# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2023 Tourism Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 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 involves interpreting and critically analysing secondary sources in relation to an aspect of a theme or topic being studied. 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.

Teachers and 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.

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
* making use of the full range of assessment tasks in the folio to allow task development to focus on a section of a topic (for example, a focus on a concept or model in one task relevant to the topic/issue/development and development of strategies relevant to the topic/issue/development in a second task rather than including both in the one 1000 word/6-minute assignment.

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified models and analysed them thus demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of tourism concepts and models (e.g. sustainability, Plog's, Butler Sequence, Doxey's Irridex)
* perceptively analysed and evaluated tourism concepts, models, and sources of information (e.g. accuracy, bias, and validity)
* authentically evaluated the validity, bias, and accuracy of sources and provided reasoning for their evaluations
* referred to sources and visuals in the text
* used a wide range of tourism terminology appropriate to the task and topic
* were developed in response to a set of assignment tasks that incorporated a wide range of skills and performance standards across several tasks, with each task having a specific focus on particular standards/skills, rather than trying to cover too many in one task
* were discerning in the response, ensuring they did not cover elements in detail that did not directly relate to performance standards (e.g. in a career task too much emphasis on what the career was, the role vs discussing the interconnections within the career and how other models/concepts applied)
* made interesting use of annotations as part of the written analysis, often incorporating source and/or model analysis within the annotations. While these still contributed to the word counts (being analysis), the nature of annotations meant that the source analysis and other skills demonstrated made more ‘efficient’ use of words vs extended prose
* utilised an extensive range of sources.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were developed in response to assessment task that covered too many elements in one task, e.g. the evaluation of many models/sources (AE2, AE3) rather than a specific focus on one or two models/sources
* were developed in response to assessment tasks that required students to demonstrate their achievement against many of the assessment design criteria within 1000 words, rather than focusing on a smaller number of these criteria for one task and then addressing the various standards across the folio
* relied on general knowledge, rather than researched evidence, limiting the ability to provide in-depth conclusions or recommendations
* recalled information and facts rather than analysing and evaluating concepts and models
* did not consider multiple perspectives of tourism issues/trends/developments
* did not use, or poorly referenced, a range of sources
* inappropriately used a wide range of tourism terms, often in ways which were not relevant
* bombarded the reader with as many tourism terms as possible, which were not always relevant to the task
* did not refer to visuals/graphs in the text/presentation.

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. This may include:
* including tasks that focus on specific elements rather than all possible elements.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used tourism concepts and models to support their analysis
* were discerning in the response, ensuring they did not cover elements in detail that did not directly relate to performance standards (e.g. in a visit to a location, did not place too much emphasis on what the place was, but more on sustainable practices/conclusions or the application of a model)
* made interesting use of annotations as part of the written analysis, often incorporating source and/or model analysis within the annotations. While these still contributed to the word counts (being analysis), the nature of annotations meant that the source analysis and other skills demonstrated made more ‘efficient’ use of words vs extended prose
* accessed, and demonstrated understanding of, primary and secondary sources and made connections between them such as connections between a survey, interview photographs, and existing secondary research
* developed and demonstrated practical tourism skills in a range of ways, for example through students doing presentations in different contexts demonstrating skills, as well as visiting locations.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not link tourism models to their research focus
* demonstrated a lack of evidence of practical skills, relying heavily on secondary information or, conversely, focused entirely on primary sources thus missing the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to make connections between primary and secondary sources of information
* recounted experiences rather than applied tourism concepts in practical settings
* were prepared in response to tasks that required students to cover too many elements and performance standards in one task.

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:

* applied practical skills alongside well-developed secondary research skills to thoroughly investigate a tourism trend/development/issue
* were well researched and written. They used evidence and referred to visuals/graphical information in the response. Responses made effective use of writing conventions appropriate to the selected format (e.g. headings in reports, captioning of graphical evidence, visual support in multi-modal presentations)
* addressed a wide range of perspectives including the student’s own
* developed a clear and specific question that had an ‘evaluative nature’ to guide the investigation (further supporting features such as AE4 as conclusions were drawn in relation to the question). This also guided achievement against other performance standards through a specific application in relation to the question
* made interesting use of annotations as part of the written analysis, often incorporating source and/or model analysis within the annotations. While these still contributed to the word counts (being analysis), the nature of annotations meant that the source analysis and other skills demonstrated made more ‘efficient’ use of words than extended prose
* utilised an extensive range of sources, including making links between primary and secondary sources
* provided insightful evaluation of sources for validity, bias, and accuracy and avoided making big ‘overarching’ statements about the sources without specific application. Some students incorporated source analysis (in addition to or in place of a table/specific source analysis) as part of the written prose (or annotations). This helped develop evaluation of sources at a higher grade level
* demonstrated obvious connections between primary and secondary sources
* included well-supported conclusions and recommendations within set word limits.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on reporting on information, rather than analysing findings
* lacked tourism terminology or used tourism terminology inappropriately
* were descriptive rather than analytical
* were developed in response to vague or non-evaluative questions. This led to more recounting of situations than analysing a particular issue from different sources and drawing conclusions
* did not apply tourism concepts and models within the investigation or utilise appropriate graphical evidence. Where these were incorporated, it was superficial and tended towards description of the concept/model or vague reference to it
* incorporated minimal or superficial source analysis and often did not make use of a wide range of sources
* did not use primary sources of information to demonstrate knowledge and understanding
* exceeded set word limits, thus their conclusions and recommendations were often not assessed. Information embedded in a table is included in the word count when concepts and models are analysed
* did not effectively evaluate sources of information for bias, validity, or accuracy
* included source evaluation in an appendix (thus not part of the word count). The SACE Board Word Count Policy specifically excludes appendices from the word count and notes that ‘all words used in the body of the text are counted for assessment purposes. This includes all words that the assessor reads, from the beginning of the introduction to the end of the conclusion’. Appendices therefore cannot be used to present information that is used to inform the assessment decisions of the assessor.

# 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 fourth year that the Tourism examination was online, so students were familiar with the e-exam format. One observation noted by markers was the fact that there were very few incomplete examinations, with the 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. Despite running out of time, those who presented dot point responses obtained some marks for at least demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and issues.

It is also worth noting that this was the second year an audio-visual source (Part B, Source 2) was used in the e-exam. Markers remarked that quite a number of students did not make reference to this source (on responsible tourism) in their responses, or merely repeated the video’s recommendations, while more successful students moved beyond quoting from the source and 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 tended to find Questions 1, 3, and 5 easiest to answer, while Questions 4 and 6 appeared to be more challenging.

Markers articulated 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 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
* 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 justification with supporting evidence resulted in responses that lacked depth of analysis and thus achieved fewer marks
* superior 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, better responses followed the questions’ instructions by referring to explicit tourism terminology or models such as economic or environmental impacts, specific sectors of the tourism industry, Doxey’s Irridex, or the Butler Sequence
* 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 justified recommendations 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, very short answers, or unstructured text in one dense paragraph tended to produce less successful responses. Markers also highlighted the increased number of responses that demonstrated poor communication skills. While incoherent and ineffective responses were not penalised in Part A, assessment of Part B was significantly 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 the sources provided
	* cited specific data relating to the importance of tourism for Byron Shire, such as the number of people employed or revenue generated.

*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:*
	* gave a detailed explanation of the role of government in managing tourism’s impact in regional communities such as Byron Bay, including responsibilities such as generating revenue via taxes, advertising, and marketing, making and implementing laws, managing resources, and employing people in tourism-related areas.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + provided irrelevant responses, not demonstrating a knowledge and understanding of the role of government bodies or authorities
	+ merely listed government roles and responsibilities without giving an explanation.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific evidence from the sources to justify the extent to which they agreed with the statement
	* provided logical and well-considered explanations that both agreed and disagreed with the effect of limiting the numbers of ‘van-lifers’ visiting Byron Bay; students articulated mostly negative effects (e.g. reduced revenue = Source 1; reduced employment created from tourism = Source 1), but also enunciated some possible positive effects on locals (e.g. examples cited in Sources 2, 3, and 4).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + showed little to no understanding of the effect of limiting the numbers of ‘van-lifers’
	+ merely mentioned or listed a possible reason without following the instruction of the question to ‘justify’ their answer
	+ only discussed the negative effects of limiting the numbers of ‘van-lifers’.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to specific sources to justify their answer
	* were able to apply Doxey’s Irridex tourism model (Source 4) to the new context of the Byron Bay community, demonstrating an understanding that ‘different locals have different perspectives’ (Source 2), equating to different levels on the model; e.g. while initially tourists would have experienced ‘euphoria’ or a positive attitude towards tourists stemming from a creation of employment and generation of revenue (Source 1), it likely transformed to ‘irritation’ resulting from van-lifers’ toilet habits, not contributing to revenue, effects on the aesthetics of Byron Bay, etc. (Sources 2 and 3).

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* + demonstrated very little understanding of Doxey’s Irridex tourism model
	+ merely mentioned or listed various levels of Doxey’s Irridex without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ how the host community of Byron Bay feels about tourism
	+ were unable to explain how ‘different locals have different perspectives’ (Source 2), or that their attitudes towards tourism changed over time.

Question 2

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated an understanding of the tourism term ‘pull factors’ or factors that attracted tourists to Kakadu National Park
	* cited specific examples from the sources such as the environment (waterfalls, gorges, walking tracks) and Indigenous culture.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + showed no or little understanding of the tourism term ‘pull factors’
	+ did not refer to specific information provided in the sources.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* were able to synthesise information from more than one source to demonstrate their understanding of the economic consequences of the crisis in Kakadu, with reference to negative impacts on employment, revenue, and infrastructure in tourism sectors and non-tourism businesses.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + were not supported from data or information from the sources
	+ merely stated potential economic consequences without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ their effect on Kakadu National Park
	+ discussed environmental or sociocultural impacts that were irrelevant to the question (economic consequences).
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* demonstrated an astute understanding of the Butler Sequence, using the terminology of the tourism model (Source 2) to provide evidence from Sources 1 and 3 supporting the argument that Kakadu National Park is in the ‘decline’ stage (e.g. specific words such as ‘degrade’, ‘disrepair’, ‘closed’, ‘closures’, ‘maintenance’, and ‘deteriorating’; citing international visitors ‘abandoning’ the National Park; and the run-down condition of the supermarket and visitor centre).

The less successful responses commonly:

* + exhibited little to no knowledge and understanding of the Butler Sequence tourism model
	+ incorrectly labelled Kakadu National Park as being in the ‘development’ or ‘consolidation’ stage
	+ 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, realistically, the government could implement to increase visitation to Kakadu National Park
	* demonstrated perceptive knowledge and understanding of environmental (e.g. site-hardening/improving, managing weeds and pests, fire management, road maintenance) or sociocultural strategies (e.g. collaboration with Indigenous communities regarding tourism-related decisions, investment by funding tourism-related activities, creation of jobs for Indigenous communities).

The less successful responses commonly:

* + provided irrelevant responses (e.g. economic management strategies)
	+ 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.

Question 3

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* focused on how employment was affected in a specific tourism industry sector when cruise ships stopped visiting Pacific nations such as Vanuatu during the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g. in the accommodation sector: fewer tourists, thus less need for concierges, administration, cleaners, cooks, etc.; less need for those in tour guide or transportation or attraction sectors with reduced demand).

The less successful responses commonly:

* + were not supported from information from the sources
	+ merely listed tourism industry sectors without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ why employment was affected.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated a working knowledge and understanding of the difference between niche and mass tourism, and how expedition tourism is more in line with niche tourism
	* recognised that expedition tourism involves a rethinking of tourism so that there would be fewer of the negative impacts associated with mass tourism (e.g. overcrowding, strain on resources, commodification) and more of the positive impacts associated with niche tourism (e.g. smaller groups, authentic culture preserved).

 The less successful responses commonly:

* + showed little to no understanding of the difference between mass and niche tourism, or of the concept of expedition tourism (specifically defined in Source 1)
	+ merely stated a response without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ why the tourism industry in Vanuatu might want to focus after the pandemic on activities such as expedition tourism (niche) instead of cruise tourism (mass).
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources provided
	* demonstrated a perceptive knowledge and understanding of sustainability
	* reasoned astutely that cruise tourism to Pacific nations can be environmentally sustainable (e.g. contribution to conservation/protection of the environment, education of tourists, repair/maintenance of the environment) or socioculturally sustainable (e.g. valuing and preservation of local cultures, education of tourists and locals, contribution to employment and standard of living of locals).

The less successful responses commonly:

* + made no reference to the information provided in the sources
	+ showed little or no understanding of the concept of sustainability
	+ provided irrelevant responses (e.g. explanations relating to economic sustainability).
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* demonstrated a knowledge and understanding of various tourism sectors (e.g. accommodation, attraction, transport)
	* suggested appropriate ways cruise tourism could collaborate with businesses in other tourism sectors (e.g. creation of packages such as shore tours including a package involving transport and attraction or attraction and off-ship accommodation; the cruise company hiring locals for tours, transport, etc., especially in relation to expedition tourism; the cruise company meeting with locals to develop ideas/business plans, etc.).

The less successful responses commonly:

* + explained strategies that the cruise company or local businesses could engage in but showed little to no understanding of how cruise tourism could *collaborate* with businesses in other tourism sectors
	+ made no reference to information provided in the sources, which could have been used as a springboard for ideas.

Question 4

1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to information in Source 1
	* demonstrated an understanding of how an increase in Rwandan interest rates might lead to a reduction in tourism-related businesses as more can’t afford loans/mortgages, thus there are fewer options available for international tourists; also, an increase in prices to cover loans/mortgages might lead to experiences being less desirable or affordable for international tourists.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + made no reference to the information provided in Source 1
	+ showed little to no understanding of the effect of local interest rates on visitors and tourism
	+ repeated information that was in the question, e.g. that increasing interest rates weakened external demand, without explaining how it would do this.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* used evidence from the sources to respond to the question
	* demonstrated an excellent understanding of possible economic impacts on Rwanda from a decrease in the number of international tourists, citing information in Sources 1 and 2 to detail explanations of effects such as a reduction in GDP (currently 8.4%), ‘job creation’ being affected (expect job reduction), thus a negative economic multiplier effect, less money for the protection of biodiversity and dealing with climate change, less opportunity to enhance private sector participation in tourism, gorilla trekking or zebra safari businesses being at risk, a degradation of natural assets (including land), and less revenue to be used to deal with overexploitation of natural resources.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + made no reference to the sources provided
	+ provided irrelevant responses (e.g. explanations relating to environmental or sociocultural impacts)
	+ merely stated a response without following the instruction of the question to ‘describe’ two possible economic impacts on Rwanda.
1. *The more successful responses commonly:*
	* referred to the sources that were provided
	* perceptively evaluated the tourism management strategy of introducing a tourism tax on nature-based tourism activities in order to deal with ‘overexploitation of natural resources’ (Source 1), demonstrating an understanding of the Rwandan government plans as having a negative impact
	* recognised negative impacts: introducing a tourism tax would increase costs for tourism businesses, which would most likely be passed onto tourists, who might find the business less affordable/attractive; this could then cause tourism-related businesses to fold, negatively impact the lucrative nature-based tourism ‘sector’, and affect Rwanda’s GDP
	* also recognised possible positive impacts: raising taxes might be used to increase revenue, which could be spent on education, conservation measures, etc.

The less successful responses commonly:

* + made little or no mention of information provided in the sources
	+ merely stated a response without following the instruction of the question to ‘evaluate’ the tourism management strategy, which necessitated a detailed judgement or explanation
	+ did not realise that the Rwandan government plans to introduce a tourism tax could have positive effects (not just negative).

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 (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. 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 explain how ‘greenwashing’ practised by businesses might influence the behaviour of tourists. Markers reported that better responses were clearly structured, using short paragraphs and even sub-headings, while some responses lacked a logical structure.

The more successful responses commonly:

* drew on a wide range of sources to answer this question
* confidently and accurately defined ‘greenwashing’ (as tourism business behaviour) and demonstrated an understanding of how it can influence tourist behaviour either by driving tourists, who might oppose greenwashing, to adopt responsible tourism attitudes and practices (evidence from sources of responsible tourism attitudes and activities were in Source 2); or it can influence tourists to adopt similar attitudes and practices, to engage in ‘veneer tourism’ (see examples in Sources 1 and 3)
* used appropriate formal communication, utilising relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* recognised that ‘greenwashing’ is the behaviour of tourism businesses ‘jumping on the environmental bandwagon’ (Source 5), ‘intentionally trick[ing] clients’ (Source 3) by pretending to ‘care about the environment and local people’ (Source 3) or ‘planet’ and ‘people’ (Source 6), but in reality, they are out to ‘cash in on [tourists’] eco-guilt’ (Source 5) or feelings of being a responsible tourist (Source 2), motivated primarily by the ‘profit’ (Source 6)
* noted that ‘veneer environmentalism’ is the behaviour of tourists, which can result from the greenwashing engaged in by businesses; as indicated in Sources 1 and 3, it is not ‘true environmentalism’ but only convenient (e.g. time and money) environmentalism
* argued their case by providing some examples of greenwashing, which are found in Sources 3 and 5, and by providing some examples of veneer environmentalism, which are found in Sources 1 and 3
* explained how greenwashing involves disingenuous behaviour of tourism businesses towards the environment and local culture/people.

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 quoted from the sources without explaining in any detail aspects of greenwashing and veneer environmentalism
* defined greenwashing and veneer environmentalism but did not demonstrate an understanding of how greenwashing by tourism businesses might influence tourists.

Question 6

This question assessed students’ ability to evaluate (make a judgement on) Sources 1 and 3 for validity and potential bias and was the least successful response in the examination. It was more cognitively demanding than Question 5, thus it was worth more marks. The ability to ‘evaluate’ the degree of bias and validity in the sources used for a student’s investigation of greenwashing and veneer environmentalism determined the quality of the response.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly identified examples of bias in the sources: we would expect Source 1 (a secondary/university level textbook) to be objective and factual rather than subjective, opinionated, and biased; there is no evidence of biased information in this model. Source 3, on the other hand, as a travel blog, is written from the perspective of someone sharing their personal experience, thus more biased, although there is no evidence of personally attacking specific companies
* astutely discussed the validity of the sources: Source 1 is a tourism model for advanced level studies of tourism, so is characterised by a higher level of credibility/reliability; proportions of the population on this model are only approximations ($≅$ 25% or $≅$ 50%), indicating that the categories are only a rough estimation, not an exact measure of the population, which reduces the reliability/validity a little. The level of credibility/reliability for Source 3 is expected to be less than Source 1 because this source is a blog of someone’s personal experiences and opinions, although the author is un-named and no judgement can be made in this regard; the examples listed are quite objective, free from emotional disposition, and most likely based on personal experience, which potentially increases validity/reliability
* effectively transferred the language and terminology concerning bias and validity from the compulsory Research Project to the tourism context.

The less successful responses commonly:

* discussed Sources 1, 2, and 3 (instead of just Sources 1 and 3), so were less detailed in their responses
* had difficulty in articulating exactly what the terms ‘bias’ and ‘validity’ were
* recounted the content of the sources without evaluating them for bias and validity
* did not discuss how the degree or extent of bias and validity contributed to their reliability as sources to be used in an investigation
* misused the words ‘bias’ (correct usage = ‘Source 3 contains some bias…’) and ‘biased’ (correct usage = ‘we would expect Source 1 to be unbiased because…’).

Question 7

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use the sources to suggest and justify three recommendations that Green Tourism Incorporated might use to protect Beachside Resort from tourists engaging in veneer environmentalism and tourism businesses operating via principles involving greenwashing. 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 labelled 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 for 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 a new tourism development
* discussed recommended changes such as:
* an education campaign focusing on responsible business practice or tourist behaviour (Source 2)
* incentives via advertising/marketing from Green Tourism/Beachside Resort for tourists to embrace authentic environmental or sociocultural practices (e.g. cheaper options rather than charging for carbon offsets, environmental levies, etc.; Rewards Program; packaging = discounts on food, transport, attractions) (Sources 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6)
* having Beachside Resort encourage and tourists engage in responsible tourism behaviours, by Beachside Resort offering authentic environmental practices (e.g. laundry, waste management, renewable energy, etc.) (Sources 2, 3, and 5)
* Beachside Resort engaging in sustainable building practices, waste management, renewable energy, etc. (Source 3)
* Beachside Resort providing and tourists participating in environmental management/protection programs (Sources 3, 5, and 6)
* Beachside Resort providing and tourists participating in practices that support local (Indigenous) community, such as local food products, building materials, employment, etc. (Sources 2, 3, 4, and 6)
* Indigenous ownership (not just employment) and management of Beachside Resort (Sources 4 and 6)
* government subsidies/investment to allow smaller groups in tourist activities, thus maximising local connection and minimising environmental impact (Sources 4 and 6)
* protection, preservation, and maintenance of sacred sites (Source 6).

*The less successful response commonly:*

* were incomplete (possibly due to running out of time)
* developed recommendations without referring to specific sources as evidence
* repeated the same or similar responses in more than one recommendation
* listed recommendations 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 recommendation.