

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	2
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level	2
Paper 8666/01 Theory.....	2
Paper 8666/02 Coursework.....	5

FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

<p>Paper 8666/01</p>

<p>Theory</p>

General comments

The number of candidates taking this examination is still quite small and this year's paper is only the second public examination of this syllabus. It is therefore very encouraging to receive scripts that have been extremely well written and that show a thorough knowledge and understanding of the syllabus. There was, however, a wide range of responses, and marks for the paper ranged from 18 to 82 out of a possible 100 marks. Some candidates were unable to access marks due to poor exam technique and this is an area that can easily be remedied for future examinations; comments about technique will be made in detail in the next section of this report. Only two candidates failed to follow the rubric for the examination and answered more questions than was necessary which may have left them short of time to answer questions in the required depth. Candidates seemed to find the Contemporary Studies section of the paper more difficult and answers at times lacked clarity, with few candidates opting to answer both questions or scoring well on this section. There were, in contrast, some excellent answers for both **Sections A** and **B** of the paper where some candidates showed their ability to relate their theoretical knowledge to practical situations extremely well. Weaker candidates showed a lack of subject knowledge and did not seem particularly well prepared for the examination; marks were typically low on all sections of the paper. Overall, the most popular question choice for the more successful candidates was **Questions 1, 2, 4 and 6**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Some candidates confused structure with function and they talked about a fibrous joint providing protection etc. that was irrelevant to the question. Some candidates also failed to give an example.
- (b) Generally this question was answered well.
- (c)(i) Candidates who scored well made sure that their graphs were quite large and were clearly drawn and labelled. Weaker candidates did not label their graphs, did not give units for the x- or y-axis, started drawing the HR response from '0' (technically dead!) and did not give any indication of HR levels during exercise.
 - (ii) This part of the question was answered quite well, with most candidates referring to adrenaline in relation to pre-exercise trends. As the question did not specify the intensity level of the exercise, credit was given to answers that described either a steady state response or maximal response to exercise. Post exercise, a common error was for candidates to be too vague and they failed to identify the very rapid decline immediately post exercise followed by a gradual decline to pre exercise levels.
 - (iii) Very few candidates understood the question and talked about either neural or hormonal control of the heart. Few Centres seemed to have covered the intrinsic control of heart rate.
- (d)(i)(ii) Most candidates could not give a precise explanation for each term and they did not seem to be aware of the relationship between the three terms. Few candidates gave the correct volumes, despite a large degree of flexibility being given within the mark scheme.
 - (iii)

- (e) Poor exam technique showed in this question where most candidates responded to the stem of the question rather than looking more closely at the actual requirements of the question itself. This resulted in a lot of information being provided about the respiratory control centre but very little applied information as to how this impacts on respiratory muscles during exercise. Candidates should be encouraged to underline the key words in the question to help them plan and focus their response.

Question 2

- (a)(i) Generally this question was answered well, although weaker candidates failed to give an example and did not make any reference to the muscle shortening *under tension*.
- (ii) Similarly this question was also answered well, although weaker candidates failed to give an example and did not make reference to the muscle lengthening *under tension*.
- (b)(i) The majority of candidates knew the answer to this question.
- (ii) Candidates who were unsure hedged their bets by writing down several bones, but most candidates gained both marks.
- (iii) Again this was answered correctly and a lot of candidates were awarded a maximum of five marks for this part of the question.
- (c)(i) This question was answered poorly by a number of candidates but mainly due to poor exam technique. Candidates failed to identify clearly any of the structures, as they did not link their answer to the diagram in any way. Candidates needed to write down the label e.g. "A = ..." and then provide their answer. Candidates also failed to score marks as they failed to give the functions of their four chosen structures, possibly because they did not read the question carefully enough.
- (ii) The majority of candidates were familiar with the term 'motor unit'.
- (iii) Very few candidates scored marks on this question and wave summation does not appear to have been covered in sufficient depth by most Centres.
- (d) This question was extremely well answered by most candidates who described the mechanisms but also linked the mechanisms well with how they aided venous return. Many candidates were awarded maximum marks.
- (e) A well answered question.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Generally answered well but some candidates named a sport as their example, rather than identifying a specific skill within an activity, and so were not awarded a mark.
- (b) Although candidates seemed aware of the term *operant conditioning* very few candidates were in a position to apply their knowledge to a practical situation. The few candidates who did wrote an extremely comprehensive answer and scored maximum marks.
- (c)(i) This question was generally answered well.
- (ii) This question was generally answered well.
- (d) Candidates found this question difficult and credit was given for knowledge of schema theory. Few candidates were in a position to be able to apply the theory successfully to the learning of a new skill.
- (e)(i) The majority of candidates scored both marks.
- (ii) Again most candidates answered this well.

- (f)(i) Weaker candidates were confused and thought that the question was linked to positive and negative transfer.
- (ii) Again, weaker candidates talked about negative transfer and another common problem was that candidates got the two terms the wrong way round and so gave the correct response for (i) as the answer to (ii).
- (iii) Only about 50% of the candidates seemed clear about bilateral transfer, with the rest resorting to guesswork.

Question 4

- (a) Very few candidates managed to give a clear definition of either a motor executive programme or a sub-routine and certainly found it difficult to go on to provide a practical example. Most answers were very vague, with the majority of candidates only scoring two out of a possible four marks. Candidates appear to need more practice at applying the theory of skill acquisition to practical situations.
- (b)(i) This was generally answered well, although weaker candidates confused the short-term sensory store with the short-term memory.
- (ii) Again, this question was only a problem when the candidate confused the short-term memory with the short-term sensory store.
- (iii) Most candidates answered this correctly.
- (iv) The majority of candidates gave an extremely detailed response to this question and it has obviously been well covered by most Centres. Many candidates scored maximum marks.
- (c) Because of the complexity of this question the mark scheme gave credit to candidates' knowledge of closed loop control without differentiating between the two levels. Some of the stronger candidates gave a very comprehensive answer to this question, providing excellent practical examples and gained maximum marks.
- (d)(i) Weaker candidates were confused by the fact that they were given three practical examples and obviously thought that there was one example for each of the three classifications. As a result, the candidates placed the triple jump or the rugby pass on the continuum as a continuous skill.
- (ii) Again, the weaker candidates attempted to justify either the triple jump or the rugby pass as a continuous skill.

Section C

Question 5

- (a) Weaker candidates were quite vague and had a tendency to repeat the same point in a variety of different ways. Candidates also had a tendency to provide just a one-word answer without any clarification; candidates should always be encouraged to incorporate their point into a full sentence.
- (b)(i) Weaker candidates did not seem clear about the term 'social values' and their answers were very similar to those made to (a).
- (ii) Many candidates confused *subjective* and *objective* danger with *perceived* versus *actual* danger and found it equally difficult to give a relevant example. Few candidates scored maximum marks.
- (c) Candidates' answers lacked structure as if they were unclear what to write. Most candidates managed to provide enough information to score three marks but rarely was the question answered succinctly.
- (d) The majority of candidates really struggled to answer this question and as a result few candidates scored well on **Question 5**. Candidates seemed to have a very sketchy knowledge of who was responsible for the administration of sport and despite the mark scheme allowing for comments regarding regional administration, few candidates scored more than four marks.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates scored maximum marks for this question.
- (b) Most candidates had a comprehensive knowledge of the concept of fair play and how it could be promoted by teachers or coaches, and therefore answered this question well.
- (c) This question was accessible to most candidates, with the majority scoring three marks.
- (d) Weaker candidates failed to notice that the question asked about the advantages and disadvantages of sponsorship to the *performer* and they related their answers to the actual businesses and corporations involved in sponsorship. Stronger candidates gave a very good response to this question.
- (e) Candidates seemed to have been put off by the higher mark questions as their response to both eight-mark questions in this section was generally of a lower standard than other responses. Candidates did not seem to be able to plan their responses effectively and frequently repeated comments made earlier in their answer. Some candidates were able to offer examples of media influence but found it difficult to relate their knowledge to how this has made an impact on the development of sport. At times, stronger candidates appeared to shy away from stating the obvious and they avoided making straightforward links. Candidates might benefit from more exam practice of higher mark questions to improve their exam technique.

<p>Paper 8666/02</p> <p>Coursework</p>
--

General comments

Centres need to read the Coursework Guidelines with care and follow them closely. The requirements are clearly set out, and include a pathway through the Coursework. Advice is always available to Centres experiencing difficulties with their assessment. Centres in need of advice should contact Cambridge International Examinations in the first instance, and an answer will be given as soon as possible.

A very wide range of ability was evident throughout the Centres. In several cases, candidates might have benefited from being offered a wider choice of activities. Some Centres chose a single activity, e.g. trampolining, for all their candidates. This meant that beginners in this activity scored low marks, and experienced performers scored high marks. However, the beginners might have been able to offer an alternative activity at a higher standard. There is no requirement that all candidates at a Centre should necessarily offer the same activities, provided that it is possible, given timetabling arrangements and availability of facilities, to offer alternatives. At Centres which gave their candidates a free choice of activity (within the syllabus), candidates tended to score higher marks. It is important to work to the strengths of the candidate.

If a candidate excels, then he or she should be awarded the 30 marks deserved. Some Centres undervalued exceptional candidates, and therefore also marked down candidates below them in the range. Moderators appreciate that it is sometimes difficult to arrive at the appropriate mark where there are few candidates to provide comparisons, but there were several cases where candidates who had been given 25/26 should have been given 30.

The Action Plans in many cases were over long. It is not intended to be a personal performance portfolio, so 8-10 sides of A4 is sufficient. Candidates are asked to design and follow an action plan for improvement in one of their chosen activities, identifying achievable goals, a method by which these goals might be achieved and then explaining how they are going to evaluate their level of achievement. Evaluation of the plan is important and should not be neglected. Specific detail of the content required is outlined in the Coursework Guidelines.

There is also an outline in the Coursework Guidelines for the analysis and comment section. Candidates should be allowed to talk with little contribution from the teacher, on a live performance of a skill from one of their chosen activities. They need to be able to analyse the phases of the skill, comment on the strengths and weaknesses, identify a fault needing correction and suggest a plan to achieve this. This should be recorded on video. An opening statement is essential but it should not be teacher led.

Please note, if a candidate is ill or injured and cannot complete his or her Coursework, the Centre should apply to CIE for special consideration as soon as the problem becomes apparent. It is important that a Centre keeps a record of interim assessments, so that it is possible to arrive at a realistic assessment in cases of injury, and so that candidates are not unnecessarily disadvantaged, through no fault of their own.

It was noticeable that some Centres had experienced difficulties in videoing Coursework. Some videos were excellent – especially one on wind surfing!! Candidates should be labelled clearly, and retain the same number throughout and it is helpful if the commentary identifies them clearly. Some Centres have numbered tee shirts which is an excellent idea. All aspects should be on tape. Any suggestions for the improvement of this time consuming procedure would be welcomed. The footage on each candidate was sometimes too long: three minutes per candidate per activity is long enough. It was extremely helpful to receive a video plan from a number of Centres.

Paperwork in general was good, though MS1 forms were not always included with other paperwork. Moderators need to receive a copy of the MS1 in order to check the correct transcription of marks.

It is pleasing to note the improvement from last year, both in standard and presentation of Coursework.