

NETBALL NEW ZEALAND
THEORY EXAMINATION – New Zealand Paper 1, June 2009
EXAMINERS REPORT

(a) Summary of Results

Twenty-one New Zealand candidates sat the June examination, of these nineteen (90.5%) were successful. The average mark for the examination was 55.

Congratulations to Kate Smith from Nelson, who gained the top mark in New Zealand with 59.5 followed by Paula Radich and Sarah Robson on 59 from Manawatu.

(b) General Comments

It was pleasing to see the very high pass rate. The marks reflected a very good understanding of the questions, with many of the passes higher than in previous papers.

Candidates were very well prepared for this examination. Candidates do need to be aware that the space allocated for answers on the examination paper are an indication of the length of answer required. Many candidates gave responses that were too wordy and this could lead to contradictions. Rulebook terminology will help candidates produce concise responses.

Check marking ensured that any question errors did not adversely affect candidate's marks.

The Moderator assisted with marking as well as being responsible for the checking of marking, including all papers close to a pass.

Anne Blomfield and Fay Meiklejohn
Mandy Nottingham

New Zealand Theory Examiners
Moderator

JUNE 2009

APPENDIX**Section 1 Comments**

Q1	Well answered
Q2	Very well answered
Q3	(ii) Candidates need to be aware of 'Team Officials' and who this includes (enables simplicity of answer)
Q4	Very well answered
Q5	(iv) Some candidates were not aware of correct ruling
Q6	Very well answered
Q7	(i) Mostly well answered
Q8	Candidates had good understanding of blood stoppages
Q9	(i) Required 'time' and 'reason' for full marks
Q10	Reasonably well answered

Section 2 Comments

Q1	(i) (b) Some candidates were unclear on "where". Refer new protocols for match officials 2009.
Q2	(ii) Many candidates answered incorrectly. Refer protocol 2.1
Q3	(i) Full answer should have included "not more than".
Q4	(ii) Some candidates answered incorrectly. Required "Team Bench Side Line"
Q5	Well answered

Section 3 Comments

Q1	Well answered
Q2	(i) Required 2 infringements to be stated to gain full marks; (iii) Error in wording – this was taken into consideration in marking
Q3	Well answered
Q4	Well answered
Q5	Some candidates did not realise that the opposition team caught the ball with feet astride the transverse line
Q6	Some candidates did not realise that as one player went offside the toss up is taken in the Goal Third with the two players involved
Q7	A number of candidates did not realise if the ball is held for 3 seconds it is a "held ball"
Q8	Well answered
Q9	Error in wording. This was taken into consideration when marking. Generally good understanding of the rule.
Q10	Generally a good understanding of this rule.