



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Physical Education

Specification A and Games

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- 3581 Physical Education Full Course
- 3583 Games Full Course
- 3586 Physical Education Short Course
- 3588 Games Short Course

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2006 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

Contents

Full and Short Courses

Practical Assessment.....	5
Paper 1 (3581/W)	9
Paper 1 (3583/W)	12
Paper 1 (3586/W)	14
Paper 1 (3588/W)	15
Mark ranges and award of grades	18

This page has been left intentionally blank

Coursework

Moderators would like to express their thanks for moderation visits being well organised by centres with evidence of considerable planning and preparation.

The vast majority of centres demonstrated a good understanding of how the moderation procedure operates and endeavoured to ensure that pupils are well prepared for the visit, which is seen as an important date in the school calendar.

Practical sessions were well structured and utilised differentiated practices and small game activities that have enabled the candidates to demonstrate their full potential and show skills under opposed or semi-opposed conditions as outlined in the specification. Increasingly the sessions fully stretched and challenge the more able candidates.

Reports from moderators indicated that there continued to be an improvement in the quality of work seen on moderation visits throughout the country. There were also some outstanding performances shown by very talented candidates.

Moderation visits included appropriate tasks to enable all students to show their ability level as well as giving them the opportunity to be assessed practically in Skill Areas C, D and E and leading the warm ups.

Additionally, it was reported that candidates involved in the leadership roles within the moderation session were particularly impressive. Moderators saw some high calibre officiating undertaken by candidates.

The majority of centres visited also provided satisfactory written evidence of coursework assessment at an appropriate standard for Skill Areas C and D.

There were fewer candidates seen in the lower mark category, and moderators saw fewer candidates demonstrating only moderate success. This was due in part to the fact that centres were effective and efficient in the delivery of the practical component of the course.

Centres provided supporting evidence to verify the marks awarded and many captured performances on video or DVD. It is particularly important for assessment only packages that this evidence is available and for minority activities offered within the centre.

An increasing number of centres arranged for as many staff as possible who were responsible for the teaching of GCSE PE to be involved in the moderation procedure and this enhanced their knowledge and understanding of the awarding of marks and the standards expected. Furthermore, they felt more confident and competent in providing guidance on next steps to enable candidates to improve their marks and attain their potential.

There tended to be very few problems with moderation visits as most centres readily responded to comments and suggestions from the moderator on previous visits.

However, there was an increasing tendency for centres to change outdoor activities such as football or rugby, to indoor sessions for seemingly minor reasons. This makes the sessions easier to run but limits the scope of the moderation process for these activities.

An increasing number of centres provided provisional marks for all activity areas, although many remained unaware that they need to provide this data.

This year, at the request of moderators, an increasing number of centres had marked training programmes available at the moderation visit; this was also beneficial to the centre as any problems, such as the clarity of marking and marking too severely or too leniently, could be discussed and amended prior to the final deadlines.

More centres adopted the HRF template advocated in the teacher support meetings and this resulted in candidates being fully aware of the nature and extent of information required and marks were awarded more accurately. However, moderators reported a tendency for some teachers to be over generous, particularly in the planning and evaluation sections.

Centres appreciated the link forged between moderator and school and felt more comfortable about asking for help or advice as and when required. Communication between centre and moderator was facilitated by the use of email.

In summary, moderators reported that candidates have displayed extremely high quality work.

Administration

The majority of centres submitted their initial documentation promptly and few centres needed a reminder to return forms ModB (indicating to the moderator convenient dates and times for visits) and ModBX (outlining assessment dates for the activities/games offered within the centre). However, very few centres provided the dates of their final assessment of activities on MODBX and a number had to be contacted to determine these and also the last date that candidates would be available to be seen.

Additionally, a number of centres failed to complete the section concerned with the number and names of exceptional candidates on the reverse of ModB. Centres are asked to identify those candidates expected to score in excess of 432 for the full courses and 252 for the short courses. Centres need to be aware that candidates scoring marks of nine for their practical marks is likely to fall within this range when their mark is added for the Health Related Exercise/Fitness Training Programme and should therefore be included in the list.

Some centres did not provide an accurate number of high scoring candidates which made it difficult to ensure that the candidates were seen at moderation as they had seriously miscalculated and underestimated the number of exceptional candidates.

A number of centres failed to include additional comments on the CRF to substantiate high scoring activities. Where centres do complete this it provides very useful corroborative evidence for the moderators.

The majority of centres submitted their Centre Mark Sheets (CMS), Candidate Record Forms (CRF) and Centre Declaration Sheets (CDS) to the moderator by the deadline and in compliance with AQA instructions. However, some centres appeared unaware that moderators need to be sent the CRFs for ALL candidates and that this is the only way that they will know the marks awarded to each candidate for the Health Related Exercise/Fitness Training Programme and which ones they will require for the sub sample.

Many centres also seemed unaware of the need to send both pink and yellow copies of the Centre Mark Sheets to moderators. For GCSE PE the system necessitates returning the yellow copy of the CMS to centres with an “S” to indicate which candidate’s work is to be included in the sample sent to the moderator and this continues to create a delay in the checking process as some centres still only send the pink copy of the CMS to the moderator.

A significant number of centres failed to include a CDS with the other materials sent to the moderator. This necessitated a further copy being sent to the centre for completion.

A number of candidates failed to specify the activity for which their exercise/training programme was planned or had undertaken a training programme for an inappropriate activity for the course for which they had been entered. However, this aspect was reported to be substantially better than in previous years. There were also fewer reported mistakes when transferring the total mark on to the CMS.

The HRF/training programme template proved to be extremely popular, with a number of centres now using these. This template is available on the AQA website (www.aqa.org.uk then Qualifications - GCSE - Physical Education A- Assessment Materials). It is a requirement that the work submitted by candidates and marked within centres indicates clearly how and where the marks have been awarded by teachers for each of the sections and sub-sections, and the template provides a useful means of doing this. Furthermore, ticks should be used in the body of the text.

As a consequence of the teacher support meetings this year, an increasing number of teachers placed ticks within the body of the text of the HRF/training programmes. This makes it easier and clearer to see where, and how, marks are being awarded and the majority of teachers are awarding marks appropriately. There are fewer reported problems with marking where centres have utilised the AQA template.

In general the marking of training programmes has improved. However, moderators reported that there was still evidence of over marking in some of the sub samples sent to them. The most common areas for lenient marking occurred in the planning section where marks continued to be awarded for generalised comments that offered little or no specific relevance to the candidates own programme, also in the evaluation section where there were still numerous instances of the maximum two marks being awarded for simplistic statements that lacked the required depth of understanding.

Moderators also reported that a minority of centres provided too much guidance and assisted candidates with the content of the training programme rather than with the process.

A number of centres appeared unaware of the exemplar HRF/training programme programmes available from AQA. There are three of these, one to show the characteristics of attainment at each level - highly competent, competent and moderately successful. Unmarked versions of these provide a useful tool for the standardisation of marking in a centre.

Teacher support meetings have helped greatly by giving opportunities to discuss and understand procedures.

In summary most centres submitted the coursework marks promptly, but there were still some centres that necessitated follow up letters or phone calls to chase up missing forms.

The most common errors involved:

- Candidate Record Forms not included for all candidates
- Failure to supply a Centre Declaration Sheet
- Candidate signatures missing.
- Teachers signatures missing.
- Exercise programmes with the activity not named
- Incorrect multiplication
- No different group for the second activity/ game

Overall moderators reported that the number of clerical errors continued to fall.

Staff are reminded that, on the day of the moderation visit, they are responsible for:

- The organisation and presentation of the activities to be seen at the moderation visit
- All candidates being present (unless previously agreed with the moderator)
- Adequate time and facilities being available
- The clear identification of all candidates

The Moderation visit

- It is beneficial if the candidates are familiar with what is expected from them on the day of the moderation visit. If they have had the opportunity of a “run through” then they often feel more at ease and are more likely to realise their potential.
- Activities offered by the centre should vary to show a range of activities, but should include candidates using the activity for their final marks
- The person responsible for the assessment of the activity/candidates should be present, with as many members who teach the course as possible.

Moderators will want to see:

- a minimum of two activities from two groups
- A list of candidates showing their identifying bib
- A rank order of candidates with provisional marks for all candidates in all activities to be moderated
- Examples of work for **Skill Areas C and D** for the activities to be moderated, and the **Health Related Exercise/Fitness Training Programme** if completed

Check list for the submission of marks to be received on the **May 5th 2007** (or **May 31st** for **Short Courses**):-

- Pink and yellow copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the EDI printout) are included.
- Supplementary Centre Mark Sheets are completed and included for late entries or those candidates who have changed course.
- Centre Declaration Sheets are all fully completed and signed for each course entered.
- The correct Candidate Record Forms (CRF) are fully completed, signed by ALL candidates and submitted in the order that the candidates’ names appear on the Centre mark sheets for each course.
- The CRFs are accurately completed with different activity/game areas for activities/games 1 and 2.
- The activity/game for which the training programme has been carried out is indicated.
- All swimming, athletic and gymnastic activities are clearly identified e.g. personal survival and life saving.

Moderators would like to express their gratitude to those centres that clearly carry out this checklist and whose administration is exemplary. These centres expedite the whole moderation process from initial contact through to the final submission of marks.

Physical Education Specification A (3581/W)

General

Candidates of all levels made an attempt at most of the questions on the paper. There were still many instances of rather vague responses being given and instances where candidates had not carefully read the question and then answered on the actual topic set. The quality of written communication overall was poor with few candidates achieving marks in the top range.

Question 1

- (a)(i) Generally answered well but some candidates failed to qualify that blood flow to the muscles increased or was faster as a result of the warm up.
- (a)(ii) Generally answered well by most candidates.
- (b)(i) Answered well.
- (b)(ii) Answered well.
- (c)(i) Answered well.
- (c)(ii) Answered well.
- (c)(iii) Few candidates achieved full marks as they failed to explain how the elements combined, beyond that it is necessary to be healthy in order to attain basic fitness and they often did not link their responses to a ‘club level performer’. Vague and unclear comments were very common.
- (d)(i) A high percentage of candidates correctly identified that competition was at a ‘higher level’ and ‘demands’ greater, but few developed this further, again lacking application of the need for ‘specific’ fitness.

Question 2

- (a)(i) Answered well.
- (a)(ii) Answered well.
- (b)(i) Some candidates, not just low scoring ones, did muddle aerobic/anaerobic and other candidates managed to get then the correct way around but then included an inappropriate activity for the second part of the question.
- (b)(ii) The examples for aerobic were not always fully developed with reference to intensity and time.
- (b)(iii) Generally well answered; sprinting was a common answer.
- (c)(i) Answered reasonably well.
- (c)(ii) Sweating and shivering were common responses from the weaker candidates who did not identify the role of blood in temperature control, there was also a great deal of reference to the speed at which the blood flows relating to contributing to control of body temperature. There were some excellent answers that fully explained vasodilation and vasoconstriction.

Question 3

- (a)(i) A common error was that candidates offered a description of interval training and not an advantage and simply did not answer the actual question asked.
- (a)(ii) Many candidates gave answers that could have been overload rather than progression and did not refer specifically to how it could be explained in relation to interval training. There was surprisingly little reference to the fact that there should be a ‘gradual increase’ but most candidates had some basic idea regarding increasing or decreasing activity or rest.
- (b)(i) Answers did not always relate to safety and some candidates focused on the fact that following the rules encouraged fair play or just made various comments about the rules in general.
- (b)(ii) There were some well developed examples from a range of games activities but many candidates concentrated on clothing rather than equipment.
- (c)(i) Many candidates gave actual examples rather than explaining that it affects the ‘body’ and many just referred to it being ‘physical’.
- (c)(ii) Answers were generally better but there were quite a significant number of candidates who got the two factors the wrong way around.
- (c)(iii) Stating the appropriate psychological factor was sometimes in the ‘effect on performance’ answer rather than clearly stated first and many candidates failed to describe the effect on the performance but merely stated a very basic effect with no further elaboration.

Question 4

- (a)(i) The majority answered well, some candidates gave examples of banned drugs rather than categories and steroids was very often spelt incorrectly.
- (b)(i) Dislocation was answered well but few candidates were able to answer what was meant by a sprain and there were many who had clearly confused it with a strain.
- (b)(ii) There were many vague causes given for hypothermia with just single words given such as ‘cold’ and ‘getting wet’ and there were similarly vague treatments identified such as ‘warm up’. Lack of detail in responses cost candidates marks on this section.
- (c)(i) In many cases the example was not fully developed e.g. the phase of the rugby scrum needed to be identified accurately to gain the mark and an activity was just identified with no clear indication of how the type of strength would be specifically applied.
- (d)(i) The better candidates answered this well, with most able to identify an introvert and an extrovert.
- (d)(ii) This part proved more challenging as candidates were not always able to fully describe or develop the effect that personality could have within the identified activity.

Question 5

This was the least well answered question on the paper.

- (a)(ii) Few candidates understood the term ‘socio-economic group’, the majority of candidates answered this considering what negative effects the peer group might have on participation.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify plenty of benefits of undertaking the various roles, but tended not to develop one of them, therefore only scoring one mark. There was also a great deal of repetition regarding these benefits.
- (c) The more able candidates were able to identify advantages and develop them for the further mark. Weaker candidates were only able to identify the advantage and not develop it and there were many repeated points as well as a great many extremely vague responses.
- (d)(i) This was not answered well with many candidates suggesting that the responsibility was coaching performers not coach education.
- (d)(ii) Answers from many candidates lacked detail. Clearly, a large number of candidates were not familiar with the role of Sport England and their responses were purely guesswork.

Question 6

- (a)(i)&(ii) Answers identified the effect on performance but many examples were poor. There were also a significant number of candidates who simply described the media but did not consider the effect on ‘attendance’ which was the main focus of the question.
- (b) Answered well by the majority of candidates with many achieving maximum marks. Some candidates did refer to fences around pitches which have now been removed. The majority of candidates were able to come up with three different measures and describe them reasonably well.
- (c) Answered well but some candidates did not always give specific examples in each case. Missing out the third element of the question resulted in many candidates attaining only two out of the three marks available for each part of this question
- (d) This was the weakest section in this question with vague answers from weaker candidates in particular. Some candidates referred to fundraising and voluntary funding rather than identifying the difference between public and private funding of facilities. There seemed to be a great deal of confusion in many candidates’ minds and many considered the quality of the provision to be a major factor.

Physical Education (Games) (3583/W)

General

Candidates of all levels were able to make an attempt at most of the questions on the paper. The majority of candidates adhered to the rubric by using games activities throughout the paper when asked. The quality of written communication overall was poor with few candidates achieving marks in the top range.

Question 1

- (a)(i) Generally answered well but some candidates failed to qualify that blood flow to the muscles increased or was faster as a result of the warm up.
- (a)(ii) Generally answered well by most candidates.
- (b)(i) Answered well.
- (b)(ii) Answered well.
- (c)(i) Answered well.
- (c)(ii) Answered well.
- (c)(iii) Few candidates achieved full marks as they failed to explain how the elements combined beyond that it is necessary to be healthy in order to attain basic fitness.
- (d)(i) A high percentage of candidates correctly identified that competition was at a 'higher level' and 'demands' greater, but few developed this further, again lacking application of the need for 'specific' fitness.

Question 2

- (a)(i) Answered well.
- (a)(ii) Answered well.
- (b)(i) Some candidates, not just low scoring ones, did muddle aerobic/anaerobic.
- (b)(ii) The examples for aerobic were not always fully developed with reference to intensity and time.
- (b)(iii) Some rubric infringements occurred, with marathon running being a common example.
- (b)(iv) Some rubric infringements occurred, and sprinting was a common answer.
- (c)(i) Answered reasonably well.
- (c)(ii) Sweating and shivering were common responses from the weaker candidates who did not identify the role of blood in temperature control. There were some excellent answers from some candidates explaining fully vasodilatation and vasoconstriction.

Question 3

- (a)(i) A common error was that candidates offered a description of interval training and not an advantage.
- (a)(ii) Many candidates gave answers that could have been overload rather than progression and did not refer specifically to how it could be explained in relation to interval training.
- (b) Some rubric infringements occurred in both sections. In part (i) answers did not always relate to safety some candidates focused on the fact that following the rules encouraged fair play. In part (ii) there were some well developed examples from a range of games activities.
- (c)(i) Many candidates gave actual examples rather than explaining that it affects the ‘body’. Answers to 3(c)(ii) were better.
- (c)(iii) Stating the appropriate psychological factor was sometimes in the ‘effect on performance’ answer rather than clearly stated first.

Question 4

- (a) The majority answered well, some candidates gave examples of banned drugs rather than categories.
- (b)(i) Answered well.
- (b)(ii) Dislocation was answered well but few candidates were able to answer what was meant by sprain.
- (c) Some rubric infringements occurred with examples from athletics. In some cases the example was not fully developed e.g. the phase of the rugby scrum needed to be identified accurately to gain the mark.
- (d) The better candidates answered this well.

Question 5

- (a)(i) This was the least well answered question on the paper.
- (a)(ii) Few candidates understood the term ‘socio-economic group’, many candidates answered with what negative effect the peer group might have on participation.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify plenty of benefits of undertaking the various roles, but tended not to develop one of them, therefore scoring only one mark.
- (c) The more able candidates were able to identify advantages and develop them for the further mark. Weaker candidates were only able to identify the advantage and not develop it.
- (d)(i) This was not answered well with many candidates suggesting that their responsibility was coaching performers not coach education.
- (d)(ii) Answers lacked detail from many candidates.

Question 6

- (a)(i) and (ii) Answers identified the effect on performance but many examples were poor.
- (b) Answered well by the majority of candidates with many achieving maximum marks. Some candidates did refer to fences around pitches which have now been removed.
- (c) Answered well but some candidates did not always give specific examples in each case.
- (d) This was the weakest section in this question with vague answers from weaker candidates particularly. Some candidates referred to fundraising and voluntary funding rather than identifying the difference between public and private funding of facilities.

Physical Education (Short Course) (3586/W)

General

Candidates of all levels were able to make an attempt on most questions on the paper but, as in previous years, there were still quite a large number of candidates who scored very low marks. There still appeared to be centres who were not fully preparing candidates by covering all of the theory in sufficient depth and this resulted in large numbers of candidates giving incorrect responses or, in many cases, no responses at all.

Question 1

- (a)(i) Generally answered well but some candidates failed to qualify that blood flow to the muscles increased or was faster as a result of the warm up.
- (a)(ii) Generally answered well by most candidates.
- (b)(i)&(ii) Answered well.
- (b)(iii) Few candidates achieved full marks as they failed to explain how the elements combined beyond that it is necessary to be healthy in order to attain basic fitness and they often did not link their responses to a 'club level performer'. Vague and unclear comments were very common.
- (c) A high percentage of candidates correctly identified that competition was at a 'higher level' and 'demands' greater, but few developed this further, again lacking application of the need for 'specific' fitness.
- (d) In many cases the example was not fully developed e.g. the phase of the rugby scrum needed to be identified accurately to gain the mark and an activity was just identified with no clear indication of how the type of strength would be specifically applied. Candidates were generally able to give the two types of strength.

Question 2

- (a)(i) A common error was that candidates offered a description of interval training and not an advantage and simply did not answer the actual question asked.
- (a)(ii) Many candidates gave answers that could have been overload rather than progression and did not refer specifically to how it could be explained in relation to interval training. There was surprisingly little reference to the fact that there should be a 'gradual increase' but most candidates had some basic idea regarding increasing or decreasing activity or rest.

- (b)(i) In part (i) answers did not always relate to safety and some candidates focused on the fact that following the rules encouraged fair play or just made various comments about the rules in general.
- (b)(ii) In part (ii) there were some well developed examples from a range of games activities but many candidates concentrated on clothing rather than equipment.
- (c)(i) Many candidates gave actual examples rather than explaining that it affects the ‘body’ and many just referred to it being ‘physical’.
- (c)(ii) Answers to 3(c) (ii) were generally better but there were quite a significant number of candidates who got the two factors the wrong way around.
- (c)(iii) Stating the appropriate psychological factor was sometimes in the ‘effect on performance’ answer rather than clearly stated first and many candidates failed to describe the effect on the performance but merely stated a very basic effect with no further elaboration.

Question 3

This was the least well answered question on the paper.

- (a)(ii) Few candidates understood the term ‘socio-economic group’, the majority of candidates answered this considering what negative effects the peer group might have on participation.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify plenty of benefits of undertaking the various roles, but tended not to develop one of them, therefore only scoring one mark. There was also a great deal of repetition regarding these benefits.
- (c) The more able candidates were able to identify advantages and develop them for the further mark. Weaker candidates were only able to identify the advantage and not develop it and there were many repeated points as well as a great many extremely vague responses.
- (d)(i) This was not answered well with many candidates suggesting that their responsibility was coaching performers not coach education.
- (d)(ii) Answers lacked detail from many candidates. Clearly, a large number of candidates were not familiar with the role of Sport England and their responses were purely guesswork.

Physical Education (Games) (Short Course) (3588/W)

General

Candidates of all levels were able to make an attempt on most questions on the paper but, as in previous years, there were still quite a large number of candidates who scored very low marks. There were also a significant number of candidates who lost marks through rubric infringements on questions 1 (d) and 2 (b) as they did not adhere to the requirement to refer to games activities only as stated in the question. There still appeared to be centres who were not fully preparing candidates by covering all of the theory in sufficient depth and this resulted in large numbers of candidates giving incorrect responses or, in many cases, no responses at all.

Question 1

- (a)(i) Generally answered well but some candidates failed to qualify that blood flow to the muscles increased or was faster as a result of the warm up.
- (a)(ii) Generally answered well by most candidates.
- (b)(i)&(ii) Answered well.
- (b)(iii) Few candidates achieved full marks as they failed to explain how the elements combined beyond that it is necessary to be healthy in order to attain basic fitness and they often did not link their responses to a ‘club level performer’. Vague and unclear comments were very common.
- (c) A high percentage of candidates correctly identified that competition was at a ‘higher level’ and ‘demands’ greater, but few developed this further, again lacking application of the need for ‘specific’ fitness.
- (d) Many rubric infringements occurred with examples from gymnastics and athletics being very common. In many cases the example was not fully developed e.g. the phase of the rugby scrum needed to be identified accurately to gain the mark and an activity was just identified with no clear indication of how the type of strength would be specifically applied. Candidates were generally able to give the two types of strength.

Question 2

- (a)(i) A common error was that candidates offered a description of interval training and not an advantage and simply did not answer the actual question asked.
- (a)(ii) Many candidates gave answers that could have been overload rather than progression and did not refer specifically to how it could be explained in relation to interval training. There was surprisingly little reference to the fact that there should be a ‘gradual increase’ but most candidates had some basic idea regarding increasing or decreasing activity or rest.
- (b) Some rubric infringements occurred in both parts of this question with examples quoted from trampoline, athletics and even outdoor and adventurous activities.
 - (b)(i) Answers did not always relate to safety and some candidates focused on the fact that following the rules encouraged fair play or just made various comments about the rules in general.
 - (b)(ii) There were some well developed examples from a range of games activities but many candidates concentrated on clothing rather than equipment.
- (c)(i) Many candidates gave actual examples rather than explaining that it affects the ‘body’ and many just referred to it being ‘physical’.
- (c)(ii) Answers were generally better but there were quite a significant number of candidates who got the two factors the wrong way around.
- (c)(iii) Stating the appropriate psychological factor was sometimes in the ‘effect on performance’ answer rather than clearly stated first and many candidates failed to describe the effect on the performance but merely stated a very basic effect with no further elaboration.

Question 3

This was the least well answered question on the paper.

- (a)(ii) Few candidates understood the term ‘socio-economic group’, the majority of candidates answered this considering what negative effects the peer group might have on participation.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify plenty of benefits of undertaking the various roles, but tended not to develop one of them, therefore only scoring one mark. There was also a great deal of repetition regarding these benefits.
- (c) The more able candidates were able to identify advantages and develop them for the further mark. Weaker candidates were only able to identify the advantage and not develop it and there were many repeated points as well as a great many extremely vague responses.
- (d)(i) This was not answered well with many candidates suggesting that their responsibility was coaching performers not coach education.
- (d)(ii) Answers lacked detail from many candidates. Clearly, a large number of candidates were not familiar with the role of Sport England and their responses were purely guesswork.

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Full Course

Physical Education Specification A (3581)

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3581/P Practical Assessment	480	480	378.7	57.8
Paper 3581/W Written Paper	105	320	178.5	59.0
Overall 3581	--	800	557.2	101.1

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3581/P component boundary mark	raw	480	448	410	372	335	278	221	164	107
	scaled	480	448	410	372	335	278	221	164	107
3581/W component boundary mark	Raw	105	86	79	72	66	56	46	37	28
	scaled	320	262	241	219	201	171	140	113	85
Scaled boundary mark		800	679	631	581	531	446	361	277	193

Provisional statistics for the award

(28764 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	9.63	25.67	45.41	64.07	86.07	95.65	99.07	99.87

Full Course

Physical Education (Games) (3583)

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3583/P Practical Assessment	480	480	360.4	58.8
Paper 3583/W Written Paper	105	320	153.8	57.9
Overall 3583	--	800	514.2	101.4

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3583/P component boundary mark	raw	480	448	410	372	335	278	221	164	107
	scaled	480	448	410	372	335	278	221	164	107
3583/W component boundary mark	Raw	105	85	78	71	65	55	45	36	27
	scaled	320	259	238	216	198	168	137	110	82
Scaled boundary mark		800	674	620	569	518	436	355	274	193

Provisional statistics for the award

(17476 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.19	15.15	32.38	51.88	78.20	92.83	98.51	99.86

Short Course

Physical Education Specification A (3586)

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3586/P Practical Assessment	280	282	182.9	39.9
Paper 3586/W Written Paper	53	188	89.7	35.9
Overall 3586	--	470	273.9	62.3

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3586/P component boundary mark	raw	280	246	224	202	180	146	113	80	47
	scaled	282	248	226	203	181	147	114	81	47
3586/W component boundary mark	Raw	53	40	36	32	28	26	24	22	20
	scaled	188	142	128	114	99	92	85	78	71
Scaled boundary mark		470	364	337	306	276	237	198	159	120

Provisional statistics for the award

(2181 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	7.38	16.89	32.17	50.41	72.05	87.97	96.75	99.61

Short Course

Physical Education (Games) (3588)

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3588/P Practical Assessment	280	282	179.2	39.9
Paper 3588/W Written Paper	53	188	57.6	30.9
Overall 3588	--	470	238.0	59.5

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3588/P component boundary mark	raw	280	246	224	202	180	146	113	80	47
	scaled	282	248	226	203	181	147	114	81	47
3588/W component boundary mark	Raw	53	39	35	31	27	25	23	21	19
	scaled	188	138	124	110	96	89	82	74	67
Scaled boundary mark		470	350	320	290	260	225	190	155	120

Provisional statistics for the award

(2344 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.93	8.20	20.04	36.85	58.49	78.63	92.02	97.61

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade. Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend only on their total marks for the subject.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).