AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Education

Travel and Tourism

TRPA   Portfolio Units

Report on the Examination

2007 examination - June series

Contents

GCE Travel and Tourism

General Comments

June 2007 was the second examination series for the moderation of AS Travel and Tourism. More of the portfolio work seen this year was well structured, meeting the Assessment Objective requirements laid down in the banner of each unit's Assessment Grid.

What was done well across the units

- Most candidates produced work in which each of the four AOs was separately and appropriately addressed. For example, in Unit 2, for AO1, candidates explicitly focused on the induction and training procedures of their chosen organisation.
- Many appropriate examples of travel and tourism organisations, destinations, and, for the Double Award, jobs were investigated. Further details are given in the unit-by-unit sections below. However, the choice of a hotel for Unit 2, one city and one seaside destination for Unit 3 and for Unit 4 the job of conferences manager in the same hotel that had been used for Unit 2, worked well.

What general issues arose

- Some work did not properly address AO requirements. For example, work for AO3 that did not explicitly clarify what research had been done or which was descriptive rather than evaluative for AO4. In Unit 3 the AO4 requirement focuses clearly on recommendations to customers, but the work of some candidates did not.
- Some candidates' work that amounted to a clear response to the set task (Mark Band 2 range) was over-generously assessed internally as being Mark Band 3 quality. That mark band range is reserved for work that is not only clear but also detailed.

Candidates mostly submitted portfolios composed of relevant evidence they had gathered and processed themselves. In some cases, however, there were pages
of downloaded material from the Internet that were not annotated or referred to in the body of the work. Candidates should have avoided any potential risk of plagiarism and should have acknowledged their sources - not least because that helped them to score marks in the AO3 research tasks.

Administratively, the vast majority of centres enclosed correct documentation with marks and samples. This was much appreciated and greatly facilitated the moderating process. Where the work of candidates was clearly annotated by teachers, moderators could more readily track the evidence that supported centre assessments.

TT02 TRAVEL AND TOURISM - A PEOPLE INDUSTRY

What was done well

- Most candidates produced portfolios based on their investigations into the customer service provided by an appropriately chosen travel and tourism organisation (such as a hotel, travel agency, visitor attraction or tourist information office) and used the same organisation throughout the unit.
- As with all these units, candidates scored well when they responded directly to the four discrete tasks set by the Assessment Criteria grid banner.

What issues arose

- A few candidates chose an organisation belonging to another industry, so they were not able to score marks. Catering (not a sector of the travel and tourism industry according to this specification) and, as a consequence, fast food chain outlets were inappropriate choices. Relevant sectors of the travel and tourism industry are given by the specification (pages 33-34) and centres in any doubt are strongly advised to consult their Portfolio Adviser.
- Task C required explicit research evidence and a clear focus on product knowledge. The work of some candidates satisfied neither.

For AO1, successful candidates produced a review clearly focused on the chosen travel and tourism organisation's induction and training procedures. Where such reviews were fully detailed, candidates were able to score in the Mark Band 3 range. The strongest candidates were able to develop their answers by reviewing the appropriateness and benefits of the organisation's induction and training procedures. They scored in the Mark Band 4 range.

Part B addressed Assessment Objective 2 (application) and required a record of customer service role-plays. Successful candidates had taken part in a range of customer service role-plays firmly set in the context of their chosen organisation. Typically these included face- to-face situations, telephone dialogues, e-mails and letters. Variation among these allowed candidates to demonstrate the range of different skills required at Mark Band 2 and above. Records of several (at least three, but often four or five) situations evidenced the application of skills to dealing with different customer groups.

Witness statements (one for each role play) were invaluable and helped moderators to confirm centre judgements of customer service quality. Witness statements showed good practice when they made use of the Mark Band descriptors' words in referring to the detail, effectiveness and appropriateness of customer service in each and every role play. Some centres made good use of the proforma offered by the AQA Teachers Guide for GCE Travel and Tourism. Others preferred to design their own, sometimes very successfully.

In some cases, good practice of witnessing was absent. Marks were adjusted to the mark band whose descriptor most closely matched the evidence actually provided. Some centres provided video evidence on tape or DVD. Such recordings were useful when the running order was clear to moderators, and when moderators could readily access the recording of any named candidate's customer service. DVDs, having a menu function, were particularly useful in this regard. Centres providing recordings also provided clear teacher assessments of customer service quality in the form of witness statements.

The highest achieving candidates scored the 17 or 18 marks of upper Mark Band 4 for AO2 by additionally evidencing the successful meeting of customer needs through well-developed responses in unfamiliar situations. Unfamiliar situations were ones that the job-holder being role played would find unfamiliar, such as the sudden need to
cover for a colleague with a different role or to cope with a customer who was behaving unusually. Witness statements that clearly flagged situations as unfamiliar were essential guides for moderators.

Part C (like all AO3 tasks) was a research and analysis task. Candidates were required to research the product knowledge that the chosen organisation's employees need, and to analyse their findings. Candidates scored at Mark Band 2 or above by explicitly providing clear or detailed evidence of appropriate research techniques in the plural. For instance, by questioning a manager, interviewing staff, observing customer service in practice, abstracting from staff training manuals and referring, where appropriate, to other secondary sources including text books. Candidates who did not provide any explicit evidence of using more than one research method were liable to have their portfolios moderated as best matching the Mark Band 1 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. Weaker ones sometimes made little or no direct reference to product knowledge – the very kernel of this task – and lost out as a consequence.

Similarly, for the AO4 evaluation, stronger performances came from candidates who responded directly and evaluated the importance of the interpersonal and technical skills of the chosen organisation's employees. Marks in upper Mark Bands 3 and 4 were awarded only to those candidates who included evaluation of the appropriateness of their own evidence.

TT03 TRAVEL DESTINATIONS

What was done well

- The majority of candidates chose two appropriate destinations, i.e. one each from Europe and North America, at the scale of resort, city, or closely defined rural area. This allowed many of them to generate sufficient detail to access Mark Band 3.
- Most responses to Task B (AO2) this year were in the required format of welcome meeting scripts.

What issues arose

- For AO1, a number of candidates again presented irrelevant material about destination attractions and accommodation when only information about location, climate and landscape was needed.
- Some candidates under-scored on AO3 because they did not make clear what research they had done.

AO1's task required information about location, climate and landscape. Candidates did best when they concentrated firmly on the three foci, presenting detailed information on all three for both destinations. Developed (MB4) responses built in, on top of the detailed foundation, relevance to tourism. Often this related to the influence of climate on UK tourist flow. However, some candidates wasted time on much unnecessary material related to the attractions of their chosen destinations. Others simply included unannotated maps as their location evidence and scored few if any marks for them. Clear descriptions of location were needed to access 2.

AO2. Successful candidates responded properly to the applied task of scripting welcome meetings (AO2). Scripts scored marks. Other formats, such as information guides, did not. High-scoring scripts were very clearly written in a resort representative's register and idiom. They began with greetings at the beginning, thanks at the end, and made references to issues such as health and safety and the range of excursions available in-between. These scripts definitely placed each welcome meeting in a named destination hotel, either at a declared time of year, or on a specified date, with a realistic audience of customer types to whom the script was explicitly addressed. Good marks were scored when detailed links between facilities and attractions offered by the destination were made with different customer types in the audience. Candidates sometimes produced superficially quite good welcome scripts that failed to score well because they did not make customer types explicit.

Task C was the research and analysis task aimed at AO3. Successful candidates presented clear evidence of the research that 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. Simply listing websites evidenced one technique only. A range of clear techniques was needed to score above Mark Band 1. High-scoring candidates researched (and referenced) other secondary sources such as brochures, travel guides and atlases, as well as sometimes using primary techniques such as interviewing travel professionals.

Analysis was successful when it was of the travel choices available to specific customer types. These included not only travel options between the UK and the destinations, but also in-destination and within the UK. Like last year, successful candidates focused on the needs of different customer types travelling between a single, explicit UK starting point, often their own home town, and the chosen destinations. These candidates examined what their options were (from an appropriate variety) as well as which would suit which customer best and why. Clearly identifying customer types at the outset of the work on each destination and then following those people through each of the AOs was an approach that showed good practice.

The AO4 task was about making recommendations to a variety of different customer types based on an evaluation of the appeal and future potential of the destination. Successful candidates had a clearly structured approach. They identified customer types, evaluated a variety of aspects of destinations' appeal for those customers and, on that basis, made clear and appropriate recommendations. These candidates 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 two destinations. Lower-scoring responses tended to begin by trying to evaluate appeal without making clear recommendations to customers and, in some cases, omitted the future altogether.

TT04   WORKING IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM

This unit was mandatory for Double Award candidates. Candidates had to investigate one travel and tourism job - the same job for all four Assessment Objectives.

What was done well

- Centres and candidates who used the same travel and tourism organisation for units 2 and 4 achieved efficiencies.
- Most candidates covered all seven, specified key areas in AO1.

What issues arose

- Some chosen jobs were not suitable because they were not travel and tourism jobs. Portfolio Advisers should be consulted whenever there is any doubt.
- There was some tendency among less successful candidates to stray from material specific to their chosen job in their chosen travel and tourism organisation and to drift into the generic as the report went on.

AO1's task required a report on seven specified key areas (at least in basic terms) and virtually all candidates achieved that. Higher achievers scored well by providing a really detailed (MB3) or well-developed (MB4) report - one which included clear evidence that they had used a range of appropriate sources. Candidates had to evidence their use of sources to score well at this level. Some missed out on marks that they might otherwise have gained by not doing so. Developed reports made clear candidates' understanding of their job's unwritten demands – those not necessarily specified by the job description but which job holders nevertheless have to satisfy.

For AO2, only the communication and professional skills and the professional qualities reported in the AO1 section were relevant. Other key areas from AO1 were not. The focus of the task was the interaction of the relevant skills and qualities with the roles of other job-holders in the organisation. Successful candidates considered a role-holder such as hotel manager's interactions with different staff in real situations that they had observed. Less successful candidates did not gain all the credit they might otherwise have done because they did not clarify what practice they had observed in the workplace. It was unfortunately clear that some candidates had not undertaken workplace observations. They must.

As last year, a number of candidates did not score well in AO3 because they failed to provide evidence of:

- linking their desk research to practice they themselves had experienced or observed, or
- clearly exercising choice over their selection of sources.

Candidates could not access Mark Band 2 without observing workplace practice. Higher scoring candidates provided detailed commentaries and gained marks in Mark Band 3 or in Mark Band 4 when their comments on validity were developed well. Candidates who did well showed thorough use of valid and current primary (field research) and secondary (desk research) sources and clear insight into the usefulness and limitations of those sources.

The evaluation task (AO4) involved self-assessment. Key questions were:

- How well did the candidate match the requirements of the chosen job?
- What were the candidate's strengths and weaknesses compared to the job's demands?

Good quality evaluations tackled these questions head on and realistically. However, less successful candidates often gave purely descriptive accounts of what the job entailed with little real thought about their own plus points and shortcomings in relation to it. Alternatively, some weaker candidates described their own strengths and weaknesses but did not relate them to the job in question.

TT06 TOURISM IN THE UK

Double Award candidates completed either Unit 6 or Unit 7.

What was done well

- Most work seen was appropriate to the unique sequencing of Unit 6's tasks, i.e. that it addressed AO3 (research and analysis) via task B and AO2 (application) through task C.
- Many candidates produced good PowerPoint presentations with accompanying notes to evidence their oral nature.

What issues arose

- The requirement for task D to be an oral evaluation was sometimes missed.
- Some vestige of last year's tendency to lump AO4 in with AO remained. Such fudging of actually distinct AOs tended to produce lower evaluation marks.

AO1's task was about the factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK. It was not appropriate to simply provide descriptive accounts of attractions. What was required was an understanding of the degree of appeal they have for potential visitors. Successful candidates were able to show how the factors listed in the Specification interacted with each other, scoring marks of at least MB3 level where their report was detailed or well-developed.

Task B was the research and analysis (AO3) task for Unit 6. Like task A it was set at the national scale. As with all AO3 tasks, it was a lack of clear evidence of research that limited some candidates to relatively low marks. To score well, candidates had to make clear to the moderator what research they themselves had done. From where had they gleaned their data? The banner of the Assessment Grid specified a bibliography here. In a number of cases, such a bibliography was simply not presented. Candidates who scored well provided clear, explicit evidence of a variety of research skills and a variety of sources. A list of websites was not evidence that a variety of skills had been used. Having gathered their data, what skills had candidates used to locate, select and verify information?

Task C required evidence of an oral presentation. There had to be evidence that a presentation suitable for oral delivery had been produced. Many candidates submitted PowerPoint slides with Presenter Notes. Teachers exhibited good practice by signing these notes to witness that the presentation had in fact happened. Actually delivering the oral presentation allowed candidates the opportunity to improve their presentation in the light of teacher/peer feedback. Marks were given according to the quality of the oral presentation's content. Those candidates who presented tourism in a clearly named tourist board region, firmly set in the UK context, achieved better marks.

Task D required evidence of an oral evaluation and many candidates again provided PowerPoint evidence. While it again proved tempting for some to combine tasks C and D, evidence showed that the latter suffered as a result. Weaker candidates' oral evaluation often consisted of no more than the last couple of slides of their Task C PowerPoint presentation. This was not detailed work. Evaluations were much more likely to reach Mark Band 3 when approached as discrete tasks, completely separate from task C.

TT07 OVERSEAS DESTINATION STUDY

This unit was alternative to Unit 6.

<u>What was done well</u>

- Virtually all candidates chose two relevant, southern hemisphere countries.
- Candidates scored well when they kept the target audience of tour operators clearly in mind.

<u>What issues arose</u>

- Some candidates wrote too much and went off message as a result. Candidates were required to investigate tourist potential for tour operators to consider for inclusion in their future programmes. This was not an invitation to write as much as possible about the tourist attractions of two distant lands.
- The AO1 requirement to consider the availability of internal transportation was sometimes overlooked.

Candidates scored well for AO1 when they provided detailed and well-balanced overviews of their chosen countries that included the degree of availability of internal transportation. Highest achievers commented critically, bearing in mind the target audience (tour operators) and purpose (future programme inclusion potential) of their profiles. The higher scoring candidates in all mark ranges featured the various tourist regions of the chosen countries in their destination profiles.

Task B was a comparison task. Candidates did better when they quoted a variety of travel options including elements such as regional airports, cheaper flights via intervening places, less obvious airlines, transport modes other than air flights (where appropriate), different travel times and different seasons. These were much more thorough answers than less successful candidates who were sometimes content with just a couple of flight options.

Part C of this portfolio unit included research into and analysis of the current coverage of the two countries by UK tour operators. Successful candidates responded to this directly, and, in doing so, showed clear knowledge and understanding of a range of different types of tour operator (e.g. traditional mass market package tour operators, specialist niche market operators and on-line travel companies). Some other candidates made little or no reference to this part of the task.

In the final evaluative task the best candidates, having addressed the tour operator audience throughout the unit, moved smoothly into task D. Candidates who scored the most marks weighed up their two countries through an in-depth discussion. They gave detailed reasons for explicitly recommending one of the countries for future tour operator programmes. Weaker candidates sometimes lost sight of the need to do so.

General Comments

This was the first moderation of A2 Travel and Tourism.

What was done well across the units

- Work was very largely appropriately structured, with discrete sections for each portfolio unit aimed at one of the four Assessment Objectives.
- Much of the submitted work was well targeted on the task requirements, with fewer of the overblown projects than were sometimes seen at AS.

What general issues arose

- Some of the work lacked a travel and tourism focus. For example, a leisure event was not acceptable for Unit 8 (Travel and Tourism Project) and a geographical issue was not directly relevant to Unit 10 (Current Issues in Travel and Tourism).
- A few candidates attempted their portfolios having apparently undertaken little direct observation of travel and tourism organisations' operations. Consequently, they struggled to achieve many marks.

TT08 TRAVEL AND TOURISM PROJECT

What was done well

- The majority of projects were appropriate. Often a trip was organised by a small group of candidates. However, successful examples of other travel and tourism projects such as hosting a visiting group were seen.
- The necessity to evaluate the contribution to the project's success that was made by ICT was realised and addressed in most cases and led to good scores.

What issues arose

- There was not always clear evidence of candidates' individual input into the presentation of the business plan (AO1) or the records of their own involvement (AO2).
- It was not always clear what actual investigation of the feasibility of the chosen project idea had been done. A simple class discussion was not a full investigation.

To address Assessment Objective 1, candidates had to present their project's business plan. Business plans were often group-generated. The presentation requirement was for each individual candidate to present the group plan to the reader. This was to assess individual knowledge and understanding of the business plan. Many successful candidates produced a detailed PowerPoint presentation with accompanying presenter notes. Where elements of the business plan were not presented in detail, but also provided some critical assessment and developed understanding of how elements related to each other, Mark Band 4 marks were earned – not infrequently.

Weaker candidates tended to produce much sketchier presentations – perhaps just a few outline PowerPoint slides with no presenter notes. Basic work could only score at Mark Band 1.

It was difficult to agree high marks for this task when a clear presentation was not made. Simple, written reproduction of a group business plan was not likely to be a true, individual presentation.

AO2's requirement was for a record of the candidate's individual involvement in the team effort. Candidates scored well when they produced a detailed record (typically, a log) that clarified both what they personally had done and what other group members had contributed. Those who additionally developed their record beyond a simply factual one into one which commented on the unfolding events, lifted their scores into the Mark Band 4 range. However, some candidates did not always record their own involvement and referred constantly to "we". This meant that their individual contributions could not be assessed.

As always, AO3 required research. Candidates had to investigate. Clear evidence of that investigation was needed. Such evidence was not always present. Some candidates moved straight into a written discussion, making assertions about how well the project idea had been expected to work on the basis of no clear evidence at all. Successful candidates, on the other hand, analysed their project idea's feasibility on the basis of investigation findings. Again, there were occasions when it was not always evident what individual candidates' personal contributions to feasibility investigation and analysis had been.

AO4 required evaluation. There were several parts to this:

- how successful the project had been
- how much the candidate had personally contributed
- how valuable the contributions of other team members were
- the extent to which ICT had played a part.

All these were needed to score in the upper part of any Mark Band. Higher marks were agreed for candidates who evaluated in detail, with criticism and comprehensively. Such candidates balanced strengths and weaknesses and justified their conclusions. Lower marks were given to candidates who addressed only some parts of the task or advanced simple judgements lacking the substance needed to properly support them.

TT10 CURRENT ISSUES IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM

What was done well

- A number of centres had clearly encouraged candidates to make their chosen issue manageable by clearly defining its scope
- Ranges of stakeholders from within and beyond the travel and tourism industry were identified by many candidates.

What issues arose

- Some candidates had not thought through:
    - why their chosen topic was an issue at all (i.e. why there were different views among stakeholders)
    - how it was current (i.e. remained unresolved)
    - what made it a travel and tourism (as opposed to, say, a geography) issue
- Self-evaluation of the extent to which candidates' own values and attitudes affected their perceptions of likely future impacts was often neglected, perhaps because of the challenge it posed.

For example, some weaker candidates had not considered why terrorism was an issue for travel and tourism and launched into historical accounts with little reference to travel and tourism. Another similar pitfall was "the Tsunami". The Indian Ocean tsunami in question was in 2004. To make it a current subject, successful candidates focussed on issues of on-going development in its wake. Weaker ones dealt only with the past and scored little as a result. Their issue was not clearly current.

Some centres showed good practice by encouraging candidates to provide a page or so of introduction that justified each approved chosen topic's status as an issue, its currency and its relevance to travel and tourism. The laying down of such a foundation proved of greater significance in achieving success that the actual choice of travel and tourism topic.

Issues that worked well for candidates actually varied quite a lot. They included:

- the impact of on-line booking on travel agents
- the impacts of a named tourism development
- whether budget airlines will continue to grow
- how the industry should respond to growing environmental awareness
- the response of the industry to concerns about tourism's sustainability
- how tourism to a particular fragile environment should be managed.

To meet Assessment Objective 1, candidates had to give an account of the processes of change in travel and tourism that had brought their chosen issue to a head. Candidates who gave accounts that were not only descriptively detailed, but which also explained relevant processes in detail were able to achieve Mark Band 3. Where this explanation was critical about processes' degree of influence, MB4 was reached provided that a detailed understanding of connections between different aspects of the industry (typically inter-sector links) was also shown.

Candidates going adrift with AO1 tended to be due to one of two causes:

1. unless processes of change were clearly travel and tourism, MB2 could not be accessed
2. some candidates were tempted into early speculation about the future impacts of their issue – irrelevant to AO1 – and consequently dealt with the relevant past processes too slightly to qualify for MB3.

Both AO2 and AO3 were about stakeholders. That did not make them the same. For AO2, candidates had to apply knowledge and understanding to explain stakeholders' views and attitudes (what these people thought).   On the other hand, AO3's task called for an investigation. Evidence was required of the research that candidates had done to discover the responses and actions of the stakeholders – what the latter had done about the issue given their views and attitudes. Strong candidates explained, researched and analysed the thoughts and deeds of a wide range of stakeholders from across relevant sectors of the industry and beyond – government (local, national, international), pressure groups and tourists themselves (actual – present and past – as well as potential). As usual, in practice, higher marks tended to be earned by candidates who clearly separated their work into discrete, single AO sections.

Less successful candidates were those who covered only a narrow range of stakeholders or who failed to make clear what investigating they had actually done. This often seemed to be the result of a mistaken view that AO2 and AO3 could be successfully fudged together.

The evaluation task (AO4) was again (see Unit 8) composite. Candidates had four foci:

1. current impacts of the issue
2. likely future impacts
3. responses
4. the extent to which their own values and attitudes influenced their perception of the future impacts.

Weighing of all four foci was needed to reach the top of any Mark Band – whether MB1 for a basic consideration or MB4 for a developed, critical evaluation. Some candidates did not gain all the marks they might have because they omitted at least one – usually the last. Candidates who were successful in self-evaluating the influence of their own values and attitudes tended to begin by considering what these had been at the outset of their study of the issue. They asked themselves how strongly held these views were, why they had them and then how how much they had changed during their investigation. What they were doing was asking themselves how objective their predictions were or how much they were the subjective result of their own preconceptions.

TT12 BUSINESS OPERATIONS IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM

This was the compulsory unit for Double Award candidates.

What was done well

- Nearly all candidates chose a relevant (travel and tourism) organisation, and stuck to it for all four Assessment Objectives
- Analysis, where it was clearly focused on how some practices met their aims, was often supported by candidate-researched evidence.

What issues arose

- Occasional instances occurred of inappropriate organisation choice. A supermarket café, for example, is not a travel and tourism organisation as catering is not among the sectors of the industry specified in Unit 1 The Travel and Tourism Industry
- One example only from each of five key areas of the chosen organisation's operation was required. Some candidates lost marks by providing superficial coverage of several examples per key area rather than detailed coverage of one.

Part A (AO1) of candidates' portfolios for TT12 was an account of the operation of five key areas of a chosen travel and tourism organisation, ranging from technical skills and target setting to budgets and electronic transactions. Candidates were required to concentrate on **one** example from each area. Successful candidates did so and were able to access Mark Band 3 marks by dint of the detail they produced, and move into MB4 when their accounts went beyond description into comment and discussion on necessary skills and problems encountered. Unfortunately, some candidates seemed not to notice the requirement to study just one example and produced shallower outlines (little more than lists) of a range of examples that might belong to various key areas. This tended to limit detail and restrict them to Mark Band 2 at best and sometimes Mark Band 1 when their treatment was generic rather than specifically related to the chosen organisation.

The choice of examples in AO1 was important because candidates needed to refer to the same ones throughout AOs 2 to 4.

For AO2, candidates needed to apply the knowledge and understanding they had gained from AO1 and to give an account of the interaction of their examples. The point was to show how such interactions in the chosen organisation help in the solution of problems, issues or other work-related situations. This was overlooked by some candidates who were content only to describe interactions without application and who limited their marks as a result. In identifying interactions good practice was shown by those who mapped pairs of practices by linking their one example from one key area with their example from another. Only at Mark Band 4 was it expected that all the practices exemplified in Task A would necessarily be dealt with. In awarding marks, emphasis was given to the quality of the account of problem-solving as much as it was to the range of practices covered.

As always, research evidence was required for AO3, task C. A range of sources was required. This limited the achievement of candidates who properly went on a visit and listened to a speaker, but who then left it at that. That meant they had used just one source. Even Mark Band 2 required a range of sources. Some candidates simply did not record sources at all. They were allowed access to Mark Band 1, on the grounds that they must have used one source to proceed at all. Little else was possible. To expand their range of sources, more successful candidates made use of observation (on a visit or during work shadowing), interviews with staff members, training materials produced by the chosen organisation and appropriate (sometimes Business Studies) text books. Well-developed comments on the reliability of a variety of sources allowed access to Mark Band 4 for research. However, in-depth analysis of the extent to which practices met their declared aims was also required. Some candidates fell at this hurdle because they did not first clarify what these aims were. Others who did clarify the aims provided themselves with necessary anchors for their analysis and were able to keep it on target.

The evaluative AO4 again focused on the examples chosen for AO1. How far did they contribute to the overall efficiency of the organisation? Candidates who lifted their sights to the scale of the whole enterprise did this well. The issue for some was what their whole organisation was. For example, some had studied the local branch of a multiple travel agency. They needed to decide whether the organisation was just the branch or the whole company. Given that such multiples are component parts of larger integrated concerns the potential for confusion grew. It was observed that in practice what mattered was clarity. So long as candidates were clear about the scale, and had an appropriate amount of material to work with, they were able to complete the task successfully.

TT13 MANAGEMENT IN TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Candidates for the Double Award completed either Unit 13 or Unit 14. In 2007 Unit 13 was the less popular choice, but was often well done by those who did opt for it.

What was done well

- Good choices of organisations were made – small to medium-sized enterprises although not at the micro-scale. Individual hotels belonging to some chains and franchises, independent and specialist travel agencies and tour operators were successful choices because they had accessible responsible managers and sufficient scale for candidates to get their teeth into.
- AO tasks were particularly closely followed, often producing tight, relatively concise work.

What issues arose

- Choice of organisation and access to appropriate management was essential. A necessary pre-cursor to beginning work was to be happy that this would be available to candidates.
- Some weaker candidates lost focus on the chosen organisation and drifted into the generic.

The first AO involved a factual description of the structure, roles, responsibilities and skills of the chosen organisation's management team. Stronger candidates climbed through Mark Band 3 by explaining in detail how the chosen organisation's management structure helped it to meet its business aims. They achieved Mark Band 4 when they showed evidence of a really in-depth investigation with well-developed understanding of reasons for the structure's efficiency. Weaker work tended to omit parts of the task or be about management structures in general rather than specifically that of the chosen organisation.

For part B, candidates moved on to detail how the management of their chosen organisation responded to recruitment, training and customer-facing issues. Work that was strong was closely based on what the management of the organisation actually did, as researched by the candidates, typically by interviewing a member or members of the management team. Less successful candidates tended to overlook issues and give mostly simple accounts of recruiting and training practices – not the applied task required.

When it came to AO3, the higher achieving were able to see their research approaches as more than separate pathways. They gained Mark Band 3 or above marks by analysing how they worked together to build the candidate's understanding. Central to the descriptors for C, for all mark bands, was the need to evidence *discussion with managers*. There were those who rather neglected this, at cost to their mark.

Where candidates had met and talked with discussions, D was well done. Managers told them about the external influences facing them and, crucially, how these influences varied in their importance, as well as how the organisation responded. This provided the raw material for successful evaluation. Candidates who lapsed into generic, descriptive accounts of external influences scored few marks.

TT14 SPECIAL INTEREST / ACTIVITY HOLIDAYS

For Double Award candidates, this unit was the alternative to Unit 13. It was the more popular choice in this first series.

What was done well

- Appropriate choices of two specialist markets such as safari, walking and diving holidays were widely made and the rubric instruction that one be itinerant and at least one overseas widely followed.
- Successful candidates appreciated that this unit was about markets rather than itineraries and understood that the market place was its key focus.

What issues arose

- Occasionally, candidates misunderstood special interest to mean a particular destination, for example holidays to Disneyland Paris. The unit specified markets in holiday types. It was not another destinations unit.
- Tasks were composite, with A calling for holiday ranges, tour operators, health and safety and tourist flows and B for future as well as recent trends. Some candidates omitted or gave too little weight to one or more of these elements.

Breadth was key to progressing through the mark bands of AO1. Stronger candidates were able to report wide ranges of both holidays on offer in their market and of the tour operators packaging and selling them. They also gave significant weight to the health and safety provision and tourist flow patterns requirements of the task. Some candidates evidenced great motivation and organisation and were able to score at the very top of Mark Band 4. In contrast, others gave only outline coverage to holiday types and/or tour operators with omission or only superficial description of health and safety provision and tourist flows. They did not score well.

Recent and future are not the same. A number of candidates described changes in their market over recent years and left it at that. Without making future predictions, they had not completed the task – not clearly answered the full question. Candidates scored at Mark Band 2 and above when they did and when they showed awareness of how changes had been, and could be expected to be, influenced by shifts in values and attitudes among the people in the market place (providers and customers). Candidates showing sound awareness could achieve at MB3 level and those whose awareness was critical about the extent of influence, and whose work was well-developed, scored Mark Band 4 marks.

Both the AO3 and AO4 task for this unit hinged around the sources and methods that candidates had used to research material for tasks A and B. As usual, candidates who attempted to fuse the two tasks into one tended to fare less well than those who kept them separate. Strong AO3 responses were characterised by original use of wide-ranging sources with candidates analysing how their methods had helped them to meet their research aims. Weaker ones tended to overlook this latter requirement and presented little more than briefly annotated bibliographies. Again, AO4's evaluation was not just of sources and methods, but of the conclusions and predictions that the candidate had made. Those who had overlooked the need to make predictions for task B could hardly evaluate them here. It was important to compare the two markets. This requirement was part of all four mark band descriptor wordings and its omission cost marks that some candidates may otherwise have gained. Four bullet-pointed subjects for evaluation were prescribed and candidates who performed well dealt fully with each in turn. Evaluations that were both comprehensive and critical, and followed developed comparisons were scored in the Mark Band 4 range.

Overall summary

More of this year's unit portfolios (in fact nearly all) were well structured with discrete sections for each of the four Assessment Objective tasks.

Where issues arose with centres' marks during moderation they often did so because either candidates had not really made clear what research they had done for AO3 or because work that had been given a Mark Band 3 score was not truly detailed.

Centres are advised to guide candidates to provide explicit evidence of what investigations, sources and research techniques they have used and also to consult portfolio advisers over issues such as the appropriateness of travel and tourism organisations or jobs whenever there is any doubt at all.

Candidates who presented clear, direct, quality responses to the set tasks scored very well.

Much of the work seen was appropriately structured to meet the assessment objectives of each unit. Projects, issues, organisations and markets were often well chosen. It was clear that careful thought in their selection was a key factor in candidates' success. A number of centres had rightly made good use of portfolio advisers to help to guide candidate choices.

As at AS, explicit evidence of the research that candidates had done made a significant difference to AO3 scores. Those candidates who wandered from a clear focus on the specific requirements of the task in hand, and who drifted into generic territory, lost marks.

Many teachers annotated candidates' work. This was good practice that made it easier for moderators to track evidence and so to confirm the centre's assessment.

On a final practical note, there was no need to send bulky appendices of material not referred to in the body of work or not necessary for another reason. For example, multiple copies of questionnaires, especially when a candidate had already provided a summary of their methodology and findings, added unnecessary bulk.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades
Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the **Results statistics** page of the AQA Website.