

Scholarship

2014 Assessment Report

Physical Education

COMMENTARY

The three compulsory questions in the Physical Education Scholarship paper in 2014 provided a fair paper and the lack of options had no negative impact on the performance of candidates. The three questions were equal in terms of difficulty. They allowed candidates to be divergent in their answers and to critically evaluate from a wide range of perspectives. The quality of responses was consistent with past cohorts.

Those candidates who were awarded Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship demonstrated a sound depth and breadth of understanding of key concepts in Physical Education and were able to critically evaluate the questions against that understanding. Of those who were not awarded Scholarship, understanding of key concepts was limited and restricted to descriptions and recall rather than critical evaluation.

Those candidates who received Outstanding Scholarships demonstrated a wide range of knowledge and, increasingly, the ability to integrate and synthesise key concepts from across Level 8 of the NZ Curriculum. Candidates incorporated HPE conceptual understanding with a sound Physical Education-related theory base, as appropriate to the respective questions, and with insightful critique – challenging assumptions and taken for granted attitudes, values and beliefs, questioning the status quo, or questioning the statements in the resource material. Responses were logically and coherently developed, and supported by a range of evidence to produce a compelling argument that frequently incorporated divergent ideas.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- developed a cohesive and logical response throughout the essay
- used examples/quotes/references which supported and enhanced their answer/argument
- answered the question with divergent perspectives and standpoints.
- developed a response that argued convincingly that cited factors have inter-connections and inter-relationships
- understood theories and concepts pertinent to each question and were able to use them in a way that demonstrated deep knowledge and ability to apply knowledge correctly
- showed evidence of having developed knowledge through a range of sources that demonstrated depth and breadth of understanding
- wrote fluently and coherently
- linked succinctly to the extracts in the questions
- showed depth of understanding and integration of ideas
- demonstrated a sophisticated critical perspective
- explored limitations with a range of alternative viewpoints
- questioned and challenged accepted wisdom with insightful judgements
- answered the question with high level subject knowledge
- backed up points made with evidence and personal experience
- produced the best response possible given the time available.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- were able to identify and challenge assumptions
- demonstrated the ability to critically evaluate identified assumptions by providing reasoned arguments in support of, or to challenge, the assumptions.
- demonstrated the ability to critically evaluate concepts and issues detailed within each question
- used quotes/references/own experiences to support judgements/arguments
- integrated a range of theories and concepts pertinent to the question
- applied evidence from own experience and/or other relevant sources to support the critical evaluation
- demonstrated depth and breadth of subject knowledge
- used knowledge and experiences judiciously to support statements
- linked to the extracts in the question
- recognised and made explicit the biophysical and sociocultural aspects of Physical Education
- showed an in-depth understanding of the subject, and answered key aspects of the question
- used their own experience to validate the points they made.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- did not answer the question
- did not sustain a discussion or argument i.e. lacked depth of response
- may have made a good judgement but did not explain further, or back up with supporting evidence
- misinterpreted the question, and / or gave an answer that did not relate to the question
- described what they did rather than using the experience to back up points
- provided account based essays that lacked critical evaluation and relevant theory/research
- used inaccurate subject knowledge.
- lacked critical thinking related to the question
- re-wrote a pre-prepared essay that was not adequately linked to the question
- did not explicitly link the impacts to NZ society from the media portrayal of violence in sport
- were unable to critique assumptions, or challenge ideas presented to them within the resource material and within the context of the questions.