As in previous years, the 2012 examination report provides feedback for candidates about performance on this examination and indications for how future candidates may improve performance in relation to examiners’ expectations of material covered and criteria addressed. The examiners’ comments are not meant to be an informal expansion of the course.

The 2012 report necessarily repeats and re-emphasises certain previous report comments. Candidates are advised to read all previous reports carefully, and to avail themselves of the advice and direction given. Examiners stress the importance of showing understanding of material for each unit of the course.

**Written Examination Paper**

As with previous years, there was recognition that many candidates were well prepared for definitions and explanation of psychological terms and concepts. All questions directed the candidate to refer to the stimuli to demonstrate understanding of concepts, yet weaker candidates still did not effectively use stimulus information.

Again, to analyse and evaluate ideas and information candidates need to be aware that they should be able to analyse and evaluate the evidence, explanations and concepts they are dealing with, not simply reproduce the presented stimulus information.

Re-writing long quotations from the stimulus is not necessary (especially without comment).

This year it was pleasing to see a generally good standard of spelling, grammar and handwriting legibility.

For the vast majority of candidates information was also communicated clearly and the information flowed.

**Section A – Remembering**

**Question 1**

This question was completed to a strong standard by most candidates who displayed well prepared and thorough knowledge of the concepts relevant to remembering; the multi store model, working memory and semantic networks were commonly included in great detail by many candidates.

Levels of processing Theory was often somewhat confused.

Retrieval was most commonly linked to cued recall as suggested in the stimulus.
The knowledge of the multi-store model in particular was impressive, although it is recommended that candidates try to develop their understanding more clearly about the empirical evidence which supports this (or not), and other models, in order to really demonstrate a more sophisticated understanding that can be rewarded at the highest level.

Candidates attempted to define all three concepts and to relate these concepts back to Stimulus 1 and Stimulus 2 explaining and identifying the points of interest in the stimuli.

Stronger answers used the stimuli as a prompt to illustrate and enhance their argument, rather than simply repeating what was said in the stimuli.

Weaker candidates who had not prepared beyond the basic referred only to the stimulus material.

Criterion 3

- Candidates who had prepared a wide range of types of evidence were best positioned for this Criterion
- Strong responses when explaining the process involved in storing information in memory were detailed and provided various pieces of empirical evidence which was well cited; case studies and general examples were also employed
- Most candidates included Atkinson and Shiffrin and Craik and Lockhart’s Models. Stronger responses also provided other empirical evidence (eg Baddeley’s Working Memory), previous experiments (eg Sperling, Miller, Peterson and Peterson) and other key concepts (eg maintenance and elaboration).
- Better responses also included Consolidation and Semantic Network Theory as other types of memory storage and organisation.

Criterion 5

- Strong candidates were able to clearly define each concept and relate these strongly to both stimulus pieces.
- Stronger responses when defining Levels of Processing mentioned visual encoding, auditory and semantic encoding or shallow, intermediate and deep. Responses also discussed the graph results in detail and included similar studies conducted on Levels of Processing and compared the results to Hyde and Jenkins study.
- Stronger responses when defining Long Term Memory discussed Atkinson and Shiffrin’s model of memory (sensory, short-term and long-term). Candidates also included Tulving and discussed Procedural and Declarative (Episodic and Semantic) in detail.
- Stronger responses provided ‘real life’ examples to show deeper understanding of the concept being discussed.
- Stronger responses when defining Retrieval analysed encoding, storage and retrieval and included types of retrieval cues, The Semantic Network Theory and mnemonic devices which were related back to evidence provided in Stimulus 2.
Stronger responses also mentioned the roles Recall, Recognition and Relearning in aiding retrieval.

Question 2

Pre-learned answers were obvious as these included a section on techniques to enhance memory (which was not required information by the question).

Some candidates completely missed out parts of the question.

Some answers doubled up by using the answer to part (a) (interference theory/motivated forgetting) as their answer to part (b); better answers provided additional causes.

Better answers related their explanations of forgetting back to the stimulus items or other questions (eg, some linked the forgetting curve with decay theory).

Criterion 3

- The question asked candidates to provide evidence for at least 3 causes of forgetting. Better answers described 3 theories in detail, and provided 2 – 3 pieces of relevant research which were explained to support their answers.
- Poorer responses generally drew on the stimulus items more extensively and used these as evidence rather than extrapolating.
- The researchers associated with the stimulus pieces do not constitute sufficient evidence.
- It is not sufficient to put a researcher’s name in brackets without any supporting evidence.

Criterion 5

- Generally, criterion 5 was well addressed.
- Better answers showed knowledge and understanding of the 3 concepts, relating them to the stimulus material and introduced 3 other causes of forgetting.
- Better answers went beyond simple descriptions of each element of the question, and showed understanding through confident use and application of the terms.
- Some candidates ignored one, or both, of the stimulus pieces.
- Candidates addressed motivated forgetting and interference in part a and stronger responses addressed different theories in part (b) – demonstrating a wider knowledge of the theories of forgetting.
- Many candidates showed a lack of familiarity with Ebbinghaus’ theory and/or research design.
Section B – Psychobiological Processes

Question 3

Candidates had prepared for this question by thoroughly learning the ‘visual perception principles’ i.e. Gestalt/Depth/Constancies. There was a pattern of ‘dumping’ everything about all three sets of principles, in detail without attempting to make relevant links to the stimulus material.

Many candidates addressed the stimulus material and nothing else or only wrote about top down and bottom up and Gestalt principles without addressing all stimuli.

Stronger candidates were able to provide solid empirical evidence for each area discussed.

Most candidates addressed part (b) where they were asked to analyse and evaluate evidence with reference to perceptual set.

Evaluation of the evidence was more difficult and ignored by many.

Criterion 3

- Stronger candidates had prepared thoroughly for this criterion and consequently had an understanding of a range of empirical studies which they could integrate into their answer to explain how perception allows us to make sense of the word.
- Weaker responses included little or no evidence apart from the stimulus material.
- Candidates need to have a range of evidences other than the stimulus material to support their argument.
- Many candidates were able to provide evidence for part (b) but only gave explanation and/or examples in part a.
- Stronger candidates were able to provide empirical evidence well for both sections.

Criterion 4

- There was some good analysis of the stimulus material.
- Stronger candidates provided evidence and then were able to analyse and evaluate it to show the significance of perceptual set in perception.
- Stronger answers outlined ‘Top-Down’ theories of perception including the role of the various psychological factors which establish a perceptual set and the impact of this on an individual’s perception.
- Better answers evaluated these by comparing to ‘Bottom-Up’ theories of perception as well as Neisser’s ‘Interactionist’ view.
- Strong answers also analysed the stimulus material in evaluating each of these theories of perception.
- Weaker candidates supplied no evidence or cited evidence without making connecting statements to the question.
Question 4

There was a wide variety of answers, well spread across all ratings.

Many candidates addressed the question well allowing the question to guide their systematic response.

Candidates frequently referred to a comparison between NWC and ASC (sleep and dreaming) explaining the common characteristics of each, giving specific examples and identifying strengths and weaknesses (evaluation) of the different sleep (and dreaming) theories.

Criterion 3

- A significant number of candidates answered parts (a) and (b) separately. It was easier to do this as the 2 parts were difficult to reconcile into a single answer and responses became disjointed.
- Weaker responses focused almost entirely on describing the stimuli only and not addressing the other information required to fully answer the question. This was particularly true for stimulus 1.
- A large number of answers concentrated on dream theories. Candidates were obviously well prepared for this.
- Some candidates did not address the theories of sleep. This may have occurred due to the nature of stimulus 2 which generally was not well explained.

Criterion 4

- There was a tendency for responses to be content driven, with little or minimal analysis and evaluation.
- Stronger responses gave evidence of some kind relating to theories, research and examples.
- Weaker responses merely described the stimuli and had little relevant specific content. This may have been due to the fact stimuli encouraged repetition of content rather than any actual analysis.

Section C – Individual Differences

Question 5

Overall this question gave candidates the chance to display their knowledge and understanding and many answers were comprehensive and detailed.
Candidates were able to distinguish between sexual identity and gender identity and better answers also included explanations of how these concepts related to gender roles and stereotypes.

On the whole candidates were able to comment on environmental influences on gender and discuss a range of biological influences.

Stronger responses outlined some of the gender differences, mentioning aspects of behaviour e.g. aggression and multi-tasking as well as cognitive abilities, then went on to discuss the various influences of the agents of socialization such as family, peers, school and media as well as social learning theory and related relevant experiments such as Bandura’s Bobo doll.

Stronger responses also mentioned other theories such as Kohlberg’s cognitive development theory, Bem’s Schema theory, Cultural Relativism, Vygotsky’s Social Cultural theory and Freud’s Psychoanalytic theory and again related relevant experiments to support points suggesting that environmental influences gender development.

A range of biological influences were discussed, including: chromosomal, hormonal, SDN (brain sex), the size of the corpus callosum. This evidence was supported with reference to a range of experiments and case studies e.g. Batista boys; Mr. Blackwell; Daphne Went and the range of intersex cases.

Stronger candidates made the link from animal studies to human behaviour.

Criterion 4

- Most candidates made a good attempt at analysing and evaluating information and various research studies.
- Candidates do need to refer to and analyse the stimulus pieces, evaluating the ideas presented in as much detail as possible.
- On the whole candidates were able to compare biological influences with alternative explanations.
- Better responses were able evaluate the research into biological influences and then make the comparison with alternative explanations and analyse these.
- Weaker candidates made only fleeting reference to the stimulus pieces and some ignored Stimulus 2 and presented only a very limited range of biological evidence.

Criterion 5

- In general candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of the concepts of sexual identity, gender identity and environmental influences on gender.
- Most candidates were able to define and explain gender identity but some struggled to give an accurate definition of sexual identity. As this is one of the key concepts mentioned in the course document, candidates should be familiar with it.
Strong candidates were able to define the concepts and then expand on each by referring to relevant theories and/or studies. Eg with sexual identity, candidates were able to discuss the main features of sexual identity and then refer to intersex cases to support their points.

With gender identity reference to gender dysphoria and resultant trans gender issues as well as androgyny were discussed.

**Question 6**

The majority of candidates had obviously prepared carefully for this question and wrote very lengthy responses demonstrating a very sound understanding of this area.

Some candidates presented well-rehearsed answers but needed to tailor this to more closely fit the question. Launching into the nature versus nurture debate did not always lead to a sound discussion of the set question.

Some areas of concern were the variations in the citing of correlation coefficients for the twin studies and the use of animal studies to demonstrate the effect of the environment, the incorrect spelling of essential concepts and the detail given on intelligence testing.

**Criterion 4**

- Stronger responses used the terms of the question and referred to biological influences before a discussion of environmental influences and the interactionist perspective and provided an evaluation of these as alternative explanations.
- Better responses made good use of the stimulus material and could link to biological and the environmental influences.
- Good use was made of the Flynn effect and how this was demonstrated in stimulus 2.
- Good use was also made of the interactionist perspective, - reaction range and the rubber band hypothesis and how this was demonstrated in stimulus 2.
- Candidates need to be mindful of how they ‘analyse and evaluate’ and this was clearly seen where the nature of the debate was being assessed.

**Criterion 5**

- The key concepts intelligence, heredity and environmental influences were generally well defined and linked to the relevant stimulus material.
- Some candidates spent too long on the concept of intelligence to the detriment of the remainder of their response; a lengthy discussion on how IQ is measured was not really warranted.
- Better answers were those that defined intelligence and briefly discussed Spearman or Wechsler and/or Gardner and were able to link these to Helfgott’s musical intelligence in stimulus 1.
• Candidates need to ensure they clearly link to the stimulus - stating ‘as shown in stimulus 1’ or to write (stimulus 1) is not sufficient to link.
• The concept of Heredity was generally well defined and explained through some reference to empirical evidence and the use of the graph in stimulus 2.
• Candidates defined environment and provided studies which demonstrated the effect of the environment through deprivation and enrichment studies.
• Candidates also used stimulus 2 to highlight the effect of environment on the IQ scores of the higher and lower social classes presented in the graph.

Question 7

A small number of candidates answered this question

The stimuli were appropriate, although the amount of detail in each made analysis under exam conditions challenging.

There were some excellent responses.

Criterion 4

• Better answers defined key terms, with reference to the stimuli and appropriate concepts such as heredity (hereditability), shared and non-shared environments and explained a variety of trait/type theories of personality.
• Stronger responses supported this with extensive evidence (research studies such as Bouchard’s family resemblance studies and theories of personality, such as Cattell’s source traits and Myers-Brigg’s Type A, B, C) relevant to the role of genetic and environmental factors and their interaction.
• Stronger responses made some evaluation/ comparisons between the different perspectives.
• Weaker responses paid little attention to the stimuli or merely re-writing or describing them, rather than providing any analysis of what they represented or the perspectives to which they related.
• A number of answers were very brief, unsupported and generalized. These demonstrated little actual psychological knowledge, analysis or evaluation.

Criterion 5

• Many candidates were well prepared to discuss a range of theoretical approaches to personality and its development including trait/type, humanistic, psychoanalytical, person-situation, social/cognitive as well as behavioural genetic perspectives. These were support with relevant research and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each in relation to genetic and environmental factors.
• Stronger responses provided clear accurate explanations of the concepts in the question, such as personality traits and type theories, including a variety of theories of personality and self (incorporating parts (a) and (b)).
• Weaker responses appeared to be unprepared as these were very brief, generalized and subjective demonstrating little actual knowledge or understanding of specific concepts, research, theories, or perspectives about the influences on personality.

Folio – Investigation Project

Candidates and teachers are referred to previous assessment report’s as comments were again very similar to past findings.

Ethics and referencing stand out as consistent issues with folios.

It appears some candidates did not read the guidelines, or are not aware of the importance of these. The most important points of the guidelines need to be emphasised, to ensure candidates address ethical or referencing issues.

Teachers and candidates are reminded of their responsibility to conduct research which is not likely to cause any harm at all to participants. Teachers must not approve and candidates must not conduct research designed to place participants under duress or which is likely to arouse worrying memories. Candidates must not approach people whom they know to have suffered traumatic events or who are undergoing treatment, to participate in IP research related to their topics

Some candidates mention that all ethical considerations were attended to and others refer to an appendix. Ethical issues must be addressed in the report.

Most candidates had made a sound effort at investigating and conducting research on a relevant topic.

In Psychology there is overlap between modules. Some reports clearly focussed on other issues with the ‘learning’ element hardly mentioned.

More competent responses were characterised by well-structured, considered, and very articulate discussions and analyses which clearly identified the connection between empirical evidence and primary data collected through the experimental process.

Referencing relates to academic integrity issues.

Criterion 1:

Assessment for Criterion 1 is based on the quality of report.
The scaffold provided in the Guidelines effectively allowed most candidates to achieve some measure of success in meeting the requirements of the task.

Many projects were 1000 words or less in length.

Some reports were questionable in terms of their appropriateness to the topic.

Candidates who did not carefully formulate an appropriate research design struggled to adequately fulfil the specifics of the task, especially the requirement that they analyse and discuss researched and experimental data in the context of their original hypotheses.

The three different types of sources are required to be used substantially – not just one type of source eg internet, used to find stimuli for study

There is an expectation candidates will link their topic to course content in the introduction.

The wording of hypotheses was often poor with some candidates not clearly stating their hypothesis.

Method and procedure must be clear.

In some folios it was difficult to decipher what exactly participates had to do, because there was insufficient information as to the method.

Many candidates misunderstood the type of sampling method they were using and did not explain why they had chosen this method.

Many candidates omitted to identify the IV and DV when using an experiment.

Some experiments were not explained in sufficient detail; candidates assumed the examiner was familiar with the apparatus referred to in their IP.

Results section often included raw data and graphs without an explanationdescriptor or multiple graphs when a summary of the data in one graph was all that was necessary or indeed discussed

Graphs need to present data clearly and contrastingly

Tables and graph need an explanation as to what they are saying; in many cases the candidate left interpretation of the results to the examiner.

All figures need to be numbered and vertical and horizontal axis need to be labelled with an explanation, not just numbers.

Results tables are of little benefit if the examiner does not know what questions the participants are being asked.
Many candidates just analysed their results and proceeded no further.

A large part of the discussion was taken up with the analysis and little if any reference back to key evidence.

Candidates in many cases did not refer to the empirical evidence they cited in their introduction in their analysis and discussion.

Candidates found it very difficult to relate the collection of qualitative data to secondary sources.

Candidates need to avoid lengthy discussion of limitations

Referencing (in-text and list) must be accurate, especially of websites and consistent to APA referencing style.

Referencing must be consistent between in-text and the reference list. Many listed a page of internet sites on their reference page but did not cite these in their actual IP.

Candidates should use a psychology dictionary for definitions.

Candidates must refer to their Appendices.

There is no need for candidates to include their completed experiment sheets in the Appendix, one example will suffice.

Proof reading of work is necessary. IPs must be carefully checked for spelling / grammar before submitting.

**Criterion 7:**

Assessment for Criterion 7 is based on processes used to examine the topic.

Important here to make sure that the task to be tested did relate specifically to the examined module.

Most candidates were able to undertake a small scale experiment involving a variety of learning tasks and integrating their findings with appropriate secondary source information.

Strong contributions sought to replicate or vary slightly primary empirical research which they had researched and applied well to their hypotheses.

It is important candidates present a clear aim and hypothesis for their study that is testable and able to be evaluated in light of the data obtained.
Some clearly inappropriate topics were submitted – alcohol was not to be used under any circumstances.

Some candidates had complicated or multiple hypotheses which they found difficult to test.

In some instances the report focussed only on the primary source data with little reference to information from secondary sources.

Background information from different types of sources needs to inform study.

The Method/procedure must be clear. Some candidates’ procedure was unclear which made it difficult to ascertain validity of their personal study.

Some candidates chose complicated experimental procedures, which were difficult to clearly explain.

With any research, there are always ethical considerations. Even if a questionnaire was used, the researcher still has a responsibility to inform participants of their rights regarding confidentiality, freedom to withdraw etc. It is not sufficient to state that there were no ethical issues with the research.

Too often there was not enough attention paid to Ethics. Participants need to be asked if they consent to participate. This includes children, even if a parent or teacher has given consent for the children to participate.

If a disclaimer is in the Appendices then it must be referred to in the report.

Debriefing in many of the topics covered was integral to the study.

The IV and DV of experiment must be identified.

Candidates did not fully/clearly outline the procedure they utilised making it difficult to understand how they controlled/manipulated the variables in their investigations.

There did seem to be a lack of critical evaluation/reflection on the validity of the research instrument in testing learning principles.

A small sample size needs to be identified as a limitation of the research. Some IPs made big claims on behalf of research which had only a few subjects.

It was notable that relatively few candidates considered the nature of the task to be a factor which could have influenced their results.

Lengthy information on procedure/research design limited the opportunity for a high quality analysis and discussion.
Careful analysis and discussions of findings is necessary to draw appropriate inferences from data obtained. The implications from findings in light of prior research needed to be included.

The processes undertaken will provide support for but do not ‘prove’ the hypothesis.

A key aspect that identified stronger reports was the capacity to integrate a range of relevant psychological concepts into the Analysis/Discussion in the light of their data / findings. This demonstrated higher level analytical/synthesis skills and was also reflected in the ability to critically reflect on their own research design process.
###Criterion 1 - Use evidence to support a psychological view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>construct and sustain a convincing psychological view</td>
<td>construct and sustain a psychological view</td>
<td>present a psychological view</td>
<td>present a view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the psychological view with relevant psychological evidence (including theory, research and/or examples)</td>
<td>Support the psychological view with relevant psychological evidence (including theory, research and/or examples)</td>
<td>support the psychological view with basic psychological evidence (including theory, research and/or examples)</td>
<td>referred to the stimulus only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draw logical conclusions</td>
<td>provide some relevant justifications</td>
<td>draw basic conclusions</td>
<td>No conclusion drawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledge and explain information with reference to researcher or theories or text and date other than the stimulus provided</td>
<td>identify and explain with theories or researcher or text and date other than the stimulus provided</td>
<td>identify sources of key information with basic references other than the stimulus provided</td>
<td>basic referencing not attempted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###Criterion 2 - Analyse and evaluate ideas and information related to Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>give a detailed interpretation of information by providing sound justification</td>
<td>interpret information in a logical and relevant way</td>
<td>explain the relevant information</td>
<td>relevant information only basically referred to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically analyse using psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>analyse and interpret using some psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>briefly analyse using psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>briefly acknowledge some information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically evaluate the quality and validity of the information</td>
<td>evaluate the quality and validity of the information</td>
<td>recognise and use valid information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draw significant psychological conclusions</td>
<td>draw logical conclusions.</td>
<td>draw basic conclusions.</td>
<td>draw a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###Criterion 3 - Display knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts and ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>define, and show a clear and detailed understanding of, psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>define and show an understanding of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>define psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>limited use of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support by relevant examples (real life examples, the given stimulus and empirical evidence)</td>
<td>support by general examples (real life examples, the given stimulus and empirical evidence)</td>
<td>support ideas with simple examples (real life examples, the given stimulus and empirical evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify and explain a broad range of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>identify and explain range of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>identify and explain a limited number of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td>identify a limited number of psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use complex and sophisticated psychological concepts and ideas.</td>
<td>use appropriate psychological concepts and ideas.</td>
<td>use basic and common psychological concepts and ideas.</td>
<td>mentioned the basic psychological concepts and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>This year</td>
<td>11% (81)</td>
<td>19% (136)</td>
<td>43% (306)</td>
<td>27% (197)</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>11% (86)</td>
<td>17% (130)</td>
<td>40% (301)</td>
<td>31% (231)</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>40 %</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>This year</td>
<td>26% (185)</td>
<td>74% (535)</td>
<td>19% (139)</td>
<td>81% (581)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>24% (179)</td>
<td>76% (569)</td>
<td>22% (163)</td>
<td>78% (584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>