



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Physical Education (8PE0)
Component 4: Performance Analysis

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 2018

Publications Code 8PE0_04_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General comments

Most candidates produced work within the Level 3 (7-9 band) for both the physiological and the technical / tactical aspects of the coursework.

As with the practical performance, almost all candidates completed this task as a performer with few opting for the coach role. The vast majority of candidates also chose to complete the technical analysis as the second task rather than the tactical analysis.

Physiological

The majority of candidates identified three appropriate component of fitness but in some cases certain choices were not the most appropriate for the demands of the sport and were not fully justified. More research is required by candidates that include a physiological overview of their chosen sport at the start of the task that will then justify the three most important components of fitness. Some candidates defined the full range of fitness components with very little application to the task or activity. This does not allow the candidate(s) to write succinctly and should be avoided.

Where candidates included evidence of research to justify each component and specific test, higher marks were awarded. The majority of candidates offered mainly standard tests that were extracted from websites like www.brianmac.co.uk and www.topendsports.com. Although a lot of these tests do uphold the validity for the particular component being tested, they tend to be totally invalid for the sport. Examples include the inclusion of the ruler drop test and the alternate handball throw. The 12-minute Cooper Run was also used by candidates for various games activities such as football, however all these tests are totally invalid and non-specific for most sports.

Normative data for the standard tests were also used for the basis of analysis, however this data in a lot of the cases is out-dated and does not allow candidates to reflect on their true fitness levels. Candidates who researched the elite standards or more specific elite levels were awarded higher marks. In the absence of elite standards, some centres also used peer data as another layer of data for the basis of analysis to good effect; and this should be encouraged.

Candidates had referred to issues around reliability and validity but in some cases this lacked depth and clarity. Some candidates did not fully understand both terms and in some cases the analysis for validity reflected reliability. In the better submissions the test data was interpreted well, including appropriate analysis of the issues surrounding validity and reliability as well as the limitations of some tests was discussed in depth.

Most candidates suggested appropriate future priorities for training and development, but in some tasks not enough detail was included that demonstrated an understanding of top band work.

Technical

Most candidates selected the technical analysis for their second task, and had selected suitable core skills. In most cases candidates provided photos of themselves and more elite performers for comparison through the three phases of preparation, execution and recovery of the skill being performed. Work that was marked at a higher level provided detailed analytical detail with a good balance between technical information, as well as the inclusion of biomechanical aspects.

The candidates who were awarded lower marks included mainly descriptive work that lacked comparisons and analysis between the candidate and the higher-level performer. The use of computer-generated images was also used by a minority of candidates that did not allow for real-life analysis, and generally lacked depth overall.

Overall, higher band candidates provided detailed qualitative analysis and the use of some data to evaluate strengths and weaknesses that were used to justify key areas for development. Quite often candidates receiving low marks did not include this section of the criteria.

Tactical

Most candidates had selected tactics that were relevant to their activity and development as a performer. It was clear that most candidates understood the purpose and how the tactic can be implemented into a competitive environment and the benefits it has to performance.

Candidates who were judged to be in the higher mark band provided detailed annotated images that analysed the application of the tactic in a competitive scenario that included specific elite examples. In most tasks this could have been extended further by including more qualitative and/or quantitative analysis of the candidate's own application of the tactic for comparison. Some candidates used data to substantiate the analysis and evaluations made, and in these cases most of the candidates had achieved top band marks.

Analysis of how the tactic could be adapted to changing circumstances was completed with inconsistency. Candidates receiving lower marks either did not include this or the information provided was too brief. The use of annotated images to demonstrate the changes and alterations to specific tactics enhanced the clarity of the presentation, especially when

relevant elite examples were used.

Accuracy of marking

Much of the work was assessed within the 7-9 band, and in most cases fairly accurate. In some cases, marking was a little generous, and it was the lack of specificity and research in the physiological task and the lack of analytical detail in the technical analyses that were key contributors to this. Centres are encouraged to review the new examples on the website and to consider attending various training courses offered by Pearson.

Summary

Much of the work was well presented, and it was clear that candidates possessed good levels of knowledge and understanding for their activities, fitness and ability levels. The work was generally well structured, although to achieve top band marks candidates must include more contemporary research that is specific to their sport, as well as making sure candidates write more succinctly within the allocated word limit.