

Examiners' Report

June 2010

GCE

GCE Physical Education 6PE02

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

June 2010

Publications Code US024528 / US024529

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

AS Task Analysis:

2.4.1 Technical Analysis: Candidates in this section should include all aspects of the criteria, in terms of technical, tactical, physiological, biomechanical and psychological. All candidates included the 'technical' - covering the phases of the skill and points of technique, unfortunately some just downloaded pictures and points of technique from the BBC website. The 'tactical' was also covered quite well; for example candidates did get across under what circumstances you would use that skill, for example I would put a high kick in rugby to put the opposition full back under pressure. The 'biomechanical' and the 'physiological' were areas that were not covered in my opinion particularly well; many candidates explained what muscles were being used, but it was fairly generic instead of linking in movement and muscles with the technique, they merely mentioned hamstrings and quads are used in this action, whereas they could have explained, for example, that when striking a football plantar flexion occurs at the ankle, initiated by the gastrocnemius. However, these aspects were covered in more detail than 'psychological'. In most cases this was not covered at all. Some candidates showed initiative where tactics was less of an issue, by commenting on the psychological, such as how a sprinter gets into the 'zone' before a 100m race. A number of candidates failed to reference their work appropriately. Some did not even include a bibliography. This was considered to be the best produced task of the paper and in the main it was marked quite well by centres, although there was some generosity.

2.4.2 Tactical Analysis: Candidates in this section are required to explore a wide range of tactics and strategies in their chosen activity, with depth and technical accuracy. For example a golfer may explore such strategies as when and where to play a draw or fade, calculating risks, different strategies for different competitions and so on. A basketball player could explore a variety of attacking and defensive formations and when they would be appropriate. Candidates could also have concentrated on tactics they would use as a coach, or they could also explore the variety of tactics used by elite leaders and compared these to the tactics they use in their school or club matches. However, much of the work was a little limited and did not cover the full spectrum. A number of centres seemed to have encouraged candidates to re-write the rule book. This was not appropriate. It would have been more appropriate to review say the offside rule then discuss the offside trap and various strategies to 'beat the offside trap'. At its best this work was well researched and written but where no reference was made to technical journals/NGB materials candidates struggled to produce work of sufficient quality to justify the marks awarded by centres.

2.4.3 Notational Analysis: This section requires candidates to undertake a minimum of three notations to complete this section and to achieve top marks, needed to produce an in depth analysis of the statistics resulting from the exercise. For example some of the better candidates explored passes forward sideways and backwards and ones that led to a direct chance on goal. The particular candidates analysis of the statistics has led him to conclude player A made more successful passes, but they were sideways and backwards, where as player B made more forward passes, but were less successful, but resulted in more scoring opportunities and therefore was more effective as an attacking midfielder etc. Many candidates, however did not produce the depth required for advanced level, with many making descriptive rather than analytical comments.

It was felt that the notations were merely summarised and descriptive and that they lacked analysis. There was a lack of identifying there core skills and developing them through analysis which would have been forefront in their training. Centre staff need to perhaps give greater guidance and use the IAG.

2.4.4 Training Analysis: In this section candidates should be covering the key components of training for performance across the full spectrum of technical, physiological and tactical. In this assignment candidates should identify the various steps and procedures to improve their performance and identify what course of action is available to help facilitate this. For example they should include fitness, skill and tactical training in this component. Many unfortunately only explored the physiological and neglected the other aspects, yet centres were still awarding high marks. In the main the candidates simply included their fitness programme, with no analysis or reference to their core skills. A weak section which centres over marked.

2.4.5 Analyses of Strengths and Weaknesses: In this section the candidates need to have reviewed their own strengths and weaknesses through the full spectrum of technical, tactical, physiological biomechanical and psychological. The candidates should also have been supplying quantifiable evidence to identify their strengths & weaknesses and then detail how they could improve weaknesses. For example they may state their cardio-vascular fitness is a weakness, their evidence is that they are regularly substituted before the end of the match because of fatigue. They then can back this up by using evidence of a low score in the beep test to further substantiate this. They then need to explain how they will improve their cardio-vascular fitness. They may state their defensive heading is a strength they can use evidence from their coach or even on statistical evidence for example the last game I played I cleared 90% of headers out of the box. Unfortunately the work of many of the candidates did not match up with this criteria. Some candidates merely produced a performance wheel and made little attempt to detail and analyse their ratings. Also many did not suggest strategies to improve their weaknesses. Again, very few referred back to their initial core skills which is the purpose of this task.

Task Analysis:

Most Centres had marked this section of coursework slightly high. The notational task was the one where Centres had been too generous in their allocation.

- a) A wide range of quality was seen. Most candidates started well with task 1 but tended to flag as they went through the tasks.
- Task 2.1 was only completed to the correct standard by a few top students in each centre. Many candidates did some very good technical breakdown but failed to mention muscles, types of movement, type of contraction. Some centres had access to some fantastic technology to aid with this task.
- Task 2.2 again was only completed to the correct standard by a few top students in each centre. Many students tended to only mention one or two tactics and failed to relate these to themselves or elite athletes.
- Task 2.3 Many centres marked this area too generously with some centres providing nothing but tally charts. Only a very few candidates went into the depth of analysis required.
- Task 2.4 Most candidates were able to identify some of the necessary fitness requirements for their sport and some provided training logs, but very few candidates analysed the effects of training or impact on performance. Analysis tended to be generic terms rather than a personal impact.
- Task 2.5 Most centres encouraged students to write under the suggested headings, but many students failed to go into any real analysis and only gave brief descriptions which were very general in nature.
- Overall: Most centres obviously gave students a “template” to work from but this varied immensely from centre to centre, with some centres directing students in the wrong direction!!

Quality of work was dependent by the guidance of the centre. It is evident which centres are well prepared, and therefore candidates benefit with the quality of work produced.

Difficulties relating to assessment:

Areas most over marked were Notational Analysis, Training Analysis, Strengths and weaknesses. Perhaps more guidance and better quality exemplars on the Web site are needed.

Administrative Matters:

As there was a delay receiving OPTEMs, this caused some confusion with several centres.

A lot of centres had something wrong which meant a lot of time spent contacting centres for further work, some not sending the highest and lowest candidate. There is still a problem with not being able to open files and to moderate the work.

Grade Boundaries:

Unit 2:

Grade	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw Mark	90	79	70	62	54	46	38	0
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

Unit 4:

Grade	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw Mark	90	84	78	68	59	50	41	32	0
UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US024528 / US024529 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH