

GCSE 2003

June Series



Report on the Examination

Physical Education

Specification B

-
- 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

© 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

Full Course

	<i>Page No.</i>
3582/C and 3582/P Coursework.....	4
3582/W Written paper.....	6

Short Course

	<i>Page No.</i>
3587/C and 3587/P Coursework.....	4
3587/W Written paper.....	6

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades.....	11
--------------------------------------	----

Physical Education

Coursework

General Comments

AQA would like to thank all centres, teachers, moderators and team leaders for the immense amount of work that has been completed to support candidates taking part in the 2003 new specification for both the full and short course examinations. All must be thanked for their patience and professionalism in handling the changes (within a short period of time), especially the paperwork, and in carrying out the moderation this year.

Standards in the majority of centres continue to be high and this year did see a slight rise in performance in the practical activities. There is some outstanding work being done across the country and there are some very talented students out there. Well done!

The majority of moderation days are generally well run, planned and organised. However, some centres still do not provide identification or a progressive programme. In a minority of cases the reason for the day is not expressed to the candidates and this is reflected in their attitude to the process.

There is still the difficulty, for some centres, of being unable to show certain activities because of the pressure on the indoor space being taken for exams or other events. This is an ongoing problem but, where possible, the moderation should show at least two different activity areas.

Centres must remember that the moderation day is a great opportunity to demonstrate good practice and celebrate achievement.

Standardisation is still a key factor in the raising of standards. Not all centres attended the standardising meetings and this was reflected in the quality of the Analytical Investigations. These centres need to address this next year, not only for the candidates' interests but for their own professional development. Those centres which did attend revealed fewer problems.

It is essential that the information in this report is shared with all relevant staff who are involved in delivering the exam.

Specifically centres need to consider the following:-

Ensure the correct paperwork is used and completed.

Rank orders should be prepared for the moderation process.

Use the specification at all times and always check you have covered all aspects and requirements.

Internally standardise practical and coursework.

Contact the coursework adviser over any issues with regard to the practical activities, AIs and PIPs.

Practical Component

In both the full and short course this was the most competently - tackled part of the syllabus, with some outstanding performances by students across the country. This year a wider range of activities was seen by the moderators, with standards generally improved.

It was felt that the new grid, which was designed for making marking easier for centres, had had an impact on raising standards and had enabled centres to apply the practical marking criteria better. Some centres are still reluctant to give full marks when clearly the students have matched the criteria.

New to this year's exam on the practical side was the health and safety section. Centres generally showed clearly the health and safety section of the marks; however, this is still an area which needs to be further explained at support meetings and standardising meetings.

More centres are aware of the need to reflect the full range of candidates' abilities and more are using an inclusive approach towards the activities, ie modification of physical activities where appropriate for the candidate(s).

The changes to two aspects have enabled candidates to demonstrate their strengths in a certain area and have given them the opportunity to achieve high marks by playing to their strengths. Candidates are answering questions well on the day of moderation and showing leadership skills in leading sessions.

Analytical Investigation and the Performance Improvement Programme

The new format of the AI seemed to enable centres to apply the marking criteria better and gave the less able student accessibility to more marks, therefore being more inclusive.

The five areas have allowed the candidate to focus clearly on each section, although there is still a need to identify clearly what is required at each section, especially *the 'audit', 'implementation' and 'evaluation'*. It is the teacher's responsibility to guide the candidates in this area and to gain advice early on from AQA or the coursework adviser. The Audit section was most commonly overmarked, probably because of a lack of understanding of expectations. This was particularly noticeable in centres which had not attended a standardising meeting.

There were some exceptional AIs and PIPs, with much good use of ICT. However, some centres are still expecting too much of their candidates. They need to understand the criteria fully and apply them carefully. This will be an area which will continue to be addressed at future teacher support and standardising meetings. Centres must continue to standardise internally in this area to ensure that standards are maintained within each establishment, as well as for their own professional development.

Candidates' PIPs need to have a clearer structure. Advice on this issue is currently in the process of being refined. Because of the size of entries across the country only a limited range of PIPs could be seen by moderators.

The centres entering PIPs had done well to apply the criteria without specific standardising material. This is something which will be addressed for next year. Some centres allow candidates to write too much and to move towards an AI in volume. There is a clear need for guidance which will be reinforced at standardising meetings, at support meetings and through coursework advisers.

Paper 3582/W Full Course and Paper 3587/W Short Course

General

The format and style of the paper was the same as that of its NEAB predecessor but its content re-arranged in line with the new specification. Section A devoted one question to each section of theory. Section B, having only three questions, did not have a question from “Resources for Participation”. Overall the Specification B paper is shorter than that of the NEAB legacy syllabus.

Comments on the quality of work

The responses of candidates showed that the paper was taken by the full range of ability and that it was accessible to the majority of candidates, even though weaker candidates could not answer in the depth intended. However, the number of candidates achieving high marks has been disappointing. Many more could have scored higher if only they answered what was asked, if they picked up on key words and if they knew definitions from the specification. There appears to be plenty of knowledge but it has to relate to the question. This might be improved if candidates knew how to respond to questions asking why? or how? Candidates should keep reminding themselves of the question so as to avoid going off at tangents, particularly in section B.

If candidates know the specification they will know the answers.

Candidates who choose, or are advised, to answer all section B questions may not gain the benefit they seek. To respond comprehensively there is only time to answer two.

Comments on the Paper / Questions

In general questions A1 and A3 were answered better than A2 and A4. As always there were sub-questions that were more successful than others. A notable weak question, in terms of responses, was A4. In section B, all were equally popular, and generally equally well answered.

Good responses	Mixed responses	Poor responses
A1 (a) (bi) (bii) (di) (dii)	A1 (cii)	A1 (ci) (e)
A2 (a)	A2 (b) (c)	A2 (di) (dii) (e)
A3 (a) (d) (e)	A3 (b) (c)	
A4 (a)	A4 (b)	A4 (c) (d) (e)
B1 (a)	B1 (b)	
	B2 (a) (b)	
	B3 (a) (b)	

General Comments on the Short Course

The format of the Short Course paper reflected the full course; that is, one question from each section of theory in Section A plus a choice in Section B. As with the NEAB predecessor, the standard of work in general was below that of the Full Course, though there were some noticeable exceptions. When candidates in the full course may be scoring nine and ten marks on a particular question, it is likely that Short Course candidates will only be achieving six, seven or eight. In some respects 2003 provided a good opportunity to score high marks; Section A included the two highest scoring questions from the full course paper, and, with section B questions being equally demanding, candidates should have achieved well on the written component. This contrasts with last year, when Short Course candidates were faced with the toughest questions.

Question A1

a) Well answered.

Basketball and athletics high jump were among the most popular answers.

b) i) Well answered.)

To use a team game, the answer had to be specific.

ii) Well answered.)

c) i) Poorly answered.

Many candidates were not sure that glycogen is a source of energy.

ii) Mixed responses.

Many candidates could not identify two storage places. One was more common.

d) i) Well answered.)

The limited number of correct answers in the mark scheme did not create any real difficulties.

ii) Well answered.)

Because some activities have planned breaks **during** play (eg football half-time; cricket tea interval), it was accepted that there were opportunities to go to the toilet.

e) Poorly answered.

Many candidates found difficulty in defining stroke volume; it was often confused with aspects of respiration.

It was possible to gain marks from the second part of the question even if the definition was incorrect. Whilst candidates were able to associate high stroke volume with improved performance, very few were able to explain why performance was improved.

Question A2

a) Well answered.

Time was the most popular response, followed by the ruler test.

b) Mixed responses.

Too often candidates settled for naming an activity rather than giving an occasion within an activity. Reactions were sometimes confused with timing.

c) Mixed responses.

Hypothermia and hyperthermia were common responses, although heat stroke was often given alongside hyperthermia. A common failing was to give ‘symptoms’ rather than ‘conditions’.

d) i) Poorly answered.

Very few candidates understood what the training threshold is, or the formula for how it is calculated.

ii) Poorly answered.

The majority of answers tended to state simply that, if a person was old, the threshold would be low.

e) Poorly answered.

There was some success at naming a method of training but answers were weak when it came to explaining why it was suitable for anaerobic needs in terms of intensity, duration and frequency etc.

Inevitably there were some candidates who could not identify a method of training, (sprinting being given by a significant number), but could make a decent attempt at explaining what was necessary when training for an anaerobic activity.

Question A3**a)** Well answered.

Coach was the most popular answer.

b) Mixed responses.

Often the answers were vague, very similar or confused with coaching, and/or officiating.

c) Mixed responses.

Challenge, socializing and friendship were among the common responses, but often one of the three answers referred to health and fitness issues.

d) Well answered.

There were many good ideas for promoting sport within school; common among them were the quality of P.E. lessons, after school club opportunities, inter-school competition and raising awareness displays.

- e) Well answered.

Candidates found it relatively easy to gain five marks; in many cases they were able to answer from personal experience. Being able to afford kit/clothing, equipment, facility hire, entrance fees, membership subscriptions and transport/accommodation costs were the factors often quoted as crucial to participation. Higher ability candidates saw the significance of wealth as it increases leisure time by allowing time off work or providing such as child-minding.

Question A4

- a) Well answered ...

... but only because a wide interpretation of local providers was adopted.

- b) Mixed responses.

Despite this question appearing in some form over the years, and comments in previous reports, many candidates did not know the National Sports Centres by name.

- c) Poorly answered.

Far too many candidates misunderstood the emphasis of the question. It was about the effects on a sport, not the sponsor.

- d) Poorly answered.

Many candidates did not know how a ladder competition works. In the few cases where candidates did know, they proved to be very accurate in their descriptions and four marks were competently gained.

- e) Poorly answered.

The International Olympic Committee confused with almost anything or anybody!

Not even the middle word (Olympic) gave enough of a clue as to its role, and hence its contribution to participation opportunities, particularly at a global (international) level for elite performers.

Question B1

- a)

Generally well answered. This part of the question gave candidates the opportunity to show what they knew about basic physiology. There was scope for lots of detail and for the most part candidates who answered this question ‘went to town’. There was sound knowledge and understanding about the antagonistic paired function of muscles on the skeleton, with the bicep/tricep example the most popular. However, there were some candidates who were too brief and whose marks suffered accordingly.

b)

The responses to this part of the question tended to look at examples first and put the emphasis of their answer on listing types of injury, eg fractures, sprains, dislocations. Sometimes the list was accompanied with detailed descriptions of the injury. Commonly they failed to identify **how an injury might occur**, and this was the hub of the question. A list of causes might have been more appropriate and rewarding.

There was no place for writing about treatments.

[Both parts of the question had to be answered to gain the full 15 marks].

Question B2

a)

There was a lot of accurate knowledge expressed about diet. However, much of it was of a general nature and related the components of a balanced diet to good health. The question required that diet knowledge be related to the improvement of physical performance. Where this was done the emphasis tended to focus on carbohydrate = energy, and protein = strength without too much amplification. Opportunities to explore carbo-loading, weight control, and fluid balance were often missed.

b)

Many of the candidates were not able to satisfy all the requirements of the question. As with part (a) it was often a case of candidates not being able to form their knowledge into an answer for the particular question, rather than not having any knowledge at all.

Answers tended to feature lists of drugs but no effects on performance, or a list of effects on the body without mentioning any drug group or type. Much of what was given as examples of drugs centred around (anabolic) steroids, stimulants and beta-blockers. To score highly an answer had to identify drugs/drug types and what they did to the body, and explain how this affected performance in an activity.

A high percentage of candidates identified blood-doping as a drug, and gave a detailed description of how it worked, but this was not part of a creditable response.

[Both parts of the question had to be answered to gain the full 15 marks].

Question B3

a)

Most candidates made a good attempt to explain the concept of sportsmanship. This usually implies good sportsmanship and involves playing by the rules, playing fairly and accepting decisions. They were able to give some examples of good sportsmanship which frequently included kicking the ball out of play to allow treatment to an injured footballer.

Some candidates had difficulty separating ‘bad sportsmanship’, ‘gamesmanship’ and ‘cheating’.

b)

Most candidates were able to give examples of cheating. The limitation to a good response to this part of the question was not finding sufficient different ways of cheating and therefore not achieving quantity or range in the answer.

Candidates tended to repeat themselves. This was particularly the case when giving examples of rule breaking, even though the examples may have been drawn from different sports.

Blood doping was acceptable as an example to use in this question.

[Both parts of the question had to be answered to gain the full 15 marks].

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Full Course

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3582/C Coursework	63	64	41.9	16.2
Paper 3582/P Practical Assessment	100	160	131.3	18.9
Paper 3582/W Written Paper	94	96	39.4	16.1
Overall 3582	--	320	212.6	41.4

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3582/C component boundary mark	raw	63	59	54	49	44	36	29	22	15
	scaled	64	60	55	50	45	37	29	22	15
3582/P component boundary mark	raw	100	100	90	80	70	58	47	36	25
	scaled	160	160	144	128	112	93	75	58	40
3582/W component boundary mark	raw	94	77	71	65	59	49	39	30	21
	scaled	96	79	73	66	60	50	40	31	21
Scaled boundary mark		320	270	249	228	208	175	143	111	79

Provisional statistics for the award

(6973 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	7.4	19.7	35.6	54.0	77.2	91.8	98.2	99.6

Short Course

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3587/C Coursework	63	64	36.5	14.8
Paper 3587/P Practical Assessment	50	160	109.7	28.2
Paper 3587/W Written Paper	47	96	42.7	16.0
Overall 3587	--	320	188.9	46.8

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3587/C component boundary mark	raw	63	59	54	49	44	36	28	21	14
	scaled	64	60	55	50	45	37	28	21	14
3587/P component boundary mark	raw	50	50	45	40	35	29	23	18	13
	scaled	160	160	144	128	112	93	74	58	42
3587/W component boundary mark	raw	47	39	36	33	31	26	21	17	13
	scaled	96	80	74	67	63	53	43	35	27
Scaled boundary mark		320	266	248	230	212	179	146	114	82

Provisional statistics for the award

(531 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	3.2	8.7	15.8	28.6	51.0	71.2	88.5	94.5

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).