



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

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

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2019

Publications Code 8PE0\_04\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General comments

Similar to the previous two series, most candidates produced work within the Level 3 (7-9 marks) band for both the physiological and the technical / tactical aspects of the NEA tasks, however, there was an increase in the number of candidates awarded marks in the Level 4 band (10-12).

The vast majority of tasks were submitted as a player/performer, with very 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, although there was a slight increase in the number of tactical tasks which were almost exclusively games based.

## Physiological

The majority of candidates were able to identify and give some application of the three most appropriate components of fitness, but they were not always justified. Top band candidates were able to research the overall physiological requirements for their sport, and then make sound judgements regarding the three most important fitness components from this research. This is excellent practice and all candidates should be encouraged to do this rather than simply stating the important fitness components that is not supported by appropriate external sources.

Some candidates defined all **health** and **skill-related fitness components** with basic links to their chosen activity. Not only are these terms not used in the specification, it also does not allow the candidate(s) to write succinctly and should be avoided. Some candidates also used the term **cardiovascular fitness/endurance**, and although this term is used at GCSE, it is not used at GCE. It is also more of a health term rather than a performance component, therefore in this case it is more appropriate to use aerobic endurance/capacity or VO<sub>2</sub> max.

There was a slight improvement with candidates using more specific tests, however there is still an over reliance of standard tests from popular websites such as [www.brianmac.co.uk](http://www.brianmac.co.uk) and [www.topendsports.com](http://www.topendsports.com). Generic tests such as the ruler drop test and the alternate hand ball throw are common tests that lacked specificity to most sporting activities, however some candidates were still using them. The use of normative data from these websites was also still being used, and although this data is readily available, they are generally outdated and not specific to elite performance standards. Candidates receiving marks in the higher mark bands were able to research specific tests with relevant standards, and in the absence of elite data, alternative data was used for comparison. This included data from either the candidate's class, club team or more elite data from a performer(s) of a higher ability.

Most candidates had described validity and reliability, and mentioned issues in relation to testing, although greater depth is required. Some candidates failed to secure a clear understanding in the application of these terms, and quite often the information provided for reliability was more appropriate for validity (or vice versa). Higher ability candidates were able to give in depth justification for each test in terms of validity and provide clarity with regards to reliability. In some cases, candidates were able to identify and explain more valid tests that could be used, especially when the test conducted lacked validity.

Most of the candidates were able to suggest what their strengths and weaknesses were

based on the outcomes of the tests. However, the recommendations for future improvement were often subjective and there was little evidence of future planning, and a lack of research to support this. Higher marks were awarded to candidates who considered the inclusion of supporting evidence and comments from a coach or higher-level performers in the form of witness statements that added further depth to the validation of the future priorities.

## **Technical**

Like previous series, 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. These were generally submitted with annotations allowing for direct analysis.

The comparisons between the candidate and the elite performers were generally completed well, but the inclusion of both technical and biomechanical aspects within the analysis was not balanced in most tasks. There was also a lot of description of what the photos showed as opposed to how it impacted on the skill. Higher ability candidates were able to analyse the differences between the elite performer and themselves that was supported by research from external sources, such as technical journals and National Governing Body website material.

Tasks that were awarded higher marks included input from coaches to justify strengths and weaknesses highlighted as well as supporting data that compared the success of performing the skill against the elite performer, usually in the form of a notation. This allowed candidates to support their evaluations and identify appropriate strengths and weaknesses.

Coaching candidates mainly chose guidance or feedback as their core skill, with some candidates choosing communication or on different coaching styles. In most tasks the analysis was subjective and included the candidates own opinions rather than support from any form of research or quantifiable data to justify qualitative outcomes.

## **Tactical**

Candidates who submitted a tactical analysis selected appropriate tactics for their activity. Most candidates included an introduction outlining the purpose of the tactic and when it was used during a competition.

Annotated images were utilised to a good standard in most tasks, illustrating how the tactic is formed, executed and adjusted to a changing environment. Higher ability candidates were able to compare the success of the tactic from their own experience with more elite examples that included substantial quantitative data in the form of a notation or a witness statement to support qualitative comments. Some candidates also included video clips of both theirs and elite performances to support the analysis provided.

Analysis of how the tactic could be adapted to changing circumstances was completed to a higher standard this series. Most candidates were able to offer alternative tactics, with examples that supported their overall analysis.

### **Accuracy of marking**

Similar to last series, much of the work in the 8PE04 section was assessed within the 7-9 band, and in most cases fairly accurate. There was an increase in the amount of work assessed in the top band (10-12), and in a lot of cases this was justified. However, there is still some work being marked too lenient. The issues surrounding this include:

- A lack of specificity and research in the physiological task, especially with regards to the lack of validity for tests chosen and the data for comparisons.
- The lack of analytical detail in the technical used in comparison between the candidates and the elite performer.
- 8PE03: Including more dynamic practices in the practical assessment to stretch the higher marked candidates. The inclusion of static practices does not showcase the ability of most candidates.

Centres are encouraged to keep up date with the exemplars and commentaries on the Pearson website, take note of the various articles released within 'Inside Track' and attend the online training provided by Pearson.

### **Summary**

The majority of work submitted was well presented and it was clear that candidates possessed good levels of knowledge and understanding for their chosen sport. Greater use of research and implementation of external sources is required to support content if top band marks are to be achieved. Centres are advised that any form of notational analysis should be authenticated properly by providing detail in the form of dates, venue, opposition. It is also advised that comments from coaches should be supported by a witness statement which could be included in an appendix.

Centres are also reminded that the maximum word limit for this task is 1750 words and should be adhered to in line with the specification requirements.

### **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link: <http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

