

# GCE Examiners' Report

Physical Education

GCE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2025



## Introduction

Our Principal Examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each unit.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.<sup>1</sup>

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

## Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	WJEC offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	<a href="https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/">https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/</a>
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	<a href="#">Portal by WJEC</a> or on the WJEC subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and unit level.  For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each unit that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: <a href="#">Results, Grade Boundaries and PRS (wjec.co.uk)</a>

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Exam Results Analysis	WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	<a href="#">Portal by WJEC</a>
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	<a href="https://resources.wjec.co.uk/">https://resources.wjec.co.uk/</a>
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	<a href="#">Portal by WJEC</a> or on the WJEC subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	<a href="#">Become an Examiner   WJEC</a>

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Executive summary	5
Unit 1 - Exploring Physical Education	7
Unit 2 - Improving Personal Performance in Physical Education	11
Unit 3 - Evaluating Physical Education	13
Unit 4 - Refining Personal Performance in Physical Education	16
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	18

## **Executive Summary**

### **AS Physical Education**

The AS qualification performed as expected, with a stable entry similar to previous years. Candidates were statically a weaker cohort.

Unit 1 (written exam) produced a higher mean than that of 2024 which demonstrated that the written paper was more accessible and less demanding for candidates.

Unit 2 (NEA) is stable producing a similar mean to 2024.

### **A level Physical Education**

Entries have increased but stable with similar profiles to 2024. Candidates are statically slightly weaker than 2024.

The performance in Unit 3 (written exam) produced a lower mean to that of 2024 which demonstrated that the written paper was more demanding for candidates.

The performance in Unit 4, non-examination assessment (NEA), produced a higher mean compared to previous series with the biggest increase around the A grade. Most candidates chose to be examined in the role of performer. The investigative research project was accurately assessed especially in the initial self-analysis section.

### **Unit 1 & 3: Exploring and Evaluating Physical Education**

The assessments for Units 1 and 3 demonstrated strengths in AO1 (knowledge recall), but consistent weaknesses in AO2 (application) and AO3 (analysis and evaluation).

#### **Unit 1: Exploring Physical Education**

Candidates performed strongly on factual questions, particularly those relating to hydration, EPOC, and muscular contractions, which had high facility factors (level of accessibility). However, more complex questions revealed significant challenges. Topics such as antagonistic muscle action, observational learning, energy systems, and the functional role of video analysis highlighted weaknesses in applying knowledge to specific contexts. The poorest-performing question, which asked candidates to describe psychomotor skills, had a particularly low facility factor, indicating a substantial gap in understanding. Psychological concepts like self-efficacy and anxiety were also poorly evaluated.

#### **Unit 3: Evaluating Physical Education**

Although the paper was accessible and aligned with the full specification, performance varied across question types. High-achieving candidates demonstrated strong understanding of content and effectively applied their knowledge using appropriate terminology. However, many candidates misinterpreted command words, especially "outline", and failed to tailor their responses to the context of the questions. Question 5 proved particularly challenging due to a lack of relevant or applied content.

Across both Units, AO3 remains the weakest assessment objective, with many students offering descriptive rather than analytical responses. To improve performance, future teaching should focus on strengthening students' understanding of command words, developing evaluative writing skills, and providing regular opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge in varied and realistic scenarios. This will support deeper learning and more effective examination performance.

### **Units 2 & 4: Improving & Refining Personal Performance (NEA)**

Units 2 and 4 form the Non-Examined Assessment (NEA) elements of the qualification, accounting for 16% and 24% of the full A-level respectively (40% of AS).

In 2025, most centres opted for live moderation; smaller centres submitted video evidence. CPD at the start of the year ensured improved assessment accuracy and understanding of protocols.

Practical performance assessments were mostly accurate, with many candidates achieving Band 4 or higher. Coaching continues to be the preferred role over officiating, with high-performing candidates delivering structured, progressive sessions.

The Personal Performance Profile (Unit 2) and Investigative Research (Unit 4) were generally well executed. Strong candidates used quantitative data, fitness testing, and coach feedback to set SMART targets or identify development needs. However, data analysis and evaluation remain challenging for many.

#### **Key messages:**

- Film the full moderation day and submit within one week
- Provide clear ID lists and bibs/numbers
- Notify moderators in advance of any absences
- Ensure clear visual and audio quality in all recordings
- Annotate candidate written work to show where marks were awarded.

Overall, the standard of assessment is accurate, and delivery continues to improve, supported by robust centre organisation.

# PHYSICAL EDUCATION

## GCE

Summer 2025

### UNIT 1: EXPLORING PHYSICAL EDUCATION

#### Overview of the Unit

The most accessible questions, with facility factors (ff) above 0.80, included 1a(i) (muscular contraction), 1c(i) (hydration), 3a(i) (EPOC), and 5a(ii) (fatigue). These questions primarily required AO1 (knowledge recall) responses.

More challenging questions, despite high attempt rates, included:

- 1a(ii), where candidates needed to describe antagonistic muscle action (ff 0.46, attempt rate 98.7%)
- 2b, which involved observational learning and analysis skills, showing poor candidate knowledge (ff 0.41, attempt rate 99.7%)
- 3a(ii), where candidates demonstrated good understanding of energy systems but weaker application to the question (ff 0.49, attempt rate 99.7%)
- 4a, on the role of video analysis, where many responses focused on available tools rather than its functional role
- 5b, which showed poor evaluation of self-efficacy (ff 0.43, attempt rate 99.4%)
- 6b, where candidates recognised the role of public schools in isolation but lacked analysis of their broader impact on sport development (ff 0.47, attempt rate 99.4%).

The poorest performing question was 2c, requiring a description of psychomotor skills, with a ff of only 0.19. A key theme across these questions is the prominence of AO3 skills, focusing on analysis and evaluation.

## Comments on individual questions/sections

**Q.1 (a)** Part (i) This was an AO1 multiple-choice question requiring identification.

Part (ii) This AO1 question asked candidates to describe antagonistic muscle action. Many responses focused on only one aspect of the antagonistic muscle pair and therefore lacked depth.

**(b)** This AO2 question required candidates to explain why endurance athletes train at altitude. Basic answers tended to focus on either the training effects or the physiological adaptations. A more developed response needed to include a connection to performance benefits upon returning to sea level. This achieved a ff of 0.60 and a mean of 1.8/ 3 marks.

Part (i) This was an AO1 multiple-choice question focused on identification. This was very accessible to candidates, ff 0.90.

Part (ii) This AO2 question required an explanation of how dehydration affects performance. Basic responses often mentioned the impact on performance without elaboration, while more advanced answers explored the underlying reasons. A common theme in higher-level responses was the increase in blood viscosity and its effect on reducing oxygen transport.

**Q.2 (a)** Analysis of the hip Joint: Most candidates correctly identified the joint type and associated muscle fibres. However, fewer accurately described the type of movement and the corresponding axis of movement.

**(b)** This was a multiple-assessment-objective (AO) question requiring analysis of observational learning, with an emphasis on skill acquisition rather than behaviour. Some candidates successfully identified components of observational learning or described the process using the DARM model. However, fewer were able to analyse the specific focus of the question. To achieve Band 3, AO3 responses needed to include clear, relevant examples directly related to teaching skills. Demonstration was the most attempted element of observational learning to analyse. While some candidates touched on other components, the analysis of these areas was generally unclear or lacked depth. This was reflected with a low ff of 0.41 even with a high attempt rate of 99.7%.

**(c)** Poorly answered response. Candidates did not know what psychomotor abilities were. Ff 0.19 with also the lowest attempt rate of 89.8%.

- Q.3 (a)** Part (i) This was an AO1 multiple-choice question focused on identification. Part (ii) This question required candidates to explain the interchanging of energy systems during exercise, using the provided figure. Many responses focused on describing the individual energy systems rather than explaining how and why they transition between each other. Without addressing this interchange and its underlying reasons, candidates were unable to access the higher-level marks. This achieved a ff of 0.49, which reflects the observations.
- (b)** This AO2 question required an explanation of how a warm-up affects a muscle. Basic responses typically identified general reasons for warming up, while stronger answers provided more detailed explanations focused on the muscle itself. High-quality responses followed a logical progression, starting with the initial effect of the warm-up, then explaining how it impacted the muscle. A surprising ff of 0.70, this is a topic area that has been regularly examined.
- Q.4 (a)** This AO3 question required candidates to assess the role of video analysis in improving sporting performance. Many responses focused on describing what video analysis is, rather than assessing its role in performance enhancement. Candidates sometimes repeated similar roles within tactics, techniques, and skills, they simply presented in different contexts, rather than offering distinct points. This achieved a ff of 0.55.
- (b)** Part (i) of this question was sometimes misinterpreted as asking what the government provides in relation to sport. However, the actual requirement was for candidates to outline how the government *uses* sport. Ff of 0.60, with a high attempt rate of 99.4%.
- Part (ii) was generally answered well, demonstrating a solid understanding of how location can act as a barrier to participation in sport and physical activity, which aligns well with the AO2 assessment criteria.
- Q.5 (b)** Focused primarily on AO3 and was answered less effectively. Many students struggled to evaluate previous accomplishments or vicarious experiences in the context of self-efficacy. Ff of 0.43 and a of mean 2.1 / 5 marks. In most cases, responses lacked depth, with students often only managing to describe the concept of self-efficacy rather than providing a thorough evaluation.

- Q.6**    **(a)**    This question required candidates to distinguish between **state** and **trait anxiety**. However, in many responses, state anxiety was described in the same way as trait anxiety, indicating a lack of clear differentiation. Candidates need to provide specific examples that clearly illustrate the difference between the two, rather than offering vague or generic references to anxiety.
- (b)**    This extended writing question required candidates to analyse the role of public schools and universities in the development of sport during the 19th century. Strong responses effectively utilised the three stages of public-school development to structure their argument. Candidates were also expected to analyse the key links and factors that contributed to this progression. A surprisingly lower ff of 0.47.

All Assessment Objectives (AOs) were assessed in this question, with a particular emphasis on AO3 (analysis). To achieve higher AO3 marks, candidates needed to incorporate universities into their analysis and demonstrate how sport evolved throughout the century, highlighting clear progression over time.

# PHYSICAL EDUCATION

## GCE

### Summer 2025

#### UNIT 2: IMPROVING PERSONAL PERFORMANCE IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

##### Overview of the Unit

Unit 2 is a Non-Examined Assessment (NEA) accounting for 16% of the full qualification (or 40% of AS). It includes three key components:

- Practical performance in one activity (as a player/performer)
- Performance as a coach or official (with coaching remaining the preferred choice)
- A Personal Performance Profile (PPP)

##### Moderation in 2025

- Most centres opted for live moderation; smaller centres used remote moderation via video evidence.
- CPD earlier in the year effectively prepared centres for correct protocols.
- The majority of candidates were accurately assessed, and moderation days were well-organised.

##### Key Reminders for Centres

- Advance Notification: inform moderators in advance of any candidate absences.
- Filming Requirement: the entire live moderation day must be recorded and submitted within one week.
- Moderator Communication: ongoing dialogue with moderators is encouraged to ensure smooth moderation.

##### Comments on individual questions/sections

###### Practical Performance

Assessment of practical activities continues to improve in accuracy with nearly all assessments in the correct band. The most effective evidence included video footage of the candidate in a variety of Rich Tasks / competitive situations. Major games are still the most popular activities. Application of assessment criteria in these activities was largely accurate with the majority of candidates placed in the correct band. Most candidates assessed were in Band 4 or the top of Band 3. Very few candidates were assessed as being in Band 2.

Centres should try to arrange for candidates to perform in the best facilities possible to allow them to clearly evidence where they have accessed marks. The most effective centres had pre-organised bibs or numbers to ensure that candidates were easily recognisable before the activities had started. They also provided these identification lists to the moderator at the start of the day to ensure a fast and effective programme. Centres are also encouraged to ensure that all video evidence clearly shows where and why candidates have accessed certain marks.

Centres are also reminded that the video recording of the day ensures that candidates are clearly identified. The video footage should be accompanied with player ID lists when uploading evidence onto IAMIS.

### **Coaching / Officiating**

Coaching remains the preferred option for nearly all candidates. Candidates assessed as being in the top band delivered progressive sessions demonstrating excellent communication, appropriate organisational skills, and high-quality feedback. The assessment of coaching was largely accurate with the majority of candidates being assessed at Band 3.

Candidates who opted to officiate tend to regularly officiate at school and in the wider community. Most of these candidates were secure in the correct application of rules, movement around the field of play and the use of correct hand signals etc.

Candidates being assessed in off-site activities should ensure that they have appropriate video evidence of their coaching/officiating to support the mark awarded. Centres are reminded to ensure that candidates can be clearly see and heard during the filming of all coaching / officiating sessions.

### **Personal Performance Profile (PPP)**

Assessment of the Personal Performance Profile (PPP) was generally accurate in terms of banding and standardisation. The majority of candidate work was assessed as being at the top of Band 2/bottom of Band 3.

A small minority of candidates struggle to produce any quantitative data (mainly due to performing at a lower level). This was often due to the nature of the sport/ activity itself. Some centres overcame this issue by getting candidates to include objective data e.g. fitness or skill test results and performance analysis statistics, along with informative coach feedback. They used this information to set appropriate SMART targets which usually included technical and physical fitness targets. Candidates at the top end applied the relevant theory when justifying their target selection.

Candidates who regularly compete at a higher level were able to utilise their knowledge and understanding of their sport and effectively apply this in their projects to access higher marks. Centres are reminded to annotate candidates' Personal Performance Profiles to highlight where marks have been awarded throughout the project.

# PHYSICAL EDUCATION

## GCE

Summer 2025

### UNIT 3: EVALUATING PHYSICAL EDUCATION

#### Overview of the Unit

This paper contained 5 questions broken down into a series of sub-questions ranging from 1-20 marks with a combination of short and extended questions posed throughout.

Overall, the paper was very accessible and offered candidates a good range of questions across AO1, AO2 and AO3, there was also a mixture of command words. Each topic from the specification was tested and the responses suggest that candidates mostly understood the content, though what did vary was their ability to apply the content to the questions asked (knowledge, command word or context of question). It is, however, also worth noting that question 5 responses (globalisation 20 marks) were particularly lower (mean of 10/ 20 marks) due to responses not linking accurate specification content to the question posed.

In terms of performance, some candidates showed a lack of understanding to AO1 command words, particularly 'outline' where responses demonstrated, lists or there was too much information, or not enough. There was a total of four questions with the command word outline. There were some pleasing responses given at AO2 in 1b(ii) (redistribution of blood), 2b (team cohesion) and 3b (Newtons second law of motion), where candidates demonstrated both good subject knowledge and sound application in response to the questions set. However, some responses to A03 questions highlighted misinterpretation, particularly in relation to the requirements of the 'analyse' command word.

Those candidates who did well in this Unit read and understood the demands of the question, particularly in question 4c and 5. They demonstrated a depth of knowledge and understanding across the specification. Their responses were clear and concise and provided applicable practical application, where the question had a practical context. Furthermore, candidates that provided good to excellent responses demonstrated the ability to write responses according to the command words in the question.

Those candidates who did less well in this Unit were those that confused key concepts, misunderstood or misread the questions, produced responses that lacked a depth of insight and struggled to apply theoretical knowledge to the practical context required.

## Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** There were a total of four questions from topic 3.1 on the specification. Questions included both, AO1 and AO2 questions.
- (a) A high attempt rate and average ff of 0.55. The command word was 'outline', with the question specifically asking for the relationship. High scoring answers were able to give a detailed relationship of cardiac output, stroke volume and heart rate. Whilst basic responses only referred to the equation.
  - (c) This question was banded with access to both AO1 and AO2 marks. Although attempts of this question were high at 98.2%, weaker responses only focused on the access to AO1 marks. The stronger responses were able to explain the impact on performance accessing the AO2 marks. Mean mark was 1.9/ 3.
- Q.2** There was a total of four questions from the topic 3.2 on the specification. Questions included both, AO1 and AO2 questions.
- (d) This question solely tested AO2 skills and was banded. It produced a low mean of 2.8/ 6 marks. Most candidates were able to give some accuracy in responses with knowledge of leadership styles. Some candidates got confused and included leadership theories and did not focus on leadership styles as per question. Those candidates that produced good responses (but not detailed) showed good knowledge and understanding of leadership styles in sport, but did not apply it specifically to a team as the question asked.
- Q.3** Question 3 had 5 questions, which had a combination of AO1 and AO2.
- (a) This item had the highest attempt in the entire paper at 99.8%, it also had the highest faculty factor of 0.84. This shows this question was high performing and accessible. It is important to note that this was an AO1 question where learners only had to 'identify'.
  - (c) Was the second lowest attempted question in the paper with an average of 91.6% Candidates who performed well in this question applied their knowledge and skills to the context of the question which was the athletics event discuss. Not many candidates were accessing the higher marks with the mean only being 2.5 out of 5 marks.

- Q.4 (c)** This question solely tested AO3 skills. The command word was to ‘analyse’ how feedback can influence sporting performance, and the mark scheme was banded. Although there was a high attempt rate of 99.2%, a lot of the answers fell into band 2 – basic responses. Candidates who performed poorly in this question showed basic to good knowledge of feedback types but AO3 skills were not consistently being applied. The mean of 4.6 marks out of 10 supports consistent band 2 basic responses. Candidates who performed well in the question were able to analyse the use of feedback, directly linked to its influence on sport performance.
- Q.5** This question was the 20 marker, that mostly tested candidates AO3 skills. The question was banded. Candidates were asked to analyse the influence globalisation has had on sport. Weaker candidates for this question got confused on the topic of globalisation and provided responses that were heavily focused on commercialisation. Although there was a high attempt rate of 99.4% due to candidates including incorrect information the mean was only 10/ 20 which is low at half marks.

# PHYSICAL EDUCATION

## GCE

Summer 2025

### UNIT 4: REFINING PERSONAL PERFORMANCE IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

#### Overview of the Unit

The NEA is worth 24% of the full qualification (40% of the AS qualification). It comprises of the following areas:

- Practical performance in one activity as a player/performer, coach or official.
- Investigative Research.

In 2025, most centres opted for live practical moderation days. Some centres with smaller entries opted for remote moderation and used video evidence.

CPD at the start of the year ensured that centres were aware of the protocols for both live and remote moderation. Most centres followed correct protocol and ensured effective organisation of the live and remote moderation days respectively. Most candidates continue to be accurately assessed, and performing remains the preferred option over coaching or officiating for nearly all candidates.

Centres are reminded that the moderator should, whenever possible, be informed prior to the day of candidates who are unable to participate in/attend the moderation. Centres are also reminded of the need to film the live moderation day in its entirety and then submit this film within a week of the moderation taking place. Centres are encouraged to maintain communication with moderators to ensure a smooth and effective moderation process.

#### Comments on individual questions/sections

##### Practical Performance (Performer / Coach / Official)

Assessment of practical activities continues to improve in accuracy with nearly all assessments in the correct band. Most candidates chose to be examined in the role of performer. As was the case in Unit 2 there were many outstanding performers who secured marks at the highest level. Most candidates were assessed as being in Band 5 or the top of Band 4. For off-site activities, the most effective evidence included video footage of the candidate in a variety of competitive situations or performing Rich Tasks. Teachers' assessments were generally accurate with marking criteria correctly applied and clear evidence of improved standardisation.

Centres should try to arrange for candidates to perform in the best facilities possible to allow them to perform at their optimum level on moderation day. The most effective centres had pre-organised bibs or numbers to ensure that candidates were easily recognisable before the activities had started. They also provided these lists to the moderator at the start of the day to ensure a fast and effective programme. Centres are encouraged to ensure that any video evidence clearly shows where and why candidates have accessed certain marks and that it is authenticated within the qualification start date.

A small minority of candidates elected to be assessed as coaches or officials. Generally, these candidates had been coaching or officiating for a significant amount of time, and many held several qualifications to support their marks. The majority of these candidates coach or officiate regularly, either in a school setting e.g. extra-curricular activities/assisting with the coaching of school teams, or coaching / officiating activities in clubs within the wider community. The most effective sessions were well-planned, demonstrated excellent subject knowledge and were delivered with excellent communication skills. Aims of the sessions were clear, organisation was effective with smooth transitions between activities and constructive feedback was also given. As a result, a significant number of candidates had been assessed as being in the top of Band 4 or in Band 5.

Centres are reminded to ensure that the video recording of the day allows candidates and their performances to be clearly identified (both from a visual and auditory perspective). The video footage should also be accompanied with player ID lists / team sheets when uploading evidence onto IAMIS.

### **Investigative Research**

Once again, CPD at the start of the year helped centres and candidates to improve the general standard of projects in 2025. The strongest aspect of candidates' work was once again the initial self-analysis of their performance. Many candidates used a combination of fitness testing, coach feedback and performance/notational analysis to produce a sound analysis of their current performance, whilst also providing appropriate quantitative data.

Most candidates chose to investigate physical or technical aspects of their performance. The majority of centres are becoming more effective at helping students to generate quantitative data. This is especially true in the case of activities where there is less of a reliance/ use of quantitative data in the first instance.

Analysis and evaluation of the programme continues to be an area that candidates find most challenging (especially the analysis of relevant quantitative data).

A small number of centres failed to annotate candidates' work. The centres that provided detailed annotation were generally more accurate in the application of assessment criteria. All centres are encouraged to annotate candidates' Investigative Research projects. Annotation should clearly highlight where marks have been awarded from the assessment criteria within the specification.

## Supporting you

### Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 02922 404271

Email: [physicaleducation@wjec.co.uk](mailto:physicaleducation@wjec.co.uk)

Qualification webpage: [AS/A Level Physical Education | WJEC](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | WJEC](#)

### CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

### WJEC Qualifications

As Wales' largest awarding body, WJEC supports its education community by providing trusted bilingual qualifications, specialist support, and reliable assessment to schools and colleges across the country. This allows our learners to reach their full potential.

With more than 70 years' experience, we are also amongst the leading providers in both England and Northern Ireland.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)