



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Physical Education (6PE03) Paper 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6PE03_01_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

To be successful in 6PE03 candidates need a good understanding of the command words. Candidates must be familiar with what each command word requires them to do. The weakest performance by far was on explain questions where candidates are required to link points together. There was some excellent understanding demonstrated on some topic areas such as adaptations to the heart, attribution theory and knowledge of the system in America for nurturing sporting talent. Some topics were not so well known such as the role of UK sport and the ways the body removes lactic acid. The essay questions were pleasing with more candidates accessing the higher bands by using more scientific knowledge and drawing from the breadth of the specification.

6PE03_01_Q01

This question was accessible to all students but many lost marks as they were not scientific enough in their response or were confusing terminology. Those who knew this well regularly scored full marks with all areas of the mark scheme being utilised. Those not scoring as highly were too generic in their responses and were not specific enough with the information that they gave. Unnecessary answers were also given such as sporting examples to support the system which were not required in this answer. Many candidates did not show evidence of the whole pathway or were not able to show a logical account of the process. Candidates did seem familiar with fat being able to be used. There was some confusion about how many ATP were made at each stage of the process.

6PE03_01_Q02

Many candidates scored only 3 marks because they did not link points together. More able candidates are able to link process with outcome. Many candidates referred to heart rate and breathing rate being high but did not refer to above resting levels. There were many well known facts about this topic such as removal of waste products, restoration of ATP, PC and Glycogen, but unless these could be linked the maximum mark was three. Outcomes tended to be referenced rather than the physiological processes. Lactic acid removal was often stated but this was not linked to oxidation or conversion to other products. More focus is needed to linking points in preparing candidates for explain questions.

6PE03_01_Q03

Those candidates who were able to understand the question often scored full marks. The most common answers were oxidation to carbon dioxide and water, conversion to protein, glycogen and glucose. Less candidates were knowledgeable about it being used in muscles, removed by non - working muscles and kidneys.

6PE03_01_Q04

This question was generally well answered by candidates. They were very familiar with the terms stroke volume, cardiac output, and bradycardia. Some marks were lost in capillarisation and vascularisation not being mentioned to be at the heart specifically. All points on the mark scheme were well known and many candidates knew this topic area in great depth.

6PE03_01_Q05a

This question was well answered. A few students confused the dimensions, but most were very familiar with the diagram and could apply their knowledge of the elements. There was overall a good understanding of the theory with many responses including the necessary detail for 5 or 6 marks. Some candidates tried to apply the theory in this question which was not required until question 5b. This question was only about the theory. Task difficulty was occasionally replaced with competition or opposition instead, although effort, luck and ability were well known.

6PE03_01_Q05b

The good understanding of attribution theory from 5a allowed the opportunity for application in this question. Though candidates often answered as if they were the coach and therefore answers lacked the scientific terminology required. Where it was answered as an exam question with scientific understanding responses were better. Candidates were very familiar with luck, referee, and bad pitch conditions. They often did not link this back to the theory missing vital marks e.g. attribute losing to external factors. Many examples were known to support answers. There was a stronger focus on external factors with many examples and less attention to examples associated with internal factors.

6PE03_01_Q06

Many candidates displayed knowledge of factors that could affect group cohesion but were often not able to state the specific factors. They seemed unfamiliar with Carron's model. Often two marks were scored. Examples were known but needed to be linked to specific factors. Sometimes factors were known but not explained very well. Common responses were Personal, Environmental, Leadership and Team factors. Full marks were awarded when two specific factors were names, well explained and then linked to examples.

6PE03_01_Q07

This question suggested that candidates divided their answer into advantages and disadvantages. We do not provide the structure for this in the answer lines but candidates could have set their answer out in this format which would have made it clearer for them to see if they had two of each. The most common answers given were about money being better spent at the base of the pyramid, athletes having to relocate and links to medals won as an advantage. Candidates were not all familiar with the whole scope of the mark scheme.

6PE03_01_Q08

This question was very well answered by the majority of candidates and they had a good knowledge and understanding of the system for developing sporting talent in the USA. Often there were more than 5 points made. The whole mark scheme was used and there was detailed knowledge of every element demonstrated. Points made were often concise and specific. This has been well taught in centres. Knowledge of scholarships, the draft system, elite coaching and facilities and draft were especially strong.

6PE03_01_Q09

This question was not well answered. Candidates were most familiar with the world class programme, identification of talent and the running of the UKSI network. They also spoke of maximising chances in international events. However, much of the mark scheme was not familiar to candidates. Very few candidates scored highly on this question. There were some very generic answers given such as UK sport oversees sport in the UK, UK sport distributes funding to athletes - but no detail about how, and that UK sport provides top class coaches. All of which were not specific enough to score marks. There appeared to be knowledge that UK sport focussed on elite performance but many responses focussed on the athlete rather than the organisation. For example, athlete receiving top coaches, funds, and so on rather than the roles of UK sport. There was little understanding of anti-doping, bids for international events or liaison with other world governing bodies.

6PE03_01_Q10

There were many candidates who did not attempt the whole of the question. There are two elements to the question: discussing the theories, and then suggesting how an athlete might use them. There was some very good knowledge of appropriate theories - mostly inverted U, drive and catastrophe. However many good essays on the theory then went on to miss strategies. Only the best candidates were able to debate the theories. A discussion needs the debate of the information to access high marks.

6PE03_01_Q11

Candidates were very familiar with environmental factors. However, the crucial part of the question is the reference to preparation and not performance. This was missed by some candidates who then spent their whole essay discussing how the environment affected their performance. The scientific detail was evident for those accessing the top band and those scoring highly focused on preparation for competition.