

GCSE 2003  
*June Series*



Report on the Examination

**Physical Education**  
*Specification A and Games*

---

- Full Course
- Short Course

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

© Assessment and Qualifications Alliance 2003

#### 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 364473 and a registered Charity 1073334.  
Registered address Addleshaw Goddard., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ.  
*Kathleen Tattersall, Director General*

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page No.</i>
Practical Assessment.....	5
Moderation Process.....	7
Paper 1 (3581/W).....	9
Paper 1 (3583/W).....	11
Paper 1 (3586/W).....	13
Paper 1 (3588/W).....	14
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades .....	16



## Physical Education Specification A (3581)

## Physical Education (Games) (3583)

## Physical Education Specification A (Short Course) (3586)

## Physical Education (Games) (Short Course) (3588)

### **Practical Assessment**

#### *The Moderation Process*

Moderators reported that centres are now fully conversant with the requirements and are generally well prepared, although in some cases they do not make sure the necessary staff are available. It is extremely difficult for one member of staff to run a session, officiate a game and make sufficient notes on the candidates being assessed to enable full discussion on their performance afterwards. Now that all candidates need to be assessed on their ability to lead a warm-up/cool down the moderators will expect the most confident of these to be responsible for this aspect of the session. As they also need to demonstrate their officiating skills they could be fully involved and show their ability when the game situation is being assessed.

Best practice involves all members of staff who teach GCSE courses being involved in marking the candidates as they participate.

Most centres have marked examples of coursework laid out for moderators to see, and they have been appropriately annotated to show clearly where marks have been awarded. If moderators have not seen any fitness training programmes, these will be requested when the final marks are submitted in May. Moderators may also request a sample to be sent if it has not been clear where the candidate has attained marks on the samples seen, or they have not been annotated.

The number and range of these which will be asked for by the moderator is in accordance with requirements laid down by AQA. It has been pleasing to report that in most cases evidence is readily available at the beginning or end of the visit, with the work for Skill Areas C and D as well as the Training Programmes laid out in rank or mark order.

The teacher standardisation meetings have been particularly beneficial to new centres in outlining the format of moderation visits and the level of marking.

The majority of centres ensured sufficient time was available to assess activities and provided a rank order of candidates for the activities being assessed. They have also made sure that all candidates were clearly identified with bibs. Technological developments have had an influence as some centres provided digital images of all candidates in rank order with their identifying bib, playing position and marks. The moderation visit runs smoothly for the major games when candidates wear their playing position for Skill Area B during Skill Area A.

A number of centres have made use of the summer term to have a moderation visit for their Year 10 candidates and to clarify the marking of Athletics, Cricket, Rounders, Softball and Tennis. This has been particularly beneficial to new centres to elucidate their marking.

Centres need to be aware that the moderator will expect to see all of the provisional marks for each candidate in each activity; this has not always been available. They will also expect all candidates to be available for the moderation. If this is not possible because of large groups or even the whole year group being entered, the moderator needs to be informed prior to the visit and should be sent a copy of the provisional marks for the activities to be seen so that they can stipulate which candidates they wish to see.

Moderators state that the visits are mostly extremely well organised and that the behaviour and motivation of the candidates has been even better than in the past. This may be as a result of the more competitive nature of Skill Area A involving the candidates participating in “...increasingly demanding situations, such as semi-opposed or opposed situations/structured practices in competition/authentic context”. In previous years skills had been seen in isolation and candidates were not always performing to their highest standard. This was particularly evident with the most able candidates.

The majority of centres ensured that sufficient time was made available for the visit. This is imperative for Skill Area B to ensure that the candidates being assessed have sufficient opportunity to become involved in the game/activity situation and have the chance to demonstrate the full range of their skills as well as tactical/strategic awareness.

The marks awarded by staff in centres have been accurate and in almost all cases the marks were within the correct band. When there were some inconsistencies these occurred in the upper band but were generally no more than plus or minus one mark. There has been some concern expressed by moderators that girls are being marked somewhat harshly; this has been particularly apparent when they take part in mixed game situations.

All moderators expressed their satisfaction at the rapport that has built up between them and the staff in their centres, which has resulted in excellent working relationships.

### ***Administration***

In the majority of cases staff in centres returned the initial paperwork outlining convenient dates for visits promptly to moderators. However, a minority of centres had to be contacted several times and held up proceedings and delayed the whole system. This not only caused extra work for moderators but additionally meant that centres who made prompt returns had to wait even longer to be notified about visits.

Moderators will give preference to those centres who reply punctually in the future. Those centres which reply much too late may find that the moderator cannot accommodate any of their preferred dates and will visit the centre at any time when assessment is taking place. Moderators will therefore ask centres to state clearly on form Mod BX when any summative assessments are scheduled to take place at the end of units of work and use these opportunities to visit centres. There is still a tendency for this section to be ticked to indicate that activities are included in the options offered to candidates rather than dates being given when assessments will take place.

Moderators were grateful when centres were able to offer alternative times for visits rather than give the same day and time in subsequent weeks. This enabled many of the moderators to spread out their visits and they were not pressured so heavily on certain days of the week, which in previous years had meant that the same classes were affected in their own centre.

It has been possible for moderators to see an increased range of activities rather than the major games. However, it must be remembered that they will expect to watch an activity that candidates will be

submitting for part of their coursework. There have been instances this year where candidates have been given low marks during a moderation visit and when this has been commented on by the moderators they have been told that only a few of the candidates would be using the activity. It would make better use of a moderator's time if they saw only the candidates taking the marks forward, and saw the performance of the rest of the candidates in another activity. Form Mod BX could be used to identify in brackets approximately how many candidates are submitting marks for each activity, as suggested in last year's report.

Moderators have expressed concern that a number of centres continue to omit to identify their best candidates on the reverse of form Mod B. To encourage centres to identify their most able candidates they were asked to rank order the best candidates rather than the exceptional performers as was previously the case, but in some instances this was still not being done and the section was left blank. If this happens in future the moderator may return the form for completion as it is a requirement to identify such candidates.

Additionally, the moderator will **definitely** want to see all of the marks for all of the candidates in all of the activities covered by the time of the visit. The provisional marks are something that moderators will expect to be available when visiting any centre.

Any centre with a candidate whose performance improves following a moderation visit may be required to produce video evidence for the moderator to substantiate the increase in marks awarded. If this happens following an early moderation visit then the centre should contact the moderator and identify such candidates before the fact becomes apparent when the marks are submitted, as has happened in the past and necessitated a follow-up visit.

Video evidence would also be beneficial for those candidates offering assessment-only activities for submission. Many parents will already be recording their youngster in action so it would not necessitate any extra work and the video could be sent to the moderator, especially if the activity was not one that the members of staff within the centre are fully conversant with.

The submission of the final marks in May for each candidate was fraught with problems this year. This was in part exacerbated by the late receipt of mark sheets in some centres. There was also some confusion as to which was the correct Candidate Record Form (CRF) to submit, as a result of AQA issuing information on the changes **to next year's forms** at around the same time. Some centres used photocopies of the CRF from the 2003 Specification as they had used it to record marks when activities had been completed, not realising that it had been amended, others because they had not received any forms at all and some centres used the form from Specification B. In other cases the incorrect CRF had been used: PE form for Games candidates and/or vice versa.

Generally, the paperwork was submitted on time, but an added complication this year arose because, for the first time, the CRF did not specify the submission date. There were various inconsistencies and inaccuracies which once again were not entirely the fault of the centre.

A number of centres did not include a Centre Declaration Sheet with their mark sheets and the majority of centres did not send the yellow copy of the Centre Mark Sheets (CMS) to moderators. However, this may well have been due to the fact that the Mod D letters set out the instructions that centres submit just the pink copy of the CMS or EDI printout and the **green** Declaration Sheet, which this year was in fact **white**, so little wonder there was confusion.

There were a number of instances where candidates had not signed their Candidate Record Form (CRF). This occurred most frequently when centres used their own computer-generated CRF. Centres must note that they can only use their own CRF if it provides **ALL** of the information required on the official AQA version.

A few centres failed to include the details relating to candidates who scored highly in some or all of the activities in the space provided on the reverse of the sheet to be completed by the teacher entitled “Teacher’s supporting statement”. In other instances some members of staff had completed this section for each candidate entered. It is not necessary to do so, but the facility exists to enable a teacher to provide any additional information in support of the marks that have been awarded to a candidate. It would help moderators tremendously if the section were completed if for any reason a candidate has been awarded a mark of zero for any component or part of it. If a candidate fails to submit work then NWK should be written rather than a zero. There may be rare occasions when a centre feels that a candidate has achieved no mark but has submitted some work of an exceptionally poor standard. In most cases candidates should be undergoing continuous assessment for the practical aspects so should be awarded a mark on their performance to date, even if they miss the final summative assessment session.

Some centres are still completing the details of the exercise/training programme inaccurately. Moderators need to know the name of the activity for which the programme was carried out, NOT the type of training that took place. It should also be noted that the training programme should be for one of the games/activities listed in Section 2 of the particular specification.

Some staff failed to identify the type of Swimming, Athletic, Dance and/or Gymnastic activity that was performed by candidates.

There continue to be some addition and/or multiplication errors on the CRF.

Some centres sent ALL copies of the CMS to the moderator with the CRF forms including the white top copy that should have gone directly to AQA. This could have got lost in the post and if the Centre had not kept a copy of any of the marks there would have been a serious problem.

There were far more candidates this year whose CRF did not match their specification entry, and a large number whose name had been added to the CMS rather than on a separate Supplementary Mark Sheet. The CMSs are optically read by a computer, and, had the errors not been spotted by the moderator, this would have resulted in many candidates scoring zero for the practical component.

This was the first year of the new specification and modified paperwork; hopefully the process will run more smoothly next time around.

Moderators reported that the majority of centres expedited the procedure with good practice. The initial paperwork was returned to the moderator on or even before the stated deadline and was completed fully, with dates for assessment provided for each activity offered by the centre and the provisional number of candidates likely to submit marks in brackets. Different days and times for the visit were also specified.

The Candidate Record Forms were placed in the order in which names appeared on the Centre Mark Sheets, with any amended entries dutifully entered onto a Supplementary Mark Sheet and the candidate withdrawn from the incorrect course. The CRF forms had been signed by each candidate and the teacher responsible for the group had made helpful comments when applicable on the reverse in support of the marks awarded. The Declaration Sheet had been signed by all staff involved in the teaching of the course. It was pleasing when this occurred and greatly appreciated.



## Physical Education Specification A (3581/W)

### *General*

The structured format of the paper, combined with the clear indication of marks available, ensured that this paper was accessible to all candidates whilst enabling the best candidates to achieve the highest marks. The amount of space available to answer questions gave a clear indication of the length of response necessary whilst allowing more able candidates to develop their answers in sufficient depth to gain maximum marks. It also meant that candidates were less likely to leave out parts of their answers.

The standard of candidates' responses varied but in general the majority showed a good knowledge base and demonstrated that candidates had been well prepared for the exam.

The general standard of quality of written communication was poor and even the stronger candidates often failed to achieve the higher marks available for this. The usual exam technique problems were still evident; failing to link the mark allocation to the key word in the question, eg describe, and repeating the wording of the question in the answer.

### *Question One*

Part (a) was generally answered well, with many candidates being able to state the accepted definition of health, but many other candidates gave extremely vague and long-winded responses with only general references to diet, exercise and fitness.

Part (b) produced generally good responses but there were candidates who confused agility with flexibility and therefore gave inappropriate responses. In part (ii) many candidates just repeated the wording of the question without going on to actually explain what it was, and there was often a rather vague example given in the second part of the question.

Part (c) often produced mixed responses with very superficial definitions of strength and stamina which were given without an explanation of how a lack of these components made everyday tasks difficult. The majority of candidates gained one mark for each example but failed to give enough detail to be awarded the second mark.

In part (d) most candidates were able to pick up maximum marks for their explanations of the need for a warm-up and warm-down. However, many candidates did not refer to increases in terms of blood flow but just gave vague responses along the lines of 'get the blood flowing'.

### *Question Two*

Part (a) was generally answered very well, with the majority of candidates being able to give three acceptable functions.

Part (b) was also generally answered well but there were fewer correct responses for the pivot joint than there were for the other two types of joint.

In part (c) very few candidates were able to give the correct explanation of flexion and many of the examples of physical movement were incorrect or vague. In part (iii) a few candidates did not use the answer given in part (ii); however, the majority were able to name the correct muscle.

In part (d) most candidates were able to gain at least one mark for their explanation of aerobic but few gained the second mark. About half of the candidates were able to give an example from a sporting situation and most answered part (iii) correctly

### *Question Three*

In general, candidates were able to gain good marks for this question if they knew their facts.

Part (a) was answered well, with most candidates knowing what specificity was, but few were able to explain overload in depth and many candidates considered it to be either harmful or dangerous.

In part (b) many candidates seemed to be able to draw upon their own experiences in undertaking the course and answered quite well, but many candidates tended to give a second component of fitness rather than give an alternative advantage. There were many and various correct responses to part (ii).

In part (c) there were often mixed responses with sometimes rather vague definitions of explosive strength and then very general examples given which just related to specific sports or activities without making any reference to the phase when explosive strength was used, eg sprinting, with no reference to the start phase.

In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained marks for the meaning of flexibility with many very imprecise, vague and unclear definitions attempted. In part (ii) responses were generally better but very few were able to give sufficient detail to attain all three of the marks available, with the majority attaining two.

#### ***Question Four***

In part (a) the definition of fatigue and the development of the effects on performance proved to be a good discriminator for the weaker candidates, with most gaining one mark but only about half of the candidates picking up the second mark for both parts of the question. Yet again, there was an alarming number of candidates who thought that fatigue in some way related to amounts of fat on the body and who had no idea of its correct meaning.

Part (b) was generally answered quite well in terms of candidates attaining a basic one mark but not all were able to progress on to collect the second one. Also, many referred just to ICT generally and did not **identify** which particular medium they were referring to in their answer and this led to many extremely vague responses.

Part (c) was generally answered extremely well by the majority of candidates, who were well aware of the term.

Part (d) was also answered quite well by the majority of candidates but it did identify candidates who had been taught all aspects of the specification and who were aware of this particular aspect and those who were not. There were some vague responses, especially with regard to the reasons for blood being removed from the body, and some candidates seemed to think that extra quantities of blood were being added.

#### ***Question Five***

In part (a), very few candidates gained full marks as they gave any form of user as user groups and did not identify particular ones, certainly not those stated in the specification.

In part (b) most candidates were able to pick up marks for stating a benefit which one of the roles could bring but few were able to go on to explain it – many just stated a brief list of benefits with no explanation. Also there was a great deal of repetition in terms of the benefits which seemed to be applied to all three roles.

Part (c) was generally answered well, especially by the more able candidates. However, there was a tendency for the responses to lack qualification, which meant that the second mark available for each section was not always attained.

In part (d) nearly all candidates answered part (i) correctly but many struggled to give three distinct reasons for part (ii), often just giving vague references to role models rather than answering the question set on their particular influence.

#### ***Question Six***

In part (a) the three different forms of the media were identified correctly in most cases. Parts (ii) and (iii) were not as well answered, with candidates often confusing the question and not sticking to basic responses which would have been more appropriate.

Part (b) was generally answered well but few candidates gained both of the marks for their definition of etiquette. However, most were able to give two suitable examples of it occurring.

Part (c) was very well answered with the majority of candidates attaining full marks. In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained the full three marks for part (i) but part (ii) was answered well, with the majority attaining full marks.

## **Physical Education (Games) (3583/W)**

### ***General***

The structured format of the paper, combined with the clear indication of marks available, ensured that this paper was accessible to all candidates whilst enabling the best candidates to achieve the highest marks. The amount of space available to answer questions gave a clear indication of the length of response necessary whilst allowing more able candidates to develop their answers in sufficient depth to gain maximum marks.

The main problem encountered by candidates on this paper was in failing to take heed of the instructions in specific parts of questions only to refer to the particular game activities in the specification. Many referred to physical activities which would have been appropriate on the physical education paper but were not acceptable on this one. If this was the case, candidates lost a maximum of one mark for using an inappropriate activity but were then given credit if the rest of the response was acceptable and correct and were awarded marks accordingly.

The standard of candidates' responses varied but in general the majority showed a good knowledge base and that candidates had been well prepared for the exam. The rubric infringement was an issue which had not been clearly identified to all candidates.

The general standard of quality of written communication was poor and even the stronger candidates often failed to achieve the higher marks available for this. The usual exam technique problems were still evident: failing to link the mark allocation to the key word in the question, eg describe, and repeating the wording of the question in the answer.

### ***Question One***

Part (a) was generally answered well, with many candidates being able to state the accepted definition of health, but many other candidates gave extremely vague and long-winded responses with only general references to diet, exercise and fitness.

Part (b) produced generally good responses but there were candidates who confused agility with flexibility and therefore gave inappropriate responses. In part (ii) many candidates just repeated the wording of the question without going on to actually explain what it was, and there was often a rather vague example given in the second part of the question. This was a possible rubric infringement question in terms of using an inappropriate activity and many did occur. This was particularly common in part (ii) where many candidates referred to the start of a 100 metres race and reacting to the starting gun. Despite a rubric error, candidates could still achieve two out of the four marks available.

Part (c) often produced mixed responses with very superficial definitions of strength and stamina which were given without an explanation of how a lack of these components made everyday tasks difficult. The majority of candidates gained one mark for each example but failed to give enough detail to be awarded the second mark.

In part (d) most candidates were able to pick up maximum marks for their explanations of the need for a warm-up and warm-down. However, many candidates did not refer to increases in terms of blood flow but just gave vague responses along the lines of 'get the blood flowing'.

### **Question Two**

Part (a) was generally answered very well, with the majority of candidates being able to give three acceptable functions.

Part (b) was also generally answered well but there were fewer correct responses for the pivot joint than there were for the other two types of joint.

In part (c) very few candidates were able to give the correct explanation of flexion and many of the examples of physical movement were incorrect or vague. In part (iii) a few candidates did not use the answer given in part (ii); however, the majority were able to name the correct muscle.

In part (d) most candidates were able to gain at least one mark for their explanation of aerobic but few gained the second mark. About half of the candidates were able to give an example from a sporting situation and most answered part (iii) correctly.

This was another possible activity rubric infringement question and errors were quite common.

### **Question Three**

In general, candidates were able to gain good marks for this question if they knew their facts.

Part (a) was answered well, with most candidates knowing what specificity was but few were able to explain overload in depth and many candidates considered it to be either harmful or dangerous.

In part (b) many candidates seemed to be able to draw upon their own experiences in undertaking the course and answered quite well but many candidates tended to give a second component of fitness rather than give an alternative advantage. There were many and various correct responses to part (ii).

In part (c) there were often mixed responses with sometimes rather vague definitions of explosive strength and then very general examples given which just related to specific sports or activities without making any reference to the phase when explosive strength was used, eg. sprinting, with no reference to the start phase.

In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained marks for the meaning of flexibility with many very imprecise, vague and unclear definitions attempted. In part (ii) responses were generally better but very few were able to give sufficient detail to attain all three of the marks available with the majority attaining two. In part (ii) there was the possibility of a rubric infringement and this quite often occurred; especially common was a reference to gymnastics. However, if the response was good, only one mark was lost for the incorrect activity being used.

### **Question Four**

In part (a) the definition of fatigue and the development of the effects on performance proved to be a good discriminator for the weaker candidates, with most gaining one mark but only about half of the candidates picking up the second mark for both parts of the question. Yet again, there was an alarming number of candidates who thought that fatigue in some way related to amounts of fat on the body and who had no idea of its correct meaning.

In part (ii) there was the possibility of a rubric infringement but this was less common than in other parts of the paper. If a mistake was made it could have resulted in the loss of just one mark if the rest of the response was correct.

Part (b) was generally answered quite well in terms of candidates attaining a basic one mark, but not all were able to progress on to collect the second one. Also, many referred just to ICT generally and did not **identify** which particular medium they were referring to in their answer and this led to many extremely vague responses.

Part (c) was generally answered extremely well by the majority of candidates, who were well aware of the term.

Part (d) was also answered quite well by the majority of candidates but it did identify candidates who had been taught all aspects of the specification and who were aware of this particular aspect and those who were not. There were some vague responses, especially with regard to the reasons for blood being removed from the body and some candidates seemed to think that extra quantities of blood were being added.

### ***Question Five***

In part (a), very few candidates gained full marks as they gave any form of user as user groups and did not identify particular ones, certainly not those stated in the specification.

In part (b) most candidates were able to pick up marks for stating a benefit which one of the roles could bring but few were able to go on to explain it – many just stated a brief list of benefits with no explanation. Also there was a great deal of repetition in terms of the benefits which seemed to be applied to all three roles.

Part (c) was generally answered well, especially by the more able candidates. However, there was a tendency for the responses to lack qualification, which meant that the second mark available for each section was not always attained.

In part (d) nearly all candidates answered part (i) correctly but many struggled to give three distinct reasons for part (ii), often just giving vague references to role models rather than answering the question set on their particular influence.

### ***Question Six***

In part (a) the three different forms of the media were identified correctly in most cases. Parts (ii) and (iii) were not as well answered, with candidates often confusing the question and not sticking to basic responses which would have been more appropriate.

Part (b) was generally answered well but few candidates gained both of the marks for their definition of etiquette. However, most were able to give two suitable examples of it occurring.

Part (c) was very well answered, with the majority of candidates attaining full marks.

In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained the full three marks for part (i) but part (ii) was answered well, with the majority attaining full marks.

## **Physical Education (Short Course) (3586/W)**

### ***General***

The structured format of the paper, combined with the clear indication of marks available, ensured that this paper was accessible to all candidates whilst enabling the best candidates to achieve the highest marks. The amount of space available to answer questions gave candidates a clear indication of the length of response necessary, whilst allowing more able candidates to develop their answers in sufficient depth to gain maximum marks.

The standard of candidates' responses varied but in general the majority showed a good knowledge base and that candidates had been well prepared for the exam.

The general standard of quality of written communication was poor and even the stronger candidates often failed to achieve the higher marks available for this. The usual exam technique problems were still evident: failing to link the mark allocation to the key word in the question, eg describe, and repeating the wording of the question in the answer.

### ***Question One***

Part (a) was generally answered well, with many candidates being able to state the accepted definition of health, but many other candidates gave extremely vague and long-winded responses with only general references to diet, exercise and fitness.

Part (b) produced generally good responses but there were candidates who confused agility with flexibility, or even with ability, and therefore gave inappropriate responses. In part (ii) many candidates just repeated the wording of the question without going on to actually explain what it was and there was often a rather vague example given in the second part of the question.

Part (c) often produced mixed responses with very superficial definitions of strength and stamina which were given without an explanation of how a lack of these components made everyday tasks difficult. The majority of candidates gained one mark for each example but failed to give enough detail to be awarded the second mark.

In part (d) most candidates were able to pick up maximum marks for their explanations of the need for a warm-up and warm-down. However, many candidates did not refer to increases in terms of blood flow but just gave vague responses along the lines of ‘get the blood flowing’.

### ***Question Two***

Part (a) was answered well, with most candidates knowing what specificity was, but few were able to explain overload in depth and many candidates considered it to be either harmful or dangerous and to refer to overuse. However, there were often extremes of responses with some of the candidates clearly knowing the answers and others clearly not.

In part (b) many candidates seemed to be able to draw upon their own experiences in undertaking the course and answered quite well, but many candidates tended to give a second component of fitness rather than give an alternative advantage. There were many and various correct responses to part (ii).

In part (c) there were often mixed responses with sometimes rather vague definitions of explosive strength and then very general examples given which just related to specific sports or activities without making any reference to the phase when explosive strength was used, eg sprinting, with no reference to the start phase.

In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained marks for the meaning of flexibility with many very imprecise, vague and unclear definitions attempted. In part (ii) responses were generally better but very few were able to give sufficient detail to attain all three of the marks available, with the majority attaining two. This was a possible rubric infringement question in terms of using an inappropriate activity and many did occur. This was particularly common in part (ii) where many candidates referred to the start of a 100 metres race and reacting to the starting gun. Despite a rubric error, candidates could still achieve two out of the four marks available.

### ***Question Three***

In part (a) most candidates were able to pick up marks for stating a benefit which one of the roles could bring, but few were able to go on to explain it – many just stated a brief list of benefits with no explanation. Also there was a great deal of repetition in terms of the benefits which seemed to be applied to all three roles. Generally the role of captain was better answered than the others and there was often confusion about the role of organiser.

Part (b) was generally answered quite well, with the majority of the candidates at least attaining one mark and the more able being able to attain all six. Many candidates were able to use their own school experiences in responding to this question.

In part (c) nearly all candidates answered part (i) correctly but many struggled to give three distinct reasons for part (ii), often just giving vague references to role models rather than answering the question set on their particular influence.

Part (d) was probably the least well answered question on the paper, with a large number of candidates being unaware of the role of governing bodies, and responses were often vague, unclear and confused.

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

### ***General***

The structured format of the paper, combined with the clear indication of marks available, ensured that this paper was accessible to all candidates whilst enabling the best candidates to achieve the highest marks. The amount of space available to answer questions gave a clear indication of the

length of response necessary whilst allowing more able candidates to develop their answers in sufficient depth to gain maximum marks.

The main problem encountered by candidates on this paper was in failing to take heed of the instructions in specific parts of questions only to refer to the particular game activities in the specification. Many referred to physical activities which would have been appropriate on the physical education paper but were not acceptable on this one. If this was the case, candidates lost a maximum of one mark for using an inappropriate activity but were then given credit if the rest of the response was acceptable and correct and were awarded marks accordingly.

The standard of candidates' responses varied but in general the majority showed a good knowledge base and that candidates had been well prepared for the exam. The rubric infringement was an issue which had not been clearly identified to all candidates.

The general standard of quality of written communication was poor and even the stronger candidates often failed to achieve the higher marks available for this. The usual exam technique problems were still evident: failing to link the mark allocation to the key word in the question eg. describe, and repeating the wording of the question in the answer.

### ***Question One***

Part (a) was generally answered well, with many candidates being able to state the accepted definition of health, but many other candidates gave extremely vague and long-winded responses with only general references to diet, exercise and fitness.

Part (b) produced generally good responses but there were candidates who confused agility with flexibility, or even with ability, and therefore gave inappropriate responses. In part (ii) many candidates just repeated the wording of the question without going on to actually explain what it was and there was often a rather vague example given in the second part of the question. This was a possible rubric infringement question in terms of using an inappropriate activity and many did occur. This was particularly common in part (ii) where many candidates referred to the start of a 100 metres race and reacting to the starting gun. Despite a rubric error, candidates could still achieve two out of the four marks available.

Part (c) often produced mixed responses with very superficial definitions of strength and stamina which were given without an explanation of how a lack of these components made everyday tasks difficult. The majority of candidates gained one mark for each example but failed to give enough detail to be awarded the second mark.

In part (d) most candidates were able to pick up maximum marks for their explanations of the need for a warm-up and warm-down. However, many candidates did not refer to increases in terms of blood flow but just gave vague responses along the lines of 'get the blood flowing'.

### ***Question Two***

Part (a) was answered well, with most candidates knowing what specificity was, but few were able to explain overload in depth and many candidates considered it to be either harmful or dangerous and to refer to overuse. However, there were often extremes of responses, with some of the candidates clearly knowing the answers and others clearly not.

In part (b) many candidates seemed to be able to draw upon their own experiences in undertaking the course and answered quite well, but many candidates tended to give a second component of fitness rather than give an alternative advantage. There were many and various correct responses to part (ii).

In part (c) there were often mixed responses with sometimes rather vague definitions of explosive strength and then very general examples given which just related to specific sports or activities without making any reference to the phase when explosive strength was used, eg sprinting, with no reference to the start phase.

In part (d) surprisingly few candidates gained marks for the meaning of flexibility, with many very imprecise, vague and unclear definitions attempted. In part (ii) responses were generally better but very few were able to give sufficient detail to attain all three of the marks available, with the majority attaining two. In part (ii) there was the possibility of a rubric infringement and this quite often occurred; especially common was a reference to gymnastics. However, if the response was good, only one mark was lost for the incorrect activity being used.

### ***Question Three***

In part (a) most candidates were able to pick up marks for stating a benefit which one of the roles could bring but few were able to go on to explain it – many just stated a brief list of benefits with no explanation. Also there was a great deal of repetition in terms of the benefits which seemed to be applied to all three roles. Generally the role of captain was better answered than the others and there was often confusion about the role of organiser.

Part (b) was generally answered quite well, with the majority of the candidates at least attaining one mark and the more able being able to attain all six. Many candidates were able to use their own school experiences in responding to this question.

In part (c) nearly all candidates answered part (i) correctly but many struggled to give three distinct reasons for part (ii), often just giving vague references to role models rather than answering the question set on their particular influence.

Part (d) was probably the least well answered question on the paper, with a large number of candidates being unaware of the role of governing bodies, and responses were often vague, unclear and confused.



# Mark Ranges 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	351.9	62.1
Paper 3581/W Written Paper	105	320	181.0	61.8
Overall 3581	--	800	532.9	110.5

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3581/P component boundary mark	raw	480	433	395	357	320	263	206	149	92
	scaled	480	433	395	357	320	263	206	149	92
3581/W component boundary mark	raw	105	87	81	75	69	58	47	37	27
	scaled	320	265	247	229	210	177	143	113	82
Scaled boundary mark		800	677	625	573	522	435	348	262	176

### Provisional statistics for the award

*(21264 candidates)*

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	8.0	22.2	40.3	57.3	79.5	92.6	98.1	99.7

## 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	337.6	65.0
Paper 3583/W Written Paper	105	320	160.6	62.8
Overall 3583	--	800	498.2	112.7

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3583/P component boundary mark	raw	480	433	395	357	320	263	206	149	92
	scaled	480	433	395	357	320	263	206	149	92
3583/W component boundary mark	raw	105	86	80	74	68	57	46	36	26
	scaled	320	262	244	226	207	174	140	110	79
Scaled boundary mark		800	667	615	563	511	427	343	259	175

### Provisional statistics for the award

*(18897 candidates)*

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.9	14.8	30.9	48.6	72.2	88.7	96.5	99.0

## 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	179.3	38.7
Paper 3586/W Written Paper	53	188	106.3	41.4
Overall 3586	--	470	286.0	67.5

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3586/P component boundary mark	raw	280	245	223	201	179	145	112	79	46
	scaled	282	247	225	202	180	146	113	80	46
3586/W component boundary mark	raw	53	46	42	38	34	31	28	25	22
	scaled	188	163	149	135	121	110	99	89	78
Scaled boundary mark		470	392	359	326	294	252	210	168	126

### Provisional statistics for the award

*(1443 candidates)*

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.7	14.4	28.5	43.9	65.9	83.9	93.8	98.0

## 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	175.7	39.9
Paper 3588/W Written Paper	53	188	86.6	38.8
Overall 3588	--	470	262.3	67.3

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3588/P component boundary mark	raw	280	245	223	201	179	145	112	79	46
	scaled	282	247	225	202	180	146	113	80	46
3588/W component boundary mark	raw	53	46	41	36	32	29	26	23	20
	scaled	188	163	145	128	114	103	92	82	71
Scaled boundary mark		470	390	354	318	282	241	201	161	121

### Provisional statistics for the award

(2318 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.4	8.7	19.9	37.6	59.7	77.5	90.1	97.2

## 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).