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## Overview

Chief Assessors’ reports give 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, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

## School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

Folio tasks focus on the interpretation and critical analysis of ‘secondary sources of information in tourism contexts’ and primarily assess the Knowledge and Understanding and Analysis and Evaluation assessment design criteria. Moderators observed that students demonstrated a stronger knowledge and understanding of tourism issues, concepts, and models in their work this year. Concepts of sustainability, change, and interconnections, as well as models such as the Butler Sequence, Plog’s model of tourist personality types, and the Triple Bottom Line approach to sustainability were a common focus in assignments. Specific features in the Analysis and Evaluation assessment design criterion address higher-order cognitive skills in folio tasks. Moderators reported that AE1 was often assessed in supervised structured assessment tasks such as source analyses and tests using interpretation and analysis of long-term trends in tourism data. They also identified that AE4 was most effectively demonstrated by students where, in addition to drawing out conclusions at the end of their work, they used paragraph structures effectively to highlight opinions, conclusions, and recommendations throughout their work. AE2 and AE3 tended to be the most challenging for students. Stronger responses highlighted students’ ability to discuss why a source was valid, biased, or accurate, and often presented this as both direct analytical and evaluative statements, and by associating one source with another to show whether or not evidence or conclusions drawn from one source supported those in another source. Successful achievement against these specific features tended to be supported by clear instructions in the task design, highlighting the connection between student achievement, task design, and assessment decisions.

Best practice task design features clearly identified instructions, limits, and themes. Well-designed tasks supported student achievement and were associated with more-reliable assessment decisions. In this regard, moderators expressed some concern towards the use of comparative tasks in the folio. Although comparative tasks meet the specifications of this assessment type, they are not a requirement, and it was noted that the complexity involved in undertaking a comparison was difficult to achieve within the word limit. Weaker tasks tended to be descriptions of two tourism sites or cultures with little or no direct comparison, which reduced students’ ability to demonstrate achievement in the higher grade bands for the Analysis and Evaluation assessment design criterion. It was suggested that, if comparative studies are to be used, instructions needed to set clearer boundaries for students, supporting achievement by specifying limits and themes such as comparing the effectiveness of site hardening at two sites. Good comparative tasks tended to be complex, high-order tasks, which are very difficult to achieve in the word and time limits set by the assessment type.

Best practice task design supports teachers’ assessment decisions and thus moderators were concerned by the use of appendices as part of task design in this assessment type. The SACE Word-count Policy states: ‘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’. Therefore, work submitted as part of an appendix should not be used to inform assessment decisions in any assessment type. Moderators, therefore, were concerned by the number of responses that included an appendix, particularly where feedback to the student indicated that this had been used to determine the assessment decision. If evidence presented in an appendix is referred to in the body of the text, then it needs to be presented in the text and not in an appendix. If evidence is presented in an appendix only to prove that a student has undertaken research, then it should not be included as part of the materials submitted at moderation as it does not inform or support the teachers’ assessment decision.

Best practice task design also features careful selection of assessment design criteria and thus specific features that match the specifications of the assessment type. This has been a focus in clarifying forums in the past two years. Where teachers have matched specific features to the assessment type and built these into the instructions to students, task design tended to have greater clarity. For example, the specification of critical analysis of secondary sources makes the specific features AE1 and AE2 central to this assessment type, while including KU2 to meet the requirement to use the Knowledge and Understanding assessment design criterion makes AE3 highly desirable and specification of particular concepts and models in the instructions to students vital. Purposeful selection of specific features as part of good task design resulted in student responses that were more focused, targeting particular knowledge and skills in depth, resulting in assessment decisions that were more reliable. Moderators noted that students were disadvantaged in instances where most or all fourteen specific features were assessed in a 1000-word assignment.

Moderators additionally observed that there is an increasing variety of formats used to assess the folio assessment type. While reports and essays continue to be the dominant formats, supervised structured tasks and oral presentations are becoming increasingly popular. While moderators felt that this reflected the flexibility of the assessment type, they were sometimes concerned by the quality of the work presented in the task design and in student responses in the latter two formats. Concern was expressed regarding the number of supervised structured tasks with no identified connection to either assessment design criteria or specific features. They felt that the absence of this in teachers’ planning impacted on the task design and consequently on opportunities for students to perform at all levels of the performance standards. Student responses using oral presentations supported by a PowerPoint frequently did not have a clear link between the script and the PowerPoint, resulting in uncertainty regarding how the two documents connected, which contributed to uncertainty in assessment decisions. If this format is to be used, moderators prefer teachers to encourage students to make more effective use of the visual and graphical evidence on their slides as part of their script.

Finally, most learning and assessment plans required students to complete two or three folio tasks, with a small proportion of plans incorporating four folio tasks. Moderators noted that, generally speaking, where students had been required to complete a smaller number of tasks, responses tended to address the work in more depth and thus supported student achievement more effectively.

Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

Practical activities focus on the development of practical tourism skills and involve ‘primary sources of information about tourism’. Therefore, assessment tasks must include data collected using primary data collection methods. Good task design directed students to use methods such as structured observations, surveys, and interviews to investigate a specific site, issue, or trend. Good design across the assessment type positioned students to engage with a range of primary data collection methods rather than favouring one or two methods. Task designs that either did not specify or made only general reference to primary data sources did not provide students with sufficient direction in this assessment type. This was critical where tasks utilise formats such as ‘event planning and management, a public display, acting as a tour guide, an interpretative display, or an industry publication’. Task design must ensure students are directed to collect data using primary sources of information and it must be evident in their presentations if these activities are to be considered practical activities.

Moderators noted that there were a number of student responses in which there was no identifiable primary data or in which the only primary data evident consisted of class photos and ‘selfies’ that did not contribute observational evidence to their discussions. This limits student achievement against IA1 and IA2, specific features that reflect the core of practical activities. Moderators suggested that collection and presentation of observations using photographs is a skill that needs further development with students.

Good tasks were achievable within the word or time limit and encouraged success using clear instructions and structures. Engaging tasks such as an itinerary pack or acting as a tour guide can be difficult for students to complete within the 1000-word or 6 minutes limit set by the subject outline. While these tasks can be appealing for students, care needs to be taken with task design to ensure they meet the specifications of a practical activity, in terms of both word count and primary sources of information, as it was not always clear that primary sources of information had been used to develop the response, and work submitted was often in breach of the word limit.

Best practice task design in practical activities encouraged successful student responses by providing flexibility for students within clearly defined boundaries. This included tasks that evaluated the tourism potential of specific destinations and attractions, and saw the introduction of a range of sites not often seen in moderation samples. Examples of these included investigations of planning and managing sustainable tourism through visits to the Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute and the South Australian Museum’s Australian Aboriginal Cultures Gallery.

Moderators identified some exceptional student responses this year in the Practical Activity assessment type. Students had engaged with the topics and primary data collection methods. They embedded relevant tourism models into their work and made clear, consistent links with their research. These student responses were well structured, used a wide range of primary data collection methods, and employed annotated visual and graphical representations effectively.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

This assessment type focuses on the investigation of a ‘tourism trend, development, and/or contemporary issue’, and involves ‘identifying, selecting, analysing, and evaluating primary and secondary sources of information … and making recommendations’ based on students’ findings. There was some evidence in the learning and assessment plans and student responses that teachers have been more selective in their choice of specific features this year. While all assessment design criteria need to be included, teachers are able to select those specific features that best fit the task. Moderators noted that, where teachers had not used all fourteen specific features, teachers had successfully ensured that they selected those that reflected the higher-order analytic and evaluative nature of this task.

The connection of primary and secondary sources is a feature of the investigation and is addressed by the specific feature IA1. Moderators commented that many student responses did not have adequate or evident examples of connections between primary and secondary sources, despite their teachers’ assessment decisions between A and C grade bands for this specific feature. Limited or no primary sources of information continue to be features of investigations in the C to E grade bands. Where these low-achieving student responses did include primary sources, they were often small surveys of classmates, with no recognition that their sample group may not be the best choice for the focus of their investigation. Where access to primary sources is difficult, students may need support to identify topics for which their peers and immediate contacts would make more appropriate primary sources. This may also help students to develop investigations that are unique and help to avoid a trend towards very similar topics in some groups.

Structure and referencing were identified by moderators as areas where student responses could be improved. Better student responses had a clearly defined focus, usually presented as a guiding question or hypothesis that encouraged the investigation of different aspects of the topic. For example, clearly structured investigations allowed a topic to be broken down into the economic, sociocultural, and environmental impacts of a development, or the benefits and disadvantages of a trend. These approaches gave students a structure on which they could build their discussion. Although referencing in the A grade band tends to be appropriate, consistent, and reflecting a wide diversity of sources, moderators felt that in many cases there was insufficient distinction between referencing assessed as being in the B to E grade bands. They identified key terms such as ‘diverse’, ‘consistent’, and ‘appropriate’ as integral to assessing source selection and referencing. Simple lists of URLs ⎯ either in-text or in bibliographies ⎯ were not considered sufficient to support assessment decisions of A to C grade band referencing. There were a number of very good student responses that used the Harvard system of referencing effectively to document sources and to build connections between their primary and secondary sources.

Incorporation of visual and graphical information (C3) was well presented in strong student responses. These students used annotations to combine results from multiple sources and thus draw conclusions from their findings that supported their investigations. It was evident in some cases that data presentation skills developed through the practical activities were transferred across to the investigation, emphasising the benefit of well-designed primary data collection methods in the Practical Activity assessment type.

Finally, moderators noted that where KU2, AE3, and/or IA4 were selected in this assessment type, students must have clearly identified and embedded concepts and models in their investigations. Moderators felt that this was a weakness in many investigations this year. Students need to demonstrate at least an informed understanding of their selected concept and model, present some evaluation of their model, or be able to apply the concept or model to their selected investigation to achieve a minimum of a C grade band for these specific features.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Examination

Marking teams noted that a key feature of many students’ responses in previous years’ examinations is the disparity in marks achieved between Part A: Short Responses and Part B: Extended Responses. Students tended to find questions 4, 6, and 7 the most challenging, while questions 1, 2, and 3 were answered comparatively well.

Historically most students perform significantly better in the short-response section, often running out of time or deteriorating in the quality of answers when attempting the extended responses in Part B. This observation prompted the setting team for the 2015 examination to give students greater opportunity to succeed in Part B. Consequently students were, in effect, allocated more time to complete their extended responses on the basis that Part A had fewer questions and that the sources in Part B involved less actual reading in this year’s examination.

Some improvement resulted. The mean mark gained in Part B in 2015 was 59.5%, which was only a marginal increase from the 2014 average of 58.9%. Interestingly the disparity between Part A and Part B was more profound this year, in that the average mark achieved in Part A was 71.8%, which was significantly higher than 2014’s mean of 65.3%. Consequently the overall examination mean increased from 63% in 2014 to 66.5% in 2015.

These statistics can be interpreted as suggesting that the majority of students found the 2015 examination more accessible, even though there was minimal improvement in achievement in Part B: Extended Responses. With this in mind, the marking panel highlighted several salient features that contributed to the quality of student responses.

First, similar to previous years, time management skills were more evident in better responses. Several markers noted that fewer questions were left unanswered, and more students completed the entire examination this year. Even so, students who wrote more than the allocated spaces allowed for in Part A: Short Responses, or who wasted time rewriting the questions in Part B: Extended Responses, either tended not to complete the examination or wrote answers that lacked depth of analysis. Students should be given ample opportunities throughout the year to practise writing concise answers in supervised, timed conditions.

The quality of responses additionally depended on students’ ability to address key aspects of specific questions. Besides requiring students to know that command verbs such as ‘explain’ and ‘describe’ call for detailed responses that are supported by evidence, markers also observed that successful answers interpreted and responded to the required thematic or conceptual focus of particular questions (for example, see discussion of Question 2, part (c) and questions 5 and 6 below).

Furthermore all markers commented that the quality of student responses depended on their ability to support a discussion with evidence from the sources provided. That is, better responses did as questions directed by referring to specific sources. Students should be guided in this aspect of examination technique by learning to interpret exactly what is required from a range of question types.

Assessment Design Criteria

*Knowledge and Understanding*

Students who achieved at a high level demonstrated an in-depth knowledge and understanding of a wide range of tourism concepts and models. Teachers should take particular care to enhance their students’ understanding of key concepts such as economic, environmental, and sociocultural impacts of tourism, responsible tourism, the role of various stakeholders (for example, government bodies and tourism businesses), sustainability, and diverse interpretations of tourism industry sectors. These thematic concerns feature prominently in the subject outline; thus, it should come as no surprise that the examination focuses on assessing students’ knowledge and understanding of them. Likewise the subject outline specifically mentions tourism models such as the Multiplier Effect, Doxey’s Irridex, Plog’s tourist personality types and the Butler Sequence. Stronger student responses exhibited a working knowledge of these models.

*Analysis and Evaluation*

The more successful responses demonstrated astute interpretation and analysis of sources and tourism-related issues. This fundamental underpinning of the examination allows students to show a comprehensive interpretation of tables, diagrams, and graphs, as well as perceptive analysis and evaluation of the validity, accuracy, and bias associated with a range of perspectives on tourism trends and concerns. A regular feature of the examination is questions that direct students to explain and justify tourism management strategies. This year was no exception.

*Investigation and Application*

Another emphasis of the examination involves the application of tourism knowledge and understanding, usually in a new or unfamiliar context. Markers observed that, following the pattern of previous years, high-achieving students were able to apply their knowledge thoroughly when confronted with unfamiliar yet relevant contexts. Responses to Question 1, parts (c) and (d), Question 3, part (b), and Question 7 varied widely, particularly in demonstrations of the specific assessment features of IA2 and IA4.

*Communication*

While appropriate use of tourism terminology is expected across the examination, Part B also assesses, in part, students’ ability to communicate effectively. Higher-achieving students were able to outscore other students in this regard by employing concise and coherent writing, and providing logically structured responses that used tourism terminology accurately and consistently.

Part A: Short Responses

**Question 1**

1. This question required students to identify two significant differences in the data provided. Almost all students identified aspects such as an increase in the proportion of independent travellers, or a decrease in group tour propensity. For full marks, students needed to cite a difference in each of part (i) and (ii).
2. Applying what they know about demonstrating cultural awareness to the specific example of Chinese visitors to Australia, successful responses briefly mentioned the possibility of the tour guide’s being bilingual (speaking English and a Chinese dialect) and accommodating culturally diverse customs such as greetings and food preferences. Students who stated ways that Chinese tourists might be assisted to be made aware of Australian culture generally misinterpreted the question.
3. This question required students to exercise higher-order thinking skills, in that they needed a working knowledge of Plog’s model of tourist personality types, and an ability to apply their understanding of this model to an unfamiliar context. The question’s directive to ‘us[e] evidence from the sources’ discriminated between student responses, and those who referred to specific features of travel preferences of Chinese visitors to Australia outscored those who made unsubstantiated statements. Most students interpreted first-time Chinese visitors to Australia as being relatively psychocentric (Y) on Plog’s model, given that Chinese tourists’ preference for group tours and Chinese-speaking guides characterise them as more ‘non-adventurous’ than ‘adventurous’. Return visitors, however, tend to be more ‘independent’, thus more ‘allocentric’ or ‘adventurous’ (X). Students who argued (with evidence) that first-time Chinese visitors to Australia are ‘relatively allocentric’ (X), on the basis that visiting a new culture is ‘adventurous’, were not penalised.
4. The majority of students were able to describe (with some explanation) two limitations or problems of applying Plog’s model to the data on travel preferences of Chinese visitors to Australia. Sound responses included a discussion of currency (the relevance of a model created in 1974 to twenty-first century psychology and society), the experiences of individuals changing over time, the difficulty of placing tourists into discrete categories, the limitations associated with categorising or defining activities as ‘adventurous’ or ‘non-adventurous’, and the difficulty of applying a Eurocentric model to Asian tourists.

The mean (average) mark for Question 1 in its entirety was 9.2 out of 12 (76.7%), which was the second-highest mean for the examination.

**Question 2**

1. The overwhelming majority of students grasped the intention of this question and answered it accordingly. Very few responses did not follow the instruction to refer to the sources, and better responses included an explanation of the link between the sources, describing how Australia is on the top of the list of countries known for ‘natural environments’ and ‘world-class beauty’, and that these aspects ⎯ characteristic of the Tasmanian wilderness ⎯ are useful for producing tourism business.
2. Student responses needed to focus on ‘negative environmental impact[s]’, and those who strayed into a discussion of either positive factors or economic and sociocultural aspects missed the conceptual intention of the question. Relevant responses described (not just listed) environmental costs of tourism such as pollution, wasted management, site hardening, erosion, destruction of flora/fauna/habitat, and so on.
3. Most students had little difficulty in articulating two strategies that would ensure environmental sustainability, such as: constructing the resort from environmentally friendly materials, using renewable or low-impact energy sources to operate the resort, protection of flora/fauna/habitat, deliberate localised site hardening to limit tourism’s impact, limiting size or height, and other relevant approaches. Again, markers noted that answers that discussed economic or sociocultural issues often were not relevant to the required environmental focus of the question.
4. Almost all students correctly explained the difference in perspective on tourism development between Vica Bayley and Ian Waller. Appropriate quoting from the radio transcript showed students’ understanding that Bayley opposed development and Waller favoured investment in tourism opportunities in the Tasmanian wilderness. Better responses were able to explain that the primary reason for differences in these perspectives lay in Bayley’s focus on environmental sustainability as opposed to Waller’s concern for economic gain. The highest marks were awarded to students who were able to link these stakeholders’ opinions to their roles (Campaign Manager for the Wilderness Society compared with Regional Tourism Manager), and only a handful of students mentioned the vested interest or bias of the stakeholders. This question acted as an effective discriminator.

The mean mark for Question 2 in its entirety was 11.07 out of 14 (79.1%), which was the highest mean for the examination.

**Question 3**

1. Most students were able to link the image to the data in the column graph, explaining that destinations such as Wineglass Bay and The Hazards in Tasmania include experiences that international tourists find appealing about Australia, especially beaches, rainforests, and national parks, and unspoilt wilderness. Better responses also referred to the description of the second source, including ‘wild, natural beauty’ and ‘forests’.
2. Few students received full marks for this question, primarily because only the highest achievers referred to the sources. Good responses were able to demonstrate an understanding of the specific stages of the Butler Sequence by discussing possible causes of decline, especially if the development at Wineglass Bay exceeded the region’s carrying capacity, thus negatively impacting on the environment, which could lead to loss of interest by tourists.
3. This question was generally handled well by students, the majority of whom could provide two ways to manage development to stay within the region’s carrying capacity. Students who listed dot points received some marks, while those who provided explanations, as instructed by the question, tended to achieve higher marks. Generally, managing tourism development within the region’s carrying capacity might be achieved in two ways: limiting tourism so that the carrying capacity is not exceeded (e.g., limiting access in terms of number of tourists or time, increasing fees) or increasing the carrying capacity (building more environmentally responsible infrastructure, deliberate localised site hardening, educating tourists, etc.).

The mean mark for Question 3 in its entirety was 6.89 out of 10 (68.9%).

**Question 4**

1. In part (i) very few students had difficulty naming a sector of the tourism industry that was not listed in the diagram. Depending on the model they studied, most named food and hospitality, accommodation, or attractions. Some misread the question and quoted a sector listed in the diagram, or stated a specific career in the tourism industry.

The concept of ‘the ability to work with others’, or collaboration, was not well understood in part (ii), and very few students were able to articulate a sound grasp of the interdependence of tourism industry sectors.

1. A trend is a discernible pattern in the data, and in part (i) the vast majority of students correctly identified a general increase in the number of jobs in the tourism industry, a decrease in the proportion of full-time jobs, or an increase in the proportion of part-time jobs. Teachers should continue to guide their students in accurate interpretation of a range of graphical representations of data.

While many students could state a factor that accounted for the trend they observed in the data, only those who described (in some detail) their reasons received full marks for part (ii). Popular answers related to an increase in the proportion of part-time (or decrease in the proportion of full-time) jobs as a result of seasonality, flexibility, age of the work force, economic uncertainty, and an increasing use of technology. More perceptive students explained how a general increase in tourism globally requires more jobs in the tourism industry.

1. A wide range of marks was awarded to responses (as indicated in a high standard deviation overall for Question 4), and this question was an effective discriminator in the examination. Many students demonstrated a good understanding of the Multiplier Effect and were able to explain how tourists’ introducing new money into the host community subsequently creates ripples both directly and indirectly throughout the economy, benefiting various sectors’ expenditure, employment, and even infrastructure. The best answers included a relevant and often complex diagram to support their explanation. Teachers should expose their students to a range of models and diagrams, and should encourage them to create their own graphical representations of tourism concepts.

The mean mark for Question 4 in its entirety was 8.78 out of 14 (62.7%), by far the lowest mean in Part A: Short Responses.

Part B: Extended Responses

Given the amount of reading and level of higher-order cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation required in Part B, teachers are reminded to give their students plenty of practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The communication assessment design criterion receives special attention in this section of the examination, thus students are encouraged to write well-structured and fluent paragraphs, to refer to specific sources when directed, and to use relevant and accurate tourism terminology.

**Question 5**

This question required students to focus specifically on ‘economic and sociocultural features’ to explain how Brazil ‘benefited’ from hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup, as specified and implied in sources 3, 4, and 6. The majority of students were able to explain economic benefits gained, which included a potential increase in international trade and tourism (Source 3); this is supported in Source 6, which reports a 16% increase in the number of international and domestic tourists to Brazil. Source 3 adds the potential benefit to the local community of building infrastructure, hence providing lasting resources or facilities for local communities.

High-achieving responses to this question also discussed in some detail potential and actual sociocultural benefits to Brazil, whereas weaker responses either omitted this aspect in their explanation or did not write in sufficient detail. Evidence for sociocultural benefits includes an increased awareness of Brazil as a result of media coverage (Source 3), which is also supported by Source 6’s claim that the World Cup ‘raised Brazil’s international profile’. Additionally, some in the local community initially experienced a positive ‘great … atmosphere’ (Source 4), and Source 6 reinforces this sociocultural factor with a reported 16% increase in tourists experiencing Brazil’s ‘cultural wealth’.

Teachers should continue to train their students to make specific reference to relevant sources in their responses, by using linking clauses or phrases along the lines of ‘according to Source 3’ or ‘Source 4 suggests’ or ‘sources 4 and 6 agree that…’

The mean mark for Question 5 was 5.26 out of 8 (65.7%).

**Question 6**

1. This question expected students to use Source 7 as a framework for structuring a response, providing evidence of the various stages of Doxey’s Irridex Model:

* *Excitement*: Source 4 states, ‘The atmosphere was great’, and this is supported by Source 5, which mentions one particular local being ‘really excited at first’.
* *Apathy*: There is no evidence in the sources of this stage of Doxey’s Irridex.
* *Irritation*: Numerous sources mention this factor in terms of locals being ‘angry’ (Source 5) and ‘protesting’ (sources 1, 3, and 4) at the exorbitant amount of money being spent on stadiums (sources 1 and 3) instead of schools and hospitals (sources, 1, 3, 4, and 5). Many locals protested because the money leaked to soccer teams, FIFA, and foreign companies (sources 1 and 5), while locals had ‘no money and no jobs’ (Source 5), remained in poverty (sources 5 and 8), and were even imprisoned by police who reportedly violated human rights (Source 4).
* *Resignation*: Source 5 recounts the story of one local whose response to the World Cup evolved from initial excitement to resignation, in that he lamented, ‘We might as well give up and get on with life …’.

Markers noted that many responses demonstrated a misunderstanding of the intention of the set question because they focused solely on local anger or irritation. Better responses, therefore, were able to use the sources to explain how the attitudes of local residents changed over time from initial excitement to irritation and then eventually evolved to resignation.

1. Interestingly all markers commented on the comparatively poor quality of responses to this question. A relatively high proportion of students simply reiterated their answer to Question 6, part (a) rather than evaluating the validity of applying Doxey’s Irridex Model (Source 7) to the change in local residents’ attitudes towards the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil.

Better responses explained (not just listed) two limitations such as:

* the issue of currency or the declining relevance of a model created in 1974 to Brazil in 2014
* the variation in the experience of individuals. This was indicated in the sources, which showed some locals following the model in the evolution of their attitudes, while some only demonstrated irritation. There is also no indication of apathy mentioned in the sources
* the difficulty of generalising the experiences of one local (Source 5) to the experiences of all locals.

While a focus on these limitations was the original intention of the examination setters, it was excellent to see (and markers consequently rewarded) quite a number of students who claimed that Doxey’s Irridex Model was valid in this instance, as numerous sources did in fact demonstrate a change in locals’ attitudes towards the World Cup in Brazil.

The mean mark for Question 6 in its entirety was 5.56 out of 10 (55.6%), which was the lowest mean in the examination.

**Question 7**

Following the pattern established in previous years, the number of marks allocated to the final question makes it one of the most significant discriminators of student grades in the examination. The highest standard deviation in the examination (2.89 out of a possible 12 marks) is strong evidence of this observation.

Markers noted that responses that scored 8 or more out of 12 successfully followed the guidelines set by the question, which required students to refer to a range of sources as well as to their own knowledge and understanding of the tourism industry, and to justify their management plan strategies with detailed explanations. Higher marks were also given to those who used appropriate formal communication, which students reinforced by employing relevant and accurate tourism terminology.

Some examples of useful management strategies included, but were not limited to, the following:

* Sources 1, 3, and 5 mention the great deal of money spent on stadiums rather than on much-needed schools and hospitals in Brazil, thus Rio 2016 (Olympic Games) organisers should ensure that local ‘social matters’ are not ignored. Government and tourism industry businesses should collaborate to build ‘infrastructure’ that is ‘needed’, providing a ‘legacy to the local area’ (Source 3).
* Soccer teams, FIFA, and foreign companies pocketed most of the $11 billion spent on the 2014 FIFA World Cup (sources 1 and 5); therefore, government and businesses developing **Rio de Janeiro** for Rio 2016 should ensure that locals benefit by ensuring profits do not leak overseas but instead multiply throughout the local community, using local produce, and providing locals (not foreigners) with jobs (Source 5).
* As the experiences of poverty of the locals featured in World Cup reports (sources 2, 4, 5, and 8), it is vital that any development takes into account local attitudes and opinions (Source 7), and does not exceed the carrying capacity of Rio (Source 2 shows existing overdevelopment and overcrowding).
* According to sources 5 and 6 accommodation was ‘overpriced’ during the World Cup, a situation that could be rectified for Rio 2016 if a sufficient number of hotels are built (and completed) to meet demand, responsibly increasing the carrying capacity of the city. Government and businesses should collaborate to ensure this occurs.
* Source 6 mentions that the World Cup experienced ‘perceived threats of violent crime’; therefore, plans should include upgrading security to protect the local area, to safeguard tourists, hence contributing to the economic and sociocultural success of Rio 2016.

The mean mark for Question 7 was 6.85 out of 12 (57.1%), which was the second-lowest mean for an individual question in the examination.

## Operational Advice

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. Teachers’ assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. Teacher grades/marks should be evident on all student school assessment work. Grades need to be A to E and displayed on the separate tasks, not just on the overall grade sheet. Moderators also noted a number of instances where performance standards and grades allocated did not match and suggested that there needed to be more consistency and correlation of grade to performance standards or a Variations ⎯ Moderation Materials form submitted.

Good preparation of the moderation sample was appreciated by the moderation team, as it made the moderation process more effective. Appropriate samples featured clear identification of student work, allocated grades, assessment sheets, the learning and assessment plan, and where necessary an addendum to the learning and assessment plan or a Variations ⎯ Moderation Materials form. These made the teacher’s assessment decision easier to understand.

## General Comments

Generally the standard of work submitted for moderation was good. Most student responses reflected a sound understanding of the complexity of the tourism industry and moderators felt that, by and large, the knowledge and understanding of the tourism industry demonstrated in students’ work has improved.

As has been suggested in previous years, teachers are encouraged to attend clarifying forums that are provided by the SACE Board. Clarifying forums provide subject experts, who are able to give detailed advice, and valuable discussion takes place among teachers. This year’s clarifying forums for Tourism focused specifically on implementation and assessment of practical activities outside the regular classroom. Clarifying forums in 2016 will be exploring further the development of good primary data collection methodology, presentation and interpretation of visual and graphical information, and connecting primary and secondary sources of information. These are three areas in which moderators noted that additional development could be beneficial.

Another way of developing expertise is for teachers to participate in examination and moderation assessment panels, for which teachers can express interest via the online link on the SACE website.
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