

**NETBALL NEW ZEALAND**  
**THEORY EXAMINATION–New Zealand Paper 2, September 2010**  
**EXAMINERS REPORT**

**(a) Summary of Results**

Thirty-three New Zealand candidates and two Oceania (Samoa) candidates sat the September examination, of these twenty eight New Zealand (85%) and two Oceania (100%) were successful.

The average mark for the examination was 54.

Congratulations to Angela Jowitt from Oceania, who gained full marks which is an exceptional result.

The top New Zealand candidates were Lina Luta from Waitakere with 59.5 equal with Bev Paul from Whakatane. Followed closely by Angela Parkin from North Harbour and Wendy Haddon from Te Aroha on 59.

**(b) General Comments**

It was very pleasing to see the high pass rate again in this exam. The marks reflected a very good understanding of the rule book and candidates clearly have a sound practical on Court knowledge. Those that were not successful needed to fully understand the umpires' decisions for on court scenarios (section three responses).

|   |  |
|---|--|
| In section one the average mark was 19. | This demonstrates a solid understanding of the basic rules.                                  |
| In section two the average was 9.5      | Clearly umpires understand protocols and discipline procedures fully. This is very pleasing. |
| In section three the average was 25.5   | This section was the determining factor for those who were unsuccessful in the examination.  |

Check marking ensured that any question errors (section 3/7) did not adversely affect candidate's marks. This check marking was completed in green pen.

Unsuccessful candidates' scripts were remarked and moderated to ensure the boundary between a successful/unsuccessful paper was clear.

Anne Blomfield and Fay Meiklejohn  
Mandy Nottingham

New Zealand Theory Examiners  
Moderator

September 2010

## APPENDIX

### Section 1 Comments

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| Q1  | Very well answered  |
| Q2  | Very well answered  |
| Q3  | A number of candidates did not acknowledge the incorrect Centre Pass, or refer to Black     |
| Q4  | Exceptionally well answered   |
| Q5  | Very well answered  |
| Q6  | Exceptionally well answered   |
| Q7  | Very well answered  |
| Q8  | Exceptionally well answered   |
| Q9  | Very well answered  |
| Q10 | A number of candidates did not write 10 minutes as one option for half time and lost ½ mark |

### Section 2 Comments

|    |   |
|----|---|
| Q1 | Exceptionally well answered   |
| Q2 | Very well answered  |
| Q3 | Very well answered  |
| Q4 | Answer to second part must be a progression from the first part. (Removal from the court is a little harsh) |
| Q5 | Exceptionally well answered   |

### Section 3 Comments

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| Q1  | Very well answered   |
| Q2  | Well answered  |
| Q3  | Well answered  |
| Q4  | Candidates lost marks if they did not realise an advantage applied   |
| Q5  | Well answered - must have both infringements, ½ mark lost  |
| Q6  | Complex question-some candidates did not realise the player (from a Throw In) needed to re-enter directly onto court. Two possible, correct answers both of which were marked accordingly. |
| Q7  | Error in the question (White C should have read Black C). Each paper moderated.  |
| Q8  | Well answered. The intention was that WA was the player receiving the Centre Pass.   |
| Q9  | Very well answered   |
| Q10 | A lot of candidates lost a full mark for not having BOTH players out of play (GD and GK).  |
| Q11 | Well answered  |
| Q12 | Well answered  |