

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Physical Education**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

**Physical Education – Standard Grade:  
Foundation, General and Credit**

---

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	16,387

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	17,271
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	

**Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report**

3201: Knowledge and Understanding

Credit: 1 32, 2 23 – 31,

General: 3 24, 4 17 – 23,

Foundation: 5 24, 6 19 – 23,

3202: Evaluation

Credit: 1 34, 2 26 – 33,

General: 3 22, 4 17 – 21,

Foundation: 5 21, 6 17 – 20,

**Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area**

No significant comment to report.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

General comments based on feedback from the marker's reports would indicate:

Foundation Paper:

A fair paper in relation to its target audience. Overall, candidates responded well in both elements and this is reflected in the increase in candidates gaining the upper award at this level.

General Paper:

A fair paper in relation to its target audience.

The paper clearly differentiates between F/G pupils and C/G pupils. Overall, candidates performed better in evaluation than knowledge and understanding. Slight concern over the difficulty of two KU questions.

Credit Paper:

A fair paper in relation to its target audience in terms of evaluation. A very challenging paper in terms of K.U. Concern has been expressed re some of the content included and use of "Higher Still" language. Further comment under "areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty".

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

The following has been gained through feedback from the marker's reports.

Markers reported that candidates performed better in evaluation at all three levels. They attributed this to tightly structured questions and a good range of activities. Overall, candidates are describing actions in greater detail, particularly at Credit level.

Foundation:

Candidates performed well in questions requiring limited responses ie complete the table/tick the correct answer. Overall, questions 1 to 4 parts A to C were well done.

General:

Candidates performed well in all evaluation questions with the exception of question 3 parts (a) and (b). Most candidates coped well with part (c) questions. G/C candidates performed well in questions 1,2 and 5 part (d)

Credit:

Candidates performed well in most evaluation questions. In knowledge and understanding questions, two parts (c) and (d) were well done although markers expressed the view that this was due to the one mark responses required.

## Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

The following understanding has been gained through feedback from the marker's reports:

### Foundation:

Evaluation – 5(a) and (b) where they were asked to view shot putt

Knowledge and Understanding – 2(d) –fitness tests in relation to an aspect of fitness

5(d) –Power

### General:

Evaluation:

Questions 3(a) and (b) – comparing/contrasting volleyball techniques

Knowledge and Understanding:

Question 3(d) – Muscles/bones/joints – strong feeling this should have been a Credit question.

Question 4(d) – Reaction time – some markers questioned whether this lay within the syllabus (arrangements document checked at vetting!)

F/G markers reported that part (d) questions were poorly answered by most candidates. In addition to the above, Q1(d) – personal and physical qualities were confused.

### Credit:

Evaluation: no pattern in marker's feedback to specify any area performed particularly poorly

Knowledge and Understanding: 1(d) – suppleness and its benefits to performance

3(c) and (d) – methods of practice

4(c) and (d) – principles of training/training methods

Difficulty with 3(d) arose, primarily, through ambiguous wording which was addressed at the markers meeting. Some concern was expressed re practice methods incorporated in the question re shadow practice/pressure drills. Had the wording been clearer there was a simple route through this question ie whole/art/whole and small-sided games both which lie firmly within the S.G syllabus. Principles of training/training methods have been answered poorly by candidates over the past few years. Difficulty with suppleness question I believe arose due to the fact that it is some years since this area has been examined.

## Areas of common misunderstanding

### General Paper

Evaluation:

Candidates are still experiencing difficulty in describing similarities and differences between actions, hence, the poor performance in 3(a). This type of question will require further practice within centres.

Knowledge and Understanding:

Due to the fact that question 3 part (d) was over the page from 3 part (c) candidates failed to see the opportunity to pull down information to assist with part (d).

### **Credit Paper**

Knowledge and Understanding:

Wording of question 3(d) was ambiguous and led to confusion. Candidates were unclear whether two different methods of practice from part (c) could be used or not. Therefore, some candidates attempted to describe four methods of practice when two would have been sufficient.

In 4 (c) the term “progressive overload” caused some confusion in relation to strength. Candidates described how they would progress training rather than how they would overload the body.