This course was assessed for the first time this year and contains valuable information about the performance of the 2014 candidature including their strengths and weaknesses.

Some major issues were highlighted during the marking process and teachers are advised to carefully consider the contents of this report.

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

The course was delivered in 20 colleges/schools across Tasmania and 13 of those participated in the marking of the Examination.

The candidature for the course was 566.

The Breakdown of the candidature in answering different Questions was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 (a)</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 (b)</td>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>single text</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>2 texts</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Single text</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Two texts</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1

(a) Most candidates made an attempt to address the question but did so in a variety of ways. Some examined the complexities of love within each of the two poems; for example, when discussing ‘La Belle Dame Sans Merci’, some candidates examined the way in which love can result in great happiness but how it can also be cruel and destructive. Another approach was to compare the way in which attitudes to love can vary from one poem to the next, thus demonstrating the complexities of love in a different way. Both approaches were seen and accepted as valid attempts to address the question.

The better answers referred closely to lines from the poems, providing close textual analysis and convincing markers of the candidates’ close knowledge of the texts. These candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of the ideas of the poems as well as the literary conventions and stylistic features through a discussion which included the judicious use of quotations.

Some answers expertly examined the way in which the literary conventions, structures and stylistic features underpin the meaning of the poems but others barely mentioned techniques. The question allowed for virtually any relevant technique to be discussed; answers which failed to do
so were disappointing. Most candidates resisted the temptation to simply provide a long list of techniques without discussing the effect of using such features.

The extent to which candidates provided a successful examination of the historical and cultural contexts in which the poems were composed varied. Some answers explored the effect of context on each of the poems in a detailed manner. Such answers avoided simply ‘dumping’ historical facts at the start of the discussion; rather, a discussion of context and its influence was carefully integrated into an analysis of the ideas.

Candidates should take care to follow the literary convention of enclosing the titles of poems within quotation marks.

High quality responses interrogate the poem, using poem evidence, analyse the cultural/historical context and the purpose and effect of literary conventions. In terms of overall form (criterion 4) better essays compare and contrast, are cohesive (very good essay structure), use a formal register, demonstrate sentence fluency (i.e. sentence rhythm: transitional words and phrases), and include an appropriate vocabulary.

(b) This was a very straightforward question given that candidates were able to choose their own poems. Weaker answers assumed the voices in the poems belonged to the poets. Although connections can be made between the speakers and poets in the Jonson poems and Section VII of ‘In Memoriam’, in most cases, it cannot be assumed that the voice is that of the poet.

Stronger responses identified the ideas in the poems, substantiating them with evidence and were able to connect these ideas with the different historical contexts. Weaker candidates tended to insert historical information in blocks rather than integrate it seamlessly into their essays. Candidates are reminded that they are writing literature rather than history essays and that they are to begin with the poems!

The best answers were able to balance the three main requirements of the task: discuss the way the poems convey a particular idea about loss, outline how they convey that idea through the structures and features of the poetic form and consider how the historical and cultural context of the poems’ composition influenced both ideas and form. A number offered good explications of the poems without considering context, others considered context to the detriment of analysing the content of the poems. Erroneous statements of historical fact do detract from the overall authority of the essay – Arthur Hallam did not die of cholera and Section VII of In Memoriam is not a sonnet.

**Question 2**

There were some wonderful, detailed responses which focused on the set question and showed evidence of close textual analysis. Most candidates attempted to address the question by exploring the way in which a character was in conflict with his or her society; however, some candidates did not directly examine a particular character struggling against societal expectations, preferring to write all they knew about the issues the text raises. Candidates are encouraged to address the question in the first sentence of each paragraph to ensure that comments are relevant.
The better answers convinced the markers that candidates knew texts well and made judicious use of quotations to support statements. Candidates should aim to write more than two pages and to cover a range of issues relevant to the question.

The better answers showed the influence of historical and cultural context on ideas and values in an integrated, expert way, rather than simply ‘dumping’ facts at the start of the essay. The question required candidates to discuss the author’s historical and cultural context and for those texts where the context of composition is different from the context of setting this at times posed a problem. With texts such as *The Secret River* and *Sophie Scholl* it was important to discuss the influence of the composers’ 21st century contexts, not just that of colonial Australia or Nazi Germany, the contexts of setting.

The key to answering this question was connecting the reasons for conflict with the relevant context. This required candidates to identify constraints, impositions and conflicting ideologies. Candidates were more able to identify conflict beyond the level of plot in *The Secret River* than in *Hamlet*.

This question required the candidates to choose ‘a character in conflict with his or her society’ and discuss the influence of the author’s historical and cultural context on the presentation of that conflict. A number of candidates were unable to discuss ‘a’ character in sufficient detail and so included an array of characters which diminished their ability to successfully answer the set question. A large number also failed to address the author’s historical and cultural context and examined, instead, the historical and cultural context of the text’s setting. Many of the answers on *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* did not acknowledge the author beyond naming him. They demonstrated good knowledge of the text but tended to retell events rather than focus on an analysis. The answers on *Hamlet* were generally better focused on the set question although some devoted several pages to a discussion of the treatment of women in Elizabethan society which they did not tie to the requirements of the question. Responses to *The Great Gatsby* struggled to identify which character was in conflict with the society, with the candidates who identified Nick Carraway developing more sophisticated responses than those who focused on Jay Gatsby or who discussed all characters. There were a number of responses that included biographical detail on Fitzgerald, and conflated the text creator with his creations. Answers on *One Night the Moon* used the personal context of the text’s creator with greater success but only the strong responses detailed the representations of characters through the choice of film techniques.

Candidates need to take care to identify that the responders to different text types are named differently – a play has an audience, a novel has readers and a film generally has viewers. The term ‘responder’ can cover all texts types and is useful, particularly when writing on module 3.

*The Great Gatsby* lends itself to a rich discussion of form and content. A range of answers focussed on either Nic Caraway, Gatsby or Jordan Baker all of whom are in conflict with their society for one reason or another. Many theme based responses dealt with how the character relates to ethical judgements of old vs new wealth; the American dream and its casualties; and just generally the sexist, racist, class divided, hedonist, world of the 1920’s. There were some responses that included autobiographical aspects of Fitzgerald: such context needed to transfer to the character under scrutiny. Higher order responses used the question to examine how Fitzgerald constructed the novel (compositional features) to reflect themes and ideas i.e. narrative point of view and the corrupted culture; or the materialism and symbolism (colour, green light, valley of ashes, eyes of TJ Eckleberg) as a symptom of American culture living too much in the moment.
The responses to *Othello*, demonstrated an excellent understanding of the historical and cultural context.

**Question 3**

This was a difficult question requiring candidates to discuss the topic in relation to both texts as well as the historical/cultural contexts and the compositional features of both texts, ensuring that they draw the appropriate comparisons/contrasts. This is a very sophisticated task and unsurprisingly the question was poorly done, by and large. Although most candidates attempted to focus on ‘pessimism and/or hope’ in their comparative texts, they struggled to integrate a discussion of these ideas in both texts with an analysis of the compositional features and the contexts in which they were composed. Often answers failed to show the connection between compositional features and ideas or the influence of context. Some responses were disjointed lists about historical and cultural context, techniques and ideas.

The better answers showed the influence of historical and cultural context on ideas and values in an integrated, expert way, rather than simply ‘dumping’ facts at the start of the essay. A discussion of the way in which the compositional features strengthen the ideas, rather than just a list of these features is preferable.

Again, the better answers convinced the markers that candidates knew texts well and made judicious use of quotations to support statements.

A number of candidates failed to answer the question focussing on exploration in texts of ideas of pessimism and/or hope. Others failed to discuss historical/cultural influences and many candidates made cursory reference to compositional features without explaining their purposes or significance to the development of meaning or without providing specific examples from the texts.

**Question 4**

This was a fair question and there were some strong answers in which a range of ‘repeated or contrasting elements’ was discussed. Some candidates analysed the way in which symbolism or particular forms of imagery is repeated in a text or the way in which characters are juxtaposed or contrasted to develop ideas; others discussed the cyclic nature of a text or the way in which setting is repeatedly used to reflect the characters’ emotions and circumstances.

Some candidates cited individual critics of texts, sometimes quoting at length in an impressive way; others referred to feminist critics’ responses or Marxist readings of texts. Such references were pleasing.

This question required candidates to select the central ideas of the text and then discuss how those ideas were conveyed through the use of repeated or contrasting elements. A number of candidates seemed a bit confused by the question and wrote about the way the central ideas ran throughout the text without mentioning compositional features that used repetition or contrast such as repeated use of symbolism or patterns of imagery; or the use of contrasting characters or juxtaposition. The majority of answers were able to clearly identify the central ideas of their texts and displayed good knowledge of plot and character. Use of quotation to support key points was generally impressive. Once again there
was a tendency to retell the narrative rather than examining the repeated or contrasting elements. The best answers on *The Secret River* referred to repeated use of symbolism to convey ideas of belonging and alienation or attitudes to land. They also examined the use of contrasting characters such as Smasher Sullivan and Thomas Blackwood. The best answers on *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* referred to the repeated use of names to reflect the allegorical nature of the novel, the repeated use of foreign settings as locations for Changrez’ epiphanies, the contrast between Changrez in the chronological present of the novel and the Changrez of the narration and the contrast between the speaker and the listener. Responses who wrote on *The Great Gatsby* discussed Fitzgerald’s repeated use of symbolism. Strong responses also outlined the contrast or use of foils in characterisation. As with other texts, weaker responses focused on the repeated ideas, without much supporting evidence or detailed discussion of compositional features.

Explicit direction to discuss repeated or contrasting elements prompted candidates to analyse narrative structure and compositional features. The freedom to select which ‘central ideas’ were discussed meant that these responses achieved a natural balance between analysing ideas and compositional features.

Some judicious references to critics or to statement from the author demonstrated a complex consideration of the text.

Many responses focussed on *The Great Gatsby* and Fitzgerald’s use of symbolism to represent the ‘unattainable’ American dream. It was good to see how the superior answers knew their texts well and could recall relevant evidence to illustrate their argument. This response needed to have a clearly structured essay to achieve high ratings. Many interesting *Hamlet* responses explored how the three revenge plots (Hamlet, Laertes, Fortinbras) as a repeated/contrasting element represent justice and/or the contemplation on life and death.

This question seemed to be more successful for candidates who based their response on *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. Responses seemed to work better when candidates made reference first to the ‘repeated or contrasting elements’ and how the ideas were developed by the author, using the nominated elements (eg womanhood, symbolism, religion).

Most candidates who tackled this question by reference to *Hamlet* seemed to have significant difficulty. Most identified some of the central ideas but few explained how these were developed through repeated or contrasting elements. Few also considered compositional or narrative features.

**Question 5**

This question required candidates to focus on the central idea of relationships that are tested, strengthened or broken. These answers clearly addressed the set question but found it difficult to organise their argument. Many responses retold and described the relationships represented. The answers on *Hamlet* generally discussed the way the ghost’s command to ‘avenge his most foul and unnatural murder’ inevitably brought Hamlet into conflict with his mother and uncle and how this conflict broadened to test his relationships with Ophelia and with his friends, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and Horatio. The best answers referred to the use of compositional features such as the parallel revengers, the parallel families and the parallel ‘friends’; the soliloquies and the patterns of imagery of disease and corruption. Responses on *The Great Gatsby* tended to outline all the relationships and make sweeping statements about the nature of friendships represented. Those who
wrote on *One Night the Moon* attempted to write on ‘friendship’ in the relationship between coloniser and colonised, offering reductive understanding of this power-based relationship. Stronger responses focused on the relationships within the Ryan family. Detailed discussion of the text’s features, and employing film language was rewarded.

The responses on *Death of a Salesman* focussed on Willy’s self-denial and subsequent destruction of the family unit. This was compared and contrasted to other relevant characters who suffered as a result of Willy’s delusions. Good responses discussed how the realism/expressionism worked in this play to convey ideas.

Most candidates focused on friendships or family relationships in their texts; however few successfully examined the compositional features used to develop this focus in sufficient detail. Many focused on the characters, implying the idea of characterisation as a compositional feature but did not examine the many other features annotated by the asterisk in the question. Stronger candidates were able to integrate literary theory and critics’ responses, however this was not mandated for an ‘A’ response.

**Question 6**

This question was answered well. Candidates made the connections between the ideas and the flawed character. *Othello* and *One Night the Moon* were compared successfully using the tragic hero and race, power, trust. Some excellent essays were also produced on *Blade Runner* and other texts.

This question required candidates to focus on the ways in which the central ideas of two substantial texts are developed through the use of a morally flawed character. Answers which addressed *Othello* and *One Night the Moon* varied in the identification of the characters who were morally flawed. Strong responses discussed morally flawed characters as tragic heroes, a convention of the genre. Candidates are reminded that they must revise and remember characters’ names. A number of responses did not refer to the character, Rose, by name, calling her the mother, Emily’s mother, Mrs Ryan and Emily (her daughter’s name)! These seemingly small errors are of greater significance when the discussion is one that centres on characters. Good responses identified the ways in which characters are developed, while less successful responses wrote as if the characters were real people. Strong responses to *Othello* drew on direct quotations from the play, while weaker responses retold.

**Question 7**

Again this was a fair question and candidates produced some pleasing responses, mostly selecting to choose only one of the options: either power or freedom or oppression; however some chose power and/or freedom/oppression, then added another theme of their own! It seemed that some were determined to write on what they knew best. Candidates handled this question better than the Comparative Text Question in Section A, possibly because they did not have to include a discussion of context as well.

Many candidates integrated a discussion of the compositional features into their discussion and were able to show how these features strengthened the ideas of the texts. The better responses moved well between the texts, pointing out similarities and differences between them.
INDEPENDENT STUDY – FOLIO

Most Candidates completed their Independent Study on ONE text from either the 2014 Prescribed Text list OR from the List of Additional Titles for Module 4. Very few candidates chose to include an additional text and those who did, wisely, paid most attention to the prose text.

The Focus of Your Independent Study

Candidates who performed well expressed their focus as a study question and showed a commanding understanding of Criterion 6.

There were many impressive critical responses in both the 1st and the 3rd person and both were equally acknowledged and rewarded for the insight of their analysis. Those candidates who wrote the more traditional 3rd person ensured that a personal interpretation and position was discernible in their writing.

Worryingly, quite a few Independent Studies did not include the focus question or statement on a cover page, preceding the Reflective Statement.

Popular texts in 2014 included the following:

Never Let Me Go 82
The Great Gatsby 52
The Kite Runner 40
Blade Runner (Director’s Cut) 31
Emma 23
The Reluctant Fundamentalist 22
Ransom 18
Skin 18
The Buddha in the Attic 18
If This is a Man 17
Elizabeth 16
All That I Am 14
Behind the Beautiful Forevers 13
Tess of the D’Urbervilles 9
Traitor 9
Wanting 9
Antigone 8
On the Waterfront 8
Paradise Road 8
Regeneration 8
Sophie Scholl 8
The God of Small Things 8
The French Lieutenant’s Woman 7
The Importance of Being Earnest 7
The Power and the Glory 7
The Secret River 7
Hamlet 6
Some candidates included the word count of their reflective statements in their total word count. This often meant that when the count was adjusted, the study was under the word limit by more than 10%. Candidates are encouraged not to include lengthy quotations but rather to embed small quotes within their own sentences, providing analytical comment on them. Some candidates had quoted extensively and had not deducted the quotes from the word count which also led to penalties being applied for being under the word count.

**The Reflective Statement**

Nearly all candidates wrote between 450 - 600 words and recognized that the Reflective Statement is **NOT** part of the word count.

All Reflective Statements were written in the first person as instructed. In some cases, The Reflective Statement was not the first page of your Independent Study, which was odd because the RS should inform the reading of the town two components.

Unfortunately, many Reflective Statements did not follow the instruction to:

- give markers an understanding of your intentions for your chosen focus
- explain the relationship between your stated focus and both the imaginative and critical responses
- outline the way(s) in which your imaginative response relates to the critical response
- analyse the influence of chosen text(s) on your own ideas, values and perspectives
- outline any independent investigation/research you may have carried out as part of your Independent Study.

Consequently, they did not support the Critical and Imaginative as comprehensively as it could have been possible.

Stronger statements were evaluative and showcased a strong personal platform in relation to the chosen text. The link between the critical and imaginative components was also addressed in detail by most candidates and this is part of the ‘intent’ of the Imaginative response as specified in the marking criteria for Criterion 5.

Weaker statements continue to include unnecessary detail about abandoned texts and inappropriate lengthy descriptions about reasons for choice of text. Candidates often did not address criterion 6 sufficiently, expressing own ideas, values and perspectives in relation to text.

The marked unevenness of expression, complexity and sophistication between the Critical component and the RS suggests that too many candidates are still rushing their reflective statements, seeing them as less important than the other two components.

Some Reflective Statements were merely a retelling of the plot. Candidates now have 450-600 words to reflect on their work and to address Criterion 6 by explaining the effect of the text(s) on their thinking and values. Some candidates did not take advantage of the opportunity to demonstrate their reflective
thinking and writing skills and completed only short responses. The better responses included a detailed explanation of the way in which the candidates’ ideas, values and perspectives had been influenced by the text(s).

Stronger responses reflected on how their personal context influenced their interpretation on the text. It is important to be explicit about the form of the Imaginative Response in the Reflective Statement. Most candidates explained how the Imaginative and Critical Responses connected in terms of ideas, and sometimes setting; but few specified form. In some cases, discerning the form was difficult, even when reading the piece.

**The Critical Response**

This was, typically, the strongest piece in the Independent Study which suggests that the time allocation given to the all three pieces was uneven.

The task for the critical response is to express a personal position and examine your own ideas, values and perspectives and those of others by critically reflecting on the text(s). Writing in the third person does not preclude you from doing this.

Nearly all CRs were at least 1 800 words. Candidates and teachers must be mindful that the combined Imaginative and Critical responses in 2015 must be between 3 000 and 3 300 words.

A critical response is different from a reflective response. A critical response is formed after _consideration_ of a close examination of the text, its context and other perspectives. Candidates must consider how this information interacts with their personal context and informs their own response.

Many candidates seemed to be following the guidelines for the ‘Analytical Response’ from the English Studies course. They referred to this component as ‘my analytical’. The Folio Guidelines referred candidates to the course criterion standards, pages 16, 17, 18 to help focus their thinking. The ‘others’ ideas, values and perspectives’ in Criterion 6 implies a range of perspectives will be considered and the descriptors for Criterion 6 identify some changes in emphasis from the previous year’s course: ‘composers’ perspectives’, ‘influence of texts and language on own ideas, values and perspectives’.

A carefully phrased question is essential for a successful critical response. To evaluate textual integrity as part of a _critical_ reflection, an analysis of compositional features is required; to express a personal position, candidates needed to reflect on the influence of the text on their own ideas, values and perspectives. The most successful questions made specific reference to both of these components. This often involved a two part question. General statements followed by ‘Discuss’ or very general questions which could have applied to many texts limited the capacity of the candidate to demonstrate a detailed understanding of the text.

Generally this part of the study was the most pleasing and there were many candidates who carefully analysed texts in relation to set focus questions, carefully selecting evidence and quotations to support the candidates’ ideas. The better critical responses also demonstrated an ability to skilfully integrate a discussion of the candidates’ own ideas, values and perspectives into the analysis of others’ ideas. Only a few candidates identified some of the contextual features shaping personal responses to texts.
Pleasingly, some candidates included alternative readings of the text(s) and accurately acknowledged the sources for such information. Most candidates correctly referenced their work and provided accurate Bibliographies and Reference Lists at the end of the Independent Study.

Accurate use of grammatical conventions, spelling and punctuation was generally stronger in this part of the Study than elsewhere; however, candidates need to take care when using semi-colons as frequently these are replacing commas and being incorrectly used.

Far too many candidates are not treating characters as fictional constructs of the composer. This led to many pedestrian statements that implied the characters were real people. Teachers need to make this point clear with candidates as such statements severely affect the sophistication of the folio.

By contrast, critical components that showed understanding of texts as purposeful constructs were outstanding and sophisticated. These candidates were able to use present tense when discussing characters and plot as constructs, and past tense when referring to historical and cultural contextual information relevant to their text. Such sophisticated critical writing showed candidates’ understanding of the complexity of the issues explored and how composers can create characters to highlight such issues. There were some outstanding critical components written in the third person which were complemented with reflective statements explaining personal contextual information resulting in the position adopted in the study. Such positions included literary perspectives such as Feminist and Marxist readings.

It is pleasing to see an improvement in referencing this year with both in text referencing and bibliographies. Weaker candidates only provided brief bibliographies, sometimes neglecting to reference the primary text and to include in text referencing. A list of URLs is not appropriate. The UTAS referencing page has some very useful guidelines on referencing the primary text.

In the critical responses it was noted that candidates often made sweeping statements and generalisations about historical and cultural contexts. While the attempt to identify contextual change is acknowledged, it is important to provide specific details. Candidates must use authoritative sources and not rely on online study guides. For the most part, these guides were cited, with only some folios containing errors when using and maintaining systems of referencing. Candidates should avoid providing long bibliographies whilst offering little or no in-text citation.

When crafting the critical response it is important to avoid re-telling the events of the plot. Strong responses selected relevant evidence from the text and analysed it while weaker responses paraphrased narrative events. Direct quotations from texts must be cited.

Although wide reading is encouraged, candidates are cautioned against overly heavy reliance on study guides, and should avoid the study becoming only a review of reviewers and expert opinion. Such resources should inform candidates, who would then develop, refine and articulate their own ideas and attitudes through reflection and critical engagement with the text/s.

**The Imaginative Response**

The intention of the 2014 IS Guidelines was to foster a sense of parity between the word lengths for the Critical and the Imaginative Response but candidates were not penalized for not adhering to these word counts due to the wording of the Examination Specifications.
The **imaginative response** must will relate clearly to the critical response and serve as another way of showing knowledge and understanding of the chosen text(s).

A number of candidates used the ideas in their analytical response as the link, presenting pieces that were contextually outside the focus text. This was often successful but candidates must ensure the connection is clear and developed throughout their piece. Imaginative pieces which presented possible scenarios that could have occurred within the prescribed text were often successful.

Effective and engaging pieces were crafted when the candidate had a clear understanding of the form they had selected. Misunderstanding of the texts’ characters or events were often revealed in the imaginative response. Successful forms were descriptive snapshots, scripts and re-contextualised narrative prose. Diary entries were often a less successful choice of form.

A title is an excellent way to convey meaning and the intent of the piece; unfortunately, few candidates availed themselves of this opportunity in the Imaginative response.

Imaginative Response was often of inferior quality to the Critical Response. Weaker responses involved summary, description or repetition of aspects of the text; stronger responses were highly original and further developed understanding demonstrated in the in Critical Response, as well as adding new insight into the text through further developing aspects of plot, setting and character.

Those candidates who could add an extra dimension to their discussion of the text(s) whilst still linking their response to ideas explored in the Critical Response were rewarded. The most successful imaginative responses showed a preparedness to ‘play’ with language and to integrate literary and stylistic features into the piece; for example, writing from a particular character’s perspective which endeavoured to capture the voice of the character was rewarded.

Some candidates’ writing was derived from the style of other authors who have been prepared to use a range of stylistic features and literary techniques and such experimentation was acknowledged in the Reflective Statement; one candidate acknowledged Markus Zusak’s writing style as the inspiration behind his or her piece as well as explaining the reasons for adopting such a style. Another outstanding response on *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* imitated Hardy’s style as well as reflecting themes commonly found in his texts.

There were very few multi-modal texts produced but those which were included were of a pleasing standard. Candidates generally explained the content and the links with the Critical Response in the Reflective Statement.

The stronger creative components immediately engaged the marker with their control of writing techniques; wide vocabularies, believable and unpredictable characters, understanding of pace and interesting ideas and themes explored. Such strong responses were addressed in detail in the reflective statements, detailing the compositional features the candidate had utilised and to what effect. Strong candidates’ personal positions were also evidenced in their imaginative responses, voiced through the characters.

When using references/quotes from any text, this must be acknowledged through a referencing system and this is also applicable in the IR.
### Award Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year</strong></td>
<td>8% (44)</td>
<td>21% (116)</td>
<td>49% (272)</td>
<td>22% (124)</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year</strong></td>
<td>12% (65)</td>
<td>18% (100)</td>
<td>40% (224)</td>
<td>30% (165)</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year (all examined subjects)</strong></td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years</strong></td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years (all examined subjects)</strong></td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Distribution (SA or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This year</strong></td>
<td>31% (171)</td>
<td>69% (385)</td>
<td>69% (381)</td>
<td>31% (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year</strong></td>
<td>32% (176)</td>
<td>68% (378)</td>
<td>67% (371)</td>
<td>33% (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous 5 years</strong></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>