

GCSE 2004
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

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

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

	<i>Page No.</i>
Practical Assessment	5
Paper 1 (3581/W).....	10
Paper 1 (3583/W).....	13
Paper 1 (3586/W).....	16
Paper 1 (3588/W).....	18
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades.....	20

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 becoming increasingly confident with the requirements of the moderation visit and are extremely well prepared. Teachers are becoming more aware of the requirement for the candidates to demonstrate linked, progressive skills for Skill Area A rather than skills in isolation. The moderators were also impressed with the range of more complex tasks given to the more able candidates to enable them to demonstrate their higher attainment levels. Moderators report that centres are coping well with the modifications to the specification.

The expectations of moderators have become clearer to centres as a result of the standardisation meetings, although in some cases they do not make sure that 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. Best practice involves all members of staff who teach GCSE courses being available for the moderation visit and involved in marking the candidates in at least one of the activities, taking it in turn to be responsible for leading the session for the various activities being seen.

As it is now a requirement that all candidates be assessed on their ability to lead a warm-up/cool-down the moderators expected to see some of the most confident of these prepared to demonstrate their ability in this aspect of the session. It is pleasing to report that the majority of centres are including pupil-led warm-ups and/or cool-downs as part of the moderation process and that the candidates are acquitting themselves well. They also reported that a large number of candidates demonstrated their officiating competence when the game/activity situation was being assessed.

Most centres have marked examples of coursework laid out for moderators to see and in many cases these are ranked or placed in competence bands. They have also been clearly marked and 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 further sample to be sent if it has not been made clear where the candidates have attained marks on the samples seen, or if the samples have not been annotated.

The number and range of samples that will be asked for by the moderator are 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 standard 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 with their identifying bib, playing position and marks. Increasingly centres have provided the moderator with digital images of all candidates. The moderation visit runs smoothly for the major games when candidates wear their playing position and team colour for Skill Area B during the assessment of Skill Area A.

An increasing 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 and/or new members of staff to clarify the expectations of each of the three main categories (Highly Competent, Competent and Moderately Successful) and ultimately assist with their marking accuracy. It has also helped with the clarification and consistency of marking of the Summer activities as there has been a tendency in the past to concentrate moderation visits in the Autumn and Spring Terms.

Centres need to be aware that the moderator will expect to see all of the provisional marks for each candidate in each activity; these have not always been available. It is a requirement that all of the candidates be available for the moderation. If this is not possible because of logistical reasons (for example, where large groups or even the whole year group are 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 select the candidates they wish to see on the day.

Moderators report that the visits are extremely well organised, with the majority of centres providing comprehensive information at the time of the visit. Candidates have been clearly identifiable and the moderator provided with a rank order for each activity, detailing the provisional marks awarded for each candidate for all Skill Areas.

The majority of centres ensured that adequate time was available for the visit. It is in the best interests of the candidates when showing Skill Area B to ensure that they 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 their 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. Moderators reported a minority of instances of over-marking and most often with staff new to GCSE or when assessing activities that have been recently introduced at the centre.

All moderators commented on the rapport that exists between them and the staff in their centres, which facilitates excellent working relationships.

Administration

A minority of centres took some time to return the initial paperwork outlining convenient dates for visits to moderators. This meant that they had to be contacted several times and this delayed proceedings. This not only caused extra work for moderators but additionally meant that centres that made prompt returns had to wait even longer to be notified about visits.

Moderators will be advised to give priority to centres that return the paperwork promptly and organise visits with them whilst awaiting replies from other centres. This may mean that centres that reply very 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 will 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. If this is the case the form will be returned to staff at the centre for them to provide exact dates and times.

Once again moderators were extremely grateful to those centres that were able to offer alternative days and 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 has resulted in the same classes being affected in their own centre.

Once again a number of moderators have expressed concern that there are still centres that continue to omit to identify their highest-scoring candidates on the reverse of form Mod B. To encourage staff to identify their most able candidates they have been asked to rank order the best candidates rather than the exceptional performers as was previously the case, but this is still not being done and the section is frequently left blank. If this happens again for the next examination the moderator will return the form for completion as it is a requirement to identify such candidates.

Additionally, the moderator will **definitely** want to have available all of the provisional marks awarded by the centre for all of the candidates in all of the activities covered by the time of the visit. These provisional marks are something that moderators will expect to be available for each of the Skill Areas when visiting the centre.

There have been instances this year where candidates had marks adjusted downwards by the moderator during a moderation visit and these were agreed by the staff in the centre, but when the final marks were submitted the mark had been increased again. It should be noted that any centre with a candidate whose performance improves following a moderation visit, whether the marks were adjusted or not, 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 the centre should contact the moderator and identify such candidates before the fact becomes apparent when the marks are submitted. This has happened in the past and has necessitated a follow-up visit.

Video evidence is extremely beneficial for those candidates offering assessment-only activities for submission. Many parents record their youngster in action and it does not necessitate any extra work for staff. 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. Any assessment-only package should be marked by staff in the centre as it is they that have been standardised. If they are unfamiliar with the activity they should give the candidate a provisional mark and then contact their moderator for further advice. The video can then be sent to the moderator, a coursework adviser or activity-specific adviser for the mark to be clarified.

The submission of the final marks in May proved problematic again this year, partly due to confusion over the submission dates as these do not appear on the Candidate Record Form (CRF). Some centres thought that 31 May was the submission date for both the Short and Full Course. It should be noted that the submission date for the Full Course is 5 May. Some centres used photocopies of the CRF from the 2004 Specification as they had used it to record marks when activities had been completed. In other cases the incorrect CRF had been used: PE form for Games candidates and/or vice versa. There were a number of instances where candidates had not signed their Record Form. 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 number of centres did not include a Centre Declaration Sheet with their mark sheets nor did they send the yellow copy of the Centre Mark Sheets (CMS) or the individual Candidate Record Forms to moderators.

As part of QCA requirements moderators need to see a specified range of candidates' work for the Fitness Training Programme. In order to decide which pieces of work will form the sample, moderators will need to know the marks awarded for the programmes, so they will need to have the Candidate Record Forms (CRF) and the yellow copy of the Centre Mark Sheet (CMS). The moderator will indicate with the letter "S" written on the yellow CMS form returned to the centre the candidates' work they wish to be sent to them. The whole checking process can be speeded up if moderators know when the Training Programmes are completed in each centre. The moderator can then either see them during a moderation visit or request a list of the marks awarded following their completion and have them sent prior to the final submission of marks. This will take the pressure off moderators having to cross-check large numbers of programmes in a relatively short period of time and also allow time for dialogue with the centre if any aspects need clarification.

Moderators have reported a number of anomalies concerning the Fitness Training Programmes. Some samples provided by centres have been completely devoid of any ticks or annotations; this makes it extremely difficult for the moderator to identify whereabouts in the text staff have awarded the marks. Centres should note that all coursework should clearly show where marks have been awarded, and if it is not apparent the moderator will return the samples to the centre for the staff to indicate the areas of text they consider warrant marks.

Moderators reported a tendency toward generous marking in some instances, with candidates being awarded marks for generalised statements that showed little or no application of the information to the candidates' personal Training Programme or the activity it was planned for. This was most evident in the planning sections concerned with the awareness of safety and the appropriate application of the principles of training. The evaluation section was also generously marked as many somewhat simplistic statements that lacked explanation or detail were awarded the full two marks rather than just one.

Consternation has been expressed by many moderators at the frequency with which large numbers of candidates, and in some cases all candidates, have been given full marks for the performing section of the programme. Moderators will be asking centres for the dates and times of this component of the course and requesting the opportunity to see candidates performing their Fitness Training Programme in the future.

It has also become apparent from the work of candidates that some candidates are carrying out their Fitness Training Programmes in their own time and often during the school holidays. If this is the case staff are prepared to give up a considerable amount of their time to see each candidate performing or they are awarding marks for this section without seeing the candidates perform. Moderators will be seeking clarification from these centres to establish the evidence that is available to enable marks to be awarded and how the centre ensures that they are reliable and accurate. It should be noted that the Teachers' Guide (page 20, paragraph 5.4, bullet point three) clearly states that "Teachers **must** observe/monitor the candidates carrying out the programme **at least once** during its implementation. Furthermore, as it is part of the Key Stage 4 National Curriculum that all students are expected to fulfil the requirements of a Personal Exercise Fitness Training Programme, it is acceptable that candidates are additionally marked for the purposes of GCSE coursework assessment. Centres should be aware that Core Physical Education lessons may be used to carry out assessments for any aspect of the practical course.

The proforma provided by AQA, available on the website www.aqa.org.uk, has been well received by centres. It provides guidance to the candidates as well as simplifying the marking process. The layout of the proforma provides more structure, which has been particularly beneficial to lower-ability candidates.

Moderators would like to take this opportunity to thank those centres who mark the Fitness Training Programmes in a clear manner with ticks indicating where marks have been awarded and often annotate the scripts with comments to clarify where insufficient and sufficient information has been provided by the candidate to justify the marks awarded.

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. A large number of forms stated “Circuit training”. It should also be noted that the training programme need not be one of the candidate’s four activities but must 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.

A few 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.

Once again there were a number of 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 could have resulted in the candidates not receiving a mark for the practical component.

There were instances where an inappropriate PE sport/activity was included on the Games CRF, or vice versa; interestingly, when this was pointed out to some centres they returned the form with an appropriate activity with a higher mark than the inappropriate one. Moderators will be following up such occurrences.

There were also occasions where the first two activities on the CRF form were from the same group and these had to be returned to the centre for correction.

Moderators reported that the majority of centres expedited the moderation process with good practice. The initial paperwork was returned to the moderator on or even before the stated deadline and was completed accurately, 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 provided.

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 Centre Mark Sheet (GCS2) 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 supporting statements when applicable on the reverse in support of the marks awarded to the candidate. The Declaration Sheet had been signed by all staff involved in the teaching of the course. Moderators would like to thank these centres as their time and effort in completing the forms correctly was greatly appreciated and made their task easier to complete.

Physical Education Specification A (3581/W)

General

The marks achieved this year are higher than those achieved last year and examiners reported seeing far fewer low-scoring scripts than previously. The candidates had definitely benefited from the booklet-style format, the complete breakdown of mark allocation in each question and the addition of blank lined paper at the end of the booklet to be used for additional answers or extensions of answers. There were still some examples of candidates using inappropriate practical activity examples in Sections A and B and this occurred particularly in Question 4 (c).

Also, as in previous years, there were countless examples of responses being too vague, unclear and not focused on the key words of the question, particularly those in bold text drawing the candidates' attention to the main point of the question.

As in previous years, the standard of Quality of Written Communication was not particularly high and many candidates failed to achieve the threshold level, with very few achieving marks in the ranges above this.

Question One

Part (a) (i) was generally answered well, with many candidates making use of the aspects of the definition of health as the basis of their two reasons and many others choosing to refer to components of fitness as the basis of their response. In Part (ii) many candidates lost marks by just listing points and factors without going on to **explain** (the key word in the question) and therefore attain the full marks available.

Part (b) (i) was answered well in the main but many candidates found it difficult to answer the question without using the term 'specific' in the answer and were unable to give a full explanation of the term in a more concise and clear way. In Part (ii) many candidates referred to aspects of skill such as passing or dribbling and failed to identify an aspect of fitness which would have been appropriate and which was asked for in the question. Those who were able to clearly identify an acceptable aspect then gave generally good and full responses which fully answered the question set.

In Part (c), the majority of the candidates were able to answer the question well and to use good and appropriate examples within their answers.

Part (d) (i) was answered particularly well, with the vast majority of the candidates clearly able to name a substance. The majority of the candidates were then able to answer Part (ii) quite well but not all were able to give a fully detailed answer which completely described the sporting situation in terms of when the carbohydrate loading should take place, appropriate quantities being considered and also a totally suitable situation being chosen. Nearly all candidates attained some of the marks available but few attained all three.

Question Two

In part (a) the main issue was one of spelling, as candidates were not able to spell tibia and fibula correctly but came up with a selection of combinations of both! The majority of candidates attained at least two marks but many failed to attain all three because of their inability to clearly identify (and spell) all three clearly. Part (ii) was generally answered quite well by those candidates who knew the function but there were many who confused the ligament with the tendon in (b) (ii) and got the answer the wrong way round.

Part (b) (i) was answered well and the type being identified in the lead-in to the question helped candidates to identify a *type* in the answer rather than just to give an example of a particular muscle. In Part (ii) there was an amount of confusion with some candidates between the tendon and ligament (as in (a) (ii)). The latter part of the question concerning the origin and insertion was answered well by the more able candidates, who had covered the specification content well and in detail, and less well by those who did not have sufficient knowledge to answer the question fully.

Part (c) (i) was probably the best-answered section of the paper, with the vast majority of the candidates able to identify two places. However, answers in Part (ii) tended to be very vague and unclear, with little or no **explanation** given to back up basic points made about heart rates or recovery rates. It was this lack of explanation and expansion upon basic points made that led to few candidates attaining the full three marks available for this part of the question.

Question Three

Part (a) (i) was answered quite well, with the majority of candidates able to give at least one acceptable benefit but not all able to go on to give two acceptable examples which were two different benefits. In Part (ii) there were candidates who clearly understood the terms and were able to give concise and precise definitions and others who found it difficult to describe them and consequently gave rather vague and rambling responses. Part (iii) was generally answered very well but there was some confusion with some candidates about the exact meaning of the word, with some of them considering it to mean performing activities in reverse order or backwards!

Part (b) (i) was generally answered well, with the majority of the candidates referring to the sit and reach test, but other candidates were also successful in clearly explaining another test of flexibility which could be used. In Part (ii), whilst the majority of the candidates were able to attain one mark for making some reference to stretching, few were able to develop their response sufficiently to attain the additional mark.

In Part (c) (i) not all candidates were able to identify particular drug types clearly, despite having been given one of the examples in the lead-in to the question. Many repeated anabolic steroids as one of their types and others gave examples of particular drugs rather than the **type**, which was asked for in the question. In Part (ii) most of the candidates were able to give reasonable responses but many failed to consider the basic point that they are taken to enhance performance and many failed to **describe** the effects they might have but just gave rather vague lists of possible effects.

Question Four

In Part (a) (i) there was a fairly even spread between candidates who were able to identify particular body types and those who were not. Poor spelling meant that it was not clear to examiners in all cases exactly what the candidate was identifying as a body type. If candidates were able to correctly refer in Part (ii) to a particular body type they then often failed to **describe** clearly how it could be an advantage and make the performer more effective. Generally, this part of the question was not answered particularly well.

In Part (b) candidates tended to repeat responses for both parts of the question. The more able candidates were able to link Part (i) to the analysis aspect and then go on to consider how this could be used to improve a performance in Part (ii), but the less able candidates made similar, or in some cases identical, comments in both parts of the question. In Part (ii) many candidates also failed to link their response to an actual example, despite being asked to do so in the question, but those who did so produced more concise and correct responses.

Part (c) was answered with a varying degree of success. Many candidates simply failed to consider what was correct and a great many candidates referred to incorrect clothing and footwear, often giving

quite absurd examples and failing to answer the question set. Despite the fact that examples were asked for in both parts of the question these were often omitted or inappropriate, and poor examples were chosen, often from unacceptable activities.

In Part (d) many candidates made very unspecific reference to rules in general without giving specific examples and there was a tendency to fail to link the response to the safety aspect identified in the question. Other candidates also chose examples which were not rules but would be more correctly considered to be etiquette or good practice.

Question Five

The format of this question, which was broken down into two mark sections, meant that it was generally answered well by the majority of candidates as the mark breakdown was very clear and obvious.

In Part (a) the majority of candidates were able to give good responses for Parts (i) and (ii) but not all fully understood Part (iii) and they seemed unclear about the role of a sports club. There were also instances where candidates did not refer to facilities in Part (ii) as being the school facilities but considered the location of facilities in general – this seemed to be a case of candidates not linking the specific areas of the question to the lead-in statement which preceded all of the separate sections.

In Part (b) there was a huge range and variety of activities identified in the two parts of the answer as being more or less popular and there was obviously a great deal of local and regional variation. Credit was given if candidates were able to justify their responses but many just made sweeping statements without including any **explanation** as to why popularity had been affected.

Responses to Part (c) also varied considerably. Those candidates who were clearly acquainted with governing bodies and their roles were able to give good, clear and concise answers but others seemed uncertain about what they were and just made reference to clubs, officials and organisations. There also tended to be a great deal of repetition with the same points made several times.

Part (d) was generally answered quite well but candidates did not always **describe** the influences, just using blanket terms such as ‘encourage’ or ‘don’t encourage’. This lack of detailed response led to some marks being lost by many of the candidates.

Question Six

In both parts of (a), candidates often attained two out of the three marks but failed to answer the question in sufficient detail to attain the final mark. This was often due to not answering the question in full. In Part (i) this often meant not linking it to an increase in participation and in Part (ii) not fully linking the response back to the question. There was a tendency for candidates to refer to sponsorship in general without actually answering the question set, because they did not check its exact wording.

Part (b) was generally answered well but where candidates lost marks it was through not considering both of the aspects of the question by stating a way and then giving an example which was appropriate. The tendency was to do either one or the other but not always to do both!

In Part (c) the majority of the responses were good, with most of the candidates attaining at least half of the marks available. Marks were lost through candidates failing to **describe** but simply making statements such as ‘disrupt’, ‘encourage’, ‘help’ or ‘riot’ without any further development as to how this would then be either a benefit or a problem.

Part (d) was generally answered quite poorly with a lot of very vague, confused and muddled responses which contained many inaccuracies. The more able candidates were able to attain full marks but many others were unable to identify correct events and to link these to either political or financial issues. Many responses failed to include examples and if they were included they often were not clearly laid out and described in any detail.

Physical Education (Games) (3583/W)

General

The marks achieved this year are higher than those achieved last year and examiners reported seeing far fewer low-scoring scripts than previously. The candidates had definitely benefited from the booklet-style format, the complete breakdown of mark allocation in each question and the addition of blank lined paper at the end of the booklet to be used for additional answers or extensions of answers. There were still some examples of candidates using inappropriate practical activity examples and therefore committing rubric infringements in Sections A and B. This occurred particularly in Question 1 (b) (ii), 1 (c) and 4 (a) (ii). Where this did occur candidates were only deducted a maximum of one mark for the unacceptable activity if the rest of the response was correct.

Also, as in previous years, there were countless examples of responses being too vague, unclear and not focused on the key words of the question, particularly those in bold text drawing the candidates' attention to the main point of the question.

As in previous years, the standard of Quality or Written Communication was not particularly high and many candidates failed to achieve the threshold level, with very few achieving marks in the ranges above this.

Question One

Part (a) (i) was generally answered well, with many candidates making use of the aspects of the definition of health as the basis of their two reasons and many others choosing to refer to components of fitness as the basis of their response. In Part (ii) many candidates lost marks by just listing points and factors without going on to **explain** (the key word in the question) and therefore attain the full marks available.

Part (b) (i) was answered well in the main but many candidates found it difficult to answer the question without using the term 'specific' in the answer and were unable to give a full explanation of the term in a more concise and clear way. In Part (ii) there were many rubric infringements with non game activities chosen and many candidates also referred to aspects of skill such as passing or dribbling and failed to identify an aspect of fitness which would have been appropriate and which was asked for in the question. Those who were able to clearly identify an acceptable aspect then gave generally good and full responses which fully answered the question set.

In Part (c) there were also many examples of rubric infringements but the majority of the candidates were able to answer the question well and to use good and appropriate examples within their answers.

Part (d) (i) was answered particularly well, with the vast majority of the candidates clearly able to name a substance. The majority of the candidates were then able to answer Part (ii) quite well but not all were able to give a fully detailed answer which completely described the sporting situation in terms of when the carbohydrate loading should take place, appropriate quantities being considered and also a totally suitable situation being chosen. Nearly all candidates attained some of the marks available but few attained all three.

Question Two

In Part (a) the main issue was one of spelling, as candidates were not able to spell tibia and fibula correctly but came up with a selection of combinations of both! The majority of candidates attained at least two marks but many failed to attain all three because of their inability to clearly identify (and spell) all three clearly. Part (ii) was generally answered quite well by those candidates who knew the function but there were many who confused the ligament with the tendon in (b) (ii) and got the answer the wrong way round.

Part (b) (i) was answered well and the type being identified in the lead-in to the question helped candidates to identify a *type* in the answer rather than just to give an example of a particular muscle. In Part (ii) there was an amount of confusion with some candidates between the tendon and ligament (as in (a) (ii)). The latter part of the question concerning the origin and insertion was answered well by the more able candidates, who had covered the specification content well and in detail, and less well by those who did not have sufficient knowledge to answer the question fully.

Part (c) (i) was probably the best-answered section of the paper, with the vast majority of the candidates able to identify two places. However, answers in Part (ii) tended to be very vague and unclear, with little or no **explanation** given to back up basic points made about heart rates or recovery rates. It was this lack of explanation and expansion upon basic points made which led to few candidates attaining the full three marks available for this part of the question.

Question Three

Part (a) (i) was answered quite well, with the majority of candidates able to give at least one acceptable benefit but not all able to go on to give two acceptable examples which were two different benefits. In Part (ii) there were candidates who clearly understood the terms and were able to give concise and precise definitions and others who found it difficult to describe them and consequently gave rather vague and rambling responses. Part (iii) was generally answered very well but there was some confusion with some candidates about the exact meaning of the word, with some of them considering it to mean performing activities in reverse order or backwards!

Part (b) (i) was generally answered well with the majority of the candidates referring to the sit and reach test but other candidates were also successful in clearly explaining another test of flexibility which could be used. In Part (ii), whilst the majority of the candidates were able to attain one mark for making some reference to stretching, few were able to develop their response sufficiently to attain the additional mark.

In Part (c) (i) not all candidates were able to identify particular drug types clearly, despite having been given one of the examples in the lead-in to the question. Many repeated anabolic steroids as one of their types and others gave examples of particular drugs rather than the **type**, which was asked for in the question. In Part (ii) most of the candidates were able to give reasonable responses but many failed to consider the basic point that they are taken to enhance performance and many failed to **describe** the effects they might have but just gave rather vague lists of possible effects.

Question Four

In Part (a) (i) there was a fairly even spread between candidates who were able to identify particular body types and those who were not. Poor spelling meant that it was not clear to examiners in all cases exactly what the candidate was identifying as a body type. If candidates were able to correctly refer in Part (ii) to a particular body type they then often failed to **describe** clearly how it could be an advantage and make the performer more effective. Generally, this part of the question was not answered particularly well.

In Part (b) candidates tended to repeat responses for both parts of the question. The more able candidates were able to link Part (i) to the analysis aspect and then go on to consider how this could be used to improve a performance in Part (ii) but the less able candidates made similar, or in some cases identical, comments in both parts of the question. In Part (ii) there were a great many rubric infringements and many candidates also failed to link their response to an actual example, despite being asked to do so in the question, but those who did so produced more concise and correct responses.

Part (c) was answered with a varying degree of success. Many candidates simply failed to consider what was correct and a great many candidates referred to incorrect clothing and footwear, often giving quite absurd examples and failing to answer the question set. Despite the fact that examples were asked for in both parts of the question, these were often omitted or inappropriate, and poor examples were chosen, often from unacceptable activities.

In Part (d) many candidates made very unspecific reference to rules in general without giving specific examples and there was a tendency to fail to link the response to the safety aspect identified in the question. Other candidates also chose examples which were not rules but would be more correctly considered to be etiquette or good practice.

Question Five

The format of this question, which was broken down into two mark sections, meant that it was generally answered well by the majority of candidates as the mark breakdown was very clear and obvious.

In Part (a) the majority of candidates were able to give good responses for Parts (i) and (ii) but not all fully understood Part (iii) and they seemed unclear about the role of a sports club. There were also instances where candidates did not refer to facilities in Part (ii) as being the school facilities but considered the location of facilities in general – this seemed to be a case of candidates not linking the specific areas of the question to the lead-in statement which preceded all of the separate sections.

In Part (b) there was a huge range and variety of activities identified in the two parts of the answer as being more or less popular and there was obviously a great deal of local and regional variation. Credit was given if candidates were able to justify their responses, but many just made sweeping statements without including any **explanation** as to why popularity had been affected.

Responses to Part (c) also varied considerably. Those candidates who were clearly acquainted with governing bodies and their roles were able to give good, clear and concise answers but others seemed uncertain about what they were and just made reference to clubs, officials and organisations. There also tended to be a great deal of repetition, with the same points made several times.

Part (d) was generally answered quite well but candidates did not always **describe** the influences, just using blanket terms such as ‘encourage’ or ‘don’t encourage’. This lack of detailed response led to some marks being lost by many of the candidates.

Question Six

In both parts of (a), candidates often attained two out of the three marks but failed to answer the question in sufficient detail to attain the final mark. This was often due to not answering the question in full. In Part (i) this often meant not linking it to an increase in participation and in Part (ii) not fully linking the response back to the question. There was a tendency for candidates to refer to sponsorship in general without actually answering the question set, because they did not check its exact wording.

Part (b) was generally answered well, but where candidates lost marks it was through not considering both of the aspects of the question by stating a way and then giving an example which was appropriate. The tendency was to do either one or the other but not always to do both!

In Part (c) the majority of the responses were good, with most of the candidates attaining at least half of the marks available. Marks were lost through candidates failing to **describe** but simply making statements such as ‘disrupt’, ‘encourage’, ‘help’ or ‘riot’ without any further development as to how this would then be either a benefit or a problem.

Part (d) was generally answered quite poorly, with a lot of very vague, confused and muddled responses which contained many inaccuracies. The more able candidates were able to attain full marks but many others were unable to identify correct events and to link these to either political or financial issues. Many responses failed to include examples and if they were included they often were not clearly laid out and described in any detail.

Physical Education (Short Course) (3586/W)

General

The marks achieved this year are higher than those achieved last year and examiners reported seeing fewer low-scoring scripts than previously, although some centres had very low-scoring candidates who did not appear to be properly prepared for this theory component. The candidates had definitely benefited from the booklet-style format, the complete breakdown of mark allocation in each question and the addition of blank lined paper at the end of the booklet to be used for additional answers or extensions of answers. There were still some examples of candidates using inappropriate practical activity examples in Questions 1 and 2.

Also, as in previous years, there were countless examples of responses being too vague, unclear and not focused on the key words of the question, particularly those in bold text drawing the candidates’ attention to the main point of the question.

As in previous years, the standard of Quality of Written Communication was not particularly high and many candidates failed to achieve the threshold level, with very few achieving marks in the ranges above this.

Question One

Part (a) (i) was generally answered well, with many candidates making use of the aspects of the definition of health as the basis of their two reasons and many others choosing to refer to components of fitness as the basis of their response. In Part (ii) many candidates lost marks by just listing points and factors without going on to **explain** (the key word in the question) and therefore attain the full marks available.

Part (b) (i) was answered well in the main but many candidates found it difficult to answer the question without using the term ‘specific’ in the answer and were unable to give a full explanation of the term in a more concise and clear way. In Part (ii) many candidates referred to aspects of skill such as passing or dribbling and failed to identify an aspect of fitness which would have been appropriate and which was asked for in the question. Those who were able to clearly identify an acceptable aspect then gave generally good and full responses which fully answered the question set.

Part (c) (i) was answered quite well, with the majority of candidates able to give at least one acceptable benefit but not all able to go on to give two acceptable examples which were two different benefits. Part (ii) was generally answered very well but there was some confusion with some candidates about the exact meaning of the word, with some of them considering it to mean performing activities in reverse order or backwards!

In Part (d), whilst the majority of the candidates were able to attain one mark for making some reference to stretching, few were able to develop their response sufficiently to attain the additional mark.

Question Two

In Part (a) (i) there was a fairly even spread between candidates who were able to identify particular body types and those who could not. Poor spelling meant that it was not clear to examiners in all cases exactly what the candidate was identifying as a body type. If candidates were able to refer correctly in Part (ii) to a particular body type they then often failed to **describe** clearly how it would be an advantage and make the performer more effective. Generally, this part of the question was not answered particularly well.

In Part (b) candidates tended to repeat responses for both parts of the question. The more able candidates were able to link Part (i) to the analysis aspect and then go on to consider how this could be used to improve a performance in Part (ii) but the less able candidates made similar, or in some cases identical, comments in both parts of the question. In Part (ii) many candidates also failed to link their response to an actual example, despite being asked to do so in the question, but those who did so produced more concise and correct responses.

Part (c) was answered with a varying degree of success. Many candidates simply failed to consider what was correct and a great many candidates referred to incorrect clothing and footwear, often giving quite absurd examples and failing to answer the question set. Despite the fact that examples were asked for in both parts of the question, these were often omitted or inappropriate, and poor examples were chosen, often from unacceptable activities.

In Part (d) many candidates made very unspecific reference to rules in general without giving specific examples and there was a tendency to fail to link the response to the safety aspect identified in the question. Other candidates also chose examples which were not rules but would be more correctly considered to be etiquette or good practice.

Question Three

The format of this question, which was broken down into two mark sections, meant that it was generally answered well by the majority of candidates as the mark breakdown was very clear and obvious.

In Part (a) the majority of candidates were able to give good responses for Parts (i) and (ii) but not all fully understood Part (iii) and they seemed unclear about the role of a sports club. There were also instances where candidates did not refer to facilities in Part (ii) as being the school facilities but considered the location of facilities in general – this seemed to be a case of candidates not linking the specific areas of the question to the lead-in statement which preceded all of the separate sections.

In Part (b) there was a huge range and variety of activities which were identified in the two parts of the question as being more or less popular and there was obviously a great deal of local and regional variation. If candidates were able to justify their responses credit was given but many just made sweeping statements without including any **explanation** as to why popularity had been affected.

Responses to Part (c) also varied considerably. Those candidates who were clearly acquainted with governing bodies and their roles were able to give good, clear and concise answers but others seemed uncertain about what they were and just made reference to clubs, officials and organisations. There also tended to be a great deal of repetition, with the same points made several times.

Part (d) was generally answered quite well but candidates did not always **describe** the influences but just used blanket terms such as ‘encourage’ or ‘don’t encourage’. This lack of detailed response led to some marks being lost for many of the candidates.

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

General

The marks achieved this year are little changed from those achieved last year, although some centres had very low-scoring candidates who did not appear to be properly prepared for this theory component. The candidates had definitely benefited from the booklet-style format and the complete breakdown of mark allocation in each question. There were still some examples of candidates committing rubric infringements on Question 1 (b) (ii) and 2 (a) (ii). Where this did occur candidates were only deducted a maximum of one mark for the unacceptable activity if the rest of the response was correct.

Also, as in previous years, there were countless examples of responses being too vague, unclear and not focused on the key words of the question, particularly those in bold text drawing the candidates’ attention to the main point of the question.

As in previous years, the standard of Quality of Written Communication was not particularly high and many candidates failed to achieve the threshold level, with very few achieving marks in the ranges above this.

Question One

Part (a) (i) was generally answered well, with many candidates making use of the aspects of the definition of health as the basis of their two reasons and many others choosing to refer to components of fitness as the basis of their response. In Part (ii) many candidates lost marks by just listing points and factors without going on to **explain** (the key word in the question) and therefore attain the full marks available.

Part (b) (i) was answered well in the main, but many candidates found it difficult to answer the question without using the term ‘specific’ in the answer and were unable to give a full explanation of the term in a more concise and clear way. In Part (ii) there were many rubric infringements with non game activities chosen and many candidates also referred to aspects of skill such as passing or dribbling and failed to identify an aspect of fitness which would have been appropriate and which was asked for in the question. Those who were able to clearly identify an acceptable aspect then gave generally good and full responses which fully answered the question set.

Part (c) (i) was answered quite well, with the majority of candidates able to give at least one acceptable benefit but not all able to go on to give two acceptable examples which were two different benefits. Part (ii) was generally answered very well but there was some confusion with some candidates about the exact meaning of the word, with some of them considering it to mean performing activities in reverse order or backwards!

In Part (d), whilst the majority of the candidates were able to attain one mark for making some reference to stretching, few were able to develop their response sufficiently to attain the additional mark.

Question Two

In Part (a) (i) there was a fairly even spread between candidates who were able to identify particular body types and those who were not. Poor spelling meant that it was not clear to examiners in all cases exactly what the candidate was identifying as a body type. If candidates were able to refer correctly in Part (ii) to a particular body type they then often failed to **describe** clearly how it would be an advantage and make the performer more effective. Generally, this part of the question was not answered particularly well.

In Part (b) candidates tended to repeat responses for both parts of the question. The more able candidates were able to link Part (i) to the analysis aspect and then go on to consider how this could be used to improve a performance in Part (ii) but the less able candidates made similar, or in some cases identical, comments in both parts of the question. In Part (ii) many candidates also failed to link their response to an actual example, despite being asked to do so in the question, but those who did so produced more concise and correct responses.

Part (c) was answered with a varying degree of success. Many candidates simply failed to consider what was correct and a great many candidates referred to incorrect clothing and footwear, often giving quite absurd examples and failing to answer the question set. Despite the fact that examples were asked for in both parts of the question, these were often omitted or inappropriate, and poor examples were chosen, often from unacceptable activities.

In Part (d) many candidates made very unspecific reference to rules in general without giving specific examples and there was a tendency to fail to link the response to the safety aspect identified in the question. Other candidates also chose examples which were not rules but would be more correctly considered to be etiquette or good practice.

Question Three

The format of this question, which was broken down into two mark sections, meant that it was generally answered well by the majority of candidates as the mark breakdown was very clear and obvious.

In Part (a) the majority of candidates were able to give good responses for Parts (i) and (ii) but not all fully understood Part (iii) and they seemed unclear about the role of a sports club. There were also instances where candidates did not refer to facilities in Part (ii) as being the school facilities but considered the location of facilities in general – this seemed to be a case of candidates not linking the specific areas of the question to the lead-in statement which preceded all of the separate sections.

In Part (b) there was a huge range and variety of activities identified in the two parts of the question as being more or less popular and there was obviously a great deal of local and regional variation. Credit was given if candidates were able to justify their responses, but many just made sweeping statements without including any **explanation** as to why popularity had been affected.

Responses to Part (c) also varied considerably. Those candidates who were clearly acquainted with governing bodies and their roles were able to give good, clear and concise answers but others seemed uncertain about what they were and just made reference to clubs, officials and organisations. There also tended to be a great deal of repetition, with the same points made several times.

Part (d) was generally answered quite well but candidates did not always **describe** the influences, just using blanket terms such as ‘encourage’ or ‘don’t encourage’. This lack of detailed response led to some marks being lost by many of the candidates.

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	364.2	61.4
Paper 3581/W Written Paper	105	320	186.2	57.7
Overall 3581	--	800	550.3	104.1

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3581/P component boundary mark	raw	480	443	405	367	330	273	216	159	102
	scaled	480	443	405	367	330	273	216	159	102
3581/W component boundary mark	raw	105	89	82	75	69	59	50	41	32
	scaled	320	271	250	229	210	180	152	125	98
Scaled boundary mark		800	685	635	585	535	451	367	284	201

Provisional statistics for the award

(24774 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	8.3	22.3	40.7	59.1	81.8	93.7	98.4	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	349.0	61.8
Paper 3583/W Written Paper	105	320	167.8	58.5
Overall 3583	--	800	516.7	105.7

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3583/P component boundary mark	raw	480	443	405	367	330	273	216	159	102
	scaled	480	443	405	367	330	273	216	159	102
3583/W component boundary mark	raw	105	88	81	74	68	58	49	40	31
	scaled	320	268	247	226	207	177	149	122	94
Scaled boundary mark		800	682	629	576	524	443	362	281	200

Provisional statistics for the award

(18888 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.1	15.0	31.3	49.8	75.0	90.3	97.3	99.4

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	181.2	40.1
Paper 3586/W Written Paper	53	188	112.5	37.5
Overall 3586	--	470	293.7	65.1

		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	46	42	38	35	32	29	27	25
	scaled	188	163	149	135	124	114	103	96	89
Scaled boundary mark		470	396	361	330	299	258	217	176	135

Provisional statistics for the award

(1620 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	5.9	16.4	29.8	46.4	68.3	84.1	93.7	97.8

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	179.4	40.0
Paper 3588/W Written Paper	53	188	85.8	36.5
Overall 3588	--	470	265.3	62.5

		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	45	41	37	34	31	28	25	22
	scaled	188	160	145	131	121	110	99	89	78
Scaled boundary mark		470	380	346	315	284	245	207	169	131

Provisional statistics for the award

(2475 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	3.4	9.7	21.1	37.7	61.5	78.9	90.5	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).