**Provincial Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Placings 1st Class Cricket** | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **1995/96** | **1996/97** | **1997/98** | **1998/99** | **1999/00** | **2000/01** | **2001/02** | **2002/03** | **2003/04** | **2004/05** | **Total** |
| **A** | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| **C** | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 40 |
| **CD** | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 39 |
| **ND** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 34 |
| **O** | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 40 |
| **W** | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 28 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2005/06** | **2006/07** | **2007/08** | **2008/09** | **2009/10** | **2010/11** | **2011/12** | **2012/13** | **2013/14** | **2014/15** | **Total** |
| **A** | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 38 |
| **C** | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| **CD** | 1 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 34 |
| **ND** | 6 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 35 |
| **O** | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 36 |
| **W** | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 38 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **1995/96 to 2017/18** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A** | 1 | 3 | 3 |  | **74** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | 2 | 1 | 6 |  | **78** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CD** | 5 | 5 | 1 |  | **84** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ND** | 4 | 2 | 4 |  | **79** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **O** | 6 | 6 | 5 |  | **93** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **W** | 3 | 4 | 2 |  | **75** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

These tables showing the aggregated final positions over a five year period are a rough but reasonably accurate guide to

the success of each province over the various periods. The lower the figure, the greater the success.

Over the past 15 years Auckland has won the first class competition on five occasions, Canterbury and Northern Districts

on three occasions and Central Districts and Wellington twice. Wellington and Auckland have been the dominant teams,

particularly in the period from 2000/01 to 2004/05. Otago has been near the bottom in all periods. Canterbury has been last on

five occasions.

The interesting aspect is to compare these results for one day cricket over a similar period. Canterbury is clearly the

leading team and along with Northern Districts have won the competition on five occasions, but Canterbury’s last victory was in 2005/06.

Otago has improved over the past five years and is the leading team for that period. Auckland has had little success and has

only one victory over the 15 years. This is in contrast with its performance at the longer game.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Centuries For and Against** | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **1995/96** | |  | **1996/97** | |  | **1997/98** | |  | **1998/99** | |  | **1999/00** | |  | **Total** |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** |
| **A** | 4 | 4 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 2 |  | 3 | 1 |  | **12** | **13** |
| **C** | 1 | 4 |  | 9 | 5 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |  | **13** | **17** |
| **CD** | 8 | 5 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 6 | 3 |  | 4 | 3 |  | **23** | **20** |
| **ND** | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 | 0 |  | 2 | 5 |  | 2 | 3 |  | **15** | **13** |
| **O** | 6 | 4 |  | 6 | 4 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 4 | 2 |  | **19** | **14** |
| **W** | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  | **17** | **22** |
|  | **23** | **23** |  | **24** | **24** |  | **15** | **15** |  | **19** | **19** |  | **18** | **18** |  | **99** | **99** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2000/01** | |  | **2001/02** | |  | **2002/03** | |  | **2003/04** | |  | **2004/05** | |  | **Total** |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** |
| **A** | 6 | 6 |  | 10 | 5 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 7 | 5 |  | 7 | 5 |  | **38** | **29** |
| **C** | 7 | 10 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 5 | 8 |  | 7 | 3 |  | 6 | 2 |  | **31** | **29** |
| **CD** | 8 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 8 | 11 |  | **30** | **30** |
| **ND** | 2 | 5 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 5 | 8 |  | 1 | 4 |  | 2 | 6 |  | **15** | **25** |
| **O** | 6 | 6 |  | 3 | 11 |  | 9 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 6 |  | **24** | **31** |
| **W** | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 3 | 4 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 6 | 4 |  | **29** | **23** |
|  | **39** | **39** |  | **33** | **33** |  | **36** | **36** |  | **25** | **25** |  | **34** | **34** |  | **167** | **167** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2005/06** | |  | **2006/607** | |  | **2007/08** | |  | **2008/09** | |  | **2009/10** | |  | **Total** |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** |
| **A** | 2 | 5 |  | 6 | 5 |  | 2 | 5 |  | 16 | 8 |  | 12 | 14 |  | **38** | **37** |
| **C** | 4 | 5 |  | 11 | 12 |  | 6 | 5 |  | 11 | 10 |  | 14 | 7 |  | **46** | **39** |
| **CD** | 6 | 6 |  | 10 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 |  | 12 | 15 |  | 7 | 15 |  | **42** | **56** |
| **ND** | 7 | 5 |  | 7 | 8 |  | 7 | 6 |  | 7 | 11 |  | 10 | 8 |  | **38** | **38** |
| **O** | 1 | 4 |  | 10 | 14 |  | 5 | 9 |  | 6 | 10 |  | 12 | 11 |  | **34** | **48** |
| **W** | 9 | 4 |  | 9 | 2 |  | 10 | 4 |  | 10 | 8 |  | 11 | 11 |  | **49** | **29** |
|  | **29** | **29** |  | **53** | **53** |  | **37** | **37** |  | **62** | **62** |  | **66** | **66** |  | **247** | **247** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2010/11** | |  | **2011/12** | |  | **2012/13** | |  | **2013/14** | |  | **2014/15** | |  | **Total** |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** |
| **A** | 4 | 5 |  | 11 | 10 |  | 10 | 11 |  | 12 | 11 |  | 8 | 4 |  | **45** | **41** |
| **C** | 4 | 6 |  | 6 | 12 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 4 | 13 |  | 10 | 5 |  | **32** | **42** |
| **CD** | 6 | 7 |  | 12 | 9 |  | 9 | 10 |  | 5 | 6 |  | 5 | 8 |  | **37** | **40** |
| **ND** | 5 | 9 |  | 7 | 6 |  | 12 | 10 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 7 |  | **38** | **38** |
| **O** | 11 | 3 |  | 4 | 7 |  | 11 | 9 |  | 14 | 9 |  | 5 | 11 |  | **45** | **39** |
| **W** | 6 | 6 |  | 10 | 6 |  | 12 | 16 |  | 11 | 7 |  | 7 | 8 |  | **46** | **43** |
|  | **36** | **36** |  | **50** | **50** |  | **62** | **62** |  | **52** | **52** |  | **43** | **43** |  | **243** | **243** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2015/16** | |  | **2016/17** | |  |  |  |  | **1995/96 to 2016/17** | | | |  |  |  |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  | **For** | **Against** | | **For** | **Against** |  |  |  |
| **A** | 10 | 3 |  | 9 | 11 |  | 19 | 14 |  | **152** | **134** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | 6 | 6 |  | 10 | 7 |  | 16 | 13 |  | **138** | **141** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CD** | 9 | 14 |  | 9 | 10 |  | 18 | 24 |  | **150** | **170** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ND** | 9 | 5 |  | 7 | 9 |  | 16 | 14 |  | **122** | **128** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **O** | 6 | 11 |  | 9 | 10 |  | 15 | 21 |  | **137** | **153** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **W** | 10 | 11 |  | 9 | 6 |  | 19 | 17 |  | **160** | **133** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **50** | **50** |  | **53** | **53** |  | **103** | **103** |  | **859** | **859** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Canterbury has been in positive ratio over the past 10 years, with particular success over the last five years. Over the 15 year

period they are second to Wellington.

**Outrights for and against**

**1995/96 to 1999/00 2000/01 to 2004/05 2005/06 to 2009/10 1995/96 to 2009/10**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | | |  | **For** | | | **Against** | | | | |  | **For** | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 12 | 14 | |  | | **A** | | 21 | | 8 | | | |  | **A** | 13 | | | 15 | | | |  | **A** | 46 | 37 | | |
| **C** | | 13 | 11 | |  | | **C** | | 10 | | 17 | | | |  | **C** | 13 | | | 11 | | | |  | **C** | 36 | 39 | | |
| **CD** | | 11 | 11 | |  | | **CD** | | 12 | | 18 | | | |  | **CD** | 13 | | | 13 | | | |  | **CD** | 36 | 42 | | |
| **ND** | | 15 | 10 | |  | | **ND** | | 13 | | 16 | | | |  | **ND** | 13 | | | 13 | | | |  | **ND** | 41 | 39 | | |
| **O** | | 11 | 14 | |  | | **O** | | 11 | | 21 | | | |  | **O** | 8 | | | 11 | | | |  | **O** | 30 | 46 | | |
| **W** | | 10 | 12 | |  | | **W** | | 20 | | 7 | | | |  | **W** | 15 | | | 12 | | | |  | **W** | 45 | 31 | | |
|  | | **72** | **72** | |  | |  | | **87** | | **87** | | | |  |  | **75** | | | **75** | | | |  |  | **234** | **234** | | |
|  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | | |  |  |  | | |  | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
|  | | **2010/11 to 2014/15** | | | | |  | | **2015/16** | | | | | |  | **2016/17** | | | |  | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
|  | | **For** | **Against** | |  | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | |  |  | **For** | | | **Against** | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **A** | | 13 | 21 | |  | | **A** | | 6 | | 1 | | | |  | **A** | 3 | | | 3 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **C** | | 19 | 17 | |  | | **C** | | 5 | | 3 | | | |  | **C** | 4 | | | 4 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **CD** | | 17 | 13 | |  | | **CD** | | 2 | | 5 | | | |  | **CD** | 2 | | | 1 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **ND** | | 17 | 16 | |  | | **ND** | | 2 | | 4 | | | |  | **ND** | 4 | | | 2 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **O** | | 18 | 13 | |  | | **O** | | 1 | | 5 | | | |  | **O** | 1 | | | 4 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
| **W** | | 14 | 18 | |  | | **W** | | 5 | | 3 | | | |  | **W** | 2 | | | 2 | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
|  | | **98** | **98** | |  | |  | | **21** | | **21** | | | |  |  | **16** | | | **16** | | | |  |  |  |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Scores Over 300 For and Against** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | | |  | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **1995/96** | | | | |  | | **1996/97** | | | |  | **1997/98** | | | | |  | **1998/99** | | |  | **1999/00** | | |  | |  | **Total** | |  | | |
|  | | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | **For** | | **Against** |  | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | **For** | | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 4 | | | 3 | |  | | 1 | | 4 | |  | 2 | 3 | | | |  | 2 | | 1 |  | 1 | | | 2 | |  | 10 | | 13 | | |
| **C** | | 3 | | | 4 | |  | | 7 | | 4 | |  | 2 | 1 | | | |  | 2 | | 1 |  | 3 | | | 3 | |  | 17 | | 13 | | |
| **CD** | | 4 | | | 3 | |  | | 5 | | 5 | |  | 2 | 3 | | | |  | 3 | | 3 |  | 3 | | | 4 | |  | 17 | | 18 | | |
| **ND** | | 4 | | | 4 | |  | | 5 | | 3 | |  | 3 | 2 | | | |  | 2 | | 3 |  | 3 | | | 2 | |  | 17 | | 14 | | |
| **O** | | 4 | | | 4 | |  | | 5 | | 5 | |  | 2 | 1 | | | |  | 1 | | 1 |  | 2 | | | 1 | |  | 14 | | 12 | | |
| **W** | | 1 | | | 2 | |  | | 2 | | 4 | |  | 3 | 4 | | | |  | 3 | | 4 |  | 4 | | | 4 | |  | 13 | | 18 | | |
|  | | **20** | | | **20** | |  | | **25** | | **25** | |  | **14** | **14** | | | |  | **13** | | **13** |  | **16** | | | **16** | |  | **88** | | **88** | | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | | |  | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **2000/01** | | | | |  | | **2001/02** | | | |  | **2002/03** | | | | |  | **2003/04** | | |  | **2004/05** | | |  | |  | **Total** | |  | | |
|  | | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | **For** | | **Against** |  | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | **For** | | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 6 | | | 4 | |  | | 5 | | 4 | |  | 6 | 5 | | | |  | 4 | | 4 |  | 5 | | | 3 | |  | 26 | | 20 | | |
| **C** | | 6 | | | 8 | |  | | 5 | | 4 | |  | 5 | 6 | | | |  | 6 | | 6 |  | 5 | | | 3 | |  | 27 | | 27 | | |
| **CD** | | 5 | | | 7 | |  | | 4 | | 3 | |  | 2 | 5 | | | |  | 3 | | 4 |  | 4 | | | 6 | |  | 18 | | 25 | | |
| **ND** | | 3 | | | 3 | |  | | 5 | | 6 | |  | 4 | 5 | | | |  | 3 | | 3 |  | 2 | | | 5 | |  | 17 | | 22 | | |
| **O** | | 3 | | | 5 | |  | | 3 | | 8 | |  | 3 | 3 | | | |  | 3 | | 5 |  | 4 | | | 3 | |  | 16 | | 24 | | |
| **W** | | 7 | | | 3 | |  | | 4 | | 1 | |  | 6 | 2 | | | |  | 6 | | 3 |  | 4 | | | 4 | |  | 27 | | 13 | | |
|  | | **30** | | | **30** | |  | | **26** | | **26** | |  | **26** | **26** | | | |  | **25** | | **25** |  | **24** | | | **24** | |  | **131** | | **131** | | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | | |  | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **2005/06** | | | | |  | | **2006/07** | | | |  | **2007/08** | | | | |  | **2008/09** | | |  | **2009/10** | | |  | |  | **Total** | |  | | |
|  | | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | **For** | | **Against** |  | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | **For** | | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 4 | | | 5 | |  | | 3 | | 4 | |  | 3 | 3 | | | |  | 7 | | 8 |  | 8 | | | 8 | |  | 25 | | 28 | | |
| **C** | | 5 | | | 6 | |  | | 6 | | 7 | |  | 6 | 8 | | | |  | 5 | | 8 |  | 9 | | | 9 | |  | 31 | | 38 | | |
| **CD** | | 5 | | | 8 | |  | | 7 | | 7 | |  | 8 | 10 | | | |  | 8 | | 8 |  | 9 | | | 8 | |  | 37 | | 41 | | |
| **ND** | | 4 | | | 5 | |  | | 8 | | 8 | |  | 6 | 6 | | | |  | 6 | | 5 |  | 7 | | | 6 | |  | 31 | | 30 | | |
| **O** | | 5 | | | 1 | |  | | 6 | | 8 | |  | 9 | 7 | | | |  | 5 | | 5 |  | 9 | | | 12 | |  | 34 | | 33 | | |
| **W** | | 7 | | | 5 | |  | | 7 | | 3 | |  | 8 | 6 | | | |  | 7 | | 4 |  | 8 | | | 7 | |  | 37 | | 25 | | |
|  | | 30 | | | 30 | |  | | 37 | | 37 | |  | 40 | 40 | | | |  | 38 | | 38 |  | **50** | | | **50** | |  | **195** | | **195** | | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | | |  | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **2010/11** | | | | |  | | **2011/12** | | | |  | **2012/13** | | | | |  | **2013/14** | | |  | **2014/15** | | |  | |  | **Total** | |  | | |
|  | | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | **For** | | **Against** |  | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | **For** | | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 2 | | | 5 | |  | | 6 | | 7 | |  | 8 | 8 | | | |  | 12 | | 11 |  | 7 | | | 9 | |  | 35 | | 40 | | |
| **C** | | 6 | | | 4 | |  | | 7 | | 6 | |  | 7 | 8 | | | |  | 7 | | 10 |  | 9 | | | 7 | |  | 36 | | 35 | | |
| **CD** | | 7 | | | 5 | |  | | 8 | | 5 | |  | 10 | 7 | | | |  | 7 | | 6 |  | 9 | | | 7 | |  | 41 | | 30 | | |
| **ND** | | 6 | | | 7 | |  | | 9 | | 5 | |  | 6 | 7 | | | |  | 6 | | 6 |  | 7 | | | 9 | |  | 34 | | 34 | | |
| **O** | | 9 | | | 4 | |  | | 3 | | 7 | |  | 7 | 6 | | | |  | 9 | | 8 |  | 7 | | | 7 | |  | 35 | | 32 | | |
| **W** | | 4 | | | 9 | |  | | 6 | | 9 | |  | 11 | 13 | | | |  | 9 | | 9 |  | 6 | | | 6 | |  | 36 | | 46 | | |
|  | | **34** | | | **34** | |  | | **39** | | **39** | |  | **49** | **49** | | | |  | **50** | | **50** |  | **45** | | | **45** | |  | **217** | | **217** | | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | | |  | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **2015/16** | | | | |  | | **2016/17** | | | |  | **Total** |  | | | |  |  | |  |  | **95/96 to 16/17** | | | | |  | **Total** | |  | | |
|  | | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | | **For** | | **Against** | | | **For** | **Against** | | | |  | **For** | | **Against** |  | **For** | | | **Against** | |  | **For** | | **Against** | | |
| **A** | | 8 | | | 8 | |  | | 8 | | 7 | |  | 16 | 15 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 112 | | | 116 | |  |  | |  | | |
| **C** | | 8 | | | 5 | |  | | 8 | | 6 | |  | 16 | 11 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 127 | | | 124 | |  |  | |  | | |
| **CD** | | 8 | | | 14 | |  | | 7 | | 6 | |  | 15 | 20 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 128 | | | 134 | |  |  | |  | | |
| **ND** | | 11 | | | 6 | |  | | 4 | | 6 | |  | 15 | 12 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 114 | | | 112 | |  |  | |  | | |
| **O** | | 4 | | | 9 | |  | | 4 | | 8 | |  | 8 | 17 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 107 | | | 118 | |  |  | |  | | |
| **W** | | 11 | | | 8 | |  | | 5 | | 3 | |  | 16 | 11 | | | |  |  | |  |  | 129 | | | 113 | |  |  | |  | | |
|  | | **50** | | | **50** | |  | | **36** | | **36** | |  | **86** | **86** | | | |  | 0 | | 0 |  | **717** | | | **717** | |  |  | |  | | |

Of interest is to note the good success of Wellington over the 15 year period, by far the most successful province.

In contrast Canterbury and Central Districts are in a negative ratio.

**CONCLUSION.**

These figures show some distinct phases in New Zealand cricket. The period immediately after the World War 2 show

a dominance of bat over ball with **high scores, frequent centuries, high run rates**, **high rate of runs for every wicket taken**.

The number of outright wins also was at a high level although clearly the cricket played was in favour of the batsmen.

This phase changed between *1956/57 and 1969/70* when the reverse occurred and the ball began to dominate the bat. The

**run rate was low, fewer scores over 300 and more scores under 100**, **fewer centuries, wickets taken more frequently,**

**fewer runs per wicket** and rather unexpectedly **fewer outright results** achieved. The cricket was said to be boring and

uninteresting and comments in the Cricket Almanack at the time were critical of the defensive cricket being played and urged

players to take a more positive approach to the game. In reality the change to 3 day cricket had not made the game in

New Zealand more attractive, if anything the complete opposite.

From *1970/71* another phase appears with an **increase in run rate and centuries**, although the trend of bat dominating

ball really takes off with the introduction of the Shell Cup competition in *1980.* However unlike the situation in the 1950's

when outright decisions were common, clearly a trend develops of **fewer results** being obtained with this trend accelerating

in the late 1980's. The introduction of 4 day cricket in *1992/93* shows an **increase in outright decisions, an increase in**

**scores over 300** and a dramatic **fall in the number of declarations** **slowing over the past two seasons.**

There was concern in *1991* that the change to 4 day cricket with the increase in playing time of the extra minimum

112 overs per match, later reduced in 1998/99 to an increase of 64 overs per match, would affect the style of cricket being

played. The belief was that batsmen would have a tendency to protect their wickets and consequently slow the run rate and

declarations would still be required to achieve decisions.

There was also concern that the opportunities for all cricketers would be substantially reduced with fewer games being

played. eg a batsman could expect a maximum of 12 innings (assuming one round followed by a final) as against the possible

20 innings under the 3 day cricket competition.

Another belief by some administrators was that by simply increasing the playing time would not come to terms with some

of the problems of the International game at that time, namely a heavy reliance on medium pace bowling and a paucity of spin

bowlers. **Some of those concerns have not materialised.**

Cricket statisticians in 1991 had shown that dating from around 1979 there had been a reduction in the use of spin at

Test level, but that the reduction in effectiveness of spin bowling as an attacking weapon was of much longer duration. There

was also concern that fast short pitched intimidatory bowling at Test level was ruining the game and if there was insistence

on faster over rates with stiffer penalties a greater employment of spin bowlers might be seen as a consequence of that decision.

In the light of those concerns expressed in 1991, it is interesting to look back on developments within the game over the

past 15 years and consider whether the introduction of 4 day cricket to New Zealand has been of benefit. Clearly

administrators in New Zealand have had problems with the 4 day format with frequent changes being made in the early years

and observation would indicate that the public have not supported the new competition any better than the previous

3 day competition.

The increased number of first class matches in 2009/10 saw a rise in the number of players used to a new high. Four

day cricket averages 110 players each season and three day averages 105 players, the difference reflecting how the

increase in International cricket has affected the composition of provincial teams and possibly there has been an increase

number of injuries.

The one positive to emerge from the years of four day cricket has been the number of outright results obtained with a

reduced need for declarations. But with so many outrights (62%) finishing within 336 overs the question arises has the

increased availability of cricket been put to good advantage, has the cricket played been of better quality, has it helped the

players more easily bridge the step up to International cricket, has it encouraged greater use of spin bowlers, have the

players enjoyed the game more, have spectators shown greater interest, has the competition been more interesting and

more closely fought, have the teams been of more equal strength.

**Provincial Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Placings Four day cricket**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **1995/96 to 1999/00** | | |  | **2000/01 to 2004/05** | | | **2005/506 to 2009/10** | | |  | **1995/96 to 2009/10** | | | | **A** |  | 19 |  | **A** |  | 10 |  | **A** |  | 18 |  | **A** | 37 | 1 | | **C** |  | **19** |  | **C** |  | **21** |  | **C** |  | **15** |  | **C** | **55** | **4** | | **CD** |  | 16 |  | **CD** |  | 23 |  | **CD** |  | 17 |  | **CD** | 56 | 5 | | **ND** |  | 13 |  | **ND** |  | 21 |  | **ND** |  | 17 |  | **ND** | 51 | 3 | | **O** |  | 18 |  | **O** |  | 22 |  | **O** |  | 22 |  | **O** | 62 | 6 | | **W** |  | 20 |  | **W** |  | 8 |  | **W** |  | 16 |  | **W** | 44 | 2 |   **Placings One Day Cricket** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1995/96 to 1999/00** | | |  | **2000/01 to 2004/05** | | | **2005/506 to 2009/10** | | |  | **1995/96 to 2009/10** | | |
| **A** |  | 20 |  | **A** |  | 21 |  | **A** |  | 17 |  | **A** | 58 | 4 |
| **C** |  | **6** |  | **C** |  | **13** |  | **C** |  | **16** |  | **C** | **35** | **1** |
| **CD** |  | 25 |  | **CD** |  | 14 |  | **CD** |  | 20 |  | **CD** | 59 | 5 |
| **ND** |  | 12 |  | **ND** |  | 14 |  | **ND** |  | 17 |  | **ND** | 43 | 2 |
| **O** |  | 28 |  | **O** |  | 25 |  | **O** |  | 13 |  | **O** | 66 | 6 |
| **W** |  | 14 |  | **W** |  | 18 |  | **W** |  | 22 |  | **W** | 54 | 3 |

These tables showing the aggregated final positions over a five year period are a rough but reasonably accurate guide to

the success of each province over the various periods. The lower the figure, the greater the success.

Over the past 15 years Auckland has won the first class competition on five occasions, Canterbury and Northern Districts

on three occasions and Central Districts and Wellington twice. Wellington and Auckland have been the dominant teams,

particularly in the period from 2000/01 to 2004/05. Otago has been near the bottom in all periods. Canterbury has been last on

five occasions.

The interesting aspect is to compare these results for one day cricket over a similar period. Canterbury is clearly the

leading team and along with Northern Districts have won the competition on five occasions, but Canterbury’s last victory was in 2005/06.

Otago has improved over the past five years and is the leading team for that period. Auckland has had little success and has

only one victory over the 15 years. This is in contrast with its performance at the longer game.

**Centuries**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **1995/96 to 1999/00** | | | **2000/01 to 2004/05** | | | **2005/506 to 2009/10** | | |  | **1995/96 to 2009/10** | | |  | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | | **A** | 12 | 13 |  | **A** | 38 | 29 |  | **A** | 38 | 37 |  | **A** | 88 | 79 | | **C** | **13** | **17** |  | **C** | **31** | **29** |  | **C** | **46** | **39** |  | **C** | **90** | **85** | | **CD** | 23 | 20 |  | **CD** | 30 | 30 |  | **CD** | 42 | 56 |  | **CD** | 95 | 106 | | **ND** | 14 | 13 |  | **ND** | 15 | 25 |  | **ND** | 38 | 38 |  | **ND** | 67 | 76 | | **O** | 19 | 14 |  | **O** | 24 | 31 |  | **O** | 34 | 48 |  | **O** | 77 | 93 | | **W** | 17 | 21 |  | **W** | 29 | 23 |  | **W** | 49 | 29 |  | **W** | 95 | 73 | |  | **98** | **98** |  |  | **167** | **167** |  |  | **247** | **247** |  |  | **512** | **512** |   Canterbury has been in positive ratio over the past 10 years, with particular success over the last five years. Over the 15 year  period they are second to Wellington. | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outrights**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **1995/96 to 1999/00** | | | **2000/01 to 2004/05** | | | **2005/506 to 2009/10** | | |  | **1995/96 to 2009/10** | | |  | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | | **A** | 12 | 14 |  | **A** | 21 | 8 |  | **A** | 13 | 15 |  | **A** | 46 | 37 | | **C** | **13** | **11** |  | **C** | **10** | **17** |  | **C** | **13** | **11** |  | **C** | **36** | **39** | | **CD** | 11 | 11 |  | **CD** | 12 | 18 |  | **CD** | 13 | 13 |  | **CD** | 36 | 42 | | **ND** | 15 | 10 |  | **ND** | 13 | 16 |  | **ND** | 13 | 13 |  | **ND** | 41 | 39 | | **O** | 11 | 14 |  | **O** | 11 | 21 |  | **O** | 8 | 11 |  | **O** | 30 | 46 | | **W** | 10 | 12 |  | **W** | 20 | 7 |  | **W** | 15 | 12 |  | **W** | 45 | 31 | |  | 72 | 72 |  |  | 87 | 87 |  |  | 75 | 75 |  |  | 234 | 234 |   Wellington is the most successful province over the 15 years and along with Auckland has had the most successful period between 2000/2001 and 2004/05. At the same time period Canterbury had little success. |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores over 300** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1995/96 to 1999/00** | | | **2000/01 to 2004/05** | | | **2005/506 to 2009/10** | | |  | **1995/96 to 2009/10** | | |  |
|  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** | |  | **For** | **Against** |
| **A** | 10 | 13 |  | **A** | 26 | 20 |  | **A** | 24 | 28 |  | **A** | 60 | 61 |
| **C** | **17** | **13** |  | **C** | **27** | **27** |  | **C** | **27** | **37** |  | **C** | **71** | **77** |
| **CD** | 17 | 18 |  | **CD** | 18 | 25 |  | **CD** | 36 | 41 |  | **CD** | 71 | 84 |
| **ND** | 17 | 14 |  | **ND** | 17 | 22 |  | **ND** | 30 | 29 |  | **ND** | 64 | 65 |
| **O** | 14 | 12 |  | **O** | 16 | 24 |  | **O** | 30 | 26 |  | **O** | 60 | 62 |
| **W** | 13 | 18 |  | **W** | 27 | 13 |  | **W** | 36 | 22 |  | **W** | 76 | 53 |
|  | **88** | **88** |  |  | **131** | **131** |  |  | **183** | **183** |  |  | **402** | **402** |

Of interest is to note the good success of Wellington over the 15 year period, by far the most successful province.

In contrast Canterbury and Central Districts are in a negative ratio.

**Home and Away 2004/05 to 2009/10**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2004/05** |  | **2005/06** |  | **2006/07** | | **2007/08** | | **2008/09** | | **2009/10** |  | **Total** |  |  |
|  | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Home** | **Away** | **Neutral** |
| **A** | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |  | **11** | **7** | 1 |
| **C** | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 8 | 8 |  |
| **CD** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 7 |  |
| **ND** | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 1 |
| **O** | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | **6** | **3** |  |
| **W** | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 10 | 9 |  |
|  | **10** | **9** | **6** | **8** | **6** | **6** | **9** | **4** | **7** | **5** | **12** | **10** | **50** | **42** |  |

This table analyses success on the basis of home and away matches. It shows that Auckland and Otago have more victories at home than the other four provinces and that there is a 54% advantage for the home team.

**CONCLUSION.**

These figures show some distinct phases in New Zealand cricket. The period immediately after the World War 2 show

a dominance of bat over ball with **high scores, frequent centuries, high run rates**, **high rate of runs for every wicket taken**.

The number of outright wins also was at a high level although clearly the cricket played was in favour of the batsmen.

This phase changed between *1956/57 and 1969/70* when the reverse occurred and the ball began to dominate the bat. The

**run rate was low, fewer scores over 300 and more scores under 100**, **fewer centuries, wickets taken more frequently,**

**fewer runs per wicket** and rather unexpectedly **fewer outright results** achieved. The cricket was said to be boring and

uninteresting and comments in the Cricket Almanack at the time were critical of the defensive cricket being played and urged

players to take a more positive approach to the game. In reality the change to 3 day cricket had not made the game in

New Zealand more attractive, if anything the complete opposite.

From *1970/71* another phase appears with an **increase in run rate and centuries**, although the trend of bat dominating

ball really takes off with the introduction of the Shell Cup competition in *1980.* However unlike the situation in the 1950's

when outright decisions were common, clearly a trend develops of **fewer results** being obtained with this trend accelerating

in the late 1980's. The introduction of 4 day cricket in *1992/93* shows an **increase in outright decisions, an increase in**

**scores over 300** and a dramatic **fall in the number of declarations** **slowing over the past two seasons.**

There was concern in *1991* that the change to 4 day cricket with the increase in playing time of the extra minimum

112 overs per match, later reduced in 1998/99 to an increase of 64 overs per match, would affect the style of cricket being

played. The belief was that batsmen would have a tendency to protect their wickets and consequently slow the run rate and

declarations would still be required to achieve decisions.

There was also concern that the opportunities for all cricketers would be substantially reduced with fewer games being

played. eg a batsman could expect a maximum of 12 innings (assuming one round followed by a final) as against the possible

20 innings under the 3 day cricket competition.

Another belief by some administrators was that by simply increasing the playing time would not come to terms with some

of the problems of the International game at that time, namely a heavy reliance on medium pace bowling and a paucity of spin

bowlers. **Some of those concerns have not materialised.**

Cricket statisticians in 1991 had shown that dating from around 1979 there had been a reduction in the use of spin at

Test level, but that the reduction in effectiveness of spin bowling as an attacking weapon was of much longer duration. There

was also concern that fast short pitched intimidatory bowling at Test level was ruining the game and if there was insistence

on faster over rates with stiffer penalties a greater employment of spin bowlers might be seen as a consequence of that decision.

In the light of those concerns expressed in 1991, it is interesting to look back on developments within the game over the

past 15 years and consider whether the introduction of 4 day cricket to New Zealand has been of benefit. Clearly

administrators in New Zealand have had problems with the 4 day format with frequent changes being made in the early years

and observation would indicate that the public have not supported the new competition any better than the previous

3 day competition.

**New Zealand First Class Cricket Grounds**

32 grounds have been used over a fourteen year period from 1996/97 with 16 having more than 5 matches. A number of

those grounds will not be used in the future for first class matches. The 2006/07 season used only nine grounds which was

the fewest number used over the past fourteen years. 2007/08 season saw an increase in number to twelve, the 2008/09 season

used 13 grounds, although the final was played at Lincoln Oval and in 2009/10 twelve grounds were used. In the 2002/03 season

18 grounds were used, the most over the last fourteen years.

**First Class Grounds 2004/05 to 2009/10**

This chart analyses matches played at the most frequently used grounds over the past six years. Of interest to

the CCA is the difficulty in achieving results at the QE2 ground.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Matches** | **Results** | **Result%** | **r/o** | **300+** | **300%** | **100-** | **r/wkt** | **Century** | **100/balls** | **LBW%** |
| Basin Reserve | 22 | 13 | 59.09% | 3.10 | 29 | 39.19% | 1 | 32.83 | 36 | 1154 | 18.96% |
| Hamilton | 13 | 6 | 46.15% | 3.07 | 19 | 39.58% | 0 | 35.30 | 29 | 905 | 14.96% |
| Invercargill | 3 | 1 | 33.33% | 3.28 | 5 | 45.45% | 0 | 37.44 | 3 | 1783 | 11.54% |
| McLean Park | 11 | 4 | 36.36% | 3.46 | 26 | 65.00% | 0 | 43.27 | 34 | 693 | 11.46% |
| Nelson Park | 4 | 1 | 25.00% | 3.35 | 9 | 60.00% | 0 | 38.75 | 9 | 949 | 16.26% |
| New Plymouth | 4 | 4 | 100.00% | 3.45 | 5 | 33.33% | 0 | 36.37 | 7 | 1113 | 11.38% |
| Palmerston Nth | 3 | 2 | 66.67% | 3.19 | 6 | 60.00% | 0 | 33.29 | 5 | 1228 | 11.22% |
| Queenstown | 7 | 7 | 100.00% | 3.07 | 6 | 24.00% | 0 | 31.25 | 11 | 1138 | 19.51% |
| Mainpower Oval | 8 | 6 | 75.00% | 3.22 | 14 | 48.28% | 0 | 35.47 | 17 | 985 | 17.00% |
| University Oval | 14 | 9 | 64.29% | 3.00 | 12 | 24.00% | 5 | 27.07 | 12 | 1960 | 18.20% |
| Village Green | 15 | 5 | 33.33% | 3.23 | 24 | 48.00% | 0 | 41.15 | 34 | 831 | 18.97% |
|  | **104** | **58** | **55.77%** | **3.18** | **155** | **42.23%** | **6** | **35.04** | **197** | **1016** | **16.59%** |

**Overall comparison of grounds 2004/05 to 2009/10**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Results** |  |  | **Run Rate** | |  | **Centuries** | |  | **300%** |  |
| New Plymouth | 100.00% |  | McLean Park | 3.46 |  | McLean Park | 693 |  | McLean Park | 65.00% |  |
| Queenstown | 100.00% |  | New Plymouth | 3.45 |  | Village Green | 831 |  | Palmerston Nth | 60.00% |  |
| Mainpower | 75.00% |  | Nelson Park | 3.35 |  | Hamilton | 905 |  | Nelson Park | 60.00% |  |
| Palmerston Nth | 66.67% |  | Invercargill | 3.28 |  | Nelson Park | 949 |  | Mainpower | 48.28% |  |
| University Oval | 64.29% |  | Villlage Green | 3.23 |  | Mainpower | 985 |  | Village Green | 48.00% |  |
| Basin Reserve | 59.09% |  | Mainpower | 3.22 |  | New Plymouth | 1113 |  | Invercargill | 45.45% |  |
| Hamilton | 46.15% |  | Palmerston Nth | 3.19 |  | Queenstown | 1138 |  | Hamilton | 39.58% |  |
| McLean Park | 36.36% |  | Basin Reserve | 3.10 |  | Basin Reserve | 1154 |  | Basin Reserve | 39.19% |  |
| Village Green | 33.33% |  | Hamilton | 3.10 |  | Palmerston Nth | 1228 |  | New Plymouth | 33.33% |  |
| Invercargill | 33.33% |  | Queenstown | 3.07 |  | Invercargill | 1783 |  | University Oval | 24.00% |  |
| Nelson Park | 25.00% |  | University Oval | 3.00 |  | University Oval | 1960 |  | Queenstown | 24.00% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Runs/wkt** |  |  | **LBW %** |  |  | **Ranking** |  |  |  |  |
| McLean Park | 43.27 |  | Palmerston Nth | 11.22% |  | McLean Park | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Village Green | 41.15 |  | New Plymouth | 11.38% |  | New Plymouth | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| Nelson Park | 38.75 |  | McLean Park | 11.46% |  | Nelson Park | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| Invercargill | 37.44 |  | Invercargill | 11.54% |  | Mainpower | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| New Plymouth | 36.37 |  | Hamilton | 14.96% |  | Palmerston Nth | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| Mainpower | 35.47 |  | Nelson Park | 16.26% |  | Village Green | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| Hamilton | 35.00 |  | Mainpower | 17.00% |  | Invercargill | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| Palmerston nth | 33.29 |  | University Oval | 18.20% |  | Hamilton | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| Basin Reserve | 32.83 |  | Village Green | 18.97% |  | Basin Reserve | 49 |  |  |  |  |
| Queenstown | 31.25 |  | Basin Reserve | 18.96% |  | Queenstown | 51 |  |  |  |  |
| University Oval | 27.07 |  | Queenstown | 19.51% |  | University Oval | 56 |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| As the number of matches played at each ground varies considerably (74 inns at Basin Reserve, 29 at Mainpower Oval, 15  at New Plymouth and Nelson Park and 10 inns at Palmerston North) it is difficult to make accurate comparisons. However some  trends do stand out.  The two grounds that clearly favour the batsmen are Pukekura Park and McLean Park.  Grounds that rank low are the University Oval, Queenstown and the Basin Reserve. |
| 1. Results  Outright decisions have been the most difficult to obtain at Nelson Park, ( one result in 4 matches), Invercargill( one result in three matches)  and the Village Green with five decisions in 15 matches  2. Run Rate  Three grounds stand out with the highest run rate achieved at McLean Park. It is surprising to note the low run rate at the University  Oval.  3. Centuries  A very wide range between top and bottom grounds. A surprise to see such a low figure at the University Oval with only twelve centuries  in 50 innings.  4. 300+ Innings  Another wide range from top to bottom and it is surprising with the short boundaries at the University Oval that only twelve  300+ have been recorded in 50 innings. The ratio improved greatly in 2009/10 with five plus scores over 300.  5. Runs/Wicket  By a clear margin more runs are scored for wickets lost are achieved at McLean Park and the Village Green but there is a  large gap to the lower rates achieved at the University Oval and Queenstown..  6. LBW decisions  Not surprising there is a low number of lbw’s at McLean Park but a high number at Queenstown and the Basin Reserve..  The Basin Reserve with 124 lbw decisions in 654 wickets is high for an International ground. However the rate has fallen  over the past three years. |