



Questions & Answers

Advanced Higher Physical Education Webinar

Project

Could you please clarify the preferred method of referencing and the penalties that may be incurred as a result of incorrect referencing?

Although foot notes are advised for this review of sources, any recognised referencing style is acceptable. There are no penalties for incorrect referencing however, if referencing is unclear, this can often leave doubt over whether the content included by the candidate is from research or simply the candidates' own words. From another question received on this area, footnotes can include details such as authors and the year of publication. However, it is also acceptable, and common, for a high volume of research to come from internet sites and therefore, a hyperlink to this is acceptable.

Do candidates have to specifically refer to scholars/academic research in section 2b, or is a generic link to section 2a acceptable?

It must be clear from the analysis which research is being analysed throughout this section. Although wording within analysis may allow for a different approach, the simplest way to make this clear is for the candidates to refer directly to the scholar or the academic research.

Is a Personal Profile Wheel an acceptable method of gathering data at Advanced Higher level?

Yes, a Personal Profile Wheel is an acceptable method of gathering data at Advanced Higher. However, care should be taken as the use of this method can be self-limiting.

Must pupils complete all sections of the project to receive a pass?

Candidates would not be awarded marks for any sections that have been omitted. SQA would encourage candidates to address each part of the project as it follows a logical process which enables candidates to work through each stage and access the marks available.

Is it a mark per quote/literary evidence for section 2a that demonstrates new knowledge, or does there have to be supplementary linking sentences explaining the quote?

The marking instructions make clear that 1 mark is awarded for each relevant point of explanation, or development of a point of explanation linked to the identified focus.

In section 4b, can candidates specifically evaluate the use of certain approaches with their training, or does it have to be solely the process of the PDP?

The approaches used in a PDP would be considered very much part of the process of the PDP and so, can be used as part of the evaluation.

In section 1a, candidates can access a maximum of 4 marks for each method. Are standardised fitness tests regarded as one method, or could they gain 3 marks for two different standardised fitness tests, if the points of discussion and explanations are different?

The use of standardised fitness tests is one method of gathering information. There is a maximum of 4 marks available for each method. It is possible to provide more than four explanations for using a variety of standardised tests however, by putting a ceiling of 4 marks for any one method, the candidate is encouraged to investigate performance using at least three different methods.

For section 4ci, if a candidate selects a future development need that is not connected to sections 4a or 4b, are they also penalised in section 4cii?

Candidates will access no marks for their justification in section 4c. However, this will not be double penalized when it progresses into section 4c, part 2.

Could candidates complete a project on Stamina (including CRE, ME and Speed endurance)?

Yes, a candidate could complete their project on stamina including Cardio Respiratory Endurance, Muscular Endurance and Strength Endurance. However, the candidate must make the link between these three areas to avoid the creation of 3 standalone projects with no clear link. For example, this could also be done by investigating their role/position and identifying these three areas as development needs.

If a gymnast identified from their video analysis, standardised tests, coach feedback and various questionnaires that they are lacking flexibility in their leap, but anxiety seems to be playing a part also, is it ok for a candidate to write about, or would this be deemed as two separate projects?

There would need to be a link established between flexibility and anxiety. This ensures that we do not have two standalone projects within one, where candidates attempt to develop both of these factors without establishing the relationship between them.

If a candidate analysed four weaknesses identified in the Performance Profile, and three were different from their development need, and then gave four suitable analytical points from various other methods, how many marks can they access? For example, Development need = CRE. They analyse their PPW and give four sound analytical points for:

**Confidence
Motivation
Communication
CRE**

They then go on to give four different suitable analytical points from different methods for CRE:

Standardised fitness tests - CRE (not tracking marker in final parts of game)

Coach feedback - CRE (skill level deteriorated in final stages)

Video analysis - CRE (later stages of game stop moving into space as much to offer for a pass)

Video analysis - CRE (when they tire, they don't make as many overlapping runs in attack)

Within the marking scheme, it states that the analysis should lead to the clear identification of a topic. If a candidate then analyses data which is not linked, nor is relevant to the focus of the project, then this would not be awarded marks. This is similar to developing several factors which have no established link.

Can you please confirm that the PDP/training diary records don't count towards the overall word count?

Training diary comments and Personal Development Plan records which are contained within appendices, do not count towards the overall wordcount. Candidates should refer to these appendices in section 3 of their project.

The climbing research question seemed quite broad. Would 'Will improving my agility improve my performance in football?' be acceptable?

This question would be acceptable as it provides scope for the candidate to make a detailed response.