

GCE



**Chief Examiner's and
Principal Moderator's Report**
**Sports Science and
the Active Leisure
Industry**

Summer Series 2024

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2024 series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Assessment Unit AS 1	Fitness and Training for Sport	3
Assessment Unit AS 2	The Active Leisure Industry, Health, Fitness and Lifestyle	8
Assessment Unit A2 1	Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry	10
Assessment Unit A2 2	The Application of Science to Sports Performance	15
Contact details		17

GCE SPORTS SCIENCE AND THE ACTIVE LEISURE INDUSTRY

Principal Moderator's Report

Internal Assessment Overview

This was the first series since 2019, to be completed without any allowances e.g. 'Advance Information', in lieu of the COVID 19 pandemic.

The 2024 Series saw fifteen centres undertake the AS Unit 1: Fitness and Training for Sport qualification. Centres demonstrated a very good understanding of the specification, assessment objectives and assessment criteria for this unit. There was good attendance at the on-line Agreement Trials in October 2023 and it was pleasing to see that most Centres followed new CCEA guidelines and advice concerning the reduction of portfolio size and workload for candidates and teachers.

Assessment Unit: AS 1 Fitness and Training for Sport

Overview

Overall Standard

The overall standard of work was high, similar to previous years. Most centres marked the portfolios to the standard agreed at the Agreement Trials in October 2023 and there were very few adjusted centres.

Task 1 Fitness Testing, Recording and Analysis

Most portfolios included an introductory paragraph with details of the client's sport which is good practice and helped set the context.

In Task 1 unfortunately, only a few candidates researched the client's sport thoroughly before analysing and showcasing at least five relevant components of fitness. Some candidates researched twenty components of fitness, which was too many. The SAMs state that an analysis should be made of the components of fitness that are required for their client's sport and assess their importance.

Most candidates applied a separate risk assessment for fitness testing so fulfilling AO2 Level 4, that is, 'highly effective application of safety requirements during fitness testing'. The advice at the Agreement Trials was to select one fitness test per component of fitness. Some candidates tested the clients in 15 tests, which was too extensive, too generic and some tests were not relevant to the client's sport.

Test protocols and validity and reliability of fitness testing were well evidenced in most portfolios. Best portfolios researched up to date and specific standardisation tables i.e. those relating to the client's sport, age and utilised them in their analysis of results.

The analysis of results in fitness testing ranged from basic to comprehensive and best portfolios focused on the requirements and demands of the client's sport. Better responses used the results from the fitness test to inform the goals they set for the client.

Task 2 **Planning, Performing and Evaluating Fitness Programme**

As part of Task 2 AO1 the best portfolios evidenced identification of the client's requirements through trainer-client interviews. Risk Assessments and potential safety and first aid issues for each training area were well presented. The best responses showed a better understanding of safety by amending existing PE Department risk assessments on facilities used for training, their training programmes and specific exercises completed by the clients.

An understanding of the principles of training and periodisation was evident in the best portfolios as these stated how the planned six-week mesocycle fitted into the client's sporting year. There were improved responses in Task 2 AO2 where candidates are required to 'identify and set realistic and achievable training goals and plan a fully developed training programme'. The best responses evidenced an overview training plan i.e. training across six weeks and twelve sessions, on two pages and included training methods to be utilised and realistic progressive overload in weeks 2-3 and weeks 5-6. Weaker responses simply described but did not apply the SMARTER goals and FITT principle to developing the components of fitness in the client's overview training plan.

Candidates who did not present an overview training plan, had recorded the plan for the next session in their evaluations. Candidates should include the overview 6 week plan and then, if necessary, record in their evaluations any amendments they may wish to make, e.g. 'client did not complete week 3 planned overload, so an increase in 3 reps in the 2 sets will be tried next session instead of an additional set'; or 'planned week 3 session was much too easy so week 4 session will increase the work time by 5secs and decrease the recovery between sets time by 2 secs'.

Diversity in the warm-ups and cool-downs of the best portfolios gave candidates more opportunity to display evidence of their AO2 knowledge, application and understanding. Up to two different warm-ups (relevant to exercises completed in a session) and two different cool-downs exercises were presented once in the portfolio and then referred to as warm-up 1 or 2 in a training session.

A few candidates mentioned the principle of recovery in Task 2 AO1 and there was a noticeable absence of the same in Task 2 AO2. In several portfolios, there was little or no evidence of rest/recovery between sets of exercises or between different exercises especially in developing muscular strength and endurance. Some training programmes that did not include recovery/rest times also did not indicate the duration of the main part of the session. Hence, some training sessions, especially those with resistance exercises, seemed unrealistic in the planned session time. Best responses, planned the timings of sessions and allocation of both work and rest times and sessions were more viable. (see Fact File on strength & power).

Many candidates cited methods to monitor intensity of training e.g., heart rate, RPE or utilising Fitbits. Best responses included the electronic devices that indicated working and recovery pulse rates and included pictures of recordings. However, many did not implement what they said they would do and did not monitor exercise intensities. Additionally, annotation often did not highlight instances where monitoring of the training programmes was absent.

Highlighting or colour coding the progressive overloads in planned training sessions helped the moderation process (especially if completed in the 6 weeks overview chart). Six of the twelve sessions should be presented and showcased in the portfolio (Agreement Trials guidelines Oct 23) in a concise manner with monitoring and brief evaluation of each session. It is still important to show evidence that the other six training sessions have taken place, e.g., pictures from a training diary evidencing these other six sessions if they are dated with time/venue recorded, plus a very brief outline of exercises completed e.g., 6 x 150m runs @ 23 secs pace with walk back recovery (1:4).

Good practice saw candidates taking notes and writing on their session planner – so creating a ‘working document’ and inserting this into their portfolio. The focus of the training sessions and the start time of the session should be clear. The evaluation can indicate why particular amendments to the session were needed e.g., planned overloads too high - had to be reduced. This information should then be utilised to inform the planning for the next session.

At the October 2023 Agreement Trials, we clarified the purpose of the training programme was to improve a client’s fitness in at least two components of fitness, over a six-week period, with their choice of components guided by the initial fitness testing results. Some candidates required the client to develop more than three components, which was unnecessary.

Some candidates also presented unnecessarily extended evaluations of every training session and included up to twelve sessions in the six weeks.

The evaluation comments for Task 2 AO3 were generally sound and best responses were more reflective over the six weeks. Some stated how successful, or not, tests chosen for re-testing were. Best portfolios looked back at the overview plan and critically commented on the suitability of planned progressive overloads and how the number of sessions completed, intensities trained at, condition/health of client, impacted on re-testing.

Overall, evaluation of the process of developing a training programme and implementing it as a trainer was well documented and some reviews suggested ways in which the candidate could improve a future fitness programme. The reduction of AO1 material throughout Task 1 and 2 has been very welcome.

Task 3 Planning, Instructing and Reviewing Three Fitness Sessions

Task Three was generally well presented with AO1 understanding of knowledge of anatomy and physiology and energy systems well evidenced. Best portfolios demonstrated this theoretical understanding by describing the theory involved specific to the client’s movement for some exercises, as well as discussing the physical adaptations they were hoping to attain in the six weeks. Weaker portfolios had theoretical knowledge ‘cut and pasted’ from research, which at times did not have the correct referencing and was not applied to the training programme.

Candidates should not print out and insert the risk assessments from Task 2 AO1 but as Task 3 indicates, review the Risk Assessment to check if it was fit for purpose and adhered to in the sessions. The same applies for reviewing other safety issues or First Aid that might have been required.

Regarding teaching styles, most candidates discussed and implemented a range of these and evidence of this was recorded in teacher witness statements, outlining the ability of the candidate to lead sessions and follow health and safety procedures.

Most candidates had three extended training sessions evaluated and the evidence of good practice was more apparent when selecting a session at the start, in the middle and towards the end of the programme. Best responses thoroughly analysed and evaluated teaching styles, motivational skills adopted, progressive overloads and strengths and weakness of the sessions.

Presentation of Portfolios, Annotation and Witness Statements

Notably, most Centres followed CCEA's advice to implement the guidelines for reduced content and page quantity. This reduced the AO1 theoretical knowledge, typically 'cut and pasted' by candidates. According to Bloom's Taxonomy in classifying learning objectives, such cut and pasted knowledge is regarded as being a lower order thinking skill and candidates should be taught to be selective in specific knowledge and then have evidence to display understanding, application and analysis of it, therefore indicating higher order thinking skills and attaining higher marks.

Several centres produced high quality portfolios with substantially reduced page counts and exemplars of these will be presented at the Agreement Trials in October 2024.

Portfolios were generally well presented, with plastic bindings or treasury tags and the majority were correctly printed, double sided with pages numbered and contents pages included. All these inclusions greatly assist referencing for teachers and moderators and help both to annotate and reference key evidence to corroborate marks awarded.

The quality of annotation provided by most centres was good – indicating clearly, where and why marks had been awarded e.g. 'T2 L3 lower, average to good analysis in AO3 but more detail needed in evaluations'. Good practice was to have the e-Candidate Record sheets printed out with marks awarded for each assessment objective and placed at the start of the portfolio. A significant concern was that some annotations in portfolios did not correlate with the e-Candidate Record sheet e.g. L2 upper, satisfactory account, was marked on e-CRS as L3 upper.

Centres need to be careful that annotations in the portfolio, which are preferred, are addressing the Moderator and not the candidate.

Teachers' witness statements are required to help verify evidence collated by candidates. The use of three teacher witness statements was widespread for the extended review of three sessions in Task 3 AO2 but two more should also be included in portfolios – one for the fitness testing Task 1 AO2 and one for fitness re-testing Task 2 AO2. So, these five teacher witness statements are important to include in all portfolios and need to be commented on and signed by teachers observing.

Independent Learning

To clearly identify the degree of independent learning demonstrated by the candidate, a 'level of guidance given' section was added as a drop-down menu, to the e-moderation template for Summer 2023 series. The completion of this provided valuable guidance to moderators.

Administration

The submission of sample portfolios to CCEA must be completed accurately. Some markings on the grey plastic coursework envelopes were misleading e.g., some stated six samples included but the package contained only five. Centres also need to place sample portfolios in rank order i.e., envelope stating '1 of 3' should have the top ranked candidates' work, while envelope 3 of 3 should have the lower ranked candidates' work.

Resubmission of Work

A few centres had candidates who resubmitted portfolios for moderation. This was discussed at the 2023 Agreement Trials and the following guidelines apply:

- Candidates who resubmit work must send a copy of their original portfolio along with their new work if their work is requested for moderation.
- A resubmitted portfolio must include a new training programme designed for a client, along with evidence of the implementation and analysis of this programme. It is not sufficient to 'adapt' the original training programme.

Chief Examiner's Report

Subject Overview

Following the provision of Advance Information in the 2023 exam series, the summer 2024 series was the first to be conducted with no allowances in place for the effects of the COVID pandemic. Responses from candidates in both examined units ranged from very basic to outstanding and there was evidence that some candidates were still finding preparation and performing in external examinations very challenging.

Assessment Unit AS 2 The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle

Unit Overview

This paper was accessible to all candidates and many demonstrated good knowledge of the specification content. The level of language used in the paper proved appropriate with most candidates showing good application of their understanding to the questions. Candidates appeared familiar with the paper style and format and there were no reported timing issues. The mark scheme reflected most of the candidates' responses.

Centres should note the following general points for the next series:

- Candidates should read each question carefully before formulating a response.
- Candidates should understand the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.

- Q1**
- (a) (i)(ii)** This question was answered very well by most candidates.
 - (b) (i)(ii)** In general, this question was answered well. Weaker responses tended to only give a basic description of each form of leisure.
 - (c) (i)(ii)** This question was answered very well, with many candidates scoring full marks.
 - (d)** Most achieved Level 2 marks in this question. Many described government initiatives in detail and the best responses included a range of initiatives, describing how these promoted an active and healthy lifestyle.
- Q2**
- (a) (i)(ii)(iii)** This question was answered very well with many candidates achieving full marks.
 - (b) (i)** This was poorly answered by many. Most responses lacked knowledge on the processes involved in carbohydrate loading and the weakest responses did not describe the positive impact this nutritional strategy has on performance.
 - (ii)** Poorly answered. Vague responses lacked specific terminology. Candidates often confused isotonic sports drinks with energy drinks.

- Q3 (a) (i)(ii)** This question was poorly answered. Many candidates did not identify the FITT principle of overload and only accessed descriptive marks.
- (b) (i)(ii)** This question was answered very well with many candidates awarded full marks.
- (iii)** Most responses to this question were poor. Many failed to accurately define a performance goal and descriptions were often vague.
- (c) (i)** This question was answered well by most candidates.
- (ii)** This question was poorly answered by most candidates. The disadvantages identified by candidates were often insufficient to access marks.
- (d) (i)(ii)(iii)** In general, this question was answered well. Better responses described in detail how each component of fitness was relevant to an elite golfer.
- Q4 (a) (i)(ii)(iii)** Most candidates scored well in this question, with best responses assessing the long-term negative effects each substance has on an individual's health and wellbeing.
- (b)** Most candidates achieved Level 2 marks in this question. The best responses discussed how an active and healthy lifestyle can help prevent coronary heart disease.
- Q5 (a)** This question was well answered by most candidates.
- (b)** Most accessed Level 2 and Level 3 marks. Responses had to discuss in detail, the range of barriers to females in sport and address the progress that has been made to remove these barriers. Poorest responses listed barriers but gave limited explanations.

Finally, teachers should be commended for their efforts in ensuring all candidates were sufficiently prepared for this exam.

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit A2 1 Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry

Internal Assessment Overview

This was the first series since 2019, to be completed without any allowances e.g. 'Advance Information', in lieu of the COVID 19 pandemic.

In the summer 2024 examination series, CCEA moderated 18 centres for GCE A2 Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry. The work presented was generally of a high standard.

Administration and paperwork in preparing sample portfolios was completed accurately in most cases, with many centres submitting printed copies of the e-mark sheet at the front of each candidate's portfolio. Most centres placed portfolios in rank order in the grey CCEA return bags e.g., top 4 candidates in bag 1 of 3.

It was clear throughout the moderation process that most centres had followed and implemented guidelines and extensive advice from the Principal Moderator concerning the reduction of portfolio size and workload for candidates and teachers. The quality of work was not lessened, and best portfolios continued to show evidence of higher order thinking skills (application, analysis and evaluation) being utilised and that differentiated them from lower-level candidates who continued to simply insert AO1 knowledge with limited comment on its context.

With most centres having a very good understanding of the specification and assessment objectives for this unit, the portfolios submitted by many of the centres were marked to the agreed standard.

The Event

The range and quality of the events selected by the centres varied for the 2024 Series. Some events catered better for their candidates as they allowed candidates to provide sufficient evidence of their individual contributions to planning, organisation, running and evaluation of the event. Best practice used generated criteria to select events that were different from the previous year.

Task 1 **AO1 Candidate's Demonstration of Knowledge, IFS and Event Selection**

The higher marked portfolios outlined clearly, the process of selecting a group event (from presented individual feasibility studies) and creation of criteria was evident with sound evaluative statements as to why other suggested events were not selected. Centres should insist that candidates research, 'How to present a power point slide effectively', so they can enhance individual and group feasibility presentations. Frequently, too many words were seen on a slide.

Task 1 **A02 Application of Candidate to Create a Group Business Plan Proposal**

This was the least well-developed task. Candidates must provide evidence (e.g. minuted meetings) that highlights the roles to be identified and chosen, to develop the business plan. Best portfolios used research from personality traits questionnaires or simple team building tasks in a lesson, to establish which members of the team would be best suited for a particular role. The same methods were also used to establish a leader/chairperson role for the team. Only a few candidates produced peer evaluation statements of the work that was completed by other team members, in developing this section of the business plan proposal. Some portfolios included a few boxes referring to an individual's contribution, but no peer evaluative statement on the work that was supplied by a team member and that they were going to be including in their portfolio.

Several centres utilised the planning of an event to cater for catchment feeder primary schools (customers) and this was supported when their business plan was presented to senior management. Other centres raised substantial amounts of money for different charities from their events. This is hugely motivational for the organising team and provides an excellent incentive.

Task 2 **A02 Application of Candidate to Implement Their Role**

Centres appeared more informed with the requirements for this task and best portfolios included evidence of the candidate's responsibilities in implementing their role to carrying out the business plan. Evidence was first documented in the format of showcasing several minuted meetings and supported by the candidate's individual contributions at meetings. Evaluative statements on a set of minutes, written by another team member, was evident in the best portfolios.

Secondly, a separate personal logbook was evidenced, highlighting chronological tasks completed by the candidate after the business plan proposal presentation. This provided an opportunity for candidates to evidence their contributions individually and also tasks completed when assisting another team member. A logbook provides clear evidence to help teachers differentiate between candidates when allocating marks. More candidates this year produced logbooks that included screen shots of emails, WhatsApp messages; pictures of planned tasks completed or pictures of assisting other team members. Most logbooks had evidence presented more concisely in a tabular format (landscape), however, some evidence was not legible as inserted screen shots/pictures were too small.

Unfortunately, some centres who did not implement guidelines highlighted at the Agreement Trials in October 2023, had candidates present too many sets of minutes (some up to 12 sets) and/or had a repetition of information in their personal logbook that was already included in Task 1.

Task 2 **A03 Analysis of Planning Before the Event**

Although some of the information for this task can be evidenced in Task 2 AO2, this task was evidenced well in the best portfolios with analytical and critical comments regarding how well the planning was going; who was pulling their weight and who was not; whether set targets (aims and objectives) for action to be taken and tasks completed were being met on time; how conflict was managed and problems that arose were resolved. Some candidates 'glossed-over' planning issues and aspects and simply stated that the organisation and meetings with their team all went smoothly and had no issues!

Best practice was to have candidates record managing and resolving conflict in their individual contributions to group meetings, usually after a set of minutes. Weaker responses just inserted AO1 theory on managing and resolving conflict but showed no demonstration of understanding e.g. an example of conflict arising through lack of communication, or a team member not being prepared for a meeting.

In this task, higher marked candidates evaluated the final risk assessment that was to be implemented on the day of the event. Comments on the role of each group member on the day regarding health and safety was limited from most candidates, barring those who held the Health and Safety officer's role.

Task 3 **A01 Candidate's Demonstration of Knowledge of Event Planning**

Best portfolios evidenced research methods to review and evaluate the event on the day. They revisited the original aims and objectives that the team had as well as the candidates own objectives, that had to be completed. Feedback surveys were reasonably well utilised, but some lacked substance, obtaining limited information from customers participating in the event. The highest marked portfolios included several insightful surveys which acquired feedback from a range of people e.g. participants (customers), supervising teachers and other senior pupil helpers. Good practice saw analysis of the feedback survey(s), to be shared by the team, and this was indicated by specific comments in portfolios. This year, feedback surveys were concisely presented and the best portfolios had evidence of more critically evaluative statements.

Task 3 **A03 Analysis of Performance During Event and Post-Event**

Reviews of the individual candidate's performance and peer reviews of team members, during and after the event, were the best addressed tasks in the portfolios. The highest marks were evident in portfolios where candidates appeared most comfortable being analytical and critical of themselves and other members of the team. They analysed issues and indicated how particular parts of the planning were not adhered to or were not stringent enough to prevent an issue arising. However, with other candidates, many issues that arose on the day of the event were only described in basic terms, e.g. 'a group of participants were mis-directed and this impacted the last hour of the event'.

Presentation of Portfolios, Annotation and Witness Statements

It was encouraging to see most centres followed recent advice regarding guidelines for reduced content and page quantity. This meant a welcome reduction in AO1 theoretical knowledge which is usually just 'cut and pasted' by many candidates.

Several centres submitted portfolios which met AO requirements and were, in some instances, very high quality, despite being substantially shorter than submissions from previous years.

We intend to share examples of this work at this Autumn's Agreement Trial and hope this will encourage all centres to guide their candidates to produce more succinct and less voluminous portfolios.

This year, portfolios were generally well presented, with plastic bindings or treasury tags, (both acceptable) and the majority were printed double-sided. Also encouraging was the vast number of candidates who numbered pages and included a contents page. For Centres this has a positive impact on marking and referencing and enables moderators to find key evidence to corroborate marks awarded.

The quality of annotation provided by most centres was good and indicated clearly, where and why marks had been awarded e.g. 'T2 L3 lower, average to good analysis in AO3 but more detail needed in evaluations'. Good practice was to have the e-Candidate Record sheets printed out with marks awarded for each assessment objective on the sheet and placed at the start of the portfolio. A significant concern for teachers to address is that some annotations in a portfolio did not correlate with the e-Candidate Record sheet e.g. L2 upper, satisfactory account, was marked on e-CRS as L3 upper.

Centres need to be careful that annotations in a portfolio, which are preferred, are addressing the Moderator and not the candidate.

This will make moderation and the corroboration of centre marks much more meaningful and can make an adjustment less likely.

Teachers' witness statement/evaluative comments are required to help verify evidence collated by candidates. Four teacher witness statements were advised in guidance material and these were mostly evidenced for Task1 AO1 (IFS); Task 1 AO2 (contribution to business plan proposal); Task 2 AO3 (contribution to overall planning); Task 3 AO3 (contribution to event day & post-event).

Some centres produced their own teacher witness statement sheet that personalised the abilities and contributions of the candidate. However, some centres inserted a generic teacher witness statement that lacked differentiation across candidates. This made it difficult for the moderator to verify the evidence in the portfolio being alluded to. It is important that teacher witness statements are signed to authenticate the work.

The completion of the candidate 'level of guidance given' section also helped to explain how marks were awarded for candidates.

Resubmission of Work

A few centres had candidates who resubmitted portfolios for moderation. This was discussed at the 2023 Agreement Trials and the following guidelines apply:

- Candidates who resubmit work must send a copy of their original portfolio along with their new work if their work is requested for moderation.
- A resubmitted portfolio must include a new training programme designed for a client, along with evidence of the implementation and analysis of this programme. It is not sufficient to 'adapt' the original training programme.

In conclusion, centres must be complimented for their commitment and teaching to prepare candidates for this qualification. Equally, candidates must be commended for the quality of the portfolios submitted and for how they organised their events, no doubt attaining valuable event management skills.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit: A2 2 The Application of Science to Sports Performance

Subject Overview

Following the provision of Advance Information in the 2023 exam series, the summer 2024 series was the first to be conducted with no allowances in place for the effects of the COVID pandemic. Responses from candidates in both examined units ranged from very basic to outstanding and there was evidence that some candidates were still finding preparation and performing in external examinations very challenging.

Unit Overview

The question paper was accessible to all candidates. Good knowledge of the specification content was demonstrated throughout the paper. The level of language used in the paper proved appropriate with most candidates showing good application of their understanding in their responses. Candidates appeared familiar with the paper style and format and there were no reported timing issues. The mark scheme broadly reflected most responses given by the candidates.

Centres should note the following points for the next series:

- Candidates should read each question carefully before formulating a response.
 - Candidates should be reminded of the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.
- Q1**
- (a) (i)(ii)** This question was answered well by candidates.
 - (b) (i)(ii)** In general, this question was answered very well. A few candidates described a functional characteristic and were awarded zero marks.
 - (c)** This question was generally well answered. Best responses explained skeletal and muscular adaptations experienced by a sprinter. Weakest responses gave physiological responses rather than adaptations.
- Q2**
- (a) (i)(ii)** This question was well answered.
 - (b) (i)(ii)** Most answered this question reasonably well.
 - (iii)** This question was poorly answered. Retroactive transfer was poorly explained and the sporting example was often incorrect.
- Q3**
- (a)** This question was answered poorly. Many identified skill continua instead of types of skill.
 - (b)** This question was generally answered well. Best responses included two detailed explanations of strategies to overcome a learning plateau.
 - (c)** Most candidates achieved up to Level 2 marks in this question. Many described teaching styles in some detail. Best responses discussed a range of teaching styles to enhance learning and performance. Some did not correctly identify teaching styles and provided a vague description worthy of zero marks.

- Q4 (a) (i)** This question was poorly answered. Most responses failed to provide a clear definition of plantar flexion. Sporting examples were vague, often not identifying the phase of the movement. Identification of synovial joint and agonist were also inaccurate.
- (ii)** This question was well answered.
- (iii)** Most candidates provided a satisfactory response to this question. Sporting examples had to indicate the phase of movement to access a mark.
- (b) (i)** Most candidates provided a satisfactory response to this question. Some candidates did not describe the structural adaptation with appropriate terminology, to access full marks.
- (ii)** Most candidates accessed Level 2 marks in this question. Best responses examined several cardiovascular and respiratory responses to an aerobic training session. Those listing responses with limited or no explanation, could only access Level 1 marks.
- Q5 (a) (i)** This question was reasonably well answered. Better responses included a detailed description of each advantage.
- (ii)** In general, this question was well answered.
- (b)** The majority of candidates accessed Level 2 marks. Candidates who listed reasons with limited or no explanation could only access Level 1 marks.
- (c)** Most candidates accessed Level 2 marks in this question. Best responses assessed the positive and negative effects technology can have on a sports performer. Level 3 marks were awarded for responses that demonstrated knowledge through detailed and accurate examples. Responses listing types of technology with limited or no explanation of effect on performers could only access Level 1 marks.

Teachers should be commended for their efforts in ensuring candidates were sufficiently prepared for this exam.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- **Specification Support Officer: Arlene Ashfield**
(telephone: 028 9590 6678, email: aashfield@ccea.org.uk)
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Donal Gallagher**
(telephone: 028 9590 6700, email: dgallagher@ccea.org.uk)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

