

This sentence contains three errors

The spelling of **this** and **three** are obviously incorrect and it is therefore natural to focus on the syntax of the sentence. When the initial errors are cleared by focusing on errors of, spelling, upper and lower case use, etc. we get.

This sentence contains three errors

The other error is not within these parameters and it will not be found unless the instruction to read (and understand) the sentence is followed (ergo by not focussing on syntax alone). Using recursive logic, having cleared the spelling mistakes, the above sentence should read "This sentence contains one error" but it does not contain any error.

Paradoxically the third error is that the sentence contains not three but two errors. The third error is of a entirely different type to the first two errors and is found by 'stepping back' and 'switching off' the close focus on spelling, and looking instead at the meaning of the sentence and what is being communicated, rather than at the individual words without the meaning of them in association with the other words in the sentence.

The Einstellung Effect is commonly found effecting umpires applying Rule 9.11 Ball-body contact and Rule 9.12 Obstruction. It is seen repeatedly effecting the application of these two Rules in every game of hockey played

Ball-body contact is penalised pretty much as a matter of course whether or not there was either intention on the part of the player hit to use the body to stop or deflect the ball and also whether or not there was any advantage gained for the team of the player hit with the ball, with the result that the vast majority of penalties awarded for ball body contact are awarded incorrectly.

Why is this happening? Because rather than thinking about each and every ball body contact as a unique event and judging it accordingly, a shortcut is taken. The umpire does what he has done before or seen others do before or has been told to do in all incidents of ball body contact. The focus is on the Rule alone, which simply prohibits all ball-body contact - and the provided Explanation (which is an explanation of how the Rule must be applied) is not considered at all.

In fact some umpires declare that the text given in italics beneath each Rule is not the Rule (they call it "notes" or "advice") and they deliberately ignore it because they consider it to be an option to do so. They are wrong and prove themselves wrong by applying 'to the letter' Explanations given with other Rules and justifying their decisions in these cases by quoting the Explanations used.

I think Explanation to be a weak word to describe what is in fact FIH Rule Committee instruction about the application of the Rules. The italic text ought

to be called Instruction and it should be made clear within the rule-book that this Instruction is to be followed – otherwise why provide it?

The Obstruction Rule suffers from the interpretation of “attempting to play the ball” which focuses, to the exclusion of all else, on the actions of an opponent of a ball holder when that opponent is trying to tackle for the ball, rather than on the actions of the player in possession of the ball which prevent an opponent making a legitimate tackle for the ball (or even positioning to do so) when but for the preventing (shielding) action the tackler would have been able to play at the ball (both immediately and directly). The Obstruction Rule should be about prohibited actions that are obstructive to an opponent. It is instead interpreted as being mostly about what a tackler must and must not do, which is a repeat Rule 9.3, 9.4, and 9.13.

Most obstructions take place in a fraction of a second (during the moment a ball holder shields the ball, using the body, past an opponent's brief opportunity to play at it) but umpires seem to require at least five seconds of continuous ball blocking with the body before they will even consider intervening and penalising the obstructing player - and many not even then. When challenged about this approach their reply often is that obstruction is not applied as it once was because we have a modern game and we don't want to go back to hockey as it was in up to 1992, but that is not a reason not to apply the current Rule, which was last amended in 2009 and is 'up to date', whatever that may mean – in fact it is not a reason at all.