This is the second year of a demanding course with a demanding external assessment component. Four essays addressing four criteria each is a significant expectation. Teachers and future candidates need to be aware that candidates wishing to attain the highest award must address the expectations of all criteria including evidence (3) and analysis (4).

There were a number of responses that did not sufficiently address these criteria in the exam setting and a disappointing number who, despite straight ‘A’ internal results, provided little if any demonstration of ‘A’ level achievement on any part of the external assessment. The marking guide is quite clear about what is expected and future candidates would be well advised to make use of it throughout the year.

Candidates usually had a good grasp of relevant information on the topic they were addressing in their responses. However, as stressed in last year’s report, when a response contains ‘information only’ it will NOT be well rewarded. A well-rewarded response selects appropriate information, provides supporting evidence, conducts a structured well-reasoned argument and analyses and evaluates the information presented.

Markers must be able to read the response to reward candidates appropriately. Illegible writing is one problem. Writing that is too small is another, and responses written in pencil or faint pen a third.

Marking is based on rewarding evidence of achievement according to the criteria. The marking guide specifically, but not exhaustively, teases out the criteria to suit the tasks in the external assessment. Teachers and future candidates should be aware that markers will hunt for evidence of a criterion to reward if necessary, but when they have to do this the award on the relevant criterion is unlikely to be a high one.

A markers comment was not required when fewer than 10 candidates answered a question, but sometimes was provided.

Question 1

This year a Leunig cartoon again provided stimulus for discussion on the beliefs of a Religious Tradition. Most candidates benefitted from good instruction and/or read last year’s report and focussed their discussion on the beliefs of the Tradition they selected. Many were pleasingly familiar with these. The stimulus was usually used and often well used, and most responses were structured and reasoned.

Too many responses, however, resembled memorised lists and many did not discriminate between relevant and less relevant information. Evidence was more plentiful than last year but can also suffer from irrelevance. As can analysis, which most often in this question should be the linking of relevant behaviour or consequences, and implications or values, to the belief under discussion.
The main point of including relevant evidence is to show that the response is not merely the opinion of the candidate writing it, but is based on text, authority or expert opinion etc. (see marking guide). Criterion 3 also credits reasoned argument and its overlap with ‘evidence’ such as the use of examples or illustrations and the presentation of a coherent argument and consistent position.

*The following are comments from individual markers of the various responses to Question 1.*

**BUDHISM (164 responses)**

**Marker 1**

Most responses displayed a good awareness of essay structure and a competent knowledge of the basic beliefs of Buddhism. Excellent responses showed an awareness of the complexity of Buddhist beliefs-as-philosophy but too many were rote learned lists with the stimulus cartoon mentioned in passing.

**Criterion 1**

- All responses referred to the stimulus cartoon and applied it to their knowledge of Buddhist beliefs quite well, some a little strenuously. The stimulus does not replace depth or detail in respect to beliefs, it is a framework only.
- Too few responses discussed what might be meant by the term ‘human condition’, which would set up an essay on how/why Buddhism is focused on what it means to be a human being and how to recognise and deal with the universal difficulties of life.

**Criterion 2**

- Buddhist beliefs form a coherent and harmonious whole rather than a set of different statements about the ‘human condition’. Better responses recognised this and related the various components of Buddhist beliefs to each other. Other candidates mentioned them but did not examine these in any detail or how a particular belief was an outcome of another important teaching. (For example anatta or not self and the 5 skandhas or aggregates of each human individual inform each other since there is no ‘self’ over and above the skandhas. A flow diagram is useful to explore these links in the classroom which can then be transferred into a written outline of these links which are part of this criterion.)

**Criterion 3**

- Most responses included suitable quotes from authorities – the Buddha, the Dalai Lama - but not all candidates explained their actual relevance to Buddhist beliefs.

**Criterion 4**

- Belief as evident in practices is part of this criterion and good responses described such practices in detail and explained how they are logical outcomes of Buddhism’s belief system. For example the Eightfold Path is directly connected to the First Noble Truth of life as dukkha, a complex term which encompasses not just pain but the general unsatisfactoriness of the ‘human condition’. These implications must be discussed not
assumed to meet this criterion well. Meditation as an essential element of the Eightfold Path did not on the whole get the attention it warrants and the sublimation of the ego it aims to achieve could not then be noted.

- An evaluation of how well (or not) the Buddhist world view is an accurate one would have been welcome here but was not offered. Had the term ‘human condition’ been explored in the introduction this would have set up a link for this criterion and the conclusion.

**Marker 2**

The Leunig cartoon of the solitary figure positioned between two signs juxtaposed against each other lent itself nicely to a discussion of the inherent difference between ‘the way life is supposed to be’ and ‘the way life actually…is’ from a Buddhist perspective.

Strong candidates used the stimulus as a launching pad and solid foundation on which to showcase strong understanding of the core beliefs of Buddhism particularly pertaining to Dukha – the first Noble truth- the truth of suffering but also incorporating lovely references to the universal truths of the human condition as described in the three marks of existence and through the Buddhist search for Enlightenment. Confident use of terms was evident and pleasing to note. Candidates who avoided the temptation to simply list all they knew about Buddhism in favour of making deeper observations about the stimulus and its link to core beliefs were well rewarded for their efforts.

**Criterion 1**

- Some candidates left it far too late into their response to begin their analysis of the stimulus. The stimulus and the question should usually be addressed in the introduction and conclusion of the candidate’s response. Better responses often made passing links to the stimulus throughout their written answers.
- Weaker candidates made limited reference to the stimulus or alternatively deconstructed the stimulus and did not make links to the core beliefs of Buddhism, a balance between the two needed to be struck.

**Criterion 2**

- On the whole a very pleasing understanding of core beliefs in Buddhism. Candidates would be advised to take care with correct spelling and use of terms and concepts especially in Pali or Sanskrit.
- The 45-minute window should not present as a challenge to pack in as much knowledge as possible at the expense of more deep analysis of what are often profound concepts that warrant unpacking and examining. Stronger candidates opted for a more thorough examination of one or two of the 4 Noble truths rather than rattling of all four and then listing the elements of the Eightfold Path and 5 precepts for good measure.
- Weaker candidates had a more shallow understanding of Buddhist core beliefs.

**Criterion 3**

- It was pleasing to see the use of Buddhist parables, teachings and quotes from the Buddha and Dalai Lama being used so confidently and accurately as credible
evidences. Reference to other forms of evidence such as quotes from Buddhist teachers and scholars is also credible evidence and should be built upon and lauded.

Criterion 4
- Stronger candidates were able to build deep connections between core beliefs and the stimulus and discuss how a Buddhist would address or view some of the universal aspects of the human condition. Information that wasn’t supported by analysis of not only core beliefs but the implication for Buddhist adherents in terms of a lived faith were not rewarded on criterion 4.

ISLAM (54 responses)

Overall this question was well answered. Nearly all candidates proposed an interpretation of the stimulus and related it to Islam. Many responses covered beliefs of Islam, some chose to use the six articles of faith, others covered concepts such as hilm, jihad, niyyah and taqwa. One approach was to discuss the greater jihad which a Muslim undertakes as a spiritual or personal journey or struggle to submit to Allah. Some of these responses acknowledged that such surrender is not easy but that Muslims are guided by holy texts and the life of the prophet Muhammad. The 5 pillars were included by some as an important part of the journey towards full surrender to Allah. Such responses generally did well on Cr4, which asks for candidates to demonstrate understanding of the implications of a religious position. Responses which focussed on the 5 pillars, rather than core beliefs, generally did not address the criteria as well as those who incorporated the 6 articles of faith and other important beliefs.

Criterion 1
- Most candidates were able to directly answer the question and make some meaningful interpretation of the stimulus. Whether the candidate chose to propose one, or more than one interpretation, did not matter, as long as the link to core beliefs was established. That is to say, there were a range of different approaches to interpreting the stimulus and no single approach stood out as preferable, as long as the candidate could justify their interpretation and link it to core beliefs.

Criterion 2
- Most candidates were able to explain some core beliefs of Islam, including, tawhid, qadar, yawm-ad-din, taqwa, hilm, niyyah, jihad, akhirah. A few responses did not include any of these and covered some or all of the 5 pillars. The question specifically asks for beliefs, and so, sticking to the 5 pillars did not provide the candidate with much opportunity to address this criterion successfully.

Criterion 3
- Most candidates provided evidence to support their answer to the question and their discussion of core beliefs. This included: quotes from the Qurán and Hadiths, quotes or references to authorities, examples, references to historical figures and sacred stories - eg. Ibrahim's preparedness to sacrifice his son, consistent use of relevant facts.
• One point to consider was that whilst quotations from the Qurán were sometimes used effectively to support an argument, too often, quotations were arbitrarily ‘shoehorned’ into the essay; that is, they did not really fit well with the point the candidate was trying to make and perhaps reflected the candidate rote learning 2 or 3 quotes without a lot of thought going into how they might be used.

Criterion 4
• Sophisticated responses demonstrated the (possible) subtle and profound implications of a life lived in submission to Allah. Some candidates managed to capture the struggle of a person submitting to Allah and rejecting selfish whims and desires. Such candidates often connected this idea with religious beliefs such as jihad, hilm, niyyah, qadar and important practices such as hajj. For example, one candidate pointed out that to carry out Salat without the right intention (niyyah) renders that prayer worthless. Another candidate explained that to accept reversals of fortune as being a part of divine destiny, can be seen as part of a person's greater Jihad.

JUDAISM (25 responses)

Having the opportunity to review the markers comments from the 2011 exam it was disappointing to again read candidate responses which failed to identify core Jewish beliefs. Numerous answers focused on the values, history (holocaust), practises and culture of Judaism rather than the core beliefs and how they provide an adherent with meaning. While length is not always the determiner of a good essay, 12 of the 25 responses numbered less than two pages, responses need to be long enough to discuss a varied amount of information and thorough analysis.

Criterion 1
• Most candidates structured their answers well and managed to incorporate the stimulus into their discussion in a relevant manner. Many drew a parallel between the two signs in the stimulus and the choice a Jewish adherent has to live a good life. Numerous responses identified freewill and focused on the values of good or evil inclinations, discussing these at length rather than addressing the question of beliefs. Others ignored the question and instead delivered a discussion on the nature of God.

Criterion 2
• Very few responses made reference to the covenant or the covenantal relationship of God with the Jewish people. Many responses lacked mention of the observance to Jewish law. Those who were rewarded in this criterion recognised and named any knowledge of either the Torah, Talmud, halacha and/or mitzvots and demonstrated an understanding of the interconnection between faithful observance of the covenant in this life as the best way to achieve good relationship with God.

Criterion 3
• Across the board this criterion was the most poorly addressed. Very few responses made any specific references to Jewish terms or ideas, references of authority, sacred text or exact quotations. 1 response referred to the Exodus, 2 directly quoted mitzvots
and another 2 cited specific Articles of Faith. Evidence should be presented and then explicitly commented upon.

Criterion 4
- The better responses also were able to evaluate some of the beliefs and analyse ways in which Jewish adherents find meaning from these faithful beliefs. A few candidates referred to differences in variants of the Jewish faith and allowed for nuances of beliefs and how variants interpret the Jewish laws and customs. Some Candidates provided insight and made interconnections with their ideas.

ABORIGINAL SPIRITUALITY

Only a few candidates responded in this section. The responses were competent to very good, with most candidates profitably choosing to take issue with the stimulus presented – and so to deeply explore the beliefs of aboriginal spirituality. The examiner deserves praise for selecting a simple stimulus which gave candidates good opportunity to display their knowledge of the issue.

CHRISTIANITY (30 responses)

A small number of candidates responded to this question using Christianity as the religious tradition; however, overall the answers were a high standard.

Better responses:

Criterion 1
- Proposed an answer to the set question using the stimulus. The variety in interpretation of the stimulus was interesting to read both as a teacher and a marker. It is important for candidates to appreciate that a broad range of interpretations are possible and equally valid. The key is to make the interpretation relevant to the core beliefs of the tradition.
- Some successful answers followed one main interpretation of the stimulus and provided detailed lines of reasoning and justified the interpretation while other successful answers proposed several interpretations but with necessarily less depth.
- Responses were well structured, coherent and clear.
- What was critical in all cases was the consistent application and exploration of core beliefs of Christianity. Some responses focused on one major variant of Christianity as an example while others gave a more typical Christian perspective; however, stronger responses all appreciated the diversity apparent in Christianity and included examples to demonstrate this understanding.

Criterion 2
- Strong responses demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of Christian beliefs involving for example:
  - The nature of the Transcendent;
  - The meaning and purpose of human existence;
  - Morality involving teachings about how humans ought to live;
Understanding the nature and purpose of suffering; death and the afterlife.

Candidates did not necessarily have to cover each aspect in detail as it depended on the framing of their answer (usually established clearly in the introduction). Some responses did cover each of these aspects in some detail, while others chose to focus on one or two and explore them in detail. Certainly good answers demonstrated solid analysis and understanding of several relevant concepts, ideas etc and supported the discussion with appropriate examples.

What was apparent in all good responses was the ability to show clear understanding of the complex relationship between Christian beliefs and values and the expected behaviour of an adherent; i.e. the lens through which a Christian would see the world, live their life [and view the Leunig cartoon.]

Criterion 3

Good responses used a range of evidence to support propositions, claims and develop arguments in a reasoned way. Certainly, many candidates did rely on Biblical quotes which would be expected for this tradition but good responses also used other authorities and scholars to develop the discussion. Many candidates seemed well prepared with a range of evidence which also included secondary sources. Further, some candidates used contemporary examples to illustrate points effectively.

Candidates were able to draw sensible conclusions drawn from their discussion/argument and the evidence presented often built towards this conclusion in a coherent way.

Criterion 4

Good responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the link between living life and Christian beliefs and values and the challenges this may present. Candidates were able to appreciate the difficulty of enacting beliefs in a number of different situations. This depended very much on how candidates interpreted the Leunig cartoon. Some for example, saw this as a burden to be borne (carrying the Cross to develop a closer personal relationship with Christ) or as a triumph of Christian belief and behaviour as ‘the way life is supposed to be’. The central focus of the discussion was analysis of the impact of belief on behaviour for individuals within Christianity. This discussion may have focused on differences in variants within Christianity or the difficulty of putting belief into action for an individual for example.

Question 2

This question provided candidates with two challenges. The first was that the aspect ‘Structures, Practices and Festivals’ did not appear in the question as it does in the course. All other aspects did appear in the question as they do in the course. The other challenge was that the question appeared to be simple and straightforward, and it was. Apparent simplicity in a question can make it difficult for candidates to mount an argument in the manner that the criteria require them to.
Candidates do need to have something to say to do well on criterion 1. Repeating information alone does not rate highly, as mentioned elsewhere. Better responses have something to say about the aspect in general and the role it plays, as well as comments to make on the role of each individual example of the aspect that they discuss.

Candidates should also be mindful of the expectations of relevance that apply to all external criteria. Too many seemed to think that the basic teachings of the tradition they studied automatically encompassed the aspect they chose to discuss. For instance, 189 candidates chose to write on an aspect of Islam, but far too many of them thought that an explanation of the Five Pillars would suffice as a response to the question. In most cases it did not. Teachers and future candidates should be aware that a clear understanding of the particular aspect and its role in the tradition is required.

*The following are comments from individual markers of the various responses to question 2.*

**ISLAM**

*Structures, Practices and Festivals (49 responses)*

Responses that answered on any combination of Structures, Practices and Festivals were accepted due to the problem with this aspect in the question.

Whilst there were quite a few good and even excellent responses far too many candidates did not meet the expectations of one or more of the criteria. It is essential, for instance, that responses indicate that the candidate knows what structures, practices and festivals are (or in this year’s case structures, and/or practices and festivals). The response should also indicate an understanding of the importance of this aspect of the tradition.

**Criterion 1**
- Though candidates were offered nothing to ‘sink their teeth in to’ in the question, better responses were able to clearly ‘explain and evaluate the role’ that the aspect plays in the tradition. Most responses were also structured and reasoned. As a consequence almost all candidates received a satisfactory award on this criterion.

**Criterion 2**
- This was the strongest criterion for most candidates. Even the dreaded ‘five pillars, information only’ response could, at a stretch, lead to a satisfactory award if the candidate knew their pillars. Better responses that used the five pillars focussed on the specific practices or festivals associated with the pillar. Best responses answered the question with specific structures and/or practices and festivals.

**Criterion 3**
- Responses that provided evidence to back up their assertions usually did so quite well. There were a few memorised quotations thrown randomly in to the mix but not very many. More of a problem were the many responses with no obviously discernible evidence at all. In these cases a coherent argument or pertinent examples and illustrations were needed to salvage a pass award.
Criterion 4

- Candidates who answered the question had usually made a good start on this criterion. Those who presented information only on pillars, structures, practices or festivals had an uphill battle to obtain a pass award. It is necessary to link the aspect under discussion to beliefs, values, or behaviours as relevant, to address this criterion adequately. These are the implications (behaviours) and underlying assumptions (beliefs and values) most readily apparent when studying a religious tradition. The way an adherent lives their life is putting their beliefs into practice. Understanding this and the beliefs and values that underpin practice, involves quite sophisticated analysis. Providing appropriate evidence and illustration of this understanding reaps appropriate rewards on this criterion. In other words, explain a practice, structure or festival. Explain why it is important to a Muslim. Identify the key belief(s) that underpin this.

*Sacred Stories and Texts* (2 responses), *Lived Tradition: Personal Experience* (1 response) – no report

*Rituals* (138 responses)

**Marker 1**

Responses on the role of rituals in Islam were in the main disappointing as most made little attempt to explore the concept of rituals and their functions. Most answers did little more than quote a single line from the subject handbook: ‘Ritual can be described as the practice or lived expression of beliefs in a formal collective context’, and here the discussion ended.

Criterion 1

- Most candidates did quite well on this criterion as essays were generally well expressed, remained pertinent to the question and had sound structure. Teachers have clearly worked hard on the need for strong opening and concluding paragraphs with carefully organised material in between.

Criterion 2

- Most candidates did reasonably well in this criterion too, though, as was to be expected, many responses were little more than ‘information dumps’ for the ‘Five Pillars of Islam’. The majority of responses were descriptively strong and explained key terms adequately. Underlying beliefs needed to be more thoroughly examined – symbolic connections between belief and actions were only fruitfully examined by the better responses.

Criterion 3

- Responses were meant to discuss rituals in Islam; few bothered to go beyond the Five Pillars. Those which explained what differentiated rites of passage from rites of devotion and then went on to illustrate the differences and how they expressed beliefs were favourably assessed. At least half the responses contained well chosen quotations from the Qur’an or the Hadiths – though a surprising number failed to show how the textual references actually influenced the ritual. Very few secondary sources were used.
Candidates had obviously been encouraged to use lots of illustrations in their answers; most did so, though perhaps fewer rituals discussed in depth might have been a better way to go as discussion of the nature of ritual was superficial to say the least?

Criterion 4

- This was the criterion candidates found hardest to meet. Responses in Section A of the examination really ought to concentrate on showing the link between beliefs and behaviour. To enable this, key values which have grown out of beliefs need to be explored. Many candidates did not seem to be aware that this criterion really requires them to show how a religious tradition provides a sense of meaning and direction to the lives of its adherents; the construction of the ritual, its repetitive nature (or perhaps its occurrence once in a lifetime) provides nurture and support to its practitioners.

- Stronger candidates noted distinctions in beliefs and behaviour between schools in Islam (though there was not a single mention of Sufism). Few noted the significance of Muhammad and the fact that he had confirmed the frequency and form of the Five Pillars and that they have not much altered since his death. The significance of ritual to individual and community identity needed to be explained, not just noted. Perhaps candidates ought to be aware that one of the important functions (of rites of devotion in particular) is making contact with the transcendent – a notion mentioned in only one response.

Marker 2

A disappointingly large number of responses to this question made no attempt to connect rituals with beliefs despite the strong linkage made in the course document.

Satisfactory responses MUST address criteria 3 and 4. Candidates need to show an understanding and use of credible and relevant information. Ways of demonstrating credibility include direct quotation, allusion, paraphrase, references to sacred texts and to authority figures either within the tradition or expert about the tradition.

Candidates who achieved high ratings included components of analysis and evaluation throughout their responses, In this way they ensured that their responses were coherent, used the relevant evidence as it was cited, and kept the purpose of the question in view.

Candidates often failed to pursue the connection of rituals with beliefs although this is clearly the thrust of this unit. Such a connection should be made, whether or not the examiner has explicitly requested such connections to be made.

Candidates who did not present an integrated response invariably dumped a mass of ritual data, and if there was any consideration of connection with beliefs it was as a very weak ‘add-on’.

Just as a point of usage, many candidates when referring to Muhammad included the blessing (pbuh) after his name. This is an accepted and conventional use. Some however added the
same to their use of the name of Allah. This is not an accepted or conventional use, and may be a source of pain for a devout Muslim.

JUDAISM

_Sacred Texts (9 responses)_

Only nine candidates did the question on sacred texts and Judaism. On the whole it was badly done as candidates failed to link the importance of sacred texts to practices and the Jewish way of life. Many just said what the texts were and nothing else, writing little. A good response would have outlined the origins of Torah and Talmud, plus a reference to the rest of the Hebrew Bible, then said a bit about how the scrolls were written and treated with veneration, their role in Bar Mitzvah and becoming a Jew, the way in which the Ultra Orthodox regard studying Torah and Talmud as central to their lives, even when it gains them no income, and some reference to the stories contained in the texts linked to Shabbat and one or two festivals when the stories are read aloud. e.g. Pesach. Status and learning of Hebrew worth a mention too.

_Structures, Practices and Festivals – (5 responses) – no report_

_Rituals (45 responses)_

Responses on ritual in Judaism concentrated heavily on rites of passage - circumcision, the bar mitzvah and mourning and burial rituals constituted the bulk of the answers.

The ‘grapeshot’ approach seemed favoured. Candidates preferred to cover a wide range of rituals, rather than to examine two or three in detail. This meant many responses relied on description to the detriment of analysis – underlying beliefs and values and the deeper purposes of the ritual eluded most answers.

Criterion 1
• This was reasonably well done. Clearly candidates grasp the importance of well structured, well expressed essays which answer the question.

Criterion 2
• This was surprisingly well covered. Many candidates had learned the meaning of a wide range of Jewish terms and were determined to point out to the marker that they knew what the terms meant. They were duly rewarded. The descriptions of rituals, though often woefully brief, usually covered the essentials. Most responses covered at least five rituals, though there was seldom a good balance between rites of passage and rites of devotion. Surprisingly, very few touched on food laws despite the many answers on the Passover and the Sabbath.
Criterion 3
- This criterion was not so well covered as the first two. Many responses cited no authorities at all: some referred to the Torah; very few secondary resources were used. Most responses still passed the criterion as they provided so many examples to illustrate their arguments. Some candidates quoted extensively from the Torah and the Talmud and made excellent use of the passages they had chosen.

Criterion 4
- This criterion separated the strong responses from the weaker ones. The fact that many responses barely touched on foundational beliefs meant that they had difficulty explaining the practical significance of rituals associated with them. If nothing else, Judaism is a ‘religion of the deed’. Few answers pointed out the great assistance that patterned, ritualised behaviour could give to practising Jews; mourning rituals, for instance, are designed to bring the bereaved from sadness and anxiety back to normal life with its personal obligations, thus converting the memory of the departed into a sort of blessing. Only one answer noted that rituals presented Jews with a variety of ways to communicate with, or to remain in contact with, the world of unseen powers.

HINDUISM
3 Responses – no report

CHRISTIANITY (12 responses over all)

Only a small number of candidates answered this question using Christianity to explore their chosen aspect.

Generally, across the 12 candidates who answered this question the responses were disappointing. Unfortunately, most responses did not make clear links between the aspect of religion being discussed and beliefs underpinning it. Also responses tended to be purely descriptive. The aspect was explained but the ‘evaluation’ tended to be over looked. It was apparent that candidates sometimes seemed unclear about the nature of their aspect. Two candidates did well on this question and both ‘explained and evaluated the role their chosen aspect played in the religion’. While it was not deliberately stated that candidates needed to relate their aspect to beliefs (as in last year’s exam), ‘evaluat[ing] the role this aspect plays in [the] religious tradition’ strongly indicates this relationship needs to be explored.

The best responses:

Criterion 1
- Showed a clear connection between their selected aspect and the role this played in the religion.
- Responses outlined a clear proposition(s) especially in relation to ‘evaluation’ and explored this in a consistent and coherent way. The particular approach being taken was clearly framed up in the introduction.
- The discussion was well structured and organised.
Criterion 2

- Candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of the relationship between their aspect and Christian beliefs. Candidates may not have necessarily focussed on all possible beliefs. Some chose to focus on one or two to illustrate deep and sophisticated knowledge about the religious tradition. (again, this was framed up in the introduction).
- Candidates used relevant terminology and provided detailed explanation of their aspect, developing their discussion/argument with relevant examples.
- One candidate’s response used a particular variant of Christianity to illustrate the role the aspect played and they included rich and specific detail to effect.

Criterion 3

- Candidates presented a range of relevant evidence to support their discussion. This varied depending on the aspect being discussed. However, kinds of evidence included direct quotes from primary sources, such as the Bible, quotes from other authorities and scholars as well as secondary sources. Further sources of evidence included relevant examples, information and leading to sensible conclusions.

Criterion 4

- Candidates genuinely tried to illustrate the relationship between the aspect being discussed and Christian beliefs and behaviour. Again candidates sometimes used a particular variant to give specific examples that showed the diversity within the tradition and the inconsistencies in belief and practice, specifically in relation to the aspect being discussed.

Questions 3 – 6

In a general sense candidates who presented a descriptive or information based answer did not fare as well as those who presented an argument and backed it with evidence and analysis.

Comments from the particular marker for individual questions follow.

Question 3 (62 responses)

Of these 25 were on the Holocaust; 9 on impact of 11/9 on Islam; 8 on Aborigines; 8 on the Crusades; 7 on the Reformation; 4 on impact on Tibetan Buddhism of the Chinese occupation since 1950; and one obscure one about India and Hinduism after 1947.

General comment: clear need to avoid just recounting what happened in terms of a challenge and analysing the response to it. This led to a clear distinction between an A and a C in terms of assessment. Some answers were fairly clearly prepared with a number of quotations ready to go but this was OK if they were relevant. Still an issue with bad spelling and failure to use capital letters for proper nouns.
Judaism and the Holocaust: 25 responses. On the whole, this question produced a number of impressive responses, linking events to how Jews interpreted where G-D stood in face of their suffering during the period of the Third Reich and the 'final solution.' A number of candidates put their response in the context of a general overview of the Jewish history of persecution over 2,000 years and a number referred to the concept of the 'Shoah' and the idea of Yom Ha Shoah as a day of remembrance. Clearly a number of quotes and authorities had been learned in advance to back up the thesis advanced in the essay but as they were in context, they were used very well. One query is over the dating of the birth of Judaism - one candidate gave a definite date as 1812 BCE while another put 1900 BCE.

The events of 11/9 produced nine responses but for some reason they tended to focus on Islam in the United States which requires a fairly detailed response because of the diversity of Muslims in North America. Too many answers just described what happened.

Impact on Aborigines of White Settlement: eight candidates responded to this issue but the answers wandered a lot, some being limited to a description of what occurred while others analysed the Aboriginal response at a spiritual level. Issues raised varied from dispossession in 1788, Land Rights, and the Stolen Generation, and the impact of Christian missionaries, but a good answer had to refer to how Aboriginal spirituality responded and adapted to these events.

The Crusades brought eight responses but answers tended to describe the events rather than analyse the impact on Christianity and Islam.

The Protestant Reformation provoked seven responses but a good answer needed to look at the impact on both Catholicism and Protestantism.

**Question 4** (12 responses)

There were 12 answers - 6 looked at Christianity and its attitude to women, one to the current issue of sexual abuse, 5 focused on Islam and 1 on how Christianity adapted to the post-Darwinian advances of modern science threatening the very existence of religious faith. The answers on Christianity and women were poorly done, tending to be limited to what was happening in Australia and making the only distinction one between Catholics and Protestants. Given the backlash against the role of women in the Sydney Diocese of the Anglican Church, (let alone the vote in the UK against women as bishops), it was hardly fair to present Anglicans as progressive and Catholics as reactionary. Nor was there any reference to the nonconformist Protestant traditions where women are recognised - as in the Uniting Church, the Salvation Army and Quakers.

The essays on Islam and women were excellent with references to authorities on both sides, both progressive and hostile.
Question 5 (26 responses)

Too many responses were just rehearsed, referring to the views of a couple of scholars with very little or no critique. The best answers put the issue of ‘Who was Jesus?’ in a historical context of the time then referred to various theories covering his life and teachings. Several essays were very brief - is this because candidates ran out of time or didn't know anything? There is a major issue with spelling and some facts, e.g., Jesus was not born in Jerusalem.

Question 6 (41 responses)

There were 39 Responses on Secular Environmentalism. This question produced a wide range of responses but it needs to be made clear that Lynn White was not a secular environmentalist - he gave a speech as an academic in 1966 whereas Arne Naess needs to be acknowledged as the father of the concept of Deep Ecology in 1983. He was not, as one candidate asserted, a wilderness photographer in Tasmania who documented the destruction of Lake Pedder. A number of answers just focused on the views of writers like Aldo Leopold or dwelt a great deal on issues like evil and suffering while other candidates seemed preoccupied with ethics and suffering. These answers simply failed to respond to the second half of the question – ‘evaluate these attempts.’

A good answer would have referred to the wide spectrum of environmentalism, outlining the difference between an anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric position. It would have gone on to outline the criticism by monotheists of secular environmentalism as well as explaining the problems arising from Dominionism and awareness of the mess this approach to the planet has developed since the late 1960s.

(2 responses on Humanism)

Question 7 (34 responses)

Marker 1

This question attracted candidates who answered with a high level of analysis and a broad worldview.

Criterion 1

- This question closely followed three key points from the course and as such candidates were required to outline various arguments presented from both atheists and theists and weigh up the merits of these viewpoints in a rationale response. Most candidates addressed the first two points within their essay with a few leaving the final point as a summary point in their conclusion. A number of responses were one sided. (8 responses did not name a single atheist) A batch of responses wrote on philosophical proof of existence of God through Ontology, cosmology, teleology and miracles through religious experience yet left no room for debate about atheism. Thus these responses were not even handed in discussion and did not address the question.
Criterion 2
- Candidates selected appropriate and detailed material/information/concepts/arguments from the unit. They demonstrated detailed understanding of at least one atheist’s world view (often more) and contrasted this with specific details of theistic viewpoints (some from Islamic and Buddhism and not just Christian). Accurate use of terminology and a number of relevant examples were provided and used effectively to develop the argument and demonstrate a sophisticated understanding and appreciation of a range of perspectives from atheists and theists.

Criterion 3
- Candidates relied on quotes from atheists and theists alike to support and develop arguments, provided a range of relevant examples to illustrate points made; provided a range of data, facts, case studies to support their arguments. The arguments themselves provided a clear line of evidence to demonstrate clear thinking, logical progression of ideas, good counter-argument. Some responses fell on Darwin (*can he be classified as a militant contemporary atheist?) as the first and last point of reference to the argument presented by atheism.

Criterion 4
- This was the criterion where the strongest candidates demonstrated their superior analysis and evaluation, especially in relation to the aspect of the question that required them to engage with the dilemma of ‘harmonious co-existence’. Numerous candidates were able to consider the suggestions of the atheists/theists viewpoints, identify consistency/inconsistency in arguments and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in atheists/theists thought systems. The best responses addressed the issue of harmonious co-existence and suggested ways this could be achieved, such as through relativism in a pluralistic society. Many were able to use the evidence presented from commentators to guide their analysis and provide a variety of nuances between arguments.

Question 8 (209 responses)

As with other questions, purely descriptive or recount responses did not fare well. The course expects reasoned argument, evidence and analysis and so do the markers.

There were a number of excellent responses to this question. There were also too many responses that were not good enough. For the second year in a row the question asked candidates to apply one ethical framework to an issue. Given this and the examiner’s comments from last year there was no excuse for a candidate presenting a memorised response applying two frameworks to an issue. A response of this kind fails to answer the question and loses much opportunity to address other expectations.

Evidence was also lacking in too many responses and there were too many simple errors in applying frameworks to an issue. For instance, usually a Consequentialist theory per se would NOT be for or against an issue like euthanasia or abortion. Consequentialist theories in general consider each case on its merits NOT each issue on its merits.
Marker 1

The vast majority of responses favoured Euthanasia and Abortion as the ethical issue of choice. Whilst the issues of Euthanasia and Abortion are current and topical from an ethical perspective, the prepared answer was disappointingly evident.

Criterion 1

- Strong responses were disciplined around meeting the demands of the question with respect to application of one framework to a particular ethical issue but were able to bring in a contrasting approach/ethical framework in their discussion of the tensions and conflicts within the ethical framework selected. Many candidates ignored the requirement of one ethical framework and in so doing did not specifically address the demands of the question and provided a lack of depth in their analysis of their first framework. This was disappointing as this was a common error on last year’s paper and candidates should have been more cautious in their approach. The marker could not credit second and subsequent frameworks as this was not in keeping with the demands of the question.

Criterion 2

- Terms such as ‘pro-life’ and ‘pro-choice’ given their connotations do not always do justice to the complex nuance of the various deontological and teleological ethical frameworks. Good level of understanding of the frameworks of Utilitarianism, Situation Ethics, Kantian Ethics and Natural Law Ethics on the whole was demonstrated and it was pleasing to observe reasonably accurate use of terminology.

Criterion 3

- It is pleasing to observe a continued uptake in the use of credible evidences by way of quotations, references to Government Acts and legislation, authorities and through drawing conclusions.
- Stronger responses were able to cite evidence to provide that all important layer of support to their application of an ethical framework to an issue. It is worth remembering that demonstrations of clear thinking, the development of clear argument and counter argument and considered logical conclusions are all valid forms of supporting evidence.

Criterion 4

- Stronger responses were able to specifically address the demand of the question to discuss the tensions and conflicts that exist with the application of an ethical framework to an ethical issue. The ability to get above the mere showcasing of information to really come to grips with the implications of applying a framework to a particular issue was the hallmark of an EA standard response.
- Given that this will be a compulsory unit for study in the revised course it will be essential for candidates to be appraised of both the traditional philosophical ethical approaches and be cognisant of the ethical frameworks that can be applied from the study of the core beliefs of at least two religious traditions.
Question 9 (100 responses)

Marker 1

This was a fairly straight forward question and generally candidates answered it quite well. Better answers:

Criterion 1
- Candidates’ responses engaged with the set question. This year’s question specifically asked for an explanation of the ‘origins of the universe’. This differed from last year’s question which also included the ‘origin of life on earth’ as well. It is important that both candidates and teachers make a clear distinction in this as it does alter the focus in the answer and the kinds of explanation and evidence offered;
- Offered clear lines of reasoning; a high level of relevance in discussion and evidence;
- provided structured and coherent discussion;
- Given that candidates were required to ‘evaluate the evidence…used to justify the explanations [for origins of the universe]’, it was evident that more sophisticated responses indicated the difficulty/tensions inherent in the explanations/evidence presented, in the introduction of the essay and explored this as an element of the question in the body of the essay.

Criterion 2
- Candidates selected appropriate and detailed material/information/concepts/arguments from the unit. They demonstrated detailed understanding of explanations offered: [by at least one religious tradition] While most candidates selected Christianity, some very good responses also offered explanations from Islam:[and modern scientific explanations]. The modern scientific explanations were usually sound but candidates did need to provide at least rudimentary detail on cosmological theory and the thinking of contemporary physicists/cosmologists in relation to the origin of the universe rather than a global statement that, ‘Big Bang is the generally accepted explanation’.
- Accurate and appropriate use of terminology;
- A number of relevant examples were provided and used effectively to develop the discussion.

Criterion 3
- The quality of evidence was generally very sound and used extensively to back up claims made;
- Candidates relied on quotes from primary sources such as the Bible or Qur’an to support and develop discussion; they also used extensive quotes/ideas from authorities to support claims/explanations.
- Candidates provided a range of relevant examples to illustrate points made;
- Better responses also critiqued the validity of theory or accuracy of information presented by authorities etc.
- The propositions presented provided a clear line of evidence to demonstrate clear thinking, logical progression of ideas, good counter-argument and response and sensible conclusions;
Candidates also used secondary sources effectively to support points

Criterion 4

- The question specifically asked candidates to, ‘Evaluate the evidence that scientists and theologians use to justify [the] explanations’
- Stronger responses demonstrated superior analysis and evaluation, especially in relation to the reliability and consistency of the evidence. E.g. discussion about Holy texts as a source authority about the origins of the universe; also reliability/limitations of scientific knowledge;
- Candidates were able to think through the implications of the religious and scientific explanations. They could identify consistency/inconsistency in information/arguments presented by others; they could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in religious and scientific thought systems and world views;
- Candidates could follow through and project possible consequences for these thought systems and the possible impact they may have on people living their lives; e.g. some discussed the nature of religious and scientific knowledge and the impact these understandings may have on beliefs about the origins of the universe.

Weaker responses:

There were few weak responses. Where there were weaknesses, these tended to involve:

- Criterion 1: not answering the set question or engaging with the issues identified in the question.
- Criterion 2: writing information that was very general and demonstrated limited or no real engagement with or learning of key knowledge, concepts or skills related to the specific unit or the course. Sometimes information was quite accurate and suggested understanding but was far too brief to demonstrate understanding;
- Criterion 3: offering limited evidence or no evidence to support claims;
- Criterion 4: demonstrating limited analysis and evaluation. Discussion was predominantly descriptive.

Marker 2

Far too many candidates seem to be operating out of the notes from an earlier course. The topic is about the origins of the universe – for which Darwin should have no input, and neither does Galileo’s championing of a heliocentric model for the planetary system nor Intelligent Design. Many candidates wasted a lot of their essay space on evolution and geology, losing time and space for relevant evidence and analysis. And, although bandied about in the literature, the multi-verse statement of William James in the 19th century was the coining of a term, not the promulgation of a theory – very different to the current multi-verse theories.
Question 10 (99 responses)

Marker 1

Surprisingly, excellent responses to this question were rarer than they should have been. Too many responses were unsupported, often inaccurate, 'potted' versions of common theodicies with no attention paid to the question and no discernible evidence. Others started off beautifully and then ran out of things to say too quickly, often because there was no evidence or analysis.

Responses that included a discussion of suffering from a Buddhist or Islamic point of view were often quite well done. Candidates should remember that this unit is not just about theodicies. In fact, Christian theodicies are just one way of addressing some of the key knowledge points of the unit. Future candidates should not expect that they will automatically be able to write on theodicies in the external exam.

Criterion 1

- The question clearly asked for a discussion of the existence of suffering and also of the possible reasons for its existence. Consequently this is what candidates were expected to provide. Definitions and discussions of evil were not relevant unless the candidate made it clear how they were. Markers can guess how a response might be an answer to the question, and most responses could possibly have been relevant. However, the more markers struggle to find evidence of achievement the lower the award is likely to be.
- On the other hand most candidates presented a soundly structured response and did address some aspects of the question.

Criterion 2

- Again, attention to the demands of the question was necessary under this criterion. Presenting mainly information from the relevant area of study is ‘C’ level. Responses that scored higher did so by presenting detail and explanation that specifically discussed the existence of suffering and the possible reasons for its existence. This is where a candidate can be rewarded for selecting appropriately from the range of their knowledge.

Criterion 3

- Responses that scored well on this criterion managed to:
  - cite authority through quotation or less formal reference
  - offer example, illustration or argument to back up claims
  - draw conclusions and sometimes even comment upon the use of evidence of others.
- Some that scored less well tended to avoid the requirement for evidence all together. More often, the weaker responses managed to hit upon some evidence in what appeared to be a lucky accident during their recount of the key features of a theodicy.
Criterion 4

- Analysis and evaluation of views on suffering should not be difficult. This is one area where those who insisted on confining their answer to theodicies should have been rewarded. They were, if they discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the views they presented and selected and identified appropriate areas for discussion according to the question. In addition, the words ‘this is why…’ often indicate an interesting and useful piece of analysis. Pointing out the underlying assumptions of a theoretical position can also be worthwhile in this topic.

Question 11 (17 responses)

There were many and varied responses to this question showing a breadth of study (and/or teaching approaches). The stronger candidates engaged with the question, skilfully using the quote or allusions to it as a refrain which kept the whole essay on track. Weaker candidates concentrated on either a theist or non-theist response rather than considering both as both the question and the course expect. Occasionally candidates simply presented their favourite position but usually they did not support their argument strongly. Contrasting an alternative view often allows for better analysis (and deeper support for one’s favoured viewpoint)! Some candidates were not well-prepared at all – one simply ‘dumped’ their summary notes, and others waffled on.
Tasmanian Qualification Authority – Written Paper Marking Tool

STUDIES OF RELIGION (REL315111) – 2012
(subject to refinement)

The extent to which, in response to the question and relevant to the particular unit, the candidate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Structure and expression of relevant ideas and arguments clearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A+</strong></td>
<td>Answers the question in a logical, coherent and relevant manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-</strong></td>
<td>Proposes an answer to the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B+</strong></td>
<td>Attempts to answer the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-</strong></td>
<td>Does not answer the specific question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C+</strong></td>
<td>Clearly and consistently explores the question in relation to the relevant unit of the syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-</strong></td>
<td>Maintains topic relevance and provides some argument, though not necessarily particularly pertinent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D+</strong></td>
<td>Answer is information only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addresses all aspects and some nuances of the question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents a structured argument with a clear opening and conclusion, where the structure contributes to the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses most aspects of the question. Structures answer with a clear opening and an attempted conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses some of the aspects or nuances of the question. Uses structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *At the ‘C’ level connections might be made for instance, between example and point, premise and conclusion, question and answer, view and criticism etc. Would not expect consistency or all links to be accurate at ‘C’ level.

The extent to which, in response to the question and relevant to the particular unit, the candidate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts in Studies of Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A+</strong></td>
<td>Selects appropriate and detailed material from the relevant area of study to answer the question. Discusses relevant and appropriate facts, ideas, viewpoints, arguments and/or practices from the relevant area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-</strong></td>
<td>Accurately uses or explains facts, ideas, issues, viewpoints, arguments and/or practices from the relevant area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B+</strong></td>
<td>Presents facts, ideas, issues, viewpoints, arguments or practices from the relevant area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-</strong></td>
<td>Answer is not relevant to the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C+</strong></td>
<td>Uses relevant terminology in a meaningful, consistent, appropriate and sophisticated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-</strong></td>
<td>Uses a variety of terminology, usually accurately and with sound understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D+</strong></td>
<td>Uses basic terminology, usually accurately, mostly simplistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-</strong></td>
<td>No relevant examples or illustrations. Little if any explanation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provides detailed explanation and analysis of several of the relevant concepts, ideas, arguments, issues etc presented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports the discussion with appropriate examples and/or illustrations where suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides detailed explanation of one or two of the concepts, ideas, arguments, issues etc presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the discussion with occasional examples or illustrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides mainly information from the topic; with some limited explanation and illustration, but may have some trouble at times establishing relevance to the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes links between different aspects of the topic unit and between the topic unit and the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes some accurate connections, between points and explanations for instance.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: At the ‘C’ level connections might be made for instance, between example and point, premise and conclusion, question and answer, view and criticism etc. Would not expect consistency or all links to be accurate at ‘C’ level.
### Studies of Religion – Written Paper Marking Tool

#### The extent to which, in response to the question and relevant to the particular unit, the candidate:

| A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- |
|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|
| Refers to authority in a relevant, consistent and accurate manner. | Refers to authority | Cites some evidence. | Offers little or no evidence. |
| Supports opinion with argument and/or authority. Uses a range of supporting evidence. | Offers evidence and/or argument in support of positions presented. | Offers some support for positions presented but assertions will often lack support. |
| Further an argument or position with supporting examples and illustrations, where appropriate. Presents a logical argument where conclusions are supported with relevant information and points made lead to conclusions. | Draws some relevant conclusions. Presents a discernably valid response; sometimes through argument but more often through relevance. | Conclusions are rare, often with little support, and usually at the end. |
| Explicitly comments upon the use of evidence. | Makes some attempt to comment upon the use of evidence. | Makes comment on evidence. |

**Criterion 3 - Use credible evidence and reasoned argument**

**Notes:** What counts as evidence may differ widely depending upon the relevant unit and topic. The following is an incomplete but useful list of examples of ‘using evidence’ that markers might find and credit. *Quotations, reference to authority (figures, text, data, relevant dates and facts…….), addressing the question, backing claims with information, drawing conclusions, illustrations and examples, internal consistency of argument, properly and subtly scoped claims, use of secondary sources………..*

| A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- |
|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|
| Presents, where relevant, a clear understanding of the link between living life and beliefs/values/theory. Including, where relevant, some understanding of the difficulty involved. | Presents understanding, and uses example where relevant, of the link between living life and beliefs/values/theory | Presents information, if relevant, that shows there is a link between living life and beliefs or values. | Information is present but analysis is not. |
| Identifies and critically comments upon the behavioural or theoretical implications, consequences, or underlying assumptions, of an idea or viewpoint. | Accurately identifies and explains some behavioural or theoretical implications, consequences or assumptions of an idea or viewpoint. | Identifies behavioural or theoretical implications of an idea or viewpoint. |
| Demonstrates an appropriately sophisticated grasp of the interconnectedness of ideas, values, practices and arguments. Presents consistent and coherent argument and comments, where relevant, on the consistency or coherence of others. | Presents an argument or recognises arguments of others, that demonstrate(s) or describes interconnectedness of ideas, values, practices and arguments. | Presents information that identifies some links between ideas, values, practices and arguments. |
| Evaluates, where relevant, strengths and weaknesses of systems of thought. Evaluates, where relevant, strengths and weaknesses of concepts, ideas and arguments. | Usually accurately, if relevant, identifies the strengths and weaknesses of systems of thought, concepts, ideas or arguments. | Identifies, if relevant, some strength and weakness in a system of thought, idea or argument. |

**Criterion 4 - Analyse and evaluate the significance and implications of religious and/or secular viewpoints**

**Notes:** Analysis and evaluation will differ significantly from unit to unit, with some of the points above more readily relevant to some units than others. Analysis and evaluation in issue or theory based units is often easier to identify than in units primarily concerned with the beliefs and practices of a religious tradition. The following is an incomplete list of examples of analysis and evaluation in this more difficult area, that markers might find and credit. *Beliefs connected to practices and vice versa, internal debate within a religious tradition, use of the stimulus piece, distinction between variants and denominations, values connected to belief, explanation of difference in view or practise, ‘heart vs head’ in religion, gaps and inconsistencies in belief and/or daily practise, diversity of practise.*
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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>9% (26)</td>
<td>19% (56)</td>
<td>38% (113)</td>
<td>35% (103)</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>11% (41)</td>
<td>18% (70)</td>
<td>46% (174)</td>
<td>25% (94)</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years (all examined subjects)</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>30 %</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>34% (102)</td>
<td>66% (196)</td>
<td>30% (89)</td>
<td>70% (209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>31% (116)</td>
<td>69% (263)</td>
<td>34% (127)</td>
<td>66% (251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>