2022 Tourism Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 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.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

Across Assessment Types 1, 2 and 3 for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students should not speed-up the recording of their videos excessivelyin an attempt to condense more contentinto the maximum time limit.

From 2023, if a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, schools will be requested to provide a transcriptand markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit (e.g. up to 2000 words for AT3).

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

School Assessment

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 studies. Key skills in this Assessment Type include:

* identification and selection of sources of information
* critical analysis and evaluation of secondary sources of information (primary sources may be used but are not required in this Assessment Type)
* interpretation and critical analysis of stakeholders’ perspectives
* development of conclusions and recommendations.

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 should also assess student responses according to their meeting of performance standards rather than awarding a mark, say out of 30.

Students need to 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.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of a range of tourism knowledge and tourism concepts and models
* incorporated perceptive analysis and evaluation of tourism models
* focused on a sub-set of tourism concepts and models that were highly appropriate for the case-study, issue, trend or development
* incorporated perceptive evaluation of the validity, bias and accuracy of sources of information into the body of the text
* selected sites that fit the assessment task’s theme and that allowed for perceptive analysis and evaluation where comparative tasks were used
* drew effectively on sources of information and findings when making conclusions and recommendations
* incorporated a range of appropriate graphical and visual evidence
* presented evidence of analysis and evaluation, such as evaluation of sources or analysis and evaluation of tourism concepts and models, within the 1000-word/6-minute Assessment Type specification.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included a wide range of tourism knowledge, concepts and models within a single task, which made the depth of analysis and evaluation difficult to demonstrate at the higher-grade bands
* were written in response to assessment tasks that did not assess specific features that are core to Folio tasks at least once across the Assessment Type. (e.g., students were not required to demonstrate their critical analysis and evaluation of secondary sources of information in any Folio tasks).

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.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were creative in their use of primary and secondary sources of information
* demonstrated obvious connections between primary and secondary sources of information
* exhibited a range of practical tourism skills and primary sources of information across the assessment type (where teachers had maintained more than one assessment task in this assessment type – COVID adjustments offered in 2022 allowed flexibility for teachers to include one Practical Activity rather than two)
* included strong evaluation of sources of information
* incorporated a range of stakeholders’ perspectives
* displayed well-communicated findings, including the incorporation of references and visual/graphical evidence which was analysed and evaluated within the word limit
* developed conclusions and recommendations that had a strong connection to the primary sources of information and the tourism site, trend, development or issue being investigated.

The less successful responses commonly:

* featured a limited range of sources such as only primary or only secondary sources of information
* made few or no connections between primary and secondary sources of information
* made little or no effective use of visual and graphical evidence
* made little or no use of primary sources (even when there were opportunities to collect primary data as part of a class excursion) in the response
* recounted rather than analysed information and observations related to tourism knowledge, concepts, and models

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).

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided insightful evaluation of sources of information for their validity, bias, and accuracy
* developed a clear and specific inquiry/research question or hypothesis with an evaluative aspect to guide the investigation
* made effective use of sub-headings and sub-questions to communicate observations and guide the discussion
* incorporated a variety of perspectives, primary and secondary sources of information, and visual and graphical evidence
* ensured that information that was analytical in nature was included in the word count, whether in table or prose form
* formed useful connections between primary and secondary sources of information
* incorporated recommendations and conclusions informed by research
* were developed in response to a tourism issue, development, or trend that could be realistically investigated using primary sources of information

The less successful responses commonly:

* featured a considerable amount of recount of events
* developed research questions that encouraged broad and general description of the tourism issue, topic, or trend
* did not make effective connections between primary and secondary sources of information
* developed generic and obvious conclusions and recommendations that tenuously connected to the findings
* used no primary sources or a limited range of primary sources
* either did not include or did not effectively include evaluation of sources of information for bias, accuracy, or validity

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 third year that the Tourism examination was online, thus students were familiar with the e-exam format. Markers consequently noted that there were very few incomplete “papers”, with the vast majority of students at least attempting to provide an answer in the space provided. The few students who did not complete Part B clearly ran short of time, perhaps suggesting that they experienced difficulty in managing their time effectively. Those who presented dot point responses obtained some marks for at least demonstrating a touch of knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and issues.

It is also worth noting that this was the first year an audio-visual source (Question 4, Source 2) was used in the e-exam. Markers noted that many students merely described the advertisement, while more successful students quoted from and analysed the source. 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 tended to find Questions 1 and 5 easiest to deal with, while they found Questions 2 and 6 more challenging.

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

* Better responses demonstrated evidence of advanced time management skills. This included restricting responses to the space provided in Part A; the size of the response box was a general guide of the length of response required. In Part B, those who spent too long on Part A were more likely to run out of time towards the end of the examination. 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.
* Successful answers showed evidence of detailed analysis supported by evidence, especially to questions with command verbs such as ‘explain’, ‘describe’ and ‘justify’.
* Superior responses highlighted students’ ability to follow the directions within the questions by referring to specific sources or to specific data in sources as evidence for their conclusions or recommendations. Similarly, better responses followed the questions’ instructions by referring to explicit tourism terminology such as economic or environmental impacts, or the collaboration of businesses and governments.
* Finally, especially relevant to Part B (where marks were allocated for clear written expression [C1] and accurately using tourism terminology [C2]), students who could communicate 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 recommended changes or strategies were much easier to read and decipher when structured in three separate paragraphs, even with clear sub-headings. The marking team noted that there were more structured answers, particularly in relation to extended responses, as a distinctive feature this year; however, rushed dot points and very short answers tended to produce less successful responses.

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

(a) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* referred to the sources provided
* cited specific data relating to the steady increase in domestic visitor numbers to (Southern Great Barrier Reef) SGBR, relatively stable interstate visitor numbers, or SGBR’s similar trend to overall Queensland data.

The less successful responses commonly:

* interpreted the graph (two measures) inaccurately
* merely described general trends or features without reference to significant features of data.

(b) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* gave a detailed explanation, including reasons such as being easier for intrastate (from within Queensland) visitors to access SGBR, so less variation; the lower likelihood of interstate visitors’ (from another state) return visitation; or the variation in fuel costs/air fares making interstate data vary
* cited specific data on intrastate / interstate visitation to SGBR.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a response that lacked relevant information
* focused on description rather than analysis of information.

(c) *The more successful responses commonly*:

* referred to specific data or information from Source 3 to support their answer
* specified stakeholders’ (local Indigenous groups, tourists, etc.) views of recreating the 1980’s image of Great Keppel Island
* provided logical and well-considered explanations, conveying that some international tourists prefer serenity to a ‘party central’ vibe; that a local Indigenous group were concerned that the community would be divided regarding sociocultural costs, despite economic benefits; and that some tourists were concerned about environmental costs.

*The less successful responses commonly*:

* did not refer specifically or in depth to Source 3
* did not refer to particular stakeholders
* merely mentioned or listed a possible reason without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ the reason.

(d) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* evaluated (made a judgement or assessment) the potential benefits of rejuvenating tourism on Great Keppel Island, discussing aspects such as the injection of revenue, improvement of infrastructure, provision of employment, or environmental protection / conservation.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* only discussed one benefit, when the question directed the students to evaluate benefits
* merely mentioned or listed possible benefits without explaining them in some depth.

(e) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* used information from the sources to support their responses, suggesting and justifying strategies such as creating an advertising or marketing campaign to invite visitors; the collaboration of local tourism businesses/government/community groups; the redevelopment (limited) of resorts, while rebranding them as eco-tourism focused destinations; and limiting the number of tourists in resorts or on tours to ensure environmental conservation/management
* referred to specific information provided in sources.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* merely ‘suggested’ strategies that the tourism industry could implement to rejuvenate tourism on Great Keppel Island without following the instruction of the question to ‘justify’ the strategy
* made little or no mention of information provided in sources.

Question 2

(a) *More successful responses commonly:*

* correctly interpreted the two different lines indicating number of tourists and Icelandic population
* cited specific data relating a difference in trend between the number of tourists and the population of Iceland, discussing the steady, gradual increase in Iceland’s population over the past 80 years (from 120 000 to 320 000) in contrast to visitors to Iceland’s recent exponential growth (75 000 in 1980 to 1 000 000 in 2015), far out-stripping population figures.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* interpreted the graph inaccurately
* merely described general trends or features without citing specific data.

(b) *More successful responses commonly:*

* showed an understanding of the host community’s opinion of tourists by identifying their irritation (Source 3) directed towards tourists. Evidence cited included the “challenges” Iceland faces and how the government has been “chastise[d]” for their “slow response” (Source 2); the “frustrations of an anxious population” as a result of “complaints from downtown residents” due to overcrowding (Source 2); the argument that this overcrowding and subsequent pressure on physical infrastructure is due to “exponential long-term increase” of tourist numbers (Source 2), supported by Source 1’s data showing visitors to Iceland’s recent exponential growth (75 000 in 1980 to 1 000 000 in 2015); and details of “the exile of young people and artists from the … downtown neighbourhood”, indicating that irritation levels are so high that it results in sections of the population removing themselves from problem areas (Source 2).

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* lacked specific quotes as evidence from Source 2.

(c) *More successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated a perceptive knowledge and understanding of Doxey’s irridex
* evaluated the usefulness of Doxey’s irridex in terms of demonstrating the potential evolution of resident attitudes in relation to growth of tourist numbers, and its usefulness as a model for tourist businesses and governments to consider when assessing the current or future response of residents to growth of tourist numbers
* articulated limitations of the tourism model by referring to the way not all residents necessarily go through all stages or go through the stages in the stipulated order; that not all residents would experience the same response, that some might experience initial euphoria while others experience immediate irritation; and that it doesn’t take into account those who move beyond ‘irritation’ or ‘antagonism’ to levels of resignation (e.g. young people/artists who gave up and moved out of the city to avoid the tourist crush).

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* exhibited only a basic knowledge and understanding of Doxey’s irridex
* struggled to evaluate the usefulness of Doxey’s irridex as a tourism model
* were unable to relate their evaluation to specific aspects of the Icelandic community and did not refer to relevant sections of Sources 1 and 2.

Question 3

(a) *More successful responses commonly:*

* referred to the sources provided or were able to apply current tourism-related knowledge
* argued that decline in visitor numbers to the Windows on the Wetland site could have resulted from significant COVID-19 restrictions, the fact that a tired and run-down “toilet stop” would be less desirable as a tourist destination, increased fuel/travel costs or a lack of advertising/marketing.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* provided irrelevant responses
* did not refer to information provided in the sources.

(b) *More successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated a perceptive knowledge and understanding of the negative multiplier effect and were able to apply this tourism model to the Kakadu context
* reasoned astutely that closing this attraction would create a negative multiplier effect, leading to factors such as loss of revenue, loss of jobs for the host community (direct  indirect), negative effects on other industries, and how it might lead to further reduction in visitation to the area, exacerbating these negative effects.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* showed little or no understanding of the negative economic multiplier effect
* were unable to apply their tourism knowledge to the Kakadu context.

(c) *More successful responses commonly:*

* proposed and justified (by referring to specific data or information from sources to support their answer) appropriate strategies that local tourism businesses and the Northern Territory Government could put in place to make the reopening of the site sustainable, strategies such as advertising or marketing campaigns, investment into the upkeep of the site, the establishment of alternative business(es), bundling or packaging the attraction with other tourism experiences, and investment in environmental protection or conservation projects
* proposed and justified strategies that would actually lead to sustainable tourism.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* listed strategies without explaining or justifying them
* made no reference to the information provided in the sources.

Question 4

(a) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* referred to both Source 1 and Source 3
* perceptively explained a reason why Australia launched a marketing campaign aimed at Singaporeans, citing that Singapore is a traditional market for Australia (“Second Top Destination”), that there are many repeat visitors from Singapore to Australia, that they are high value tourists ($1.53 billion per annum) and the increased revenue would be valuable, that 89% are considering visiting Australia, and that many are considering visiting friends and relatives (VFR).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* either referred to the incorrect sources, or only one source, or made no reference to Sources 1 and 3
* merely mentioned or listed a reason for targeting Singapore in a marketing campaign without explaining it in some depth.

(b) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* applied specific details of the commercial to distinct tourism industry sectors
* demonstrated knowledge and understanding of how the attractions, accommodation, transport or visitor services sector (for example) would benefit by increased revenue, employment or development.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* merely mentioned a tourism industry sector that would benefit without explaining how it would specifically benefit
* were unable to mention or explain a relevant tourism industry sector; markers were generous in this regard because numerous models exist that outline tourism industry sectors.

(c) *More successful responses commonly:*

* perceptively evaluated the proposal that the Australian Government reduce the price of airfares or accommodation in order to encourage Singaporeans to stay in Australia longer; interestingly, very few students recognised that it is not the role of the government to directly reduce airfare or accommodation prices, but they can do so indirectly by reducing taxes or granting subsidies; it seems that the question was rather ambiguous in this regard, and was interpreted to mean that the Australian Government recommended a reduction in the prices, thus markers allowed for this interpretation in the responses
* recognised that if tourism businesses reduced airfares or accommodation prices, tourists would redirect their savings to accommodation spending and would be able to stay longer; others evaluated the proposal positively in reference to the economic multiplier effect, in that staying longer would benefit other tourism sectors, such as the attraction sector, and cited specific examples from the advertisement in Source 3.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not recognise that it is not the government’s role to directly reduce prices of airfares or accommodation
* only provided a superficial evaluation of the proposal, with little or no reference to Source 3.

(d) *More successful responses commonly:*

* exhibited an excellent understanding of the economic importance of the Singaporean market to the Australian tourism industry, citing at least two aspects such as revenue injection of ‘new money’ ($1.53 billion or $2624 per visitor); the positive economic multiplier effect as tourists benefit other industries and other tourism businesses; the contribution to healthy employment levels; the need for development or infrastructure; and the benefit to regional areas (44% of visitation).

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* provided irrelevant or very brief responses
* only provided a superficial assessment of the notion, with little or no reference to the sources.

Part B: Extended Responses

Given the amount of reading and level of higher-order cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation required in Part B, teachers should give their students plenty of practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The Communication assessment design criterion (with specific features C1 and C2) receives special attention in this section of the examination; thus, 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.

Question 5

This question required students to refer to a range of sources to discuss two major economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the tourism industry of Venice. Markers reported that responses were generally structured in paragraphs or with clear sub-headings.

The more successful responses commonly:

* drew on a wide range of sources to answer the question
* confidently and accurately outlined two distinct economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the tourism industry of Venice
* used appropriate formal communication, utilising relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* explained how the pandemic has led to a significant reduction in the number of tourists visiting Venice, previously 10.2 million (Source 1) plus day-trippers from cruise ships, trains and buses (Sources 1 and 6), making the probable annual number about 20 million before COVID-19 (Source 1); this has led to a profound loss of revenue for Venice’s economy, which previously “revolve[d] entirely around tourism” (Source 1), and “mass tourism” (Sources 1,2,3 and 5) contributed about $3.3 billion per year (Source 1)
* recognised that the significant reduction of the number of tourists has also resulted in a loss of employment in tourism-related areas; according to Source 1, “The pandemic has shut down Venice’s accommodation industry”, leaving “lots of empty buildings”, which could lead to a future decline, exacerbating the negative effects resulting from COVID-19
* argued that a drastic reduction in numbers of visitors would also result in a reverse multiplier effect, creating a loss of revenue and jobs in not just the accommodation sector but other tourism-related sectors as well as non-tourism related industries in Venice and beyond Venice
* noted positively that the pandemic has provided an opportunity to “rethink” tourism in Venice (Source 5), to “develop an economy that doesn’t revolve around tourism” (Sources 1 and 2), to avoid “overtourism”, repurposing money to environmental protection and cultural preservation (Sources 3 and 5).

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
* only explained one economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the tourism industry of Venice
* discussed environmental and/or sociocultural impacts that were generally not relevant to the question.

Question 6

This question assessed students’ ability to refer to a range of sources to explain why Venice has experienced some environmental and sociocultural benefits stemming from the pandemic. Markers noted that student responses tended to be able to articulate the environmental benefits experienced by Venice, but struggled at times to enunciate sociocultural benefits.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly explained examples of environmental benefits: the pandemic caused a significant reduction in the number of tourists (Source 1), who traditionally “put pressure on the [natural] environment by generating mountains of refuse” (Source 3); thus, the reduction in visitor numbers has given Venice “breathing space” (Source 3); similarly, a lack of boat traffic in Venice’s canals has led to the return of white swans (Source 7); additionally, cruise ships no longer dock in Venice, leading to less “air pollution and erosion of the area’s sensitive lagoon environment”, increasing the aesthetic beauty of the region as well (Sources 3 and 6)
* astutely discussed the sociocultural benefits: with fewer cruise ships, less resident irritation can be expected due to overcrowding/mass tourism (Sources 3, 4, and 6); also, some students recognised that residents are not as impacted with lower numbers of tourists – the tourists will not see the host community as a tourism commodity through mass tourism, but can embrace “slow tourism” and see “destinations as people’s homes, not just attractions” (Source 3); additionally, lower tourism numbers affords locals “breathing space” from “overcrowding…mass tourism” (Sources 1 and 5), evident by a contrast of Sources 2 and 4; furthermore, “lack of permanent residents” (Source 5) perhaps suggests the resignation stage of Doxey’s irridex, which will be alleviated with fewer tourists; likewise, lower tourist numbers gives Venice an opportunity to “preserve the city’s vast cultural heritage…[and] the Venetian culture and lifestyle” (Source 5).

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
* lacked a detailed explanation of sociocultural benefits, neglecting to use relevant and appropriate tourism terminology.

Question 7

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use the sources to recommend and justify three changes that they considered necessary after the COVID-19 pandemic in order to make tourism sustainable in Venice. Students were required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the tourism concept of sustainability 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 changes 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 labelled sub-headings) three distinct recommended changes
* justified their recommended changes 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 for their recommended changes
* used a wide range of tourism terminology
* clearly and convincingly applied their knowledge of sustainability to the context of tourism in post-COVID Venice
* discussed recommended changes such as:
* an advertising/marketing campaign, rebranding Venice as a destination that embraces “slow tourism, not mass tourism” (Sources 4, 5, and 6)
* diversification: rebuilding Venice by “develop[ing] an economy that doesn’t revolve entirely around tourism” (Source 1), perhaps filling empty buildings with scientific/academic pursuits (Sources 1 and 5)
* taking into account aspects of Venice’s carrying capacity, encouraging “slow tourism” rather than “mass tourism / overcrowding” (Sources 4, 5, and 6)
* promoting responsible tourism in small groups (by limiting numbers) who are interested in “the city’s vast cultural heritage” (Source 5); thus, encouraging government subsidies/investment to allow smaller groups
* banning (government laws) cruise ship visitation so close to Venice, encouraging port and lagoon environmental rejuvenation and protection (Sources 3 and 6)
* introducing government laws that facilitate “greener attitudes” that will “help fragile destinations” (Source 3)
* facilitating the protection, preservation and maintenance of environment and culture (Sources 3 and 5)
* refurbishing empty hotels, targeting them to more niche high value tourism (Source 1).

The less-successful responses commonly:

* were incomplete (possibly due to running out of time)
* developed recommended changes without referring to specific sources as evidence
* repeated the same or similar responses in several recommended changes
* listed recommended changes but did not provide substantiating evidence or an explanation
* did not clearly structure their response (in paragraphs or by numbering), making it difficult for markers to distinguish each recommended change.