General Certificate of Education

Travel and Tourism

TRPA   Portfolio Units

Report on the Examination

2010 examination - June series

Contents

GCE Travel and Tourism

General Comments for AS Units

What was particularly good

- Portfolio work was largely well structured. Each unit portfolio was presented in four separate sections – one for each Assessment Objective (AO) task. Such appropriate structuring facilitated assessment and moderation as well as helping to maximize candidate marks.
- Appropriate travel and tourism organisations and destinations were chosen as subjects for study. In Unit 2, for example, most candidates chose a hotel. Such choice afforded potential access to all parts of the mark scheme.

What was not so good

- Work that was a clear response to the set task (Mark Band 2) was sometimes over-generously assessed as being of Mark Band 3 quality. MB3 is reserved for detailed work that deals with the matter in hand in its various constituent parts. For instance, not just employees but different members of staff in the chosen organization (TT02) or different customer types as opposed to just customers (TT03).
- Some candidates attempted to "kill two birds with one stone" by conflating separate AO tasks. For example, in the Double Award's Unit 6 (Tourism in the UK) there was a tendency among some to try and combine the tasks for AO2 and AO4. As reported for previous series, this generally resulted in one other task (usually, AO4 in the case of TT06) being less than fully answered. This left the candidate short-changed in terms of marks scored.

TT02 – A People Industry

What was particularly good

- Most candidates chose an appropriate travel and tourism organisation (such as a hotel or visitor attraction). Such choices worked well because they were large enough to have different employees. This helped candidates produce detailed work, for example for AO1 and AO3 about induction and training provided for and product knowledge required of different staff members.
- Many candidates were able to provide records of successful customer service role-plays (AO2). Witness statements signed by the teacher were provided that clarified for the moderator the quality of performance observed in each oral role-play. These referred directly to the wordings of the mark band descriptors.

What was not so good

- Travel agency and Tourist Information Office case studies sometimes proved to be less successful choices of organisation. This was the case when the organisation (or at least the branch investigated) was small-scale so that there were insufficient numbers of different staff roles to allow candidates to produce detailed work (for AO1, AO2 and AO4).
- Task C is an AO3 task. All AO3 tasks require explicit evidence of research. Exactly what research had been done was not always evident.

For AO1 most of the work seen this year was clearly focussed on the actual induction and training procedures used by the chosen travel and tourism organisation. Stronger candidates were able to show how the organisation benefits from these procedures. The most successful candidates developed their responses by reviewing the appropriateness as well as benefits of the organisation's induction and training procedures. This allowed access to MB4 marks.

For AO2 appropriate witness statements were seen which allowed moderators to accept centre assessments of role-play performances. Such witness statements made good use of the descriptor wordings, referring to the detail, effectiveness and appropriateness of customer service in each role play. Centres are reminded that a witness statement template is offered in the AQA Teacher's Guide for GCE Travel and Tourism.

The highest achieving candidates scored the upper MB4 marks because they provided clear witness evidence of successfully meeting customer needs in unfamiliar situations. Unfamiliar situations are unfamiliar to **both** the job-holder being role-played **and** to the candidate. Examples included the unexpected arrival of a non-English speaker, the sudden need to cover for a colleague with a different role or to cope with a customer who was behaving unusually. It should be made clear to the moderator not only why the situation is unfamiliar to the job-holder but also that the candidate has not had the opportunity to plan and rehearse their response. Only spontaneous performances in oral role-play can be truly said to be unfamiliar.

A useful tip for AO2 is to consider it as a follow-on to AO1. Candidates have investigated and now know about their organisation's induction and training procedures. So, they know something about what newly recruited members of staff can be expected to do. They themselves are likely to be aged 16-19. Making a young relatively inexperienced staff member the subject of the unfamiliar situation role-plays widens the scope of what may be justified as unfamiliar.

For AO3 it must be made apparent what research has been done. In the work of successful candidates such evidence made clear how sources had provided evidence of the product

knowledge required by various staff at the organisation. In the work of some other candidates this section tended to be dominated either by research methods or product knowledge accounts. It should be remembered that both research and analysis (in this case of the level of product knowledge required of the organisation's staff) are demanded by all AO3 tasks.

Turning to the AO4 evaluation, most candidates described, explained and evaluated a range of interpersonal and technical skills necessary to deliver good customer service. Those scoring at MB3 and MB4 levels dealt substantively with a range of different staff. This is a potential area for improvement by future candidates in some centres.

TT03 – Travel Destinations

What was particularly good

- More candidates included appropriate information about major physical landscape features in their destination descriptions. Key climatic information in more detailed descriptions enabled many of them to progress to MB3 in AO1.
- Welcome meeting scripts more frequently matched facilities and attractions to the needs of a range of customer types.

What was not so good

- There were still candidates who chose regions, states and countries rather than appropriately scaled resort, city or national park (or similar rural) destinations. Though few, there were also some ineligible choices this year of destinations that are not in Europe or North America as defined by the Specification and illustrated by the maps at its end. Ineligible destinations do not score. Centres are advised to check with their Portfolio Adviser if in doubt.
- Some candidates again presented irrelevant material about destination attractions in AO1. This tended to squeeze out the more challenging landscape description, which, along with location and climate, scores marks.
- Some candidates lost marks on AO3 because they did not make clear how they had used a range of research techniques and because they described how people could access their chosen destinations rather than analysing the options available for a range of customer types.

Of the three required descriptive elements in Task A (AO1), it was still landscape that caused most problems, although more candidates made a genuine attempt at its description and some described the physical setting of their chosen destinations well. Some candidates included irrelevant travelogue-style information about attractions that earned them no specific credit.

For AO2 some candidates became bogged down in describing lots of hotel facilities. The focus of the welcome meeting scripts needs to be the destinations themselves. Successful candidates made detailed links between facilities and attractions offered in destinations and a range of different customer types notionally present in their audience. The key to success in this whole unit is its underpinning narrative. It is about people – customers who might visit the chosen destinations. Establishing a dramatis personae of customer types at this stage (if not at the very beginning of the unit) and following those characters through the AOs is an approach that keeps candidates focused on the mark-scoring people connections. Candidates sometimes produced superficially detailed welcome scripts that could not score at MB3 precisely because they did not make customer types explicit.

Responses to Task C (AO3) were, in general, markedly improved. Many more were complete in that they included all three required elements of travel options: within the United Kingdom, between the UK and the destination and within the destination. There was some increased reference to specific customer types and their likely travel choices. Nevertheless many candidates would have benefited from getting away from just finding out how one can access a destination from the UK and then describing it. They need to analyse the degree of fit between a variety of options and a variety of customer types. Moderators reported examples of good practice in which references to sources used were made throughout the text as well as in a bibliography.

AO4 requires candidates to make recommendations to a variety of different customer types based on an evaluation of the appeal and future potential of their chosen destinations. Many

candidates made use of a tabular approach. Tables were sometimes poorly laid out but most managed to include detail in a reasoning column. Some took a quantifying approach. Values quoted (on a points out of 5 scale, for instance) do need to be explained if they are to be useful. Prediction of future developments was the weak link in the work of some candidates and was sometimes rather vague or over- optimistic and therefore unrealistic. In some cases candidates lost marks because they omitted the future altogether and referred exclusively to recent (but by definition past) trends.

TT04 – Working in Travel and Tourism

For Double Award candidates this unit is mandatory. They must investigate a travel and tourism job.

What was particularly good

- Many centres and candidates saved themselves valuable time by using the same travel and tourism organisation for this unit that they had chosen for Unit 2.
- On the whole, candidates reported on all seven, specified key areas in AO1.

What was not so good

- In AO4 some candidates became too focussed on the evaluation of their own strengths and weaknesses. As a result they underplayed the required assessment of the requirements of the job.
- Both desk and field research evidence forms are essential for even MB2 marks. Yet some candidates provided no evidence at all of observations of work practice.

For AO1 candidates needed to report on seven specified key areas. Virtually all candidates did so. Better reports included clear evidence of the use of a range of appropriate sources. At MB4, fully developed reports made clear the chosen job's unwritten demands. These are those that are 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 that were reported on in the AO1 section are relevant. Candidates must deal with the interaction of these skills and qualities with the roles of other job-holders in the organisation. Successful candidates considered a role-holder such as a hotel manager. They reported examples of that job-holder's interactions that they had observed. It is absolutely essential that candidates undertake workplace observation if they are to expect to score above MB1. Yet, it was once again perfectly clear that a few candidates had simply not undertaken workplace observations.

AO3. Workplace observation is again crucial here. Candidates must provide clear evidence that they have linked desk research to actual observed practice they themselves had experienced or observed and that they themselves have selected sources used.

They cannot access Mark Band 2 without observing workplace practice. Among those who had, higher scoring candidates provided detailed commentaries. Successful candidates showed clear insight into the usefulness and limitations of the sources they had chosen and used.

The AO4 evaluation task hinges on answers to two key questions:
- How well does the candidate match the requirements of the chosen job?
- What are the candidate's strengths and weaknesses compared to the job's demands?

The first depends upon a clear assessment of what the job requirements are. Some weaker candidates described their own strengths and weaknesses well enough but because they omitted this initial assessment they did not properly connect them to the demands of the chosen travel and tourism job.

TT06 – Tourism in the UK

Double Award candidates may complete **either** Unit 6 **or** Unit 7 (Overseas Destinations Study).

What was particularly good

- Many candidates covered a wide range of factors affecting the popularity of the UK as a tourist destination. Factors are listed in the unit specification.
- PowerPoint presentations with supporting presenter notes were frequently well done. They evidenced the oral nature of the AO2 Task C.

What was not so good

- Task B was sometimes under-supported with data. A variety of graphs of differing sets of visitor number statistics is needed. Such data is readily obtainable, for example via the National Statistics website.
- There remains a quite widespread tendency to try to combine AO4 with AO2. This has been advised against in previous reports and in Teacher Standardising meetings. It is not a good idea. Fudging actually distinct AOs causes candidates to lose marks – usually for AO4.

AO1 requires a written report on factors affecting the popularity of tourism in the UK. Weaker candidates produced largely descriptive accounts of attractions. This is not what is required by the task and therefore unlikely to be scored at MB2 or above. It is necessary that candidates clearly evidence their understanding of the appeal factors have for potential visitors. Successful candidates showed how factors interact with each other, scoring marks of at least MB3 level where their report was detailed or MB4 when it was done so critically.

Task B is the AO3 research and analysis task for Unit 6. It and the AO1 task A are set at the national scale. Being a research and analysis task, candidates had to explicitly evidence the research they had done if they were to score at MB2 or above. The wording of the task in the banner of the Assessment Grid specifies a bibliography here.

Tasks C and D both focus on a chosen tourist region of the UK. Both are oral in nature. These commonalities do **not** mean that they may be considered to be one task. They are separate and should be treated quite distinctly.

For Task C (which is for AO2) evidence that a presentation suitable for oral delivery has been produced is required. As usual, many candidates submitted PowerPoint slides with presenter notes. This is absolutely fine. Some teachers' good practice is to witness presentations that are actually delivered. Marks are given according to the quality of the presentation's content (i.e. the content of the printed slides and notes).

Task D is a separate task for AO4. It is worth 12 marks. Too many candidates sacrifice marks they may well have earned by following the approach of adding a couple of slides to Task C's presentation and regarding the result as satisfying AO2 and AO4. It does not. It is the AO2 task with a basic level AO4 addendum that is likely to be worth only a couple of the marks available for the latter.

AO4 demands distinct, separate evidence of a discrete oral evaluation of current provision in the chosen tourist board region. Only when done as a stand-alone task does it earn candidates their just reward of marks. Detailed evaluations of provision (not mere descriptions) coupled with a clearly identified range of gaps in that provision and realistic suggestions for improvements scored at MB3. MB4 marks were awarded to work that additionally analysed gaps in some detail, coming up with multiple improvement suggestions.

TT07 – Overseas Destination Study

Double Award candidates choose **either** Unit 7 **or** Unit 6 (UK Tourism).

What was particularly good

- Most candidates this series included some comment on the degree of availability of internal transportation. In AO1 this is crucial in progressing through the mark bands beyond mid-MB2 and has been overlooked by many in the past.
- Reports are generally well balanced. In earlier series overlong profiles have been produced but for this series submissions were generally more appropriate in length.

What was not so good

- The applied purpose of the unit is to investigate two southern hemisphere countries' potential for inclusion in tour operators' programmes. This continues to appear as an afterthought in many candidates work when they conclude AO4. It certainly does not come over as being central to their thinking while they are compiling their portfolio. They may maintain focus and score more highly if it did.
- In AO2 the ranges of costs and options investigated were again often narrow and treated rather superficially. Only the most successful candidates produced detailed or developed comparisons for MB3/4. Others could have scored higher marks if they had followed suit.

For AO1 candidates who provided detailed and well-balanced overviews of their chosen countries that included the degree of availability of internal transportation did well. Note that the availability of internal transport must be included even at MB2. There was more widespread inclusion of a variety of tourist regions of the chosen countries in their destination profiles. Only the highest achievers commented critically, bearing in mind the target audience (tour operators) and purpose (future programme inclusion potential) of their profiles. Other candidates seemed not to consider tour operators at this stage, yet it is the focus of the whole unit.

AO2 involves comparing travel costs and options. It was generally the weakest this series. Candidates need to weigh a variety of options including choices such as using regional airports, cheaper flights via intervening places, less obvious airlines, transport modes other than air flights (where these are appropriate), different travel times and different seasons. Just dealing with a couple of flight options was seen as only a basic (MB1) response.

AO3 involves research into appeal, along with visitor trends and analysis of the current coverage of the two countries by UK tour operators. This series, more candidates responded directly to the analysis of coverage by UK tour operators section. More detailed work (MB3 and higher) showed 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, which affected their scores adversely.

AO4. The narrative of this unit concerns recommending a choice to tour operators. That is the scenario of the unit. It is intended that in the final evaluative task candidates, having addressed the tour operator audience throughout the unit, will move smoothly on to Task D's conclusion. 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 generally made a more simplistic final gesture to the unit's purpose or, less often than in past series, sometimes lost sight of the need to do so altogether.

Overall Summary for AS Units

Virtually all portfolios were well structured with discrete sections for each of the four Assessment Objective tasks.

A continuing though less marked issue is that some candidates still did not really make clear what research they had done for AO3, or else contented themselves with a sparse list of websites at the back. The approach seen by more candidates in this year's TT03 of acknowledging clearly referenced, varied sources throughout the task was welcome and should be extended to the other units.

Work that achieves at MB4 standard is developed work. Such development shows greater insight and critical awareness. More able candidates score better when they are encouraged to think critically about what they are learning during their investigations.

General Comments for A2 Units

What was particularly good

- Most portfolios were correctly structured with four discrete AO sections.
- In general candidates chose appropriate travel and tourism events, issues and, in Double Award units, organisations and/or holiday types.
- Many centres correctly assessed basic work at MB1. Work that clearly responded to the task set attained MB2 and that which did so in detail, typically by breaking down the matter in hand into its constituent parts reached MB3. Excellent work that was not only detailed but showed critical insight as well was able to score within Mark Band 4.

What was not so good

- Direct observation is essential for Double Award candidates. Yet some seemed not to have undertaken any. This caused them to underachieve for Unit 12 in particular.
- Some centres make good use of the Portfolio Adviser service. However, others do not. In some cases it was apparent that their candidates would have been better served if advice had been taken on choice of project (TT08) or current issue (TT10).

TT08 – Travel and Tourism Project

Units 8 and 10 are compulsory.

What was particularly good

- Most projects were appropriately travel and tourism trips organised by a small group of candidates. Each candidate had a clear, specific and sufficient role to enable them to actively participate and so score marks for their individual contribution.
- Most candidates produced clear or detailed computer-generated presentations for AO1 and records for AO2. The clear majority also included specific evaluation of the contribution of ICT in AO4.

What was not so good

- Events that were not sufficiently clearly travel and tourism projects were organised by some candidates. A trip to the theatre for example is not travel if it is local. Nor is it much of a travel and tourism project for A2 if it involves little more than organising transport there and back. Substantial travel and tourism content is required to give each candidate a chance to have a meaningful role.
- There was occasional slight over-marking in AO3 and AO4 where credit was sometimes given for comprehensive and detailed evaluations of ICT that were not present.

For AO1 most candidates achieved Mark Band 2 by producing presentation slides using a software package that covered the elements of their business plan. These generally followed the checklist that is provided in the Specification. Additional presenter notes were usually detailed enough to allow Mark Band 3 access. The most successful candidates were able to score at MB4 level by showing a real understanding of links between different elements of their business plan. More candidates attempted to do that this year, which is a trend that is welcomed.

AO2 requires a record. Most candidates again produced diaries or logbooks. Clear records identified what contributions had been made throughout the project by the candidate and what by the rest of the team. MB3 level records added greater detail including what named individuals had done. Critical commentaries allowed access to MB4 for the most successful candidates. Such commentaries were best when compiled during the project as additionalities to each diary entry for example. They considered whether problems encountered were important or not and how they might be overcome or planned around with further comment a few days later about the progress then made.

AO3 is as ever a research and analysis task. It is absolutely key that analysis of feasibility is based upon proper investigation and that it is made clear what that research has been. A classroom discussion is not research. Candidates who conducted clear or detailed analyses did so through investigating different travel options and costs, the availability of resources, constraints, customer demand and other factors derived from the business plan elements. The results of such enquiries provided a proper foundation on which successful feasibility analyses were built.

For AO4 candidates need to evaluate the project's overall success, their own, personal contributions, the contributions of individual team members (best when these are individually named) and the contribution made by ICT. All four evaluative elements have to be included to satisfy descriptor wordings. Some candidates lost marks they might have gained by omitting one or another – usually the ICT contribution or that of other individual team members. The best evaluations were realistic and balanced with both positives and negatives weighted equally.

TT10 – Current Issues in Travel and Tourism

What was particularly good

- Most portfolios focused on issues (debatable questions or contentions) that were travel and tourism focused and, just as importantly, current (i.e. unresolved and on-going).
- A wide range of stakeholders were considered by many candidates. Even at MB2, AO2 requires the identification of "many stakeholders". Since there are six sectors of the industry (TT01), since stakeholders commonly include pressure groups, local residents, businesses outside the travel and tourism industry, tourists and government (at various levels) and since there will be different individuals and groups within each of these categories, it is often the case that stakeholders will be numbered in double figures.

What was not so good

- Some centres seemed not to have checked titles with their Portfolio Adviser. Centres are reminded that to do so protects them and their candidates against possible mark loss through inappropriate choices.
- Evaluation, in AO4, of the extent to which the candidates' own values and attitudes had influenced their perception of future impacts again proved challenging and was sometimes not attempted – resulting in loss of potential marks.

Future candidates are strongly advised to begin by stating their issue in so many words (many simply do not). They should then introduce their portfolio briefly by explaining why the subject of their investigation is an issue at all (ie why there are two or more sides to the debate or conflict, why it is current (unresolved) and why it has a travel and tourism industry significance.

It is appropriate to consider the portfolio as a narrative through time. AO1 is the past of the issue. How has it come to a head? AOs 2 and 3 (which are quite distinct and must be kept so) are the present – what are stakeholders thinking and what are they doing about the issue? To some extent at least AO4 is concerned with the issue's potential future.

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. The history of terrorism or biological origins of swine flu are not travel and tourism changes. The growth of long-haul travel, and expansion of budget airlines are travel and tourism changes.

Most candidates who identified sufficient stakeholders (see above) were able to go on and explain values and attitudes. The key trigger to better quality work is the range of mixed attitudes to be found within stakeholder groups. Some apparently able candidates became trapped in the lower reaches of the mark scheme because they did not develop this idea. Clearly, future candidates would be well advised to do so.

AO3 is a separate task and demands a separate section of the portfolio. Candidates who tried to combine them did not generally score well. AO3 is, of course, a research and analysis task. Candidates must explicitly evidence that research. They must record where their information has come from and how. Even some erudite and able candidates simply did not do so. This is potentially very serious in terms of marks lost. The research that candidates need to evidence is into the responses and actions of stakeholders. Then they need to analyse their findings as to the responses and actions of their many identified stakeholders.

For AO4 candidates have to evaluate the current and the future impacts of their issue, responses to it and, most challengingly, the extent to which their own values and attitudes

influenced their perception of the issue's future impacts. Successful candidates dealt methodically with each of these four elements in turn. They coped with the last by asking themselves what their view of the issue had been at the outset, how it changed during the investigation and write-up of the portfolio and how much it then affected their judgement of what the future of their chosen current issue is likely to be. Avoiding this aspect of AO4 only loses marks – at all Mark Band levels.

TT12 – Business Operations in Travel and Tourism

This is mandatory for Double Award candidates.

What was particularly good

- Most candidates coped well with AO1. They covered one example from all five areas of operation in nearly all cases and did so in detail more often than is the norm for the other AOs of other units.
- The most successful candidates followed the narrative of this unit in which the five key area examples reported on for AO1 introduce the unit's other 3 AOs and become the focus for them.

What was not so good

- Some candidates did not grasp that the solving of problems is central to AO2. Without a framework of identified problems to anchor their work they tended to drift thorough the AO without clear purpose.
- Similarly, in AO3 some candidates tried to analyse examples of practices without focussing on their aims. This has been reported in previous series. It is suggested that future candidates will need particularly careful guidance as they begin their work on this AO and on AO2.

For AO1 the five key areas of operation on which candidates need to report are listed in the Specification. **One** example of each area is required and sufficient. Attention to detail within each area equips candidates to tackle the other three AOs better. Such candidates frequently accessed MB3 as a result. To reach MB4 they would need to have commented critically on skills and discussed problems in operation of business systems within the chosen organisation. Some less successful candidates wrote basic accounts of the areas of operation that failed to deal with examples in any detail. They lost marks as a result.

AO2 depends upon candidates concentrating specifically on examples of problems. These are problems that are solved within the chosen organisation by interaction between or among the key area examples covered in AO1. Those who did so scored well; those who did not scored lower marks. Good practice was shown by those candidates who introduced this section by explicit identification of the problems they would cover and then divided their work into headed sub-sections – one for each problem. Three problems examined in detail often produced MB3 level scores.

AO3 is about how far the example practices covered in AO1 meet the aims the organisation has for them. It is, as ever, a research and analysis task. Candidates must state what research they have 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 well. This is a unit, which demands a level of understanding of the inside of the chosen organisation. Double Award A2 Travel and Tourism candidates ought to be visiting/work shadowing in travel and tourism organisations.

AO4's evaluation task concerns the contribution that the five examples from AO1 make to the efficient operation of the chosen travel and tourism organisation. Candidates who had tried to complete this task from the outside looking in, relying exclusively on secondary source materials, generally struggled with the demands of the unit. The truth is that to do it well candidates need to get on the inside track of the organisation's operations. Those who did so often performed well.

TT13 – Management in Travel and Tourism

Double Award candidates choose **either** Unit 13 **or** Unit 14 (Special Interest/Activity Holidays).

What was particularly good

- Candidates had visited organisations and interviewed managers. The inside knowledge they gleaned proved valuable.
- Concise and purposeful portfolios were produced.

What was not so good

- While many candidates provided evidence of AO3's specified three types of research (observation, documents and discussion with managers), some overlooked the need to analyse how these and their results fitted together.
- Fewer candidates chose this option over Unit 14. However, if good access to an organisation has been established for the Double Award's mandatory Unit 12, time efficiencies could have been be gained from choosing Unit 13.

Many candidates seemed to find AO1 relatively straightforward. Having interviewed a manager they had the information needed for their description at their fingertips. Description and explanation of management structure, roles, responsibilities and skills in detail enabled candidates to score at Mark Band 3. Those candidates whose work showed greater critical insight accessed 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.

AO2 is about the responses of the chosen organisation's management to issues of recruitment, training, and customer service. More successful candidates explicitly considered the relevance and success of management responses to these issues. Less successful candidates simply described what management had done.

For AO3 stronger portfolios were those that analysed how the three types of research activity linked with and complemented each other. The candidates producing such portfolios made clear what research they had done via documents and observation, as well as through discussion with at least one manager. Lower scoring work tended to simply lay out what research had been done.

AO4's evaluation task considers the importance of external influences on the management team. Interviews with managers are crucial here. Candidates who had had the opportunity to sit down and discuss externalities with a manager(s) had collected a body of information that enabled ready evaluation. It was difficult to score well otherwise.

TT14 – Special Interest/Activity Holidays

Double Award candidates choose this **or** Unit 13 (Management in Travel and Tourism).

What was particularly good

- Virtually all candidates correctly chose itinerant and overseas markets.
- Health and safety provision and patterns of tourist flow were well integrated in candidates' descriptions for AO1.

What was not so good

- Some portfolios (though admittedly fewer) were too long. In some cases AO1 alone was bulkier than other entire portfolios. This overkill was not necessary and wasted candidates' time, often late in their course. Unit 13 (the alternative to this unit) tended to produce more concise, time-efficient responses.
- The breadth of the chosen markets was an issue for some who tended to stick to more obvious, often mass market, tour operators for their examples. Niche market operators are important to this unit but were commonly overlooked.

For AO1 the best work came from candidates who maintained a tight focus on the requirements of the task: ranges of holidays and tour operators, health and safety provision and patterns of tourist flow. Less successful candidates tended to shortchange one or more of these elements in their descriptions of the chosen two markets. Others produced work that scored reasonably well but at great time cost to themselves. Of course, it is important (indeed essential) to reflect the range of holidays offered in each market, but that does not mean that example after example should be lengthily described. It is the range that matters. Illustrative examples should be carefully selected.

AO2: changes over approximately the last ten years and predictions of future trends. More successful candidates homed in on the influence of changing values and attitudes in society on their chosen markets. Others were not able to score at the top of mark boxes because they more simply, in however much detail, merely described what the trends had been and what they were likely to be. It was essential to actually include the future and not just the recent past.

While slightly different from other AO3s in that the analysis of the fruits of research is evident in the work done for the other AOs rather than discretely within this AO, it is still a research-based task. As always, therefore, candidates scored higher marks when they made their research sources and methods explicitly clear.

AO4 merits careful approach and planning. It has two main parts:
- a comparison of the two chosen markets
- an evaluation of sources, methods, values and attitudes and conclusions and predictions made.

Successful candidates dealt with both of these in a balanced way, carefully sub-dividing their work. Others quite often overlooked one or the other, typically the comparison. Such candidates' scores were, as a result, limited to the lower halves of mark band ranges.

Overall Summary for A2 Units

A candidate who did well in A2 Travel and Tourism portfolio work would have produced 2 (or for the Double Award, 4) pieces of work. Each would be well structured, carefully targeting the precise wordings of the tasks. AO3 tasks would always explicitly clarify the research they had done and, in the case of the most successful, they would have not only detailed their work but reflected upon it to display evidence of critical insight into travel and tourism.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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