2020 Tourism Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2020 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

The folio involves ‘at least two critical analysis assessments’ that focus on assessing students’ ability to ‘interpret and critically analyse secondary sources of information in tourism contexts’ (p. 38). Evidence of student learning is assessed primarily in relation to Knowledge and Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation, and Communication assessment design criteria. Effective task design will consider the relationship between the assessment type, activities and assessment design criteria when selecting the specific features for the task.

The more successful responses in this assessment type were often associated with task design that addressed a subset of specific features from the relevant assessment design criteria and tasks that were specific and clearly defined.

Less successful pieces were often in response to task designs that included all specific features from the appropriate assessment design criteria and where tasks required students to cover a wide range of tourism knowledge, concepts and models within the word count.

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.

Where a supervised task is included in the assessment sample, teachers need to ensure a copy of the questions and sources are included as part of the teacher materials in addition to the task cover page and specific features.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used a range of tourism terms appropriate to the task
* showed their knowledge and understanding of trends by applying tourism-related concepts and models
* integrated, annotated, and acknowledged images and graphs
* used an appropriate report format
* developed informed opinions, conclusions, and recommendations
* responded within 1000 words or a 6-minute limit
* included a range of secondary sources
* sourced and referenced information accurately
* included models and concepts appropriately
* demonstrated knowledge and understanding of a range of concepts and models across the assessment type
* focused on interpretation and analysis of perspectives on one tourism trend, development or contemporary issue
* used text structures such as headings and mini questions appropriately in reports
* displayed detailed understanding of tourism knowledge, concepts and/or models
* focused on analysis and evaluation of information to help them present informed opinions, conclusions and recommendations
* evaluated the extent to which models applied to specific case studies
* accurately evaluated their sources of information and provided reasoned justifications for their decisions
* were developed in response to tasks designs which included:
* correct assessment specifications such as the 1000 words for a written text or a maximum of 6 minutes an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form
* the appropriate assessment design criteria for the assessment type
* instructions that related to the selected specific features
* task requirements that were clear and achievable within the word count.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not use tourism-related concepts or models in their work or did not apply them meaningfully
* did not acknowledge the origin of sources
* did not evaluate the validity, bias or accuracy of sources, or did so beyond the word limit — attached to the bibliography
* were associated with task designs that required students to accomplish too many steps within the 1000-‑word specification for this assessment type
* were associated with marking schema that were not specifically related to the performance standards; it is important to note that, while it is possible to use methods such as marks and percentages in addition to a grade scale, assessment must be referenced to the specific features of the task
* demonstrated a limited relationship between student evidence and specific features of the assessment design criteria
* provided a descriptive recount of potential impacts of tourism
* focused on description of a trend, development or tourism issue rather than on analysis or evaluation
* provided some evaluation of sources of information either inconsistently or without explanation (such as a 5-star rating with no explanation of how the rating was achieved), or did not evaluate their sources
* did not include concepts or models in their work or, if included, did not integrate them into their work in a meaningful way; for example, they might have included a diagram of a model and then not used it to help them analyse or evaluate the trend, development or tourism issue
* did not reference their sources of information or use their research to substantiate their conclusions and recommendations
* were developed in response to tasks designs which:
* included incorrect assessment specifications for the word/time limit or did not specify limits such as time limits on supervised tasks
* included specific features that did not relate to the assessment instructions; for example, where AE2 was included on the rubric and students were not directed to evaluate the validity, bias or accuracy of sources in the task instructions, students often did not present evidence of their evaluation of sources but were assessed in the A or B band for this specific feature
* encouraged description rather than analysis and evaluation, limiting students’ ability to achieve in the A band across the assessment type
* required students do too many things within the word limit such as apply multiple models to a tourism site or include detailed descriptions prior to analysis of their information, thus limiting the depth of their analysis
* converted a numerical grade to the A+ to E scale without matching evidence presented in supervised tasks to assessment design criteria and specific features
* focused on lower order questions in supervised tasks, limiting opportunities to demonstrate evidence of interpretation and critical analysis of secondary sources of information.

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 and Understanding, Investigation and Application, and Communication assessment design criteria. Common practical activities included investigations of sustainability of tourism destinations or activities and strategies aimed at rebuilding tourism in response to a range of events.

Teachers are reminded that, where industry publications are used to present findings as an example of a practical tourism skill, students must incorporate evidence from their primary sources. While these types of tasks are often course highlights for students, task design that focused on procedural or descriptive aspects of these publications resulted in less successful responses as students did not demonstrate evidence of learning. For example, connections between primary and secondary sources of information were not always clear. These tasks were more likely to be associated with breaches of the word limit (1000) for this assessment type.

In some instances, assessment presented at moderation included only one practical activity in the sample. While teachers had flexibility to modify their practical activities in response to COVID-19 restrictions, students were still required to undertake the minimum of two practical activities.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used primary data from online surveys or interviews (via Zoom, Skype or even email) to use when they could not easily access sites due to COVID-19 restrictions
* annotated images and diagrams to meet the purpose of the activity
* applied appropriate concepts and models to show their tourism understanding
* were in response to tasks ‘re-imagined’ in response to COVID-19 restrictions on school visits to tourism destinations; thus, teachers used innovative ways to allow their students to demonstrate their practical skills
* used primary data collected by a student on a field trip or tourism activity (class or individual)
* used secondary sources to help explain findings; for example, research on Doxey’s irridex was used to help explain why the host community is unhappy with the impact of tourism at a site at which the student visited and collected primary data
* presented findings from their primary sources of information in a clear and organised manner
* included obvious evidence, such as their own photographs or survey results, to show that a practical activity was undertaken
* demonstrated that students had clearly visited places and collected information at that place (‘A practical activity is an assessment that in most cases is undertaken beyond the classroom and involves the collection of information from primary sources’ p.39)
* provided detailed, substantiated recommendations and conclusions relevant to the site, trend or development being studied
* used a wide range of visual and graphical evidence to present findings and demonstrate their ability to investigate a tourism trend, development or issue, and to apply their tourism knowledge, concepts and models in a range of contexts
* included a range of primary sources of information across the assessment task; for example, using different types of data collection in each practical activity. Common primary sources of information included but were not limited to surveys of people at a venue/attraction/event, interviews with industry professionals, recorded personal observations using photographs or bi-polar surveys, and tallies of frequencies. Using different primary sources in each practical activity allowed students to develop a wider range of possible primary sources prior to completing their Investigation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not use primary source information as the basis of their response
* did not include tourism models or concepts effectively
* predominantly relied on secondary source information
* only completed one practical activity; this didn’t provide enough evidence against assessment criteria to justify the grade awarded, and was counter to the guidelines agreed by the Tourism community and published by the SACE Board
* provided a recount of a class excursion
* did not provide evidence of learning from primary sources; in some cases, primary sources could only be inferred through the task design rather than being clearly evident in the student’s work
* did not include tourism models or concepts in either practical activity
* did not use visual and graphical evidence effectively to present findings and demonstrate their ability to investigate a tourism trend, development or issue, and to apply their tourism knowledge, concepts and models in a range of contexts
* used the same primary source of information in both practical activities — i.e. only using observations recorded through photographs as the primary source of information across the assessment type
* relied mostly on secondary sources
* used primary evidence from online searches as their own; to meet the specifications of this assessment type, students must collect their own sources of information
* focused on doing an activity such as designing tours and holidays without clear and convincing application of primary sources of information. These tasks often restricted the extent to which students could demonstrate their ability to apply their tourism knowledge, and tourism concepts and models within the word or time limits for this assessment type.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

This assessment type requires students to identify a tourism trend, development, and/or contemporary issue for investigation. For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the Knowledge and Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation, Investigation and Application, and Communication assessment design criteria.

Common patterns in student responses included emerging trends in tourism such as ‘slow travel’ or ‘second city travel’, consideration of the impact of events such as the 2019/20 bushfire season or COVID-19, and sustainability of tourism destinations.

Moderators noted that several projects focused on specific sectors and industries such as the airline industry. Overall, they noted that the quality of investigations has improved over the past few years.

The more successful responses commonly:

* had a clear guiding question that was not too broad or multi-faceted
* incorporated concepts that supported analysis and evaluation
* chose topics to investigate in keeping with 1500 words
* used COVID-19 to their advantage by investigating issues that related to aspects such as degree of dependency, sustainability, and reduced environmental impact
* provided perceptive answers to specific tourism issues
* posed an inquiry question or hypothesis that encouraged evaluation of a trend, development or issue
* maintained a focus on a tourism trend, development or issue
* focused on solutions and responses to a tourism trend, development or issue rather than on descriptive elements
* included both primary and secondary sources of information, as specified by IA1
* focused on local areas that could be investigated in depth and on repeat occasions
* were underpinned by a clear question or hypothesis
* used models and/or concepts effectively
* demonstrated a clear purpose
* chose topics/questions where it was possible to collect primary source data
* provided a large amount of recent substantiation
* showed that the author was invested in the outcome. A small number of investigations were drawn from student experiences with a tourism trend, development or issue.

The less successful responses commonly:

* breached the word limit and attempted to mask doing so by incorporating significant analysis in text box, table or image form
* ignored the word limit altogether
* used models that didn’t support their issue, simply to have been seen to use a tourism model
* did not refer to sources used
* lacked a tourism focus
* did not evaluate the validity, bias or accuracy of sources, or did so beyond the word limit — attached to the bibliography
* attempted to answer research questions that were too broad to be investigated effectively within the specifications of this assessment type
* provided a descriptive response rather than an analytic or evaluative response
* did not include visual or graphical evidence such as maps, graphs, tables, photographs, drawings, charts or statistical data
* included diagrams of models unmodified to suit their trend, development or issue
* used models that did not fit the trend, development or issue, or were included but not incorporated into the text
* incorrectly used concepts such as sustainability, or classified economic impacts as sociocultural impacts
* did not use primary sources of information
* did not refer to secondary sources of information
* featured a limited use of tourism terminology
* did not accurately reference primary or secondary sources
* did not complete their response within the word limit requirements for this assessment type, or presented the work in ways that contravenes the SACE Board’s word count policy
* did not focus on tourism
* did not evaluate validity, bias and/or accuracy of sources effectively.

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.

There was some variance in marks achieved between Part A: Short Responses (Questions 1-5) and Part B: Extended Responses (Questions 6-8). This was the first year that the Tourism examination was online, and markers noted that far fewer students submitted incomplete papers, with the vast majority of students at least making an attempt to provide an answer to all questions. Those who did not complete Part B often ran out of time, perhaps suggesting that they experienced difficulty in managing their time effectively; those who presented dot point responses obtained some marks for at least demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and issues.

Students tended to find Questions 1 and 6 easiest to deal with, while they found Questions 5 and 8 more challenging.

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

* Better responses exhibited evidence of advanced time management skills. This included restricting responses to the space provided in Part A; the size of the response box was a general guide of the length of response required. In Part B, those who spent too long on Part A were more likely to run out of time towards the end of the examination. It is important to give students opportunities to practise writing concise answers in timed, supervised conditions throughout the year, to prepare them for examination conditions.
* Successful answers showed evidence of detailed analysis supported by evidence, especially to questions with command verbs such as ‘explain’, ‘describe’ and ‘justify’.
* Superior responses highlighted students’ ability to follow the directions within the questions by referring to specific sources as evidence for their conclusions or recommendations. Similarly, better responses followed the questions’ instructions by referring to specific tourism terminology such as sociocultural impacts, the collaboration of businesses in two distinct tourism sectors, or the role of the government.
* 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. The marking team noted that there were more structured answers, particularly in relation to extended responses, as a distinctive feature this year; however, rushed dot points and very short answers tended to produce less successful responses.

Assessment Design Criteria

For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning especially in relation to KU1 and KU2, AE1, AE2 and AE4, IA2 and IA4, and C1 and C2.

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

Part A: Short Responses

Question 1

(a) More successful responses commonly:

• referred to the source provided

• cited specific data on international arts tourism and/or total tourism in Australia.

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not highlight significant features of data

• interpreted the graph inaccurately

• merely described general trends or features.

(b) More successful responses commonly:

• referred to specific data from the source to support their answer (e.g. females 56%, aged 25-34 25%).

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not highlight significant features of arts tourists by referring to explicit data.

(c) *More successful responses* commonly:

• referred to specific data or information from the source to support their answer

• provided explanations as to why the film and television industry is important for tourism in Australia, mentioning its economic impact ($725 million expenditure), the strengthening of Australia’s brand, or being a major motivation for international tourists coming to Australia (e.g., 230 000 visitors in 2016).

The less successful responses commonly:

• did not refer to explicit data from the source

• merely mentioned or listed a possible reason without following the instruction of the question to ‘explain’ the reason, elaborating on the information in the source in their own words.

(d) *M*ore successful responses commonly:

• understood how the film and television industry could collaborate with the tourism industry

• presented specific tourism experiences that involved two distinct interdependent sectors of the tourism industry (did not matter which tourism sector model was preferred) such as a tour [tour guide] to the location of a film/TV show, perhaps staying overnight [accommodation] and visiting a local restaurant [food/hospitality].

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not mention two specific sectors of the tourism industry

• were unable to demonstrate how tourism industry sectors often collaborate.

Question 2

(a) More successful responses commonly:

• referred to the source provided

• cited specific data on business tourism by international visitors to Australia to support their response, such as the significance of 9% of the market or $4.2 billion expenditure.

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not refer to explicit data from the source

• merely mentioned or listed data without following the instruction of the question to ‘discuss’ the importance of business tourism for international visitors to Australia.

(b) *More* *successful* responses commonly:

• referred to the source provided

• clearly highlighted a downturn in the number of international visitors to Australia

• were knowledgeable of historical reasons for various downturns (e.g., 1998 = Asian Stock Market Crash; 2002 = aftermath of September 11 terrorist attacks; 2008 = effects of the GFC); students who gave valid, albeit not historically accurate, reasons for a downturn were rewarded with marks.

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not correctly interpret a decrease in the data or mis-read the graph by discussing incorrect year(s).

(c) *More* *successful* *r*esponses commonly:

• demonstrated an excellent understanding of and explained in some detail the effect on an Australian tourism industry sector of hosting the ICC Cricket World Cup in New Zealand, e.g., some answers mentioned lower occupancy rates in Australian accommodation, or alternatively an increase in Australian accommodation occupancy rates resulting from international travellers to New Zealand potentially visiting nearby Australia.

Less successful responses commonly:

• were unable to exhibit an understanding of how an event hosted in New Zealand might impact on Australian tourism

• did not discuss a specific tourism sector, as the question required.

(d) T*he more successful r*esponses commonly:

• identified a specific Australian tourism destination and recognised why there might have been a downturn (e.g., bushfires, COVID-19, etc.)

• demonstrated an excellent understanding of collaboration between governments and local tourism authorities, explaining a specific stimulus activity to assist the struggling tourism destination, such as the government reducing taxes on a tourism destination and the savings being passed on to tourists, or the creation of an advertising campaign suggesting a destination is clean and safe, or the establishment of major events, or investing in infrastructure / various elements of an affected destination.

The less successful responses commonly:

• were unable to identify a particular Australian tourism destination (e.g., the Southern Ocean Lodge on Kangaroo Island, or the Great Barrier Reef), or identified a destination that was too broad (e.g. Victoria)

• showed no or little understanding of the role of the government in the tourism industry.

Question 3

(a) More successful responses commonly:

• defined ‘development’ and ‘consolidation’ well in terms of how they are used in the Butler Sequence

• applied the terms ‘development’ and ‘consolidation’ to specific tourism-related examples.

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not relate the definitions of ‘development’ and ‘consolidation’ to tourism, despite the source highlighting these terms on a familiar model specified in the subject outline.

(b) *More successful r*esponses commonly:

• discussed economic impacts of a destination exceeding the carrying capacity, such as inflation (higher prices of goods and real estate), unemployment as tourism numbers begin to fall, reduced investment as the area begins to become less desirable, or a diminished positive economic multiplier effect in the host community.

Less successful responses commonly:

• stated but did not explain results of exceeding the economic carrying capacity

• focused on environmental impacts, which were often not relevant to exceeding the economic carrying capacity

• recommended management strategies rather than impacts of tourism.

(c) *More successful* responses commonly:

• understood that doubling the size of a hotel would most likely have a negative impact on the host community, exacerbating problems associated with mass tourism, such as overcrowding, noise pollution, environmental damage, inflation, etc.

• recognised that initial impacts might be positive (employment, Multiplier Effect) but eventually negative impacts would dominate.

Less successful responses commonly:

• accepted the strategy at face value, not considering the possibility of negative impacts, of worsening the effects of mass tourism.

Question 4

(a) More successful responses commonly:

• referred to aspects mentioned in Source A (e.g., rare species of turtle, fishing, etc.)

• demonstrated an understanding of positive environmental impacts of tourism, such as awareness/education of tourists, protection/conservation of rare turtle species, revitalisation of beaches, construction of environmental signage or an education centre, or site hardening measures.

Less successful responses commonly:

• made no reference to details in the source provided

• did not focus on environmental impacts, instead discussing economic or sociocultural effects, or did not discuss positive effects and focused on negative impacts.

(b) *More successful responses commonly:*

• demonstrated a perceptive understanding of how the Triple Bottom Line model of sustainability (Source B) could be applied to the scenario outlined in the Source A

• explained various ways that sustainability could be achieved in the Thai resort, such as making revenue while protecting the turtles, or providing jobs for the locals while enhancing the local culture, or conserving the beach thus increasing local pride

• emphasised how the environmental, economic, and sociocultural impacts were balanced in the model.

Less successful responses commonly:

• made vague references to sustainability without applying it to the scenario provided in Source A

• did not discuss how the environmental, economic and sociocultural impacts should be balanced.

(c) *More successful responses commonly:*

• demonstrated a perceptive understanding of practices of responsible tourists

• explained how practices of responsible tourists might improve the Thai host community economically (e.g. spending money on locally-owned products and services, increasing the positive economic multiplier effect or benefiting the employment of locals) or socioculturally (e.g. respecting the local culture via dress and behaviour, or learning about and being immersed in local customs).

Less successful responses commonly:

• discussed strategies by the host community rather than responsible practices of visiting tourists

• only listed the economic or sociocultural practices without explaining them in any detail.

Question 5

(a) More successful responses commonly:

• demonstrated a clear understanding of the effects of global warming on small island developing states, such as deterring tourists because of coral bleaching, storm surges, beach erosion, etc.

• referred to and explained specific details mentioned in Source B

• interpreted global warming as having a positive effect due to ‘Last Chance’ tourism.

Less successful responses commonly:

• made no reference to details in the information mentioned in Source B.

(b) *More successful* responses commonly:

• demonstrated an astute understanding of the role of the government in tourism

• identified a range of government strategies that could be implemented to balance economic and sociocultural impacts, such as deliberate (costly) site hardening to protect the environment, thus increasing community pride; joint ownership of government and community-managed ecotourist lodgings in order to encourage positive economic multiplier effects; development of paid tours in National Parks in which responsible tourists protect the environment; reduction of taxes on local environment/culture based tourist businesses, etc.

• related their argument specifically to various aspects of small island developing states.

Less successful responses commonly:

• only listed the economic and sociocultural strategies without explaining them in any detail

• did not demonstrate an understanding of the role of the government (e.g. the government’s role is not directly reducing prices, but the government can reduce taxes, thus reducing prices indirectly).

(c) *More successful* responses commonly:

• demonstrated an excellent understanding of a specific tourism model and how to apply it relevantly to community engagement in small island destinations, such as the importance of community excitement when gaining local involvement or development (Doxey’s Irridex or Butler Sequence), or ensuring that tourism development occurs within the carrying capacity of a destination (Butler Sequence)

• discussed other relevant models such as the Multiplier Effect or the Triple Bottom Line approach to sustainability.

Less successful responses commonly:

• did not apply the tourism model specifically to small island developing states

• tried unsuccessfully to apply a tourism model (e.g. Plog’s model of tourist types) that bore no or little relevance to aspects of the question

• explained the importance of community engagement in small island developing states but did not specify a model as requested in the question

• lacked a good understanding of how the tourism model was applicable to community engagement or to small island developing states.

Part B: Extended Responses

Given the amount of reading and level of higher-order cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation required in Part B, teachers should give their students plenty of practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The Communication assessment design criterion (with specific features C1 and C2) receives special attention in this section of the examination; thus, students are encouraged to write well-structured and fluent paragraphs, to refer to specific sources when directed, and to use relevant and accurate tourism terminology. Students were greatly assisted by having a printed copy of the sources due to the number of sources and type of questions (comparing and contrasting tourism concepts or elements).

Question 6

This question required students to indicate the most likely position on Source 1 (Plog’s model of tourist types) that voluntourists would be located, and then to justify that decision by referring to evidence from a range of sources provided.

The more successful responses commonly:

* drew on a wide range of sources to answer the question
* confidently and accurately argued that voluntourists are relatively allocentric (Y) or allocentric (Z), conversely contending that voluntourists would most likely not be relatively psychocentric (V) or psychocentric (U)
* used appropriate formal communication, utilising relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* followed the suggested word count range, while providing sufficient detail in their argument
* provided a brief definition of ‘allocentric’, which includes being adventurous, being prepared to move outside of their comfort zone, and trying new experiences
* explained how Source 3 presents the notion of ‘exploring a different country or culture’, echoed by Source 4 which mentions ‘the opportunity to broaden one’s cultural understanding’; Source 6 and Source 9 also list the development of ‘cultural understanding’, repeating Source 7’s focus on gaining ‘the fresh perspective of a different culture’; a psychocentric tourist would probably not feel comfortable learning about a new culture
* recognised that various sources focus on working ‘directly with local communities’ (Source 3), ‘development of communities’ (Source 4), ‘assess[ing] the community’s needs’ (Source 5), and ‘doing jobs for the locals’ (Source 7); psychocentric tourists would most likely remain in their tourist bubble and refrain from being immersed in authentic local culture
* argued that a voluntourist would probably contribute to the economic and sociocultural gains (Source 9) of a local community by participating in local activities and supporting local businesses (Source 6).

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not demonstrate a working knowledge of Plog’s model of tourist types, being unable to determine whether voluntourists were more allocentric or psychocentric
* provided no or little detailed evidence from the sources provided, or only discussed one or two sources as the basis of their response
* did not write structured, coherent paragraphs
* quoted from the sources without explaining in any detail how this related to voluntourism
* showed evidence of poor communication skills by misspelling (not mistyping) key tourism-related terminology.

Question 7

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to evaluate (make a judgement on) the notion that tourism benefits the (volun)tourist more than it benefits the host community. Possible conclusions could be that they agree with the statement, disagree with the statement (thus, local communities benefit more than the voluntourist benefits), or that neither benefits more (thus, both the voluntourist and local community benefit equally).

The more successful responses commonly:

* used evidence from a range of sources provided to furnish support for or against the statement
* followed the suggested word count range, providing sufficient detail in their argument
* astutely discussed the *benefit to the voluntourist*: Source 3 = learning about ‘a different country and culture’ and the fulfillment of the voluntourist’s ‘potential’; Source 4 = the creation of ‘cultural awareness’ by being educated or prepared, in that this source argues for the ‘endless benefits for each participant’, e.g. the broadening of ‘one’s cultural understanding’; Source 5 = focuses on ‘service learning’, which involves the ‘preparation… interaction… [and] reflection’ of the voluntourist; Source 6 = discusses the opportunity of voluntourists to go ‘sightseeing’ in their free time; Source 7 = mentions the benefit of gaining a ‘fresh perspective of a different culture’ and enjoying being able to do jobs for the locals; Source 9 = argues the benefits of ‘cultural understanding’ and ‘knowledge and skills exchange’
* also recognised the *benefit to the local community*: Source 2 = ‘capacity building for economic development’; Source 3 = discusses the ‘positive change’ for ‘local communities’, who are worked with ‘in close consultation’; Source 4 = focuses on the ‘benefit’ for ‘communities’, especially in terms of helping to ‘sustain a local economy’ and their ‘development’; Source 5 = mentions the ‘needs’ of the local community as they are ‘helped’; Source 6 = reinforces the idea of a ‘positive impact’, e.g. a ‘new water well’ as the ‘capacity within the community’ is built and local businesses are supported; Source 7 = mentions a school being helped, people’s houses being painted and the local community enjoying the benefits of a feeding program; Source 8 = focuses on the building of better futures; Source 9 = focuses on ‘environmental, sociocultural and economic gains’
* perceived that local communities also experience some costs (which suggests that voluntourists benefit more than they do): Source 7 = emotional cost when voluntourists leave, and profit leakage; Source 9 = suggests that non-locals are employed, and the voluntourists lack training/skills and have a ‘Western saviour’ attitude
* appreciated, as argued in Source 4, that voluntourism is ‘*mutually beneficial*’ both to the voluntourist and the local community.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a general discussion of voluntourism without answering the question or referring to a range of sources
* did not recognise that both voluntourists and the host community can experience benefits and costs
* did not score highly in the Communication assessment criterion as a result of poorly argued and structured responses, lack of specific tourism terminology, or poor spelling and written expression.

Question 8

This question primarily assessed students’ ability to use a range of sources to develop strategies that various stakeholders might adopt to achieve sociocultural sustainability in voluntourism. Students were required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the tourism concept of sociocultural (not environmental or specifically economic) sustainability by defining it (KU2), and applying their knowledge to a new, perhaps unfamiliar context (IA4). They also needed to develop three well-supported 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
* explicitly mentioned various stakeholders such as voluntourists, host communities, government bodies, voluntourist organisations/businesses
* clearly identified (via the wording of separate paragraphs or by numbering) three distinctly different strategies
* justified their chosen strategies by referring to details mentioned in 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 strategies
* used a wide range of tourism terminology
* followed the suggested word count range, providing sufficient detail in their argument
* discussed strategies such as:
* The creation of projects that have a long-term or ‘lasting impact’ (Source 5) on *local communities*: Project Abroad (Sources 2 and 3) claim to be involved in ‘capacity building for economic development’, creating ‘long-term, sustainable solutions and work directly with local communities’, involving ‘close consultation with local communities’ (Source 3), reinforced by Source 4, which claims that ‘voluntourism can sustain a local economy’; Source 6 also supports this notion, arguing that local communities, if voluntourism is truly sustainable, will be ‘left with the tools to improve their own lives’, that the local community can experience sociocultural sustainability if voluntourists deliberately work themselves out of a job and the locals ‘do the job they initially set out to do’
* *Organisations or companies* should prepare voluntourists to better impact the local communities, especially clear in Source 5, which focuses on training voluntourists in ‘Service Learning’ before they travel, emphasising the need for ‘preparation’, ‘interaction’, and ‘reflection’; Source 4 reinforces this idea, arguing for ‘educating and preparing volunteers beforehand’
* *Voluntourists* themselves should go with an attitude of ‘shared responsibility’ (Source 8), thus sociocultural sustainability of local communities will be strengthened when voluntourists go with a mindset of enjoying the adventure of experiencing ‘cultural awareness’ (Source 4; also see Source 1), of ‘help[ing] others’ (Source 3). Voluntourists should go with the approach of going out of their way to ‘support local businesses’ (Source 6), of ‘buying locally made products’ (Source 7) rather than a plethora of foreign goods. Similarly, instead of a ‘Western saviour attitude’ (Source 9), voluntourists should go ready to ensure local communities benefit by doing things like ‘helping out in a school, painting people’s houses and being involved in a feeding program’ (Source 7), or ‘capacity building for economic development’ through education (Source 2). Finally, Source 5 raises the important point of Service Learning, that voluntourists should be educated and prepared beforehand ‘in order to make a lasting impact’.

Less successful responses commonly:

* were incomplete (due to running out of time)
* did not focus on sociocultural sustainability, instead discussing environmental strategies or economic strategies that were not clearly related to sociocultural benefits
* developed strategies without referring to specific sources as evidence
* repeated the same or similar responses in several strategies
* listed strategies 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 between each strategy
* referred only to the sources without a mention of their own knowledge of the tourism industry
* did not specify (either explicitly or implicitly) which stakeholders were involved in the implementation of strategies.