

# Assessment Report

## New Zealand Scholarship Health and Physical Education 2018

### Standard 93501

#### Part A: Commentary

There is an ever-increasing variety of topics coming through. The flexibility of selecting a topic allowed the reports to reflect valuable and interesting current issues.

In general, the layout of the reports has become more consistent with what is asked for. Some candidates appeared to see the 30-page limit as a target and the quality of the report decreased because they were just filling in space.

A general focus on 'sport' was evident in many reports, rather than showing links with physical education or physical activities.

Many students set up an 'analysis', rather than an 'evaluation', which from the outset led them down the wrong path.

The HPE underlying concepts were often incorporated, but at times were not well integrated into the evaluation, or were applied superficially.

In health contexts, it should be noted that a focus on suicide or eating disorders is not appropriate.

#### Part B: Report on performance standard

Candidates who were awarded **Outstanding Scholarship** commonly:

- produced well-constructed reports showing a logical development of their argument/ideas, which allowed for coherent, convincing, and interconnected discussion; analysis; and evaluation
- created a strong structure that allowed their argument to develop in a logical and persuasive manner, including the use of headings and subheadings
- communicated with fluency and sophistication
- were convincing in their argument, developed a 'case', and a strong supporting narrative that placed the examination within a relevant and clear context
- applied knowledge across the report that showed exceptional breadth and depth of understanding that was always relevant and pertinent to the argument at the front of the report
- evaluated critically with perception, insight, and in-depth understanding the topic and its connection to HPE underlying concepts and knowledge
- synthesised highly-developed knowledge, concepts, and ideas in a complex manner
- provided a wide variety of examples (and referenced supporting evidence from a range of relevant and reputable sources) to support the critical evaluation
- demonstrated a deep understanding of the issue being critically evaluated – content knowledge, theoretical underpinnings, links to BP, and/or SC factors
- selected a unique, out-of-the-box topic, or if they chose a common topic (e.g. nature/nurture or PEDs) presented a unique take on the issue
- explored future consequences and outcomes of their selected topic
- showed a sophisticated level of critical thinking, with divergent, perceptive, and insightful ideas
- challenged theoretical ideas or included some critique of literature – did not just take the information presented to them as gospel

- integrated and extrapolated theories and made connections with their own experience or New Zealand examples
- provided a balanced view – explored the different perspectives – but were able to state a position and justify it based on a reasoned argument and supporting evidence
- drew on theories from a wide range of sources, e.g. sociology, psychology.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- selected a topic meaningfully linked to the Health, PE, or Home Economics (HPE) learning area
- constructed a logically-structured report, including use of headings and subheadings
- set up the critical evaluation by posing a question in the introduction that they then answered by the end of the report
- followed a format that enabled them to research, present a range of ideas, challenge assumptions, and make substantiated conclusions
- included a theoretical and practical balance
- made explicit and deliberate links and interconnections to the underlying concepts of HPE (hauora, attitudes and values, health promotion, socioecological perspective)
- demonstrated an understanding of the interrelationship between sociocultural and biophysical concepts
- referenced supporting evidence (and integrated this evidence effectively into their report)
- showed independent reflection on their argument
- provided New Zealand-based examples
- used both their own experience as evidence or to reinforce a point, and research to justify their conclusions
- showed independent reflection on their argument
- consistently applied a strong critical perspective to appropriate issues, theories, practices, and learning experience
- questioned issues, theories, and practices and challenged with insight and perception commonly-held beliefs
- identified, challenged, and questioned assumptions, the status quo, and/or power relations in society
- wove meaningfully their own experience and/or their own evidence into the report
- brought wider societal ideas into the topic such as political, cultural, religious, historical, and social contexts; this was particularly the case for those who used a sports context, e.g. sport and politics, sport and gender (in)equality, sport, and religion.

Candidates who were **not** awarded Scholarship commonly:

- lacked a coherent report structure
- did not link to in, through, and about movement
- did not select a topic that lent itself to be critically evaluated, or did not demonstrate an understanding of what an evaluation meant
- wrote more of a persuasive essay on a topic
- chose a narrow-focused topic
- used few or poor-quality references, such as Wikipedia and popular movies, or YouTube clips
- provided an account-based discussion with minimal critical evaluation, which was often closely linked to certain 'narrow-focused' topics that were frequently approached through account-based writing
- submitted work from Achievement Standards that had little or no alterations to make it an acceptable Scholarship report; however, drawing upon learning experiences from HPE programmes to support critical examinations of a selected topic is encouraged
- wrote a piece that tried to cover too many ideas, which often ended up being superficially dealt with
- lacked the demonstration of knowledge and understanding befitting a L8/NCEA Level 3/Scholarship report in terms of HPE conceptual understanding and/or content knowledge
- wrote from a position of opinion, rather than using evidence from a range of sources to support personal reflections
- lacked explicit links to the HPE underlying concepts, or provided these in too little depth
- included assumptions and generalisations, and did not sufficiently substantiate judgments
- inaccurately applied HPE theories and concepts
- provided little independent discussion or reflection
- applied SPEEECH in a formulaic way, which did not show the interconnections between the different socio-cultural aspects
- wrote in an over-complicated way interfering with communication
- included images, diagrams, tables, statistical information without explaining their relevance to the argument
- made few New Zealand links and relied on foreign examples (athletes, sports, political/cultural environments)
- included a significant amount of unsubstantiated information – assumptions and generalisations
- instead of being critical, wrote comments that go against the attitudes and values of HPE, accepted the status quo, did not dig deeper to challenge assumptions.

[Subject page](#)

**Previous years' reports**

[2017 \(PDF, 50KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 198KB\)](#)

---

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority