AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Education

Travel and Tourism

TRPA   Portfolio Units

Report on the Examination

2008 examination - June series

Contents

GCE Travel and Tourism

AS Units

A2 Units

GENERAL COMMENTS FOR AS UNITS

Summer 2008 saw the third series for the moderation of AS Travel and Tourism. The qualification has become more established and, with a few exceptions, portfolio work was well structured, with four discrete sections per unit, which directly addresses the Assessment Objective requirements laid down in the banners of the units' Assessment Criteria grids.

What was particularly good

- Most candidates' work properly addressed the four separate AOs of each unit. In Unit 3 AO1 for example, successful candidates explicitly focused on the location, climate and landscape of each of their two chosen destinations.
- Appropriate examples of travel and tourism organisations, destinations, and, for the Double Award, jobs were by and large, the subjects of candidates' investigations.
- There was evidence that a number of centres who had issues to address following moderator feedback last year had indeed done so. The attainment of candidates in such centres rose as a consequence.

What was not so good

- Some work did not properly address AO requirements. Some centres who had had feedback last year about the need to closely follow the tasks set in the banners at the tops of Assessment Criteria grids continued to credit inappropriate work. In particular, work for AO3 that did not explicitly clarify what research had been done or which was descriptive rather than evaluative for AO4. For example, the Unit 2 AO3 requirement focused clearly on research and analysis of product knowledge, but the work of some candidates did not.
- Work that was a clear response to the set task (and therefore in the Mark Band 2 range) was sometimes over-generously assessed as Mark Band 3. MB3 marks are reserved for work that is not just clear but that is detailed as well.

Administratively, the vast majority of centres enclosed correct documentation with marks and samples. This was much appreciated and greatly facilitated the moderating process. Wherever the work of candidates was clearly annotated by teachers moderators were able to track the evidence that helped support the centre's assessment.

TT02 – A People Industry

What was particularly good
- There was almost no evidence of inappropriate choice of organisation. Nearly all chosen organisations were from the travel and tourism (and not, for example, the leisure or retail) industry.
- As with all units, many candidates scored well because they had responded directly to the four discrete tasks set by the Assessment Criteria banner.

What was not so good
- A few candidates did choose an organisation that belonged to another industry and were not able to score marks as a result. Catering (not a sector of the travel and tourism industry according to this specification) organisations including fast-food outlets were examples of such, relatively rare, inappropriate choices. Relevant sectors of the travel and tourism industry were given by the specification (pages 33-34) and centres in any doubt were 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 and firmly 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 MB4 range.

Part B required a record of customer service role-plays. Witness statements (one for each oral role-play) were essential in allowing moderators to confirm centres' judgements of the quality of customer service role-played by candidates. 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. However, Mark Band 4 does require the role playing of at least two unfamiliar situations and witness statements sometimes did not make clear in what way situations were unfamiliar. This led to some otherwise high-scoring candidates being unable to access the highest marks for AO2. Unfamiliar situations were those 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 unexpectedly speaking in a different language.

In some cases good practice 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. Recordings were not seen as a substitute for teacher witness statements.

The third task (like all AO3 tasks) was a research and analysis task. Candidates were required to show clear, explicit evidence of what research they had done. Failure to do so led to some being unable to progress beyond the threshold of Mark Band 2. Candidates scored at this level or above by providing clear or, for MB3, 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.

Stronger candidates analysed (rather than just described) the results of their research. They 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. Those candidates who had made their research techniques explicit in Task C, were often able to move smoothly to this aspect of the evaluation task. Some candidates simply did not respond to this part of Task D, which limited the score they could achieve.

TT03 – Travel Destinations

What was particularly good
- Most candidates chose two appropriate destinations, i.e. one each from Europe and North America, at the scale of a resort, city, or closely defined rural area.
- Nearly all responses to Task B (AO2) were in the required format of welcome meeting scripts with the more successful firmly rooted in a named hotel in the destination and clearly linked facilities in the destination with a variety of clearly identified customer types present at the welcome meetings.

What was not so good
- For AO1, a number of candidates presented irrelevant material about destination attractions and accommodation when only information about location, climate and landscape was relevant. Candidates who wrote at length about visitor attractions and historical monuments were wasting mark-scoring opportunities.
- Some candidates under-scored on AO3 because they did not make clear what research they had done beyond surfing the internet.

Throughout Unit 3, candidates would be well advised to have a variety (4 or 5) of types of customer clearly in mind – tourists traveling to their chosen destinations from their locality (AO3), who are present at the welcome meetings (AO2) and to whom recommendations can be addressed in AO4. Detailed descriptions of climate and landscape (AO1) can be developed (for MB4) with these customer types in mind.

AO1's task required information about location, climate and landscape. Candidates succeeded when they concentrated firmly on these three foci, presenting detailed information on all three of them for both destinations. Developed (MB4) responses additionally incorporated some thoughtful reference to tourism. Often this related to the influence of climate on UK tourist flow. However, as stated above, some candidates wasted time on much unnecessary material concerning the attractions of their chosen destinations. Others included un-annotated maps as their location evidence and scored few if any marks for them. Clear descriptions of location were needed to access Mark Band 2.

AO2. Successful candidates responded properly to the applied task of scripting welcome meetings. Scripts scored marks; other formats, such as information guides, did not. Supplementary materials such as posters did not add marks since these were only given for the scripts themselves. High-scoring scripts were very clearly written in the style in which a resort representative would be likely to speak. 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.

C was the research and analysis task aimed at AO3. Successful candidates began with examples of four or five customer types, followed by a reasoned and analytical account of the travel options (including within the UK) available to them. Indeed most candidates included all three elements of travel (within the UK, between the UK and the destination and within the destination itself). However the lack of clear evidence of research was still a problem for a

significant number. Many candidates relied heavily, often totally, on the internet for information and the less successful rarely acknowledged their sources properly. Nevertheless there was plenty of good practice shown with references given throughout the text to sources including brochures and travel guides, as well as in a bibliography.

AO4. Successful candidates approached the task head-on and gave clear and explicit recommendations to the customer types they had previously identified. They based these recommendations on detailed evaluations of the appeal of their destinations. However, weaker candidates became too bogged down in the latter and often overlooked the need to actually give recommendations to customers. Use of a table using a scoring system of values from 1 to 5, for example, was only any real use if it made clear which end of this range was the more desirable. The layout of such tables by weaker candidates often left a lot to be desired, for example by having three equally wide columns, two of them having almost nothing written in them and the third stretched longitudinally over several pages. Higher scoring candidates went on, after their recommendations to customers, 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 particularly good

- Most candidates chose an appropriate travel and tourism job to investigate.
- Centres and candidates who used the same travel and tourism organisation for units 2 and 4, as recommended in last year's Examiner's Report, again achieved time and effort efficiencies.

What was not so good

- Some candidates chose "the manager" as the job to investigate. Among lower scoring candidates this term was sometimes vaguely applied and it was not clear to which manager in the organisation they were referring. For example, a hotel may have a general manger, duty manager, restaurant manager and conferences manager (possibly among others).
- In AO2 a number of candidates miscued by wrongly dealing with interactions between the job-holder and customers when they should have been considering interactions between the job-holder and other members of the staff team.

For AO1 most candidates produced a clear (MB2) or detailed (MB3) report on seven specified key areas of their chosen travel and tourism job. Highest achievers provided a well-developed report that made clear their understanding of the chosen job's unwritten demands – those not necessarily specified by the job description but which job-holders nevertheless have to satisfy. Candidates also had to evidence their use of sources to score well at this level. Some missed out on marks they might otherwise have gained by not doing so.

There was misinterpretation of Task B by less successful candidates. They considered interactions between the job-holder and customers rather than, as they should, other job-holders in the organisation. Only communication and professional skills and professional qualities that were reported upon in Task A were relevant. Other key areas from AO1 were not. Successful candidates considered a role-holder such as a hotel manager and her/his interactions with different staff, in real situations that the candidate 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.

AO3. Many candidates coped well with Task C. They made thorough use of valid and current primary (field research) and secondary (desk research) sources and showed clear insight into the usefulness and limitations of those sources. Some candidates did not score so well because they did not provide clear evidence of 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 MB3 or in MB4 when their comments on validity were well developed

The evaluation task (AO4) involved self-assessment. Candidates scored well when they were able to successfully link and weigh specific job requirements to themselves. Some scored fewer marks because while they could evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses they did not explicitly link these to the demands of the chosen job. Alternatively, other less successful candidates gave largely descriptive accounts of what the job entailed without much real thought given to their own plus points and shortcomings in relation to it.

TT06 – Tourism in the UK

Double Award candidates completed **either** Unit 6 **or** Unit 7 in addition to the mandatory Unit 4. It was an infringement of the rubric to do otherwise.

What was particularly good

- For AO2 (Task C) most candidates produced detailed oral presentations.
- In general, work appropriately addressed the unique sequencing of Unit 6's tasks, i.e. AO3 (research and analysis) through Task B and AO2 (application) via Task C.

What was not so good

- There was again a tendency among less successful candidates to lump AO4 in with AO2. As reported last year, such fudging of what are actually discrete AOs produced lower marks than when the two tasks were properly separated.
- Some centres sent moderators recordings, which on some occasions were in unusual formats that moderators had difficulty opening. Actually delivering the presentation is good practice and enables candidates to hone their skills.

AO1   Many successful candidates made good use of the list of factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK listed in the Specification. High achieving candidates were able to show how the factors interacted with each other, scoring marks of at least MB3 level where their report was detailed or well-developed. Some candidates reduced their score by not clearly addressing the interaction requirement of the task.

Task B was the research and analysis (AO3) task for Unit 6. Like Task A, it was set at the national scale. 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? Successful candidates analysed graphically presented data in real detail. Candidates who produced one or two graphs, no matter how neatly drawn, with little more than cursory descriptive comment did not gain many marks.

AO2. There had to be evidence for Task C that a presentation suitable for oral delivery had been produced. Many candidates submitted PowerPoint slides, which they had printed out together with clear Presenter Notes. Some teachers showed 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. Many candidates performed well.

Successful candidates took cognisance of the fact that Task D's oral evaluation (AO4) was worth 12 marks and produced detailed oral evaluations that were entirely separate from Task C. The responses of candidates scoring fewer marks were frequently brief – sometimes very brief (just a couple of PowerPoint slides) at the end of their Task C presentations.

TT07 – Overseas Destination Study

Unit 7 was the alternative to Unit 6 for Double Award candidates.

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

What was not so good
- 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.
- Other candidates wrote unequal reports. Typically, too much (with irrelevant material) for the first and too little for the second country.

Candidates scored well for AO1 when they provided detailed reports on their chosen countries that included the degree of availability of internal transportation. Able candidates recognised that *overviews* were appropriate rather than encyclopedic descriptions and selected key information accordingly. The highest achievers commented critically, bearing in mind the target audience (tour operators) and purpose (future programme inclusion potential) of their profiles. Well-structured reports featured sub-sections for the various tourist regions of the chosen countries in their destination profiles.

AO2 Most candidates found information about the costs and options of travel to the two countries readily accessible. More successful candidates made true comparisons between them, something that proved more difficult for the less successful. Generally, 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 or came up with unrealistic suggestions, such as quoting overland travel for routes to countries for the sake of it rather than because the tour operator commissioner of their report would be likely to consider them.

AO3 was 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.

Better candidates, having addressed the tour operator audience throughout the unit, moved smoothly onto AO4's final evaluative task. They weighed up their two countries by means of an in-depth discussion, giving detailed reasons for explicitly recommending one of their countries for future tour operator programmes. Weaker candidates sometimes lost sight of the need to do so and in some cases simply did not actually recommend which country the tour operator should go for. Stronger candidates realised that it was the decision and its justification that counted for marks.

OVERALL SUMMARY FOR AS UNITS

Portfolios were nearly always well structured with discrete sections for each of the four Assessment Objective tasks. Candidates who presented direct, detailed and well-considered responses to the tasks as set scored well. Candidates whose work was not only detailed (and therefore likely to be scored in Mark Band 3) but also revealed critical understanding were able to access Mark Band 4.

Issues arose during moderation where some centres had given too much credit to candidates who had not made clear what research they had done (AO3) or who had produced work that while it was a clear response to the task was insufficiently detailed to warrant a Mark Band 3 score.

Centres are again advised to guide candidates to provide explicit evidence of what investigations, sources and research techniques they have used. Factual accounts laying out what this research has been and in-text referencing are valuable tools here. Some candidates placed too much reliance on simple, sometimes quite short, lists of (often just internet) sources. Centres are further advised to consult portfolio advisers over issues such as the appropriateness of travel and tourism organisations or jobs whenever they are in any doubt at all.

There was much good work and good internal assessment to be seen and candidates who scored well, as well as centres whose marking was accurate are to be congratulated.

GENERAL COMMENTS FOR A2 UNITS

Summer 2008 was the second series for the moderation of GCE A2 Travel and Tourism.

What was particularly good

- Work was mostly properly structured with each portfolio having four discrete sections, each aimed at one of the four Assessment Objectives and clearly and appropriately focused on travel and tourism events, issues or organisations (depending on individual unit requirements).
- A lot of centre assessment was correctly in line with the expectations of the four Mark Bands. Basic work was correctly scored at MB1 level. Work that clearly responded to the task set was recognised as having attained MB2 and that which did so in detail to have reached MB3. Work that additionally showed critical insight climbed to Mark Band 4.
- Quality of written expression was largely appropriate to A-level work, allowing marks at the top ends of the various mark bands to be agreed when the rest of the relevant descriptor's wording was met.

What was not so good

- Some work did lack a travel and tourism focus. For example, leisure events such as shows and parties performed or held in the centre or locally were not acceptable for Unit 8 (Travel and Tourism Project).
- A few Double Award candidates appeared to have undertaken little or no direct observation of travel and tourism organisations' operations. Consequently, for Units 12 and 13, they struggled to score many marks.
- There was little or no annotation on some work. Annotations are very useful to explain to the moderator why marks have been given. In some cases moderators found it difficult to track evidence and difficult to agree marks as a result.

TT08 – Travel and Tourism Project

Units 8 and 10 were mandatory portfolio units for all A2 candidates.

What was particularly good

- Most projects were appropriate in that they were events involving travel and/or hosting tourists. Most frequently a trip was organised by a small group of candidates. However, successful examples of other travel and tourism projects such as hosting and acting as guides for a visiting group were seen.
- AO1 was well done by many and ICT's contribution clearly evaluated in most projects. Indeed Unit 8 portfolios generally addressed the demands of the Assessment Objectives well.

What was not so good

- Events that were not travel and tourism projects were organised by some candidates. A school sports event where candidates were mostly involved in face painting, for example, was neither travel nor tourism. Leisure events held in the centre or locally were not appropriate.
- Evidence of individual candidate involvement was not always clearly recorded (AO2). Conversely, the evidencing of successful teamwork was sometimes overlooked by others.
- Real *investigation* of the chosen project's feasibility (AO3) was not always evident. A class discussion and ideas-shower session was not a real investigation.

AO1 – Most candidates produced printed PowerPoint slides as their presentation evidence with good speaker's notes that were often detailed enough to reach Mark Band 3. The great majority of work seen this year was correctly of presentations produced by individual candidates. Task A's job is to assess the individual candidate's knowledge and understanding of their business plan, even though this may have been group-generated. Group produced presentations are not appropriate, as pointed out in last year's report. Pleasingly, they were seldom seen this year.

To access Mark Band 4 candidates needed to "see the wood for the trees". They needed to understand how elements of their business plan linked together to make a fused whole, rather than just, in however much detail, deal only with its various elements separately.

The key outcome of Task B (AO2) is a record. Many candidates produced successful diaries or logbooks – sometimes literally, as a separate volume. Such logs recorded not just what happened throughout the project but who was responsible for the various recorded steps. Was it the candidate her/himself? Was it an/other team member/s? If so, who? Names were named in detailed, MB3-quality work. Candidates who scored highest marks additionally provided a critical commentary of the project's progress. In work that exhibited best practice this commentary was integrated with the record. Comments included whether a stage in the project's organisation had gone well or not. Why (or why not)? If not, was it a major problem or a minor setback that could be planned around or not? Such considered commentaries provided component ideas which the strongest candidates were able to use in assembling their evaluations for the AO4 Task D.

As with all AO3 tasks, success rested on evidence of research and analysis. Candidates who scored well when they presented evidence of a proper investigation into the project's feasibility, either in relation to other, subsequently discarded project ideas, or in its own right. A common approach was to conduct a market research exercise of potential customers, with questionnaire, graphed result and subsequent, often detailed analysis. It was, however, vital that the individual

candidate's role in undertaking research was clarified. It was not sufficient just to say that the group did some research.

AO4 called for evaluation. Candidates had four aspects to value:
- the project's overall success
- their own, personal contributions
- the contributions of other team members (best when these are individually identified)
- the contribution made by ICT.

Candidates who dealt with all four, and did so with an appropriate quality of written expression, were able to score at the top of the appropriate mark band (MB2 when work evaluation was clear, MB3 when it was detailed (including the contribution of ICT which some candidates let pass with too little comment) and MB4 when additional critical insight was developed.

TT10 – Current Issues in Travel and Tourism

What was particularly good
- Most chosen issues were travel and tourism, with few general topics such as "global warming" that could just as easily have been Geography as Travel and Tourism.
- Wide ranges of stakeholders (commonly up to double figures) were identified by many candidates

What was not so good
- Some candidates did not understand their work to be an investigation into an issue (a contentious debate with sets of opposed stakeholders holding different views).
- The self-evaluation part of AO4 about how much candidates' own values and attitudes affected their perceptions of their issues' likely future impacts was again ignored or misinterpreted as a simpler than A-level "what my opinion is" section.

A successful approach to the whole unit was:

- to begin by clarifying why the chosen subject was:
  (a) an issue at all
  (b) current (unresolved)
  (c) important to the travel and tourism industry
- to go on to report on the past (AO1), present (AO2 and AO3, separately) and future of the issue (AO4).

Successful candidates gave AO1 responses that were accounts of processes of change *in travel and tourism* in the recent past. Such candidates realised that relevant changes were travel and tourism changes – not, as a few wrongly thought, ideological and political developments that spawned terrorist organisations.

Candidates did well when they saw AO2's relating to the present of their chosen issue. Who are the stakeholders (now)? What are their views and attitudes? These were seen to be the key questions with detailed work dealing clearly with the mixed views found not just among but also within stakeholder groups.

A minority of centres and candidates continued to attempt to conflate Task B (AO2) and Task C (AO3). Candidates doing so did not score well. These were completely separate tasks, each addressing a different Assessment Objective. AO2 assessed candidates' ability to apply knowledge and understanding (for which a written account of stakeholder views sufficed), while AO3 was to test the ability to research and analyse stakeholder responses and actions. Candidates scored well by clearly and explicitly evidencing what research they had done into the responses and actions of stakeholders (what they had done given their views and attitudes as reported in Task B). They then went on to analyse their findings. Some candidates just did not clarify their research methods and sources. They lost marks as a result.

AS with Unit 8 the evaluation task had four parts. This time candidates had to weigh the current and the future impacts of their issue, responses to it and, most challengingly for a number of them, the extent to which their own values and attitudes influenced their perception of the issue's future impacts.

Strong candidates tackled all four elements head on, dealing with the last by considering their own views and judgement of the issue's future and then asking themselves how much the former affected the latter. Weaker candidates only explained their own opinion and left it at that (short of the demand of the task). This prevented them scoring as well as they otherwise might.

TT12 – Business Operations in Travel and Tourism

All Double Award candidates were required to complete this portfolio unit. They then had a choice between Units 13 and 14. Candidates who did otherwise infringed the rubric.

What was particularly good

- The great majority of candidates addressed all five key areas that were required for AO1.
- The most successful candidates realised that the five key area examples unlocked the rest of the unit and focused their work for Tasks B-D very clearly on them.

What was not so good

- Some candidates missed the crux of AO2's Task B (solving problems). They wrote irrelevantly about interactions other than problem-solving ones.
- Similarly, in responding to Task C (AO3) some candidates tried to analyse examples of practices without focussing on the organisation's aims.

The five key areas that are relevant for AO1 are listed in the Specification. It was sufficient to use **one** example of each in describing the operation of each. Proper attention to detail on such a restricted number better equipped candidates for the three AOs to come. Some candidates wrote superficial accounts of each area of operation without using examples in any detail. They did not score well as a result.

Candidates scored well for AO2 when they concentrated specifically on examples of problems that were solved as a result of two or more of the key area examples interacting. Those who did not see this problem-solving focus scored lower marks.

As the focus of AO2 was problem-solving, so that for AO3 was meeting organisational aims. Like all AO3 tasks this was about testing candidates' research and analysis abilities. Candidate scored better when they made explicit what research they had done. Those who had properly used observational evidence from inside a travel and tourism organisation which they had visited, or where they had done work-shadowing, generally scored most marks.

Evaluation in Task D was of the contribution the five examples from AO1 had made to the efficient operation of the chosen travel and tourism organisation. Again, it was familiarity with an organisation the candidate had actually visited and collected evidence in that bred a higher-scoring response. Candidates who had tried to do the unit from the outside looking in, relying exclusively on secondary source materials, fared less well, as a rule.

TT13 – Management in Travel and Tourism

Double Award candidates completed **either** Unit 13 **or** Unit 14. Unit 13 was, as it had been in 2007, the less popular choice. Nevertheless, Unit 13 was again very well done by some centres' candidates

What was particularly good

- Interesting choices of travel and tourism organisation were made, for example a specialist independent travel agency. Such a choice was of an appropriate scale (big enough to have a management structure worth investigating, small enough for A2 candidates to understand)
- Work was not flabby. Candidates stuck to the point of each of the four sections.

What was not so good

- Access to appropriate management sources was essential and was possibly why relatively few chose the unit.
- An insider view produced much better work. As for Unit 12, candidates attempting to complete their portfolio from a standpoint outside the chosen organisation had difficulty in scoring very many marks.

AO1 was generally well done. While detailed description and explanation enabled candidates to score up to Mark Band 3, it was, as with other units, the greater critical insight of the most able that allowed them to access MB4. In this case that was by determining the effectiveness of their chosen organisation's management structure, and how the people running the organisation made that structure effective.

Issues was the key word for Task B (AO2). The application here was of the candidate's informed judgement about the relevance and success of management responses to issues of:
- recruitment
- training, and
- customer service.

Candidates performed better when they applied their judgement to management responses to these aspects of the organisation's business as issues. They performed less well when they simply described what management had done.

Success at AO3 hinged upon candidate's analysis of how the three prongs of their research activity linked and complemented each other. Successful candidates made clear what research they had done via documents and observation, as well as through discussion with at least one manager. They then discussed how the three investigative strands wound together to help them develop their understanding of the chosen organisation's management.

For AO4's evaluation, candidates scored higher marks when their consideration of the importance of external influences was based on a real discussion with a manager of the chosen organisation. Such contact facilitated good responses; lack of it considerably hampered other candidates.

TT14 – Special Interest/Activity Holidays

Most Double Award candidates chose this optional unit in preference to the alternative Unit 13.

What was particularly good

- It was more widely understood, than had been the case in 2007, that this unit was about **two** markets in holiday types and not about two destinations.
- Many candidates included useful information on health and safety provision and patterns of tourist flow in their chosen markets.

What was not so good

- Some candidates seemed unclear about which of their markets was specialist, which was itinerant and why.
- Some were content with referring to only a narrow range of tour operators for markets where they would have done better to have shown a realisation that there are in fact many, varied operators active.

AO1. Successful candidates produced detailed but relevant and to the point descriptions of wide ranges of holidays and tour operators (mass and niche market), as well as of health and safety provision and the patterns of tourist flow. Candidates scored less well if they omitted or underplayed one of these four elements of their descriptions of their two markets.

For AO2, successful outcomes were achieved by candidates who clarified changes over the last ten years or so and then went on to predict future trends sensibly, largely on the basis of extrapolating recent trends. Highest marks were gained by those who were able to demonstrate real awareness of how changing values and attitudes in society (for example about the impacts of tourism) have influenced and may be expected to influence actual recent and likely future changes in their chosen markets.

Tasks C and D were separate and candidates scored better when they considered each separately. As usual with AO3, success often flowed from an initial, specific account of the research they had undertaken. AO4 involved both a comparison of the two chosen markets and an evaluation of sources, methods, values and attitudes and conclusions drawn. Successful candidates included all of these in a total evaluation that had some meat to it. Some candidates overlooked the comparison part of the task. Their scores were, as a result, only in the lower halves of mark band descriptor boxes.

OVERALL SUMMARY FOR A2 UNITS

Portfolios were successful when they focused, as most did, on clearly travel and tourism matters and when the research elements of AO3 tasks were clearly detailed. Candidates who kept their eyes on the ball by following the wording of tasks as written scored well, those who wandered off target gained fewer marks. Units 12 and 13 in particular really required candidates to have a genuine insight into the internal workings of travel and tourism organisations if they were to do well. The building of good centre-industry links by their teachers has been the path to success for some candidates.

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