# 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.

The more successful responses commonly:

* 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:

* 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.

Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

This assessment type requires students to collect information from primary sources of information such as surveys, interviews and frequency tallies. In most cases, it is undertaken beyond the classroom in tourism-related fieldwork. Students must complete at least two tasks in this assessment type, allowing them to demonstrate and develop their practical tourism skills. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the Knowledge & Understanding, Investigation & Application, and Communication assessment design criteria.

The more successful responses commonly:

* 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
* other comments are as for previous year.

The less successful responses commonly:

* 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 undertake an individual investigation of a tourism trend, development, and/or contemporary issue. Students complete one task and utilise both primary and secondary sources of information. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to all four assessment design criteria.

The more successful responses commonly:

* 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:

* 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

Teachers and students should be aware that 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. Students complete two sections: Part A: Short Responses, and Part B: Extended Responses. 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.

Following the pattern of previous years, there was a disparity in marks achieved between Part A and Part B. This year, equal marks were allocated to Questions 5-7 (Part B), which was not the case for previous years. Consequently, more students than last year ran out of time in the extended responses section, perhaps suggesting that students this year experienced some difficulty in managing their time effectively.

Students tended to find Questions 1, 4 and 5 easiest to deal with, while they found Questions 2 and 7 particularly challenging.

There was general agreement amongst members of the marking panel of the following features that contributed to the quality of student responses:

* Better responses demonstrated evidence of effective time management skills. Students who wrote concise responses in the space provided in Part A tended to complete 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 imperative throughout the year.
* 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.

**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 as for the previous year.

**Part A: Short Responses**

**Question 1**

1. The more successful responses commonly:

* identified ‘economic’ impacts such as income generated for a specific sector during the Games and after the Games
* discussed the creation of a multiplier effect throughout UK regions after the Games.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not discuss ‘economic’ impacts
* did not refer to the sources by quoting specific numbers, tourism sectors or regions of the UK.

1. The more successful responses commonly:

* argued that prices of accommodation were prohibitively expensive or that tourists visited friends and relatives during the Games
* contested that advertising campaigns after the Games encouraged people to stay longer and travel further afield
* noted that differences occurred because of the time periods measured (i.e. two weeks *versus* three years).

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not understand the intent of the question
* did not relate their discussion to the accommodation sector.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* suggested and justified two strategies for generating ‘ongoing’ or long-term economic benefits for the UK community
* argued for an effective marketing or advertising campaign aimed at particular markets
* suggested the creation of festivals and events in specific UK regions
* recommended making use of the infrastructure developed for the Games in the years following the Games.

Weaker responses commonly:

* merely suggested strategies without explanation or justification
* only articulated one strategy
* strayed from a focus on ‘economic benefits’.

1. *Responses that achieved high marks commonly:*

* provided a working definition of the Multiplier Effect
* made specific reference to data, to UK regions outside of London, and to tourism sectors mentioned in the sources
* justified two strategies for generating ‘ongoing’ or long-term economic benefits for the UK community
* created a relevant and perceptive diagram that explained how money spent in London was able to circulate throughout the UK in the tourism industry (this diagram was not compulsory).

*Low-scoring responses commonly:*

* showed little understanding of the Multiplier Effect tourism model
* were unable to apply the model to an unfamiliar context with specific reference to the sources provided.

**Question 2**

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* focused on relevant social and economic benefits of tourism, outlined in and implied by the sources
* discussed benefits such as ‘jobs’ and ‘investment’, the creation of infrastructure and revenue, leading to a possible economic multiplier effect in the host community.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* misinterpreted the question, assuming that a ‘war on poverty’ was a negative phenomenon, whereby tourism created poverty for the host community.

1. *Sound responses commonly* explained relevant negative socio-cultural effects of tourism such as:

* disrespecting local people, customs and laws by inconsiderate behaviour
* the creation of higher crime rates in tourist zones
* the commodification or commercialisation of the local culture, leading to inauthentic (‘fake’) cultural shows (as indicated in Source C).

*Weaker responses commonly:*

* made poor use of the available sources
* discussed impacts of tourism that were either positive or unrelated to the host community’s social or cultural context (e.g. environmental impacts).

1. *Responses that achieved high marks commonly:*

* applied an astute understanding of the notions of validity, accuracy and bias to comment about all three sources
* discussed accuracy and validity well: a high level of accuracy and validity was apparent in the UNWTO source, given that it was the expert opinion of the Secretary-General of the UNWTO; the cartoon was exaggerated, thus not necessarily accurate, yet it still made a valid criticism about the motivation of some tourists and the effects on developing countries; the tourist’s post about Cambodia was not generalisable to all tourists’ experiences and opinions, yet it was a valid experience of one tourist.
* explored the bias of the sources: Source A was expected to be positively biased; Source B, as a socially critical cartoon, was expected to be negatively biased; and Source C was a balanced opinion, showing both positive and negative opinions.

*Low-scoring responses commonly:*

* showed little understanding of the sources’ validity, accuracy and/or bias, and were unable to make intelligent judgements in this regard
* did not discuss each source, or did not discuss all three notions of validity, accuracy and bias.

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

**Question 3**

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* identified relevant trends (patterns in the data) from Source A, such as an increasing number of people employed, a higher proportion of women employed, or a growing proportion of women employed in the tourism industry
* cited specific statistics to gain full marks for this question.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer to specific data found in Source A
* merely quoted irrelevant information that did not show trends or patterns in the data.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* described one advantage of part-time employment in the tourism industry such as flexibility for employers or employees, and suitability for students or backpackers
* discussed relevant disadvantages such as lack of job security because of seasonality, and lower wages due to low skills required.

*Weaker responses commonly:*

* did not refer to specific tourism industry sectors, as directed
* did not explain their answer in any detail.

1. *Responses that achieved high marks commonly:*

* demonstrated their understanding of how workers might advance their career in the tourism industry by means of education or certification, development of skills on the job, or the advantage of time or experience
* were also able to outline specific jobs in a career path in a particular sector of the tourism industry.

*Low-scoring responses commonly:*

* were characterised by a lack of explanation expected for 4 marks
* did not specify a precise career path in a particular tourism industry sector, as directed by the question.

**Question 4**

1. *More successful responses commonly:*

* identified specific niche or special interest tourism activities relevant to the image provided (e.g. beach camel rides, walking tours, 4WD tours, beach fishing)
* were subsequently able to explain how these activities created conflicts relating to limited space, environmental damage, and so on.
* Described, if students were astute, the conflict between economic benefit and environmental damage.

*Less successful responses commonly:*

* did not refer their discussion to specific niche or special activities relevant to the image provided.

1. *Sound responses commonly:*

* explained in some detail how tourism might create socio-cultural benefits for Indigenous communities
* described benefits such as cultural respect and exchange of ideas, provision of employment, building of community pride, development of infrastructure and subsequent increase in the quality of life, and education of tourists leading to preservation of Indigenous culture.

*Weaker responses commonly:*

* did not refer to socio-cultural factors, but strayed into a discussion of environmental impacts
* discussed negative impacts instead of positive impacts as directed by the question.

1. *Responses that achieved high marks commonly:*

* demonstrated a superior ability in being able to make perceptive tourism-related recommendations (AE4) in a new or unfamiliar context (IA4)
* exhibited an understanding of carrying capacity (Butler Sequence), and relevant management strategies designed so the carrying capacity is not exceeded
* suggested strategies such as intentional site-hardening to protect vulnerable areas, limited access to vulnerable areas by capping tourist numbers or limiting access times, and providing guides (and/or signs) to educate tourists on sustainable tourism practices.

*Low-scoring responses commonly:*

* did not demonstrate a working knowledge of carrying capacity
* did not understand the role of the government
* merely listed strategies without explanation
* repeated similar strategies in each response.

**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 the sources to show how ‘last chance’ tourism is both a threat anda strong positive force for endangered species and destinations. Markers reported that students generally did well responding to this question, and the average score for this question was the highest in Part B.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used appropriate formal communication, using relevant and accurate tourism terminology (C1 and C2)
* defined ‘last chance’ tourism (LCT), as outlined in Sources 1 and 4 as a ‘double-edged sword’
* described how LCT can ‘attract more tourists’, which can ‘accelerate negative human impacts on nature’
* explained how, according to Source 3, tourism’s profit of endangered species commodifies them
* argued that Source 4 reports on animals being ‘habituated to human presence’, and that the photograph clearly shows tourists encroaching on the habitat of an endangered species
* also contended that LCT can ‘raise awareness [of] and promote conservation efforts” (Source 1)
* maintained that LCT encourages people ‘to relish rather than ravage the natural environment’ (Source 2), providing supporting evidence from Source 4
* presented the perspective that ‘viewing animals as a valuable commodity’ (Source 2) is a positive step; many showed that the author of Source 5 sees this as a ‘conservation success story’
* argued, in the papers of more astute students, that a ‘decline’ in numbers can lead to ‘rejuvenation’ according to Source 7.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only argued one aspect of the question: either a threat or a ‘strong positive force’, rather than both
* did not refer to specific sources as evidence
* did not define ‘last chance’ tourism
* neglected to refer to a range of sources, as directed by the question; however, markers noted that there was a marked improvement on previous years in this regard.

**Question 6**

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use the sources to develop strategies that allow ‘last chance’ tourism to be sustainable in the long-term (AE4). Responses needed to show how the government and/or tourism industry businesses might develop strategies that lead to various aspects of sustainability, primarily in terms of environmental and economic impacts (some strategies relevant to socio-cultural sustainability were developed). 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 well-supported recommendations by specifically referring to the sources provided.

Sound responses commonly explored strategies such as:

* the development of a responsible tourist code (extended from Source 4, and supported by Source 6’s reference to ‘stewardship’)
* requiring tourists engaging in LCT to participate in an educative/interpretive session before visiting the species or destination, which was relevant to ‘raising awareness’ and ‘promoting conservation efforts’, as mentioned in Source 1
* economically, governments and tourism businesses could increase the cost of participating in LCT activities (as per Source 5), to keep numbers under the carrying capacity
* restricting the number of tourists or access times, also as an attempt to keep within the carrying capacity
* ‘raising awareness’ of conservation efforts (Sources 1 and 6), which could be done through various targeted advertising or marketing campaigns.

Weaker responses commonly:

* answered the question without referring to specific sources as evidence
* suggested strategies but did not justify their responses, as directed by the question
* discussed a narrow range of strategies (e.g. all relating to advertising/marketing), with no variation in recommendations
* were clearly rote-learned lists of strategies, and were not explicitly discussed in relation to the sustainability of ‘last chance’ tourism.

**Question 7**

Although with an identical number of marks allocated to it as Questions 5 and 6, this question was cognitively more demanding, thus acted as an effective discriminator of student grades in the examination. The requirement to evaluate ‘to what extent’ Source 7 (a modified Butler Sequence) was applicable to ‘last chance’ tourism proved difficult for many students.

The responses that achieved high marks 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 the Butler Sequence model to new or unfamiliar contexts (IA4)
* noted that the Butler Sequence (Source 7) both applied and did not apply to ‘last chance’ tourism, or it applied to some extent or to a great extent, but not absolutely; strong responses noted that the Butler Sequence applied to LCT, but was not applicable in all cases
* explored the notion that the development, consolidation or even rejuvenation of tourist numbers can result from the notion of LCT, as seen specifically in Source 5, which reports on increasing numbers of tourists; students noted that this agrees with Source 1 in terms of ‘raising awareness’ and ‘promoting conservation’
* recognised the limitations of applying this model to LCT by arguing that the definition of LCT (Source 1) is contradicted by Source 7 and a range of other sources; Source 5 shows the number of gorillas increasing, which shows a rejuvenation of the destination, but no indication of a delayed decline as indicated in Source 7; this is more relevant to ‘conservation’ (Sources 2, 5 and 6), implying that tourism can actually reverse the notion of endangerment before it reaches extinction
* engaged in a discussion of the limitations of Source 7, such as the difficulty of generalising, lack of validity, etc.

Low scoring responses commonly:

* were incomplete (due to running out of time)
* did not address the ‘to what extent’ aspect of the question, only arguing for or against the application of the Butler Sequence to LCT
* answered the question without referring to specific sources as evidence.