the sources they use and that they employ a genuine range of research skills. Gathering raw data is the beginning. What skills did candidates use to locate, select and verify information?

Task C required evidence of an oral presentation. Many candidates submitted a PowerPoint presentation (or its printed slides at any rate) with accompanying Presenter Notes that they had used. Good practice was exhibited by teachers who signed these notes to witness the presentation has happened. However, marks were given according to the quality of content (rather than delivery) of the presentation. Better marks were, as usual, achieved by those candidates who stuck closely to the task brief by presenting tourism in a clear, named tourist board region (so, Northumbria rather than some sub-division of it) and remembering that they were required to set it in the context of the UK study they had developed through Tasks A and B. This is the logic behind Task B being the research and analysis (AO3) task: Tasks A and B are about the UK, and Tasks C and D are about the local tourist board region.

Task D required evidence of an oral evaluation and many candidates again provided PowerPoint evidence. Audio-recording the evaluation and providing an accompanying assessment summary showed alternative good practice. While it may be tempting to seek to kill two birds with one stone by combining Tasks C and D, evidence in practice showed that better results were achieved with discrete tasks – where the candidate clearly ended Task C and then began a separate piece for Task D.

TT07 – Overseas Destination Study

This is the alternative to Unit 6 for Double Award candidates. Relevant countries were only those entirely or largely within the southern hemisphere. The *AQA Teachers' Guide to Travel and Tourism* lists permissible and non-permissible countries. By and large, however, choice of country did not present the main obstacle to candidates scoring marks. That role was played by a failure on the part of some to respond to the scenario set for this unit in the banner's introductory sentence. Candidates are required to investigate tourist potential for an identified travel and tourism sector (tour operators) for a specific use – inclusion in their future programmes. The unit is not an open invitation to describe the tourist attractions of two distant lands.

In responding to Task A, candidates did well when they provided detailed and well-balanced overviews of the locations, features, facilities and amenities of both chosen countries, crucially including the degree of availability of internal transportation (simply omitted by the less successful, though it is required at

MB2 upwards) as well as critical commentary, bearing in mind the target audience (tour operators) and purpose (future programme inclusion potential). *Regions* are required at all mark band levels. For some smaller, island countries such as Mauritius, such a sub-division may be more challenging but is still achievable. A factor to be borne in mind in country selection is the ease or difficulty of splitting it into tourist regions.

Task B is a comparison task, so similarities and differences were sought. What are the comparative costs of the various options for travel to the two countries from the UK? There are inevitably many for the most popular countries candidates chose, such as South Africa and New Zealand. Less successful candidates presented a very limited selection, concentrating on flag-carrier airlines offering direct scheduled flights from capital to capital. Candidates did better when they quoted additional options involving such elements as regional airports / cheaper flights via intervening places / less obvious airlines / non-air modes (where appropriate) / different times and different seasons. Much more thorough answers than many candidates gave were necessary to score well for this Assessment Objective.

A number of candidates underachieved for Task C by not responding to the first part of the task. Rather than analysing the appeal of the countries, they tended to jump straight to some visitor data they had collected and interpret that in isolation from appeal considerations. The third part of this composite task was to analyse the current coverage by UK tour operators. Successful candidates first of all did respond to it (the weakest did not), and approached it aware that there are different types of tour operator (traditional mass market package tour operators, specialist niche market operators, on-line tour operators) catering for different market segments, and so were able to produce a much more sophisticated and genuine analysis than the poorer quality responses of the weaker candidates who gave only a brief statement of some mass market operators who featured their chosen countries in high street travel agent brochures.

The final, evaluative task is overtly related to the tour operator target audience. The best candidates, having addressed this audience throughout, moved smoothly into Task D while others found it difficult to have to suddenly think of tour operators, or simply continued to ignore the scenario in the banner. Successful candidates weighed up the two countries and gave, following an in-depth discussion, detailed reasons for the one country they actually recommended (some failed to give a recommendation at all) for future programme inclusion.

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
TT01	90	90	29.9	10.8
TT02	60	60	27.4	11.4
TT03	60	60	26.8	11.9
TT04	60	60	26.4	12.1
TT05	90	90	37.0	12.6
TT06	60	60	29.4	10.1
TT07	60	60	24.6	12.3

For units which contain only one component, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

TT01 (1218 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	90	55	48	41	34	27
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT02 (1340 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	45	39	33	28	23
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT03 (1378 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	40	34	28	22
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT04 (274 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	47	41	35	29	23
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT05 (320 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	90	58	52	46	40	34
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT06 (98 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	40	34	28	23
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

TT07 (175 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	45	39	34	29	24
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Advanced Subsidiary Single Award

Provisional statistics for the award (929 candidates)

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	2.3	8.4	22.1	41.9	68.9

Advanced Subsidiary Double Award

Provisional statistics for the award (225 candidates)

	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE
Cumulative %	0.9	2.2	9.8	12.9	21.8	31.6	44.9	54.7	65.3

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A is always 80% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50% and grade E is 40%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and the uniform marks for the units which count towards the AS or A-level qualification are added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.