

NETBALL NEW ZEALAND
THEORY EXAMINATION – New Zealand Paper 2, September 2009
EXAMINERS REPORT

(a) Summary of Results

Twenty-three New Zealand candidates and One Oceania candidate sat the September examination; of these eighteen New Zealand candidates (83%) were successful.

The average mark for the examination was 53.

Congratulations to Stacey King from Hamilton City who gained the top mark in New Zealand with 58.5 followed by Sasha McLeod from Wakatipu and Sophie Cliff from North Harbour who gained 56.5.

Congratulations to Waikato, Southland and Auckland Waitakere for having three candidates all of whom were successful. It was pleasing to see positive results from these regions and we acknowledge the tutors and candidates in these areas.

(b) General Comments

In Section One only sixteen candidates gained either 18 or more marks out of a possible 20. This is lower than in previous examinations and possibly due to candidates not taking enough care to read the questions in enough detail to answer accurately.

In Section Two only three candidates gained full marks. This was disappointing and it appeared that candidates were still not aware of some of the new protocols, especially those involving the Reserve Umpire and the use of electronic Devices.

In Section Three six candidates gained less than 25 marks. In many instances marks were lost where the candidates did not give a full answer, including discounting goals etc.

Anne Blomfield and Fay Meiklejohn
Mandy Nottingham

New Zealand Theory Examiners
Moderator

September 2009

APPENDIX

Section 1 Comments

Q1	Not well answered, candidates need to take care in reading the question.
Q2	Well answered-candidates were not penalised if they were uncertain as to whether it was the first or second quarter of the game.
Q3	Very well answered.
Q4	(iv) Some candidates were not aware of correct ruling.
Q5	Very well answered.
Q6	Very well answered.
Q7	Well answered-candidates must understand an accidental kick is not penalised.
Q8	Well answered-to gain full marks candidates needed to state a free pass was awarded and the player must leave the court.
Q9	Very well answered-many variations accepted as long as they were stipulated in the rule book.
Q10	Not answered well-candidates must understand the blood policy.

Section 2 Comments

Q1	Very well answered.
Q2	(ii) (a) Candidates needed both reason and time to gain full marks.
Q3	Very well answered.
Q4	Candidates need to be aware of the procedure when wearing an electronic device.
Q5	Well answered-candidates must be aware of the responsibilities of the reserve umpire at various times eg before, during and after a match.

Section 3 Comments

Q1	Not well answered-Candidates need to be aware that there was an infringement in part (i) and play continues in part (iii) as per rule book.
Q2	Some candidates failed to recognise the held ball had already occurred before the GK landed. Half a mark was lost if the candidate failed to add that the goal was not counted.
Q3	Well answered -(those that lost marks in (iii) were not aware of the new ruling in the rule book)
Q4	Well answered.
Q5	Some candidates lost marks as they were not aware of where the Toss Up was to be taken and/or who would be involved in the Toss Up.
Q6	Candidates lost marks when they did not discount the goal in (ii) or count the goal in (iii).
Q7	Most candidates lost marks as they did not state the first infringement was penalised.
Q8	Very few candidates recognised that a shooter can successfully shoot for goal after leaning on the ball outside the Goal Circle.
Q9	Many candidates lost half a mark when they did not state why play continued (advantage rule applied).
Q10	Well answered however many candidates lost half a mark for not stating that both penalised players needed to stand beside and away.