



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Physical Education

Specification B

Examiners' Report

2005 examination - June series

- 3582 Full Course
- 3587 Short Course

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

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Contents

Full Course

3582/C and 3582/P 5
3582/W 7

Short Course

3587/C and 3587/P 5
3587/W 7

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades 14

This page has been left intentionally blank

3582 and 3587 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 2005 full and short course examinations. The new layout of the Candidate Record Form was much better for centres as it reduced some of the administrative burden.

Standards in the majority of centres continue to be high and this year more centres showed a consistent use of the practical marking criteria. Yet again there was some outstanding work across the country and there are some very talented students out there - well done.

The majority of moderation days are generally well planned, organised and run. However, some centres still do not provide identification of their candidates or rank orders, thus making it very difficult for the moderator. During the moderation process it is ideal for centres to show the candidates' abilities through a progressive programme of activities, but this is not happening in all centres. In a few cases the reason for the day is not expressed to the candidates and this is reflected in their attitude to the process.

Centres must remember that the moderation day is a great opportunity for centres to demonstrate good practice and celebrate achievement. Standardisation is a key factor in the maintenance of standards and this must take place within the department. Best practice involves all members of staff who teach the GCSE courses being involved in the moderation process. It is essential that the information in this report is shared with all relevant staff involved in delivering the exam.

Some centres have again been unable to show certain activities in the summer because of indoor space being taken for exams. Where possible, the moderation should show at least two different activity areas. This year some centres were creative in showing a wider range of activities. This was helped by the flexible approach of the moderators, who performed a two-part moderation: one part in January to show certain activities not available in the summer and two other activities at the normal moderation time.

Generally the Analytical Investigations were much improved in their layout; however, there are still centres that have not been able to attend a standardisation meeting and the quality of some of their AIs reflected this. In these cases attendance at a meeting next year would be not only in the candidates' interest but would also help the teachers' own professional development.

Excellent working relationships continue to develop between the staff in the centres and the moderators. It is appreciated by the moderating teams and is very beneficial to all concerned but especially the candidates.

Centres should consider the following points specifically:

- Attendance at teacher standardisation is essential for all centres new to the specification and for those that experienced problems with the assessment of practical or coursework in 2004.
- If one member of the department attends the standardisation meeting this member should then feed information back to departmental colleagues.
- The correct paperwork should be used and completed.
NB Please ensure that the correct Candidate Record Form for the Short Course is used in 2006, as the requirements of the PIP have been revised.
- Rank orders should be prepared for the moderation process.
- The specification should be used at all times and checks should be made to ensure that all aspects and requirements have been covered.

- All coursework should be standardised internally.
- The coursework adviser should be consulted over any issues with regard to the practical activities, AIs and PIPs.

Practical component

In both the full and short courses this was the most competent part of the assessment, with some outstanding performances by candidates across the country. There was again a wide range of activities seen by the moderators, with standards still of a high quality.

It was again noted that the assessment grid had had a beneficial effect in improving centres’ application of the practical marking criteria and hence the level of success. However, some centres are still reluctant to give full marks when clearly the criteria have been met. All candidates need to have the opportunity to gain their maximum potential. Centres need to remember that each candidate individually should be assessed against the marking criteria and not against the centre’s best performer in that activity.

As candidates now take part in a wide range of activities, with many participating outside school, many of these activities are unavailable for the moderator to see on moderation day. It would be good practice to make available some evidence of the level that the candidates have achieved, so that the moderator can see justification for the marks awarded. Evidence could be in the form of video, a written statement from a club coach or certificates indicating the NGB level.

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, e.g. modification of physical activities where appropriate.

Centres generally showed clearly the health and safety section of the marks; however, this remains an area that merits further attention at support meetings and standardisation meetings.

As candidates are able to select only two activity areas they are able to demonstrate their strengths well and benefit from the opportunity to achieve high marks by playing to their strengths. Candidates are still answering questions well on the day of moderation and showing excellent leadership skills in leading warm-up sessions and officiating.

Analytical Investigation and Performance Improvement Programme

The Analytical Investigation format facilitates centres’ application of the marking criteria and allows accessibility for the less able student. Standardisation Meetings again made use of exemplars with clear indications of why the marks had been awarded. These proved to be useful in helping centres to direct their students in their planning and to apply the marking criteria. This year centres felt more confident in applying marks in the ‘Implementation’ section although there is still a need for work in this area with regard to content.

The five areas allow the candidate to focus clearly on each section, although there is still a need to revisit them and clearly identify what is required in each section, especially the *audit*, *implementation* and *evaluation*. Some centres still do not appear to be setting out to their students what is required and emphasising the need to keep work in the specified areas identified, e.g. the audit should appear in the *audit* section and the planning should appear in *planning*. It is the teacher’s responsibility to guide the candidates in this area and to gain advice early on from one of AQA’s coursework advisers.

Generally the *Audit* section was much better marked this year. However, there were still candidates that did not include a **pre-test** in this section. This was particularly noticeable in those centres that had not been able to attend either a **support** or **standardisation** meeting. The *implementation* is the ‘doing’ part. This is where centres award the marks for the candidate actually **performing** one of the roles; evidence of participation is via a diary, log, photos, video or a written statement from a professional. Some centres

have again asked students to put lesson plans in this section, whereas they should go in the planning. The *evaluation* section was generally answered poorly and this was where most candidates lost marks through being too simplistic. Here it is necessary to evaluate the whole process in a critical way and suggest areas of improvement if the investigation were to be done again.

There were some exceptional AIs and PIPs, with much good use of ICT. However, some centres are still expecting too much of their candidates within this aspect. They need to understand the criteria fully and apply them carefully. There was a slight improvement in length this year, with fewer candidates writing reams and reams of information. However, centres need to be careful with the type of guidance they give; templates where students just fill in the gaps are helpful for the planning of the whole Analytical Investigation but should not be used as the investigation itself. This will be an area which will continue to be addressed at standardisation meetings. Centres must continue to standardise internally in this area to ensure that standards are maintained within each establishment.

Because of the small entry for the Short Course only a limited range of PIPs can be seen by moderators. Some centres still allow candidates to start off approaching the PIP the same way as an AI and then stop half way through. This is not good practice and centres should apply the PIP criteria and expectations. Centres are reminded that there are revised assessment criteria for the PIP to be used in 2006. A clearer structure of areas and requirements for the PIP will be discussed at standardisation meetings and support meetings this year.

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

General Comments

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”.

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 A2 and A3 were answered better than A1 and A4. As always there were sub-questions that were more successful than others. Notable weak questions, in terms of response, were A1(e); A4(b) and A4(e) plus B1(a) and B3(b). In Section B, B3 was most popular, and B1 was least popular.

Good Responses	Mixed Responses	Poor Responses
A1 (b)	A1 (a) (ci) (cii)	A1 (di) (dii) (e)
A2 (a) (b) (c)	A2 (di) (dii) (e)	
A3 (a) (b) (d)	A3 (c) (e)	
A4 (a)	A4 (c) (d)	A4 (b) (e)
B1 (b)		B1 (a)
	B2 (a) (b)	
B3 (a)		B3 (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. The standard of work in general was below that of the Full Course. Answers tended to be shorter, with less depth of knowledge, 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. Hence the number of higher grade passes may be less in the Short Course when compared to the Full Course. Nevertheless, the 2005 paper provided a good opportunity to score high marks and candidates should have achieved well on the written component.

Question A1

a) Mixed responses

Skeleton and muscles were the most common answers.

b) Well answered

Carbohydrates and fats were the common responses, but pasta and sweets did get a mention.

c) i) Mixed responses

A recurring response was along the lines of “a quick rush of energy” but what was required was “hormone”.

ii) Mixed responses

Many candidates understood that adrenalin improved performance but were often vague on the detail; few recognized that too much adrenalin could have a negative effect on performance.

d) i) Poorly answered

Some candidates just named a test of strength but this was not required. Some simply offered “lifting weights”. There appeared to be limited understanding of testing procedures. A description of a test for strength was generally only given by the more able candidates.

ii) Poorly answered

It came as some surprise that candidates could be so vague in response to this question. Stating that strength improved performance was nothing more than re-stating the question.

e) Poorly answered

The stork stand and headstand/handstand were popular initial responses. Gaining one mark did not seem to be a problem. Candidates knew that muscles work in pairs and the term antagonistic appeared in many responses. However, few knew the physiology underpinning a static balance. They could name appropriate muscles but candidates appeared to have little idea of how muscles work isometrically. That contraction occurs without movement. Responses often referred to muscles contracting and relaxing.

Question A2

a) Well answered

The most usual answers were body build or body shape.

b) Well answered

The most common answers included weightlifting, together with examples from combat sports and field athletics.

c) Well answered

Usually the three answers came from ... headache, dizziness, fainting, thirsty and pale skin. Many candidates mistakenly put “tiredness”.

d) i) Mixed responses

Candidates tended to be limited to a few causes of pressure/stress, usually focusing on parents, friends or crowds. Answering part (b) here was a cause of lost marks.

ii) Mixed responses

Candidates concentrated answers on “try harder” or words to that effect.

e) Mixed responses

There were many really good answers; many candidates secured five marks. This suggested that the topic of training had been well covered and learned – even though this question had been posed in a negative form. When responses did not score highly it was usually because the candidate did not provide sufficient quantity of examples, or too much was written to explain just one example.

Question A3

a) Well answered

Usual responses included “dance teacher” or “someone who designs routines”.

b) Well answered

Examples had to be taken from the list in the specification, together with some limited acceptance of vocations within sports science.

c) Mixed responses

When candidates failed to gain two or three marks it was usually due to answering in too general terms such as “if it is hot go outside to play; if it is cold play indoors”.

d) Well answered

Common answers included ... cheapness, friends and family, facilities, clubs, transport, traditions, enjoyable. Those candidates who answered in the negative gained no marks.

e) Mixed responses

For two to three marks the answers tended to focus on coverage (live/highlights), adverts, interviews or role models. Securing three to four marks brought in answers such as documentaries and specialist sport channels.

Candidates did not always communicate clearly how sport was promoted through television's use of sport.

Question A4

a) Well answered

The accepted answer was one of two other types of competition from the specification only.

b) Poorly answered

Answers read like they had been guessed, using the clue (coaching) in the question. Candidates offered “training coaches” or “coaching people” but nothing much besides.

c) Mixed responses

“Improving performance, improving confidence, making the performer try harder, using the coach's experience” were all well-used examples. On the other hand, some candidates answered, wrongly, from the coach's perspective.

d) Mixed responses

Most responses followed the lines of the general use of money to provide facilities/ equipment and/or coaching/training. Some extended their answer to include P.E. and sport provision in schools, along with provision of a wider range of competition at all levels.

e) Poorly answered

Only the high-scoring candidates were able to answer this question with any degree of detailed knowledge about the role of UK Sport. The vast majority of candidates tended to repeat their answers to part (d) with the words facilities and training coming up repeatedly, as answers were mainly based on funding.

Question B1

a) Probably the least popular Section B question

Many candidates knew about vital capacity, tidal volume and oxygen uptake, which relate to respiration; they also knew about stroke volume and cardiac output, which relate to circulation, but failed to focus on rates and consequently did not gain the marks. Candidates did not recognize the significance of low rates at rest and high rates at work for successful performance. Instead, the terminology used included such as *heavy* breathing, *harder* breathing, and *good* heart rate. Candidates knew that increasing breathing led to greater oxygen uptake and that increasing heart rate gave rise to increased blood flow and increased supplies of oxygen to working muscles. Some concluded that high breathing/heart rates allow the body to work better, and therefore associated high rates with success. However, many did not recognize and make the point that an individual who could satisfy energy demands at rest with low rates of breathing and circulation, and therefore without taxing the circulo-respiratory systems, was in an advantageous position for significantly increasing capability when in high demand situations. The concept of efficiency was lost on all but the best candidates.

b) Generally much better answered than part (a). Most of the marks for B1 were gained in this section.

Candidates were very knowledgeable about the two muscle-fibre types. They could identify and competently describe the attributes of fast and slow twitch fibres, highlighting the speed and duration of contraction together with some mention of the force or intensity of contraction. Candidates recognized the influence of each fibre-type on performance and related each to appropriate sports or physical activities.

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

Question B2

Probably the second most popular Section B question

a) Candidates made poor attempts to define specific physical fitness.

A definition should then have been followed with the identification and association of the relevant components of fitness (speed, strength, stamina and suppleness) with the chosen sport or physical activity, giving reasons why as the analysis unfolded. Keeping a close linkage between the component of fitness and the demands of the activity was crucial to a good answer – this was achieved with moderate success. Where the link was missing, marks were hard to come by; for example, in gymnastics you need strength/ in football you need stamina. These could have been so much improved if they had read ... “in gymnastics you need arm strength to support the body on a pommel-horse routine/ in football you need cardio-vascular stamina to last the 90 minutes of a match”.

Body types and issues to do with diet were not relevant to the question, nor were the components of skill - a mistake a lot of candidates made.

- b) It was intended that candidates should keep with the same sport or physical activity they had chosen in part (a). If they changed/referred to a different sport or physical activity they lost one mark.

Candidates made good attempts at answering this part of the question. There was sound knowledge of the methods of training, usually accompanied by a brief explanation, and in general they were linked to a component of fitness and applied appropriately to the chosen activity.

The following mistakes were usually the cause when candidates went wrong:

- not identifying a specific method of training by name, but offering such as running/ jogging instead;
- not identifying a specific method of training to improve performance but offering a test to measure the component instead;
- not identifying specific methods of training but identifying principles of training instead.

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

Question B3

Probably the most popular question in Section B

- a) Candidates were able to identify how people can become involved in sport and physical activity in their leisure time. The most common responses included:

- engaging in physical pastimes (e.g. cycling, swimming; aerobics);
- taking the stairs, walking to work/ to the shops;
- joining a team/ club;
- joining a class;
- having a kick-about with friends;
- doing extra-curricular sport at school;

More able candidates recognized a wider range of options that included:

- coaching a team;
- officiating a match;
- spectating at the ground or from the armchair.

An explanation about why people have more leisure time was unrewardable.

- b) Few candidates connected different ways in which sport can develop friendships between different groups of people. They did not show how different sporting situations provide opportunities to develop friendships. Few candidates actually mentioned the target groups.

Most answers simply stated that sport encourages people to be friends; they referred to mixing in teams or/and at clubs, with a common interest, learning to 'get on' for the benefit of the cause (in effect, friendships through teamwork). At a more basic level it was suggested that whilst at the gym you talk to those you train with, or even talk to those supporters next to you if you attend a live football match. The categories of people included in the question stem were not used effectively to guide thinking and answering.

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

Mark Range 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	43.6	15.2
Paper 3582/P Practical Assessment	100	160	133.9	18.4
Paper 3582/W Written Paper	94	96	40.0	15.3
Overall 3582	--	320	217.7	39.4

		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	80	72	64	57	47	37	28	19
	scaled	96	82	74	65	58	48	38	29	19
Scaled boundary mark		320	268	248	230	212	177	143	109	75

Provisional statistics for the award

(6954 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	9.2	23.7	41.5	58.3	82.2	94.7	98.9	99.9

Short Course

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3587/C Coursework	63	64	32.7	13.4
Paper 3587/P Practical Assessment	50	160	107.8	20.8
Paper 3587/W Written Paper	47	96	34.5	14.9
Overall	--	320	175.2	37.4

		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	34	31	28	25	22	19	16	13
	scaled	96	69	63	57	51	45	39	33	27
Scaled boundary mark		320	252	241	219	198	169	140	112	84

Provisional statistics for the award

(454 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	1.8	5.1	12.6	26.7	46.9	74.2	91.6	97.1

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).