

## GCSE PE 1PE0 04: PEP 1 Table Tennis Commentary

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

The candidate stated their aim straight away in the first line: *'Over the next 6 weeks my aim for my PEP is to improve my strength/power for table tennis.'* Not only are strength and power two different components, there is no initial analysis of the fitness test data to justify the aim. A physiological overview of table tennis would have been more beneficial to start with that could potentially influence the amount and types of tests used.

There are *some attempts* to analyse fitness test results in comparison to normative data that does help to justify the component selected. The tests are also quite selective, although a power test would be recommended for inclusion considering the nature of the sport and the previous mention of power in the introduction.

A PARQ has been completed and is included within the appendix.

**The work provided in this strand shows some attempts and is marked at Level 2: 8 marks**

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

The overall main aim was mentioned prior to the analysis that also lacks relevance to improving performance in table tennis.

The application of SMART targets has been completed to a good level, albeit slightly descriptive at times and lacking specific and measurable targets. There is a clear plan and a subjective link with how the undertaking of the PEP will improve their performance.

The principles of training have also outlined how the candidate will structure their PEP with some good examples of how they will be applied. However, within the *'specificity'* section, the candidate does again mention that they will include certain exercises (e.g., clap push-ups) to improve their power. The issue with this statement is that there has been no fitness test either pre- or post-PEP to measure power, and it does not form part of the main aim, therefore ultimately decreasing specificity of this task.

Information regarding the application of methods of training is brief, and the candidate has provided *some attempts* to justify the use of circuit training to improve strength for table tennis. Greater justification of circuit training and the specific exercises/stations are required within the main text to be awarded marks in higher levels (although there is some justification within the appendix).

**The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 9 marks**

### **Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.**

The candidate has completed three fitness tests again for speed, agility and strength with illustrated comparisons completed in both table and graph format. There are *some attempts* to link training to the improvements in the fitness tests data, however overall, this was lacking depth and specificity as the main aim was concerned with strength, not speed and agility. The candidate has also analysed HR data, again this lacks specificity as this would be more concerned with a PEP that focussed on aerobic endurance rather than strength.

The candidate would have benefitted from including the following areas:

1. Focused on one component as outlined in the main aim
2. Made comparisons to the main aim and provide greater justifications and supporting evidence as to why strength has improved?
3. Included an analysis with regards to performance and how potential adaptations as a result of training have led to this improvement.

Training logs are evident in the appendix and do demonstrate progressive overload with regards to the amount of repetitions performed each week, although the candidate is advised to include dates and times and individual training sessions. There are good descriptions as to why some of the exercises have been selected, although as previously stated, most of this should have been included within the main task.

**The work provided in this strand shows some attempts and is marked at Level 2: 8 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 starts their evaluation with '*I would like to think that I have completed all my SMART targets after my PEP...*'. If targets are measurable then the candidate should be more confident as there should be ample quantitative evidence to justify any progress.

The candidate continues by saying '*my goal was definitely achievable, I wanted to improve enough to achieve a few kilograms more in the hand-grip dynamometer and I managed to do that*'. This statement is too simplistic that lacks detail and without any quantitative data to fully justify.

There are *some attempts* to link the success of their training to improved sporting performance... '*circuit training has definitely helped me as I can now apply more power to table tennis*'. However, there is a lack of quantifiable data to support this, but it is also slightly confusing since the main aim of the PEP was to increase strength. The candidate continues on the next line about how the coach has commented on how much stronger the candidate has become, although there is no evidence of a witness statement to substantiate this statement or relevance to improving performance.

At the end of the PEP the candidate does *make some attempt at recommendations for future training and performance* but again the candidate refers to increasing power rather than strength (although power would seem to be a more appropriate component of fitness).

Overall, this section lacks depth and **the work provided in this strand shows some attempts and is marked at Level 2: 6 marks**

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

The PEP does have a clear structure and uses some appropriate terminology throughout, but this is inconsistent. Terminology surrounding possible adaptations to assist with evaluating the progress of the task was missing as was the use of generic terms e.g. *'means lam becoming fitter..'*

The work is completed within the 1500-word limit but the main issue with the PEP is that it lacks detail and objective evidence when evaluating performance. There is some *'good coherence and structure...but with some errors of judgement and accuracy'*.

**The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 9 marks**

**Principal Moderator mark:**

S1: 8

S2: 9

S3: 8

S4: 6

S5: 9

**Total: 40/5= 8**

**Level 2 - 8**