

Scholarship

2011 Assessment Report

Physical Education

COMMENTARY

Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult the extensive range of annotated Scholarship Physical Education exemplars published on the NZQA website. Fewer than 3 per cent of candidates who sat the examination were awarded Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship.

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. These candidates made effective use of research material they had engaged with to justify their responses. Of those who were not awarded Scholarship, understanding of key concepts was restricted to descriptions and recall rather than critical evaluation. The candidature generally continues to demonstrate a difficulty in satisfying fully the requirements for *critical evaluation*, the single most important component for achieving Outstanding Scholarship. Candidates were able to discuss the pros and cons in their critical evaluation, but those who did not achieve Scholarship did not challenge assumptions or question the validity of issues.

Several candidates completed only two of the four questions and produced very good responses for these two questions. In some cases, the responses were at the Scholarship standard.

Of concern is the number of candidates who presented childhood obesity essays in response to the issue of dropping out of sport in Question Two. The annually published assessment specifications provide specific guidance and preparation for teachers and Scholarship candidates alike.

A number of candidates made good use of the references provided for each question. References are provided as a starting point for a response and often contain information that can be used to scaffold a response. The references are also used to represent one or more viewpoints and, therefore, should be used as part of the response. References should be accepted, challenged, or refuted as part of the candidate response. In Question One, the references provided contrasting views on the concept of individuality in a physical activity programme or experience. Candidates were not limited to only considering the second reference for outdoor education, nor the first for a personalised exercise programme. Good candidates recognised that there were valid/contentious points made in each reference that could be applied within either context. Equally, in Question Three, the use of Fitts and Posner's (1967) model of motor skill learning was an opportunity to recognise it as a foundation theory, but also to use competing/complementary theories to consider the role of practice in performance improvement. Candidates awarded Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship recognised this fact; candidates who did not recognise this fact described the stages of skill learning as it applied to their experiences using the Fitts and Posner (1967) model.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- critically evaluated by providing a range of perspectives with relevant research and/or own experience
- showed evidence of wider reading/research/personal experience
- wrote fluently with a high level of sophistication

- developed a logical and coherent essay that concluded with a justified position
- challenged assumptions clearly.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- critically evaluated some questions
- considered a range of perspectives and supported these with research and/or effective use of their own experiences
- planned their answers in relation to the question and where applicable answered both parts of the question
- provided a logical essay that flowed i.e. one paragraph progressed into another rather than being a series of disjointed statements.

Specifically Scholarship candidates:

Question One:

- considered the role of individuality in each aspect of the development of the programme or experience and considered the implication of focusing only on the individual
- looked at the differences between developing a programme for themselves and one in which an experience was developed for a group of people
- considered the role of the individual within a group in a programme experience
- considered the pros and cons of individuality within the programme or experience or considered the differences between a programme and experience.

Question Two:

- considered a range of perspectives on *kids dropping out of sport*, such as to do another sport or to concentrate on their favourite sport, or change to social sport, or that they might drop sport but be involved in another physical activity
- challenged how SPARC gathered statistics and used other statistics to critically evaluate
- considered whether or not sport being provided was relevant to young people
- considered a wide range of impacts or potential impacts on New Zealand – both positive and negative
- demonstrated a balance in causes/influences and impacts.

Question Three:

- considered the relevance of a theory from 1967
- provided other theories and ways of developing motor skills
- critiqued the ability to “race” through the stages
- focused and/or questioned the role of practice in the development of skill, and considered the role and place of other factors (biophysical and socio-cultural) within this.

Question Four:

- used the Action Competency process and considered the role of the wider school community in each stage to increase engagement of children in physical activity
- considered the need for more than one-off “events” to make a change

- considered the need for consistent messages from a range of sources in the role of sustainable change.

OTHER CANDIDATES

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

- provided subject knowledge but very little evidence of critical thinking or critical evaluation
- discussed rather than evaluated
- used prepared answers and attempted to make them fit the question
- answered only part of the question and/or less than three questions
- made assumptions throughout the essay
- provided information or irrelevant subject knowledge to the question
- retold stories of experiences without critically evaluating or using it to support a point made
- provided a series of paragraphs or points that did not connect into a logical essay.

Specifically Other candidates:

Question One:

- provided subject knowledge on how to develop a programme or plan for an experience but little or no evidence of critical evaluating what needed to be considered
- provided superficial information as they attempted to consider both the programme and the experience
- stated what they had done in their own experience but did not connect it to a point they wanted or intended to make.

Question Two:

- made assumptions that because *kids dropped out of sport* that they would become obese
- made a quick leap from kids dropping out of sport to an obesity essay
- did not provide a balance between the issue and impact on New Zealand society
- interchanged terms such as sport/exercise/physical activity/fitness
- assumed that sport made kids fit
- spent too much time on providing solutions when this was not asked for in the question.

Question Three:

- provided subject knowledge about Fitts and Posner's (1967) stages of learning
- showed evidence of assuming that people move through the stages quickly
- did not challenge the theory from 1967
- focused more on the stages of learning and less on the role of practice
- tried to use other biophysical subject knowledge that was not relevant to the role of practice or the question.

Question Four:

- did not understand the health promotion process as used in the Health & Physical Education learning area
- linked the need for more physical activity for candidates because they were dropping out of sport.