

Examiners' Report Summer 2009

GCE

GCE Physical Education (8PE01)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2009

Publications Code US021578

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

1. Unit 1: Participation in Sport and Recreation	5
2. Unit 2: The Critical Sports Performer	9
3. Statistics	15

Unit 1: Participation in Sport and Recreation

General Comments:

General impressions are favourable of the first sitting of the new examination series. Candidates had to answer all questions on the paper and it was pleasing to see there were relatively few blank spaces left by candidates.

Most questions had examples of candidates scoring the maximum allocation available, however there were also numerous examples where candidates failed to score appropriately due to a lack of knowledge and an inability to apply that knowledge to the specific questions. An inability to provide definitions to terms that are clearly on the specification is a concern.

Candidates and centres should be aware of the need for specific, accurate answers that make use of correct technical language and should avoid vague generalisations. Although questions 4 and 9 are the last questions in their respective sections they are also the highest scoring singular questions. As such candidates should consider the prospective value of answering these questions earlier, and allowing time to plan and structure their answers.

Q1(a): The 4 requirements are clearly identified on the syllabus however many candidates failed to identify them, instead referred to concepts such as access and provision.

Q1(b): Candidates who had answered 1(a) correctly, generally scored well in this part of the question also. To score candidates had to link a requirement to a named/described target group. Common criticisms were that requirements were often linked to generic groups or even just people.

Q1(c): Once again candidates had to name and refer to a named requirement in order to score in this part of the question. This time candidates were asked to identify and link strategies designed to improve participation. Candidates invariably scored both available marks or failed to score at all.

Q2(a): Definitions for health were frequently accurate. The definitions for fitness were generally accurate but often a little too vague. Definitions for exercise were on the whole poor. 2 out of 3 was the most common score for this question.

Q2(b): Where candidates understood the link but also the difference between health and exercise they were able to score the full 4 marks available. However all too often candidates described what they thought was a healthy individual but identified that he was not physically able. Obviously forgetting their earlier definition of “a complete state of physical and mental well being. Consequently the individual described was not healthy as they were lacking physically. The key being that fitness is sport specific.

Q2(c): A significant number of candidates scored well on this question, providing a good definition with suitably identified and accurate factors that would raise or lower BMR. A number of candidates confused it with heart rate and a number ignored the fact that it was basal, therefore at rest.

Q3(a): On the whole a poorly answered question with a great many candidates simply assuming the presence of the word stability meant that core stability was simply about balance. Failure to explain what core stability was by reference to the trunk area of the body prevented many from accessing the available marks. Those who did explain core stability often failed to appreciate or explain the importance of a good core for the efficiency of other sporting movements.

Q3(b): Not a particularly well answered question. When identifying types of stretches candidates frequently referred to passive and active as types of stretches. Descriptions of the identified types of stretching were frequently too vague to score the available marks.

Q4: Candidates who were able to correctly identify the 3 fibre types, describe the characteristics of them and then link the characteristics to the methods of training, - explaining the link, were often also able to describe the appropriate adaptations and so scored in the top band. Candidates failing to link the fibre characteristics to the training but meeting the other requirements would be at best in the 7 - 9 band. Unfortunately a great many candidates were unable to identify the fibres correctly and often just listed methods of training. Circulatory adaptations were also frequently described.

Q5: A very well answered question with many candidates scoring the 5 available marks.

Q6(a): Answers attempting to explain access were frequently poor, often referring to or using access in the answer. Answers for opportunity, provision and esteem were, on the whole well written.

NB candidates must be aware that they are not able to use the term being defined in their explanation and expect to score the mark(s).

Q6(b): Better answers easily scored the available 4 marks for this question. Weaker answers tended to rely on concessions and taster days to score two of the available marks.

Q7(a): A poorly answered question that clearly identified significant gaps in knowledge and understanding. Answers were vague and waffled somewhat. Candidates would often refer to a choice of school or university rather than identifying the role provided by each in sports progression. Clearly an area that centres need to ensure is covered in more detail in future

Q7(b): PESSCL, Top sport, advisory 2 hours of PE and aspiration of 5 hours of PE were the most common answers used by candidates. The answer seems to have been clearly understood but a lack of specific knowledge has prevented candidates scoring the top marks.

Q7(c): The majority of candidates were able to identify the 3 different levels of the world class performance programme, and also that the programme was designed to support elite athletes. Better candidates were able to explain how the programme provided the support.

Q8(a): This question was very well answered, the majority of candidates scored at least 2 marks with sponsorship and media / TV rights being the most common answers. Merchandise, franchising and endorsements were also common answers.

Q8(b): Better answers were able to explain Americanisation and provide numerous examples of how it is influencing sport in the 21st century. Weaker answers simply stated that Americanisation was increased commercialisation and that the win at all costs attitude was now dominant. On the whole this was a very well answered question.

Q9: Better answers, grades A and B, identified that the question was asking for an answer that discussed the view that deviance and gamesmanship were recent developments. These answers contained a clear structure where deviance and gamesmanship were defined, often with appropriate examples of each. Reasons for an apparent growth of both were identified as well as that of a counter position where by they might not be recent developments. Here candidates provided historical examples of deviance and gamesmanship. Finally, reasons for the apparent rise in awareness of or even existence of both were discussed.

Typically grade C type answers would have defined the two concepts but then listed reasons as to why they were recent developments. Very little discussion or awareness of a counter position would have been present.

Grade D and E type answers would have been more generic and descriptive, sometimes failing to distinguish between gamesmanship and deviance or simply stating that deviance was merely drug taking that was on the rise as a result of a win at all costs attitude.

Unit 2: The Critical Sports Performer

General comments:

The standard of the work was good in general, given that this was the first year of the specification. Some centres had clearly embraced the ethos and expectations of the specification and this was evident in the marks that the candidates achieved. Most of the centres organised their portfolios well and in nearly all cases the work was submitted on time and the administration was accurate. There were some issues relating to IT and moderators being able to access/open work submitted. If centres could use generic formats then this would be very beneficial. More guidelines in relation to this will be posted on the website.

- Overseas centres need to read the Internal Assessment Guide (IAG) and use Ask the Expert - many missed the intention, depth and scope required to access top marks. Performance Analysis over marked more than any other - due to this being the first time but centres are reminded that this is 30% of the Unit 2 course and adequate time needs to be devoted to this.
- Overseas centres also need to try to give some comparison to UK based standards i.e. is this performance at local, area or county level if the player were in the UK?
- The quality of work submitted by centres varied significantly and it was clear which centres had accessed training and the support materials. Given that each centre has been provided with extensive feedback in their E9 report, this should give all centres the information they need to improve the quality and format of work submitted. However, where possible it is strongly advised that those staff in centres that have not yet accessed training should do so in 2009/10. Those colleagues that are in overseas centres may have access to some training but can also use Ask the Expert and exemplar material which will be uploaded during the summer break.
- It was felt that centres with better access to IT facilities and software were at an advantage to those that were not, particularly with the use of video, editing and analysis software.
- Lack of evidence of 'quality' or the performances in 2.1 and also much of the process seems to be judging how good the quality of the evidence is and not the quality of the candidate.
- Some candidates did submit video evidence but in some cases it was not evident which of the team they were, which made it invalid.
- Files need to all be put into the correct sub folders. Too many candidates just put stacks of files on disc and we had to sort out which ones were for 2.4.1 - 2.4.2 etc. This was mainly true for 2.1 and 2.4.
- Local and nationals were okay in the main but this was predictable due to prior experiences. Overseas centres need to pick carefully which location they select for the local in particular.

- Some centres have not even read the IAG/specification and this was particularly clear in task 2.4 as they had not followed the requirements of the five tasks. This is also evident from the questions directed to Ask the Expert which in the main could have been answered in centre had they read the IAG.
- It is imperative that centres attend further training for both AS and A2 to ensure that they give candidates the best possible chance of success. The centre staff are responsible for guiding the candidates and so they need to ensure that they have read all the correct documentation and have asked questions to eliminate uncertainties. There have been many more candidates contacting Ask the Expert this year because they felt they were not receiving the correct guidance having accessed the IAG from the website.
- E-portfolio evidence on website will help centres to develop this unit.
- Some candidates just having one side of A4 for a task in 2.4 and given 6/6.
- Major weakness was 2.4 with a lack of depth or rubric not being undertaken. Candidates not including a full movement analysis - agonists, antagonists, ranges of movement, fixators, synergists, joints and the processes of the skill. In most cases they failed to include any physiological, psychological or biomechanical information in this section.
- 2.4.3 notation needs to be looked at - the candidates are doing the notation but the follow up and what they do with the evidence gained was lacking. Some candidates did not follow the rubric of three notations and many did notations that were not connected to their core skills which made the investigation invalid.
- 2.4.4 not well done or 2.4.5 - no depth, no supportive data e.g. test results etc. Candidates need to explore sports science here. For example in 2.4, what about diets as an essential part of training and good preparation for the Development Plan in Unit 4?
- 2.4.5 needs to include an outline of what their Development Plan is going to be on next year as a sort of final conclusion. Some of the more able candidates had done this.
- Some work seen from candidates has been innovative and of high quality with many candidates scoring 80+ this reflects the staff in centres spending enough time on the this Unit - 50% of the award at AS, so half their time allocation.

Task 1 - Performance

The majority chose performer and leadership role, very few chose officials. Quality varied, some centres included video evidence with coach testimonials, and this made the process easier. Some centres included video evidence but it was not clear which of the football team was the 'actual' candidate and this almost made the evidence invalid. Not all had followed the guidance in the IAG document. Several had not completed the compulsory evidence. Likewise, judging quality of leadership proved difficult in several cases. Some centres included video evidence and material that substantiated quality of leadership and clear planning. Some quality of leadership level 2 documentation left something to be desired. In many/most cases the candidates had presented a log of sessions that they had led but the marks are awarded for how well they had done this and not for the quantity. Many had not shown evidence of the minimum eight weeks and very few had teacher testimonials verifying that it had actually taken place.

Task 2 and 3 - Local and National Study: Local and National Provision was completed in the main well and marked with accuracy. The most common omissions were still the lack of information about gender, funding and disability. Some candidates had included more information in their appendices but this should be supplementary evidence i.e. lists of clubs/contacts, divisions etc and should not contain information that should be included in the main body of text, namely that which receives the marks. Those that presented these via Powerpoint were of a good standard but centres must ensure that they include some information about the quality of presentation. This would aid the moderator in determining both the quality and value of this format of presentation.

Task 4 - Analysis of Performance

This task produced the greatest range in quality of work and marking. Several centres marked generously. In some cases it would appear they had followed guidance in the IAG. In most this was not true and some had produced one A4 sheet of work for the whole task and awarded the candidate 6/6!

Core skills tended to focus on technical execution of the 4 skills and little else. Notation was the clearest weaknesses, where tasks were abstract in content. The exercises were plucked from obscurity, with candidates failing to evaluate the notional tasks undertaken. Candidates also failed to apply the work to themselves. Another area of weakness in this section was 'strength and weaknesses'. Candidates in some cases appeared to run out of time or energy to complete a good portfolio. Again, centres had not followed guidance in the IAG documentation.

Technical analysis

This tended to be the best attempted in the work seen in this component of the work. Candidates often appeared to have spent time to produce detailed work using pictures and diagrams which were often well analysed. However, candidates need reminding that top marks require consideration of physiological, biomechanical and psychological elements of the skills.

Tactical analysis

Many chose to consider systems of play and movement patterns for this section. Although some work seen was of a high order much of the work submitted lacked visual evidence and was more descriptive than analytical of the technical detail required for high marks. Some made no reference to their playing position and how this impacted on tactics or indeed little reference to the rules of the game.

Notational analysis

In a number of cases candidates did not complete three notations. In many instances the notations had been done quite well, but the resultant analysis was weak. Notations are ultimately designed to aid and improve performance, but this dimension of the work was often limited or missing completely.

In some examples this work had been genuinely well thought through, was done in detail and with care and proved an interesting adjunct to the other work in this section.

Training analysis

Often methods of training were covered in some detail but the applications of key principles of training were not considered in many instances. Again much of the work was descriptive rather than analytical.

Strengths and weaknesses

Many candidates compared aspects of performance against an elite performer or the perfect model. The observations presented elsewhere in candidates' work was often overlooked as additional points of reference, but again in some cases this work was done well and in some cases referred to additional future planning for their Development Plan in Unit 4.

Recommendations:

- those centres that have not already accessed a training event should do so to ensure a better understanding of the new specification and its requirements
- ensure that work submitted is in a universal format so that moderators can open/access the work within the portfolio
- view the exemplar material on the website to ascertain the standards required for a grade A
- include some form of visual format within 2.1 so that the standard of the performer is clear
- insure that the candidates undertake two roles and not two performances
- encourage candidates to introduce themselves and create a performance profile
- all portfolio's must contain the **compulsory** evidence outlined in the IAG accessible from the Edexcel website
- remember that the marks awarded in the other role in 2.1 are for 'how well they lead or officiate' and not for how often. There must be some form of assessment probably by the teacher and/or peers to show strengths/weaknesses and how these have been developed through the opportunities they have presented.
- please ensure that all the tasks for 2.4 are conducted using the information in the IAG and refer again to the exemplar material for clarification
- the unit is worth 50% of the overall mark so please allocate sufficient time for its completion
- ensure that each portfolio is submitted with a CRAF - not all centres sent these to moderators this year which meant that centres had to be contacted
- conduct an internal standardisation - does the portfolio present the student in the most positive way? What will the moderator be able to deduce from the evidence presented?
- use the Ask the Expert service to confirm any questions or queries that you may still have

I would like to thank all centres and their staff for embracing the concept of the e-portfolio and I am sure that given all the hard work that has already taken place this year and the recommendations given, that if these are acted upon, then the standard will improve year on year. Given that this was the first year of the specification the work was generally of a good standard and some centres produced some excellent portfolios.

Grade Boundaries - Summer 2009

Unit 1: Participation and Performance in Sport and Recreation (6PE01)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E	N
Raw mark	53	47	41	35	30	25
UMS	80	70	60	50	40	30

Unit 2: The Critical Sports Performer (6PE02)

Grade	A	B	C	D	E	N
Raw mark	72	64	56	48	40	32
UMS	80	70	60	50	40	30

Advanced Subsidiary Cash-in code (8PE01)

Qualification grade	A	B	C	D	E
Maximum uniform mark - 200	160	140	120	100	80

Summer 2009 Mark/UMS Mark Conversion Charts

Unit 1 (6PE01) - Participation and Performance in Sport and Recreation									
Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS
1	1	11	13	21	25	31	42	41	60
2	2	12	14	22	26	32	44	42	62
3	4	13	16	23	28	33	46	43	63
4	5	14	17	24	29	34	48	44	65
5	6	15	18	25	30	35	50	45	67
6	7	16	19	26	32	36	52	46	68
7	8	17	20	27	34	37	53	47	70
8	10	18	22	28	36	38	55	48	72
9	11	19	23	29	38	39	57	49	73
10	12	20	24	30	40	40	58	50	75
Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS
51	77	61	93	71	100	81	100		
52	78	62	95	72	100	82	100		
53	80	63	97	73	100	83	100		
54	82	64	98	74	100	84	100		
55	83	65	100	75	100	85	100		
56	85	66	100	76	100	86	100		
57	87	67	100	77	100	87	100		
58	88	68	100	78	100	88	100		
59	90	69	100	79	100	89	100		
60	92	70	100	80	100	90	100		

Unit 2 (6PE02) - The Critical Sports Performer									
Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS
1	1	11	10	21	20	31	29	41	41
2	2	12	11	22	21	32	30	42	43
3	3	13	12	23	22	33	31	43	44
4	4	14	13	24	23	34	33	44	45
5	5	15	14	25	23	35	34	45	46
6	6	16	15	26	24	36	35	46	48
7	7	17	16	27	25	37	36	47	49
8	8	18	17	28	26	38	38	48	50
9	8	19	18	29	27	39	39	49	51
10	9	20	19	30	28	40	40	50	53
Mark		Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS	Mark	UMS
51	54	61	66	71	79	81	91		
52	55	62	68	72	80	82	93		
53	56	63	69	73	81	83	94		
54	58	64	70	74	83	84	95		
55	59	65	71	75	84	85	96		
56	60	66	73	76	85	86	98		
57	61	67	74	77	86	87	99		
58	63	68	75	78	88	88	100		
59	64	69	76	79	89	89	100		
60	65	70	78	80	90	90	100		

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US021578 Summer 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH