

Examiners' Report Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Physical Education (8536/9536)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA020362

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Unit 1 The Social Basis of Sport and Recreation | 5 |
| 2. | Unit 3 Exercise and Training | 7 |
| 3. | Unit 2 and 5 Enhancing and Refining Performance | 11 |
| 4. | Unit 4 Global Trends in International Sports | 19 |
| 5. | Unit 6 Scientific Principals of Exercise and Performance | 23 |
| 6. | Summer 2008 Grade Boundaries | 30 |

Unit 1: The Social Basis of Sport and Recreation

General Comments

Examiners reported a general improvement in the candidates' responses to this paper. The work done on making the paper more accessible through a more structured approach to the answer templates continues to encourage candidates to give more focused points.

There was a good spread of responses in section A with both questions proving popular. Candidates choosing Q1 scored slightly higher on average than those choosing Q2. Again, the key to success is reading the question carefully and working out the best way/structure of answering the question. It was good to see that most candidates were confident with the ePEN style of papers. It is still, however, very important to stress the importance of clear and legible writing.

There was a feeling that the standards of essay continues to improve, the essay topics this year were popular topics and allowed candidates to develop contemporary answers with much reference to Beijing, London 2012 and the recent issues concerning Marian Jones and Dwayne Chambers.

Section A: UK and European Context

Q1(a): This question was either answered well or not. Some candidates were confused by the concept of explaining how the games functioned and simply gave a description of mob games - those that understood the question generally scored well.

Q1(b)(i)-(ii): These questions were answered very well. Candidates showed a good knowledge of the development of rational sport, some did get a little confused in part (i) often missing the focus on social changes. Many candidates scored maximum on these questions

Q1(c): Many candidates appearing to have a very limited knowledge of the role of the UKSI and the work it does with elite athletes in the UK - this is an area that is clearly identified on the specification. Those that had revised the area often scored maximum marks.

Q1(d)(i)-(ii): Most managed to score at least 1 mark on (d)(i) but only a few were able to extend their answer to cover 3 points. Part (d)(ii) was well answered with many candidates scoring maximum or near maximum marks.

Q1(e) Mixed responses to this question, some gave a good description, weaker candidates simply explained the organisation of local sports clubs.

Q2(a): Well answered, though only a handful of candidate managed to gain full marks.

Q2(b): As always a very popular and well answered question.

Q(c)(i)-(iii): A range of answers to these questions, though it was good to see a general improvement in this area which has been for some year a weak examination area. Many candidates showed a good knowledge of both the historical development of physical education and the contemporary view of PE and school sport.

Q2(d): A range of responses from candidates. Weaker candidates focused on examples of commercial funding in sport. Better answers explained both the positive and negative effects of Americanisation on sport in the UK.

Q2(e): Weaker answers, many candidates appeared to have little knowledge of the terms stacking and centrality, most relied on answers relating to sports myths.

Section B - The Olympic Case Study

Q3: Some good answers explaining the positive roles the games can play in promoting participation amongst ethnic minorities. Better answers also developed a discussion about some of the negative impacts - the reinforcement of stereotypes. Weaker candidate were side tracked into long descriptions about protests at the Olympics particularly the 'black power' protest at the 1968 Olympics.

Q4: A popular question with many candidates writing a detailed account of the increasing role women play in the modern games. Many candidates were able to give a good overview of the historical development with better candidates making reference to how this reflected the changes in society.

Q5: A range of answers given and the most popular question. Many candidates had obviously studied the types of drugs and their effect on the body. Some candidates did begin to discuss the influence of monetary rewards and pressure for athletes to do well. Many answers lacked depth with only better candidates talking about the historical changes in sport that have changed the focus between sportsmanship and gamesmanship.

Q6: A range of answers to this question. Weaker answers simply described how the games have become increasingly commercialised, many identifying Uberroth's role and the LA Olympics of 1984. Better answers had clearly read and understood the question, they made points that tracked the development of commercialism in the wider area of sport and how this had impacted on the Olympic movement.

Unit 3: Exercise and Training

General Comments

This paper seemed to differentiate between candidates who had been taught well and prepared for the examination against those who had simply covered the syllabus. All questions were accessible with many having appeared in similar format in previous examination series. However, an inability to define concepts accurately, to apply concepts and most importantly to read the questions accurately prevented many candidates from scoring the available marks. Candidates still seem to struggle most when questions are based on the fitness and more applied aspects of the syllabus with Q3(a) and (b) being clear examples of this.

Q1(a): Candidates who read and understood the question scored well, relating the activities performed within the cool-down with the specific reasons for performing each activity. Weaker candidates listed the benefits of performing a cool-down. Jogging and stretching were frequent answers as were the removal of waste products and maintain muscle elasticity. Better candidates identified that the gross motor activity should be of a decreasing intensity and related the need to maintain O₂ delivery in order to speed up recovery.

Q1(b): Generally well answered with most candidates scoring the 2 marks for the types of contractions. Weaker candidates either got the contractions confused or provided descriptions that were too vague, ie failing to state that the muscle was contracting as it lengthened etc.

Q1(b)(ii): When answered well the candidates scored the full marks with concise and accurate answers. Candidates generally failed to score when they provided an invalid sporting example or were too vague with the example.

Q1(b)(iii): As for (b)(ii), when the concept of muscular contractions was understood candidates were able to score the full allocation for Q1(b), (ii) and (iii). Misunderstanding and vague answers were the most common mistakes here.

Q1(c)(i): Well answered with the majority of candidates scoring the 3 available marks. Of concern was the small number of candidates who identified muscle fibre and tendon arrangements eg pinnate, fusiform etc.

Q1(c)(ii): Not a particularly well answered question. It clearly states that candidates were to list **two** structural characteristics for **each** fibre and to then describe how each characteristic affected the performance of the fibre. However most common answers simply listed characteristics of the fibres and failed to identify the affect the characteristics had upon performance.

Q2(a): Candidates generally scored well here but could have been more systematic with their answers in order to save time and avoid repetition. Better answers identified the structural and the functional adaptations separately. Weaker answers simply listed a series of adaptations. Cardiac hypertrophy and increased SV were the most common answers.

Q2(a)(ii): Generally a well answered question with most candidates identifying the need to **use** the O₂.

Q2(b): Mixed answers for this question once again. Still some candidates explained the three cycles as totally independent of each other with different sports being suited to the different cycles. There still persists the notion that a macro cycle has to be 4 years in duration and is therefore only suited to an Olympic athlete!

Pleasingly a significant number of answers identified that micro cycles make up a meso cycle and that meso cycles make up the macro cycle. The answers were also often appropriately related to games players as required by the question.

Q2(c)(i): A well answered question with most scoring the 2 marks available. Some vague answers failed to identify the need for the differing pressured areas to be in close proximity/adjacent to each other.

Q2(c)(i): A very well answered question with many candidates writing answers that could have easily scored more than the 4 marks available.

Q2(d): Very few candidates identified the need for blood to be returned to the right side of the heart. The most common answers focused on valves preventing backflow and muscles squeezing the veins. There were few answers that were detailed enough to score the full 6 marks allocated.

Q3(a): Q3 was generally poorly answered with vague and inaccurate answers being common. Candidates rarely correctly identified two appropriate tests with accompanying components of fitness. The bleep test was a very common test used as an answer despite numerous reports stating that the correct name would be required as “bleep test is too vague”. When its correct name was used it was usually associated with cardiovascular endurance when it is clearly a VO_2 max test.

30m flying sprint was often accompanied with the component of speed to score 1 mark.

Q3(a)(ii): Better scores were achieved for this part of Q3, however many answers were still very vague and frequently got the required distances wrong.

Q3(b)(i): Not a particularly well answered question with candidates providing vague and waffling answers when definitions are required. Definitions for maximal strength were the better of the three defined components. Cardiovascular Endurance was surprisingly poorly answered with many candidates preferring to explain what the cardiovascular system contained instead, and then often listed the lungs as a component. Reaction time was also poorly answered with the most common answers defining response time rather than reaction time.

Q3(b)(ii): This part of the question was answered quite well with the majority of candidates scoring at least 3 of the available 6 marks by correctly identifying 3 appropriate sports. Some explanations were a little vague however, with better candidates scoring the 3 additional marks for justifying the sports relative to the components of fitness.

Q3(c): This question highlighted the inability of many candidates to learn and apply definitions to concepts. The majority of candidates scored for TLC, with IRV and ERV being the next most successfully defined. Many candidates lost marks for vague answers and also the use of oxygen rather than air.

Q4(a): A high scoring question for many candidates with 4 out of the available 6 being a frequent score. Poor structure of answers was often the cause for the loss of the remaining 2 marks ie failing to differentiate the adaptations caused by aerobic and anaerobic training resulted in the sub max being hit.

Q4(b)(i): A straightforward and well answered question.

Q4(b)(ii): Clearly identified in the specification, frequently examined and reported on yet once again this was answered extremely poorly. Very few candidates were able to state or apply Karvonen's equation. Any marks that were scored were for a named and described zone.

Q4(c)(i): A mixed question with many candidates scoring the available 4 marks. Fixator and synergist were frequently accurately defined however agonist and antagonist were equally often answered too vaguely ie "the contracting muscle" or "the relaxing muscle".

Q4(c)(ii): A very well answered question, with the Biceps curl being a common choice and 4 out of 4 being achieved regularly; a fact which would suggest that candidates understand many concepts but are unable to describe them accurately.

Q4(d): When candidates answers identified that their descriptions were clearly of circuit training, ie mention of different stations, they scored well. Vague and generic answers often let candidates down.

Unit 2 and 5: Enhancing and Refining Performance

General Comment:

This year nearly 430 centres undertook and completed the examination requirements for the Advanced Subsidiary, Unit 6722, and the Advanced GCE, Unit 6725, in Physical Education. A series of 'cluster moderations', external moderations and video support moderations took place for centres entering candidates both from the United Kingdom and from overseas centres.

This has been a successful series of moderations and centres are to be congratulated on the high number of candidates producing assignments and practical performances of a good to very high standard. The moderation teams are grateful for the levels of co-operation shown to them by staff in what is a stressful and demanding time period for them with increasing pressures to exhibit higher levels of exactness.

The recurring theme of plagiarism has once again been evident but it is pleasing to report this has been less of an issue than in previous examination series. Centres have a duty to ensure that when signing their authentication forms they are certain that the work being submitted is that of their own candidates. It is disappointing that in a few cases centres were submitting work that was virtually identical from candidates within the same centre. This implies that centre staff are not undertaking a suitable process of standardisation and checking for such malpractice.

Administration issues were overall completed satisfactorily inline with established examination procedures. However, in some cases numerical mistakes, the completion of the incorrect 'optems' forms and the inclusion of incorrectly completed authentication sheets made the process of moderation more difficult for the moderation teams. Attention is drawn to centre staff of the need to check the detailed instructions for all of the administration processes prior to the submission of candidates' coursework and to comply with the published deadlines for the submission of assignments. In addition, some centres are allowing their candidates to exceed the word count for assignments therefore it is imperative that the established word count limits are strictly enforced.

6722- 01 - Skill Acquisition

Overall a good standard of assignments were produced by the candidates. The majority of centres had prepared their candidates well, nearly all the candidates attempted to answer the assignment correctly and a wider range of titles were undertaken than in previous series. The issue of word count authenticity appeared to be a concern and some centre staff are signing the authentication sheet complying with the 1200 word count limit when clearly the assignments are way over. As a result candidates work was moderated up to and not beyond the 1200 count with the consequence that mark adjustments were made. Fewer candidates achieved a combined mark of 8-12 for their two assignments with the vast majority being moderated in the mark band 16-24. It is pleasing to report that very few centres marked their assignments inaccurately. Once again a few centres are still using the old assignment titles from over six years ago and similarly the out-dated authentication sheets.

The acquiring section was again a major strength and candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the key terms and issues relating to their specific assignment title and used a good range of sporting examples to illustrate their depth of knowledge and understanding. Where candidates did not provide an appropriate range of sports examples then this was reflected in their marks. Interestingly, it is common to find a lack of racket activity examples being used.

The analysis section was adequately completed but a frequent observation was that candidates did not apply their analysis, linking parts of the answer to the question title, with depth. As expected the better candidates were analytical in their application and knowledge. Rarely did candidates attempt to include socio-cultural or physiological aspects to their analysis. Only a small percentage of the assignments moderated were in the top band of 13-15 which once again reflected the candidates' ability to answer the question analytically.

6722- 02 and 6725 - 03 - Practical Activities

In general, the marking of the practical activities was good and accurate. This is particularly true for games activities. Candidates were reported to be showing great application in this subject area and many playing sport at the highest level.

On the whole, candidates performed well and made every effort to produce their best performance while being moderated. There were some very good and outstanding performances in several centres especially in activities in which candidates participated outside the school situation for example horse riding, gymnastics and some water sports where the teaching and coaching is of a high standard. As with previous years the practical moderation was dominated by the major games, despite making every effort to include minority activities by the moderation teams it was still necessary to include football, netball or rugby in the moderation process, because otherwise a full range of marks and candidates were not possible. However, an attempt to include more minority activities remains a priority to support those centres and candidates offering such activities. There were a high number of candidates in the top two bands and it was pleasing this year to see a depth of ability in practical activities such as badminton, gymnastics, trampolining, table tennis, rowing, horse riding, judo, karate and rounders. It was noticed that dance was becoming more popular and the range of dance was increasing.

One issue still exists and is reflective of previous examination series.

At AS level there are still a number of candidates/centres who find difficulty in choosing an appropriate second sport and demonstrate little evidence of any work on development of the skills of their candidates. Centres are advised to plan carefully their time allocation and staff support in such cases. There remains however a concern that some centres are offering rounders, because they perceive it to be an easy option.

Some small centres are still over marking, particularly in boys and girls football, while the A2 component 'Skills in Isolation' is often overlooked in some centres. The quality of the practical sessions undertaken by some centres do not stretch the more able candidates and therefore centres are advised to plan ahead in order to fulfil this element of the moderation. Some centres still provide weak practical sessions with structured practices more worthy of key stage 4 GCSE candidates.

Where video evidence was provided the quality in some cases was poor and made the process of moderation a difficult one. Centre assessors are reminded of the need to consult the Edexcel published advice on constructing video evidence. Overseas centres in particular are reminded of the need to apply the assessment criteria fully and to seek advice and guidance via the 'Ask the Expert' service. Centres are also becoming complacent in assessing off site activities with rigour and many had little or no video evidence for all sports moderated off site and this is a requirement as detailed in the Coursework guidelines Issue 3 January 2003.

There are, however, some issues with regard to the marking of the summer activities and centres are advised to instruct their A2 candidates to keep detailed records in their IPPs' prior to the advanced course commencement thereby logging their participation and progress during the summer months.

6722- 03 - The Research Project

Overall there was some very good work undertaken by candidates in this component. In the cases where high marks were awarded it was clear that centres had undertaken a thorough and comprehensive tutoring system to help their candidates complete each stage of the project.

Similar to previous years there was a wide range of ability and interpretation of the mark scheme was in evidence. A number of centres produced studies of the highest academic quality, well researched, extensive bibliographies and personalisation. At the other end of the spectrum were projects which were incomplete and showed minimal engagement with the task. Some candidates simply repeated aspects of other assignments, such as skill acquisition tasks, as part of their wider coursework. In many cases candidates would have scored significantly higher with more centre guidance and advice on the assessment criteria.

Where candidates receive centre guidance projects are generally of a high standard with appropriate focus and scope for research, within the word count. Seemingly some centres still provide little or no guidance and candidates produce coursework that is investigative in nature (ie A2 coursework). Too many centres allow the whole centre to do coursework with the same title, leading to suspicions of plagiarism. In addition, too many candidates adopt a standard essay approach which is not appropriate, as it complicates marking for both the centre and the moderator. Candidates should divide their work into the four categories identified by the

assessment criteria. Overall, it is evident that more centres are taking on board the advice provided in the detailed feedback on the E9s.

Plagiarism continues to be an issue although some centres appear to be insisting that candidates should reference their work. However, for many centres this was a patchy effort with either only a limited bibliography or inconsistent referencing within their work without a reference/bibliography at the end. Once again there was evidence of over reliance on anonymous internet sources without questioning the reliability or validity of sources used.

Centres with a large number of candidates undertaking the Research project are also advised to undertake internal standardisation before sending work for moderation. This should be strongly encouraged in future examination series.

Component 6722- 04 - Analysis of Performance

The Analysis of Performance, 6722-04, was generally accurately marked. Disappointingly though, most centres appear to have lost interest in the IPP where this component really comes into its own. However, where the IPP has been used it provided support for the work that had been completed on this section. It is clear that where centres have devoted sufficient time to this component the quality of knowledge and understanding demonstrated by candidates was high - where not candidates were vague and had little knowledge and understanding of their sports activity. In all, the level of marking was perhaps slightly generous particularly at the top end of the mark range.

The Local and National Assignments were on the whole, marked to a very good level. The only concern is that candidates still do not paint a whole picture about what goes on in their community particularly and, surprisingly, in relation to their own schools structure. In many cases centres allow the projects to be too generic and lack the necessary local scene. While in the majority of cases the 1000 word count limit was adhered to a few centres are ignoring this limit and therefore their candidates are being disadvantaged at the moderation. Centres are also advised to steer their candidates away from downloading information *cart blanche* as a short cut to demonstrating a depth of a quality to their research.

Component 6725 - 01 - Factors Affecting Performance

For the first section of the 'Assignment Title and Research Objectives' there was a good range of titles and these were applicable to the candidates needs. Most centres though did not provide sufficient guidance regarding suitable areas of research, or the identification of the role to be adopted. In several cases a range of sources were consulted but some relied too heavily on a single text book or one sport specific article. Some of the candidates referenced their work resulting in good academic standards but not all included a bibliography. Objectives were clearly set in nearly all studies moderated which made it easy to ascertain from the outset what the candidate was trying to achieve. However, some did not then follow this through to a clear conclusion.

Where research was accurate, many assignments lacked detail and reference to current findings. The range of academic creditability varied from only 'limited' to well executed. Several candidates failed to apply their knowledge to a selected

practical sport and it appeared as a generic description. The use of other practical examples in sport was absent in most centres while some fulfilled this aspect with clarity. In most cases this was a good section and candidates provided the expected theorists relating to their studies while for others their work was far too subjective and discussed intervention more than the related theories and therefore did not provide a real academic base, with depth, from which to conduct their FAP. For additional marks candidates need to ensure that they relate to their own sport and then draw comparisons with other sports for a wider development. There was evidence of over marking by centres for this section.

In the Applications to Performance issues have arisen again this year. Because of the generic nature of the research and literature review candidates in several centres failed to demonstrate clear application to their own or another's refinement of performance with a clear identification of what the role is and why they have selected another's performance for the FAP. In the centres with poor teacher guidance this was clearly evident. Analysis of this section helps to draw the conclusion that in a wide variety of assignments it appears this aspect of the completion of the FAP is left to the last moment and therefore limited time and research are afforded to it. All candidates completed primary research at different levels and this was encouraging. While some were very simple tests, all were measurable in some way and in most assignments showed some refinement to their respective performances.

There was some confusion in the weaker studies and it would have been better, for example, if candidates sought help and guidance in writing out a goal setting programme where applicable and the methodologies to achieve the outlined goals. In some cases this was vague or non-existent. In addition, the use of video analysis is a very good method to test and improve technique but centres are advised to remind their candidates to ensure that this is then discussed in relation to the improvement in their performance outcomes. Whilst technique may have improved in an athletic throwing event, for example in one FAP, the extension would be as to how this has impacted on the distance subsequently thrown by the student.

For the conclusion and evaluation, as with the other aspects of this piece of coursework, the range of student work varied widely with most leaving little space in their word count to offer clear and detailed conclusions. All candidates formed some conclusion but some had not obtained sufficient results and analysis to offer anything more than subjectivity. Few candidates offered much in the way of any detailed 'appraisal' but all attempted included some comment.

Finally, the overall performances of candidates ranged from poor to excellent, sometimes reflecting limited guidance from staff or failing to take into account the level of academic expectation at A2 level. The extending of the word count in several centres was still evident, and in some cases, candidates are claiming to have used fewer words by several hundred than the assignment contained. Centre staff must check that all assignments do not exceed the 1500 word count limit.

Centres are once again reminded to read the FAP notes and guidance issued on the Edexcel web site. Centres are also reminded that it is not expected that all candidates will undertake the same area of study. Where there was evidence of good teacher guidance the assignments were well presented. It is pleasing to report that invariably administration procedures were adhered to. In future coursework should not contain teacher annotations for marking or any other influential comment.

Component 6725- 02 - Personal Exercise Programme

Generally the PEPs were successfully completed by a large number of candidates with the only real issues arising from the marking of new centres and international centres mainly occurring as a result of a lack of experience. Some outstanding examples were seen reflecting a high level of commitment and thoroughness in the planning section in particular from both the more able candidates and organised centres.

Some centres do not scrutinise the content of their candidate's training programmes sufficiently to make judgements on the credibility of what training is being claimed to have been completed when undertaking PEP marking and their own standardisation. The preparation section is the one that is mostly over marked where the candidate has not included any or enough scientific detail. Centres are reminded that it is imperative that all candidates spend more time on the selection of appropriate training routines and loadings to enable adaptations to take place and to demonstrate progression in their programmes as appropriate to their aims and the demands of their own sports activity.

Teachers should advise their candidates that more than one aspect of their performance to be improved over a comparatively short time is ambitious and therefore not recommended. Downloading large chunks of information from the internet is still a feature of some programmes and is not reflective of good practice and maybe construed as plagiarism. Many of the programmes are presented too vaguely and lack detail on what has been actually undertaken in the programme.

Refreshingly though, many of the candidates that were awarded high marks were able to substantiate their marks in their personal interviews. However, in several cases many high marked candidates had little knowledge and understanding of what they had done in their training and more importantly why they had undertaken a particular programme. A lack of scientific explanation of the effects and consequences of their training was also evident.

Component 6725- 04 - The Investigative Study

Candidates have generally been more concise, followed the Assessment Criteria and adhered more to the word count this year. There have been some cases, however, where candidates have put a word count of 2500 or below on the recording sheet and the study is clearly over that. In other cases the word count has been omitted on the Recording Sheet and the study is over 2500 - centres are reminded of the need to be vigilant.

For the 'Introduction', candidates are making sure that the purpose is evident through the title although it could be clearer within the introduction. Some candidates are losing marks by not explaining in enough detail how the investigation is to be carried out; this should also include what and how it is to be researched. Candidates should be encouraged to include clear objectives in this section as this provides more detail and more potential to achieve full marks.

In the section 'Review of Literature', this has been much more concise with a wider variety of sources being used. However, this is still the main area where candidates exceed the stipulated word count limit. The increasing numbers of candidates that

use recent and relevant journals/research articles have subsequently submitted a more in depth research of the topic area and scored well. Candidates should be reminded to find research that is relevant to their purpose/aim. If possible, they should find studies that agree and disagree with their hypothesis (eg contradictory evidence) enabling them to generate more of an argument in their 'Discussion/Conclusion of results'.

For their Research Methods candidates are giving detailed accounts of their research methods, however, they are not giving clear reasons for their use. A better justification of their methodology is needed. In the 'Results' section it was clear not as many candidates have used statistical analysis this year to explain their results. Candidates that have used advanced statistical tests to assist with the analysis of their results have achieved higher marks. Some candidates have put all their results in the appendices, the graphs and tables should be in the results section.

In the section 'Discussion and Conclusion' candidates are giving a written explanation of their results in this section when that should go in the results section. Candidates should be encouraged to relate their results to their literature review. As few candidates are finding related studies in their literature review, it is then very difficult for them to score highly in this section.

Finally the 'Appraisal' section is done very well. Candidates are able to identify the limitations of their study and make suggestions for improvement. The choice of topics selected by some centres was not always appropriate and limited the candidates' ability to carry out proper research. Use of the internet was widespread, in some cases used exclusively. This should be discouraged as the criteria clearly state, 'a wide variety of sources.' Several centres with multiple candidates, submitted identical topics, differing only in the sport being studied. Again, this should also be discouraged.

There are still some centres that do not use the Assessment Criteria headings and clearly candidates are not aware of the Criteria that are being used to assess their work. Some are even producing a research project while in one case a candidate had a header for a FAP. Centre staff are reminded that primary research must be carried out in all studies. While in the main all administration tasks were carried out centres are reminded of the need to read the ICE document, double check all additions and be familiar with the rubric of assessment.

Web Site

Centres are to be thanked for their patience and co-operation in all matters relating to this moderation and are advised to consult the Edexcel web site for regular update information and to download appropriate documentation relating to next years moderation processes. Details of the moderation, the new coursework guidelines and examination assessment forms will all be posted by Edexcel from September 2008.

Unit 4: Global Trends in International Sports

General Comments

This was our largest summer series of exams so far and examiners reported a spread of responses from candidates. There were a number of exceptional answer papers and obvious evidence of thorough preparation and teaching. There was also however, a large number of candidates who appeared to have a very limited knowledge of large areas of the specification for this unit.

It was good to see a number of candidates using very up to date contemporary issues in both sections of the paper and this does tend to help candidates explain their points. Many made reference to the issues surrounding both the forthcoming Beijing Olympic Games and London's bid for the 2012 games. There was however still too much reliance on Olympic examples and although there had been many recent global games only the better candidates used these in their answers.

It is pleasing again to report that there were very few candidates this year choosing a culture they had obviously not studied or answer too many question in section A. The majority of candidates appeared to have done the essay question first; can we remind centres that the essay scores will be given twice the weighting.

In section A, Q1 was again overwhelmingly the most popular.

There was a good spread across the essay titles, with Q7 and Q8 being marginally the most popular. Too many essay answers were predominately descriptive with only a limited analysis. The highest scores were achieved where candidates wrote sound balanced essays often relating to a central argument. Can we also remind centres that candidates should be using range of examples from global games and not just focus on the Olympics - this was covered in the AS and we expect candidates to show progression.

Section A: North American cultures

Q1(a): This question was answered well with most candidates making reference to both the Win ethic and the American Dream. Better answers give a detailed description of the three key ethics outlined in the specification; win, radical and counter culture ethics.

Q1(b): This question produced a mix of answers, some candidates did misinterpret the question and simply talked about outdoor sports. Better answers mentioned the range of climate and topography, often making links to acclimatisation and preparation for global games.

Q1(c): Key problem with this question was candidates failing to recognise that the answers had to relate to high school education. Far too many simply referred to colleges in their answers. However, this remains an area of strength and many did score maximum marks.

Q1(d): Answered well by the majority of candidates though only better candidates picked up all 3 marks. For part (i) too many candidates made too few points to match the marks available. Candidates produced very good answers for part (ii).

Q1(e): This question resulted in a range of better answers with most candidates identified that the win ethic acted as a constraint, again the main fault was failing to get enough points down.

Section A: New World Cultures: Australia, New Zealand And South Africa

Q2(a): The majority of candidates did appear to have a good grasp of the advantages the new world cultures have in terms of climate and topography as well as a positive contribution from new world governments.

Q2(b): The majority of candidates could only explain that the public sector funded sport in New World Cultures and that each state had developed its own sports institutes. Only the better candidates explained the fact that each state had its institute and the support these centres offered elite athletes.

Q2(c)(i): A well answered question, many candidates showed a sound understanding of the Sport Education programme common in New World Cultures. Better candidates went on to discuss the various roles candidates undertake on the programme. Weaker candidates mixed up sport education with talent identification programmes.

Q2(c)(ii): Well answered question with better candidates correctly identifying that this question referred to sport rather than physical education. Weaker candidates discussed the difference in the provision of PE. Most marks were awarded for points relating to sport being played within school time in Australia and the fact that sport education is often a compulsory lesson in New World Cultures.

Q2(d): Another well answered question with many explaining in depth the Aussie sport programme.

Q2(e): A well answered question. Most candidates described the Institute system operating in Australia, many linked this development to the Olympic failure of 1976. Better candidates identified that there was a clear elite pathway, beginning with talent identification or Sports search at school level, athletes being offered both scholarships and full sports science back up in order to help them prepare fully for global sports competitions.

Section A: Developing Cultures

Q3: Not many candidates attempted this question. As in previous years most of the examples given related to long distance running in Kenya. Candidates scored best on the more general questions such as (b) and (c). Where candidates were asked to give specific example, centres are reminded that they can use examples from both named cultures.

Section A: Asian Cultures

Q4: Not many candidates attempted this question. The main issue was candidates failing to give or refer to specific cultural examples in their answers. Many of the questions specifically asked for this. Again, candidates scored best on the more general questions such as (c) and (d).

Section B: A Synoptic Analysis of Trends in International Sport through Global Games

Q5: This question produced some of the better synoptic answers. Good answers identified that historically anthems, flags and medal tables gave countries a chance to gain shop window status. Other examples mentioned included New World cultures and Emergent cultures using success in global sport to promote their country in return for both intrinsic and extrinsic benefits. Weaker answers gave a very biased view, often focusing entirely on either the benefits of hosting a major global sporting event, much reference to London's 2012 Olympic bid, or simply gave a list of political protests that have occurred at Olympic Games over the last century.

Q6: Another popular essay question, with most candidates producing a sound response. The majority gave a historical overview of the topic, though again examples were often limited to Olympic examples and is therefore showing little progression from AS. Points relating to ethnic groups were more detailed and good ranges of specific examples were given.

Q7: Good responses to this question with many candidates giving detailed descriptions of a range of global models of excellence. The most popular models used were Australia, East Germany, USA and France. Not as many candidates actually went on to compare the effectiveness of the various models.

Q8: A popular synoptic question. The better answers gave a balanced response weighing up the romantic ideal of the traditional amateur which emerged at the start of the 20th century against the modern full time professional athlete. Many correctly identified that the majority of elite athletes are still amateur to a large degree and only a select few make the millions and even these still play for the love of the game. Weaker answers failed to identify the differences between amateur and professional - mainly reproduced an Olympic essay relating to the concept of commercialism - much detailed description of the role Uberroth played in the financing of the 1984.

Unit 6: Scientific Principals of Exercise and Performance

General Comment:

It was pleasing to see less rubric errors again this year-with the majority of candidates answering the right number of questions. Centres need to emphasise the need for candidates to indicate which questions they have answered in the relevant boxes at the top of the page. In section A there was not much to choose between the popularity of Q1 and 2. In section B, Psychology continues to remain far more popular than Biomechanics. In the Psychology section, Q6 was favoured slightly more than 5. Essay 8 was most popular, followed by 7, then 10, and 9 was least popular.

Candidates who answer in bullet points on the short answer questions tend to score better than those who write in paragraphs because they ensure that they make enough points to match the marks available. More candidates are now writing essays that have a better structure and are including evidence of planning, many trying to allude to including information from each section of the syllabus, which is good practice. On the whole candidates are good at the 'first part' of questions but then fail to apply the theory to sporting examples. This needs practice.

Section A: Exercise and Energy Systems

Q1(a)(i): Candidates understood that carbohydrate loading was a 'week long process'. Most candidates knew it was to allow the body to hold onto more carbohydrate (better candidates were able to say glycogen). A lot of candidates were able to tell us that just before the event they should rapidly increase carbs and decrease training. The 'average' candidate scored 4 or 5 marks. The teaching of this section needs to allow candidates to understand more specifically what is required on each day leading up to competition to be able to access the best marks.

Q1(a)(ii): Candidates were able to tell us about sleep patterns being affected, feeling over full or weight gain. This question scored well and most responses on the mark scheme were used by candidates. However, many candidates seemed to think that liver and kidney problems would arise from carbohydrate loading which is incorrect.

Q1(b)(i): This question was particularly well answered possibly reflecting candidates' preference for learning information in parrot-like fashion. I have no objections to this as I consider this an acceptable approach to biochemistry at this level. Candidates do appear to learn the energy systems thoroughly as demonstrated in other questions.

Q1(b)(ii): Some candidates gave general answers or incorrectly mentioned ATP-PC system. However the majority scored maximum marks on this straightforward question.

Q1(c): Whilst candidates could link specific events to predominant energy systems they were not so good at actually explaining what an energy continuum is and why it is of use for targeting training strategies. A worrying number of candidates still seemed to think that energy systems work independently of each other, shutting down whilst another takes over.

Q2(a)(i): Candidates were able to accurately name energy systems. The odd candidate still uses the term 'anaerobic system' which is too vague to be worthy of credit.

Q2(a)(ii): A lot of candidates are still only achieving half marks on this type of question as they omit any mention of the intensity of work within each pathway. This was surprising given that a very similar question appeared on last year's paper and the mark scheme did reflect the need for stating exercise intensity in order to gain full marks.

Q2(b)(i): This straightforward question was not answered well. Candidates either had no understanding of, or were confused about, the anaerobic threshold. A large number of candidates think it is when aerobic energy production begins. Candidates were unable to define OBLA as onset of blood lactate accumulation.

Q2(b)(ii): Candidates were not able to answer this question well. A few of the better candidates highlighted interval training as a suitable type of training, and were able to talk about buffering/dealing with lactic acid better. There were references to aerobic training-continuous training, possibly because of confusion (as detailed in Q2(b)(i)) about the anaerobic threshold being when aerobic energy systems take over. Candidates did not access any of the other points on the mark scheme. This will need attention in centres. Candidates are still referring to 'waste products' and not lactic acid specifically.

Q2(b)(iii): Candidates scored well on this straightforward question. There are still candidates who talk about lowering heart rate-not resting heart rate-which is not specific enough to score marks. There are also candidates who talk about hypertrophy instead of cardiac (or heart) hypertrophy. Again answers such as this are too vague at this level.

Q2(c)(i): Candidates did not understand the terminology in this question. Only the very best candidates were able to articulate that EPOC returns body to homeostasis (using the term 'to resting levels'). Candidates did not know O^2 debt and they did not know the differences.

Q2(c)(ii): Candidates failed to gain marks where they made no mention of times for restoration of muscle pc. Some stated that full replenishment was within 2-3 minutes and for such a vague answer could gain no marks. However, a large number of candidates had learnt 50% in 30 seconds and full in 3 mins so scored 2 marks. Some candidates used the coupled reaction and use of phosphate. Candidates do not appear to know that energy for this comes from aerobic system. Centres should note that although candidates were awarded a mark for 100% replenishment in 3 minutes this year, it is actually 99%.

Section B: Biomechanics

General comment:

Those candidates who answered this section tended to score high marks. A worrying number are still not using the correct units (or sometimes any units at all) in answers despite this being mentioned in last years report as well.

Q3(a)(i): Candidates knew that distance was a measurement between two points. They knew displacement (using terms like 'as the crow flies' from A to B) but did not use the terms vector and scalar to answer this question.

Q3(a)(ii): Candidates knew this well. Some candidates decided that rather than use the simple example of a 400m race on the 400m track they would use the 400m track with a different event-eg 200m. They made the question harder than it needed to be. Most candidates scored maximum marks for this.

Q3(b)(i): The better candidates easily scored their marks for this question. Weaker candidates were able to score a mark for correctly labelled axes. Candidates often had the middle part of the graph correct but missed out the start and finish.

Q3(b)(ii): Candidates were not able to answer this question. They talked about A-athlete bending knees to jump, B-athlete jumping so velocity increasing and C-slowng down as they come back to ground. Candidates needed to link the graph to the velocity and use figure 1 in their explanation. This would have assisted them in accessing the right type of answer.

Q3(c)(i): Candidates knew how to do this question. Some candidates are still not using the correct units for answers which is important.

Q3(c)(ii): Most candidates knew that air resistance and friction would affect the ball. This question scored highly.

Q3(c)(iii): Most candidates were able to score a mark for knowing that momentum before=momentum after. However most candidates did not have a negative value for the momentum of the bat before which meant they had a positive answer. Again, candidates need to use units for their answers, which they are better at, but still not all doing.

Q3(c)(iv): Candidates had learnt Newton's laws well and were able to give detailed definitions of them. Higher grade candidates were easily able to access all marks. Weaker candidates found explaining the application to a practical example more difficult.

Q4(a): This question was well answered by those who understood what it was asking. Candidates regularly scored full marks. However, a surprising number of candidates thought it was asking about how and why you would play a top spin or back spin shot. They gave detailed answers, incorrectly, about the technique for performing these shots and when in a tennis match you would play them-occasionally stumbling on 1 mark for saying the top spin shot dips quicker.

Q4(b): All candidates were able to talk about 45 degrees being the optimum angle for release and this point is obviously well taught. Candidates do not know, or did not articulate in the exam, that the flight path of an object is at a tangent to circular path when circular motion is involved. Better candidates were able to talk about hammer or discus flying into the cage if released too early or too late. A lot of candidates made the error of talking about releasing too early or late rather than angle of release with javelin.

Q4(c): Candidates knew all of the points in the mark scheme, and were able to score well on this question. They tended not to achieve full marks if writing in one long paragraph rather than splitting it up into bullet points to ensure they had made enough points. A few candidates incorrectly thought that 'windy days' and 'disability such as amputated legs' would affect stability.

Q4(d)(i): Only the better candidates were able to define moment of inertia (tending to say resistance to turning). Very few were able to give technical answers about factors affecting it. This needs attention in centres.

Q4(d)(ii) Candidates regularly scored just the 1 mark for saying an ice skater who brings her arms in will turn faster. Candidates did not apply the other points on the mark scheme.

Section B: Sports Psychology

General Comment:

Where candidates associated the correct theory to the question asked then marks were easily gained. Identifying an incorrect theory caused most loss of marks in this section. On some theories candidates know the theory well but lack the ability to link it to practical examples. In the teaching of this unit theories should be related to their practical application.

Q5(a)(i): This question has clearly been well taught in centres and most candidates were able to access all the marks available.

Q5(a)(ii): Too many candidates did not link their answer to a specific sporting example and so could not gain marks. Some were far too vague, just stating something like 'e.g. football'. Very vague examples could not gain marks. It was surprising given how many candidates scored well on 5a) how few could link the theory to practice.

Q5(b): A straight forward question that was generally well answered. A few candidates thought 'introvert' was one dimension and 'extrovert' the other only scoring one of a possible 2 marks. Candidates also used terms like 'extrovertism' and 'neuroticism', which were given the 'benefit of the doubt'.

Q5(c): Nearly every candidate was able to gain maximum marks on this question and this has clearly been well learnt by candidates.

Q5(d)(i): Better candidates were able to link audience to arousal, and then draw a graph showing a positive linear relationship. Most candidates know that 'dominant response' will result. Candidates sometimes confused arousal with anxiety.

Q5(d)(ii): Unfortunately whilst most candidates were able to discuss the dominant response for beginners and experienced performers, they did not take the extra step and relate that to the presence or absence of an audience. Marks were only ever awarded for beginners performing worse and advanced performers being better.

Q5(e): The majority of candidates know that this is 'innate/we are born with it'. Only the better candidates were able to go on and say that aggression builds and sport provides a release. Few candidates used examples to support points made. Weaker candidates gave definitions of aggression.

Q6(a): Despite a similar question last year candidates were still confusing the cognitive approach to learning with Fitts & Posner's Theory of Learning (cognitive, associative and autonomous learners). Better candidates used the terms 'whole' or 'holistic' and trial and error learning. A lot of candidates incorrectly thought it should be broken down into parts for teaching.

Q6(b): Most candidates only achieved 3 out of 5 marks here because they did not progress to state points 5 and 6 on the mark scheme. Candidates regularly scored 3 marks for saying goal blocked, frustration and then aggression. A worrying number think that a blocked goal is specific to a goal keeper blocking a shot.

Q6(c): Candidates who got the correct theory often scored all the marks. There was some confusion between this and factors affecting self efficacy (Bandura) 'vicarious experiences, performance accomplishments, verbal persuasion and emotional arousal'-possibly only because there were four of them as well. Some candidates also started giving general answers about demonstrations being clear and how we learn best.

Q6(d)(i): Another straightforward question that all candidates could easily answer.

Q6(d)(ii): Candidates earned less marks than they possibly thought they were going to earn. Nearly all could identify and describe the difference between somatic and cognitive anxiety, and better candidates could go on to mention duration of anxiety once performance began, but in total this would only gain them 1 or 2 marks. They might have considered this worth 4 marks when writing their scripts and as they may well have run out of writing space and considered this type of answer full enough. Very few were able to talk about the effects they had on sporting performance. Better candidates sometimes mentioned inverted U for somatic.

Section C: A Synoptic Analysis of Scientific Principles

General comment:

Most essays showed evidence of good planning. Candidates are structuring essays better and mentioning all units in the syllabus. Candidates continue to fail to score highly because they simply list examples and do not explain, analyse or give opinions to support the examples they have given. There was more evidence of technical language being used this year, but still not enough analysis and debate for the essays to be worthy of more marks. Candidates who identified debate and tried to argue two sides to an argument and supported it with scientific terminology were scoring higher marks. Candidates were more easily able to identify that debate was needed in Q8.

Q7: Candidates used both short (boot camp) and long term preparation (Australian Institute of Sport) in their answers. Candidates were able to talk about acclimatisation (though worryingly some candidates still call this 'climatisation'), getting over jet lag and cohesion of a team. Weaker essays failed to include any science at all and just talked in general terms about the benefit of getting away and bonding with your team. Some candidates mistakenly thought they needed to talk specifically about Australian cricket throughout. Candidates did not go on to talk about the positives and negatives of training camps or institutes. Very few talked about units other than physiology and psychology. Candidates would benefit from hearing top sports performers talking specifically about their experiences at such camps. Could a group of local schools arrange such a talk between them?

Q8: This was a highly popular question often lacking in analysis and debate, precluding the top grades. Standard answers often were composed of lists of known technology in sport rather than structuring the answer in accordance with themes eg usefulness of latest technology for training/skill acquisition. Too many answers focused on drugs or the new swimsuit design and gave nearly half their answer space to the one technology. Another popular thing to mention was Hypoxic tents and Rooney and Beckham. It appeared that some candidates were wanting a question on drugs and ergogenic aids and then gave a pre-prepared answer to this question ignoring whether it was directly relevant or not. I would still recommend that wherever possible schools and colleges look to visit a University sport department in order to get some first-hand experience of latest sport technology. I'm sure this would enrich their answers. Often candidates allude to technology in such terms as, 'a machine that measures VO^2 max' without really knowing what that technology looks like or how it works. A visit to a centre that uses such technology can only benefit. The only negatives to technology that candidates tended to mention was 'drugs and deviance' in sport. The occasional reference to it slowing the game down for referee decisions or references to Oscar Pistorias 'blade runner' and their thoughts on whether able bodied and disabled athletes could compete together. Essays tended to support the idea that technology was beneficial and candidates had no idea what the negatives were. Lessons where they debate positives and negatives would also be a good idea.

Q9: Candidates struggled to do well, concentrating only on leadership styles (eg democratic, autocratic, laissez-faire) or whether leaders were emergent or prescribed. Many candidates did not cover all areas of the syllabus and failed to include any real science in their answers. Essays tended to be full of sweeping statements. There was a real opportunity here to relate to several different psychological and coaching theories but only a few of the top grades did this. Weaker answers tend to talk about David Beckham or Martin Johnson or Lawrence Dallaglio and just talk about what they do on or off the field to inspire their players, and their relationship to players. Alex Ferguson and Roy Keane as autocratic leaders was another common inclusion. A few references to Alex Ferguson and managers picking their team is about as far as the weaker candidates got. This does not show us what they have learned as an 'A level PE candidate' as most people in the street have opinions on captains and managers and how good they are that they could share. These types of essays were not synoptic and theoretical enough.

Q10: On the whole answers to this question contained a lot of information and candidates appeared well informed. Analysis and debate again was not often present and so the highest grades were often missed. Some did not plan their time well and so only focused on half the question (either recovery or prevention). Candidates seemed well able to provide specific examples such as warming up, cooling down, specific clothing, athlete education, ultra sound and physio. Those candidates selecting this question regularly provided lots of examples to support their answers such as TENS, laser etc. Debate was found to be more difficult on this topic. Weaker answers tended to focus on RICE and Beckham/Rooney hypoxic tents.

Grade Boundaries - summer 2008

Unit 1: The Social Basis of Sport and Recreation (6721)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 33 | 31 | 29 | 27 | 25 | 23 |
| UMS | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 27 |

Unit 2: Enhancing Performance - Option A: Practical (01, 02, 04)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 78 | 69 | 61 | 53 | 45 | 37 |
| UMS | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 | 36 |

Unit 2: Enhancing Performance - Option B: Research Project (01, 03, 04)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 75 | 66 | 57 | 48 | 39 | 30 |
| UMS | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 | 36 |

Unit 2: Enhancing Performance (Component Grade Boundaries) (6722)

| Component | Grade A | Grade E | Weighting |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | Raw mark | Raw mark | |
| Skill Acq (01) | 23 | 13 | 1.001 |
| Practical (02) | 48 | 28 | 0.833 |
| R. Project (03) | 74 | 34 | 0.500 |
| AoP/LNP (04) | 23 | 13 | 0.667 |

Unit 3: Exercise and Training (6723)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 33 | 29 | 26 | 23 | 20 | 17 |
| UMS | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 27 |

8536 Advanced Subsidiary GCE in Physical Education

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
| UMS | 240 | 210 | 180 | 150 | 120 |

Grade Boundaries - Summer 2008

Unit 4: Global Trends in International Sport (6724)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 47 | 44 | 41 | 38 | 35 | 32 |
| UMS | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 27 |

Unit 5: Refining Performance - Option A: Practical (01, 02, 03)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 78 | 70 | 62 | 55 | 48 | 41 |
| UMS | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 27 |

Unit 5: Refining Performance - Option B: Investigative Study (01, 02, 04)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 74 | 66 | 58 | 51 | 44 | 37 |
| UMS | 72 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 36 | 27 |

Unit 5: Refining Performance (Component Grade Boundaries) (6725)

| Component | Grade A | Grade E | Weighting |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | Raw mark | Raw mark | |
| FAP (01) | 34 | 22 | 0.741 |
| PEP (02) | 35 | 20 | 0.741 |
| Practical (03) | 36 | 23 | 0.741 |
| Inv. Study (04) | 70 | 38 | 0.333 |

Unit 6: Scientific Principles of Exercise and Performance (6726)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E | N |
| Raw mark | 61 | 55 | 49 | 44 | 39 | 34 |
| UMS | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 | 36 |

9536 Advanced GCE in Physical Education

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
| UMS | 480 | 420 | 360 | 300 | 240 |

Summer 2007 Mark/UMS Mark Conversion Charts

| Unit 1 (6721) - The Social Basis of Sport and Recreation | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 21 | 25 | 31 | 63 | 41 | 90 |
| 2 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 26 | 32 | 68 | 42 | 90 |
| 3 | 4 | 13 | 15 | 23 | 27 | 33 | 72 | 43 | 90 |
| 4 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 24 | 32 | 34 | 77 | 44 | 90 |
| 5 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 36 | 35 | 81 | 45 | 90 |
| 6 | 7 | 16 | 19 | 26 | 41 | 36 | 86 | 46 | 90 |
| 7 | 8 | 17 | 20 | 27 | 45 | 37 | 90 | 47 | 90 |
| 8 | 9 | 18 | 21 | 28 | 50 | 38 | 90 | 48 | 90 |
| 9 | 11 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 54 | 39 | 90 | 49 | 90 |
| 10 | 12 | 20 | 23 | 30 | 59 | 40 | 90 | 50 | 90 |

| Unit 3 (6723) - Exercise and Training | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 21 | 39 | 31 | 68 | 41 | 90 |
| 2 | 3 | 12 | 19 | 22 | 42 | 32 | 70 | 42 | 90 |
| 3 | 5 | 13 | 21 | 23 | 45 | 33 | 72 | 43 | 90 |
| 4 | 6 | 14 | 22 | 24 | 48 | 34 | 74 | 44 | 90 |
| 5 | 8 | 15 | 24 | 25 | 51 | 35 | 77 | 45 | 90 |
| 6 | 10 | 16 | 25 | 26 | 54 | 36 | 79 | 46 | 90 |
| 7 | 11 | 17 | 27 | 27 | 57 | 37 | 81 | 47 | 90 |
| 8 | 13 | 18 | 30 | 28 | 60 | 38 | 83 | 48 | 90 |
| 9 | 14 | 19 | 33 | 29 | 63 | 39 | 86 | 49 | 90 |
| 10 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 30 | 65 | 40 | 88 | 50 | 90 |

| Unit 2 (6722) Enhancing Performance - Option A: Practical (01, 02, 04) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 21 | 20 | 31 | 30 | 41 | 42 |
| 2 | 2 | 12 | 12 | 22 | 21 | 32 | 31 | 42 | 44 |
| 3 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 23 | 22 | 33 | 32 | 43 | 45 |
| 4 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 24 | 23 | 34 | 33 | 44 | 47 |
| 5 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 25 | 24 | 35 | 34 | 45 | 48 |
| 6 | 6 | 16 | 16 | 26 | 25 | 36 | 35 | 46 | 50 |
| 7 | 7 | 17 | 17 | 27 | 26 | 37 | 36 | 47 | 51 |
| 8 | 8 | 18 | 18 | 28 | 27 | 38 | 38 | 48 | 53 |
| 9 | 9 | 19 | 18 | 29 | 28 | 39 | 39 | 49 | 54 |
| 10 | 10 | 20 | 19 | 30 | 29 | 40 | 41 | 50 | 56 |
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 51 | 57 | 61 | 72 | 71 | 87 | 81 | 100 | 91 | 113 |
| 52 | 59 | 62 | 74 | 72 | 88 | 82 | 101 | 92 | 115 |
| 53 | 60 | 63 | 75 | 73 | 89 | 83 | 103 | 93 | 116 |
| 54 | 62 | 64 | 77 | 74 | 91 | 84 | 104 | 94 | 117 |
| 55 | 63 | 65 | 78 | 75 | 92 | 85 | 105 | 95 | 119 |
| 56 | 65 | 66 | 80 | 76 | 93 | 86 | 107 | 96 | 120 |
| 57 | 66 | 67 | 81 | 77 | 95 | 87 | 108 | 97 | 120 |
| 58 | 68 | 68 | 83 | 78 | 96 | 88 | 109 | 98 | 120 |
| 59 | 69 | 69 | 84 | 79 | 97 | 89 | 111 | 99 | 120 |
| 60 | 71 | 70 | 85 | 80 | 99 | 90 | 112 | 100 | 120 |

| Unit 2 (6722) Enhancing Performance - Option B: Research Project (01, 03, 04) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 21 | 25 | 31 | 37 | 41 | 51 |
| 2 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 26 | 32 | 39 | 42 | 52 |
| 3 | 4 | 13 | 16 | 23 | 28 | 33 | 40 | 43 | 53 |
| 4 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 24 | 29 | 34 | 41 | 44 | 55 |
| 5 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 43 | 45 | 56 |
| 6 | 7 | 16 | 19 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 44 | 46 | 57 |
| 7 | 8 | 17 | 20 | 27 | 32 | 37 | 45 | 47 | 59 |
| 8 | 10 | 18 | 22 | 28 | 34 | 38 | 47 | 48 | 60 |
| 9 | 11 | 19 | 23 | 29 | 35 | 39 | 48 | 49 | 61 |
| 10 | 12 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 36 | 40 | 49 | 50 | 63 |
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 51 | 64 | 61 | 77 | 71 | 91 | 81 | 104 | 91 | 117 |
| 52 | 65 | 62 | 79 | 72 | 92 | 82 | 105 | 92 | 119 |
| 53 | 67 | 63 | 80 | 73 | 93 | 83 | 107 | 93 | 120 |
| 54 | 68 | 64 | 81 | 74 | 95 | 84 | 108 | 94 | 120 |
| 55 | 69 | 65 | 83 | 75 | 96 | 85 | 109 | 95 | 120 |
| 56 | 71 | 66 | 84 | 76 | 97 | 86 | 111 | 96 | 120 |
| 57 | 72 | 67 | 85 | 77 | 99 | 87 | 112 | 97 | 120 |
| 58 | 73 | 68 | 87 | 78 | 100 | 88 | 113 | 98 | 120 |
| 59 | 75 | 69 | 88 | 79 | 101 | 89 | 115 | 99 | 120 |
| 60 | 76 | 70 | 89 | 80 | 103 | 90 | 116 | 100 | 120 |

| Unit 4 (6724) - Global Trends in International Sport | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 16 | 14 | 31 | 26 | 46 | 69 | 61 | 90 |
| 2 | 2 | 17 | 14 | 32 | 27 | 47 | 72 | 62 | 90 |
| 3 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 33 | 30 | 48 | 75 | 63 | 90 |
| 4 | 3 | 19 | 16 | 34 | 33 | 49 | 78 | 64 | 90 |
| 5 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 35 | 36 | 50 | 81 | 65 | 90 |
| 6 | 5 | 21 | 18 | 36 | 39 | 51 | 84 | 66 | 90 |
| 7 | 6 | 22 | 19 | 37 | 42 | 52 | 87 | 67 | 90 |
| 8 | 7 | 23 | 19 | 38 | 45 | 53 | 90 | 68 | 90 |
| 9 | 8 | 24 | 20 | 39 | 48 | 54 | 90 | 69 | 90 |
| 10 | 8 | 25 | 21 | 40 | 51 | 55 | 90 | 70 | 90 |
| 11 | 9 | 26 | 22 | 41 | 54 | 56 | 90 | 71 | 90 |
| 12 | 10 | 27 | 23 | 42 | 57 | 57 | 90 | 72 | 90 |
| 13 | 11 | 28 | 24 | 43 | 60 | 58 | 90 | 73 | 90 |
| 14 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 44 | 63 | 59 | 90 | 74 | 90 |
| 15 | 13 | 30 | 25 | 45 | 66 | 60 | 90 | 75 | 90 |

| Unit 6 (6726) - Scientific Principles of Exercise and Performance | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 31 | 33 | 41 | 53 |
| 2 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 23 | 32 | 34 | 42 | 55 |
| 3 | 3 | 13 | 14 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 35 | 43 | 58 |
| 4 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 24 | 25 | 34 | 36 | 44 | 60 |
| 5 | 5 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 26 | 35 | 38 | 45 | 62 |
| 6 | 6 | 16 | 17 | 26 | 28 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 65 |
| 7 | 7 | 17 | 18 | 27 | 29 | 37 | 43 | 47 | 67 |
| 8 | 8 | 18 | 19 | 28 | 30 | 38 | 46 | 48 | 70 |
| 9 | 10 | 19 | 20 | 29 | 31 | 39 | 48 | 49 | 72 |
| 10 | 11 | 20 | 21 | 30 | 32 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 74 |
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 51 | 76 | 61 | 96 | 71 | 116 | 81 | 120 | 91 | 120 |
| 52 | 78 | 62 | 98 | 72 | 118 | 82 | 120 | 92 | 120 |
| 53 | 80 | 63 | 100 | 73 | 120 | 83 | 120 | 93 | 120 |
| 54 | 82 | 64 | 102 | 74 | 120 | 84 | 120 | 94 | 120 |
| 55 | 84 | 65 | 104 | 75 | 120 | 85 | 120 | 95 | 120 |
| 56 | 86 | 66 | 106 | 76 | 120 | 86 | 120 | 96 | 120 |
| 57 | 88 | 67 | 108 | 77 | 120 | 87 | 120 | 97 | 120 |
| 58 | 90 | 68 | 110 | 78 | 120 | 88 | 120 | 98 | 120 |
| 59 | 92 | 69 | 112 | 79 | 120 | 89 | 120 | 99 | 120 |
| 60 | 94 | 70 | 114 | 80 | 120 | 90 | 120 | 100 | 120 |

| Unit 5 (6725) Refining Performance - Option A: Practical (01, 02, 03) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 21 | 14 | 31 | 20 | 41 | 27 |
| 2 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 22 | 14 | 32 | 21 | 42 | 28 |
| 3 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 23 | 15 | 33 | 22 | 43 | 30 |
| 4 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 24 | 16 | 34 | 22 | 44 | 31 |
| 5 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 16 | 35 | 23 | 45 | 32 |
| 6 | 4 | 16 | 11 | 26 | 17 | 36 | 24 | 46 | 33 |
| 7 | 5 | 17 | 11 | 27 | 18 | 37 | 24 | 47 | 35 |
| 8 | 5 | 18 | 12 | 28 | 18 | 38 | 25 | 48 | 36 |
| 9 | 6 | 19 | 13 | 29 | 19 | 39 | 26 | 49 | 37 |
| 10 | 7 | 20 | 13 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 26 | 50 | 39 |
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 51 | 40 | 61 | 53 | 71 | 64 | 81 | 75 | 91 | 87 |
| 52 | 41 | 62 | 54 | 72 | 65 | 82 | 77 | 92 | 88 |
| 53 | 42 | 63 | 55 | 73 | 66 | 83 | 78 | 93 | 89 |
| 54 | 44 | 64 | 56 | 74 | 68 | 84 | 79 | 94 | 90 |
| 55 | 45 | 65 | 57 | 75 | 69 | 85 | 80 | 95 | 90 |
| 56 | 46 | 66 | 59 | 76 | 70 | 86 | 81 | 96 | 90 |
| 57 | 48 | 67 | 60 | 77 | 71 | 87 | 82 | 97 | 90 |
| 58 | 49 | 68 | 61 | 78 | 72 | 88 | 83 | 98 | 90 |
| 59 | 50 | 69 | 62 | 79 | 73 | 89 | 84 | 99 | 90 |
| 60 | 51 | 70 | 63 | 80 | 74 | 90 | 86 | 100 | 90 |

| Unit 5 (6725) Refining Performance - Option B: Investigative Study (01, 02, 04) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 1 | 1 | 11 | 8 | 21 | 15 | 31 | 23 | 41 | 32 |
| 2 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 22 | 16 | 32 | 23 | 42 | 33 |
| 3 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 23 | 17 | 33 | 24 | 43 | 35 |
| 4 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 24 | 18 | 34 | 25 | 44 | 36 |
| 5 | 4 | 15 | 11 | 25 | 18 | 35 | 26 | 45 | 37 |
| 6 | 4 | 16 | 12 | 26 | 19 | 36 | 26 | 46 | 39 |
| 7 | 5 | 17 | 12 | 27 | 20 | 37 | 27 | 47 | 40 |
| 8 | 6 | 18 | 13 | 28 | 20 | 38 | 28 | 48 | 41 |
| 9 | 7 | 19 | 14 | 29 | 21 | 39 | 30 | 49 | 42 |
| 10 | 7 | 20 | 15 | 30 | 22 | 40 | 31 | 50 | 44 |
| Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS | Mark | UMS |
| 51 | 45 | 61 | 57 | 71 | 69 | 81 | 80 | 91 | 90 |
| 52 | 46 | 62 | 59 | 72 | 70 | 82 | 81 | 92 | 90 |
| 53 | 48 | 63 | 60 | 73 | 71 | 83 | 82 | 93 | 90 |
| 54 | 49 | 64 | 61 | 74 | 72 | 84 | 83 | 94 | 90 |
| 55 | 50 | 65 | 62 | 75 | 73 | 85 | 84 | 95 | 90 |
| 56 | 51 | 66 | 63 | 76 | 74 | 86 | 86 | 96 | 90 |
| 57 | 53 | 67 | 64 | 77 | 75 | 87 | 87 | 97 | 90 |
| 58 | 54 | 68 | 65 | 78 | 77 | 88 | 88 | 98 | 90 |
| 59 | 55 | 69 | 66 | 79 | 78 | 89 | 89 | 99 | 90 |
| 60 | 56 | 70 | 68 | 80 | 79 | 90 | 90 | 100 | 90 |

Summer 2008 AS Level PE (8536)

Example (Option A - Practical)

$$6721 = 24 \text{ marks} = 32 \text{ UMS}$$

$$6723 = 38 \text{ marks} = 83 \text{ UMS}$$

$$6722/01 = 15 \text{ marks} \times 1.001 = 15.015$$

$$6722/02 = 50 \text{ marks} \times 0.833 = 41.65$$

$$6722/04 = 26 \text{ marks} \times 0.667 = 17.342$$

$$6722 = 15.015 + 41.65 + 17.342 = 74.007 = 91 \text{ UMS}$$

$$8536 = 32 \text{ UMS} + 83 \text{ UMS} + 91 \text{ UMS} = 206 \text{ UMS} = \text{C Grade}$$

Summer 2008 A Levels PE (9536)

Example (Option A - Practical)

$$\text{AS (8536)} = 206 \text{ UMS}$$

$$6724 = 37 \text{ marks} = 42 \text{ UMS}$$

$$6726 = 61 \text{ marks} = 96 \text{ UMS}$$

$$6725/01 = 25 \text{ marks} \times 0.741 = 18.525$$

$$6725/02 = 32 \text{ marks} \times 0.741 = 23.712$$

$$6725/03 = 42 \text{ marks} \times 0.741 = 31.122$$

$$6725 = 18.525 + 23.712 + 31.122 = 73.359 = 66 \text{ UMS}$$

$$9536 = 206 \text{ UMS} + 42 \text{ UMS} + 96 \text{ UMS} + 66 \text{ UMS} = 410 \text{ UMS} = \text{C Grade}$$

Please note - the conversion of marks to UMS is unique to each examination series. Only UMS can be carried forward from one examination series to the next.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA 020362 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH