



Questions & Answers

Higher Physical Education Webinar

When setting targets, must they be time bound? (I know that we teach around SMARTER targets but in last year's paper around target setting it seemed like nearly every target was accepted)

When a question asks about the short- or long-term nature of a target, then some detail of the length of time the target must be achieved within would be required to demonstrate candidates understanding of the difference. When a question is more generic, reference to time may not be required.

When teaching to the pupils we find that we are clearer when teaching the pupils, the standard for:

- 1. Analyse – identify something and make a point of analysis / the implication of this (what is it implying) / the impact**
- 2. Evaluate – candidates make a judgement and then give evidence to back up their evaluation**
- 3. Describe – what, where, when – features and characteristics**

However, when teaching explain – we find it harder to clarify – depending on the questions. We usually ask that they – Make a point, give evidence of the issue related to the point, and then explain why... relating to the question.

Are their key structural tips or advice to help pupils understand the amount of explanation needed? Can the explanation be purely an example? We have tried different approaches here with the pupils – trying to make sure they make a clear point of explanation relating to question/factor – then we sometimes refer to this as the 'how' part (the evidence of their point) and then finish with (similar to an impact) – '... this meant that.' or 'this will result in...'

e.g., 2021 paper Question 3

In badminton, if my agility is poor, I won't reach all the shuttles in the multi-feed pressure drill. This will likely result in me trying less because I keep missing or just give up. (1 mark)

Point – evidence of issue - explanation

Explanation questions require candidates to provide reasoning (the why) for decisions and choices made in relation to all mandatory areas of content. Your structure seems sound and should provide the candidates with sufficient scaffolding to be able to provide the required knowledge to access marks. The key part is to bring the response back to the 'so what', what does the evidence provided mean to the performer, the performance, the process etc.

Regarding the Higher Question Paper, I believe it would be beneficial for pupils to know of any split marks on offer in any questions where this comes up, would this be possible? (I feel knowing the allocation of marks when reading a question on the paper itself is very important for staff to prepare effective teaching and learning and for pupils as they plan and write their answers)

The mark allocation is included in the paper and in reading the question, the number of points required is always made clear. For example, in question 3 of the 2021 paper – ‘Explain 2 ways the PDP process can be negatively impacted by physical factors’. This should guide the candidate to write about two different ways the physical factor impacts on performance, making 2 points of explanation about each. In question 7a – describe 2 changes made to the PDP – for 2 marks – needs just 2 different changes.

Could you please clarify the type of questions that the use of the Analyse command word would examine?

Any question which looks for depth of knowledge on a certain area of content may ask the candidate to analyse. In relation to the scenario questions, we will always look to provide candidates with sufficient information in which to provide sound analysis. When asked to analyse information about a factor, an approach or a method of information gathering the candidate will be expected to have that depth of understanding based on their experience of the course.

What we mean by that is; will the Analyse command word look to question a pupil about HOW something is done or is it a ‘deepened’ version of WHY something is done?

It can be both, depending on the question – the key element to analysis is that the candidate must break a subject down and provide evidence of a clear understanding of the importance of that part to the overall process or performance.

What is the difference between describe and explain the impact of a factor on performance?

Describe will look for a picture to be painted of what the impact looks like and explain will look for an understanding of how the factor can impact the performance (positively or negatively).

So, if asked to describe the impact of physical factors - all that would be required is ‘I lose my opponent in the last 5 minutes of the game’. Whereas when asked to explain the impact: ‘I lose my opponent in the last 5 minutes of the game, leaving her free to get the ball into the circle, meaning the opposition put more pressure on us in the last quarter of the game’.

Can you clarify anxiety being a mental sub-factor?

Anxiety can come in two forms – cognitive and somatic. Cognitive anxiety is deemed to be a mental factor as it includes worries about outcome, potential failures, and inadequacies - all thinking/thought processes. Whereas somatic anxiety is the physical manifestation of thoughts which are characterised by increased heart rate, muscle tension, sweating etc. – all physical/bodily reactions. Because of this it can be deemed to be both a mental and emotional response to the performance context.

Can you clarify trust being an emotional sub-factor?

Trust is deemed to be an emotional response to different situations closely linked to confidence. Like many emotions it can affect mental factors such as decision making and even in social factors affecting team dynamics. Trust can be developed through logical development – having all the answers, weighing up the probabilities and essentially making a decision based upon your findings.

Can you give some clarification on answering analyse questions and how the content needed differs from explain command words and typical PEE structure?

In an explain answer the candidate could use the PEE structure to access marks. In analysis, the candidate would need to give the impact of their explanation. For example, 'The performer was unable to fully complete the half turn within the swivel hips (POINT), ending up out of position for the seat drop (EVIDENCE/EXAMPLE). This meant the next transition into the front drop was untidy because they didn't have the required height (EXPLANATION). Point of analysis: proving that maintenance of height and positioning are crucial to give enough time to complete skills effectively'. Or 'My tackling in hockey is often mistimed (POINT). I make contact with the opponent's stick and not the ball (EVIDENCE/EXAMPLE) meaning I get blown up for a foul against me (EXPLANATION). Point of analysis: suggesting that I am not watching the ball closely enough as the opponent comes towards me'.

How much descriptive detail is needed for one mark - 3 pieces of detail = 1 mark. For example, I completed the MPW straight after a competitive game of Netball against a team of a similar ability. Clarifying that this would get 1 mark but would 3 unrelated points also get a mark.

One mark could be given for the response up to 'game of Netball'.

'I completed the MPW straight after a competitive game of Netball'

The 'completing the MPW' is the identify and the descriptive 'features/characteristics' (required from the marking instructions) about the process of completing the wheel comes at 'straight after a competitive game'. The 'against a team of similar ability' only clarifies the 'competitive game' mentioned in the first description which has already been allocated a mark.

Can you clarify the amount of explanation in questions such as explain the suitability of this method? Is it enough to say this means that I know my approaches will be working or do you need to include so I can continue with this approach etc?

It would depend on the whole content of the answer. Stopping an explanation at 'I know my approaches will be working' might not fully explain the suitability of the approach.

In the Nation 5 portfolio you don't get marks for describing the set-up of methods to develop performance, is this the same in Higher?

No credit will be given for describing the set-up of an approach to develop performance.

Is the candidate evidence in the webinar from more than one candidate? As there are 4 considerations and not 3.

The responses displayed are from different candidates.

Does anxiety as a feature and also the SCAT test as a method fall under emotional or mental?

Anxiety can be mental or emotional and the SCAT can be used for either factor as it measures both somatic and cognitive anxiety.

In last year's question paper, there was a question asking to describe a method to develop emotional factor, then later asking to describe method to develop mental factor. Could the candidate write the same answer twice i.e., describe breathing techniques and access full marks for both questions?

If a candidate used the same approach to develop performance for two different factors, then they could access marks as long as references made to factors were appropriate.

When asked to describe an approach, are marks awarded for describing the set-up of the approach or the warm up?

Marks are not awarded for any preparations required to carry out an approach.

Does the SCAT test fall under both mental and emotional?

Anxiety can be mental or emotional and so the SCAT can be used for either factor as it measures both somatic and cognitive anxiety.

Are you awarded marks for describing the equipment needed and set-up of a training approach?

Marks are not awarded for any preparations required to carry out an approach. Equipment used during/within the approach may access marks.

Could you mention again the description of an impact of a factor on performance.

Describe will look for a picture to be painted of what the impact looks like and explain will look for an understanding of how the factor can impact the performance (positively or negatively).

So, if asked to describe the impact of physical factors - all that would be required is 'lose my opponent in the last 5 minutes of the game'. Whereas when asked to explain the impact: 'lose my opponent in the last 5 minutes of the game, leaving her free to get the ball into the circle, meaning the opposition put more pressure on us in the last quarter of the game'.

Can you provide clarity on the describe command word and how it differs between data collection and methods of development?

When describing the characteristics or features of data collection, detail about the process of gathering information would be required. This might include where the method was carried out – in the gym, the swimming pool for example, who was involved in the completion of the

method, when the method was used, what equipment/resources were needed to be able to carry it out.

Describing the approaches for developing performance could include features or characteristics of the length of time the specific approach was used for, where the approach was carried out, the types of activity included within the approach or details about how groups were organised.

Can coach feedback be used as a method to gather information on performance and an approach to develop performance?

Coach feedback can be used as a method of gathering information on strengths and development needs. Using coach feedback as an approach would not be acceptable because the feedback provided by the coach would be used to instruct and support the performer implement and adapt approaches as part of the performance development process.