

# **Scholarship**

## **2009 Assessment Report**

### **Physical Education**

## COMMENTARY

The percentage of candidates earning a Scholarship (including Outstanding) from the 2009 examination was 2.06%. It was evident from marking that there is a considerable range of candidates sitting Scholarship. The variation in responses to each question was considerable and is reflected below. Importantly, those who earned Scholarship demonstrated a high level of both understanding and preparation. Those who did not, produced responses that skirted around or avoided the question, or concentrated on their own experiences, or used pre-prepared responses (see below).

Candidates should have been aware of the need to consider what constitutes critical thinking/evaluation, taking action and health-promotion, and to balance the link between theory and practice.

The following were common issues with each question in the 2009 examination.

### Question 1:

Common areas of concern were candidates who:

- critically evaluated their own programme or wrote about how to plan a programme, but did not critically evaluate the *purpose of the evaluative process*
- provided superficial answers to the list of factors or tried to include all factors (some of which were not applicable), rather than using the list of factors as triggers to demonstrate their depth of understanding.

### Question 2:

Common areas of concern were candidates who:

- used pre-prepared answers
- wrote about the *causes and influences* but did not critically evaluate the *impact* on NZ society – in effect, providing only half a response to the question
- made assumptions throughout the essay without justifying these or providing evidence in support
- did not cover a range of SPEECH factors where appropriate
- made generalisations about some demographic groups.

### Question 3:

Common areas of concern were candidates who:

- did not draw from a range of biophysical and socio-cultural knowledge
- tried to put too many ideas into the essay and so it became superficial (breadth at the expense of depth)
- used the quotes from the question in the essay with little or no value, often detracting from the points being made.

### Question 4:

Common areas of concern were candidates who:

- did not show any understanding of health promotion and/or a taking action process

- wrote about *fixing* the issues or about barriers/enablers, but did not critically evaluate if it was a good example of health promotion, nor evaluate the actual process.

## **SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- interpreted the question accurately and answered the question specifically
- critically evaluated consistently across all responses
- demonstrated breadth and depth in subject knowledge
- synthesised knowledge
- provided evidence from their own experiences and a wide range of readings to support a justified position, i.e. skilfully integrated theory and practice to enhance their response
- made creative suggestions
- demonstrated essay writing skills which were structured, fluent, sophisticated and succinct.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:**

- interpreted the question accurately and answered the question specifically
- critically evaluated when and where it was required
- demonstrated breadth and depth in subject knowledge
- synthesised knowledge
- provided evidence from their own experiences and a wide range of readings to support a justified position, i.e. integrated theory and practice
- demonstrated essay writing skills which were generally well structured, fluent, sophisticated and succinct.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

### **Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:**

- used pre-prepared answers that did not address the question specifically
- did not answer three questions
- repeated information throughout essays
- demonstrated lack of breadth, depth or subject knowledge
- did not integrate theory and practice
- used Physical Education terms out of context or without appropriate placement in essays (such as *hegemonic*, *technocratic*, etc)
- made many general statements and / or assumptions without evidence to support them.