

**Assessment Schedule – 2009****Scholarship Physical Education (93501)**

Evidence	Judgement
QUESTION ONE	
<p>The candidate:</p> <p><b>Critically evaluates</b> the necessity of the review process by making judgements about the worth of such a process.</p> <p>A physical activity “programme” or “experience” could include, but is not limited to, a personalised exercise programme, an outdoor education expedition/ experience, or a skill improvement programme.</p> <p>The candidate should demonstrate an understanding that the purpose of reviewing/evaluating is so we become better informed about what we are doing and why we are doing it. As a consequence we become more “physically educated” and are able to critically evaluate and discriminate to a greater extent what we are being told by coaches or read in the media. Further it allows us to be able to pass on our experience of success/failure and advice to others who come after us.</p> <p>The candidate must be able to critically evaluate the contributing issues or factors involved in the evaluation of the processes of the physical activity programme or experience.</p> <p>A critical evaluation could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An understanding of why identification of positive and negative factors surrounding the programme/experience is important, ie what has been learned?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The necessity to review a programme or experience.</li> <li>• Possible consequences if there was no review.</li> <li>• Possible assumptions made when deciding whether or not to review programmes.</li> <li>• Possible outcomes of such reviews, eg identifying what made it work or contribute to the intended outcome, learning from mistakes and considerations for what to do if there is a next time.</li> <li>• The worth of a review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive and negative impacts that a review identifies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An appropriate judgement.</li> </ul> <p>A candidate should say why it is important to review/ evaluate those aspects they select. We are asking for the “what”, “why” and “how”, ie:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What did you do?</li> <li>• Why did you do it that way?</li> </ul>	<p>The question is focused on the candidate’s ability to critically evaluate the necessity of evaluating/ reviewing a physical activity programme/ experience.</p> <p><b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance (7, 8 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate’s response demonstrates depth of understanding through a high level of sophistication across a range of factors including integration of ideas, original thought, fluency, and logical and precise communication. There is balance in the integration of theory and practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 8 there may be small / minor modifications that could be made to the response to improve the answer – given the time available to a candidate. The answer clearly demonstrates that the candidate fully understands the necessity of critically evaluating the review process of the physical activity programme or experience.</li> <li>• For 7 there may be modifications that could be made to improve the response of the candidate.</li> <li>• In either case, the response shows a balance in the integration of theory and practice.</li> <li>• In either case, there is clear evidence of depth of understanding on those aspects the candidate has chosen to consider as opposed to covering many aspects of the programme with minimal depth – quality of understanding as opposed to breadth of recall.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent Performance (5, 6 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate’s response critically evaluates information to demonstrate a holistic understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 6 the candidate has shown a balance between the theoretical knowledge and practical application. Depth of knowledge is evident in the answer but it lacks the sophistication, logic and fluency.</li> <li>• For 5 there is a balance in the integration of theoretical knowledge and practical application. There is less depth of idea development compared to a 6. There are more issues with the fluency, logic and sophistication of the essay when compared to a 6.</li> <li>• In either case, there is more than a superficial treatment, ie the candidate has not sacrificed depth to focus on breadth of knowledge.</li> <li>• A candidate in this area has produced a piece of work worthy of Scholarship standard.</li> </ul>

- How did you learn from it?

Evidence	Judgement
<p>The candidate should identify those aspects that are important in the development and review of the programme or experience such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the programme or experience</li> <li>• Gathering information of well-being, testing / research on the environment, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is testing of the environment?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Physical Activity programmes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• goal-setting</li> <li>• consideration of safety management</li> <li>• design of a programme</li> <li>• sports nutrition</li> <li>• psychology</li> <li>• biomechanics</li> <li>• time management</li> <li>• logbooks and recording of progress</li> <li>• group culture</li> <li>• learning environment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Factors affecting participation in the programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• motivation</li> <li>• perseverance</li> <li>• challenge</li> <li>• or other identified barriers / enablers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Outdoor education experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• purpose and reason</li> <li>• planning</li> <li>• logistics</li> <li>• safety management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The evaluation should be supported with appropriate examples drawn from the candidate's participation in a personal physical activity programme or experience.</p> <p>To this extent the quotes provide what we are looking for a candidate to demonstrate through the recollection and evaluation of their experiences, ie:</p> <p>"Successful training is intelligent training. Intelligent training is knowing the 'why' of an exercise, as well as the 'what' and 'how'".</p> <p><i>Arthur Lydiard (1998)</i></p> <p>"Physical activity programmes must be evaluated to reflect on our progress, see where we're going and where we've come from and what we have learned from our experiences."</p> <p><i>US Department of Health and Human Services (2002).</i></p>	<p><b>Sound Performance (3, 4 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate critically evaluates information to demonstrate an informed understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application. The candidate attempts to address the question – is able to apply some relevant understanding. Reasonably well-organised, but inconsistencies are evident, as well as superficial coverage and examples that do not relate to or detract from the answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 4 the response shows <i>some</i> evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding in producing a piece of work that only has breadth / development of ideas, or producing a piece of work with a few points in depth / some detail.</li> <li>• For 3 the response has no evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has clearly favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding only in producing a piece of work that lacks depth, or covering a piece of work on a few points that lacked breadth.</li> </ul> <p><b>Poor Performance (1, 2 marks).</b></p> <p>Ideas stated, information recalled. The candidate shows no evidence of critical evaluation, and demonstrates very little basic understanding of physical education, whether arising from theoretical knowledge or practical application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 2 the response has shown evidence of some relevant subject knowledge. However, no critical evaluation is evident.</li> <li>• For 1 there is minimal evidence of relevant subject knowledge.</li> </ul> <p><b>(0 marks).</b></p> <p>Blank answer or irrelevant evidence.</p>

Evidence	Judgement
QUESTION TWO	
<p>The candidate:</p> <p><b>Critically evaluates</b> a current physical activity event, trend or issue and examines the impact that this is having on New Zealand society.</p> <p>A critical evaluation should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of perspectives on possible causes / influences on the current physical activity event, trend or issue.</li> <li>• A range of perspectives on possible impacts it is having on New Zealand society, drawn from societal, political, economic, environmental, cultural, or historical perspectives.</li> <li>• An indication of where the candidate stands in relation to the issue following a reasoned argument.</li> </ul> <p>A well-balanced answer shows that not only is a candidate aware of the theory / research / evidence / assumptions surrounding their issue, but they can also illustrate where we might see evidence of this, or they can justify the assumption.</p> <p>An imbalanced answer might be shown by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of examples for the sake of using examples without the support of a theory or point the candidate is trying to make.</li> <li>• Statistics presented in isolation.</li> <li>• Theory dominant to the detriment of examples.</li> <li>• a disconnect between theory and practice.</li> </ul>	<p>The question is focused on the candidate's ability to critically evaluate how a current physical activity event, trend or issue has impacted on New Zealand society.</p> <p><b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance (7, 8 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate's response demonstrates depth of understanding through a high level of sophistication across a range of factors including integration of ideas, original thought, fluency, referencing that enhances the body of the answer, and logical and precise communication. There is balance in the integration of theory and practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 8 there may be small / minor modifications that could be made to the response to improve the answer – given the time available to a candidate. The answer clearly demonstrates that the candidate fully understands the issue they have written about.</li> <li>• For 7 there may be modifications that could be made to improve the response of the candidate.</li> <li>• In either case, the response shows a balance in the integration of theory and practice.</li> <li>• In either case, SPEECH is used judiciously, and coverage of all components is more than superficial.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent Performance (5, 6 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate's response critically evaluates information to demonstrate a holistic understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 6 a depth of knowledge is evident in the answer but it lacks the sophistication, logic and fluency.</li> <li>• For 5 there is less depth of idea development compared to a 6. There are more issues with the fluency, logic and sophistication of the essay when compared to a 6.</li> <li>• In either case, SPEECH is used judiciously, and coverage of all components is more than superficial.</li> <li>• The candidate has not sacrificed depth to focus on breadth of knowledge.</li> <li>• A candidate in this area has produced a piece of work worthy of Scholarship standard.</li> </ul>

**Sound Performance (3, 4 marks).**

Critically evaluates information to demonstrate an informed understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application. The candidate attempts to address the question – is able to apply some relevant understanding. Reasonably well-organised, but inconsistencies are evident, as well as superficial coverage and references that do not relate to or detract from the answer.

- For 4 the response shows some evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding in producing a piece of work that only has breadth / development of ideas, or producing a piece of work with a few points in depth / some detail.
- For 3 the response has no evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has clearly favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding only in producing a piece of work that lacks depth or covering a piece of work on a few points that lacked breadth.
- In either case, there are many unsubstantiated assumptions and generalisations.

**Poor Performance (1, 2 marks).**

Ideas stated, information recalled. The candidate shows no evidence of critical evaluation and demonstrates very little basic understanding of physical education, whether arising from theoretical knowledge or practical application.

- For 2 the response has shown evidence of some relevant subject knowledge. However, no critical evaluation is evident.
- For 1 there is minimal evidence of relevant subject knowledge.

**(0 marks).**

Blank answer or irrelevant evidence.

Evidence	Judgement
QUESTION THREE	
<p>The candidate:</p> <p>The candidate <b>adopts a position and critically evaluates</b> whether good athletes are “made” or “born”. The candidate may take the middle ground in that an athlete is neither made nor born, but is a product of both.</p> <p>The candidate’s answer must provide a reasoned argument that integrates knowledge about factors impacting on performance improvement.</p> <p>A critical evaluation should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of the “born” or genetic factors that can give athletes an advantage, AND on the “made” or training, and socio-cultural factors that develop the athlete.</li> <li>• Support of the evaluation with appropriate breadth and depth of knowledge drawing on biophysical and socio-cultural factors, which influence performance improvement.</li> <li>• Support of their evaluation with appropriate examples from their own experiences of performance improvement, research, or examples from wider society.</li> <li>• Statement of the candidate’s position with respect to the question, and support with reasoned argument from both viewpoints, ie “made” and “born”.</li> </ul> <p>The key in this question is that the candidate recognises that there are genetic, training and socio-cultural forces at play in the make-up of the athlete. While they may argue exclusively for one as being more important, they are cognisant of the other factors in their argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role the environment (social, political, economical, cultural, environmental, historical), plays in the opportunities that people get to participate and improve in physical activity.</li> <li>• The synthesis of the genetic, environmental and training factors in developing athletes.</li> <li>• Candidate may use examples from their own training programme/experience or skill development.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate may consider (but not be limited to), such aspects in the “born” argument as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are genetic (born) characteristics? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VO<sub>2</sub></li> <li>• Muscle fibre type (Fast/Slow Twitch).</li> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• The way a person physiologically responds to training.</li> <li>• Anthropomorphic characteristics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The question is focused on examining whether the candidate can critically evaluate the notion whether athletes are “made” or “born”.</p> <p><b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance (7, 8 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate’s response demonstrates depth of understanding through a high level of sophistication across a range of factors including integration of ideas, original thought, fluency, referencing that enhances the body of the answer, and logical and precise communication. There is balance in the integration of theory and practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 8 there may be small / minor modifications that could be made to the response to improve the answer – given the time available to a candidate. The answer clearly demonstrates that the candidate fully understands the inherent genetic predispositions and the influence of biophysical and socio-cultural influences on the athlete.</li> <li>• For 7 there may be modifications that could be made to improve the response of the candidate. This may be demonstrated in either the content of the answer, or in the fluency, structure and logic of the answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent Performance (5, 6 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate’s response critically evaluates information to demonstrate a holistic understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application, though not to the same standard as an outstanding candidate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 6 the depth of knowledge is evident in the answer but it lacks the sophistication, logic and fluency.</li> <li>• For 5 there is a little less depth of idea development compared to a 6. There are more issues with the fluency, logic and sophistication of the essay when compared to a 6.</li> <li>• In either case, the response is more than superficial, ie the candidate has not sacrificed depth to focus on breadth of knowledge.</li> <li>• A candidate in this area has produced a piece of work worthy of Scholarship standard.</li> <li>• In either case, socio-cultural and biophysical considerations are evident.</li> </ul>

- Where are examples (theory into practice)?
  - Runners of West African descent have a higher FT fibre composition in muscles.
  - Runners from Kenya, Ethiopia, etc have a higher ST fibre composition.
  - Particular sports tend to have athletes falling in a particular range of muscle fibre / body type.
  - We often test and measure young children looking for these latent characteristics (because they are valued and recognised), eg talent identification, talent scouting, intentional state sponsored testing (eg China, Russia, and the old East Germany).
- Exceptions / arguments against:
  - How much of Kenyan running ability in middle- and long-distance is due to genetics, and how much is a product of diet, lifestyle (running to school each day), cultural heritage, societal expectation (stereotype threat), and other aspects of upbringing, ie simply being from one of these dominant countries does not predispose an athlete to being a champion athlete.
  - Children of sporting parents often have the weight of expectation placed upon them to be as good as their parent(s).
  - A person may have these latent genetic predispositions but they can lie dormant unless they are triggered, or brought out by good coaching, environment, opportunity and support.
- What about environment / socio-cultural factors?
  - The opportunity has to be present in order for an athlete to develop or be moulded
  - Social environment influence from school, club, family, peers, facilities and the perceived value of activity. Parental expectation and involvement.
  - Political environment and the government policy on access to physical activity.
  - Economical environment and the influence of costs involved, eg costs, access to sport, technology.
  - Environmental factors that influence access to physical activity opportunities such as physical environment, facilities, weather.
  - Cultural factors that influence the group or community that you are part of and the activities they are involved in.
  - Historical influences and changes, such as some schools / communities have a strong tradition of particular activities.

**Sound Performance (3, 4 marks).**

Critically evaluates information to demonstrate an informed understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application. The candidate attempts to address the question – is able to apply some relevant understanding. Reasonably well-organised, but inconsistencies are evident, as well as superficial coverage and references that do not relate to, or detract from the answer.

- For 4 the response shows some evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate may have put forward a case based predominantly within one viewpoint, ie biophysical with only some consideration of socio-cultural influences, or vice versa. The candidate has favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding in producing a piece of work that only has breadth / development of ideas, or producing a piece of work with a few points in depth / some detail.
- For 3 the response has no evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate may have put forward a case based solely within one viewpoint, ie biophysical with limited / no consideration of socio-cultural influences, or vice versa. The candidate has clearly favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding only in producing a piece of work that lacks depth, or covering a piece of work on a few points that lacked breadth.

**Poor Performance (1, 2 marks).**

Ideas stated, information recalled. The candidate shows no evidence of critical evaluation and demonstrates very little basic understanding of physical education, whether arising from theoretical knowledge or practical application.

- For 2 the response has shown evidence of some relevant subject knowledge. However, no critical evaluation is evident.
- For 1 there is minimal evidence of relevant subject knowledge.

**(0 marks).**

Blank answer or irrelevant evidence.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What about training?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Training is where an athlete may be “made”.</li><li>• Correct application of principles and methods of training can bring about adaptations that are specific to the type of training undertaken. These can “bring out” those genetic predispositions and enhance them.</li><li>• Psychological training and the impact it has on an athlete’s performance.</li><li>• The use of biomechanics and motor learning aspects can improve an athlete’s ability – examples from their skill development programme.</li><li>• Access to specialist knowledge, eg sports nutritionist, biomechanist, sports psychologist, physiotherapist, etc.</li><li>• The place of technological advances and its impact on performance.</li></ul></li><li>• Overall:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Candidates may consider that while a person may be born with certain genetic predispositions, they may not be interested in pursuing the life of an athlete; they may be content to move into others areas in their life.</li><li>• An imbalance will be found in a candidate who writes a very biomedical or socio-cultural answer without due consideration of the other. Equally, one that demonstrates wide knowledge, but without examples or illustration to show how these factors “make” an athlete, or are advantageous to them in the case of being “born”.</li></ul></li></ul> |  |
|--|--|

Evidence	Judgement
QUESTION FOUR	
<p>The candidate:</p> <p><b>Critically evaluates</b> the scenario against a process of achieving health promotion.</p> <p>The candidate must draw on their own experience in a taking action process.</p> <p>The candidate must be able to adopt a position in respect to, and critically evaluate how successful the action of the Year 13 students was in promoting physical activity and contributing to health promotion.</p> <p>The candidate must provide a reasoned argument that integrates knowledge and understandings about health promotion.</p> <p>A critical evaluation should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The value of the Year 13 student's actions as a process for getting children active and contributing to health promotion.</li> <li>• Support of the evaluation by considering who is being advantaged and disadvantaged by their actions</li> <li>• A consideration of the positive and negative aspects of their action in taking action, and alternative ways in which the scenario could have been played out better (this may involve a consideration of taking action models)</li> <li>• Support of their evaluation with appropriate examples from their own experiences around implementing an action to promote physical activity and contributing to health promotion.</li> </ul> <p>Taking action requires careful consideration of where an intervention/programme/activity can have the greatest benefit.</p> <p>A possible process for achieving Health Promotion could be Gillian Tasker's (2000) Action Competency Model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying an Issue.</li> <li>• Developing Knowledge / Insight ("Critical Thinking").</li> <li>• Developing a Vision ("Creative Thinking").</li> <li>• Understanding.</li> <li>• Planning includes Barriers / Enablers and what action.</li> <li>• Acting.</li> <li>• Reflecting and Evaluating.</li> </ul> <p>Or any other appropriate process.</p>	<p>The question is focused on examining whether the candidate can critically evaluate the scenario against the expectations of health promotion with the purpose of taking action to improve/increase participation in physical activity. For Scholarship, the candidate's answer must include a range of perspectives that integrates knowledge around physical activity, health promotion and the taking action process.</p> <p><b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance (7, 8 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate's response demonstrates depth of understanding through a high level of sophistication across a range of factors including integration of ideas, original thought, fluency, referencing that enhances the body of the answer, and logical and precise communication. There is balance in the integration of theory and practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 8 there may be small / minor modifications that could be made to the response to improve the answer – given the time available to a candidate. The answer clearly demonstrates that the candidate fully understands the concept of health promotion and taking action as it relates to the scenario and their own experiences.</li> <li>• For 7 there may be modifications that could be made to improve the response of the candidate.</li> <li>• In either case, the response shows a balance in the integration of theory and practice / experience.</li> </ul> <p><b>Excellent Performance (5, 6 marks).</b></p> <p>The candidate's response critically evaluates information to demonstrate a holistic understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application, though not to the same standard as an outstanding candidate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 6 depth of knowledge is evident in the answer but it lacks the sophistication, logic and fluency.</li> <li>• For 5 there is less depth of idea development compared to a 6. There are more issues with the fluency, logic and sophistication of the essay when compared to a 6.</li> <li>• In either case, the response is more than superficial, ie the candidate has not sacrificed depth to focus on breadth of knowledge.</li> <li>• A candidate in this area has produced a piece of work worthy of Scholarship standard.</li> </ul>



**Sound Performance (3, 4 marks).**

Critically evaluates information to demonstrate an informed understanding of physical education, arising from both theoretical and practical application. The candidate attempts to address the question – is able to apply some relevant understanding. Reasonably well-organised, but inconsistencies are evident, as well as superficial coverage and references that do not relate to or detract from the answer.

- For 4 the response shows some evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding in producing a piece of work that only has breadth / development of ideas, or producing a piece of work with a few points in depth / some detail.
- For 3 the response has no evidence of critical evaluation. The candidate has clearly favoured breadth over depth. The candidate has clearly favoured breadth over depth, or depth over breadth. This may be illustrated in trying to cover as many points as possible and succeeding only in producing a piece of work that lacks depth, or covering a piece of work on a few points that lacked breadth.
- In either case, there are many unsubstantiated assumptions and generalisations.

**Poor Performance (1, 2 marks).**

Ideas stated, information recalled. The candidate shows no evidence of critical evaluation and demonstrates very little basic understanding of physical education, whether arising from theoretical knowledge or practical application.

- For 2 the response has shown evidence of some relevant subject knowledge. However, no critical evaluation is evident.
- For 1 there is minimal evidence of relevant subject knowledge.

**(0 marks).**

Blank answer or irrelevant evidence.

## Codes:

The following Physical Education-specific marking conventions may also have been used when marking this paper:

<b>D</b>	=	Defined / Definition
<b>R</b>	=	Referenced / Quotes
<b>SK</b>	=	Subject Knowledge
<b>A</b>	=	Applied
		<i>The "A" could go in front of anything, eg: ASK = Applied Subject Knowledge</i>
<b>OE</b>	=	Own Experience
<b>EX</b>	=	Explained
<b>EID</b>	=	Explained in Detail
<b>CT</b>	=	Creative Thinking
<b>CR</b>	=	Critical
<b>EV</b>	=	Evaluation
		<i>Could put "CREV" together</i>
<b>PO</b>	=	Position (make a statement on where they stand)
<b>JPO</b>	=	Justified Position (they justify after reasoned argument on where they stand)
<b>GS</b>	=	General / Statement
<b>AS</b>	=	Assumption
<b>RD</b>	=	Requires Development
<b>N</b>	=	Negates Argument
<b>IR</b>	=	Irrelevant
<b>REP</b>	=	Repetition

The following Physical Education-specific marking conventions may also have been used when marking the following questions:

### QUESTION ONE

<b>FIP</b>	=	Factors Influencing Participation
<b>WWL</b>	=	What Was Learnt
<b>P+</b>	=	Evaluative Process Positive
<b>P-</b>	=	Evaluative Process Negative

### QUESTION TWO

<b>IMP+</b>	=	Impact Positive
<b>IMP-</b>	=	Impact Negative
<b>C / I</b>	=	Causes / Influences

### QUESTION THREE

- FIP** = Factors Influencing Performance
- BPF** = Biophysical Factors (includes genetic and training factors)
- SCF** = Socio-cultural Factors (SPEECH)

### QUESTION FOUR

- P+** = Taking Action Process Positive
- P-** = Taking Action Process Negative
- FAP** = Factors Affecting Participation
- S** = Suggestions