

Assessment Schedule – 2014**Scholarship Physical Education (93501)****Cut Scores**

| Descriptors | Outstanding Scholarship | | Scholarship | | Just below Scholarship | Below scholarship | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2, 1, 0 |
| Analysis and critical thinking | Divergent ideas surrounding the topic. Complexity. Appropriate use of references and relevant experience. | Slightly lower level of sophistication. | Critical evaluation mostly sustained. Theoretical, practical balance. | Critical evaluation not sustained. Theoretical, practical balance. Theoretical underpinnings may be inferred. | Some critical evaluation, but not consistent. | Little evidence of critical thinking and no critical evaluation. | 2 = Relevant Scholarship subject knowledge, but no evidence of critical thinking, or evaluation. 1 = Minimal evidence of relevant Scholarship subject knowledge. 0 = No relevant Scholarship subject knowledge shown. |
| Integration, synthesis, and application of highly developed knowledge, skills, and understanding of complex situations | Depth of understanding and integration. Understanding of complexity. Divergent ideas. | Less complexity in argument may present as less convincing. | Addresses all aspects of the question and feels balanced. | Addresses all aspects of the question, although limited viewpoints may have been considered. | Not evident, or lacks balance (to the extent the questions are not really addressed). | | |
| Logical development, precision, and clarity of ideas | Logical development of argument. Supports argument with further evidence. | | | May be issues with logic. May be some repetition of ideas. | Covers too many points, inadequately. | Questions not properly answered – recollection, explanation alone. | |
| Sustained perception and insight | Across a range of selected appropriate contexts. Depth in chosen contexts. | | Depth in some areas. Breadth may overtake depth. | | Breadth over depth. | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Sustained sophisticated integration and abstraction | Generalise to likely future outcomes. | Less sophistication and creativity. | Some development of ideas. |
| Sustained independent reflection and extrapolation | Provide scenarios based on personal reflection to illustrate a point. | Some personal reflection evidence in answer. | Little evidence of independent reflection. |
| Sustained convincing communication | Balanced response (theory and practice). Compelling argument. Clarity, precision, and creativity. | Clear argument. | May be issues with fluency. |
| | | | Many unsubstantiated assumptions and generalisations. |

Evidence Statement

Question One

The candidate critically evaluates the assumptions within the LISPA Model with respect to maintaining or increasing physically active lifestyles, and supports their evaluation with appropriate examples from their own knowledge and experience of strategies that focus on the maintenance of lifelong involvement in physical activity.

Central to this question is the identification of assumptions from the LISPA model. These assumptions include:

- Addressing fun, skill development, individual needs, and maximum participation, will encourage people to stay involved in physical activity.
- Achieving success at all levels in line with individual choices, will encourage physical activity to be maintained.
- Applying such a model across all stages of development will increase or maintain involvement in physical activity.
- Involving oneself in physical activity as a consequence of participating in such a programme will / would lead to lifelong participation.

The candidate will critically evaluate these, and any other assumptions implied in the model, by referring to their own experience, knowledge and research. Some of the following points, which are NOT exclusive, may be considered:

- (1) Does reaching optimum potential have to come about through direct involvement in physical activity?
- (2) Are fun, skill development, etc, key variables in aiding involvement in physical activity throughout the life cycle?
- (3) Addressing individual needs, while good in theory, is difficult to achieve in practice with a large group.
- (4) How do we define “achieving success”?
- (5) The model is admirable in its intent and could be successful in implementing change in attitude towards physical activity because it is looking to act at the personal, interpersonal, and societal levels of influence, by tapping into the key enablers / barriers to involvement in physical activity, rather than at the level of consequence.
- (6) If we can change the hearts and minds of people, does research support the idea that they will remain physically active?
- (7) Did this model come about using a health promotion approach in conjunction with the Action Competency Process, or if not, were the conclusions / objectives generated merely assumptions? (The candidate may approach this question from a health promotion angle).
- (8) Does sport = physical activity as implied in the LISPA model?
- (9) Does the development of fundamental skills mean engagement in physical activity / sport will be more meaningful? Do we have to be skilled to be physically active?
- (10) Comparison of the LISPA Model and objectives with models that currently operate in New Zealand.
- (11) Use of competing models from within New Zealand or internationally to demonstrate a more holistic or inclusive approach to maintaining or increasing involvement in physical activity.

The following are likely to be integrated throughout the candidate’s answer to show a personal response to the question:

- (12) Comparison of the LISPA Model with programmes that the candidate has implemented in an attempt to engage people in physical activity.
- (13) Use of anecdotes / experiences from the candidate’s own life, with respect to involvement and maintenance of involvement in physical activity.
- (14) Strategies the candidate intends to put in place to ensure maintenance of involvement in physical activity.

Question Two

The candidate critically evaluates the portrayal through the media of the issue of violence in sport, and the potential impact on New Zealand society, and supports their evaluation with appropriate examples from their own knowledge and research about the role of the media in the portrayal of violence in sport in New Zealand.

Note: This is NOT an essay on the causal factors of violence in sport, independent of the role of the media; answers must be linked directly to the question. The candidate may recognise the scope / breadth / complexity of causality, but the focus must be on critically evaluating the role of the media.

The critical evaluation may include, but is not limited to, consideration of the following:

- (1) The media and sport occupying a symbiotic relationship.
- (2) The difference between aggression and violence.
- (3) Aggression can be physical or psychological (eg verbal), with the intent to physically or psychologically harm another person.
Violence being physical, with its sole objective being to deliberately attempt to harm or injure someone else.
How the motivation to be aggressive or violent is justified / qualified.
Theories of violence in sport.
- (4) Consumers of sport through the media finding it difficult to distinguish between aggression and violence, and often using the media to inform the difference.
- (5) Sport is often used as a 'front of house' for wider society, and therefore sensationalising or normalising violence in sport potentially impacts negatively on society by normalising it in a wider context.
- (6) The role of the media in shifting the boundaries between violent and / or aggressive acts in male and female sport.
- (7) How the media normalise the notion of violence as a tool for entertainment.
- (8) The likelihood of being able to address the issue of the role of the media in sport violence (opinions must be supported by justification / evidence / examples).
- (9) The media is a major factor in violence in sport, but there are other causal factors. It is too simplistic to merely blame the media.

Question Three

The candidate critically evaluates the influence of sociocultural factors in performance improvement programmes, and supports their evaluation with appropriate examples from their own knowledge and experience of programmes designed to improve performance.

The critical evaluation is demonstrated through an understanding that performance improvement does not operate in isolation from sociocultural factors, because performance improvement is complex. Following the dominant paradigms concerning performance improvement (in a biophysical sense) does not guarantee performance improvement. Further, how we define performance improvement is an important consideration.

In order to address this central assumption, aspects the candidate may address include, but are not limited to:

- (1) What is performance improvement?
- (2) Traditional (biophysical) views of performance improvement (physical improvement) versus more inclusive definitions of performance improvement (whole athlete well-being / health).
- (3) How did candidate go about performance improvement programmes?
- (4) Strengths and weaknesses of the biophysical application of performance improvement strategies.
- (5) Why, if we follow the “rules” of performance improvement, do we still not necessarily see performance improvement manifested physically?
- (6) Recognition that performance improvement strategies operate within a wider environment, ie they are not simply a case of having ‘nature’ performing well, whilst ‘nurture’ is ignored.
- (7) Power relationship between intrinsic controls versus extrinsic influences on performance improvement.
- (8) Elaboration of how some sociocultural factors influence performance improvement.
- (9) How, as athletes, coaches, leaders, an understanding of sociocultural factors may lead to an increased likelihood of performance improvement.
- (10) Sociocultural influences directly affecting performance improvement.
- (11) Why do we value biophysical factors over sociocultural ones (objectivity, measurability, ‘controllability’, etc)?
- (12) Discussion could include such sociocultural factors as: gender roles, body image, personal motivation, support structures, popular culture, cultural factors, attitudes and values, socioeconomics, etc.