



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel Advanced Level
In Physical Education (9PE0)
Paper 04 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 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_04_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

This report considers the moderation of component 9PE0_04 for the examination series 2024.

Work for this series has been submitted for the purposes of external moderation through the Learner Work Transfer (LWT) platform on Edexcel Online.

There were no reported problems linked to uploading work onto the LWT platform. However, some centres did upload out-of-date versions of the authentication sheets which had been revised for this series, to take into account potential AI tools that may have been used in the learner work, in addition to the usual requirements to clearly reference any sources used in learner work.

To ensure centres are using the most up to date authentication sheets, centres are encouraged to check all administration requirements relating to each series on the subject webpage here.

Centres are thanked for their work on this component and for the regular and helpful communication that was established with moderators.

There were fewer reported concerns linked to the word count than last series and the majority of centres provided learner work which was concisely written and of a high standard.

General Comments

Almost all the work for this component was undertaken in the performer role.

Centres are encouraged to continue to support candidates to write more succinctly and to accurately record the word count at the bottom of each page, which includes the wording in text boxes. Quotes to demonstrate research should be succinct and contextualised in the candidates work to demonstrate relevant research, rather than excessive use of quotes which are not related to the key points being made by the candidate.

Performance Analysis

Physiological Component

Much of the work presented for this task was well-structured and of a good quality and frequently the highest scoring part across the four sections.

The majority of candidates identified three appropriate components of fitness. In some evidence, candidates discussed a wide range of other components of fitness which was not credit worthy. In a few cases, certain choices were not the most appropriate for the demands of the sport and not fully justified.

There was evidence that candidates were using more contemporary and sport specific tests for this task rather than relying on dated and generic ones.

The analysis of the test results was generally sound, but there were still examples of candidates being awarded centre marks from level 5, where there was only generic analysis that was not necessarily backed up with additional data and therefore subjective.

To support candidates to access contemporary sport specific fitness tests they should be encouraged to spend time exploring governing body websites and technical journals for information about contemporary fitness testing.

Most candidates identified appropriate components of fitness and compared their scores with normative data. Some of the candidates however did not include enough depth in their outcomes of fitness tests by not including peer group results or elite level performer's results to support their analysis.

The principles of reliability and validity of testing were considered by most candidates, in some cases in good depth, although for some this is an area needing more detail, to confirm the understanding of what these terms mean and how they are applied to each of the fitness tests selected. In the higher achieving work, the test data gathered was interpreted well and the limitations of certain tests were discussed.

Most candidates were able to provide suitable priorities for training which provided the platform for their planning work.

Technical Component

Almost all candidates chose the technical component for this task, and this was generally the most accurately centre marked section.

Most candidates had chosen an appropriate core skill and carried out an analysis of the three phases of the skill – preparation, execution and recovery.

Annotated photos of each phase were mainly of a high level with some very good examples of comparison to elite performers, and in some cases, to peers. Candidates had used elite performers as a means of identifying their own strengths and development needs. Some candidates offered vague descriptions and lacked technical or biomechanical detail. The majority of the technical evidence identified the key areas for improvement, although with some candidates this was lacking depth and not focused on refining and improving the technique. There was however some high level work presented for this task, which included detailed diagrams together with other data to support an insightful analysis of strengths and weaknesses and the justification of key areas for development.

It is important for candidates to remember that any analysis included in their annotated diagrams contributes to the word count. A few candidates had not done this which meant they breached the word limit; this had implications for the moderated marks.

Tactical Component

Very few candidates opted for the tactical option and those that did sought to present work in a structured way, using carefully annotated

images to describe the tactic. Often the initial description of the tactic was detailed and accurate.

Candidates had used data from elite performances to support the application of the tactic in a competitive situation and this helped candidates to achieve good marks.

Some candidates however did not properly use data from elite and local club players to provide supporting quantitative evidence to enhance the evidence presented for this task.

Candidates should be encouraged to undertake research to enhance their understanding of the tactical aspects of performance. Technical or National Governing Bodies (NGBs) journals are a good starting point for this, so too, are various sport-specific magazines and daily newspapers or their online alternatives.

Performance Development Programme Planning

Some candidates still defined SMARTER targets and the principles of training rather than explaining how SMARTER targets and the principles of training can be used to underpin the planning of an effective PDP. The higher marked work applied their own performance and analyses through SMARTER and training principles, rather than treating them as separate tasks.

A number of candidates had referred to the science which underpinned the methods of training identified, although in some work more detail was needed to explain the choice of exercises undertaken, how the level of intensity was identified, and how progressive overload might be applied. For example drop heights in plyometrics and the speed of lifting in weight training.

Some tests chosen were generic, and in some cases dated, although there were some excellent examples of sport-specific tests in a number of pieces of work presented. It is important that candidates include contemporary, sport-specific tests to effectively monitor progress. Many candidates had compared their performances with athlete populations such as elite athletes, in addition to the norm-referenced tables.

All candidates should be urged to take the time to research the growing range of sport-specific tests which can often be found on NGB websites.

Evaluation of the PDP

Many candidates were offering a greater range of qualitative and quantitative data to support their evaluations of their programmes, this included coach testimonies, notational match data and elite/peer comparisons.

Candidates awarded the higher marks managed to write in a succinct and analytical manner and managed to bring their PDP to a logical conclusion, with thoughtful recommendations for future developments and what may be key priorities for further improvements in the short and medium term.

In some pieces of work, very little evidence was presented by candidates.

Coaches

There were very few who offered the coach role and much of this work had similar strengths and weaknesses to the performers.

In addition to the points raised above, centres should remind coaches that an element of this work requires candidates to consider their personal development as a coach, as this can easily be overlooked.

Accuracy of marking

The majority of centres had marked their work accurately, although some marking remains lenient. Much of the work was accurate across all of the tasks and it was encouraging to see that many candidates had been able to integrate analysis of data, comments from their coaches and references to their work in a succinct way, with concise and accurate writing.

Word Count

Moderators reported that the number of candidates who had breached the word count was much reduced compared to last series.

Where issues did arise, it was frequently because candidates had not counted the written analysis included in tables and text boxes for the technical/tactical section. Candidates should be reminded that their own written analysis, including that which is shown in text boxes, counts towards the final word count.

Centres have consistently been advised the following information in previous moderations:

Where learner evidence has a word count of greater than 3500 words, the moderator will use their professional judgement and stop moderating the evidence after this word count has been reached. This ensures parity and fairness in the moderation process and marking of learner evidence for this component. Centres are reminded that the specification states that:

"Performance Analysis and PDP: maximum 3500 words. Students should be advised that if they exceed the word count it is likely that they will not be able to satisfy the requirement of producing of a concise and coherently structured Performance Analysis and PDP. The use of Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaires (PARQs), graphs, charts, tables, and diagrams/flow charts do not count towards the word count. The bibliography does not count towards the word count."

Summary

Moderators commented that much of the work was of a high standard, well structured and well organised. It is evident that the candidates have dedicated a lot of time and taken part in a great deal of research for this component.

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. There are several articles which relate directly to this work that can be found in the back copies on the website.

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