

PRINCIPAL EXAMINER'S REPORT



BOTSWANA
EXAMINATIONS
COUNCIL

JCE PHYSICAL EDUCATION 2025



PAPER 1: WRITTEN THEORY

General Comments

This report presents an analysis of candidates' responses to Physical Education Paper 1. The purpose is to highlight areas of strength and weakness demonstrated in the examination, focusing on comprehension, interpretation, and application of subject knowledge. Candidates showed significant improvement in attempting the questions as most attempted all the questions. There has been notable improvement across centres in subject knowledge and understanding of concepts, however candidates still tend to confuse certain related concepts.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1 Most candidates confused **Recreation** with **Leisure** so most of them were defining Leisure and some even misuse the term "Spare time." This indicates a lack of clear understanding of the concept of Recreation, which refers to activities done during leisure or how one spends his or her leisure time.
- 2 (a) Most of the candidates correctly stated principles such as **Overload** and **Specificity**, though some incorrectly used verbs like "**Overloading**."
(b) Most of the candidates failed to explain how these principles make training effective, they only defined training principles e.g. Overload- increasing training load. But they failed to explain how overloading makes training effective. Eg Training becomes effective because overload challenges the body beyond its usual level, leading to improvement in strength, endurance, or performance.
- 3 (a) Most of the candidates described movements instead of naming them, e.g., "Circular movement" instead of **Circumduction**.
(b) Most of the candidates correctly identified muscles such as **Biceps, Triceps, and Trapezium**.
- 4 Candidates confused the roles of specialists, mixing responsibilities of a **Sports Physiotherapist** with those of a **Sports Psychologist**.
- 5 (a) Candidates often wrote "**Sports**" instead of "**Sport**," affecting accuracy.
(b) Many explained why **Play** is not sport rather than listing its characteristics.
(c) Some incorrectly compared participant numbers in sport and play.
- 6 (a) Most candidates wrongly linked high fitness levels with high resting heart rate, instead of recognising the correct association with **lower resting heart rate**.
(b) Misinterpretation of the table led to further incorrect responses.
- 7 Most candidates successfully explained how sporting activities can disseminate information on **HIV/AIDS**.
- 8 While many answered correctly, others confused **social and interpersonal skills** with fitness components e.g. cardiovascular Endurance ,showing inconsistency in comprehension.
- 9 (a) Most candidates correctly identified **Mhele**, though some incorrectly wrote **Morabaraba**.



- (b) Rules were generally well stated, including **Khoho**, 24 pebbles, interchange play, and minimum of two participants.
- 10 (a) Candidates largely interpreted the graph correctly, identifying **fast twitch fibres**, though some gave incorrect answer as Slow twitch muscle fibre
- (b) Those who answered correctly justified their responses well, citing much force exerted and short duration, those who got it wrong were giving contacting with less force etc
- (c) Examples like **jumps, sprints, and throwing** were correctly given, though some wrongly included football, netball, and push-ups.
- 11 Candidates gave examples of synovial joints (e.g., hinge, pivot) instead of correctly classifying joints as **freely moveable, slightly moveable, or immovable**.
- 12 Candidates described body types with everyday terms (slender, obese, muscular) instead of scientific classifications: **endomorph, mesomorph, ectomorph**.
- 13 Many incorrectly associated **netball** with net/wall games, though some correctly identified volleyball, squash, badminton, tennis, and table tennis.
- 14 The majority correctly identified **soft tissue injuries** such as cuts, sprains, and strains.

Section B

- 15 (a) Most of the candidates correctly selected **Soccer** and interpreted the table well.
- (b) Factors affecting participation such as age, health, fitness level, and sex were correctly mentioned, though some confused these with fitness components such as Speed etc
- (c) Some candidates incorrectly focused on physiological differences such as females are more flexible than male, rather than **gender roles and stereotypes**.
- (d) Effective solutions were suggested: education, equal opportunities, facilities, and campaigns.
- (e) Few candidates related **technology** to participation; most gave general solutions like reducing fees or increasing female activities.
- 16 (a) (i) Most candidates incorrectly gave **speed** instead of **cardiovascular endurance**.
- (ii) Most candidates gave correct answers including **stopwatch, timer, and measuring tape**.
- (iii) Misinterpretation led to wrong answers, with candidates describing speed tests.
- (b) Activities such as **jogging, walking, skipping, and cycling** were correctly identified, though some gave unqualified answers such as push ups or competitive activities like Netball.
- (c) (i) Most correctly defined **sedentary lifestyle** as lack of physical activity, though some linked it to diseases; diseases cause by lack of exercise.
- (ii) Correctly identified sedentary lifestyle diseases included **hypertension, stroke, and heart attack**, though some incorrectly listed communicable diseases Covid, HIV/AIDS etc.



Conclusion

The analysis reveals that while candidates demonstrated competence in certain areas such as interpreting graphs, identifying injuries, and understanding participation factors, there were notable weaknesses in conceptual clarity, classification, and application of principles. Common errors included misuse of terminology, confusion between related concepts, and failure to interpret data accurately.

To improve performance, emphasis should be placed on:

- Strengthening conceptual understanding of key terms.
- Practicing accurate classification in anatomy and physiology.
- Enhancing interpretation skills for data and graphs.
- Integrating technology and contemporary issues into Physical Education contexts.



PAPER 2: COURSEWORK

General Comments

This is a School Based Assessment which assesses the candidate's ability to perform physical activities of their choice, analyse their or other candidates' performance in a written workbook. During performance candidates are expected to perform certain activities while in a workbook candidates are expected to analyse and recommend ways to improve their or other candidates' performance. Generally, performance in component 2 showed the same analytical skills and performance throughout all offered activities as most of the candidates were able to present their practical skills in isolation and in game situation for performance whilst in the workbook, they were able to identify the key skills and attempt to come up with the strengths and weaknesses including coming up with ways of improving performance. In general workbooks were neatly presented.

Comments on Individual Sections

WORKBOOK

The following are subheadings/sections in the workbook and how candidates performed in each of them.

Key skills

This sub section was well handled by majority of the candidates as they were able to describe the key skills in detail, mentioned the uses of the key skills of the activity both simple and complex skills. There were a few candidates who did lack detail in their skill description as the stance, the execution, the follow through and the product of the skill including how and when the skill is used in the activity. Some candidates failed to describe the offensive and defensive tactics of the activity including advanced skills of that activity. Diagrams, illustrations and pictures of the activity to further justify their skill descriptions were lacking.

There are four to five centres where candidates were writing 80 to 100 pages on key skills and only a quarter page on the strengths and weaknesses, centres are discouraged from doing this especially where the workbook goes to 200 pages, as is too much for JCE candidates.

Strengths and Weaknesses

A larger number of candidates failed to handle this sub section well as instead of using their own words to analyse performance they instead used the learning cues or literature on skill description and used words like perfect, well, good to make the cues the strengths whilst using words like poor, weak and not well to make the cues weaknesses. Candidates also failed to justify how the weakness or the strength did affect the general performance in the activity. Many candidates only analyse the technique which is how the skill is executed and fitness in performance leaving out the tactical analysis.

There is a lot of contradiction from a number of centres where a strength would appear exactly as it is as a weakness which means it cancels the earlier stated strength. A number of candidates were using table form and bullets to do their analysis, and this limited the analytical skills of the candidates compared to when is in essay form, considering that an aspect can appear as both a strength and a weakness.



Other factors affecting performance

Majority of the candidates mentioned the factors affecting performance though found it difficult to mention how it affected performance the day of assessment. Other factors are things which to Physical Education understanding are avoidable like injury, attire, diet etc.

Ways of improving performance

A few candidates did handle this sub section well, as they came up with drills that were not addressed in the earlier identified weaknesses or reinforce the strengths mentioned, some drills defied the principles of training like having a highly demanding activity in general warm up. Drills in the main activity or in the skill or fitness application should be related to the activity addressed e.g. netball drills be for netball not for soccer or gymnastics. Candidates in most instances suggested very few drill or no drills at all in their ways to improve performance. The ways of improving always covers fitness weaknesses, technique weaknesses and candidates hardly suggest ways to improve tactical weaknesses.

Discussion and response

This was well handled by majority of the candidates though a few of them do not mention or show that they did have a discussion with their assessor and even fail to mention their response.

PERFORMANCE

Generally, majority of the centres presented videos which were visibly clear, audible, with candidates well identified and performing adequate drills in the activities of their choice.

Skills in isolation

Majority of the centres handled this aspect well as skills in isolation were presented though in many instances the presented skills in isolation were very few in the number of drills. In instances where skills in isolation were presented, they lacked detail as in they did not show the candidates stance, execution, follow through and the product. This made it difficult to access better marks as some aspects of the skills in isolation were not seen by the moderators. In most cases simple skills were presented whilst complex skills and tactics of the activity were not seen and this also denied candidates better marks as per the criterion.

Game situation

In most of the Centres, candidates did present the game situation or skill application, though in some instances advanced skills and tactics were not seen. In some Centres, candidates did not fully participate in the game situation to give the moderators enough evidence to assess them, as they would have not been part of the game. Candidates also fail to exhibit skill mastery especially in complex skills and as such fail to defend marks awarded during internal moderation at centres. In some instances, the game situation is too short to give moderators a picture of the candidate's performance. Some few centres presented videos without game situation, and this denies candidates better marks on the criterion.

Sampling

In a handful of centres sampling is not properly done, firstly identification is a problem as candidates are given similar attire in colour and design which makes it difficult for moderators to differentiate the identified candidates. This is even made harder by poor tracking of candidates and non-audible clips. If candidates introduce themselves the centre moderator should echo their names for better identification. In a good number of centres candidates of similar ability are sampled to represent different abilities especially where candidates of high ability are deliberately given low marks with the hope that moderators will scale the



centre up, in many cases this tendency of hiding poor candidates with better ones negatively affects the centre marks.

In many centres marks are not allocated according to the criterion as most of the candidates are allocated more marks than they deserve that is to say the evidence given also fails to justify the allocation of such marks.

Safety is not observed in some centres especially in gymnastics where is done in rooms with furniture and the attire not suitable for the candidate's safety.

There is evidence of malpractice in about four centres and evidence have shown that there is lack of centre supervision as this happen every year and it disadvantage the affected candidates.

In conclusion centres are advised to standardise before marking at centres or as clusters or clusters so that the criterion is properly applied and they adhere to the criterion when allocating marks to avoid big deviations with external moderators. Video tapes should be tested (replayed) at centres before being sent for external moderation to avoid sending unclear, non-audible clips, inverted clips and those with nothing in them. The videos be shot in time and be done with a good video shooting plan.

All materials that are sent for moderation must be signed by the Chief invigilator.