



General Certificate of Education

Travel and Tourism

TRPA Portfolio Units

Report on the Examination

2009 examination - June series

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

Copyright © 2009 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.

Contents

GCE Travel and Tourism

AS Units

General Comments for AS Units	4
TT02 Travel and Tourism – A People Industry	5
TT03 Travel Destinations.....	6
TT04 Working in Travel and Tourism	7
TT06 Tourism in the UK.....	8
TT07 Overseas Destination Study.....	9
General Overview for AS Units.....	10

A2 Units

General Comments for A2 Units.....	11
TT08 Travel and Tourism Project	12
TT10 Current Issues in Travel and Tourism	13
TT12 Business Operations in Travel and Tourism.....	14
TT13 Management in Travel and Tourism.....	15
TT14 Special Interest/Activity Holidays	16
General Overview for A2 Units	17
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	17

General Comments for AS Units

AS Travel and Tourism has now become quite a mature specification. Summer 2009 was its fourth moderation series. Most candidates produced appropriately structured work that directly addressed the demands of the four assessment objective tasks for each unit. Assessment was often in line with the AQA standard, sometimes slightly lenient and occasionally a little harsh, although moderation brought such discrepancies into line with AQA standard.

What was particularly good

- Most candidates' work addressed the four separate assessment objectives of each unit. For AO4 of Unit 2, for example, successful candidates evaluated the many customer service skills needed by their chosen travel and tourism organisation's staff, as well as the quality and usefulness of their own evidence.
- In almost every case candidates chose to investigate appropriate travel and tourism organisations, destinations or, for Unit 4, jobs.
- There was increased evidence of centres taking on board the advice given at standardising meetings, and in previous reports, to encourage candidates to make the research they have done for AO3 tasks explicit. Every unit has an AO3 research and analysis task. It is vital that candidates clarify their personal roles in undertaking the research that has collected data to analyse.
- Many centres annotated candidates' work and provided summary comments on an AO by AO basis. Such good practice helped moderators identify evidence and so agree marks.

What was not so good

- Once again, some work that amounted to a clear response to a task (and therefore in the Mark Band 2 range) was assessed over-generously as being detailed Mark Band 3 work. Centres in this position are advised to attend a standardising meeting and to make use of the benchmark exemplars that are provided there.
- Some centres who had issues to address following moderator feedback last year had apparently not guided their candidates any differently this year. The attainment of candidates in such centres did not improve much as a result. All centres are urged to follow the lead of the majority of colleagues who take careful note of moderator comments and make adjustments in response to them.

TT02 – A People Industry

What was particularly good

- There was a very clear focus in AO1 on the induction and training procedures that were in place at the chosen travel and tourism organisation.
- Many candidates did well in their role-plays (AO2). Useful witness statements were provided which clarified for moderators how well each candidate performed in each oral role-play by reference to words used in the mark band descriptors.

What was not so good

- Task C (AO3) required candidates to make explicitly clear what research they themselves had done. Some candidates did not and instead they launched directly into a descriptive account of product knowledge. Their more successful counterparts, having given an account of the research they did, went on to analyse the levels of product knowledge required by staff in a variety of different jobs in the chosen organisation.
- In responding to AO4 some good candidates failed to address all parts of the higher mark band descriptors. There is a requirement to evaluate evidence collected as well as the interpersonal and technical skills that staff require.

The clear focus of AO1 was induction and training. Successful candidates reviewed those procedures used by their chosen organisation clearly (Mark Band 2), in detail (Mark Band 3) or in a well developed (critical) way for the highest (Mark Band 4) marks. Candidates who wrote in generic terms or who did not clearly focus on induction and training restricted themselves to Mark Band 1.

Witness statements are key to the assessment and moderation of the customer service role-plays that constitute AO2. The purpose of these is to explain to the moderator the quality of the customer service that was delivered in oral role-plays. The AQA Teachers' Guide (available on the AQA website, www.aqa.org.uk) offers a proforma that many centres use effectively to convey to the moderator what each customer service situation was, what took place and how well the candidate performed. It is important to ensure that a variety (at least three, typically four or five) of different customer needs are role-played using a range of customer service skills. Successful candidates often present evidence of a face-to-face oral situation, a telephone dialogue, an e-mail and a letter.

The Mark Band 4 descriptor asks for some unfamiliar situations (at least two). These need to be unfamiliar both to the candidate (i.e. they should be unrehearsed) and to the member of staff s/he is role-playing. A successful approach here is to play the role of a recently inducted trainee member of staff. Such a person may find the unexpected (hard of hearing, non-English-speaking or otherwise awkward) customer unfamiliar. It is essential that the unfamiliarity is explained to the moderator.

Like all AO3 tasks, the investigation into and analysis of product knowledge involves both research and analysis. These two elements both need to be made explicit. How did the candidate collect information about the level of product knowledge different members of staff need? What do they need to know about what they are providing for customers? Why? Successful candidates answer these questions within a fluent prose account. All AO3 and AO4 tasks include an element of the quality of written communication in their assessment.

Many candidates produced pleasing evaluations of a wide range of interpersonal and technical skills that staff at the chosen organisation need to deliver excellent customer service. Weaker responses tended to outline or simply describe such skills rather than genuinely weigh their significance.

TT03 – Travel Destinations

What was particularly good

- Many candidates included good descriptions of the major physical landscape features of their chosen destinations, as well as locating them well and providing key climatic information.
- Methods of travel to each destination frequently included all three required elements of the journey (within the UK, from the UK to the destination, and within the destination).

What was not so good

- Some candidates chose destinations at an inappropriate scale, such as a whole country, state or large island. They would have been better advised to focus on a resort, city or defined rural area, such as a National Park. Candidates who did so tended to produce more genuinely detailed work and were thus more likely to access Mark Band 3 or higher.
- The core of Task D for AO4 is the recommendation of aspects of the chosen destinations to potential customers. Less successful candidates missed this point and launched inappropriately into an attempted evaluation of appeal with no customer types clearly in mind.

AO1 is about three elements of each destination: location, climate and landscape. The simple truth is that candidates who clearly focus on these score better marks than those who attempt to fudge the issue – usually evading the landscape issue. A successful approach to tackling landscape is to begin with an aerial photograph (such as those that are available on the internet, for example on Google Earth) or a relief map of the destination; then pick out major landscape features (hills, valleys, rivers, lakes, woodlands, beaches, bays and so on) and go on to name and describe them. In this way successful candidates were able to build clear written accounts of the physical setting within which each destination has developed.

More or less every candidate produced two correctly formatted welcome meeting scripts that began with a greeting and ended with thanks and an opportunity for questions. Successful candidates made sure that the information they presented was relevant to the destination itself (as opposed to the hotel or ways of travelling there) and clearly addressed at a range of identified customer types in the audience. Generic descriptive accounts addressed to no-one in particular scored less than half of the available marks.

Through both AO3 and AO4 successful candidates focused clearly on a variety of different customer types. They researched and then analysed the transport options that would most likely suit their clearly identified customer types in AO3. For AO4, they went on to make clear recommendations to those same customers, based on an evaluation of the appeal of each of their destinations. AO4 also required an evaluation of the likely future popularity of each destination. Unfortunately, many weaker candidates tended to describe recent trends without going on to extrapolate those into the future, or to explain why they were unlikely to continue into the future. The recent past is not the future.

TT04 – Working in Travel and Tourism

What was particularly good

- Many candidates reported well on all seven key areas of their chosen travel and tourism job (as specified for AO1)
- Successful candidates often used a scenarios approach for AO2, by describing examples of situations in which holders of their chosen job interact with other job-holders to solve problems and deal with complex situations.

What was not so good

- Some candidates misinterpreted AO2 as being about interactions between the job-holder and external customers rather than, as it should be, about interactions between the job-holder and their staff colleagues who hold different job roles.

Successful candidates provided detailed information on all seven key areas of the chosen job. Some weaker responses underplayed one or two of these areas, typically feedback and personal development, and scored fewer marks as a consequence than those that were more balanced and which maintained detail throughout. Centres are reminded that the Specification gives guidance as to the content expected for each key area.

As outlined above (in *What was particularly good* and *What was not so good*) AO2 produced differentiated responses according to whether interactions with other job-holders were successfully exemplified or not. It is important to note that the *other people's roles* of Task B are the roles of other staff members.

The key to AO3 is to link research and observations of workplace practice. Candidates simply cannot do well on this unit unless they have watched someone doing the chosen job. Thankfully many had done so and scored better marks when they made clear how their desk research inter-related with the observations they had made.

For AO4, successful candidates evaluated their own strengths and weaknesses, and related these to specific requirements of the chosen job. Higher marks were gained by those who went on to assess their own strengths and weaknesses in a variety of contexts, for example in part-time work and in coping with stressful situations, and applying these to the demands of their chosen travel and tourism job.

TT06 – Tourism in the UK

Double Award candidates chose to complete **either** Unit 6 **or** Unit 7.

What was particularly good

- Many candidates wrote detailed and well-structured reports on factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK (AO1).
- Good PowerPoint presentations about tourism in the chosen region were frequently seen for AO2 (Task C, in this case)

What was not so good

- For AO2, a number of candidates made little or no attempt to put the chosen region in the national context. They lost marks as a result since this is a requirement of the task.
- AO4 was quite often rather weak. It was rather tagged on to the end of the presentation for AO2 – apparently an afterthought in a number of cases. Centres are reminded that AO4 is a separate part of the unit worth 12 marks in its own right.

For AO1, good detailed accounts of factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK (using the prompts given in the Specification) were common, which was pleasing. The most successful candidates (scoring in Mark Band 3 and above) were those who also showed how these factors interacted with each other.

Task B addressed AO3 and was therefore a research and analysis task. It followed on from Task A in being concerned with the national tourism picture. Many candidates produced perfectly competent graphs to illustrate a range of visitor trends and made sure that they recorded the sources from which they had derived their data. However, fewer candidates went on to analyse their graphical information very thoroughly. Less successful candidates were often content with often quite brief descriptive outlines of what each graph told them. Candidates should remember that this is an AS level task and some evidence of insight is expected.

For task C (AO2), most candidates wisely chose their own local tourist board region. This tended to give their work clarity since they understood what the key features of local tourism were. There were many good PowerPoints. However, some candidates stopped short of properly placing their region in the national context, and would have scored higher marks had they done so. Stronger candidates produced detailed analysis (rather than mere description) of provision in the chosen region.

The key to Task D is to recognise that it is a separate strand from Task C. Less successful candidates, as has been noted on previous occasions, tended to attempt to incorporate the evaluation called for by D with the comparative description and analysis required by C. Such “integrated” approaches frequently underplayed AO4 and lost marks as a consequence. The best advice is to treat D and C separately. One approach is to vary the style of presentation. Some candidates produced an audio presentation for AO4, for example.

TT07 – Overseas Destination Study

What was particularly good

- Many candidates produced detailed destination profiles of two southern hemisphere countries for AO1. There was a pleasingly widespread inclusion of comment on the degree of availability of internal transportation.
- Candidates who collected sound data on visitor trends were often able to analyse them quite well.

What was not so good

- Ranges of costs and options (AO2) were quite often narrow and were treated rather superficially. Detailed comparison was achieved by only the most successful candidates.
- In recommending one of their two countries, a number of candidates tended to think of their own preferences rather than of the tour operators who were their target audience.

Many candidates produced detailed destination profiles for AO1. The more successful structured these carefully, using identified regions as sub-sections and specifically including a section about the availability of internal transportation. Features, facilities and amenities were organised into the regional sub-sections. Some candidates allowed AO1 to dominate their portfolio. It is worth 12 of the 60 marks available. Candidates would be well advised to plan their work for the unit as a whole rather than launch into an encyclopaedic AO1 at the expense of other sections.

AO2 is worth 18 marks. However for a significant number of candidates research into costs and options was limited, and effective comparison of them slight. Successful candidates researched a range of costed ways of travelling to each of their chosen countries and compared them in detail, carefully weighing both similarities and differences between them.

Many candidates fared well on AO3. Having gathered appropriate statistics on visitor numbers they described them well and went on to subject their findings to clear (MB2), detailed (MB3) or critical (MB4) analysis. Less successful candidates skated over the requirement to analyse current coverage by UK tour operators. Candidates are advised to give equal weight to both parts of the task, that is to say to tour operator coverage as well as to visitor trends.

In the final task (AO4), candidates were asked to recommend one of their destinations, with reasons, to tour operators. Successful candidates rightly saw this as the culmination of the work they had done for the rest of the unit and presented a well-concluded evaluative discussion leading to an actual choice. Weaker candidates may or may not have made a choice, but, when they did do so, they argued for it only slightly, or in terms of “why I think this country is the best”, rather than because of what might matter to tour operators.

Overall Summary for AS Units

Most of the AS portfolio work seen was clearly structured to meet the requirements of each of the four Assessment Objectives that make up each unit. The great majority of candidates chose appropriate travel and tourism organisations, destinations and jobs to investigate. Successful candidates took careful note of the wording of Mark Band descriptors as well as of the tasks in the Assessment Grid banners. They made sure that all aspects of a task were covered in a balanced way.

When candidates under-achieved it was mostly as a result of not quite fulfilling the specific requirements of a task. Occasions where work was over-assessed most frequently arose when work that was a clear response to the task (and which should have been MB2) was marked as though it were detailed MB3 work. Mark Band 3 is reserved for work that is detailed as well as clear, and which matches the MB3 descriptor wording best. In general, MB4 work is not only clear, not only detailed, but also shows critical thought or insight.

General Comments for A2 Units

What was particularly good

- Most portfolios submitted for moderation correctly addressed each assessment objective individually.
- Many detailed (yet relevant and to the point) responses were seen and credited at Mark Band 3. Among the strongest candidates at A2 there was clear evidence of a significant critical insight. Where apparent, such insight allowed MB4 marks to be given.
- AO4 tasks are always evaluative. As one might expect at A2, many candidates addressed evaluation tasks directly, so that there was relatively little evidence of simple description masquerading as true evaluation, which was good.

What was not so good

- AO3 tasks are always research and analysis tasks. They always require explicit evidence of investigation: what did each individual candidate do to collect information? Some candidates skated over this fundamental issue and underachieved for AO3 as a result.
- There is a need to fully satisfy the wording of a descriptor to score the top mark available in any mark band. Some candidates satisfied only part of some descriptors (often longer, composite ones such as Unit 8, AO4) and lost some marks that they may otherwise have gained as a consequence.
- Teacher annotation was not provided on all portfolios. Where annotation was provided it was often very helpful because it guided the moderator to particular pieces of a candidate's portfolio. As a result, annotation facilitated the agreement of marks given by the teacher.

TT08 – Travel and Tourism Project

What was particularly good

- A large number of interesting trips were organised by small groups of candidates, with each taking an active role. The project does not have to be a trip – hosting visiting tourists and taking them on a guided tour are among the other options.
- AO1 was well done by many and ICT's contribution was clearly evaluated in most projects. Indeed Unit 8 portfolios generally addressed the demands of the Assessment Objectives well.

What was not so good

- Some candidates organised what amounted to leisure events at their centre. Occasions such as parties and shows, no matter how charitable their aims, are unlikely to be travel and tourism.
- Evidence of actually investigating the feasibility of the chosen project was sometimes thin. Class discussions were not regarded as A2 investigations. Actual research was expected, and credited when evidenced.
- In both AO2 and AO4, some candidates did not clarify exactly who did what (and how well) in their team. Vague references to “we” are better avoided, in favour of naming individual team members.

For the most part candidates produced PowerPoint presentations for AO1. Many were accompanied by presenter notes, which were often in sufficient depth to achieve MB3 (detailed) standard. The strongest candidates did not content themselves with just the individual element of the business plan. Instead, they developed a critical assessment of the degree of linkage between them and consequently scored in Mark Band 4.

For AO2, candidates were asked to produce a record of involvement. Usually this took the form of a diary or log. Minutes of meetings were an alternative approach. The strongest candidates developed a commentary to accompany their records. Best practice was shown when commentaries were an integrated part of the records. Weaker candidates tended to record either what “I” did, with little reference to teamwork or what “we” did in which case it was difficult to see what the individual candidate had actually contributed.

There was a sharp divide between candidates who provided clear evidence of an actual investigation of the feasibility of the chosen project and those who did not. The former scored more marks. Successful feasibility investigations included market research surveys, costings of different options and interviews with centre senior managers to find out what would be allowed for the project and what procedures would have to be followed.

Candidates scored more on AO4 when they deliberately set out to address all parts of the task. Such successful candidates considered the overall success of the project, the contributions of themselves and others and the contribution made by ICT. Candidates who omitted one or more of these elements could not score at the top of any mark band range.

TT10 – Current Issues in Travel and Tourism

What was particularly good

- Not only were most of the chosen current issues genuinely travel and tourism, but accounts of processes which have brought those issues to a head were more often focused (as MB2 demands) on change *in travel and tourism* than has been the case previously.
- Most candidates recognised that although AO2 and AO3 are both about stakeholders, they are inherently different tasks. AO2 is an assessment of the candidate's application of knowledge and understanding (of what stakeholders think), while AO3 requires research and analysis of what stakeholders have done.

What was not so good

- Some candidates did not fully clarify (for the reader or for themselves) why the subject of their report was actually a current travel and tourism issue. That is to say why:
 - there is a debate or conflict between different sets of stakeholders
 - the issue is one for the travel and tourism industry
 - it is unresolved (and therefore current rather than past).
- Some candidates ignored or avoided the AO4 requirement to evaluate “*the extent to which (their own) values and attitudes... influenced their perception of future impacts*”. To do so meant that marks were lost since all four mark band descriptors include an assessment of this self-awareness aspect. Successful candidates realised the need to refer to how much their conclusions about the future of the chosen issue resulted from their own subjective perceptions.

Candidates made a good job of AO1 when they stuck to processes of change *in travel and tourism*. Others, who fared less well, diverted into realms such as politics (for terrorism's effects on travel and tourism) or physical geography (for issues related to the effects of natural hazards on travel on tourism). Issues such as whether budget airlines are likely to continue to expand were much more clearly travel and tourism in nature and strong candidates were able to account not only for the expansion of such airlines but also for more recent checks on that expansion – including the current recession.

The keys to success in AO2 are to identify sufficient stakeholder groups and to understand the variation in values and attitudes within, as well as among, those groups. Even the Mark Band 2 descriptor opens by requiring *many* stakeholder groups. Stronger candidates realised that this was likely to mean 10 or more groups. There are six sectors in the travel and tourism industry (specified by AS Unit 1). Add to that pressure groups, local residents, the local council/government, businesses other than travel and tourism organizations, and tourists themselves, and the number of groups quickly rose into double figures. Consideration of mixed views meant identifying individual people and organisations with different opinions. The total number of stakeholders considered escalated further. Candidates who dealt only with a few stakeholders were clearly at a considerable disadvantage to those who rose to the challenge of the task and dealt with *many*.

The message for AO4 is now becoming familiar. It is that all parts of the task descriptor must be met. Yes, there is lot to evaluate, but it must all be included if any of the mark bands is to be satisfied. Even Mark Band 1 calls for a basic evaluation of impacts (future as well as current) and of the influence of the candidate's own values and attitudes on their perception of the future. To omit part of this task meant missing out on marks that might otherwise have been scored.

TT12 – Business Operations in Travel and Tourism

Candidates for the Double Award had to complete this unit. They had a choice between Units 13 (Management) and 14 (Special interest/activity holidays).

What was particularly good

- Most candidates gave a clear or detailed account of the specified five key areas in their chosen travel and tourism organisation. In the best practice examples, they had interviewed a manager and elicited useful first-hand information from that source.
- When, in AO3, it came to analysing how the examples of practices they had described in AO1 met their aims, strong candidates researched a variety of sources including staff, customers and managers of the organisation.

What was not so good

- Some candidates didn't latch on to the narrative thread that runs through this unit. They did not realise that the five key area examples they had accounted for (probably quite successfully) should be the same examples they used for each of AOs 2, 3 and 4.
- AO3 focuses on the aims of the example practices. Less successful candidates attempted to complete this task without first clearly identifying what these aims were.

The Specification lays down which five key areas are to be exemplified and described. Most candidates gave proper and appropriate accounts that were clear (MB2), detailed (MB3) or, for the highest MB4 marks, that were well developed with commentary on necessary skills and discussion of problems.

AO2 is about difficulties that can arise with the operation of the chosen travel and tourism organisation as a business. An approach taken by some successful candidates was to find out about some examples of difficulties from a source within the organisation. They then applied their knowledge and understanding to give an account of how practices they had exemplified in AO1 interact in the easing of these difficulties. Weaker candidates had a tendency to describe the solution of problems without referring to the necessary interactions.

Candidates who did well on AO3 were very clear about what the aims of their example practices were. This kept them on track. Their less successful peers either did not come to terms with what the aims were or became confused because they had not understood that the practices referred to in AO3 were the same as those that they had exemplified and described in AO1.

Candidates who had cultivated a source within the chosen organisation were in a good position to do well on AO4. This was because they were able to glean first-hand information about the efficiency of the example systems they had been learning and writing about throughout the unit. This was crucial in informing the detailed or critical evaluations presented by the most successful candidates.

TT13 – Management in Travel and Tourism

Unit 13 was again the less popular alternative to Unit 14. Centres with good access to a manager within a travel and tourism organisation (perhaps the one chosen for an AS unit or for Unit 12) may do well to consider Unit 13. Given good quality information Unit 13 has tended to encourage more concise, more tightly-focused work than Unit 14 where, despite the superficial attraction of the topic for some, weaker candidates produce too much irrelevant or simply descriptive material and insufficient incisive information.

What was particularly good

- There was appropriate selection of a travel and tourism organisation to investigate.
- Work was concise and to the point, closely guided by the task and descriptor wordings.

What was not so good

- To score well candidates need to both gather and digest first-hand information in order to respond well to the tasks set, for example to show awareness of how well the chosen organisation's policies worked in practice.
- AO3. To reach the top of Mark Bands 2-4, candidates needed to analyse how the three types of research (documentary study, observation and discussion with managers) have complimented each other. Some candidates rather overlooked this and treated the research methods separately.

AO1 again proved to be quite approachable for those candidates who had good access to a travel and tourism organisation. Such access equipped them with the tools to show knowledge and understanding of the organisation's structure and of the roles and responsibilities of managers as well as of the skills they need.

The focus of Task B was focus. Having used their organisational contact to help them identify examples of issues that management had faced, more successful candidates have done better when they have thought through and understood how management responses to issues have been in the context of the organisation's corporate policies.

A significant factor in how well candidates performed for AO3 was whether they linked up the three sorts of research they had been asked to do, or whether they treated them separately. Since all of the mark bands from MB2 upwards require an analysis of such links it was, in mark terms, potentially costly to do the latter.

Again, success at AO4 hinged upon the quality of information gained from within the chosen organisation. By asking those on the inside, candidates are able to discover what external influences most impinge upon the organization, and how management has responded to them. The crucial next step to success was to try to weigh the nature and importance of those various influences and the quality of the management response, in order to produce a clear or more detailed or developed evaluation.

TT14 – Special Interest/Activity Holidays

This was a more popular choice than the alternative Unit 13. Whether it was always the better choice is less clear. Unit 13 candidates can do well if they have good access to a manager in their chosen organisation. Unit 14 candidates have sometimes under-performed when they have lost sight of the specific requirements of the unit and lapsed into lengthy descriptions of exciting holidays.

What was particularly good

- Both health and safety provision and tourism flow patterns were often explicit and clear in candidates' responses to the AO1 task.
- Many candidates had clearly undertaken research from a wide variety of sources.

What was not so good

- Tour operators sometimes received short shrift in AO1 descriptions. Candidates need to remember that AO1 is about a market not just about a holiday type and the major players in that market need to feature prominently in their work. In the cases of the more successful candidates, they did.
- AO4 is a composite task. To satisfy all its requirements candidates needed to take cognisance of the mark band descriptor wordings as well as of the banner directive.

AO1. This is a unit about special interest and activity holidays. The latter were much less evident in the choices made by many candidates than less physical types of special interest holiday. Cruising is a permissible market but candidates often made little attempt to present in the context of the unit title. This tended to involve them in unnecessary extra work in order to produce a detailed description of holidays and tour operators across the whole cruises market.

Changes in markets (the focus of AO2's Task B) over the last ten years were well understood by a good number of candidates. However, rather fewer were able to predict future trends with much conviction. The future may not turn out to be the same as the recent past has been. Extrapolation of current trends may have been all very well a couple of years ago, but the current recession has rather altered the outlook for some specialist operators. Good candidates reflected on that.

Unit 14's AO3 task addresses the quality of the research and the analysis that candidates have undertaken in the remainder of the unit. However, it is assessed separately. Good practice is to give this AO its own section – just as for any other. In that section candidates should explicitly evidence the sources and methods they have used and do well when they explain how it has allowed them to achieve their aims, including successful analysis.

AO4 has lots of parts that all have to be done. Less successful candidates tended either to evaluate their research and, actually slightly less often, their conclusions and predictions, or they completed the comparison referred to at the start of the descriptor wording at the expense of much evaluation. Stronger candidates were those who produced a more even-handed section that both compared the chosen markets and evaluated the investigation undertaken.

Overall Summary for A2 Units

A2 candidates have already completed AS Travel and Tourism. They have therefore already learned lessons of proper portfolio organisation and the need to respond to tasks as set. This was, as it should have been, evident in most of the work seen.

There was a more widespread understanding of the clear travel and tourism focus of Unit 10 and of the demands of Unit 12. Many candidates evidently enjoyed Unit 8. In a sense that Unit is the culmination of their applied study of travel and tourism, since it provides the opportunity to be actively involved in a real project with customers.

Most candidates completed Unit 14. Some, of course, did well. Others were less successful than they might have been because they were rather blinded by the specifics of what they had to do; focusing instead on the attraction of the opportunity to simply, if lengthily, describe some holidays. Centres where candidates did well at Unit 12 may wish to reflect on whether Unit 13 may offer a more cost-effective alternative for such candidates than the superficially attractive Unit 14. This may especially be the case because the choice of the same travel and tourism organisation for both units can allow some significant time economies to be made.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.