# 2018 Tourism Subject Assessment Advice

## Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the previous year’s 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.

# School Assessment

## Assessment Type 1: Folio

This assessment type requires students to interpret and critically analyse secondary sources of information in tourism contexts. Students must complete at least two critical analysis tasks in this assessment type. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the Knowledge & Understanding, Analysis & Evaluation, and Communication assessment design criteria.

Teachers are also reminded of two points. First of all, the supervised tasks and case studies mentioned in the subject outline are suggestions only. Folio tasks might also include assignments such as a report on a tourism trend or activity, an oral presentation on a tourism concept, a media file that outlines a region or country, and so on. Secondly, if a supervised task is carried out, the nature of supervision might vary. Supervision might relate to the length of time given or the number of sources students can use. Consequently, this reduces the need for teachers to provide active supervision of students completing the task in timed test conditions, and the task can be completed as an assignment out normal classroom time.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were developed around engaging topics and case studies
* appropriately used tourism terminology with insight and clarity (performance standard C2)
* were developed in response to tasks that provided scaffolding, which supported student achievement across grade bands without constraining students by being overly prescriptive
* focused on one case study, concept, or model, allowing students to demonstrate a high level of knowledge and understanding, analysis, and evaluation; case studies are not required to be comparative in nature
* made use of multimodal presentation formats such as voice-over PowerPoints and videos
* applied concepts and models to genuinely different contexts
* used concepts and models as an integral part of evaluation and analysis
* evaluated the validity, accuracy and bias of sources of information
* covered multiple concepts across the assessment type
* were succinctly and coherently communicated, without unnecessary repetition
* were developed from task designs that were focused, allowing for in-depth analysis and evaluation
* provided clear recommendations that directly related to the task/topic when AE4 was used as a specific feature in the task design.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were descriptive rather than analytical, limiting achievement against analysis and evaluation-specific features
* used out-of-date sources, information, and case studies
* were required to include multiple case studies, concepts, or models within the 1000-word limit
* breached subject specifications for the assessment type such as word limit
* did not provide evidence against an assessed specific feature
* were prepared in response to out-of-date or no performance standards, thus did not include aspects of Folio tasks required by the subject outline
* were prepared in response to task designs that challenged students to include information irrelevant to the performance standards, themes, and topics
* included supervised tasks not assessed in relation to the performance standards; for example, practice tests were merely marked out of 30 and designated a summary grade rather than being assessed against specific performance standards
* included very little visual or graphical evidence when C3 was used as a specific feature in the task design
* did not show adequate understanding of tourism knowledge, concepts and models (KU1 and KU2)
* provided descriptive comments rather than comparative or evaluative comments, resulting in responses that were anecdotal in nature
* were developed in response to task designs that either required a significant number of steps or were too broad in nature; the first task design problem made it challenging for students to complete the task at a high level within the word count, while the second did not provide students with sufficient direction or scaffolding
* were developed in response to task designs that de-emphasised or omitted the Analysis & Evaluation assessment design criterion.

As more supervised tasks (typically tests and practice examinations) are being included in Learning and Assessment Plans, there is a potential for students not to provide evidence against the Folio performance standards, thus reducing their level of achievement. A sample task is available on the Tourism mini-website (Support Materials), which illustrates how to map tasks such as these to specific performance standards.

## Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

This assessment type requires students to develop and demonstrate practical tourism skills, and involves the collection of information from primary sources. Students must complete at least two tasks in this assessment type. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the Knowledge & Understanding, Investigation and Application, and Communication assessment design criteria. Common practical activities included class visits to museums and nature parks, where students were required to use primary source methods including interviews, personal observations, experiential learning, and a range of surveys. Superior tasks required students to develop their own data collection instruments while facilitating access to sites.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used primary sources as the basis of their work
* used secondary sources to help explain findings from primary sources (IA1), making clear and obvious links between primary and secondary sources of information when IA1 was used as a specific feature in the task design
* applied concepts and models to address the task (IA4)
* annotated photographs and diagrams to support discussion
* used graphical and visual evidence to present findings
* used a range of primary sources across tasks in this assessment type
* presented focused investigation of a single trend, development, or issue (IA3)
* collected and applied diverse primary source evidence, demonstrating a range of practical skills
* conducted their own surveys and interviews
* converted their own statistical data into graphical forms
* effectively incorporated visual and graphical evidence from site visits and surveys into their reports
* made clear and obvious links between primary and secondary sources of information when IA1 was used as a specific feature in the task design
* presented their findings with clarity and in such a way that it was clear that the student had visited sites beyond their classroom
* applied tourism skills in a range of contexts
* were developed in response to task design that allowed students to demonstrate their achievement in the A-band

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a description of the trend, development, or issue
* provided limited evidence of practical tourism skills
* used secondary sources of information as the basis of their work
* lacked a specific focus – for example, they attempted to investigate the success of the Adelaide 500 rather than focusing on one aspect of the event such as successful marketing
* were required to include multiple case studies, concepts, or models within the 1000 word limit
* breached subject specifications for the assessment type such as word limit
* made limited use of primary sources as evidence
* made few or no links between primary and secondary sources of information when IA1 was used as a specific feature in the task design
* misinterpreted the assessment design criteria
* recounted or described the practical task/primary evidence collection with limited analysis
* were overly reliant on secondary sources of information, thus not meeting the primary source specifications for a Practical Activity
* featured little integration between primary source evidence (such as statistical results, graphs and photographs) and the text of the report, in both oral and written responses
* were over the word count for the Practical Activity specifications (1000 words for written tasks and 6 minutes for oral presentations)
* were developed in response to task designs that limited students’ opportunities to perform at all levels of the performance standards. For example, omitting some of the Investigation & Application specific features across both assessment tasks disadvantaged students.

## Assessment Type 3: Investigation

This assessment type requires students to identify a tourism trend, development, and/or contemporary issue for investigation. Students identify, select, analyse, and evaluate primary and secondary sources of information and make recommendations based on their findings. Students must complete one task in this assessment type. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the Knowledge & Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation, Investigation and Application, and Communication assessment design criteria. Common investigations focused on examples of niche tourism, tourist types, and sustainability. Moderators noted an increase in the number of investigations that focused on positive trends such as the growth of a type of tourism.

The more successful responses commonly:

* had a narrow focus and manageable question or hypothesis
* incorporated appropriate concepts and models
* included appropriate visual and graphical evidence to support discussion
* posed a question or hypothesis that allowed the student to utilise relevant primary sources of information
* incorporated evaluation of the validity, bias, and accuracy of sources (which is by definition analysis, assessed according to the AE2 performance standard) in the body of the text
* incorporated analysis and evaluation of tourism concepts and models in the student response
* evaluated the validity, accuracy and bias of sources of information (AE2)
* were completed within the word limit of 1500 words
* had well-focused, achievable questions or hypotheses
* other comments are as for previous year.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were too broad for the specifications of the assessment type
* were poorly worded and ambiguous in their focus
* were descriptive rather than analytical and evaluative
* lacked tourism terminology and knowledge
* included limited or no primary sources
* were prepared in response to out-of-date performance standards or no performance standards, thus did not include aspects of Investigation tasks required by the subject outline
* breached subject specifications for the assessment type such as word limit
* incorporated much analysis into tables that contributed significantly to assessment of IA1, AE1 and AE3, which often resulted in students breaching the word limit
* considered global issues with limited opportunities for data collection from quality primary sources of information
* were descriptive rather than analytical
* made limited connections between primary and secondary sources of information (IA1).

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Examination

This assessment type requires students to undertake one 2-hour 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.

As in previous years, there was some disparity in marks achieved between Part A: Short Responses (Questions 1-4) and Part B: Extended Responses (Questions 5-7). Students sometimes ran out of time in the extended responses section, perhaps suggesting that they experienced difficulty in managing their time effectively. Students should apportion their time according to the number of marks allocated for each question.

Students tended to find Questions 1 and 4 easiest to deal with, while they found Questions 2 and 5 challenging.

Members of the marking panel tended to highlight the following general features that contributed to the quality of student responses:

* Better responses demonstrated evidence of superior time management skills. Students who wrote concise responses in the space provided in Part A generally completed a greater proportion of the examination. In Part B, students who wasted their time rewriting the questions were more likely to run out of time towards the end of the examination. Giving students opportunities to practise writing concise answers in timed, supervised conditions is necessary throughout the year for adequate examination preparation.
* Successful answers showed evidence of detailed analysis supported by evidence, especially to questions with command verbs such as ‘explain’, ‘describe’ and ‘justify’.
* Higher quality responses demonstrated students’ ability to do as questions directed by referring to specific sources as evidence for their conclusions or recommendations.
* Finally, especially relevant to Part B (where marks were allocated for performance standards C1 and C2), students who could communicate in a concise and structured manner, with accurate spelling, grammar and sentence construction, tended to write higher quality responses.

Assessment design criteria

For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning especially in relation to KU1 and 2, AE2 and 4, IA2 and 4, and C1 and 2.

Discussion of assessment design criteria is the same as previous years.

**Part A: Short Responses**

### Question 1

1. The more successful responses commonly:

* referred to Source A
* cited specific data relevant to accommodation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not directly contrast domestic and international visitors in each answer.

1. The more successful responses commonly:

* used their tourism knowledge to explain that interstate tourists travel between states (and stay for a longer time), while intrastate tourists travel within their state of origin (and stay for a shorter time).

The less successful responses commonly:

* showed some misunderstanding of the concepts by reversing the correct answer
* utilised Source B to show differences in data without explaining the difference between terms.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* referred to the data in Source B
* quoted specific data, explaining, for example, that a higher proportion of domestic visitors travel to the Eyre Peninsula than do international visitors, yet international visitors tend to stay longer than domestic visitors stay
* gave a valid explanation, which included reasons such as the short distance domestic visitors travel, increasing their tendency to visit the area, while international visitors travel further to the Eyre Peninsula, thus they stay for a longer period of time
* referred to other sources (for example, Source A’s mention of VFR).

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not directly compare domestic and international visitor data, only discussing domestic *or* international tourists
* were unable to discuss valid reasons (as outlined above), which also included better domestic advertising campaigns and the fact that it is cheaper to travel domestically.

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*

* understood (and clearly articulated) that a strong overseas currency would potentially increase the number of international visitors to the Eyre Peninsula on the basis that it would become cheaper for international tourists to travel to Australia
* followed the question’s instructions to ‘identify and explain’.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated a poor understanding of tourism’s economic impacts by reversing the explanation.

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*

* discussed strategies that tourism businesses, rather than government bodies, might implement, such as collaboration of sectors through the creation of package deals, marketing/advertising campaigns, discounting tourist activities, or the creation of additional attractions and events
* focused on improving occupancy rates, which were quite stable all year round
* referred to the sources for ideas. For example, Source D showed the dominance of water-related activities as popular attractions in the Eyre Peninsula tourism region.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* showed little or no understanding of the term ‘occupancy rates’
* suggested strategies without explaining how they might increase occupancy rates
* repeated the same strategy, merely worded differently.

### Question 2

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* clearly defined the term ‘tourist’ and were able to apply these sources to the definition
* provided an informed explanation based on digital nomads’ motivation, activities, length of stay, and their creation of a multiplier effect in the host community.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not understand the intent of the question
* made poor use of the sources provided.

1. *Sound responses commonly*:

* provided a working definition of the Multiplier Effect
* explained how money spent in Bali by tourists was able to circulate throughout the host community in the tourism industry.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer to the sources
* demonstrated little or no understanding of the tourism term ‘Multiplier Effect’
* were unable to apply the model to an unfamiliar context (digital nomads in Bali).

(c.i) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated a practical understanding of Doxey’s irridex model and could apply it to the unfamiliar context of Ayok’s perception of digital nomads in Bali
* recognised, in Source A, Ayok’s initial excitement, no real signs of irritation, and examples of apathy or eventual resignation.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* lacked the level of explanation expected for 4 marks
* did not refer to Ayok’s perception, which was outlined in Source A.

(c.ii) *The more successful responses commonly:*

* exhibited a sound understanding of the limitations of Doxey’s irridex model, discussing factors such as generalisation (not all locals experience the same response or the same order of emotions) and cultural bias (“European” perception).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* did not demonstrate an understanding of the limitations of Doxey’s irridex model
* did not explain their answer in sufficient detail.

### Question 3

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* used their knowledge of tourism terms, clearly distinguishing between mass tourism’s tendency towards large numbers, familiar options, and uncontrolled activities, in contrast to niche tourism’s smaller scale, generally being involved in more aware or responsible, and controlled activities.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer to the sources provided
* showed little or no understanding of the difference between the two terms.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* explained economic benefits of tourism for host communities in destinations such as Palau, including employment, revenue, and the development of infrastructure.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* referred to the Multiplier Effect, despite the question’s instruction *not* to do so
* discussed impacts of tourism that were either negative or unrelated to the host community’s wellbeing (e.g., obvious environmental or socio-cultural impacts).

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*

* explained in some detail how government-developed strategies might minimise the environmental costs of mass tourism, such as reducing waste or other aspects of pollution through laws or fines, deliberate site hardening, education programmes, placing limits on tourist numbers or hours of operation, or zoning (staying under the environmental carrying capacity)
* demonstrated a superior ability in being able to make perceptive tourism-related recommendations (AE4) in a new or unfamiliar context (IA4).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* did not understand the role of the government in tourism
* merely listed strategies without sufficient explanation
* only discussed one strategy
* repeated similar strategies in each response
* discussed tourism’s impacts that were not related to the environment.

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*

* explained in some detail how tourists themselves might engage in actions to preserve the environment, discussing practices such as reducing levels of pollution (e.g., noise), environmental education or respect, abiding by government laws, or remaining under the environmental carrying capacity.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* merely listed practices without sufficient explanation
* only discussed one practice
* repeated similar practices in each response
* discussed tourism’s impacts that were not related to the environment, and instead discussed how responsible tourists might minimise their impact on culture or the economy.

### Question 4

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* Identified and described in some detail an employment opportunity in a specific sector of the tourism industry. Valid responses were wide-ranging.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer to a specific sector of the tourism industry such as accommodation or transport.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* explained in some detail how redeveloping a wildlife park might benefit the environment, discussing aspects such as awareness or education of flora/fauna leading to preservation and conservation, positive site hardening, increase in funds for further protection and conservation, and reduction in negative environmental effects.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* referred to impacts of tourism that were either negative, or were more economic or cultural rather than environmental
* provided minimal explanation or vague descriptions.

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*

* applied an astute understanding of all three notions of validity, accuracy, and bias (AE2) to evaluate or judge the source
* recognised that the validity/accuracy of the source would increase because it was recently developed, was relevant to the proposed development, and was a government source (council newsletter)
* realised that the source was not merely one-sided but included the perspectives of a range of stakeholders (business, overseas tourists, government, Indigenous elders, residents, opposers); however, the majority of stakeholders supported the proposed development.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* showed little understanding of the source’s validity, accuracy, or bias, and were unable to make informed judgements in this regard
* did not discuss all three notions of validity, accuracy, and bias
* did not respond in any detail, as expected by a question worth 6 marks.

This question acted as an effective discriminator in the examination, demonstrated by the wide range of marks earned by responses.

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 ample practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The Communication assessment design criterion (C1 and C2) receives special attention in this section of the examination; therefore, 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 use only Sources 1-5 to show how cultural commodification by means of tourism might benefit host communities. Markers reported that students generally struggled with this question, as commodification is usually seen in a negative light.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used appropriate formal communication, utilising relevant and accurate tourism terminology (C1 and C2)
* defined commodification, as outlined in Sources 1 and 3, as ‘turning a place’s culture…into a product (commodity) with economic value’
* noted that Source 1 recognises commodification as ‘good thing’ without specifying how, but focuses on the generation of a large enough profit ‘to support an area’s economy’
* explained how Source 4 supports Source 1. Commodification of culture in Bali ‘builds up the economy’ because tourism is ‘labour intensive’. Similarly, ‘money from abroad’, or an influx of revenue, will build up the host community’s economy
* argued that Source 2 focuses on the increasing demand for cultural tourism in Africa. According to this source, tourism makes the culture more ‘authentic’ because it showcases ‘traditional ways’ such as water transport
* also contended that Source 5 demonstrates how commodification can be positive because tourists are educated regarding the culture of the host community. This recognises and validates the host community’s culture, even if it is presented by means of a performance.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not recognise the intent of the question, and focused on the negative aspects of commodification
* responded according to their own knowledge, rather than referring to specific sources as evidence
* only referred to one or two sources, instead of referring to Sources 1-5
* were brief and did not respond in sufficient detail, as expected when answering a question worth 8 marks
* did not write in a structured, coherent paragraph.

### Question 6

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use Sources 1-5 to develop well-supported arguments, making specific reference to negative aspects of cultural commodification. Students were required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the tourism concept of commodification by defining it (KU2), and applying their knowledge to new, perhaps unfamiliar, contexts (IA4).

The more successful responses commonly:

* defined (perhaps reiterated) an accurate definition of commodification
* utilised appropriate formal communication, using relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* argued, as does Source 3, that tourism can alter the local culture, leading to a loss of meaning or a loss of a sense of belonging, a ‘dilut[ion]’
* contended that Source 4 reinforces Source 3 (tourism can alter the local culture), and provided examples of how tourism creates negative effects on a host community’s ‘social life…art, religion, lifestyle, the environment’, and so forth
* recognised, with Source 1, that tourism can alter tourists’ ability to experience ‘an authentic experience’ because a ‘false culture’ is introduced, as evident in the introduction of globalised fast food; some argued that Source 3 also reinforces Source 1’s focus on the establishment of globalised food chains, which can negatively alter the local culture
* noticed that Source 2 echoes Source 1’s push for an ‘authentic’ experience, otherwise the local culture becomes ‘staged or performed’, exemplified in Source 5, which shows a photo of a Maori dance, and uses the words ‘performance’
* noted that Source 4 adds that commodification of a local culture because of tourism can lead to ‘vulnerability’ because of reliance on foreign tourism and the higher possibility of profit leakage.

The less successful responses commonly:

* answered the question according to their own knowledge without referring to Sources 1-5 as evidence
* were brief and did not respond in sufficient detail, as expected when answering a question worth 10 marks
* did not write structured, coherent paragraphs
* discussed economic or even environmental costs, with no relevance to cultural loss.

### Question 7

Besides having 12 marks allocated to it, this question was also quite demanding; consequently, it acted as a constructive discriminator of student grades in the examination. The requirement, thus the ability, to ‘evaluate’ the sustainability of ‘slow travel’ tended to determine the quality of responses.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used appropriate formal communication, employing relevant and accurate tourism terminology (C1 and C2)
* followed the guidelines set by the question, which required students to refer to a range of sources as well as to their knowledge and understanding of the tourism industry – particularly how to apply Source 6 (a model of sustainability) to what was for many the unfamiliar concept of slow travel (IA4)
* compared ‘slow travel’ and ‘mass tourism’, as the question required students to ‘evaluate’ or measure the extent to which slow travel is ‘more sustainable’ than mass tourism; most students argued that slow travel is more sustainable than mass tourism, as suggested by the majority of sources; some, however, argued against this statement, and backed up their answer with evidence from the sources; the most astute responses argued for and against the statement
* defined slow travel (more than just transport, but immersing oneself in the culture of the host community), mass tourism and sustainability; Source 6 indicates achieving a balance between the three components of economic, social/cultural, and environmental impacts
* recognised that mass tourism tends to lead to the negative commodification of host community culture, and many responses reiterated some aspects of Question 6
* contended thatSource 3 indicates that tourists’ desires are placed in a position above locals’ needs; slow travel will protect local culture from this occurrence, which, according to Source 7 (positive blog), occurs because tourists have a ‘greater likelihood’ of ‘connecting with local people’; Source 8 reinforces the concept of an ‘immersion process’, and tourists who engage in slow travel tend to ‘connect to a culture’
* argued that Source 7 (negative blog) assumes ‘adventurous activities’ are fast-paced, etc., but experiencing a new culture, with the attendant focus on food and other cultural components, can be equally adventurous
* recognised, conversely, that slow travel is not necessarily sustainable because, according to Source 7 (negative blog), tourists need time and money for it, thus it is a niche market; then again, if it is a niche market, then it is not mass tourism
* reasoned that mass tourism, which tends to lead to commodification of culture, ‘can be seen as a good thing’, according to Source 3; responses at this point reiterated aspects of Question 5 relating to economic benefits
* acknowledged that, if a local culture is ‘altered’, ‘diluted’, or becomes ‘inauthentic’, then economic benefits will be short-lived, thus it will not be sustainable.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were incomplete (due to running out of time)
* did not address the ‘evaluate’ aspect of the question, only arguing whether or not slow travel is more sustainable than mass tourism, rather than considering both sides of the position
* answered the question without referring to specific sources as evidence
* simply quoted from (or identified the positions taken in) a range of sources and assumed this demonstrated the higher order skills of analysis and evaluation.