

**GCE AS Level and A Level
Physical Education**

H155 and H555

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the [OCR website](#).

Further support from OCR



Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

GCE AS Level and A Level Physical Education (H155 / H555)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H155/01 Physiological Factors Affecting Performance	4
H155/02 Psychological and Socio-Cultural Themes in Physical Education	8
H555/01 Physiological Factors Affecting Performance	12
H555/02 Psychological Factors Affecting Performance	17
H555/03 Socio-Cultural Issues in Physical Activity and Sport	21
H155/03 and H555/04 Performance in Physical Issues	24

H155/01 Physiological Factors Affecting Performance

1. General Comments:

There were some very good scripts offered in response to the Summer 2018 H155/01 examination paper, yet performance overall, quite logically varied greatly. After a year to get to grips with the new specification and some, more varied question styles and varied weighting of the questions it is clear that many centres are becoming familiar with the challenges of the new specification and preparing their candidates accordingly. Evidence would suggest that candidates understood what was required of them throughout all 4 sections and there was almost no evidence of candidates misinterpreting questions. Examination technique showed improvements on the first year. Candidates clearly addressed the command words well in the majority of cases and followed the rubric of the paper accurately.

In response to the 10-mark question, which required longer answers and different examination technique, candidates continue to show evidence of knowing the five generic criteria: 1. Knowledge and understanding 2. Development of knowledge 3. Examples 4. Technical Vocabulary and 5. Good quality of written communication. The question asked for candidates to address a number of items concerning movement at the ankle joint as well as the lever systems involved. Those achieving the top level managed to cope with the spread of information required which showed good preparation and structure. A thorough plan worked well in most cases.

As in 2017, when lower mark totals were evident, the key reason was lack of fundamental knowledge. Additionally, candidates on lower marks were careless with units for answers to tidal volume equation and were not attentive enough to the command word. Also, lack of clearly expressed knowledge is an issue, leading to TV (too vague) being stamped on responses (no marks). Candidates should be reminded that all additional objects (continuation sheets) must be labelled accurately so that examiners can link them correctly to answers in candidates' answer booklets. It is particularly important for candidates using word processed answers to label the question number accurately.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

Overall, the question performed quite well with candidates achieving a good spread of marks.

Q1a– Responses to this question were variable. In the main, few candidates were accurate enough with the agonist for hip abduction. Many referring to gluteus maximus or iliopsoas. Writs flexor was fine, Planes of movement generally completed well for both parts but examples were generally speaking too vague as phase not given on a lot of answers. Many candidates gave a generic sporting skill as opposed to a specific movement.

Q1b Receptors were named well. This is an area the candidates are clearly prepared well for. Lots of good answers for pts 2 and 4. Very few answers mentioned baroreceptors act to decrease HR if pressure increases. There was some confusion between baroreceptors and

proprioceptors. Candidates were getting marks for identifying receptors but were not explaining the effect on heart rate.

Q1c Gravity mentioned a number of times, which for the question set was TV. Pt's 1 and 2 not accessed much or at all. Some quite vague explanations of how VR mechanisms work. Most got pocket valves. There was a misconception that smooth muscle allows blood to flow smoothly, indicating a belief that it reduces friction. Smooth muscle and respiratory pump were often identified but not clearly described.

Q1di – The first time in this specification that candidates have been asked to plot lines on a graph. There were some reasonably good attempts. Lots with no anticipatory rise, or plateau. Quite a few with peak at end of exercise. Some not breathing at rest! There were some easy marks here eg not starting at 0, however very few achieved full marks.

Q1dii Mostly answered quite well. Most common error on units (either absent or l/m) Some did not do the necessary alterations to the standard equation to gain the marks successfully.

Question No. 2

Overall slightly weaker area particularly in Q2b and 2di.

Q2ai A fairly easy multiple choice question which was generally answered well. Around 50% accuracy.

Q2aii – Again around 50% accuracy. Common errors included water, oxygen, spinach! If they named a mineral, it was usually iron. Copper was rarely used.

Q2aiii Answered well if they went for a pharmacological aid to start with. Common cause of failure to score was by using creatine/blood doping. Many candidates gave more information than the question asked for. E.g. reasons/benefits of aid

Q2b – Few candidates achieved full marks here. There were a lot that didn't finish off the comparison so ended with several KU's but very few ticks. A reasonable number too vague for pt. 7 by just mentioning elderly. The command word 'Compare' seemed to throw a lot of candidates, most were getting 0 or 1 on this by not making a direct comparison. Some were still referring to bleep test. An even spread of points but evaluation was not used often.

Q2ci - Some did well on this by using numbers. Lots of GCSE style answers: high reps low weights etc. A huge amount of circuit training answers. Some candidates did not give weight training programmes, but circuit, HIIT or plyometric sessions. Achieved point 1 by naming an exercise but often through talking about a different programme. Points one and three hit the most.

Q2cii- Many candidates did very well on this. Vast majority hit pt1, those with mnemonics down the side tended to do well! There was quite a lot of reference to cardiovascular adaptations, a lot of repetition of point 1 through increased muscle mass/ cross sectional area/ size/hypertrophy- many answers only made reference to this point but in 3 or 4 different ways.

Q2di – Unfortunately this was a poorly answered question. Many misread the question and referred to stretching. Lots of reps in definition “the flexibility of a joint...” They got the movement/no movement part, and lots had reasonable examples, but not the definitions so did not score. Focus was on difference (eg with speed of movement, or without) many forgot to define flexibility.

Q2dii – Very well answered on the whole. Candidates achieved well on this question with a range of practical examples used - explosive strength often linked to tumbles and jumps endurance based on rings routines

Question No. 3

Overall, the biomechanical aspects were the most successfully answered of the four sections. There were several very accessible questions. Much greater clarity required for full marks on question 3ei particularly in identifying the effort and load arms.

Q3a Scores often in the 2-3 range, scoring pts 1, 3, 4 mainly. Not many accessed pt 2. Blurred understanding of the effect of a net force, with a lot saying balanced = still/unbalanced =moving rather than acceleration/change in motion. Many again did not make direct comparisons and were stating correct knowledge but not able to get credit for it. Very few achieved full marks in this question. Confusion was evident between points 2 and 3.

Q3bi A good discriminator. Many candidates did not get the definition. Many referring to the time taken to increase speed etc. A02 answered well by some – these ones linked the examples well – particularly for pt 6, reduced AR. Common misinterpretation of the question was to mention strength training. Many were naming factors that would increase acceleration but were not supporting with examples so not achieving marks.

Q3bii Most candidates got this right. 1 decimal place seemed to confuse some candidates.

Q3ci Quite well answered for N1 although quite a few in slang (eg “things won’t move unless a force is applied.”)

Q3cii This was a difficult question for many candidates particularly in relation to the ball in flight. Many did well with ball on the tee. Ball in flight ok although pt5 hit mostly, only a small handful hit pt 4. It is unclear if a lot who got pt5 actually understood the mechanics. Candidates generally achieved either 1 or 3.

Q3ciii Quite well answered by candidates. most simply referred to action reaction and did not include reference to reaction force - practical examples were fairly good but if just using a practical example candidates need to reference key elements of the definition to hit the marks.

Q3d Most candidates made a good attempt at this question. Pt1 hit by the majority. Pts 2 and 3 (both) were mostly hit by those who used cycling as the eg as that lent itself better to mentioning both design of the bike, and technique of the rider. (Unlike F1 who were less likely to get pt2. Almost everyone got pt5.

Some candidates believe that a wind tunnel is a training/resistance aid.

Question No. 4

Q4. Quite a broad range of marks either hitting level 1 or level 2 - level 1 awarded mainly as only one section covered normal movement and did not do levers or poor knowledge of levers. Level two given for good knowledge on levers and movement but application was lacking. Many hit mechanical advantages and disadvantages of levers, which was AO3 information but not fully applied in the correct context.

Candidates were often very strong on the motion analysis aspect of the ankle. Some excellent ones but also a lot who claimed ball, and socket/condyloid, then were vague about movements (flexion and extension). Plantar flexion identified as 2nd class lever by many. Dorsi flexion as 3rd class lever was a discriminator between good and very good understanding.

A surprising number had gastrocnemius and soleus as an antagonistic pair.

The eccentric contraction often incorrectly identified.

Knowledge of levers FLE order was quite good.

Many could state mechanical advantage and disadvantage but didn't demonstrate proper understanding.

H155/02 Psychological and Socio-Cultural Themes in Physical Education

1. General Comments:

This is the second series of the new H155-02 component, there were some excellent scripts submitted where candidates demonstrated both excellent subject knowledge and application, overall however performance varied greatly. Overall candidates showed the strongest subject knowledge in the Psychology section of the paper and again were weakest in the Socio-cultural element. Overall candidates interpreted the questions correctly but struggled to apply their knowledge to sporting examples which prevented them scoring highly in the questions with an AO2 focus, in some cases candidates did not read the question thoroughly for example in questions asking for a sporting example candidates often referenced more than one sport in their examples which prevented them achieving full marks.

In the new format 10 mark question candidates generally demonstrated better exam technique than those in the previous series by attempting to apply AO1, AO2 and AO3 skills, however they were often let down by lack of subject knowledge particularly in relation to accurately explaining the 4 stages of Bandura's model.

Most candidates were able to fully complete their answers and very few ran out of time to answer the whole paper, thus demonstrating good time management and succinct responses. Most candidates used the allocated answer space well to determine the length of their responses however; candidates are reminded that all additional objects (continuation sheets or separate booklets) must be labelled accurately with the question number so that examiners can link them correctly to the main body of their answer. Candidates should also avoid writing in the margins of the page.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

In this section of the paper candidates generally demonstrated good subject knowledge but poor exam technique often prevented many from scoring higher marks, many candidates struggled with the demands of the AO2 questions where sporting examples were required to support each statement made.

Q.1a Candidates generally understood the content of this question and often demonstrated good knowledge of the theory, with trial and error, SR bonds and positive reinforcement the most common points made. However, content points were rarely applied to sporting examples or one generic example was provided at the end of the response, which did not fully support each of the content points provided thus restricting the overall marks achieved for this question.

Q1.b(i) Many candidates provided good responses to this question using the terms 'helps' or 'hinders' to describe the two types of transfer, however many candidates simply repeated the question using the words 'positive' and 'negative' in their response.

Q1.b(ii) The most common answer given to this question was related to the teaching of similar skills together, this was often backed up with good sporting examples. Many candidates only provided one method thus only scored one mark. Again, many candidates did not apply each point they made to sporting examples and therefore were not able to access all of the marks available.

Q1.c(i) Most candidates demonstrated good knowledge to answer this question with many achieving full marks, the most common responses were positive feedback and allowing practice time.

Q1.c(ii) In this question candidates generally demonstrated good subject knowledge with habitual/ lack of conscious thought the most common responses given, although many responses were not backed up with sporting examples thus preventing candidates from gaining all of the marks available, candidates often repeated the same point from the mark scheme twice.

Q1.d Higher level candidates performed well on this question often giving a range of positives and negatives for both intrinsic and extrinsic feedback with good links made to the stages of learning (cognitive and autonomous) to support their answers. Weaker candidates often tended to describe the theories rather than evaluate.

Question No. 2

Overall candidates performed best in the Psychology section. For the most part candidates demonstrated good knowledge but their ability to apply their knowledge to sporting examples let them down especially in the questions requiring them to apply one sporting example throughout their response. Centres are encouraged to remind candidates to read the question carefully to ensure that they are aware of the demands of the question.

Q2.a Both subject knowledge and exam technique were an issue for many candidates in this question, with many incorrectly identifying the components of attitude as beliefs and emotions rather than stating cognitive and affective as listed in the specification. This meant that candidates were unable to access the marks for either the description or the application to sport. This question also required candidates to use the same sporting example throughout many candidates gave examples from different sports to explain each component and subsequently limited the marks they were able to achieve for this question.

Q2.b(i) This question was generally well answered with most candidates achieving the mark available.

Q2b.(ii) Many candidates answered this question well with training in front of an audience and blocking out the crowd as the most common responses given. Weaker candidates tended to only give one method or were quite repetitive in their answer often just listing differing methods of arousal control eg deep breathing and muscle relaxation.

Q2.c Most candidates referenced both trait and social learning theories in their answers and attempted both the positives and negatives for each theory. However many candidates described the theories rather than evaluating them. It was decided to allow candidates to gain marks where they had described the positives of the theory without explicitly stating they were

positives, as without this allowance many candidates would have scored no marks in this question. The negatives were generally attempted but on the whole, candidates' knowledge was fairly superficial and therefore did not fully answer the question. Centres are reminded to encourage candidates to specifically state if their point is a positive or a negative.

Q2.d(i) Many candidates accessed all 3 marks available in this question with the most common responses being motivation, improve a specific skill and measure progress. Weaker candidates tended to say things such as 'achieve a target', which is too vague or only gave one or two reasons.

Q2.d(ii) Most candidates gave good descriptions of the remaining elements of SMART and provided a consistent sporting example to describe each. However, the question required candidates to use the same sporting example throughout their response, many did not gain all of the marks available as they used different sports to describe each element.

Question No. 3

On the whole candidates struggled with this section of the paper, most performed well on the question requiring interpretation of data however many struggled with the newer elements of the specification specifically law and order in the 21st century.

3a.(i) Very few candidates were able to give the correct definition here with many simply choosing not to attempt the question. Those who did gain the mark correctly identified that moral integrity and physical endeavour were key aspects of the cult of athleticism.

3a.(ii) On the whole this question was answered well and candidates had good knowledge of how the games were spread from the public schools, the most common answers were taking the sports to university to standardise rules, joining the army and teaching the games to others abroad or as vicars and teaching their parishioners. Some candidates mentioned teachers but could only gain the mark if they specifically stated that they took the games to other schools as the question asks how games were taken from the public schools. Others simply stated the method eg army, vicar etc. without fully describing how they spread the games and therefore could not achieve the marks.

3b. Candidates interpreted the data well in order to draw effective conclusions; stronger candidates addressed all three areas of the data (initial increase by both genders, plateau for women/decrease for men more recently and women's participation always lower than men's) although this wasn't required to achieve all of the marks. Most candidates mentioned the increase in media coverage and the London 2012 Olympics in their response.

3c. Higher ability candidates were able to correctly discuss how law and order has impacted factors such as safety, violence and equality however on the whole subject knowledge related to this area was weak. Many candidates referred to post-industrial sports and mob football becoming safer, therefore clearly not understanding that 21st century was referring to modern day sports. Very few candidates referred to negligence or duty of care when discussing safety. The best answers used case study examples to support their response although this was not a requirement of the question for many candidates this helped to clarify the point they were making and they would not have achieved the marks without this further clarification.

3d. Candidates were particularly strong when describing the political exploitation of the Berlin 1936 Olympics with many gaining the full sub max available, the best answers accurately described the impact of both Hitler and Owens. Higher level candidates were able to accurately describe the significance of the Mexico City games with many accurately describing the Black Power Demonstration and the reasons for it. Weaker candidates tended to confuse this with events, which occurred at the Munich games (Palestinian Terrorism) or only described the actions of Carlos and Smith on the podium without elaborating on the reasons behind them.

Question 4

Q4. On the whole students struggled with the content of this question and exam technique was an issue for some. In the first section many candidates were not able to name and describe the 4 components of Bandura's model and were particularly weak when describing motor reproduction, with many simply stating that this was the performer attempting the skill rather than saying that the athlete is physically and mentally able. Higher level candidates were able to accurately describe all 4 stages of the model and gave well developed points for each element and each stage was supported by accurate sporting examples. Weaker candidates tended to provide one sporting example usually linked to attention but this was then not carried through to support the rest of their answer.

Most students attempted to give both positives and negatives of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation however generally answers were very superficial or tended to merely describe the types of motivation without fully evaluating. Some candidates also confused motivation with feedback. The best answers were those which contained a variety of well developed positives and negatives and included an overall summary conclusion.

H555/01 Physiological Factors Affecting Performance

1. General Comments:

This examination contained three sections. Section A: 5, 2 mark questions, section B: 19 questions ranging from 1 to 6 marks and section C: 1, 20 mark extended response question. Candidates who performed well generally produced clear and concise responses, applied their knowledge and understanding to practical examples where required and matched the quantity and depth of knowledge to the question demands. Candidates who performed less well generally produced responses with a lack of clarity, depth or practical application. There was a general lack of knowledge concerning definitions of key terms however, no issues with rubric and little evidence of poor time management. Centres should focus on application of knowledge and understanding to practical scenarios and the requirements of a comparative question.

The most successful questions were on acclimatisation (1), types of spin (3), mechanics of breathing (6di), blood doping (7a), types of injury (7bi), response to injury (7biii), adaptations to flexibility training (7cii), Newton's third law of motion (8a) and force diagram (8di).

The least successful questions were on the badminton smash (2), energy continuum (6b), practical application of injury types (7bii) and practical application of the factors affecting flexibility and lever systems (8bi).

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A

Question No. 1

Well answered question, which required an understanding of acclimatisation to high altitude and an appropriate sporting example. Higher ability candidates identified adapt to lower pO_2 compared to weaker candidates repeating the question 'adapt to high altitude'. Most candidates correctly identified an appropriate sporting example, many used marathon runner.

Question No. 2

Relatively poorly answered question, which required the application of the role of ATP to a badminton smash. Many candidates described the characteristics of a badminton smash without any reference to the role of ATP. Some candidates wrongly applied the ATP-PC system.

Question No. 3

Candidates generally answered this question well, which required an identification of two types of spin and their effects of flight path. Candidates most commonly correctly identified topspin to shorten the flight path and backspin to lengthen the flight path, however, candidates lost marks by using hook and slice rather than sidespin, which is appropriate for table tennis. Some candidates incorrectly focussed on the effects the type of spin had on the bounce of the ball rather than the flight path.

Question No. 4

Candidates were required to compare explosive to endurance strength. Candidates experienced some success but a lack of direct comparisons limited marks. For example, a candidate may have stated the speed and force of explosive strength contractions but detailed the number of strength endurance contractions with an example, therefore no direct comparisons or credit gained.

Question No. 5

Higher ability candidates performed well describing limb kinematics with several benefits; however, it was clear a significant number of candidates did not understand the key term often confusing limb kinematics with wind tunnels or force plates. Used to improve technique was the most commonly credited answer.

Section B

Question No. 6a

There was a range of responses for this movement analysis. Although there was analysis of the illustrated sporting movement, there was also a proportion of knowledge only required. Most candidates correctly identified the wrist as a condyloid joint, which moved through the sagittal plane, although there was a differing ability to identify all three articulating bones of the wrist joint. Many candidates stated radius, ulna and 'meta'carpals or radius, ulna and humerus. The limiting factor for candidates was the incorrect identification of the movement. If the candidate stated correctly the movement was extension, they often also correctly identified the agonist and antagonist. Unfortunately, if the candidate identified the movement as flexion they commonly lost 3 marks.

Question No. 6b

Candidates were required to explain the term energy continuum and apply to a sporting example. A less well answered question due to a general lack of clarity in the explanation of the energy continuum. Some candidates were too vague by describing the progressions through the energy systems, thresholds between energy systems or a description of a graph of ATP production against activity duration. Most candidates achieved credit for appropriate application to a sporting activity and reference to the intensity of the action.

Question No. 6c

An applied question to cycling, candidates were expected to explain how and why the vascular shunt mechanism redistributed blood as the cyclist started an event. Most candidates recognised the involvement of the vasomotor control centre, arterioles and pre-capillary sphincters however struggled to meet the applied nature of the question. Some candidates' responses were too vague when referring to muscles rather than the 'working' muscles or 'leg/lower body' muscles in the cyclist. To achieve maximum marks candidates must have touched on the 'why' aspect of the question which required a difference to resting conditions ie most/more O₂ required at the working muscles, candidates struggled with this clarity providing just a description of redistribution.

Question No. 6di

A very well answered question requiring candidates to describe the mechanics of breathing. Many candidates gained full marks, for those who didn't a lack of clarity in which of the two intercostal muscles contracted limited success.

Question No. 6dii

Candidates were required to give two reasons minute ventilation could be lower in a trained athlete with the same tidal volume as an untrained performer. Most candidates worked out breathing frequency was lower due to the equation $VE = f \times TV$. Higher ability candidates went on to consider the structural adaptations in the respiratory system of a trained athlete to make O_2 utilisation more efficient.

Question No. 7a

Candidates were required to describe the process of blood doping and identify one benefit of its use and one associated risk. This was a very well answered question with candidates using varied correct benefits (most commonly increased red blood cell count) and risks (most commonly increased blood viscosity).

Question No. 7bi

Candidates were required to make two comparisons between chronic and acute injuries. Higher ability candidates made comparisons with relative ease; some candidates struggled to give two complete comparisons.

Question No. 7bii

Candidates were required to make a comparison between sporting examples of chronic and acute injuries. Most candidates gave a comparison of two injuries however did not apply these to sporting situations.

Question No. 7biii

Three key points regarding the medical treatment for a dislocation were needed. Many candidates used the acronym SALTAPS, which was not appropriate, or PRICE, which if elements were unexplained was too vague. The strongest answers considered the need for medical attention, immobilisation and pain medication.

Question No. 7ci

An applied question to the illustration of the gymnast. Candidates were required to describe the factors affecting flexibility that enabled to gymnast to perform the splits therefore there was a positive context required in the answer. The gymnast could do the splits therefore describing the factors that limited flexibility was too vague. Candidates often focussed on the negative with statements such as; with increasing age flexibility decreases, yielding no marks. More successful answers considered the ball and socket joint, greater elasticity of connective tissues and young age leading to greater range of motion at the hip joint.

Question No. 7cii

Candidates described two flexibility training adaptations well, most commonly citing increased elasticity of connective tissues and a delayed stretch reflex.

Question No. 7d

A six mark question requiring a four mark HIIT training session for aerobic capacity and two marks for its effectiveness over continuous training. Most candidates scored with a general description of HIIT training and appropriate examples, higher ability candidates offered time scales, work: relief ratios and intensity. Few candidates scored full marks as many focussed on HIIT being more effective due to psychological reasons such as prevents boredom or maintains motivation rather than the physiological reasons required.

Question No. 8a

One mark available for a definition of Newton's third law of motion and two marks for its application to a sporting situation. Generally answered well with good definitions and application largely to either a sprint start (between the foot and the blocks) or kicking a football (between the foot and the ball). Candidates did not score if they did not consider the equal and opposite nature of the forces.

Question No. 8bi

A four mark question of lever systems at the elbow joint with practical examples. Candidates were required to identify the two lever systems that operate at the elbow joint, describe the component order and give a practical example. Higher ability candidates completed all three elements of the question commonly using an overarm throw for the first class lever and biceps curl for the third class lever. Weaker candidates used the second class lever or did not identify the classes of lever or their component order.

Question No. 8bii

The correct calculation and answer with the correct units was required for two marks. Many candidates multiplied the two figures provided which did not gain credit. Higher ability candidates wrote the correct calculation and provided the correct units. Some candidates who made the correct calculation unfortunately gave the incorrect units (most commonly kg/m^2 rather than kgm^2).

Question No. 8ci

Candidates were required to explain the shape of the graph with specific reference to the tucked somersault from A to B for three marks. If candidates used point A and point B they were likely to gain credit compared to a general description of the whole graph. Many candidates identified angular momentum remaining constant and noted the difference moment of inertia and angular velocity in relation to the body position. Less able candidates did not link the shape of the graph to the changing body position during the somersault.

Question No. 8cii

Three marks available for the correct description and application of the angular analogue of Newton's first law of motion. A less well answered question due to the lack of clarity in candidate's answers regarding angular terminology. Many candidates used Newton's first law of motion rather than its angular equivalent with 'angular momentum' and 'torque or eccentric force'.

Question No. 8di

A well answered question with many correctly sketched force diagrams with weight and air resistance originating at the centre of mass and the direction of motion indicated.

Question No. 8dii

Candidates were required to sketch a parallelogram of forces for three marks identifying the weight and air resistance, parallelogram law and resultant force. Answered well by those candidates experienced in drawing resultant force diagrams.

Section C

Question No. 9

A 20 mark extended response question with a levels of response mark scheme. Candidates were required to show knowledge and understanding of the alactacid component of recovery, a range of strategies used to maximise recovery and an evaluation of nutritional strategies to aid the recovery process. In the evaluation of nutritional strategies, it was expected for candidates to consider both the benefits and side effects of use.

Higher ability candidates showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the alactacid component of recovery with a depth and quality relating this knowledge to the activity taken part in, some went further to appreciate the lactacid component of recovery has already begun in the first 3 minutes of recovery also. They provided a range of strategies, most commonly warm-up, active cool-down, cooling aids, timeouts, structure of the game and tactical play, and considered the potential negatives of these strategies to the performer or team as well as the benefits to recovery. These candidates considered a range of nutritional aids, most commonly carbohydrate loading, creatine supplementation, isotonic and hypertonic solutions, bicarbonate and nitrate, and considered not only the benefits to recovery but also the side effects of their use.

Lower ability candidates did not show significant knowledge and understanding of the recovery process largely considering only the replenishment of PC and removal of lactic acid. Their range of strategies was limited to one or two (usually active cool-down and substitutions) and nutritional aids were often a description of a balanced diet rather than an application to aiding recovery. There was often no attempt made to evaluate the aids presented or apply to the recovery of a team game player.

The quality of written communication was good with most candidates writing in continuous prose, in appropriate paragraphs and clear structure to their response. Most candidates continued their response to additional space. A good percentage of candidates achieved level 4 (17-20 marks), most candidates achieved between level 2 and 3 (7-16 marks) and some candidates achieved level 1 (1-6 marks).

H555/02 Psychological Factors Affecting Performance

1. General Comments:

There were some excellent scripts submitted in this first examination series for H555/02 and some candidates had a clear understanding of psychological factors affecting performance as well as excellent exam technique. Overall performance varied considerably as expected with a new specification. The new format sees three examined components for GCE level, and the clear separation of topics has enabled candidates to focus and prepare effectively for each examination. The questions on H155/02 were of a mixed approach ranging from 'identify' questions worth 1 mark, through 4-6 mark short answer questions, and one levels of response question worth 10 marks. Questions covered AO1, AO2, and AO3 as outlined in the specification. This structure worked effectively to allow a wide spread of scores on this unit to enable candidates to benefit from a fair and thorough assessment of their knowledge, understanding and application.

Candidates should be reminded about appropriate exam technique to allow them to maximise their marks:

- 'Evaluate' requires candidates to address the strengths / positives / advantages and weaknesses / limitations / disadvantages. In these questions, there were some excellent responses whereby answers were identified as 'strengths' and 'weaknesses'. When candidates did not get marks, it was because they simply gave descriptions.
- 'Using sporting examples / practical examples from sport' requires candidates to apply sporting examples to their factual knowledge throughout their answer. There were some excellent examples of candidates applying sporting examples to numerous facts enabling them to access high marks. Some candidates gave facts unsupported by examples, or one applied example with subsequent unsupported facts, which limited their marks.
- Candidates should consider the number of marks available for each question and compose their response with this in mind. In section A some candidates wrote more than required for full marks, whilst not writing enough in the 4 – 6 mark questions.
- Candidates should be reminded that all continuation sheets must be labelled accurately with the correct question number. They should avoid writing in the margins and in space outside of that allocated for the question.
- Candidates should be reminded to look at whether a question states a specific number of responses, and to adhere to this instruction.
- Candidates should be reminded to use alternate words when describing a term, eg 'positive transfer is when one skill has a positive effect on another', is TV, as is 'retention is retaining information'.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1

There were some excellent responses with candidates describing visual and verbal guidance followed by an applied example explaining its use. Where marks weren't credited for verbal guidance this was because of reference to verbal feedback. The example needed to focus on how verbal guidance could help a sports person when performing, rather than telling the performer what they did wrong.

Question No.2

Most candidates knew what learned helplessness was, with 'belief that failure is inevitable' being the most common response. More able candidates correctly described mastery orientation, lower ability candidates repeated the word 'master' or talked about performing successfully without having a real understanding of mastery orientation.

Question No.3

Well answered and good responses adhered to the command word 'identify'.

Question No. 4

Well answered, although a number of candidates incorrectly identified somatic management techniques.

Question No. 5

Most candidates knew what positive reinforcement was and exemplified it well. A common error was to describe negative reinforcement as punishment or refer to weakening S-R bond. This question was a good differentiator.

Question No. 6

ai) Well answered.

aii) Well answered.

aiii) This question assessed AO2 'applying knowledge and understanding of the factors that underpin performance and involvement in physical activity and sport' and is similar in style to questions on the specimen paper and AS papers whereby a practical scenario is given in the question. Candidate's coped well and good responses showed candidates understood they needed to give a situation when front crawl was affected by the environment and explain why. Weaker responses simply stated what an open skill was, making no reference to front crawl.

bi) Most candidates knew what transfer was, those that gained marks clearly described positive and negative transfer, those that didn't access marks tended to repeat the words positive and negative from the question.

bii) Better answers appreciated that skills that appear to be similar when they are actually different is a likely cause of negative transfer. Where marks weren't credited this was because candidates referred to general causes of poor performance.

biii) Some candidate responses focussed on maximising positive transfer failing to access marks.

ci) Most candidates successfully explained that retention referred to 'remembering the model', although some candidates were too vague using the term 'retain' in their answer. Motor reproduction proved challenging and many candidates described this as copying/performing the response, Better responses correctly referred to having the physical / mental ability to reproduce the skill. To allow for spread of marks this part of the answer was opened up to credit candidates referring to 'being able to reproduce the skill' although candidates should be encouraged to learn the full description for future papers.

cii) This question was a good differentiator allowing stronger candidates to show a more extensive understanding of factors affecting successful modelling. Some candidate responses incorrectly referred to unsuccessful modelling.

di) Well answered. Some candidates referred to terminology from the old specification (STSS) and although this was credited, centres are reminded to consult the new specification and ensure that candidates are aware of currently terminology (sensory memory). A small number of responses were too brief simply identifying aspects, 'outline' requires more than this.

dii) This question differentiated well. Most candidates attempted to give limitations to the multi-store approach with some success, although many candidates omitted the strengths instead opting to describe the approach and thus covering points from the previous question.

Question No. 7

a) This question differentiated well. Most candidates successfully used examples to support their answer, rock-climbing proving popular and straightforward. The systematic responses explaining the model from left to right scored highest marks. Where candidates did not score this was due to showing a limited understanding of the process involved or referring to how the model produced ineffective leadership.

bi) Some candidates knew what cognitive dissonance is, more able candidates were able to describe it in terms of attitude change.

bii) In this question, AO2 was examined as in previous specifications whereby candidates come up with their own practical examples. Good responses identified 3 factors and applied a sporting example to each fact to show how persuasive communication is effective in changing attitude. Credit was also given to candidates whose examples focussed on ineffective persuasive communication. Many candidates successfully identified and described how factors influence the effectiveness of persuasive communication although did not use of practical examples and consequently were unable to be credited marks.

c) Most candidates attempted to give limitations to the instinct theory of aggression with success, although many candidates omitted the strengths instead opting to offer a description. To allow spread of marks on this occasion 1 mark submax was credited for a descriptive point. Candidates should be reminded that evaluate requires them to clearly identify and describe strengths and weaknesses. Stronger candidates that did this were still able to access higher marks on this question ensuring the intended differentiation was achieved.

di) This question required students to understand sport confidence as a 'belief in ones capability to perform well in sport'. Weaker responses repeated the term confidence or referred to specific situations

dii) This question was well answered, with candidates often giving well developed analysis of the impact of sports confidence on both performance and participation. This is particularly encouraging as it is a new part of the specification and is clearly well taught and well understood.

Question No. 8

This 10 mark extended response assesses candidates on:

- AO1 – knowledge and understanding
- AO2 – application of knowledge and understanding through practical examples
- AO3 - analyse and evaluate
- Technical vocabulary
- Structure and relevance of written response

Excellent responses contained detailed understanding of all parts of the question as well as a thorough application of the required examination technique. Candidates that simply described the theories gained some credit. Many candidates supported their evaluations with descriptions of arousal theories and applied examples which, although weren't necessary, showed a very good understanding of the whole topic area being examined and gained credit. The highest quality responses simply addressed the questions asked, gave balanced evaluations of all theories and detailed discussion of the different types of skills requiring different levels of arousal supported by examples with a good balance of AO1, AO2 and AO3 as appropriate.

Candidates that offered descriptions of arousal theories did so with mixed success. Inverted U was best understood. Many candidates knew that Drive theory stated that an increase in arousal causes an increase in performance, and Catastrophe theory has a sudden significant decrease in performance once over-aroused. Excellent candidates also described the dominant response aspect of Drive theory, applying it to beginners and experts, and the effect of somatic and cognitive arousal on performance in Catastrophe theory. A similar essay featured on H155/02 in June 2017, candidates should be reminded that practising exam questions is fundamental to success and AS Level questions cover some of the same specification content.

Answers commonly featured weaknesses of Drive theory, strengths and weakness of Inverted U theory and strengths of Catastrophe theory. With excellent answers, in addition to this, detailing strengths of Drive theory and weaknesses of Catastrophe theory.

Some candidates addressed many different types of skills in part 2, whilst higher scoring candidates linked the question to the specification detailing complex, simple, gross and fine skills, backing facts up with examples.

H555/03 Socio-Cultural Issues in Physical Activity and Sport

1. General Comments:

This was the first examination for the new specification. Candidates' general performance across the paper was good with the vast majority attempting all questions, demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding of the assessed subject content.

However, many did not access a significant proportion of marks through weak question interpretation and examination technique, writing descriptive responses linked to key words in the question rather than focussing on what the question specifically asked.

There was little evidence of candidates failing to complete the paper in the allotted time, indeed many wrote at length. A number of candidates wrote responses outside the lined answer space provided, including in margins and at the top and bottom of pages. Centres should remind candidates that this is not permitted and that they should use the continuation sheet provided in the answer booklet. They should clearly indicate where they have continued a response in additional answer space and show the question number in the margin of the additional sheet as the instructions state.

2. Comments on Individual questions:

Q.1

This question was relatively poorly answered. A significant proportion of candidates missed the main focus of the question, which was how the "Old Boys" had helped spread sport **around the world** and answered instead on how games were spread in the UK. Therefore, responses including going to university, teaching in public schools, forming NGBs and codifying rules did not gain credit. Candidates should also be encouraged to pay attention to the instruction in the question to identify **two ways** as many listed multiple ways, which did not gain credit.

Q.2

This question was very well answered with a high proportion of candidates accessing both available marks. The most common responses were scholarships and bursaries and world class facilities. Some candidates mistakenly stated that TASS was awarded by universities and others did not qualify "facilities" and "coaches" with "high quality" or "world class", missing the question focus on elite sporting success.

Q.3

This was another well answered question with candidates showing good knowledge of the use of modern technology to increase participation in sport, giving relevant examples. Where candidates did not access both marks it was generally because they did not explicitly link the effect of the technology on participation. Common incorrect responses included reference to the effects of media and travel as examples of modern technology.

Q.4

A well answered question with candidates demonstrating sound knowledge of the causes of crowd violence. Those candidates who did not access both marks commonly listed two sources

of frustration eg frustration with the result and frustration with the referee's decisions. Again, candidates' attention should be drawn to the emboldening of the word "two" in the question as only two attempts are allowed.

Q.5

Candidates displayed good understanding of how the different classes had more or less free time in pre-industrial Britain, but many omitted to explain how this affected their participation in sport. A significant proportion also did not make a clear link to the social class they were describing and so were unable to access the mark scheme.

Q.6(a)

This question was less well answered by the majority of candidates. It required candidates to describe three features of globalised sport and provide a sporting example for each feature, but many were unclear about the features and answered instead on commercialisation and sponsorship. Many also confused the concept of freedom of movement with the idea of easier travel. Centres should remind candidates that some major competitions, such as the Olympic Games, pre-date globalisation and so should not be referenced as examples.

Q.6(b)

Candidates demonstrated very good knowledge of political exploitation of the Olympic Games, with the majority being able to correctly give the name, date and political event for each Olympic Games. Many went into unnecessary detail about each Olympic case study rather than being succinct and matching points made to marks available. Candidates should be encouraged to confine examples to the five Olympic Games included in the specification.

Q.6(c)

Candidates scored poorly on this question, largely due to poor answering technique. Higher scoring responses compared factor by factor eg sport in pre-industrial times was occasional whereas in the public schools it was more regular. Weaker responses commonly included a paragraph on each, including many relevant points, which did not match up to give a comparison. Centres should encourage candidates to compare characteristics on a point by point basis.

Q.6(d)

This was another question where candidates demonstrated good knowledge but less secure examination technique. The question asks for a description of how education affects participation and whilst some candidates had been clearly well prepared for answering this style of question many did not link the aspect of education to the actual effect on participation.

Q.7(a)

The best responses for this question focussed on the advantages and disadvantages of the rising cost of match coverage and these candidates were able to give an accurate summary of the positive and negative effects on both football and its spectators. Less successful responses digressed into discussions of the rising number of games shown. The weakest responses simply repeated data from the table and did not analyse as the question required.

Q.7(b)

Most candidates were able to identify the increased risk of match fixing and addiction and so scored two marks. Some focussed too much on the different types of match fixing and should be encouraged to visit different areas of the specification and mark scheme to access the full range of marks

Q.7(c)

Good examination technique was evident in responses to this question with the majority taking note of the instruction to discuss and so giving points from both sides of the argument. The vast majority of candidates were able to identify that modern technology aided officials in making more accurate decisions. The most successful candidates matched points made to marks available and answered succinctly.

Q.7(d)

Candidates found this question difficult and generally resorted to a description of the progress to excellence section of the specification. Successful candidates understood the progression of an athlete from identification to elite status and were able to identify the factors which should be included in a development programme. Weaker candidates wrote about the World Class Programme, which is not relevant to this question.

Q.8

This was an accessible question where all candidates wrote something creditworthy. The vast majority had been well prepared by centres and showed confidence in supporting their answers with a range of examples of sports performers, pundits and sports events. Some were unsure of the dates for the 20th century and confused this with pre-industrial times, so included irrelevant material about, for example, smock racing. A common reason for not accessing levels two and three was imbalance in responses, where only one part of the question was addressed. The effects of commercialism were almost always better covered than the changing status of women and a significant minority did not refer to this at all.

To aid the structuring of responses centres should prepare candidates to make a point (AO1) develop it (AO3) and give an example (AO2)

H155/03 and H555/04 Performance in Physical Issues

Although the new H155 & H555 specifications are not a radical departure from the legacy G452 & G454 specifications there are enough alterations, such as a new assessment criteria across 6 levels through to the introduction of application of theory within the EAPI, to ensure that we are no longer directly following the same assessment path of the legacy specification.

It is fully appreciated that for many centres this new assessment process and the placement of students' marks by moderators was somewhat challenging. That being said moderators, host centres and all attending centres worked extremely well this year in order to enable the moderation process to occur and to ensure that alongside the assessment process detailed feedback was provided as to the reasons for the marks credited. It was felt that through providing continual feedback that centres became more comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to award candidate marks.

Although there was a need for many adjustments across both the practical and EAPI sections of the Non-Exam Assessment it was felt that the process was a successful one. The final Grade Award followed a similar pattern to that set out in the previous H155 cycle; within **H155** an A grade was 45/60 (Practical 23 & EAPI 22) and an E grade was 22/60 (Practical 11 and EAPI 11), whilst at **H555** an A grade was 44/60 (Practical 22 & EAPI 22) and an E grade was 20/60 (Practical 10 and EAPI 10).

The A* boundary is equivalent to 50/60 (practical 25 & EAPI 25), centres should therefore be aware that candidates placed in level 6 are outstanding performers.

Paperwork Submissions

The new version of the PEMIF for H155 is now the only method of providing the assessments to the moderator and this has eradicated the transcription errors from one sheet to another. However this has not completely eliminated transcription errors as many errors were still found when entering data onto the IMS1 form.

Centres are reminded that all assessed marks are now to be submitted to their moderator by the 31st March deadline & that they should be aware that the ability to submit 'summer activity' marks at a later date is no longer a possibility. Centres are also required to provide the additional evidence to their moderator at this time, this year many centres were not in a position to provide this and required time through the Easter break to collate this and send on which did in some instances hold up the moderation process. The additional evidence required is all filmed evidence of 'off-site' practical activities and a sample of 'on-site' practical activities, all coaching activity evidence (log book and filmed evidence), the sample of EAPI's and formal evidence of any times or distances recorded against a performance table (Athletics, Cycling and Swimming); centre should also have collated all their candidate performance log books and have these ready to send to the moderator when requested.

Centres should be aware that the marks on the Final Practical Activity form also need to be forwarded to the board via an IMS1, which can be accessed via the OCR Interchange system. This was a particular issue this year as many PE Staff do not have access to either the OCR

Interchange system or that their level of access does not enable them to enter marks as such they require time with their Exams Officer to complete the process.

From the 2019 assessment series onward centres are advised that all centre paperwork (PEMIF & IMS1) and associated evidence are to be submitted to the moderator and the board before the 31st March.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
<p>On the whole the deadline for paperwork was met, although many centres did not submit traditional summer activities at the required time.</p>	<p>Many centres had difficulty in printing aspects of the PEMIF; it was deemed that this was often a result of the macros not being properly turned on at the outset or that centres had part entered marks, saved the document and returned to it at a later date, in this instance they need to progress to the end of the process and re-fresh the scores before printing.</p>
<p>The majority of centres provided component marks where appropriate ie Cricket. Centres should be aware that on the new PEMIF when you select an activity that has component marks two or more yellow box are highlighted for mark entry, where as an activity that only has one mark requirement one yellow box becomes highlighted.</p>	<p>The removal of the 'triplicate' MS1 form and the need for all marks to be submitted electronically caused many IMS1 marks to arrive extremely late to moderators. Exams officers should be fully aware how to submit a centres marks and print a confirmation copy that must be sent to the moderator. Centres are reminded that from the next assessment series the IMS1 needs to be submitted at the same time as the PEMIF documents.</p>
	<p>There were many transcription errors between the Final Practical Activity Form and the IMS1. Centres need to ensure that this process is carefully checked as errors often lead to candidates being disadvantaged. It is advised that where the inputting of the IMS1 marks are completed by the examinations officer a member of the staff directly involved with the PE process also be present to spot errors at the point of entry as this year many entries were made for sub sections of marks rather than at the overall mark point.</p>
	<p>Where a centre has submitted a candidate for Athletics, Cycling or Swimming there is a need for a performance related mark, which is derived from the Performance Tables within the NEA. Here centres should also provide hardcopy evidence of the recorded time/distance to the moderator via an official results sheet from the event. Within the PEMIF centres should first enter the technique mark out of 30 (1/3rd of mark) then the performance table mark out of 30 (2/3rds of</p>

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	mark) in order to ensure that the candidate obtains the correct final score.

Centres should also note that the Special Considerations process has been revamped at OCR with a department now dealing with centre applications and it is therefore essential that they inform their moderators of any application they have made under this system.

Practical Activity

On the whole the new specification was a welcome change for centres who felt that assessing a candidate in one activity was more appropriate to all candidates. It should be highlighted that as with the legacy G454 specification the ability of a candidate to focus on their strongest activity is also reflected in the expectations of the assessment process.

Although the new assessment criteria in tabular form was initially challenging for many staff, once the process of identifying the candidates performance against the 5 sub categories (Range of Skills, Quality of Skills, Physical Attributes, Decision Making and Effective Performance) was outlined finding the line of best fit was efficiently followed.

Many centres had not noticed that the marks had been tapered within each level; the top level (6) and bottom level (1) only being 4 marks wide in each case, with levels 5 and 2 being 5 marks wide and levels 4 and 3 being 6 marks wide each.

The majority of centres over assessed their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended. It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and although it was a shock to the system for many, once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the new assessments were accurate and fair. It is felt that these adjustments and their rationale have been fully justified when looking at the placement of the grades identified earlier.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
Most centres had spent a great deal of time working through the new assessment tables and were working to the line of best fit.	Staff appreciated the breakdown of acquired and developed skills in to 'Core' and 'Advanced' although they did not directly correlate these to the wording within the assessment criteria table, which resulted in many students being over assessed.
Many staff spent a great deal of time working through the range of acquired and developed skills listed under each individual activity and found that when assessing candidates this enabled them to place them into a level with ease.	Many centres struggled with only working with 30 marks when thinking like a legacy G454 performer.
The desire to provide a more even spread of marks across the cohort was achieved.	Many centres assessed their performers too narrowly across the mark range and as such did not allow the differentiation between candidates to be achieved. Centres are encouraged to use the full mark range

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	appropriately; by applying a careful focus on the wording in the assessment criteria we are confident that centres will place their candidates appropriately.
The accessibility of an A grade was achieved at the bottom of level 5 which not only ensures accessibility but also enables our 'elite' performers the recognition.	It was disappointing that most centres had not recognised that <u>all</u> candidates must now produce a 'log book' detailing their competitive performances over the duration of the A Level course. These log books must be present at moderation for all candidates & a moderator may request to see them at any time. It should also be stressed that the log is a detailed record of the candidate's competitive performances over a 2 year period; many logs contained training sessions and were limited to just one season of competition.
	It was disappointing that most centres did not provide supporting evidence for assessments that are directly linked to a performance table; Athletics, Cycling and Swimming. Centres are expected to provide a hardcopy of the time or distance and candidate is putting forward as part of their assessment. It is felt the easiest form is a print out of the events result sheet which identifies all the relevant details such as candidate name, event, date and time/distance recorded and is then counter signed by a member of the centre staff to authenticate the performance.

Coaching Activity

Although the assessment of coaching is not new to OCR A Level PE, as with the practical there is a new assessment criteria focussing around the Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Evaluation & Reflection and the Technical Knowledge of the candidate. The tabular form of the assessment criteria takes this one step further by identifying the candidate's performance as a coach against the 6 sub categories (Range & Quality, Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, Evaluation & Reflection and Coaching Plan). It is this latter 6 sub categories that enable the line of best fit to be established and as such a final assessment mark identified.

The majority of centres over assessed their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended. The major area of concern was the lack of standardisation between the assessed level of a coach and a practical performer; many of the coaching candidates observed lead a session rather than coached, there was also significant concern over the level of technical knowledge displayed in many sessions. It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the new assessments were accurate, fair and in line with the practical assessments previously agreed during the

moderation day. It is felt that these adjustments and their rationale have been fully justified when looking at the placement of the grades identified earlier.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
<p>Most centres followed the rubric for the number and duration of sessions as identified in the Guide to NEA.</p>	<p>Many centres struggled to differentiate between the skills of a 'sports leader' and a 'coach' and this was reflected in many of the assessments viewed both live and by filmed evidence. Those candidates who focussed on fault identification and the resulting correction and technical development were rewarded with high level assessments compared to those candidates who managed a group of performers through a range of drills with little if any individual corrective measures being put into place.</p>
<p>All candidates produced a log of coaching which encompassed most of the areas required.</p>	<p>When assessing the coach for their 'Technical Knowledge' centres are reminded that we are looking at them being able to "demonstrate outstanding knowledge of the correct technical models for the skills and analytical phases of the activity and of the progressive practices" (level 6) then we would be expecting the candidate / centre to utilise the 'performance' element of the Guide to NEA as an illustration of the range of core & advanced skills a candidate should be delivering within their teaching. It would be expected that a level 5/6 coach should be delivering some of the advanced skills within their sessions and not just core skills to a good level; this might have a knock on effect as to the age of the group a candidate coaches.</p>
<p>It is pleasing to see that many candidates are viewing coaching as a viable assessment process where they are looking to develop their knowledge of an individual sport and help others often within a school or club setting.</p>	<p>Throughout the moderation process we observed candidates delivering sessions to a wide range of performers. Although the ability level, age range and number of the performers a candidate coaches is not be stipulated centres are reminded that the choice of group will have a direct impact on the type and level of coaching the candidate can offer. As such we strongly advise centre staff to take a leading role in the initial group selection for the candidate. Better candidates had fewer participants, were able to coach advanced skills, provide individual feedback and fault correction as well as to their entire group and in many cases apply tactical situations that were relevant.</p>

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	It was evident from viewing log books that many candidates rotated their delivery between a variety of groups over the duration of the assessment process in order to meet the requirement of 20 sessions. The aim of the Guide to NEA is that the 20 sessions are delivered to the same group of performers so that a sustained developmental approach to coaching is achieved.
	The Guide to NEA clearly states that the duration of each coaching session should be 40 minutes and that a minimum of 2 are filmed. These filmed sessions provided to moderators should be start to finish and not clips of one session; it is also advised that centres ensure that the two coaching sessions filmed are the best coaching sessions the candidate has delivered both in terms of their coaching and the delivery of the most advanced skills they could thus enabling the moderator to award marks in the higher levels. Centres are also reminded that it is a 2 year process and that a candidate might even have more than two 40 min sessions filmed across their assessment process.
	Centres should also be reminded that they should cross reference the standard of their coach to the standard of their practical performers and ensure that they have standardised across the whole specification.

Evaluation and Analysis of Performance for Improvement (EAPI)

Centres were very pleased that the ‘oral response’ element of the Non-Exam Assessment process closely followed that of the legacy specification; however it was felt that many centres had not looked closely enough at the specification to identify the changes which resulted in some significant over assessment by centres. The updated EAPI assessment form now has greater subdivision with individual headers to aid centres in their assessment process.

Centres adapted to the new assessment criteria in tabular form quickly and were able to identify which elements of the oral response fell into each of the 5 sub categories (Range & Quality, Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, and Evaluation & Reflection).

Although no tapering within the levels is found in the EAPI assessment table centres did struggle to move from assessing an oral response out of 20 as in the legacy specifications to one out of 30. This combined with the lack of ‘new content’ resulted in the vast majority of centres significantly over assessing their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended.

It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and although it was a shock to the system for many once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the new assessments were accurate and fair. Once again it is felt that these adjustments and their rationale have been fully justified when looking at the placement of the grades identified earlier.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
<p>A lot of continuity from legacy G452 & G454 specification and as such centres felt comfortable with this process.</p>	<p>Understandably many centres complete their own assessments inside a classroom as this aids filming; however it is felt that if this is the only experience a candidate has of the process they struggle with the live process at moderation. It is felt that best practice would be to ensure that all candidates complete at least one EAPI 'pitch side'.</p>
<p>Candidates were well prepared for the task at moderation and were ofay with the process. It was very pleasing to see the majority of candidates arriving with a clipboard and pen ready to take notes throughout the observation.</p>	<p>The duration of candidate responses are in general far too long. It is appreciated that the task is complex and multi-faceted however centres should ensure that candidates are not speaking for excessive periods of time; it is felt that an appropriate response is possible inside 15 minutes for H155 and 20 minutes for H555; candidates who are exceeding 30 minutes are possibly creating more issues for themselves.</p>
<p>Centres found the process of completing the assessment grid with a line of best fit accessible and familiar.</p>	<p>Too many candidates used the observation time to regurgitate pre-prepared notes rather than observe the performance in front of them. This over reliance by candidates on pre-prepared notes leads them not only to focus too narrowly on one aspect of the observation but often provide inaccurate observations. Centres are also reminded that the time provided to a candidate should be appropriate; essentially enough time for them observe a performance and</p>
	<p>Many centres did not identify the 'new' elements within the evaluative comments of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Level of Success</u>; this should not only relate to the individual performer but also how their observations will affect the overall performance of the team where appropriate. - <u>Justification of weakness</u>; candidates should relate their selection to the level of success and the potential gains that could be found by a significant improvement.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	<p>Many centres did not identify the ‘new’ elements within the development plan of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Timescale justifications</u>; most candidates identified a timescale but lacked the reasoning why this was appropriate in length for the action plan to follow. - <u>Measurement of improvements</u>; some candidates identified a pre-test and post-test within their actions plan which is a successful way of incorporating this element. Candidates are reminded that excellent conclusions need to be drawn from the potential results of the tests in order to access the higher levels. - <u>Adaptations</u>; most candidates offered a range of progressive practises however the progressions were set across the development plan and very few candidates offered adaptations to the planned progressions based on the progress shown in the previous practice. The better responses looked to link the measurement and the adaptations throughout the development plan, utilising the measurement process as ‘check points’ across the 2-3 months and then offered adaptations based on the outcome.
	<p>Many centres did not identify the ‘new’ elements within the justification of evaluation of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Placement of theory</u>; all candidates provided theory however the vast majority either provided this only within the action planning section or as a ‘bolt-on’ at the end of their response. However it must be noted that the specification required that a candidate justifies their ‘<i>evaluative comments and their action plan</i>’ with theory. - <u>Wide range of relevant theory</u>; most candidates identified one or two areas of theory repetitively which although applied differently can only be given credit for once. The main culprits here were muscle / movement terms and guidance. Candidates should ensure that they access a wide range of

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	theoretical topics from Components 01 & 02 (H155) and 01, 02 & 03 (H555) in their response. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Lack of application of theory</u>; far too much theory was simply a regurgitation of fact rather than applying the concept to the observations or the action plan.
	Many candidates did not cover all of the required areas as such it is felt that in order to assist candidates the way in which the question is posed to a candidate should now take 2 parts with the candidate responding to each on in turn. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Part One</u>; Comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance - <u>Part Two</u>; Creating of a viable action plan Pages 25, 26 & 27 in the NEA provide exact wording which we would suggest all centres follow or abridge to suit.

Filmed Evidence & Log Books

Although the requirement of centres to provide filmed evidence was reduced there is now a need for centres to film all aspects of the live moderation. Centres welcomed the former, as it was one less task however the later provided many logistical issues not only on the day but also in submitting to the board either as an individual centre or as a cluster. Centres need to plan this into their moderation day going forward as it is their responsibility not the moderators as this will be the first point of reference for a moderation review requested by a centre.

Many centres had not recognised the new guidance on filmed evidence that was issued in the 2017 report and issued via the OCR website (item 3c.4 <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/siu/alevel-pe-nea-250817>). Here it identifies that centres should in addition to the ‘off-site’ activity filmed evidence requirement keep as a minimum a record of 6 candidate performances, across 2 activities for ‘on-site’ activities. Centres should look to ensure that this ‘on-site’ evidence encompasses the range of marks credited by a centre, ideally top, middle and lowest with each of the two activities filmed.

Centres are reminded that where the filmed evidence is used that it should not only meet the requirements of the individual activity as set out in the Guide to NEA but it must show the performer in a formal competitive situation. This was a significant barrier to the moderator’s decision making process this year, especially with the ‘off-site’- activities; centres are reminded that it is their responsibility for the production of appropriate footage. For candidates offering coaching for assessment then the two 40 minute sessions that are filmed need to be continual in nature. Much of evidence viewed had clips from a session which did not enable an appropriate assessment to occur.

The production and quality of candidate log books showed significant variances across all centres. These logs are extremely helpful to moderators when making final decisions as to the appropriate assessment of a candidate. Centres are reminded that they do not carry any direct weighting towards the assessment process; they are simply there to support the judgement. Centres are reminded that the log is there for a candidate to identify the regularity of competitive performance in their sport and show the level that they participate at. It should not be a weekly record of their training and it must record their performances across the two years of the A Level course. For those practical activities whose main ‘in-competition’ season is the summer such as Athletics & Cricket then it is acceptable that a candidate records their performances from the July prior to their entry to Year 12.

The method of providing centres are reminded that all the evidence they pass on to the moderator should be a copy as these will no longer be returned to the centre after the assessment process.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
Many centres are still following good practice of filming a range of marks so that they can provide additional evidence to a moderator if they feel it is required; but also to use this footage for future EAPI's.	Centres need to be aware of the range of filmed evidence they need to provide to the moderator for ‘on-site’ and ‘off-site’ practical activities, coaching and EAPI's.
Most centres are providing filmed footage that is clearly labelled with the candidate name and number.	Centres need to be aware of the live filming requirement. This incorporates all practical activities and all EAPI's listened to live by the moderator on the day.
Many centres had collated their candidate log books in advance of the submission of marks in order to provide these to the moderator when requested. Best practices was identified where centres utilised a ‘shared’ document between the candidate and the member of staff to record the log, this way the live document could be regularly checked and printed as needed by the centre rather than a reliance on the candidate to provide the printed copy.	When videoing the live practical's it is very important that each candidate presents to the camera before the sessions starts so that they can easily identified at a later date if required.
Most centres are providing filmed evidence in a format that can easily be played by the moderator.	Filming should include a range of shooting styles ie a wide angle shot so all participants can be seen as well as closer up elements focussing on a smaller number of candidates so exact technicalities can be observed.
	Centres need to ensure that candidates in video evidence present to the camera at the start of a video so it is clear who they are and what their identifying bid/number is.
	Greater consideration of the environmental conditions ie teacher / students conversations around the camera need to made. Much of the filmed evidence viewed was marred by poor sound quality.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
	Best practices for candidates who's filmed evidence is across a range of clips is to compile these into one 'video' so that the entire assessment can be made in one viewing rather than across multiple clips.
	Provision of filmed evidence needs to be clearly labels and must be a copy; as this will not be returned to the centre after the assessment process. Moderators find it easiest if the evidence can be provided on a USB memory stick rather than multiple DVD's.

The moderation team would like to express its thanks to all centres that participated in this year's moderation process; we full appreciate that the first year of a new specification will never be straight forward however the professionalism and pragmatism shown by all highlights the range of exceptional Physical Education staff delivering the subject.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

