

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Badminton PEP Commentary

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

The candidate gave a brief introduction which included their aim. This should have come about after the analysis and interpretation of fitness and performance data. Both performance and fitness test data were included. The performance data would be enhanced by using %'s to determine successful shots. Some attempts were made at interpreting the performance data including linking the outcomes to components of fitness. The fitness tests results were compared to normative data, but the interpretation of this data was limited.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 4 marks

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

The predetermined aim was reiterated and supported with three SMART targets. There were some attempts at the application of SMART. A method of training was selected; however, this could be questioned in terms of appropriateness of developing muscular strength for badminton. The candidate discusses 80%+ of 1RM across the principles of training. They attempted to apply the principles, but the depth of application was limited.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 4 marks

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

The required PARQ was included. 15 centre devised training record forms were included which is good, although providing the dates of the training would help authenticate this further. Adaptations were also noted on the forms. A training log was included which was a summary of the training sessions and replicated the training record forms.

Pre, mid and post PEP fitness tests were presented in a graph. It is always important to label all axes. Exercises used across the programme were also on a graph to show improvement, this was useful. The specific fitness test tabulated did not link to the initial SMART targets. Post-PEP performance data was also tabulated. The comparison and interpretation of both the fitness and performance results was limited.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 4 marks

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

The candidate offered a limited evaluation of the method of training used. They briefly discussed their SMART targets and the application of principles of training, but the work lacked the required depth and detail. Recommendations to improve future training and performance were limited.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 4 marks

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

The work presented read well and followed a coherent structure which has probably been centre driven. It was good to see all training record forms presented. All required sections had been included and the work was within the 1500-word count. To gain higher marks the work must be more detailed. There were some errors within the work.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 4 marks

S1: 4
S2: 4
S3: 4
S4: 4
S5: 4

Total: $20/5 = 4$ Level 1 – 4 marks