



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Physical Education (1PE0)
Paper 04: Personal Exercise Programme
(PEP)

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 2022

Publications Code 1PE0_04_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Strand 1: Interpretation and Analysis of pre-PEP fitness tests and sporting/activity performance:

Many candidates now provide a more appropriate introduction by including a physiological overview of their sport at the start rather than unnecessary comprehensive player profiles that includes other interests and sports played. This allows the candidates to determine the most relevant fitness tests to be included within the initial fitness test battery, as not all tests from the specification need to be undertaken if they are not relevant to the sporting activity.

Although most candidates used the fitness test battery to determine their overall aim, still too many candidates pre-determined their aim before any analysis was undertaken. Some candidates included a pre-subjective analysis on what they thought would be their weakness(es), which is fine, however the candidates should be encouraged to interpret and analyse the fitness data in comparison to normative values and/or more elite data to help justify the aim. A common theme for lower marked tasks was performing every test from the specification and then providing a summary of all results with little application to the aim or chosen sporting activity.

Candidates who scored higher marks in this strand included performance data to assist in establishing the overall aim. Examples of performance data collection methods included a notational analysis, Dartfish and GPS. On most occasions the data was utilised effectively and analysed in depth that allowed candidates to construct an effective aim that was performance based, supported by an element of fitness. Less effective aims were only fitness based that lacked justification from the prior analysis (or lack of) of both fitness and performance elements. On some occasions candidates did include some form of performance data, however this was either not referred to enough, or had minimal relevance to the aim.

Centres are encouraged to present all data gathered and illustrate the results in graph format. Some candidates included this in the appendix which is acceptable, however, centres are reminded that this information does not count towards the overall word count and therefore are encouraged to include this within the main body of the task. In this way the flow of the PEP may be enhanced and it also allows candidates to refer directly to the data when completing their analysis.

The vast majority of candidates included a PAR-Q, which demonstrates good practice when starting any form of exercise, and in some cases highlighted issues that needed to be addressed within the planning of the programme.

Strand 2: Evaluation and justification for method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training:

Centres approach to SMART was mixed, with higher marked candidates being able to include specific and measurable targets to aim for, including a fitness and a performance target that was derived from the overall aim. This allowed candidates to

write clear, concise and structured targets which ultimately helped with the initial planning of the PEP, and for the basis for comparison in the evaluation. Lower marked tasks still tended to select multiple components of fitness to focus on, and although this is not forbidden, it was evident that it diluted the depth of information supplied throughout the PEP. In addition, candidates scoring lower marks just provided definitions with a lack of application of the SMART targets to the PEP.

Most candidates selected an appropriate training method and those scoring in the higher mark bands were able to explain and justify this method and sometimes compared this against other methods of training that could have been used. With regards to the principles of training, where candidates did not achieve marks in the higher mark bands, the information was too generic and lacked application to the overall task. Not all principles need to be included, and candidates generally performed well when they supplied correct training intensities. However, there were issues surrounding this, especially if the task was not endurance-based, as some candidates looked to monitor their progress with heart rate (HR) data, even though the focus was strength and or power-based. In this case, the percentage of one repetition maximum (1RM) should have been applied.

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted:

Candidates on the whole were comfortable in collecting post-fitness data and making judgements about the success (or in some cases, not fully achieving their aim) of the PEP in meeting their overall aim or individual targets. However, there was lack of depth regarding the reasons why fitness has improved. Although this section of the specification has improved, higher marked candidates were able to give a deeper analysis of the effects of their training on **possible** adaptations that may have led to fitness improvements. For example, some candidates who improved in a chosen aerobic endurance test attributed improvements to **possible** reasons linked to cardiac hypertrophy which in turn could help to increase resting stroke volume and ultimately decreasing resting HR (RHR), especially if RHR data was gathered. The more that candidates were able to link changes to fitness, based on their knowledge from the examined components (especially with Component 1), the more in depth the evaluations were.

However, as mentioned in strand 2, it was confusing when candidates collected HR data even if the data was irrelevant to their aim, as seen in strength and/or power-based PEP's, or it was just collected for the sake of collecting and not referred to. Also, some candidates re-tested the whole battery of tests that were conducted at the start of the PEP which is not necessary and only the test(s) specific to the aim is required.

Candidates marked in higher bands also successfully utilised performance data and compared this to pre-PEP standards. These candidates made clear and measurable links that impacted their sporting performance when offering justifications and evaluations of the different aspects of the PEP.

Like with strand 1, candidates are encouraged to include all tables of data and graphs in the main part of the PEP that will not only assist students to refer to the data more when justifying the effectiveness of their training, but increase the flow and potentially improve the presentation of the task.

Strand 4: Evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training with justified future recommendations:

The amount of data collated pre, during and post-PEP did have a bearing on the level of depth included within the evaluation. When this was lacking, candidates had no choice but to include vague and descriptive statements regarding the impact the training has had on the outcome of the PEP. Candidates still need to avoid just simply saying their performance has improved, but rather recognise the impact of how and why their training has contributed to improvements and the extent to which these improvements have progressed over time.

Candidates scoring in higher mark bands were able to justify the application of their targets, methods and principles of training by referring to the data collated from their training logs. Where full training logs were not submitted, this made it difficult for candidates to complete this section and to fully justify the impact that the training had on fitness and performance. For some centres, this section of the task lacked depth and was kept short due to the lack of evidence, whereas others provided a more in-depth evaluation that linked the application of the criteria to the impact on the progress made and formed the strongest part of the task. Ultimately, candidates need to revisit their initial aim and determine if they are a better performer.

Future recommendations varied, and often included a brief line on what they would do next time, sometimes with reference to focussing on another component of fitness; or were completed well where a full explanation was given with regards to how they could adapt the training plan by modifying the SMART targets, methods and principles of training to make further gains.

Strand 5: Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology:

The coherence and structure of the tasks has seen an improvement, with candidates on the whole, more comfortable using appropriate terminology. A lot of centres use the appendix well as a way of presenting their training logs and data, however there are still candidates that refer to the appendix too much rather than embedding the relevant information within the main part of the PEP. Centres are reminded that the appendix does not form part of the assessment criteria, and should only be used for reference only. Therefore, all analytical and evaluative content must be included within the main body of the PEP, and it is encouraged as mentioned previously, to include the relevant fitness and performance data within the main section of the task.

An improvement has been that most tasks have stayed within the 1,500-word limit, although there are still cases where this is not adhered to. Centres are reminded that it

is their responsibility to ensure all candidates stay within this limit as it could affect the overall coherence and succinct nature of the task.

For some lower mark tasks, there were noticeable spelling and grammar issues, something that needs to be reviewed prior to submission. A common spelling mistake was when candidates referred to the 12-minute **Copper** test rather than the 12-minute **Cooper** test.

There are still a minority of centres using a template for all candidates. Although the task may lend itself to having a common structure in the way it is written due to the specification breakdown, pre-loaded questions and advisory notes from teacher-assessors are forbidden under the JCQ guidelines and candidates must be given the opportunity to present their work independently.

General Comments:

It is hoped that this report will prove to be informative, positive and constructive in improving standards for future series. The key areas of the assessment criteria that need further attention include the following:

- Ensure that performance data is also included alongside fitness data in determining the aim and measuring the level of impact the training has had on the outcomes of the PEP- please refer to the [‘PEP Performance Data examples’](#) form on the Pearson subject webpage if collating full game data is an issue.
- Continue to apply knowledge and understanding of the SMART targets, methods and principles of training in planning the PEP rather than providing descriptive and generic statements.
- Use the knowledge learnt from Components 1 & 2 to assist in justifying the effectiveness of the training.
- Greater links between training data is required to construct more appropriate evaluative conclusions for strand 4.
- Use the exemplars, [‘PEP Content Checklist’](#) and [pre-recorded training modules](#) on the Pearson subject webpage to help prepare candidates for the next series.

The standards of the PEP submissions have improved, even under the difficult circumstances of the past couple of examination series, therefore centres should be congratulated for their efforts. Good luck for the next academic series.