

Every sport has its risks. But some sports come with an extra layer of risk, which is why it's important for players of those sports to take precautions by wearing what ever protective equipment is available to reduce those risks. This goes for protective headgear in soccer. Protective headgear should be mandatory for soccer players because it has shown to be affective at reducing the risk of concussions.

U.S. Soccer player, Ali Krieger wears headgear because she knows what it's like to suffer a concussion. Her reasonably priced headgear, made by Unrequel, has opened the door to a discussion about why headgear is important especially for kids. (Text 1)

Lines 12-13 says, "George Connelly, head woman's soccer coach at Holy Family High School [Colorado], has been requiring his players to wear headbands." He says, "I just feel the added protection they give... is worth the minor discomfort." (lines 20-21)

He's right, although some say "there's little scientific research showing these headbands prevent concussions." (lines 8-9). The fact is FIFA researchers put crash test dummies to the test. They "outfitted crash test dummies heads with various types of soccer headgear. Early studies had shown that soccer player's heads sometimes collided at speeds up to 2.5 meters p/second So the researchers dropped one dummie head against another at approximetly that speed. They found that the headgear reduced peak linear acceleration by a third." (Text 2, lines 47-52)

This is proof it works to reduce concussions. It may not eliminate them completely but its important to make sure that some protection is there. Some protection is better than no protection and that's why Ali Krieger decided to wear hers. Now she is able to protect her own head and make other players see the benefits too.

Some protection is better than no protection from concussion and other injury. That is why, even though more research should be done, soccer coaches like George Connolly should make all their players wear headgear and why sould be mandatory in soccer.

Anchor Level 3–A

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Protective headgear should be mandatory for soccer players because it has shown to be affective at reducing the risk of concussions*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts (*It may not eliminate them completely but its important to make sure that some protection is there*), as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*He's right, although some say "there's little scientific research showing these headbands prevent concussions"*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*U.S. soccer player, Ali Krieger wears headgear because she knows what it's like to suffer a concussion and FIFA reserchers ... "outfitted crash test dummies heads with varous types of soccer headgear. Early studies had shown ... that the headgear reduced peak linear acceleration by a third"*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, by identifying line numbers but not always clarifying texts [*(Text 1) Lines 12–13 says* and *(lines 8–9)*]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, first introducing a claim emphasizing that *some sports come with an extra layer of risk* and that *protective equipment is available to reduce those risks*, then moving to three body paragraphs supplying evidence to support the need for mandatory headgear and identifying support for why it works, then concluding that *some protection is better than no protection*. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*Her reasonably priced headgear, made by Unequal, has opened the door to a discusion about why headgear is important*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*what ever; concussions; important especially; kids. (Text 1); woman's; coarch; reserchers; dummies heads; varous; its important; sould*) that do not hinder comprehension. The essay addresses fewer texts than required by the task and can be scored no higher than a 3.

Do you think it should be made mandatory for soccer players to wear helmets or guards? I don't like soccer but still I don't think it should be mandatory for them to wear the ~~the~~ head gear.

One reason I think not is because of what is stated in article 1 "Athletes may become more aggressive knowing that they have an extra layer of protection, so it could actually increase injury." Coaches who already make their players wear the headband say "it is poppycock." ~~the~~ The reason they say that is because if you are a coach you will be trying to get the best from your players, so as a coach you wouldn't admit that your players need extra equipment to try their hardest.

I also don't think so because in article 2 it says "In one experiment, held by FIFA researchers shot balls from a mechanical launcher at a subject holding accelerometers in his mouth, and found that the head gear made little to no difference to the movements of his head." A concussion is caused when the brain hits the skull due to trauma and swells if they are not lessening the movement, therefore the chance of a concussion, what would the point be in making it mandatory for the players to ~~wear~~ ^{wear} them?

and the final reason ~~is~~ can be found in text 3 "For girls, whose neck muscles are often weaker

than boys – a helmet or other headgear makes the head heavier... since girls already face a higher concussion risk, a headgear could be especially dangerous." If the equipment you use has a chance to cause more injury than without the idea should be burned then and there.

In all it comes down to the individual player if they want to wear it or not but as to the question of if it should be mandatory or not it is a resounding no on my behalf.

Anchor Level 3–B

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*I don't think it should be mandatory for them to wear the headgears*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*The reason they say that is because if you are a coach you will be trying to get the best from your players and If the equipment you use has a chance to cause more injury ... the idea should be burned*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Coaches who already make their player wear the headband say "it is poppycock"*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*"Athletes may become more aggressive knowing that they have an extra layer of protection and "In one experiment, held by FIFA researchers shot balls from a mechanical launcher ... made little to no difference to the movements of his head"*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, identifying only the text (*in article 1 and text 3*) but not providing the line numbers and sometimes misquoting evidence. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces the claim, three paragraphs that support the claim (*if they are not lessening the movement ... what would the point be in making it mandatory*), and a brief conclusion that reiterates that mandating headgear should be a *resounding no*. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*One reason I think not is because of what is stated in article 1 and In all it comes down to the individual player if they want to wear it or not*) with some inexact words (*were* for "wear" and *headgears* for "headgear"). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*mandatory, helmets, guards, like soccer but still I, their player wear, concussion, therefore, and the final, whos, more injury than without the idea, In all it comes, not but as*) that hinder comprehension.

In Soccer I think they should have headbands, why well because what if there is a concussion. I ~~am~~ agree with the ~~B~~ headband because its safe for the soccer players. In the ~~text~~ text 1 it talks about how the ~~athletes~~ Athletes are going to become more aggressive because they know they have a extra layer of protection.

In my opinion I dont think the athletes should become more aggressive just because they have a layer of protection.

In text 2 it talks about more about the headgear in Soccer. "A competitive 16-year-old soccer player, Lauren Skeen was leaping for a ~~head~~ head ball when she craked ~~her~~ ~~head~~ into the head of an opposing player. It was her second such collision, and this time she fell into a grand mal seizure^(p. 1)" In this quote it talks about how she craked ~~her~~ ^{into} head while doing a head ball and fell and into a seizure. This is why I ~~am~~ agree with the concussion band because its safe and it can save your life. ~~B~~ In text 4 it talks about

protecting heads. In the text it talks about how the types of injuries in soccer. "Despite the frequency of those of ~~many~~ injuries in soccer, you won't see many international pros wearing gear that ~~would~~ might prevent a concussion - ~~re~~ reinforced headbands."

Is this quote means just because wearing a protection band doesn't mean that it's going to protect you well well, like I'm sure it's ~~if~~ you'll be injured bad but ~~if~~ you won't die.

In this text I read about protection like head gear is safe for sports, how it will help while a game is going on.

Anchor Level 3–C

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*In soccer I think they should have head bands, why well because what if there is a concussion*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*This is why I agree with the concussion band because its safe and it can save you're life*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*This quote means just because wearing a protection band doesnt mean that its going to protect you well well, like Im sure you'll be injured bad but you wont die*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*"A competitive 16-year-old soccer player, Lauren Skeen was leaping for a head ball when she craked into the head of an opposing player. It was her second such collision, and this time she fell into a grand mal seizure"* and *"Despite the frequecy of those of injuries in soccer, you wont see many international pros wearing gear that might prevent a concussion — reinforced headbands"*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, citing three texts, but not all being properly punctuated or having line references, and some being quoted inaccurately (*In the text 1 it* and *In text 2 it*). The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, consisting of an opening paragraph that introduces the claim and counterclaim, followed by a paragraph that exemplifies support of the claim and then one that briefly addresses a counterclaim, and concluding with a restatement of the basis for the claim (*In this text I read about protection like head gear is safe for sports, how it will help while a game is going on*). The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate (*well well, like Im sure*) and imprecise (*In this quote it talks about how she craked into head while doing a head ball and fell and into a seizure* and *In the text it talks about how the types of injuries in soccer*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*bands, why; what if ... concussion.; agressive; a extra; dont; craked; its; you're life; frequecy; doesnt; you well; Im; wont*) that make comprehension difficult.

I would say that headgear is just psychological. The thought of it just sounds safe, and it looks more safe but it's not needed. But if you really think about it for a minute you will realize the same way a rubber bumper-shield on a car can only help for a soft bump and not for a highway crash, so to these helmets can only help for little bumps and not for hard bangs.

This will explain why in text 3 lines 5-12 the doctors say it doesn't help for regular safety but it helps for big trauma and other things.

For the same reason in text 4 there were a group of parents that sued to ~~forcing~~ force the wearing of head gear. This is because parents are always way too protective over their kids and nervous ~~about~~ about them. Like we find in text 13

we find Jeff Skeen a parent of a girl that had a few concussions would lose money on making new types of helmets just because his daughter had some concussions.

This can only come from an overly nervous parent.

But really the head gear just looks safe and doesn't need to be used. Most don't get big traumas from it. They get little ones that make parents scared and parents want to help but the headgear doesn't stop little concussions so it doesn't help.

That's why they shouldn't be in soccer.

Anchor Level 2–A

The essay introduces a claim, as directed by the task (*headgear ... looks more safe but it's not needed*). The essay demonstrates confused and unclear analysis of the texts (*the doctors say it doesn't help for regular safety but it helps for big trauma*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (*there were a group of parents that sued to force the wearing of head gear. This is because parents are always way to protective*), making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant (*Jeff Skeen ... would lose money on making new types of helmets just because his daughter had some concussions*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources (*text 3 lines 5–12, text 4, text 13*), excluding line numbers in one instance and replacing the text number with the line number in another. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, by first comparing car bumpers and headgear and stating neither can support hard crashes, then transitioning to a second paragraph that supplies text support that disproves the claim, moves to a third paragraph that presents a new argument about *overly nervous parent* and concludes with a restatement of the claim (*But really the head gear just looks safe and doesn't need to be used*) and a contradiction of the initial analysis (*the headgear doesn't stop little concussions so it doesn't help*). The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate or imprecise (*hard bangs, big trauma, other things, were* for “was”, *to* for “too”, *there kids, Most don't get*). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*sichological; safe, and; But ... for a minute you; regular, trauma, Jeff Skeen a parent ... concotions would*) that hinder comprehension.

I tink soccer player should NOT use
hedgear cause it be difficult to play
socer w/ the hedgear. According to the
tex 1 womans can use the hedband
because they help to hold womans
hair so they can run better with
out hair on there face On line
35-40 the Director for health
rejected the idea that theres no
down side to wearing the hedbands.
Once you put a protective band on
some ones head they start to play
the game different" he said.
the player may become more
agresive knowing that they they
have and xtra Layer of protection,

Anchor Level 2-B

The essay introduces a claim (*I tink soccer player should NOT use hedgear cause it be difficult to play soccer w/the hedgear*). The essay demonstrates confused and unclear analysis of the texts (*womans can use the hedband because they help to hold womans hair so they can run better*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently in an attempt to support analysis (*it be difficult to play soccer w/ the hedgear ... they help to hold womans hair so they can run better*), making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant (*the player may become more aggressive*). The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material (*According to the tex 1 and On Line 35-40*). The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, using a single paragraph to prove that headgear would make playing soccer *difficult* but then disproving this claim with an example from Text 1, then providing an irrelevant quote that speaks to aggressive playing. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate and imprecise (*cause* for “because”, *According to the tex 1, so they can run better, there* for “their”, and for “an”, *xtra*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*tink; soccer; player; hedgear ... it be; difficult; tex; womans can; Face on Line; theres; some ones; said. the*) that make comprehension difficult.

There are many argument about if soccer players should wear protective head bands or not.

According to article 1 pg 3 "~~the~~ And while little ~~research~~ research is given, . . . only reduces risk." This is saying that ~~the~~ there might only be a little bit of research but it does still reduce the chance of a concussion.

There is many different article and opinions ~~on~~ whether ~~the~~ head bands should be manditory or not it can be either or to be honest. You decide whether it should or not. ~~I pick~~

Anchor Level 2-C

The essay does not introduce a claim. The essay presents confused or unclear analysis of the texts (*There are many argument about if soccer players should wear protective head bands or not*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently (*According to article 1 ... it does still reduce the chance of a concussion*), in an attempt to support analysis. The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when paraphrasing material (*article 1 pg 3*). The essay exhibits little organization of ideas and information, introducing a single inconclusive statement about mandatory soccer headgear, followed by a brief summary of a quote from Text 1 in paragraph two, and concluding with another paragraph stating *there is many different article and opinions on soccer headgear* and leaving it to the reader to decide. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate or imprecise (*if* for “whether”, *pg*, *a little bit of*, *is* for “are”, *to be honest*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*argument, soccore, article 1 pg 3, manditory, not it can be*) that make comprehension difficult.

People get Concussions everyday, Sometimes they are more serious than others. People especially get concussions when playing contact sports contact sports can be very dangerous and some think that we can do even more to protect ourselves.

You can get serious brain damage from concussions and it can lead you down the road of trouble. Many people think that concussions are just some little head injury but it's really more than that. It can cause brain damage and other serious health problems.

Anchor Level 1–A

The essay does not introduce a claim, stating that *contact sports can be very dangerous and some think that we can do even more to protect ourselves*, and does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the texts and does not make use of citations. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, consisting of an opening paragraph that discusses *concussions when playing contact sports* and a second paragraph which discusses the *serious* injuries caused by contact sports. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate (*can lead you down the road of trouble* and *concussions are just some little head injury*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*everyday*, *Sometimes* and *contact sports contact sports*) that do not hinder comprehension. The essay is a personal response, making little reference to the task or texts, and can be scored no higher than a 1.

Across majority of the text headgear should
be worn whenever sports are being played. This
could save player from major to minor injuries
that sports come with.

Anchor Level 1-B

The essay does not introduce a claim, stating that *headgear should be worn whenever sports are being played* and does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents little or no evidence from the texts, stating that *This could save player from major to minor injuries that sports come with*. The essay does not make use of citations. The essay is minimal, consisting of two sentences, making assessment of coherence, organization, and style unreliable. The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

The nature of sports originates from entertainment and competition among peers. However, sports have more dangerous aspects attached, creating harmful situations. Certain equipment and protective gear have been enlisted in sports to protect players. Although it is important to have safety options, specific protective sportswear could hinder the sports safety and attitude altogether. The utilization of protective headbands in soccer is unnecessary and could possibly endanger the players more than before.

Many experiments and studies have been conducted in order to ~~prove~~ foresee the positive or negative impacts protective headbands have on preventing/reducing concussions. Within the data derived from the experimental studies, headbands and helmets showed that there were still concussions, however the severity of them was reduced. This information does not change the overall statistic of concussions. Protective headgear/headbands are not suitable enough for differing concussion reasons. It is likely that proper training and techniques are the best way to counter (for 3.1.3/4) concussions. "Players who understand soccer's rules and accepted norms are less likely to play aggressively or put themselves in harm's way." Previous studies and educated opinions display how protective headwear does not in fact lower concussion statistics, therefore they should not be used to impede the style of the game as a whole.

Although the need for protective headgear during soccer is not necessary, some may say that it is a safety necessity. Concussions can have harmful effects on the brain, and with the rate of concussions in soccer increasing, many believe there should be safety precautions and additional protective gear. Studies evaluating

headbands on soccer players showed a decrease in severity of the concussion. "... five stars translates to a reduction in concussion risk of at least 70 percent for the impacts tested." (text 4 L. 33-34). The main concern of injuries comes from worried mothers trying to protect their children. Although wearing the headgear may be beneficial for some, they still should not be used during the game.

The utilization of protective headgear in soccer can also make the sport more dangerous and confusing. Once players believe they are completely protected, they might begin to feel invincible while playing. "Athletes may become more aggressive knowing that they have an extra layer of protection, so the headband could actually increase injury." (text 1 L. 39-40). Players may become more rough and aggressive while playing due to their belief that they are safe. Also, the use of headgear can also change how the game is played. In instances, many players had to figure out how to head the ball differently and how to play regularly with the headgear on. Protective headbands/helmets will not drastically improve the concussion rates statistics, they will only inhibit how a player plays the game.

The controversial topic over protection in sports has persisted onward towards women's soccer. Although the protective headbands seems like a beneficial safety precaution, they will only cause more trouble. Most importantly, players can be exposed to more harmful players due to a invincible mindset. Also, the entire nature and attitude of the game would change. The use of safety headbands will impede on the fun/entertainment aspect of the sport. ~~moreover~~ The appreciation and style of the game would be lost.

Part 2 – Practice Paper – B

Athletes are commonly injured, and though protective gear has decreased the frequency of some injuries, concussions are still occurring. Except forⁱⁿ football, most athletes don't wear helmets while playing their sport, so concussions comprise a large percentage of sports (specifically soccer) injuries. Protective headgear should be mandatory for athletes that play soccer, because it will decrease the risk of^a concussion even ~~at~~ during head collisions.

Some people say that protective headgear, such as concussion prevention headbands won't help, or even that wearing such headgear would increase the risk of concussions. They argue that headgear makes the head heavier, so whiplash would be more prevalent, and that it wouldn't change the impact during a head-to-ball collision (Text 3, lines 22-24). However, studies have shown that head-to-ball collisions don't generally cause concussions because the ball absorbs most of the impact force. (Text 2, line 18)

In addition, the initial analysis from an ongoing study indicates that "there's no indication that using [headbands] increases the risk of head injury". (Text 4, lines 52-53)

There are a few reasons for mandatory headgear in soccer. One such reason is the rate of concussions ~~x~~ in the sport. A study in the American Journal of Sports Medicine stated that "women's soccer had the second highest rate of concussions among high school athletes" (Text 1, line 26); ~~second~~ only football had a higher rate. In addition, girls ~~have~~ ^{are} at higher risk of concussion than boys (Text 1, line 27-28).

This suggests that headgear should be mandatory at the very least for women's soccer. Any type of protection that would reduce the risk of concussions should be mandatory for athletes playing the sport.

Another reason for mandatory headgear is the degree to which ~~they are~~ it is effective. Tests have shown that "some brands can reduce the impact of a concussive blow by more than 70 percent". (Text 4, line 7-8) This decrease in impact would lower the severity of a concussion even if ~~an~~ not entirely precluding ~~any~~ injury. In a head-to-head collision at 3 m/s, the risk of concussion was "56% with ~~it~~ was 56% with "10% without headgear and 5% with". (Text 2, line 55) This is a 50% decrease in ~~risk~~ risk, which is quite significant.

To conclude, science is on the side of headgear. It ~~lowers~~ greatly lowers the risk of^s concussion, and mitigates the force of impact during a collision, so it should be mandatory for soccer players.

I think that they should not wear head gear in soccer because it not garateed that the head gear will protect your head cause in one of the passages they said that they sued one of the compaines cause it did not help the person.

When we think about serious head injuries sustained in various sporting activities, we often picture football players piling on one another in a scramble to retrieve a fumbled ball, or the hockey goalie taking a line-drive puck to the noggin, or even the NASCAR driver slamming into a concrete wall. What we do not picture is the elegant, flying, head shot a soccer player makes to score the winning goal or the mid-air collision between two soccer players both going for the ball. Concussions are a real concern in sports today, especially as medical experts learn more and more about their long-term effects. Causing anything from memory loss, seizures, or in ferocious impacts, even death, protection from concussions is a hot topic in sports. So why does it seem so natural that the first three sports mentioned above require protective headgear but when it comes to soccer, there is controversy over its use? ~~What~~ The answer has to do with the contradictions in the conversation. So, should protective headgear be mandatory in soccer? Surprisingly, probably, not.

There is much skepticism surrounding the efficiency of soccer headgear. Considering that the average soccer player "heads the ball 10-12 times per game and performs at least 2000 headers during a 20-year career in addition to ~~to~~ repetitive heading drills in training" (Text 2, lines 26-27) with a concussion rate resulting in "23 percent of all game injuries" for boys and "30 percent of all game injuries" for girls (Text 3, lines 14-16), it would seem more people, especially in sports medicine, would be pushing the US Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer to require some ~~sort~~ form of headgear, much like the NFL, NHL and NASCAR do of their athletes. But again, the arguments for headgear rely on dramatic stories and inconclusive test results that sometimes indicate that they do more harm than good, not protecting ^{soccer} athletes from

the most common forms of concussions in their sport.

While a FIFA study indicated that the harder a head-to-head collision using headgear resulted in a smaller ratio of concussion compared to those without headgear (Text 2, lines 47-56), there are also sports medicine experts who say that the this test does not show the bigger picture. According to Dr. James Robinson and Dr. Larry Lemak, this test does not account for the more common concussion causing injury of whiplash when a heavier head knocks into another head at an angle (Text 3, lines 20-29). Nor does it take into account the "cumulative trauma" of heading the ball (Text 3). Even Jeff Steen, designer and owner of soccer headgear company, Full 90, admits to designing headgear that is only designed to cushion blows of head-to-head trauma, not repetitive head-to-head trauma, "We're trying to make the headgear ignore ^{the} head-to-ball impact, because if you reduce the impact you would slow the rebound speed or direction of the ball" (Text 2, lines 36-37). Based on this statement, one of the top brands isn't looking to protect soccer players from cumulative trauma at all for fear of changing the game; its design is meant only for the occasional collisions between players. But do the players realize this?

According to St. Paul's soccer coach, Chad Threlson, "Sometimes the kids wearing headgear are more reckless... because they think they have that added layer of protection" (Text 3, lines 32-34).

University of Colorado's associate director for health and performance, Miguel Rueda, agrees saying, "Once you put a protective band on someone's head, they start to play the game differently" ~~and~~ claiming that athletes "become more aggressive" and that the headbands "could actually increase injury" (Text 1, lines 35-41).

But the true support against headgear in soccer is ~~fully~~ supported through physics, and goes back to the most common head impacts – heading the ball. "Researchers have suggested that headgear causes a change in the radius of the head," changing the ball's momentum when it makes contact with the head while the head is in motion (Text 2, lines 29-30). Add this to the added aggression of the player who feels protected by the headgear, thus adding momentum of the head and the impact will be greater. "That could explain why one study showed that volunteers who headed a soccer ball 15 times in 15 minutes suffered small but significant short-term memory losses if they wore headgear, but not if their heads were bare" (Text 2, lines 31-33).

Of course, there are studies that also show the headgear's benefits, much like the FIFA study, and those that would argue that protection from any type of concussion makes the headgear worthy of being made mandatory, especially ^{by} younger players, but the experts in the game itself have hesitations about putting the gear on and taking the hits. The majority of soccer impacts are not the same as American football impacts or hockey impacts or car racing impacts. Any studies that suggest the headgear could be more damaging than helpful should be taken seriously. ~~and~~ All sports assume some amount of risk. If the goal is to eliminate the risk, then the game shouldn't be played at all, but if the goal is to mitigate the risk then it would make no sense at all to add headgear that would make players feel that risk has been eliminated and take more aggressive chances with how they use the head to attack the ball and "head off" other players. And it would make no sense at all to add headgear that creates physical properties to an impact situation that creates faster, harder hits at more dangerous angles. At this time, soccer headgear

Part 2 – Practice Paper – D

has not been proven to be a means of eliminating the risk of
concussions in the sport or of reducing a player's long-term
concussive effects.

Protective head gear are very important in football as in American football as it can help prevent most concussions because of player being knock to the ground by other big strong heavy players. So dose soccer ^{players} need helmet when you think of soccer it people pass a ball around to hit it in to a using only their feet and most injure are around their legs. So we don't need helmet for soccer players, right? while the answer is yes as old as it seem.

When a player's all have their eyes focus on the ball some time they may hit into the person with the ball and their heads will bash in to one another's head. Some may say it dose hurt its a scratch but in text of line 30 it state; "direct head to head hits generated a force of 150g (150 times the accelerative force of gravity) compared to an average of 100g during football hits." AS this shows Soccer player will take more damage than foot ball players with helmets and they are facing more danger.

Practice Paper A – Score Level 4

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4.

Practice Paper B – Score Level 5

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 5.

Practice Paper C – Score Level 1

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 1.

Practice Paper D – Score Level 6

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 6.

Practice Paper E – Score Level 2

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2.