



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Physical Education 3582

Specification B

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- 3582 Full Course
- 3587 Short Course

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Contents

Full and Short Courses

3582/C and 3582/P 5

3582/W 8

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades 15

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 2006 full and short course examinations.

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

The majority of moderation days were generally well planned, organised and run. However, some centres still did 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 did not happen in all centres. In a few cases the reason for the day was not expressed to the candidates and this was 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 both, with centres attending the standardising meetings in the autumn term and within the department itself. This year there was an increasing amount of evidence which suggested this internal standardising did not happen in many centres. This must happen to enable 'all' candidates the best possible outcome. 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 were again unable to show certain activities in the summer because of indoor space being needed for exams. Where possible, the moderation should show at least two different activity areas. This year more centres were creative and showed 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. However if an early moderation does take place a rank order with marks awarded must be sent to the moderator before the moderation day takes place. This is the same requirement as the normal period of moderation.

The layout of the Analytical Investigations continued to improve; but there were still centres that had not been able to attend a standardisation meeting and the quality of some of their AI's reflected this. It was also evident that some centres were giving candidates too much guidance in the completion of their written coursework. 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.

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

Good working relationships continued to develop between the staff in the centres and the moderators which is appreciated by the moderating teams.

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 2006.

- 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.
- Rank orders should be prepared for the moderation process, including any early moderations.
- 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

Again, 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, and standards were 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 were 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 centres best performer in that activity.

As candidates now take part in a wide range of activities, with many participating outside school, some of these activities were unavailable for the moderator to see on moderation day. It is good practice to make some evidence available, showing the level that candidates have achieved, so 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.

It was good to see that more centres were aware of the need to reflect the full range of candidates abilities and that more used an inclusive approach towards the activities, e.g. modification of physical activities where appropriate.

Centres generally showed the health and safety section of the marks clearly; for the candidates. However, there were issues with regards to some centres' own health and safety practice with certain activities when moderators have been on their visits. This type of practice does put the moderator in a very difficult position and centres should ensure this area is covered appropriately.

As candidates were required to select two activity areas they were able to demonstrate their strengths well and benefited from the opportunity to achieve high marks by playing to their strengths. On the day of moderation candidates were still answering questions well, showed excellent leadership skills and demonstrated an awareness of health and safety through leading warm-up sessions and officiating.

Analytical Investigation and Performance Improvement Programme

The Analytical Investigation format facilitated centres application of the marking criteria and allowed accessibility for the less able student especially in the *Implementation* section. 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 the majority of 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 with a small amount of centres.

The five areas allowed 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 did 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 teachers' responsibility to guide the candidates in this area and to gain advice early on from one of AQA's coursework advisers if necessary.

Most of the overmarking took place in the *Audit* section. There were still candidates that did not include a **pre-test** in this section. Also, many candidates included pupil profiles and rules either in the audit or the planning section. These aspects were not required in here unless they were of significance to their study and a lot of the time they were not. This year there was an increase in candidates putting the history of sport in the planning section. This information is of no relevance to an Analytical Investigation and should not be included. The *implementation* section is the "doing" part. This is where centres should 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 again asked students to put lesson plans in this section, whereas they should go in the planning section. The *evaluation* section was generally answered better, although 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. For candidates to get into the top mark band the candidate has to give extensive technical detail as to how performance has improved.

There were some exceptional AIs and PIPs, with much good use of ICT. However, some centres still expect too much of their candidates in this aspect. They need to understand the criteria fully and apply them carefully. There was a slight improvement in length this year; fewer candidates wrote 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 also led to Candidates not being in a position to clearly identify the role they have chosen and give reasons why. This year a small number of centres chose the role for all the candidates. This does not match the assessment criteria and centres need to be mindful of this when directing the candidates. This is 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 is seen by moderators. Some centres still allowed candidates to approach the PIP in 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 this year used the new revised assessment criteria. This gave a much clearer structure for the three areas and requirements for the PIP helped make the process much more manageable. The new format of the PIPs 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 “Factors Affecting Performance”.

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. Very few questions were left un-attempted, though some of the weaker candidates could not answer in the depth intended. The number of candidates achieving high marks has been encouraging this year, significantly higher than in previous years. The general quality of responses has been of a good standard. There appears to be plenty of knowledge but for future improvement it would help if candidates read and re-read the question, then concisely related their answer to what was asked without going off at tangents and writing too much, particularly in section B. This is usually less of a problem when candidates respond in bullet points. However, it is not acceptable for this approach merely to resemble a list; a stem is required with a verb in each bullet point. Answers would be improved if candidates knew how to respond to questions asking why? or how?

If candidates know the specification, in terms of key words and definitions, 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. More candidates this year were following this advice.

Comments on the Paper / Questions

In general, question A3 was answered better than A1, A2 and A4, though these were by no means poor. As always there were sub-questions that were more successful than others. One notable weak question was A4(d). In section B, B1 and B2 were the most popular, with B1 answered well, and better than B2 and B3 which had similar quality in their responses.

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

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 2006 paper provided a good opportunity to score high marks, candidates should have achieved well on the written component.

Question A1

a) Well answered.

Most candidates were able to give a type of joint. Usually ball and socket or hinge.

b) Well answered.

'*Biceps*' and '*triceps*' were common answers but by no means the only ones. Some abbreviations for abdominals ('*abs*'), pectorals ('*pecs*') and latissimus dorsi ('*lats*') were accepted.

c) Mixed responses.

Some lack of understanding shown in this question but where responses were good there were usually two correct answers. The main answers included '*brain*' and '*nerves*'; the main mistake was '*muscles*'.

d) i) Poorly answered.

Many candidates found it difficult to score two marks. Blood pressure was not readily defined without using '*pressure*' in the definition. Alternatively, candidates were mixed up, confusing blood pressure with rates, speed and beats of the heart or circulation. Very few mentioned artery.

ii) Mixed response.

Often the candidates put the correct answers for '*how*' but unnecessarily gave a reason '*why*', which was often wrong!

e) Mixed responses.

Whilst there was good knowledge about water balance, identifying the significance of dehydration, but some candidates misread the question to mean all sorts of things related to '*water*' or '*balance*' separately.

Most candidates had little difficulty in picking up three marks for stating the importance of drinking fluids '*before, during and after*' exercise.

Both parts of the question had to be answered for full marks.

Question A1 in general was quite a hard question to start the paper and some candidates didn't seem to get into their stride until A2. However, where some candidates lost marks on A1 (d), they gained on A1 (e).

Question A2

a) Well answered.

Popular responses were fartlek and circuit training. Though candidates often had to describe the example of interval training they had in mind, eg. run 30 secs – rest 30 secs etc.

b) Mixed responses.

This did not have to relate to athletics, nor did it not have to relate to competition at low altitude, but to the benefits for the body and the advantages for performance in any sport or physical activity. Many answers were too vague. Expanding an answer relating to 'improving aerobic stamina' with more details could have given rise to three marks.

c) Mixed responses.

Often the candidates' answers did not specifically link the type of weather to the effect on performance; or the weather wasn't even mentioned at all. Sometimes they just referred to "nicer weather...". Candidates needed to consider the aspect of weather, its effect on the body or the facility and its effect on performance to arrive at acceptable answers.

d) i) Mixed responses.

Candidates either knew the components listed in the specification or they didn't.

ii) Mixed responses.

If a candidate got this wrong it was usually because the answer was about 'reaction time' or 'the speed of a race'. Whilst reacting to a gun in an athletic race start was not correct, responding to music as a stimulus in dance was.

It was recognised that there may be overlap in examples of good timing because candidates may find it difficult to distinguish between timing and co-ordination in striking games especially if contacting a stationary object (eg. in golf), and between timing a kick to pass a ball and timing a run to receive a pass (eg. in football).

e) Well answered but some common mistakes.

This question was not about blood doping – so no marks. There were no marks for being able to name drugs. To gain the marks candidates had to state the effect(s) of certain drugs on the body and state the outcome on performance ... for example 'analgesics disguise pain, allowing a person to play through injury'. There were some difficulties remembering drug categories, especially *diuretics*, or remembering the correct effect/outcome for a particular drug category. In the case of *steroids*, candidates mixed up the effects with the outcome viz steroids make you stronger was a misconception, whereas more accurately, steroids increase muscle mass which if trained will improve strength.

However, many candidates had a good knowledge in this area of theory.

Question A3

- a)** Mixed responses.

The problem some candidates had was using the word 'lead' to define a leader. Common answers not given credit included "a person in charge", or "in control".

- b)** Well answered.

To score the marks candidates had to be precise with their words, or clearly make the link between a job and sport/physical activity where sport/physical activity was a significant element. A 'physiologist' was acceptable, a 'sports club doctor' was acceptable but a 'doctor' was not.

A 'sports scientist' was not something that was in mind!

- c)** Well answered.

There appeared to be plenty of scope for candidates to present three different examples of good sportsmanship, even without presenting them in a negative form, though many candidates relied on a similar limited range of instances. "3 cheers, shaking hands, clapping opponents, and swapping shirts" were considered too similar to score separate marks.

- d)** Well answered.

To score marks on this question, candidates had to be positive about participation now rather than negative about participation in the past. Many different circumstances surrounding gender role issues were recognised and candidates generally found it comfortable to score three or four marks. Popular among answers were "changing attitudes, more opportunities and increased media attention", plus "more time, more clubs, more role models".

- e)** Well answered.

Many candidates struggled to achieve full marks though they understood the question, however, they were usually able to pick up three marks and common among the examples were :

... conferring with additional linesmen/assistant referees, as in football;

...engaging more than one judge, as in gymnastics;

... using media technologies/instant action replays, as in rugby league;

... using media technologies/electronic line detectors, as in tennis;

... applying rules/being unbiased/being neutral.

Question A4

- a)** Well answered.

No real difficulties encountered in naming one major national sports facility. Difficult not to score on this question!

- b) i)** Well answered.

Answers were various but holding 'international events' was a frequent favourite answer.

- ii)** Well answered.

Again answers were various but 'expensive' maintenance 'costs' was a frequent favourite answer.

c) Mixed responses.

Gaining two marks appeared to be within the capabilities of many candidates, but finding the third mark often proved difficult without resorting to naming 'national' governing bodies. Some candidates identified facilities (eg. 'sports centres') rather than organisations.

d) Poorly answered.

A minority of the entry made a successful attempt to answer this question. The correct answer hinged around the keyword 'types'. Three types of competition are identified in the specification, namely ladder, league and knock-out. Therefore, opportunities for participation had to relate to these. In the absence of this recollection candidates suggested a wide range of competition possibilities, among them:

... high/low level competitions;	... local/national competitions;
... women's/men's competitions;	... competitions for the disabled;
... competitions for enjoyment;	... but, all wrong!

If candidates named all three types of competition without outlining anything else, one mark was awarded.

e) Well answered.

Candidates provided lots of ideas for raising money to pay the professional(s). The answers tended to become lists. Many examples of fund-raising only secured one mark whilst grants, as in National Lottery grants, did not score a mark.

Question B1

a) Probably the most popular section B question.

Many candidates knew about general physical fitness and were able to suggest a range of exercises, activities and sports to facilitate its improvement. These ranged from very practical options, such as walking the dog and walking to work, to joining an aerobics class or sports club. Importantly, they were able to point out that exercise ought to be more demanding than usual, as well as frequent and regular.

They were able to identify the four 'S' components of physical fitness and link them with appropriate training methods that would bring about an improvement in general physical fitness, eg weight training would be a way of increasing strength. They were able to identify key principles of training, together with rest and recovery strategies, which would also help to bring about an improvement.

Marks were available for valid points raised about diet, smoking and drinking alcohol in relation to general physical fitness.

b) Generally slightly better answered than part (a). Many of the marks for B1 by weaker candidates were gained in this section.

Candidates were very knowledgeable about the precautions that could/should be taken to avoid injury and listing these in the form of bullet points tended to keep their minds focused and consequently on task. Candidates were able to draw on work learned previously in core PE lessons to assist them in putting together an answer; things that come naturally at the start of lessons such as :

- ... wearing appropriate kit;
- ... removing jewellery and securing hair;
- ... warming up;
- ... playing on a safe surface;
- ... playing to the rules;
- ... displaying good technique;
- ... behaving well.

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

Question B2

- a) Probably the second most popular section B question.

This question arose from the section of the Specification ‘Reasons for Participation’ and therefore in the main the answers were required from a sociological perspective. It was acceptable for one mark to say that ‘...*for fitness and health*’ was a good reason to include sport and physical activity in leisure time but additional physiological reasons did not gain additional marks. Making and meeting friends was the typical social reason.

It was not the case that answers presented and marks gained at B1 could be re-presented here.

- b) Promotion is one of the topics listed under ‘Factors Influencing Participation’. Without too much by way of variation, there was no shortage of suggestions but it took the more-able candidates to put together the substantial answers explaining ‘*how?*’ rather than just through any of the many media by way of ‘*advertising*’. That is to say, where many candidates said ‘*through television, radio and newspapers*’ they didn’t say ‘*how*’ these media would promote sport and physical activity. It was the same if they said ‘*schools*’ or ‘*leisure centres*’ – this is answering the question ‘*who?*’ David Beckham featured extensively in many answers.

Very few candidates recognized the varying purposes and nature of promoting sport and physical activity. They didn’t distinguish between the (macro) scale of publicity campaigns associated with national promotions and the concept of target audiences as exemplified by Sport England, compared with the (micro) scale associated with promoting local initiatives and issues.

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

Question B3

- a) Probably the least popular question in section B.

Too many candidates made the simple mistake of not reading the question correctly and began an answer about government and councils.

With the option to consider local provision and then national provision it means that only three or four valid points were needed to answer this part satisfactorily. Candidates, therefore, who knew about the functions of governing bodies would be able to partition these for local or national applications. The most common responses included:

... providing coaching;
... providing competitions;
... providing money and/or resources;
... providing facilities.

- b) This part of the question was probably answered more fully than part (a). Having said that, few candidates made much of the awarding of the 2012 Olympics to London as a stimulus for their answer. There seemed to be even less reference to major sports festivals other than an Olympic Games, even though we are in the year of a football World Cup.

As a general impression the benefits to a host country, as outlined in the responses, were roughly equally divided between sporting and non-sporting issues. On the one hand there are the benefits for local, regional and even national infra-structures such as access and communication networks; there are commercial investments in projects and facilities which have knock-on income benefits from employment, business and trade. Then on the other hand there are the benefits for the population to engage in sport and physical activity whether it be playing, participating in some other role or just spectating but at a higher level of awareness.

There seemed ample opportunity for candidates to show what they knew – most took that opportunity though some did get a little ‘entrenched’ when rambling about prestige. There were probably less max. scores on this question compared to the other two.

[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	45.5	15.1
Paper 3582/P Practical Assessment	100	160	135.6	17.3
Paper 3582/W Written Paper	94	96	48.6	15.1
Overall 3582	--	320	229.7	38.0

		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	84	77	70	64	54	45	36	27
	scaled	96	86	79	71	65	55	46	37	28
Scaled boundary mark		320	275	257	239	222	187	152	117	82

Provisional statistics for the award

(6294 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	10.64	26.38	45.19	62.60	86.13	96.52	99.49	99.96

Short Course

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Paper 3587/C Coursework	63	64	32.5	14.5
Paper 3587/P Practical Assessment	50	160	103.1	24.6
Paper 3587/W Written Paper	47	96	42.8	16.3
Overall	--	320	178.5	45.3

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
3587/C component boundary mark	raw	63	58	53	48	43	35	28	21	14
	scaled	64	59	54	49	44	36	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	42	36	30	25	21	18	15	12
	scaled	96	86	74	61	51	43	37	31	25
Scaled boundary mark		320	266	250	223	197	168	139	110	81

Provisional statistics for the award

(460 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	1.91	5.50	18.18	33.73	60.05	81.10	94.02	98.09

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

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 candidate lie in 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).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A* is always 90% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade A is 80%, grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50%, grade E is 40%, grade F is 30% and grade G is 20%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and the uniform marks for the units will be added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.