

# CONTENTS

---

<b>PHYSICAL EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Paper 0413/01 Paper 1 .....	2
Paper 0413/02 Coursework.....	4

# PHYSICAL EDUCATION

---

<p>Paper 0413/01</p>
----------------------

<p>Paper 1</p>
----------------

## General comments

The general standard of answers demonstrated a good understanding of the syllabus with many cases of candidates showing excellent application of their knowledge. Clearly a great deal of good teaching has taken place. This year candidates seemed to apply their knowledge more effectively, a good example being in part **B3 (f)** where a number of candidates applied a variety of responses from different aspects of the syllabus to compile very good responses. A frequent error made by candidates of all abilities was the reversal or duplication of points, it may help candidates to recognise that the reversal of a point will not gain an additional mark; for example in **B3 (e)** many candidates answered that professionals get paid whilst amateurs do not. It seems that a number of candidates may have thought of this as two separate points but only a single mark was awarded.

There were no examples of candidates being unable to attempt any aspects of the paper and there was no indication that any candidates found themselves short of time.

There were cases where a number of candidates completed papers in such a way that they were very difficult to mark. Text was written upside down and around the edges of the answer sheet and although great care was taken when marking it is a concern that marks could be missed due to the difficulty in reading the answers. Certainly some Centres could help support candidates by providing some clear instructions on techniques that will allow them to answer the paper more effectively. The allocation of marks for each question, shown at the end of the question in [ ], together with the number of lines given for the answer are a good indication of how many points candidates are expected to make and how long the answer is expected to be.

**Section A** was generally well answered with only **Questions 2, 8 and 12** causing consistent difficulties for all but the most able candidates. In **Section B**, for parts **B1 (c) and (d)**, many candidates were unable to score the maximum marks; **B2 (e)** required a correct answer to part **(i)** and where candidates were unable to identify this, they could not score marks for the additional elements depending on it. **B3 (d)** was generally not well answered and **(f)** posed problems for the less able candidates, however, the more able candidates provided some excellent responses.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

Almost all candidates were able to either describe or define the term skill.

#### **Question 2**

Many candidates found it difficult to give an accurate description of the treatment needed to treat someone who is winded.

#### **Question 3**

Generally well answered.

#### **Question 4**

A number of candidates failed to understand the term "socially accepted" and therefore answered the question by looking at the effects of illegal substances, which was not what the question asked.

#### **Question 5**

A well answered question, most candidates gave a very accurate description of the WHO definition of mental well being.

### Question 6

Most candidates gained both marks.

### Question 7

For this question on the physical problems which may be encountered by a person who is obese, a number of candidates overlooked the word “physical” in the question and suggested other problems: these did not gain any credit.

### Question 8

Many candidates failed to gain both marks as they gave examples of activities that people might take part in, rather than giving a clear description relating the terms to time and giving the type of activity that they take part in during that time.

### Question 9

Most candidates gained both marks by applying FITT to the answer.

### Question 10

Many candidates gave the obvious answer regarding payment for the professional but then made the same point in reverse for the amateur thus not gaining the second mark.

### Question 11

Well answered, the vast majority of candidates answered this question well with a wide variety of responses.

### Question 12

In general this was poorly answered, apart from by the most able candidates who scored fully, giving a variety of good responses relating to school/community and the financial implications to a local authority. Many candidates seemed confused about the term “dual-use facilities”. They interpreted this as applying to two physical activities which could make use of the same facilities, rather than seeing the possibilities of a variety of different uses (theatre, sporting activities, crèche) for the same environment.

## Section B

- B1(a)** Well answered, most candidates gave the response of “avoiding confusions” to gain their mark.
- (b)** The more able candidates gained both marks, many candidates were able to describe the element but not how they would recognise this feature.
  - (c)** The common error made by candidates was confusing feedback and motivation. However, a number of candidates scored at least one mark although the description of how the feedback might be delivered was often not very clear.
  - (d)** Very few candidates gained full marks for this question, many gained just one mark. The marks were awarded for where the activity was placed on the line rather than in relation to each other. However, there did not seem to be a great deal of understanding about open and closed skills, and many candidates clearly guessed the position of the activities.
  - (e)** This was a well answered question, most candidates gave a very good description of the differences between active and passive stretching.

Most candidates used the Sit and Reach Test. However, if candidates used other recognised tests credit was given. A common error that candidates made was describing a method of measuring flexibility that did not constitute a test.

- (f)** Parts **(i)** and **(ii)** were very well answered but only the very able candidates gained marks in part **(iii)** where many candidates seemed not to understand the use of testing for an elite performer and applied their answers to the use of testing for all performers.

- B2(a)** Almost all candidates gained a mark for their description of a drug.
- (b) Many candidates gained both marks for the question on soft tissue injury.
  - (c) Most candidates were able to offer some relevant points about the factors determining an individual's energy requirements.
  - (d) The common errors that candidates made were related to repetition: for example there was one mark available for wearing safety equipment, and many candidates who offered a list of safety equipment, but failed to consider any other aspect, were only able to gain the single mark here.
  - (e) Candidates could not gain any marks if they failed to name an appropriate training method in part (i) of the question, since the other parts of the question depended on this, therefore many gained no marks at all for this question. The more able candidates scored well.
  - (f) Apart from (iv) this was well answered by the majority of candidates. Most candidates displayed a good knowledge of the energy systems and in (iii) often gave very detailed descriptions of the effects on the muscular system. Part (iv) was generally not well answered as candidates often responded with "train more" which did not fit into a question that required a response related to a physiological response.
- B3(a)** A well answered question, candidates gave a variety of good responses.
- (b) There were common errors in answering this question, many candidates failed to answer beyond the use of television as a type of media and despite the question many candidates described different methods of showing women's sport.
  - (c) Well answered, there were some very good responses as candidates used both financial and environmental reasons in their answers.
  - (d) The more able candidates gave some very good responses to part (i) of this question but generally this was not very well answered. There seemed to be a lack of understanding of the influence of television on its viewers. Many candidates did not answer (ii) well as they failed to describe how television has developed in its use of technology to provide different ways of looking at sport and therefore, increase our understanding. There were many responses about the use of a commentator but these were insufficiently focused on the question which asked about increasing our understanding beyond a basic level.
  - (e) Most candidates gained marks but few gained full marks. Apart from the obvious point of the professional being paid, other responses were limited. Many candidates reversed/duplicated points, for example "professionals get paid, amateurs do not" which could only gain one mark.
  - (f) There were some excellent responses to this question: some candidates applied a variety of points and examined physical changes as well as the wide variety of social changes that take place at this stage. The common error made by a number of candidates was in continuing to apply answers from the previous question related to professional performer and then looking at the changes that result when a young person starts to perform professionally.

<p><b>Paper 0413/02</b> <b>Coursework</b></p>
---

### General comments

The popularity of the CIE IGCSE in Physical Education course has been demonstrated once again this year. New Centres in Central America, South East Asia, Africa and Europe have joined the established list of Centres throughout the world that are keen to offer the syllabus to their students.

The essential appeal of the examination would appear to be the wide range of practical activities that candidates are able to participate in as part of an integrated Physical Education course. Also, the recent change in the regulations for the examination means that candidates are now able to select four activities from at least two of the six categories of activities offered within the syllabus instead of four activities from three of the six activity areas, allowing greater choice.

The range of activities offered by Centres varies considerably. Some Centres still prefer to offer a narrow range of activities to candidates, often concentrating on four or five practical activities. Although this may seem very restrictive, the aim of these Centres is clearly to try to ensure that by maximising particular facilities or staff expertise their candidates will ultimately achieve high levels of performance in the activities offered. Such a policy does have its merits although some Centres offering activities such as Swimming or Gymnastics do find that some of their candidates, who lack basic experience of these activities, tend to struggle to gain acceptable marks. Other Centres adopt a different policy and allow their candidates the freedom to choose whichever activities they prefer, providing they are receiving instruction in these activities. Most of the activities are offered within the Centres but an appreciable number of off-site activities are offered, often with considerable success. In many cases, candidates opting for off-site activities are receiving expert tuition in such activities as Horse Riding, Tennis, and Rock Climbing, to name but a few of the more popular activities.

As in previous years, the Games category continues to be the most popular, and within it, Association Football, Basketball, Badminton, Netball and Hockey the most popular sports. However, other games which continue to be popular are Rounders, Volleyball and Tennis and to a lesser extent Golf, Squash and Table Tennis.

Within the Gymnastics category only Artistic Gymnastics seems to have attracted candidates and in this activity the numbers were very small indeed.

Once again the Dance category provides an opportunity to offer a variety of different forms of ethnic dances although the number of candidates offering this was once again quite small.

From the Athletics category the most popular activity is Track and Field Athletics and to a lesser extent Cross Country Running. The reason for the popularity of Track and Field Athletics would appear to be the fact that Centres like the objective method of assessment in this activity.

Within the Outdoor and Adventurous Activities category certain activities continue to be popular. Skiing continues to be extremely popular in areas where the local facilities make this a popular leisure activity. However, rather surprisingly some Centres in the tropics with no local skiing facilities have candidates who travel many thousands of miles to participate in Skiing and are prepared to provide video evidence of their ability. Horse Riding is also popular in Centres where candidates have a history of interest and instruction in the activity, as are Hill Walking and Campcraft in Centres where the local mountain or open terrain make these activities particularly appealing to candidates. It is also worth pointing out that the standard of performance of candidates in these activities is on the whole extremely high, which reflects very well on the standard of instruction in these rather 'specialised' activities.

Swimming also remains a very popular activity. Once again the reason for this is not just the Centre's proximity to facilities but the fact that objective times and distances are used as the means of assessing performance.

All Centres are required, as an essential part of the examination, to provide video recorded evidence of their candidates' performances for moderation purposes. On the whole, most Centres have been aware of this requirement and have, in consequence, prepared themselves and their candidates for the filming. However, it must be said that some Centres have prepared less well and in some cases several Centres found themselves in difficulties trying to produce good video evidence by the Coursework deadline date.

The preparation for the task of video recording candidates needs to be planned well in advance of the actual filming. Centres unused to filming need to plan this carefully, ensuring that the candidates are well prepared, know exactly which activities are to be filmed, and the range of skills and sessions for each activity. Even the day on which the filming is to be carried out needs to be written into the calendar. Candidates need to be briefed beforehand and clearly identified by numbered bibs. The bibs and numbers also need to be very large in order to be seen as clearly as possible. Some Centres had not ensured that this was the case, and consequently their candidates were not always clearly identifiable.

Most Centres take the assessment of their candidates very seriously and this was clearly apparent from the evidence on the video tapes. In general, the marking for the two assessment objectives, Planning, Performing and Evaluating, and Analysing and Improving was accurate; firstly, candidates were placed in their correct ranked order according to ability, and secondly, were awarded an appropriate mark according to the activity assessment criteria. In the vast majority of cases this was done extremely well and marks were accepted. However, in some cases marks were adjusted at moderation. This tended to occur at Centres following the syllabus for the first time, or at Centres where the small number of candidates has made it difficult to assess standards of performance against other candidates. Advice on assessment is always available from CIE where needed, and some teachers have made contact with others in their country, where a Centre has been teaching the CIE IGCSE Physical Education Syllabus for a number of years. In this way teachers have been able to gain advice about any unforeseen difficulties before they emerge.

From the video evidence provided, it is quite noticeable that a large number of candidates were entered for the examination because they are particularly talented in a range of practical activities. The practical evidence overwhelmingly shows many candidates from Centres performing at the highest levels in terms of Planning, Performing and Evaluating, with a lesser number performing at middle levels. This would seem to indicate that the vast majority of candidates are clearly being attracted to the course because of their enthusiasm, interest and undoubted ability in the range of sporting activities available within the syllabus. In an examination that recognises practical ability, many candidates are clearly keen to demonstrate their ability and be rewarded for their physical prowess. Although the syllabus caters for candidates of all abilities it is very noticeable that the spread of practical activity marks is very skewed towards the high ability level and perhaps this should not be too surprising.

As in previous years the marks for Analysing and Improving, Assessment Objective 2, reflect a wide range of ability. On the whole, the video evidence provided for this aspect of the course shows that Centres' candidates have a good grasp of the fundamentals, rules and regulations and training methods of their chosen activities. Often this is supported by very good written evidence. However, as in previous years, some Centres fail to provide any video evidence of this assessment objective and rely mainly on written evidence for their candidates' Analysing and Improving marks. Once again this year, several Centres failed to forward any written evidence of Analysing and Improving and had to be reminded of this fact.

The quality of the written work for Analysing and Improving varies considerably from Centre to Centre. Some Centres have forwarded work that is quite outstanding and in such instances the candidates have gained the highest marks. However, in some cases, teachers seem reluctant to award the maximum mark for work that is clearly exceptional and well above the level expected for the highest mark. In such instances, teachers have opted for the 'safer' mark of nine. A considerable amount of this work is now word-processed and is beautifully presented and Centres encouraging candidates to produce such high quality work should feel proud of their achievement. On the other hand, there are some Centres which seem to ask candidates to produce written evidence in support of marks awarded for Analysing and Improving almost as an afterthought. The quality of this work is much lower and is often reflected in the candidates' marks, although not always. Where the standard of work and presentation was low some marks were reduced at moderation. Much of this work tends to lack depth of knowledge and the ability to suggest ways in which performances might be improved, once weaknesses have been identified. This latter point is a fundamental problem with the work produced by some candidates. Teachers should give more guidance on how candidates can structure their responses in order to make it clear what training or practice methods can be used to improve any weaknesses in skills, techniques, fitness or simply "reading the activity".

### **Video recorded evidence**

The video recorded evidence provided by Centres is the only way in which candidates' performances can be presented for moderation purposes. It is therefore imperative that the quality of the video recording is as detailed as possible. In order to achieve this, most Centres have followed the instructions that are available from Cambridge. These lay down clearly what should be filmed and the best sequences of shots to take, how to identify candidates in numbered training bibs and how to show candidates in the most favourable conditions. However, despite repeated instructions, some Centres fail to take this advice, do not film their candidates in the most favourable situations, often do not check the quality of the picture and soundtrack before sending the tape to Cambridge and consequently place their candidates at a distinct disadvantage. Centres are strongly advised to check both the quality of the pictures and the soundtrack before dispatching the tape, well-packaged, to Cambridge. Furthermore, Centres are advised to keep a second copy of the tape, just in case the original tape gets damaged or lost in transit.

Once again this year, the difference in the quality of the videotapes received varied considerably. The very best videotapes showed excellent sequences of shots, showing skills and activity situations. Candidates were clearly identified and the accompanying commentary helped not only to identify candidates but to pin-point their strengths and weaknesses. The poor quality tapes were often filmed indoors, in situations where it was difficult to identify candidates from the picture quality and there were no accompanying notes or commentary. In some instances the candidates were not identified at all. Centres had to be asked to forward additional information identifying candidates so that their performance could be assessed. In order to identify candidates clearly, many Centres used the identification column on the Centre Order of Merit to indicate the number and colour of each candidate's training bib, but sadly not all Centres did this.

The best advice to offer Centres is to view the videotape before sending the tape to Cambridge and imagine that you do not know any of the candidates on the screen. Then ask whether it would be possible to assess them and compare the marks awarded if the candidates were not identified. If this information is not supplied in the form of either identification numbers on the candidates and on the assessment sheets or by way of mentioning candidates' names in the commentary, then these matters need to be addressed.

Some Centres planned and carried out excellent interviews of candidates in connection with Assessment Objective 2, Analysing and Improving. Many were quite brief but oral questioning of this kind quickly enables the Moderator to assess a candidate's ability to understand the activity they are taking part in and to discover whether they can identify strengths and weaknesses in their own or another person's performance. Where candidates are being interviewed, the teacher needs to know precisely what questions he/she is going to ask and to be equally well prepared. Sometimes this was not the case and some teachers repeated the same questions. As most teachers who have undertaken interviews will testify, there is a technique to doing it and this has to be learned and practised.

On the whole the sequence of video camera shots taken by most Centres was helpful in gaining an accurate picture of each candidate's performance. However, this was not always the case and some Centres produced shots that did not convey the full picture of whether candidates could perform the skills or not. A typical example might be where a group is performing a Badminton smash and because of the angle of the camera to the candidate, it is not possible to see whether the candidate delivers the shuttlecock in court or out of court. Also, if the sequence of shots wishes to show a game situation and the game is filmed from a distance, not only is it impossible to identify individual candidates but it is impossible to see them perform any skills. Identification of candidates is always crucial in such circumstances. More often than not in such instances it is far better to film the sequence of shots in a small activity situation. By doing this, the camera can easily move between the players, focusing on each candidate's action without losing the context of the activity. By failing to present their candidates in the best possible situation teachers are doing them a considerable disservice.

Most Centres provided video recorded evidence of a sample of candidates from across the ability range, in a range of practical activities. In most cases, Centres followed the guidelines and showed candidates demonstrating a sufficient range of skills. They were then often placed in an activity or game situation, in some instances not a full game but a small-sided game. This is perfectly acceptable and serves to demonstrate the essential skills of the activity within a team game situation. However, some Centres have failed to do this. Consequently they run the risk of having their candidates' marks reduced, simply because they have not been seen in a team situation. Centres need to realise that even if they have a very small number of candidates for an activity, such as Volleyball, the candidates must be seen in a small-sided game of Volleyball. Just showing the candidates demonstrating a small range of individual skills is not sufficient.

Each year most overseas Centres arrange for video-tapes to be copied onto the PAL format which is the standard system used in the United Kingdom and Europe and which is accepted in most video recorders. However, some Centres, usually in the Americas, and Japan have video recorded using a different system, which is not compatible with the PAL system, and this caused considerable delays in moderation. Wherever possible, Centres using a different recording system, such as NTSC, are asked to try to have the tape transposed onto the PAL format so that it can be viewed more quickly on arrival at Cambridge. Where moderation has been delayed due to this difficulty, Centres have been informed in the Report to the Centre.

Once again, this year, most Centres have taken great care to send all the necessary documentation, along with good video evidence of candidates' performances by the deadline for receipt of Coursework. These Centres clearly followed CIE guidelines and as a result most coursework material arrived on time and intact. However, not all Centres did, and these had to be faxed and e-mailed to request missing paperwork, subsequently delaying the process of moderation. It is hoped that these Centres will in future make every effort to ensure that coursework material arrives complete by the stated deadline date.