

Australia in Asia and the Pacific

Course Code: AAP315116

148 candidates attempted the exam this year. As in previous years, there was a clear distinction between those candidates who revised and studied and those who tried to 'wing it', with predictable results. Given the issues with some of the questions, most candidates were able to produce answers that the examiners believed demonstrated at least some knowledge of the Australia in the Asia and Pacific region. The following comments specify more carefully some of the faults encountered, but more importantly what teachers in 2017 can concentrate on to improve outcomes.

Section A

Some candidates tried to answer all the questions in Section A as one response. They are separate questions and this should be reflected in student responses. Most candidates attempted the three questions, but it must be noted that any student who did not do all three were immediately penalised, particularly on Criterion 3.

It would seem that suggestions made in the 2015 Examiners' report were considered and spelling, while not perfect, was much better. Candidates must be aware that they need to analyse the wording of the question and try to answer the question set and not the one they want it to be. Appropriate geographic terminology was essential. Candidates were able to show their understanding of a range of case studies, although not necessarily in the specific depth required by the question. All answers should have the question numbers prefacing them enabling ease of marking.

Question 1

There were some good responses to this question, although many answers demonstrated a general knowledge and understanding of a Pacific country rather than a more in depth one as expected by the question. Popular countries chosen by candidates included Fiji and New Caledonia. Some also incorrectly chose New Zealand which is part of the Australasian region. Candidates were generally well prepared for this question with many responses including relevant data and statistics such as latitude, longitude, area and number of islands that make up country being discussed. Strong responses were able to name major landforms such as highest peaks, longest rivers and largest island/s. Strongest responses included some discussion on aspects of human geography such as the location of major towns including the capital or why areas are sparsely populated, as the question specified 'geographic features' in addition to the 'range of landforms'.

Candidates are encouraged to use correct terminology when they provide responses. Candidates were correct in discussing volcanoes relevant to their chosen country, however better responses included terms such as 'active', 'extinct' or 'dormant' when referring to a volcano's current status. Some candidates also discussed hurricanes in the Pacific region. Correct terminology would have these descriptions as cyclones for the region. In discussing landforms some candidates also chose to write about natural attractions and how tourists come to see the specified attractions. Whilst this may be true, it is advised that this detracts time from responding to the question efficiently.

While the question required only a description it should be noted that Criterion 3 requires assessment and few students actually addressed these aspects. Perhaps the most ominous omissions were explanations backed by statistics with the majority of students making somewhat vague reference to 'coral reefs', 'clear blue waters' and 'tropical climates' etc. Geographic features, whatever their nature, should always include an overview of pattern and where possible at least one example.

Question 2

Overall, answers to this question were disappointing with many student responses clearly under prepared. Some candidates chose to not answer this question in this Section. A large proportion of responses included generic discussion about an environmental issue without mention of a specific country in Asia – as required by the question. Many answers would have benefitted from defining what environmental degradation is in a general sense and then relating it to their chosen example. Many candidates wrote about extinction of species such as orangutans or butterflies. The most common example that was used was deforestation, many in relation to palm oil, followed by the effect of this in countries such as Malaysia and Indonesia and, in particular, stronger responses referred to the deforestation specifically taking place on the island of Borneo or Sumatra. Nepal was another popular country used as an example. Some thought that deforestation was happening in all countries in the 21st century, including Bangladesh.

Some candidates did try and link this question to Question 3 on urbanisation and the cause of deforestation as a function of the process urbanisation. Whilst there can be a link, the question was focused on the effects. Better responses included the relocation of populations, the lack of habitat and the impact on the biodiversity of the location as well as soil erosion and the subsequent impact on the waterways. Some candidates chose to discuss desertification, air pollution and water pollution as their response to environmental degradation. These are areas of environmental degradation in the region, however responses were not expected to discuss these based on the course outline, which can be considered to be overly narrow.

Some candidates who discussed climate change almost exclusively wrote as though Asian countries had the similar problems as low-lying Pacific countries. Examples were minimal and references were usually to a vague part of their specified country.

Question 3

This question was completed with a mix of responses. At the top end, candidates were articulate in discussing major urbanisation issues in popular examples such as Mumbai in India, Dhaka in Bangladesh, Sydney in Australia and Beijing in China. Strong responses included examples comparing push and pull factors between countries and the concept of the rural/urban drift. Responses that included statistics about unemployment and population splits between rural and urban areas were viewed strongly. Some candidates attempted to use some examples that were not suitable, such as Pacific Island capitals and also Singapore. Some candidates also had cities linked with incorrect countries; for example Bangkok is not in India. Some candidates also discussed tourism as a problem caused by urbanisation. In this situation, candidates discussed how many tourists are coming to their specified location and discussed the impacts of tourism rather than the problems of urbanisation. Such statements as 'Bangladesh is situated in India' or 'Singapore's grasslands are going due to buildings' need to be avoided on the basis of accuracy.

A surprising number of students did not appear to understand what the term urbanisation means, confusing it with % urban rather than a process. This may have helped to explain why so many candidates used Singapore as their main example. Many also tried to use a Pacific example with little real knowledge. Better answers named cities but few could support answers with statistics. Where China was used as an example only one student mentioned the role of government policy in rural to urban migration and then failed to comment on the significance of the policy. Use of the term 'overpopulation' should be avoided as it was obvious that it was misunderstood. For example, many wrote about Singapore being 'overpopulated'. There was some real misunderstanding which came to the fore in this question.

Strong responses discussed the economic problems such as finding employment and the drain of specialised fields of work (particularly doctors and medical expertise) from rural to urban environments. In addition to this was discussion around infrastructure and the lack of provision for it leading to the creation of slum areas of cities. Dharavi in Mumbai was a popular example. Environmental problems were also highlighted with deforestation raised along with the continued clearing of land to make way for the built environment as well as access to water and water treatment and sanitation issues centered on health and hygiene. One aspect of the question that let many candidates down was the lack of comparison between countries. Many candidates discussed examples but did not compare between them.

Section B

Some candidates tried to answer both Question 4 and Question 5 in Section B. Instructions on the examination paper clearly state candidates are to attempt 'ONE question from Section B'. An essay was required for this section, so necessary requirements of sentences and paragraphs that link together was mandatory. Paragraphs with one or two sentences does not constitute an acceptable form, nor does, in general, essays of less than 2 pages.

Question 4

This question was to be completed in essay form despite the question being broken into (a) and (b) parts. Candidates were generally well prepared for Part (a) of this question. Clearly candidates had studied the relationship between Australia and chosen Asian and Pacific countries and to this point, Part (a) of the question was well addressed by most candidates. Popular countries chosen were Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands. The benefit of choosing such countries allowed candidates to discuss the relatively longer historical context (development and change) of the partnership. Some candidates chose to write about Nepal and Japan and the aid assistance offered to these countries by Australia in the aftermath of recent natural disasters, however candidates who did this were unable to adequately discuss the development and change of the relationship between chosen countries and Australia. It also impeded responses to Part (b) of the question in looking to the future. Waiting for a natural disaster to occur does not allow the candidate to address the question adequately.

Stronger essays clearly introduced the two countries to be discussed in the introduction and were also able to briefly introduce the nature of Australian aid projects. Some candidates wrote a general essay on aid and ignored the details of the question, referencing other partnerships as well. A number of candidates wrote brief essays on emergency aid and aid arising from natural and human disasters, borrowing content from Section D. Stronger responses also discussed the type of aid projects delivered along with relevant Non-Government Organisations and with the intended aims and linkages to Millennium Development Goals or the more contemporary Sustainable Development Goals and some also provided a value and timeframe of delivery for discussed projects.

Strong responses discussed specific examples of the development and change of the relationship with their chosen country. For example, Indonesia was often discussed with regard to Australia's involvement in the Bali bombings investigations and assistance and the Boxing Day 2004 Tsunami relief assistance and more recently the execution of Australians for involvement in drug trafficking. These events were linked to an increase or reduction in aid to Indonesia and the apparent political motivations behind them. Other strong responses mentioned, in passing, the relationships between discussed countries to trade and defence agreements and membership of economic forums such as APEC and the G20 and the Pacific Islands Forum.

Very few candidates actually used the language of the last part of the question, which was how might Australia give aid to one of the countries discussed in the future. To this end, Part (b) of the question was answered relatively poorly in relation to Part (a). Many candidates responded by discussing world events and political tension as possible motives for changes in a relationship with the chosen country. Solid responses addressed the changing economic conditions of developing countries and the dependence on aid becoming less likely because development targets and goals of aid assistance will be met in the future and so the requirement for Australia to provide aid becomes less in terms of actual need and in financial amount.

Question 5

Criterion 2

Generally, most candidates wrote correctly in essay form, using appropriate sentence and paragraph construction, but the occasional answer believed that one or two sentences constitutes a correct paragraph- this is patently not the case.

A few items will need to be addressed by future candidates, such as;

- Do not write in pencil
- Take more care with spelling, especially key subject-specific terms. Using the word 'required' probably not appropriate in immigration matters.
- Capital letters are required for such proper titles as, Europeans, Asians, Norwegian, British, Indians. Also capital letters are conventional for Acts of Parliament.
- Less than 2 pages as an essay is really not sufficient.
- Use paragraphing conventions. Generally 4 to 5 sentences constitutes a paragraph, and change of paragraph when there is a change of time, subject or place are the conventions.
- No such word as 'seeked' as a past participle- sought is the correct term.

Criterion 4

The objective of the question required candidates to outline the changing Australian Government policies since 1901, then carefully describe and analyse the impact 2 migrant groups have had on Australia's cultural development, followed by 'crystal ball gazing' on the situation in 10 years' time.

Some other key factual or analysis issues included;

- It is not sufficient to just list changes in government policies. Candidates need to explain or assess value of these changes. Any essay on this topic requires some sort of overview of change in Australian Government Policies over time. Candidates cannot, without it, logically launch into an account of current situation. Nature of the question requires an historical account of changes as well as a current assessment. Not good enough just to rely on analysis of current policies.
- Candidates need to make sure of the accuracy of basic facts;
 - In 1958 neither Holt nor Fraser was PM. Nor was Menzies PM in 1979. Nor was Holt PM in 1950, nor was Whitlam PM in 1966. John Howard was PM from 1996, not just from 2001.
 - Is Indonesia a major Australian migrant source?
 - Gold Rush happened before 1901.
 - Japanese migrants before 1901?
 - Who was the Duke of Cornwall in 1901? He certainly was not PM.
 - Arthur Calwell NEVER became Australian PM. He was certainly Immigration Minister and a Leader of the Opposition, but never PM- that was left to Gough Whitlam in 1972.
 - Tony Abbott PM from 2013, not 2012
 - Governor-General in 1901 was NOT Alfred Deakin
 - Japan is not, nor has ever been, communist.
- Most traced the migration history of Australia since 1901 with some discussing the Chinese and their involvement in the Goldfields, which in relation to the question is perfectly viable discussion so long as they continued it into the 20th and 21st century as the question required.
- Candidates need to provide evidence for change in migration attitude in 1986-87 due to non-assimilation of Vietnamese. If such a claim is made, some attempt at verification is necessary.
- However, some students found it difficult to relate policy and history to specific nationalities; for example The White Australia Policy and Vietnamese Boat People in the 1970's.
- Not sure whether the claim that Indian migrants/workers were in truth slaves.
- The requirement to describe 2 countries migration patterns has led to a lack of depth or evaluation of impact of ethnic migration.
- The Tampa incident was often given great consideration in a descriptive sense but with little understanding of the significance and political reasons behind the publicity of the incident. Late 20th century and 21st century discussions on asylum seekers often evolved into value judgments of politicians and lacked statistical support or even acknowledgement of country origins. Few mentioned 'People Smugglers' and there was little understanding of the role of Nauru.
- What does 'high education rate' mean?
- Pre-federation Australia would not be called multi-cultural. If candidates want to pursue the claim, evidence needs to be provided.
- 'Populate or Perish' policy was designed to encourage non-English speaking European migrants, not really Chinese or other Asians. Thus the 1958 Act did not fully abolish the IRA 1901.

- Afghanistan NOT part of the AAP region. Try to avoid including non-AAP countries.
- Need to use some dates, hopefully correct ones.
- Dictation test may have applied to people from, say Vietnam/Indonesia but not really logical. They were not actually sovereign countries at the time of Immigration Restriction Act 1901.
- Clever, appropriate use of the Orderly Departure Program 1975.
- Try to avoid being too definite. NOT all Australians are racist and hateful towards migrants.
- The politician that manages migration is the Minister for Immigration, NOT Officer.

Section C

Again, this section required an answer in essay format, correct sentences and paragraphing conventions which link together. Candidates should remember that only 2 specific case study destinations were required, so to include a third meant the rest of the essay lacked some depth of both description and analysis.

Question 6

Criterion 2

Under test conditions markers are looking for three elements for this criterion in this section:

1. Compose a structured and analytical essay: introduction, body and conclusion; third person voice; a series of paragraphs that develop a thesis (argument); formal language; specific and appropriate examples as evidence in analysis.
2. Use terminology applicable to the concept of tourism within the AAP region such as tourism trends, the multiplier effect, economic leakage, tourism hot spots, management practices, cultural authenticity, sustainable practices, international receipts.
3. Use grammatical conventions, spelling and punctuation to achieve clarity in written responses.

Findings and recommendations for these three elements:

The best responses were at least 3 pages, contained a clear introduction that addressed the essay question, and then developed a thesis about the reasons for growth of tourism in the two destinations. Further, they articulated the economic impacts of tourism on the chosen destination (both positive and negative) and provided clear, specific and plausible management practices that could be effective in minimising negative impacts. Terminology and clarity of written expression were features.

Weakest responses were brief, did not adhere to essay features, applied very little specific tourism terminology and lacked clarity due to significant issues with language conventions. There is no excuse for not organising the response as an essay. If a student does not have competent written language skills they need to hone these by working with their teacher and then practising under test conditions.

Criterion 5

For this question the marker required:

1. Reasons for the growth of tourism in two destinations.
2. Analysis of the economic impacts of tourism in one of these destinations.
3. Assessment of management practices on minimising negative economic impacts in the future.

Findings and recommendations:

1. The best responses answered all parts of the question, and they could do so because they had thoroughly prepared, could adjust their focus to factors responsible for tourism growth and its economic impacts. These candidates used different approaches for the first part of the question. Some provided an overview of the broad economic, demographic, technological and political changes responsible for the rapid growth of tourism in AAP – and linked these changes to their two destinations. Others highlighted specific tourism trends that accounted for growth such as dark tourism, doom tourism, eco-tourism and medical tourism. Still others identified and described specific characteristics of these destinations that made them attractive for tourists and hence growth – these included references to the presence of the 5 A's: access, accommodation,

activities, attraction and amenities; some described geographical, cultural and spiritual features that acted as pull factors for tourists. In other words, a clear thesis was provided as to why growth in tourism has occurred in these nations. These candidates used a range of examples, including statistics as evidence. Weakest responses were vague about reasons for growth and/or described them in informal language that was juvenile.

2. The best responses included both positive and negative economic impacts of tourism on one destination (some managed to do this for two destinations and were not penalised). They described increased foreign exchange that enabled destination governments to improve infrastructure and delivery of services such as health care and education, employment for locals in a range of tourist-related industries and activities that lifted them out of poverty, increased their life expectancy and overall quality of life, and that these jobs occurred in both the formal sector and the informal sector. They acknowledged that over-dependency on tourism is an issue given that tourism arrivals can decrease through human and natural crises that trans-national companies contribute economic leakage, that tourism is seasonal and can leave locals unemployed outside the peak season, and that for many jobs are functionary such as maids and drivers which are poorly paid by Western standards. A few explained the economic divide between those in the tourist hot spot and those on its periphery i.e. rural areas. Specific examples of all these impacts were used to create convincing paragraphs. Weakest answers contained generalised descriptions of impacts.
3. The best responses linked management strategies with 1 or 2 negative economic impacts of tourism previously outlined. They were appropriate, detailed, specific and logically applied. Weakest responses either did not address this part of the question or provided brief and implausible management practices.

Popular tourist destinations used by candidates included: Phuket, Siem Reap and Bali from Group A; from Group B popular selections were Fiji, Vanuatu and New Caledonia; and from Group C many candidates used Norfolk Island, the Great Barrier Reef and Uluru. Pre-learning an introduction and using that irrespective of the focus in the question is not wise. Nor is it wise to write a lengthy introduction that includes much specific detail that is best included in the body of the essay. It is reasonable to expect at least 3 pages in 45 minutes; this should be aspiration for candidates in 2017.

Section D

Candidates need to be mindful of the formatting requirements for this section and it is designed to allow them to write as someone else, so role-play would have advantaged final outcomes. Best answers were able to personalise their country, giving it a name, including some mention of specific places/features/aspects, even graphic details enhanced this appearance.

Question 7

For question 7 nearly all candidates chose to discuss climate change. Bird flu, nuclear contamination and a political coup were also occasionally chosen.

The standard of the answers to this question was generally good and some were excellent. It was clear that most candidates had studied and prepared for this section. However, suggestions for further improvement are provided below.

- Report format should be used. This means headings, sub headings, dot points and/or a numbering system. Many candidates did not use any of these features and were therefore penalised on criterion 2.
- Candidates must refer to the relevant information from the given blurb about Country A in their answers. A short introduction is recommended, but this should not be so long that it detracts from the discussion of the chosen crisis. Some candidates wrote more on their introduction (2 pages) than they did addressing parts a), b) and c).
- It is recommended that candidates refer to the major effects of the crisis that they have provided in question a) when analysing the responses and their effectiveness in questions b) and c). In several cases these impacts were not referred to again at all.
- Information provided must be relevant and likely given Country A's location and data. Would country A have a large air force and army? Or several universities? Or would many thousands of people have already lost

their lives as a result of climate change? Better answers were able to relate Country A's low GNI PPP and the high % of people in the primary sector, many most likely subsistence farmers, to its inability to fix most of the issues themselves without the assistance of foreign aid and assistance.

- Candidates must be specific about the impacts of their crisis. Some candidates writing about climate change did not mention a single environmental impact, surely the most likely at this point.
- When writing about the responses to the crisis, again candidates need to be specific. Several wrote at length about "mitigation and adaptation strategies" without actually stating what they were. Other candidates focused too much on re-educating the population to enable them to live in other countries without looking at more immediate strategies such as moving villages to higher ground, building sea walls and combatting increasing salinity of the water supply. Better answers considered a range of immediate and long term environmental and social impacts and solutions and were able to effectively evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- Candidates should use data to enhance their descriptions of the impacts of the crisis on Country A, and in their evaluations of the various responses; e.g. the % of the land which is now inundated during storms, the height, length and location of sea walls being constructed, the number of wells which have been destroyed by increasing salinity, the number of people who will need to be relocated etc.

Question 8

For question 8 a variety of likely natural disasters were selected – tsunamis, earthquakes and cyclones. The standard of the answers to this question was generally good. It was clear that most candidates had studied and prepared for this section. However, suggestions for further improvement are provided below.

- Report format should be used. This means headings, sub headings, dot points and/or a numbering system. Many candidates did not use any of these features and were therefore penalised on criterion 2.
- Candidates must refer to the relevant information provided about Country A in their answers. A short introduction is recommended, but this should not be so long that it detracts from the discussion of the chosen crisis.
- It is expected that candidates refer to the date of the crisis. While some did not provide a date at all others dated their disaster in October or November of this year, which made the national and international responses to the crisis very difficult to evaluate. Some went for the very superficial "it's too early to tell" response, while others had all problems fixed after 2 weeks "...back on their feet in no time!", even though most of the island was destroyed and thousands of people lost their lives. Unlikely!
- It is recommended that candidates refer to the major effects of the disaster that they have provided in question a) when analysing the responses and their effectiveness in questions b) and c). In several cases these impacts were not referred to again at all.
- Candidates must adapt their knowledge to the hypothetical county's location, on this occasion in the Pacific. Some candidates were clearly writing about Nepal. Others included information that was unlikely- colonisation by Hungarians, wheat and rice crops, railways, nuclear reactors and huge death tolls of 90,000 or more, for example.
- Candidates should use data to enhance their descriptions of the impacts of the disaster on Country A, and in their evaluations of the various responses e.g. "there was a 10% loss of homes in the city of..." or "30% of crops were destroyed in the north of ...". "Two years after the crisis 5000 people are still displaced and living in temporary accommodation". Candidates, who select huge death and injury tolls as a feature of their crisis, should consider the loss of medical and other relevant workers and the impact that this would have on an immediate national response to the disaster.
- Several candidates wrote at length about earthquake warning systems either not working or not having been installed. These are not available at this time. This is a more appropriate discussion for tsunamis and cyclones for which such systems do exist.