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Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025, and these are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 Subject Assessment Advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* continuing to ensure that uploaded student work is accessible and saved in the file formats listed in the Accepted File Formats
* ensuring that teacher documents, including Learning and Assessment Plans, addendums, and assignment outlines, are provided. This should include the assessment rubric and assessment design criteria relevant to each task.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

This assessment type involves interpreting and critically analysing secondary sources in relation to an aspect of a theme or topic being studied.

The specific features of assessment for these tasks must be drawn from the Knowledge and Understanding (KU), Analysis and Evaluation (AE), and Communication (C) assessment design criteria. Teachers should ensure that specific features selected for assessment reflect the specifications of this assessment type.

The length of folio tasks is 1000 words/6 minutes for non-supervised tasks. The time limit for supervised tasks must be specified. Teachers must ensure they assess student responses according to their meeting of performance standards, particularly when using assessment tasks completed under supervision or as oral presentation formats.

Teachers and students must be aware that incorporating analysis and evaluation into tables, text boxes, or images does not exclude it from the word count for this assessment type.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* considering task design carefully to ensure that the task is achievable in the word count and that the task requirements align with the assessment design criteria being assessed
* ensuring that task specifications for students reflect the assessment design criteria and specific features being assessed, supporting students' inclusion of evidence of learning relevant to those specific features in their work
* ensuring that, where supervised, structured tasks are included, assessment is reported against the assessment design criteria and specific features.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were in response to a Learning and Assessment Plan that incorporated a range of skills and performance standards across several tasks, with each task having a specific and narrow focus on a particular standard or skill rather than trying to cover too many in one task. This allowed students to achieve the ‘in-depth’, ‘comprehensive’, and ‘insightful’ standards required in the A-band
* were in response to well-structured and achievable tasks. These tasks illustrated the power of well-designed starting points for students
* used the word count carefully by covering only elements in detail that directly related to the assessment design criteria and specific features for that task. These responses focused on applying, analysing, and evaluating key models, concepts, and tourism knowledge rather than on descriptive elements
* provided a detailed and insightful analysis of the information
* demonstrated students’ abilities to use research to develop logical discussions of tourism issues
* were able to apply depth of understanding of tourism concepts and models to a range of contexts
* demonstrated insightful evaluation of the bias, accuracy, and validity of sources beyond creating tables
* could articulate well-supported conclusions and recommendations
* communicated in highly effective and coherent forms
* made selective use of quotes and paraphrased sources with analysis and evaluation presented in their own writing
* incorporated relevant visual and graphical evidence, integrating it into the flow of the discussion
* accurately and consistently acknowledge a wide range of sources
* used an extensive range of diverse sources
* passion for the topic or issue was evident in the work.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were prepared in response to tasks that required too many elements or specific features in one task, such as requiring the evaluation of many sources and models (AE2 and AE3) within a single task
* were prepared in response to tasks that required students to recount information such as locations, types of tourism, or tourism sectors rather than applying this information
* lacked analysis and evaluation of the sources
* made little use of sources of information and tended to be brief, generalised, and descriptive rather than evaluative or analytical
* overused quotes or paraphrased source material with limited student voice in the text
* did not demonstrate a wide range of tourism terminology or tourism models
* used tourism concepts and models without evaluating them
* poorly evaluated sources for bias, accuracy, or validity
* did not demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of different perspectives on tourism trends or issues.

Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

This assessment type involves the development of practical tourism skills and focuses on the collection of information from primary sources. Practical activities, in most cases, involve the collection of primary sources of information either in class field trips or individual investigations. Evidence from primary sources of information is used to explain and make connections to knowledge of tourism concepts and/or models and secondary sources of information. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning primarily in relation to the Knowledge and Understanding (KU), Investigation and Application (IA), and Communication (C) assessment design criteria.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* considering task design carefully to ensure that the task is achievable in the word count and that the task requirements align with the assessment design criteria being assessed. Including tasks that focus on specific elements rather than all possible elements
* ensuring that students have multiple opportunities to develop their practical tourism skills and collect information from primary sources across the Learning and Assessment Plan
* incorporating a wide range of skills and specific features across several tasks, with each task having a specific and narrow focus on specific tourism knowledge, concept, or model
* encouraging voice-over or recorded presentations when oral formats are implemented.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were underpinned by effective task design and teaching. Students had access to structured activities outside of the classroom, which facilitated data collection, and this was reflected in student responses
* provided a range of primary and secondary sources to support their argument
* clearly demonstrated that they had collected data through site visits or other primary data sources
* incorporated relevant visual and graphical evidence that was integrated into the flow of the discussion and that was clearly derived from the student’s primary data collection activities
* where annotations were used to present analysis or evaluation of tourism information, concepts, or models, they were included in the word/time limit and used to enhance rather than restrict the main text
* used secondary sources to help analyse, evaluate, and interpret data collected from primary sources
* used creative media to present findings, conclusions, and recommendations
* articulated well-supported conclusions and recommendations using highly effective and coherent forms of communication
* made effective use of the word count/time limit to cover elements relative to the specified assessment design criteria and specific features.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were either very brief, thus not fully developing the response to the assessment task, or significantly breached the word/time limits
* did not use report writing effectively
* restricted analysis and evaluation to tables and other visual elements rather than including them in the body of the text, thus leaving the main component of the response descriptive in nature
* did not demonstrate a clear understanding of a primary source and did not show insightful connections between primary and secondary sources
* were dominated by recount and description rather than analysis and evaluation.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

Students select and investigate a tourism issue, development, or trend. They demonstrate the ability to identify, select, analyse, and evaluate primary and secondary sources of information. In this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning primarily in relation to all assessment design criteria (KU, AE, IA, and C).

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* considering task design carefully to ensure that the task is achievable in the word count and that the task requirements align with the assessment design criteria being assessed. This may include:
* including tasks that focus on specific elements rather than all possible elements
* supporting student development of research questions that allow them to focus on higher order skills of analysis and evaluation of a specific issue, development, or trend within the 1500 word/10-minute assessment type specification.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used a range of primary and secondary data and sources effectively, as well as applied models appropriate to the investigation focus
* started with a workable question that had an evaluative aspect that guided the investigation. This supported standards such as AE4 as they encouraged conclusions to be drawn in relation to the question
* were based on a trend, development or issue that enabled students to collect a range of data
* used firsthand experiences, which resulted in a more insightful response
* were based on topics of interest, which was reflected in the response
* had a depth of analysis and evaluation
* integrated models and concepts by applying them to the issue being discussed. This was particularly evident in visual evidence, where diagrams of models or concepts were developed by students or modified to fit the investigation. For example, a multiplier effect diagram specific to the issue, trend, or development should be included rather than a generic multiplier effect diagram. This helped students demonstrate their ability to apply tourism knowledge, concepts and/or models (IA4)
* considered a smaller number of key sources in depth
* applied practical skills alongside well-developed secondary research skills to thoroughly investigate a tourism trend, development, or issue
* featured evaluation of sources that were specific to the source rather than being big ‘overarching’ statements about how the sources were all accurate. Often, strong source evaluation occurred throughout the student response rather than being completed in a specific source analysis table or paragraph
* were well-researched and written. Evidence and visual/graphical information were used effectively in the responses
* effectively used literacy and communication conventions appropriate to their selected format.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were built on questions that were too broad or where the student response was unclear about whether they were discussing a trend, development, or issue. These questions were often either vague or non-evaluative in nature and led to recounting of situations rather than analysing issues from different perspectives, using different sources, and drawing conclusions
* were developed from questions that did not lend themselves to the analysis of both primary and secondary sources of information or where access to relevant primary sources was going to be challenging
* were developed from inherently biased questions, such as asking how tourism is destroying site X or how tourism can save site Y. As a result, the discussion of the issue tended to be one-sided or provided a tokenistic treatment of opposing perspectives
* made passing reference to concepts and models without specific application to the topic
* incorporated significant amounts of analysis and evaluation into visual or graphical formats and then excluded this from the word count. This is a breach of the SACE Board Word Count Policy, which states that ‘the word count includes … any argument or analysis that is introduced in supporting materials’
* did not investigate or analyse connections between primary and secondary sources of information (IA1)
* did not draw conclusions and recommendations from the evidence presented in the investigation, or the conclusions and recommendations were contradictory to the evidence presented in the investigation (AE4)
* focused on descriptive elements of the issue, trend, or development rather than on higher-order analysis and evaluation.

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Examination

This assessment type requires students to undertake a 130-minute written examination on the subject’s core themes. Students analyse various tourism-related sources of information and apply their knowledge and understanding of tourism to both familiar and unfamiliar contexts. The examination comprises two sections: Part A: Short Responses and Part B: Extended Responses.

This was the fifth year that the Tourism examination was online, so students were familiar with the e-exam format. One observation noted by markers was that there were very few incomplete examinations, with most students attempting to provide an answer in the space provided. Having said this, the few students who did not complete Part B most likely ran short of time, perhaps suggesting that they experienced difficulty in managing their time effectively. Even so, those who presented dot point responses obtained at least a few marks for demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and issues.

It is also worth noting that this was the third year an audio-visual source (Part B, Source 5: a video highlighting tourism to Antarctica) was used in the e-exam. Markers remarked that, yet again, quite a number of students did not refer to this source in their responses, while more successful students used it as a springboard for further analysis. Teachers are encouraged to participate in numerous practice opportunities, and to remind their students that audio-visual sources should be treated in a similar way to written sources.

Students were frequently successful in Questions 2 and 7, while Questions 4 and 6 presented some challenges.

Markers articulated the following general features that contributed to the quality of student responses:

* Successful answers showed evidence of detailed analysis supported by evidence, especially to questions with command verbs such as ‘explain’, ‘describe’, and ‘justify’. Merely listing or stating conclusions, strategies, or recommendations without an explanation or justification with supporting evidence resulted in responses that lacked depth of analysis and thus achieved fewer marks.
* Successful responses highlighted students’ ability to do as questions directed by referring to specific sources or to specific data in sources as evidence for their conclusions or recommendations. Similarly, stronger responses followed the questions’ instructions by referring to explicit tourism terminology such as sociocultural or environmental impacts, particular sectors of the tourism industry, Plog’s model of tourist types, or the Butler Sequence.
* More successful responses demonstrated evidence of advanced time management skills. This included restricting answers to the space provided in Part A; the size of the response box was a general guide to the length of response required. In Part B, those who had spent too long on Part A were more likely to run out of time towards the end of the examination and thus submitted brief responses to Questions 5 to 7. It is important to give students opportunities to practise writing concise answers in timed, supervised conditions throughout the year, which will prepare them for examination conditions.
* Finally, especially relevant to Part B (where marks were allocated for clear written expression [C1] and accurately using tourism terminology [C2]), students who communicated in a concise and structured manner, with accurate spelling, grammar, and sentence construction, tended to write higher-quality responses. For example, responses to Question 7 that required three justified recommendations were much easier to comprehend when structured in three separate paragraphs, perhaps with clear sub-headings. The marking team noted that there were a high proportion of structured answers, particularly in relation to extended responses, as a distinctive feature this year; however, rushed dot points, very short answers, or unstructured text in one dense paragraph tended to produce less successful responses. Markers also highlighted the significant number of responses that demonstrated poor communication skills. While incoherent and ineffective responses were not penalised in Part A, assessment of Part B was affected.

Assessment Design Criteria

The following specific features of the assessment design criteria for this subject are assessed in the examination:

* knowledge and understanding — KU1 and KU2
* analysis and evaluation — AE1, AE2, AE3, and AE4
* investigation and application — IA2 and IA4
* communication — C1 and C2.

Part A: Short Responses

Question 1

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to Source 1
	* quoted specific data/numbers that related to volunteers, such as 36% interested in this experience were young singles/couples, 53% were females, 29% were low-income earners, etc.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + did not highlight significant features of the data
	+ merely described general features without reference to specific data.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* specifically referred to (e.g., directly quoted from) Source 2
	* explained how travel trends changed in the aftermath of COVID-19, providing a detailed explanation of the post-COVID ‘Great Connect’, whereby tourists sought ‘reconnection’ or ‘restoration through nature-based activities’, and a desire to ‘give back to local communities and the environment’.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + merely listed post-COVID characteristics of tourists without giving an explanation.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific evidence from the sources to explain their response
	* clearly understood the definition of push factors (tourist motivation) and could relate it to the ‘regenerative traveller’, including descriptions of tourists who want to ‘give back to the local communities and the environment’, seek ‘reconnection’ or ‘restoration through nature-based activities’.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + did not understand what push factors (tourist motivation) were, often referring instead to pull factors (destination characteristics)
	+ merely mentioned or listed a possible push factor without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ their answer by referring to the sources.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific tourism sectors (regardless of which model they used) to justify their answer
	* demonstrated an understanding of package deals (via collaboration of tourism business), such as a transport and accommodation package so tourists ‘give back to the local communities’, or an accommodation and attraction package based on nature-based or eco-activities.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + demonstrated very little understanding of tourism sectors or how they might collaborate (packages)
	+ merely mentioned or listed various sectors without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ how they might collaborate by using package deals.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific evidence from the sources to explain their response
	* clearly articulated positive sociocultural impacts of encouraging ‘regenerative tourism’ in a host community, such as the development of community pride and feeling of being valued, contribution to local business/culture, link to employment/revenue (fostering a sense of purpose/value), ‘authentic engagement with local people’ as they led workshops and conducted tours, a lack of commodification, the revival/growth of authentic culture, and the education of tourists.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + did not refer to the sources in their response
	+ stated a sociocultural impact but did not explain it, as directed by the question
	+ discussed environmental or purely economic impacts (the question directed them to discuss sociocultural impacts).

Question 2

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific evidence from the sources to explain their response
	* cited distinct characteristics from the sources, such as travelling beyond their usual place of residence, visiting, and participating in a parkrun that is not their home, travelling to new places, travelling overnight/more than 24 hours, likely ‘meeting new people and discovering new places’, and visiting places that ‘become tourist attractions’.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + did not refer to discrete information provided in the sources.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* were able to explain why parkrun events might not be considered a form of sports tourism, giving one of the following reasons: sports tourism is ‘expensive and out of reach for some people’ (Source 2), while parkrun events are free weekly events (Source 1) and within reach of everyone (Source 2); sports tourism is associated with large-scale, mass tourism (Source 2), while parkrun events are low-key local events (Source 2) and often ‘off the tourist track’ (Source 3); sports tourism is associated with large-scale, mass tourism [therefore, in well-known destinations] (Source 2), while parkrun events are in less known locations, ‘somewhere where I’d never visit’ ‘in a location that’s just lovely, that you’d otherwise never know about’ (Source 3).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + were not supported from information from the sources
	+ merely stated why parkrun events might not be considered sports tourism without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ their response.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* demonstrated an astute understanding of why the host community and tourism industry of a small town would support parkrun events, giving a reason such as: parkrun events encourage people to travel to new places (Source 1), so small towns like Cleve can use the event to attract more/new visitors, which would boost their local economy (injecting revenue, creating an economic multiplier effect); parkrun events are mass events involving thousands of people (Source 2) that all follow the same process (Source 1), making it easier for small towns, which often rely on volunteers (Source 2), to host an event and support parkrun events as they have an existing organisation/structure to support them; or they are a great way to raise a small town’s profile by promoting and marketing them as destinations that can sometimes be seen as ‘hidden away’, ‘off the tourist track’, that ‘you’d otherwise never know about’ – the ‘Yelduknie Weir’ is a good example (Source 3).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + merely stated why the host community and the tourism industry in small towns would support parkrun events, without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ their response
	+ were unable to provide evidence from the sources.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* were able to articulate strategies that responsible parkrunners could use to maximise their positive impact on host communities, including spending time in the area (Source 3) and contributing to the local economy by spending money on accommodation, food, and attractions (the multiplier effect was well explained); taking care of the parkrun event site (the “leave only footprints” argument), as parkrun events rely on volunteers (Source 3; responses discussed a specific way parkrunners might take care of the site, such as not leaving equipment behind, avoiding trampling vegetation, etc.); treating the host community/host parkrunners respectfully, as it is not the visitors’ ‘home parkrun’ (Source 1), ensuring parkrunners follow the process (Source 1 indicated that all parkruns follow the same process).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + merely ‘suggested’ possible strategies without following the instruction of the question to ‘justify’ the strategy with valid information from the sources or more detailed explanations
	+ misunderstood what a tourist could control versus what a host community was responsible for (e.g., improving paths or creating more parkrun events).

Question 3

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* were able to explain how Gen Z travellers seek ‘authentic experiences’ and ‘places to visit’ (Source 1); therefore, responses included information such as: an example of authenticity is that Gen Z travel when it suits them, not during the ‘traditional tourist season’, being ‘more interested in the landscape’, to ‘embrace what they’re getting when they get’ there (Source 1); regional guides could be changed to depict more of an ‘authentic experience’, ensuring ‘younger people’ are ‘not disappointed’; and catering for authenticity increases the likelihood of them visiting and giving good reviews online, as they are reportedly digitally connected (Source 2).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + were not supported from information from the sources
	+ did not following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ why a destination might aim to provide an authentic experience for Gen Z travellers.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* selected M or N, possibly L (more allocentric or adventurous than psychocentric or dependable) and justified their choice on the basis that: allocentric/near allocentric travellers seek ‘new experiences’ that are ‘original and authentic’ (Source 2); Gen Z travel ‘when it suits them, rather than sticking to the traditional tourist season’ (Source 1), which is more allocentric, given that more psychocentric travellers seek tradition and familiarity; more psychocentric tourists seek familiar comforts (including crowds/greater tourist development), whereas the ‘younger tourists’ ‘enjoyed staying in a place without mains power or Wi-Fi’ and getting ‘closer to nature’ (Source 1); or more allocentric tourists are more likely to spend more for experiences than psychocentric travellers (Source 1)
	* might have selected J or K but were able to justify their selection; this was a very rare occurrence.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + showed little to no understanding of the difference between allocentric and psychocentric tourists
	+ merely selected where on the graph a Gen Z traveller might be featured but provided a poor justification of their selection.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated a perceptive knowledge and understanding of limitations of Plog’s model of tourist types, especially as it applied to the given context of characteristics of Gen Z travellers
	* reasoned astutely that Plog’s model of tourist types: doesn’t account for the same individual having varying tastes or interests, which might change depending on their mood (e.g., a Gen Z traveller may seek authentic experiences, engaging in ‘geodesic domes’ (Source 1), then move on to 5-star comforts); activities might be impacted by other factors such as being restrained by cost, causing them to visit during cheaper ‘off-peak’ times (seeming more allocentric by circumstance rather than by choice); the model was developed in 1974, so tourist behaviours may have changed, so the model is less applicable in 2024 (e.g., easier access to ‘technology’ for a ‘digital-savvy’ generation, which is ‘always connected … via technology’ and they regularly ‘share experiences via social media’ (Source 2), so what was once considered ‘unfamiliar’ would be considered ‘familiar’ to them resulting from digital immersion even though they haven’t actually visited).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + made no reference to the information provided in the sources
	+ showed little or no understanding of Plog’s model of tourist types as it related to the characteristics of Gen Z travellers.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to information in the sources
	* suggested appropriate strategies that a tourism venture might implement to attract more Gen Z travellers, such as: providing experiences all year round, not just during ‘traditional tourist seasons’, as Gen Z tourists ‘travel when it suits them’ (Source 1); developing and/or promoting ‘authentic’ and ‘original’ experiences (Sources 1 and 2); promoting unique landscapes and natural experiences, as Gen Z are ‘more interested in the landscape’ (Source 1) and are ‘closer to nature’ (Source 2); ensuring that promotional materials represent the ‘authentic experience’ of a destination to ensure ‘younger people who visit outside of the normal tourist season are not disappointed’ (Source 1); using ‘social media marketing’ and ‘influencers’, as Gen Z is ‘digital-savvy’ and will ‘choose, review, plan and book … experiences online’ (Source 2); practising and promoting responsible tourism, as Gen Z ‘travel with conscience’ and ‘consider their impacts on the environment and local culture’ (Source 2); or providing means to support Gen Z to ‘connect’ via ‘social media’ (Source 2) via Wi-Fi, Internet, connectivity.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + made no reference to information provided in the sources, which could have been used as a springboard for ideas
	+ merely ‘suggested’ possible strategies without following the instruction of the question to ‘justify’ the strategy with valid information from the sources or more detailed explanations
	+ recommended tourism strategies that were general in nature and were not clearly linked to attracting Gen Z travellers.

Question 4

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to information in the sources
	* demonstrated an understanding of a sociocultural or environmental benefit of the Woodford Folk Festival to the host community. Sociocultural benefits included recognition of local Indigenous culture (Source 1), sharing of culture (local and non-local culture) (Source 2), and development of local community pride or value; environmental benefits discussed were how 110,000 trees were planted and provided habitat for wildlife (Source 1), and how the lake was filled by stormwater and filtered by organisms (Source 1).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + made no reference to the information provided in the sources
	+ showed little to no understanding of sociocultural or environmental benefits.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* responded in terms of specific tourism sectors mentioned in the sources, such as accommodation – camping and glamping (Source 2), activities/attractions – the event (Sources 1 and 2), and transportation – inferred
	* demonstrated an excellent understanding of how and why various tourism sectors might collaborate to foster successful tourism event outcomes, such as (but not limited to): providing goods and services to meet the needs of tourists and the host community; and collaboration with others to help solve problems (Sources 1 and 2); generating a strong multiplier effect - $25 million for the Morton Bay region (Source 2).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + made no reference to the sources provided
	+ did not discuss specific tourism sectors or, if they did, were unable to explain why the interdependence of sectors was important
	+ merely stated a response without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ why the involvement of multiple tourism sectors is essential.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated an astute understanding of the Butler Sequence (not illustrated Question 4, but it does appear in Part B, Source 4) and how it can be applied to the new context of glamping leading to the ‘rejuvenation’ (redevelopment that engenders growth) of the Woodford Folk Festival
	* connected the construction of glamping tents to the ability of Woodfordia to: target new markets – corporate functions, short holidays (Source 2); provide year-round experiences and thus grow beyond their usual season (Source 2); control tourism via site-hardening; create new experiences to attract new tourists.
2. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated an excellent understanding of sustainability
	* typically evaluated the sustainability of the Woodford Folk Festival by referring to **environmental** (tree planting [Source 1] and the recycling of stormwater [Source 1]), **sociocultural** (sharing local and other cultures [Sources 1 and 2]), and **economic** (support from Queensland Government and the expansion of facilities to allow year-round experiences [Source 2]) benefits
	* at times disagreed with the claim by arguing that 17,000 people on-site (Source 1) at one time is not environmentally sustainable, or that relying on government financial support (Source 2) is not economically sustainable in the long run.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + demonstrated little to no understanding of sustainability
	+ made no reference to information provided in Sources 1 and 2, which could have been used as a springboard for ideas
	+ evaluated the source itself (discussing the credibility or reliability of the authors or of a tourism textbook) rather than what the source claimed about sustainability.

Part B: Extended Responses

In Part B, students engage in significant amounts of reading and higher-order cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation; therefore, teachers should give their students plenty of practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The Communication assessment design criterion (specifically the performance standards C1 and C2) receives special attention in this section of the examination. Consequently, students are encouraged to write well-structured and fluent paragraphs, to refer to specific sources when directed, and to use relevant and accurate tourism terminology. Markers specifically noted that, where responses showed poor communication skills, this negatively affected the quality of student work.

Question 5

This question required students to refer to a range of sources to discuss the costs and benefits of tourism in Antarctica. Having done so, the overall purpose of the question was to evaluate or judge the claim made by many people that we should ‘keep the tourists out’ of Antarctica.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* drew on a wide range of sources to answer this question
* used appropriate formal communication, utilising relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* were clearly structured, using short paragraphs and even sub-headings
* recognised the benefits or positives of tourism in Antarctica: the ‘amazing experience’ (Source 1) of glaciers (Source 1, Source 2E), penguins (Source 1, Source 2A), kayaking (Source 1, Source 2C), ice formations (Source 1, Source 2B), and all the positive experiences seen in Source 5; guidelines limiting size of ships, numbers of visitors, and number of places that can be visited can contribute to protecting wildlife and specific areas, and ‘keeping Antarctica pristine’ (Sources 1, 3, and 7); tourists can be educated regarding ecosystems (Source 1); and becoming an ‘ambassador’ for conservation as tourists develop greater recognition of the importance or value of Antarctica (Sources 1 and 3)
* noted the costs or negatives of tourism in Antarctica: risk of pollution from ships, which themselves are a clear indication of mass tourism (Sources 1, 2D, 3, and 6); ‘damage to delicate ecosystems’ (Sources 1 and 2E); introduction of invasive exotic seeds, spores, and insects (Sources 1 and 3); disturbance to wildlife breeding and habitation (Sources 1 and 2F); the concentration of tourists in ‘highly sensitive ecological areas’ (Source 3); the fact that there is no ‘host community’ to protect Antarctica (Sources 1 and 3); and the possibility of breaching Antarctica’s environmental ‘carrying capacity’ (Source 4), especially as tourist numbers continue to grow (Source 6)
* as required by the question, made some sort of judgement or evaluation of the claim to ‘keep the tourists out’, either agreeing or disagreeing with the statement based on the evidence cited in their argument.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer to the sources provided or only discussed one or two sources as the basis of their response
* did not write structured, coherent paragraphs
* merely described or quoted from the sources without explaining in any detail aspects of costs or benefits of tourism in Antarctica
* discussed only costs or benefits without considering the converse
* discussed costs and benefits but did not evaluate the claim to ‘keep the tourists out’.

Question 6

This question assessed students’ ability to evaluate (make a judgement on) the Butler Sequence tourism model in terms of its usefulness and limitations when attempting to assess tourism in Antarctica. Students were expected to do a little bit more cognitively for this question than for the previous question, so it was worth more marks than the previous question as higher order thinking skills were involved (evaluation in Question 6 vs. mostly synthesis with some evaluation in Question 5).

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* astutely discussed how the Butler Sequence tourism model might be useful in assessing tourism in Antarctica:
* useful in visualising the effects of the growing numbers of tourists on a destination over time – this is relevant to Antarctica, which is showing definite signs of increasing tourism numbers (Source 6), so it could act as a warning of a possible breach of carrying capacity and slide into decline
* useful in showing the potential impact of the growing number of tourists, such as pollution (Source 1 and 2), invasive species (Source 1), effect on animal life (Sources 1, 2, and 3), and crowding and concentration of activities (Source 3) – these impacts have explicit relevance to the notion of ‘carrying capacity’, which can be defined as the limit in the number of tourists that the environment (or economy or culture) can handle without negative impacts starting to be realised
* if the carrying capacity is breached through these negative impacts, the Butler Sequence tourism model is useful in showing that the most probable result will be stagnation and possible decline
* recognised possible limitations in applying the Butler Sequence tourism model to tourism in Antarctica:
* Sources 1 and 3 mention the fact that there are ‘no local residents’ or ‘no host community’ to speak for Antarctica, to protest if tourist numbers increase and carrying capacity is breached; in this sense, it is difficult to apply this model to the context of Antarctica
* many of the sources suggest that ‘we need to … preserve it’ (Source 1) and be awakened to ‘environmental concerns’ (Source 3), that it requires ‘careful management’ (Source 7) but, because Antarctica is such a pristine context, there is a distinct lack of data by which we can measure concepts like ‘carrying capacity’ (although Antarctic tourism is clearly at the discovery or growth / development stage)
* not all destinations (e.g., Antarctica) would necessarily go through the same sequence; given that there are already ‘strict guidelines’ (Source 7) or ‘strong protections’ (Source 3) in operation ‘to help avoid adverse impacts’ (Sources 1 and 7), and assuming that they continue to operate in the future, there is no reason to believe that the environmental carrying capacity might be breached, and no reason to believe Antarctica would enter into a stage of ‘decline’ (Source 4); for example, an analysis of Source 2 (photos) shows that there is no indication of whether or not these demonstrate carrying capacity being breached, except for the interpretation presented in the captions.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* instead of discussing the usefulness and limitations of the Butler Sequence model of tourism, explained how tourism in Antarctica demonstrated the various stages of the model (e.g., discovery, growth/ development, success, stagnation, rejuvenation, and decline)
* had difficulty in articulating exactly the definition of the terms ‘usefulness’ and ‘limitations’
* did not follow the instructions of the question, which required students to examine the concept of *carrying capacity*.

Question 7

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use the sources to suggest and justify three responsible tourism strategies that tourists and tourism businesses might practise to ensure that Antarctica is protected from any negative effects of tourism. Overall, students were required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the tourism concept of sustainability, which they could have done by defining it (KU2) and applying their knowledge of sustainability to a new, perhaps unfamiliar, context (IA4). They also needed to develop three well-supported recommended strategies by specifically referring to the sources provided and to their own knowledge of the tourism industry.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* used appropriate formal communication, employing relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* clearly identified (via the creation of separate paragraphs, by numbering, or by clearly labelling sub-headings) three distinct recommendations
* justified their recommendations by referring to sources provided and to their own knowledge of the tourism industry
* drew on models and concepts studied throughout the year to provide an explanation of their recommendations
* used a wide range of relevant and appropriate tourism terminology
* clearly and convincingly applied their knowledge of sustainability to the context of protecting Antarctica from the negative effects of tourism
* discussed recommended changes such as:
* education campaign focusing on responsible business practice and/or tourist behaviour (Sources 1, 3, and 7)
* various tourism businesses (via IAATO) to encourage and tourists to engage in responsible tourism behaviours, by only offering environmental practices with minimal impact (e.g., small scale tours, no or minimal land-based activities, using renewable energy, etc.) (Sources 1, 2B, 2C, 2E, 3, and 7)
* IAATO providing and tourists participating in environmental management/protection programs (Sources 1, 3, and 7)
* government subsidies or investment to allow smaller groups in tourist activities, thus minimising any environmental impact (Source 7)
* protection, preservation, and maintenance of valuable sites (Source 7)
* encouragement of tourists to be Antarctic ambassadors (Sources 1 and 3)
* restrictions on mass tourism (such as cruises) (Sources 1 and 2D), limiting the number of tourists allowed in activities (Sources 4 and 6); making the tours more expensive, which might restrict numbers but sustain economic revenue
* abiding by strict guidelines in Treaties (Sources 1, 3, and 7).

The less successful responses commonly:

* were incomplete (possibly due to running out of time)
* developed recommendations without referring to specific sources as evidence
* did not develop recommendations that related to both tourists and tourism businesses (both interest groups did not need to be discussed in each recommendation, but both should have been mentioned somewhere in the three recommendations)
* repeated the same or similar responses in more than one recommendation
* listed recommendations but did not provide substantiating evidence or a justification
* recommended strategies that did not consider the context of Antarctica, such as constructing hotels or engaging in significant site-hardening (e.g., boardwalks)
* did not clearly structure their response (in paragraphs or by numbering), making it difficult for markers to distinguish each recommendation.