



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel Advanced Level
In Physical Education (9PE0)
Paper 02 Psychological and Social Principles of
Physical Education

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 2024

Publications Code 9PE0_02_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Generic Points

Many candidates had been well taught and guided on how to complete the paper successfully. It was disappointing though to see some questions were not attempted and as such it is noteworthy that candidates should be encouraged to attempt a response as it may result in the award of a mark whereas a blank page can only ever attain a zero. Where candidates were unsure and produced educated guesses, often they were rewarded.

- The extended writing questions remains an area of weakness simply due to both a lack of depth subject knowledge beyond the first areas of common content and this is even more pertinent when you consider the number of marks allocated forms 60% of the paper. Responses tended to be very descriptive and failed to grasp the subtleties in the question, resulting in marks of six or lower being awarded for the fifteen-mark questions. Some candidates accessed level 4 and 5 and many at level 3 which reflected responses which contained structure, content and fulfilled the command word demand.
- The eight-mark question using the command word examine continues to be a challenge for candidates where once again only writing beyond the first one or two most obvious or common answers were evident.
- It is pleasing to report though that there were some outstanding extended question responses where candidates fully engaged with the question, provided a plethora of credit-worthy content and wrote in a coherent and analytical style. These were awarded in the highest two levels 4 and 5.
- Centres are beginning to focus on and understand the demands of the command words consequently candidates seem to be moving on from the "write all you know" about responses.
- Ensure the spelling and application of technical language is learned as given through the specification glossary - in particular for 'define' questions.

Q01

Question one used the command word describe which assessed assessment objective 2 (AO2) requiring an 'account of something without reasons'. This question was well answered by most candidates providing a confidence building start to the paper. The most common descriptions referred to the external environment and many mentioned the self-paced nature of closed skills. This question required an example to support the answer and the phrasing of this meant that even if the example was of a closed skill, if the description was incorrect, no mark could be awarded. Candidates need to be careful with examples and in this case, an overt closed skill was required. Responses that mentioned swimming or running a race were not accepted, nor were references to games play. The most common correct examples were of throwing a dart, taking a penalty or shooting a free throw in basketball. Confusions also existed with reference to discrete skills which have a clear beginning and end.

Q02

Question two used the command word outline assessing AO1 requiring a 'brief account of non-linked points'. Candidates performed well when they understood the models given in the question which allowed reference to the components of either of the two models which greatly aided candidates in their quest for marks as it increased the amount of awardable content. Where understanding may have been a little incomplete, candidates were still able to attain marks for mentioning simple constructs such as input, output and feedback. Complimenting this, there were many examples of excellent responses providing a full outline of perceptual, transitory, effector mechanisms as well as output systems demonstrating understanding of memory stores and systems.

Q03i

Question three across two parts used the command word summarise assessing either of the three AO 1, 2 or 3 requiring an 'expression of the most important facts or ideas about something'. Part-one required a summary of two characteristics of the command style of coaching. This was a well answered question as candidates clearly knew the style and were able to articulate a decent summary. Most answers included reference to coaches making decisions, having control or leading the sessions and learners having little or no input. As this provides a summary of two characteristics, then this alone would be worthy of full marks but many candidates went on to identify the use for beginners and implementation in dangerous situations. Repetition was a common cause of not being awarded full marks as candidates focused solely on the leader's role in terms of control, leading and decision making. It should also be noted that the question, as does its antecedent, asks for characteristics not consequences so autonomous learners becoming bored could not be credited.

Q03ii

Question three part two was slightly less successfully negotiated than part one. However, this question did manage to elicit a high number of positive responses where candidates were able to identify that the task, or problem was set by the coach and it was more suited to autonomous learners. As it is inherent in the phrasing of the question, learners solving the problem themselves were not credited but where this was accompanied by reference to task insight or creativity, then this was.

Q04

Question four used the command word discuss assessing AO1 and AO3 and required candidates to 'explore issues, lines of reasoning and situations articulating different view points'. In addition this question was marked with an asterisk (*) which enabled students to draw from the wider specification in their response. Being the first of the extended questions it was pleasing that many candidates did at least attempt a response with some extended writing. There is enough diversity in this topic to allow candidates to access the top two-mark bands but sadly this was an infrequent occurrence. The overwhelming majority chose to describe the different types of transfer and accompany this with an example from sport. If done well and accurately, then level 2 and 3

marks were awarded but there was little attempt to relate to learning and performance as separate entities or to draw in other aspects of the course as indicated by the asterisk. There was occasional confusion between proactive and retroactive transfer, though positive and negative transfer were both popular features of responses. There was opportunity to draw in knowledge from learning theories such as Fitts and Posner or Thorndike and preparation strategies such as confidence building and imagery. Good candidates did this well and provided a rounded answer that merited higher level marks. Judgements were rare and tended, when present, to be based on supposition rather than analysis and this was a weakness of most answers. Candidates are reminded to always include a conclusion in their response.

Q05

Question five used the command word define assessing AO1 requiring candidates to provide a 'statement of translation' and therefore a straightforward question requiring knowledge of catastrophe theory. However, many candidates failed to score as they did not make the distinction between catastrophe and inverted U. The key to the correct answer was to identify the sudden or dramatic decline in performance beyond optimal arousal which distinguishes catastrophe from the general application of the inverted U theory where there is a decline but it is less drastic and mirrors the rise in performance.

Q06

Question six used the command word describe which assessed AO2 requiring an 'account of something without reasons'. This question required a knowledge of Hollander's theory which is a mainstay of the Psychology of personality. Many candidates seemed to know and understand the theory and thus were able to provide detailed descriptions of the four elements of the theory. A common misconception was that there was an outer layer which is not strictly true as the concentric circles are surrounded by the social environment but candidates were not penalised for referring to this as a layer. The description necessitated the correct identification of each layer and inner/outer core was not deemed credit-worthy. Very few candidates identified the decreasing permeability of each layer as you approach the core but those that did were given credit as this is a correct observation. This was answered well on-the-whole by many candidates but some failed to score.

Q07

Question seven used the command word outline assessing AO1 requiring a 'brief account of non-linked points'. The question made a direct reference to Carron's model and its four factors – although candidates were only required to outline any three. Those who were familiar with the model attracted full marks whereas those who focused on the teamwork or cohesion and were less informed, did less well. The four factors are leadership, environmental, team and personal and the ones chosen had to be written exactly as given. Many responses restricted comments to factors that came under the umbrella of 'team' as they detailed task and social cohesion, shared goals and strong relationships.

While this provided a good overview of team factors it could only be allocated one mark as it was limited to one factor. Most candidates scored either zero or one mark on this question while many scored full marks.

Q08

Question eight used the command word describe which assessed AO2 requiring an 'account of something without reasons' - namely a description of the Ringelmann Effect while also giving an accurate sporting example to support the answer. Very few candidates attained full marks for this question as they either confused Ringelmann with social loafing, referred to motivation or performance rather than a decline in individual effort or provided an incorrect example. There needed to be a distinction between Ringelmann and social loafing as Ringelmann refers to a proportional decrease effort in line with an increase in group size. The best examples provided included rowing in a pair, four or eight compared with rowing solo or a tug of war where if more members join the team, individual effort reduces proportionately. Examples relating to team games were generally not relevant and did not illustrate knowledge of Ringelmann, they were more appropriate to social loafing.

Q09

Question nine used the command word evaluate which assessed AO2 and AO3 requiring candidates to 'use analysis to make a judgement'. The question asked for an evaluation of leadership styles and a range of sports performers. It was reasonably well answered while many candidates' responses lingered between the level 2 and level 3 with very few accessing the top bands. It was encouraging to see some candidates consider the subtle needs of the question, correctly judging that they were required to evaluate the three key styles of leadership, theories of leadership and apply these where applicable, for instance a range of personalities, abilities and subsequently a range of diverse sporting activities. Those candidates who did this were successful in accessing levels 4 and 5. The most common answers limited themselves to a description of the three leadership styles of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire with an accompanied indication of each style's strengths and weaknesses. Judgements were rare and, where present, lacked analytical focus. Scant reference was made to Fiedler and Chelladuri, Steiner or prescribed and emergent leaders and this limited access to higher level marks with the most frequent award centring around a mark of six.

Q10

Question ten used the command word define which assessed AO1 requiring candidates to 'a statement of translation'. This was another definition question but required two aspects to gain the mark. Reference to moral development or healthy body and healthy mind alone was not enough as the link needed to be made with Christian values. Many candidates missed including the link between the two and were not awarded with a mark. Positive answers made the connection between physical endeavour (namely sport) while embracing Christian

values and morals. Many candidates failed to make this link and therefore scored zero.

Q11

Question eleven used the command word summarise which assessed AO1, AO2 or AO3 requiring candidates to 'express the most important facts or ideas about something'. This was a good scoring question for most candidates as they were able to identify and offer only a short summary of the ways in which female status in sport has been promoted. There was an abundance of awardable material ranging from grass roots provision, inclusion campaigns and legislation, to increased media, access to elite stadia and equal prize money. Where marks were dropped, there was a list of factors and no summary but this was rare showing candidates are familiar with the demands of the questions.

Q12

Question twelve used the command word state which assessed AO1 requiring candidates to simply 'recall a fact or an example'. In some ways this proved problematic to many candidates who misread the question and interpreted it as referring to popular recreation in general. Therefore many answers included reference to mob games and violent activities. To gain marks here, responses needed to be exclusive to the aristocracy as indicated in the specification, as opposed to the mob games of the peasants. Common correct responses referred to sophistication, rules, specified courts and specialist equipment. Stating activities such as hunting, bear baiting and falconry are not features they are examples of different activities and therefore, could not be credited.

Q13

Question thirteen used the command word outline which assessed AO1 requiring candidates to give a 'brief account of non-linked points'. The focus shifted from pre to post-industrial eras and, despite some misreading of the question, this was very well answered with most candidates gaining two or three marks. Candidates were able to select from a range of content and provided good responses identifying the formation of National Governing Bodies, codification of sports, the formation of leagues, developments in transport and a reduction in violence among other features. Most candidates understood what rational recreation was and demonstrated a high level of knowledge.

Q14

Question fourteen used the command word summarise which assessed AO1, AO2 or AO3. This required candidates to 'express the most important facts or ideas about something'. Despite some responses referring to media in general and not as given in the question - social media, this question was answered very well and most candidates scored highly here. The command word was to summarise and therefore, lists were not credited and the key word in the question was "consequences". Common and accurate answers included reference to abuse and hatred, fake news and invasion of privacy. Others stated creation of role models, influencing opinion and benefits for smaller

clubs of media exposure. Many candidates wrote about increased pressure on performers, which is accurate but required some elaboration as to why.

Q15

Question fifteen used the command word examine which assessed AO1 and AO4. This required candidates to 'Justify and an exemplification of a point using analysis or evaluation'. As is ever the case, candidates struggled to score well on the eight-mark question and very few accessed above the one to two levels of assessment. In general, most candidates showed some accurate and relevant knowledge hitting at least two aspects identified on the mark scheme but there was a distinct lack of balancing ideas against each other. The specification clearly identifies this topic giving actual examples for candidates to study. Confusions existed while there was some coverage of the indicated content, this was completed successfully by many candidates.

Incorrectly many candidates interpreted this question as focusing on Olympic Games or World Cups rather than the isolated and one-off fixtures from the NFL, NBA or World Club Championship fixtures played in either the UK, USA or Australia.

To access level two a wide range of ideas needs to be balanced and this simply did not happen for most candidates. Very few candidates showed a level of sophisticated writing skill needed for this question where they wrote discursive and insightful paragraphs that examine ideas and do not just state facts. Candidates were drawn into attempting to identify advantages and disadvantages for the continent rather than the sport. Answers were overly descriptive and failed to cover enough of the indicative content and tended to be limited to one or two marks as a result.

Q16

Question sixteen used the command word evaluate which assessed AO2 and AO3 requiring candidates to 'use analysis to make a judgement'. Labour migration is a bountiful topic for an extended writing task as there is a significant potential content available. Impact can be positive and negative which assists with the structure of the response and many candidates answered this question quite well with some notable exceptional responses assessing level 5 marks.

Candidates must ensure that they elaborate on the points they make rather than stating them and then moving on to the next point. They needed to state how the point made has a positive or negative impact and give evidence to substantiate their point. Those who did that for this question, and there were several, reaped significant reward. Some candidates became confused with building workers as opposed to sports performers and were able to produce only a limited response. Those that did answer the question were brief in terms of content, commonly; advantages - athletes move countries for financial gains, increase commercialisation and revenue, learning of new tactics from coaches, creates role models, increased fan base, high level competition. Disadvantages commonly - loss of national identity, home grown talent blocked. An issue was that many candidates failed to give a full description of all points and therefore rarely achieved band 3 or above.

Again, as this is an evaluation question, a judgement should be made and supported by analysis.

Q17

Question seventeen used the command word discuss which assessed AO1 and AO3 requiring candidates to 'explore issues, lines of reasoning and situations, articulating different viewpoints. As the final question on the paper it has been observed that some responses were relatively short and candidates failed to structure their responses. This year there were many exceptions where candidates produced good quality answers. The demands of the final question are also difficult as there is the data to consider as well as the inclusion of the wider specification as marked with an *. In this context, candidates did well and were credited for their depth of responses.

Hosting the Olympic Games is a welcome topic and there were fewer 'blank' answers as seen in previous years. While many responses tended to be descriptive, there was some evidence of more sophisticated writing accompanied by an interpretation of the data – although this often is used merely as a statement of fact rather than analysed for implications. The highest scorers included a host of advantages and disadvantages and used the data as a catalyst to explore these. They used the increased money generated by television rights to discuss the "shop window effect" and the more perceptive students latched onto the comparatively lower expenditure from 2008 to launch into a discussion of facilities, people being displaced and human rights. Many candidates drew examples from London 2012 and highlighted urban regeneration and the legacy of facilities and the increased housing pool. Candidates also referred to the games of 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1984 but failed to appropriately apply this to the question as many were unsure of the destination of income from television rights and sponsorship deals. Judgments tended to be basic and lacked substantiation.

Key points for future examinations:

- Plan the extended responses with a neat introduction which is not overly long, write using shorter discrete paragraphs which make a point and where appropriate include a sporting example. Always include a conclusion which conforms to the command word which should be longer than the introduction.
- Use the acronym PEEL – make a point, give an example, develop and explore in context to the command word and finally link this to the next paragraph.
- Do not guess facts which are then proved to be incorrect as this gives the impression of a lack of knowledge.
- Where lower points assessed questions have one to four marks, use a new line for each point being made as this promotes a structure to the response and a clearer identification of responses.
- A strategy for completing the paper could be to answer the two extended questions in Section A first then attempt the points-based questions and repeat this for Section B.

- Ensure candidates write with clarity as many papers were difficult to read and interpretations of content can be generated which can lead to mis-understandings.
- Do not use bullet points for extended responses as these require comprehension and continuous prose. The element of written communication is assessed.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom