Summary report of the 2019 ATAR course examination: Physical Education Studies

| Year | Number who sat all <br> examination components | Number of absentees from <br> all examination components |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 1843 | 10 |
| 2018 | 2083 | 13 |
| 2017 | 2170 | 19 |
| 2016 | 2280 | 33 |

Examination score distribution-Practical


Examination score distribution-Written


## Summary

Practical examination
Skills performance

Attempted by 1857 candidates
Conditioned performance
Attempted by 1854 candidates

Section means were:
Skills
Attempted by 1822 candidates
Alternative examination
Attempted by 35 candidates
Performance
Attempted by 1819 candidates
Alternative examination
Attempted by 35 candidates

Mean 30.37\% Max 50.00\% Min 6.67\%

Mean 30.49\% Max 50.00\% Min 5.00\%

Mean 60.65\%
Mean 30.32(/50) Max $50.00 \quad$ Min 6.67
Mean 65.90\%
Mean 32.95(/50) Max $48.33 \quad$ Min 15.00
Mean 61.08\%
Mean 30.54(/50) Max $50.00 \quad$ Min 5.00
Mean 55.14\%
Mean $27.57(/ 50) \quad$ Max $50.00 \quad$ Min 7.50

| Examination | Population | Mean | Standard <br> deviation | Maximum | Minimum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative | 35 | 60.52 | 16.62 | 90.83 | 29.17 |
| Australian Football | 195 | 63.14 | 10.82 | 90.00 | 30.83 |
| Badminton | 91 | 60.67 | 14.92 | 100.00 | 33.33 |
| Basketball | 161 | 58.86 | 13.28 | 98.33 | 29.17 |
| Cricket | 48 | 61.44 | 12.96 | 82.50 | 24.17 |
| Hockey | 98 | 60.96 | 10.87 | 89.17 | 35.83 |
| Netball | 648 | 60.28 | 12.48 | 100.00 | 16.67 |
| Soccer | 172 | 64.34 | 11.08 | 85.00 | 0.00 |
| Tennis | 39 | 67.35 | 16.95 | 94.17 | 21.67 |
| Touch | 221 | 58.93 | 12.28 | 85.00 | 30.00 |
| Volleyball | 150 | 58.64 | 15.95 | 100.00 | 25.83 |

## Written examination

Attempted by 1940 candidates
Mean 54.77\%
Max 90.96\% Min 0.00\%
Section means were:
Section One: Multiple-choice
Attempted by 1940 candidates
Section Two: Short answer
Attempted by 1939 candidates
Section Three: Extended answer
Attempted by 1936 candidates
Mean 66.15\%
Mean 13.23(/20) Max $20.00 \quad$ Min 0.00
Mean 50.30\%
Mean 25.15(/50) Max $46.96 \quad$ Min 3.38
Mean 54.78\%
Mean 16.44(/30) Max $29.50 \quad$ Min 0.00
The examination was designed to be a fair and valid assessment of a candidate's knowledge of the five key areas of the syllabus; Exercise Physiology, Biomechanics, Motor Learning and Coaching, Functional Anatomy and Sport Psychology. Questions ranged from simple to complex with the majority of questions scaffolded to provide discrimination between candidates. There was a more even distribution of marks across the three sections of the paper compared to last year. The greatest improvement was in the Extended answer section with a mean of $54.78 \%$ compared to $46.46 \%$ in 2018 . The overall mean of $54.77 \%$ is higher compared to the mean of 2018 (51.42\%)

## General comments

## Practical examination

In each sport, five skills were examined. The drills were appropriate to the skills being assessed and allowed the candidates to show their understanding of the skill in both their application of the skill and knowledge of the drill. The conditioned performance allowed candidates to show their abilities in game play. They demonstrated attack, defence and effective communication. The five skills along with the conditioned performance were a sound indicator of the candidates' ability.

## Written examination

Candidates continued to perform poorly in areas such as Carron's Model, while questions about the Magnus effect and transfer of learning were handled well.

## Advice for candidates

- Read the question carefully. Too many candidates misread the question and don't provide an appropriate answer.
- Any examples used must relate to the context of the question.
- If a question asks to outline, write at least a sentence rather than three to four words.
- Remember to use ID E; identify the concept in the answer, describe/define the concept and provide an example relevant to the stem of the question.


## Advice for teachers

- Encourage students to read the questions carefully and more than once so they know exactly what is expected.
- Remind students to relate examples to the context in the stem of the question.
- Use past examination papers to teach students how to answer questions and receive full marks.


## Comments on specific sections and questions <br> Practical examination

Questions 1 to 5 relate to skills. Only the skills in the support document are used in the examination. The full range of marks were awarded. The examinations of the different sports were similar so that comparisons could be made between sports. Each sport was aimed to be a moderate to high level examination with one static and four dynamic components; with one less complex (or bit easier skill) and one more technical (or more difficult skill). All of the practical examinations enabled markers to assess, differentiate between candidates and reflect the range of ability (i.e. low, middle and high). They included a range/spread of skills for each sport with no specialist skills. Three drills to assess five skills worked well for most sports.

## Written examination <br> Section One: Multiple-choice (20 Marks)

Candidates scored well in this section. The mean score of $66.15 \%$ was the highest of the three sections. Three questions that scored a mean of below $50 \%$. Question 6 was the hardest for candidates to answer with a mean of 33\%. A pivot point was identified in the photograph indicating a lever system in action and there was only one answer (torque) from the distractors that related to levers. Question 2 was the second lowest scoring question from the section. Candidates were required to identify the physiological effects of using anabolic steroids from a list. By deduction, candidates should have been able to narrow down their choice to two. Candidates may not have read the question properly that only asked for physiological responses, not psychological. Question 10, about drag and the impact of turbulent flow around an object, was answered poorly.

## Section Two: Short answer (74 Marks)

The mean for Section Two increased to $50.30 \%$ compared to $48.86 \%$ in 2018. Candidates found it difficult applying their knowledge to justify an answer, hence, were unable to take full advantage of the allotted marks. In general, candidates were able to identify the concept required by the question. The more capable candidates were able to apply the concept to their answer or were able to justify their answer using the concept. Less able candidates only gave a simplistic answer.

## Section Three: Extended answer (30 Marks)

The mean for Section Three was 54.78\%. Compared to 2018, this is an increase of $14.32 \%$ and also presents the highest mean for the Extended answer section in the last five years.

