



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In Physical Education (9PE0)  
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 9PE0\_04\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

This report reviews the moderation of 9PE0 04 for the examination series 2019.

Work for this series has been submitted for the purposes of external moderation through USB pen drives and hard copy.

Centres are thanked for the efficient administration of this examination series and the regular and helpful communication established with moderators.

### **General comments**

As with the practical performance, most completed this task as a performer with only a very few opting for the coach role. A number of candidates, although fewer than last year, exceeded the word count. It was usually a lack of analysis that limited candidates to mark bands below the top band (9-10) marks. Many candidates produced work at levels three (5-6) and four (7-8) for the four tasks.

### **Physiological**

Much of the work offered for this task was well structured and of good quality. The majority of candidates identified three appropriate components of fitness although in a few cases certain choices were not the most appropriate for the demands of the sport and were not fully justified. Candidates should be encouraged to research movement data which is readily available for many activities. A brief reference to such evidence can be used to support the choice of components for this work, especially for stop-start, multi-directional sports.

As last year, there was a tendency for candidates to offer standard tests and referred to normative data which is readily available on websites, and which were not always valid. A number of candidates, for example, offered tests for static balance to assess sports where dynamic balance was fundamental to performance. Candidates also need to specify their role or position in their chosen activity so as to fully support their justification of the three components of fitness. To achieve top band marks, candidates should be encouraged to undertake additional research to enhance personal knowledge and appreciate current trends in testing.

Many National Governing Bodies offer information around key components of fitness for their sport, target levels of fitness for potential elite performers and guidelines for effective training programmes. Candidates should be encouraged to consider elite and peer level performances (age group at club and school) as well as normative data as this provides candidates additional opportunities for analysis. This has been referred to in previous reports and it was pleasing to see that a number of candidates had followed this advice.

Most candidates understood concepts of reliability and validity but in some cases this was confused and needed additional clarity. In the best work, test data was interpreted well and the limitations of some tests was discussed.

Many candidates suggested appropriate future priorities for training and development but additional analysis was needed in some submissions in order to achieve the standard of work

required for the highest mark band.

### **Tactical**

Relatively few candidates opted for the tactical option but those who did almost always chose tactics listed in the specification.

Most candidates presented their work in an orderly and structured way and used carefully annotated images to describe the tactic. In many instances the initial description of the tactic was detailed and accurate.

It was often the quality of the analysis that let candidates down. Although some form of analysis had usually been attempted, it sometimes failed to fully demonstrate how the tactic could be applied in a competitive situation or how it might be adapted in changing circumstances, such as when teams might need to protect a lead or had lost players through injury or sanctions.

A number of candidates had used data from elite performances to support the application of the tactic in a competitive situation and in these cases candidates achieved good marks.

It was also encouraging to see that fewer candidates had relied on simply copying and pasting work from popular websites and adding a few words of their own. Candidates should be encouraged to undertake research to enhance their understanding of tactical aspects of performance. Technical or NGB journals are often a good starting point for this.

### **Technical**

For many candidates this was their best work. Candidates had selected suitable skills and included detailed descriptions and analysis of a core skill, presenting the work with clear photographs and pictures, diagrams and reference to elite performers. In a few cases though more than one skill had been considered which is not necessary and uses up vital words.

The best work included detailed and accurate annotated diagrams and included data to support an insightful analysis of strengths and weaknesses to justify key areas for development. Work which was mainly descriptive, lacked analytical detail, or failed to identify future priorities scored less well.

### **Planning of the PDP**

Candidates were able to identify an appropriate component of fitness on the basis of the performance analysis.

Most candidates defined SMARTER targets and sought to apply them to their own work. More work was needed by some candidates to fully explain how SMARTER targets underpins the planning of an effective PDP. Lengthy definitions need to be avoided here however, with more emphasis needed on their application.

The work on principles and methods of training was frequently of a good standard, although,

as with the work on SMARTER targets, some did not apply this well enough to their own circumstances.

It was also encouraging to note that more candidates had considered contemporary/ valid tests and also compared performances with athlete populations in addition to the norm referenced tables; this is good practice. All candidates should be encouraged to undertake research to identify valid, sport-specific tests which can sometimes be found on NGB websites.

## **Evaluation of the PDP**

Although some of the work in this section was of a very good standard many struggled to produce the necessary quality of work to score in the top two bands. Overall, candidates need to utilise qualitative and quantitative data more effectively to support the evaluation of the impact of the programme.

Some candidates provided detailed analysis on the outcome of their PDP and had included a notational analysis of their performances pre and post training. All candidates should try to provide evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the plan.

Centres should encourage candidates to consider the changes in the test scores and potential physiological changes where appropriate. Correctly applying theory and science to the outcomes is necessary to achieve top band marks.

Recommendations for future development was covered well by some, but more insightful recommendations were frequently required. Candidates might, for example, make reference to the need for modifying methods or principles of training or finding additional research to enable further improvements in performance levels.

In a number of cases, evaluations lacked depth because so few words were available as a result of excessive words being used in the previous sections. Accordingly, candidates should be encouraged to note the word count at the end of each section and a total at the end; in turn, this might aid the candidate in ensuring an even distribution of words across the assignment, vital for high marks.

## **Coaches**

Relatively small numbers of candidates offered the coach role and much of this work had similar strengths and weaknesses to the performers.

In addition to the points raised above, it is worth pointing out that in the physiological work not all of the coaches introduced the individuals they were working with, nor the level they perform at; providing this detail would help contextualise the work. In the technical section, most coaches discussed coaching styles but did not provide much in the way of a comparison to higher level coaches; doing this would allow candidates to more clearly identify points for improved practice.

### **Accuracy of marking**

It was pleasing to note that more of the work was assessed in line with national standards than last year. In a number of cases, however, marking was lenient, in others it was very lenient, and in a few the marking was a little severe. Centres are encouraged to consider attending the training courses offered by Pearson.

### **Summary**

It was encouraging that much of the work was well presented, demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the tasks and included a bibliography to indicate a certain level of research.

As previously, centres had supported the candidates well, with the result that much of the work presented had a distinctive house style and was of a good, occasionally very good, standard.

To achieve top band marks however, candidates must write succinctly and allocate time to researching current trends and the science that underpins performance improvement. Finally, centres are encouraged to refer to the material provided in the online magazine, Inside Track, which provides advice and articles of interest for all components of the specification.