

A SURVEY OF COACHES AND OFFICIALS' CONCERNING THE KANSAS
IBM CARD RATING SYSTEM AND LICENSE REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICIALS

by 6791

DENNIS LEE ERKENBRACK

B.S., Kansas State University, 1967

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Physical Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

Approved by:


Major Professor

20
2668
R4
1971
£75
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	5
Method of Study	5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	8
Survey Question #1	8
" " #2	9
" " #3	11
" " #4	12
" " #5	14
" " #6	15
" " #7	16
" " #8	18
" " #9	20
" " #10	22
" " #11	24
" " #12	26
Recommendations	29
CONCLUSIONS	31
APPENDIX	32
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	35

INTRODUCTION

The earliest form of rating system for athletic officials in the state of Kansas was the numerical system. Officials were given a rating of one, two, or three by coaches with one being the best rating and three being the poorest rating. In the mid-nineteen-fifties the rating system was changed to a letter system. An "A" rating was given the top officials and a "B" rating was given the lower ranked officials. Neither of these rating systems proved satisfactory.

Then five years ago, Kansas began using an IBM card system of rating officials and coaches. By this system the officials and coaches rate each other, and the state has a means of "checking up" on the conduct of the coaches and the conduct and skills of the officials.

The procedure for enacting this rating system is quite simple. Before the game, the head coach of the visiting team and the head coach of the home team are each given IBM rating cards for each official working the game that night. At that time, to avoid duplication of ratings, both the coach filling out the card and the official who is to be rated must sign the card. The coach is instructed by the state activities association not to fill out the rating on the card until at least twenty-four hours after the conclusion of the game. After a time lapse of this length a coach should be less emotional and more rational in his rating of the official.

The coach's procedure for filling out the official's card

is to first rate the official on a five point scale with one being the highest score. A one is a superior rating meaning the official is good enough to officiate in a regional or state tournament or a conference championship basketball game. A two is an above average rating meaning an official is qualified to work in most games and matches. If the coach checks number three this means an official is just average and needs improvement, but is capable of officiating. A four means the official is below average and acceptable for a "B" team or Junior varsity games only. A five is unsatisfactory.

After rating the official on this five point scale, the coach must check the items under "Needs Improvement." Fifteen items with explanations are provided on the card. If a coach

IBM M44095

OFFICIAL NAME		ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	SCORE
TOWN	NUMBER	CITY & STATE	MEETING	

RATING SCALE:

1 - SUPERIOR: - Good enough to officiate in a regional or state tournament or a conference championship football game.
2 - ABOVE AVERAGE: - Qualified to work in most games or matches.
3 - AVERAGE: - Needs improvement but capable of officiating.
4 - BELOW AVERAGE: - Acceptable for a "B" team or Junior varsity game only.
5 - UNSATISFACTORY.

CHANGE ADDRESS TO: (OFFICIAL)

ADDRESS
CITY & STATE
TELEPHONE

IBM M44094

1 ☐ SUPERIOR

2 ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE

3 ☐ AVERAGE

4 ☐ BELOW AVERAGE

5 ☐ UNSATISFACTORY—SEND A WRITTEN REPORT WITH ALL 5 RATINGS

FOOTBALL OFFICIAL'S POSITION (CHECK ONE)

REFEREE _____ UMPIRE _____ LINESMAN _____ JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO SCHOOLS

- Place a check mark in the box to the left of the rating you wish to assign the official indicated on the top of this card.
- Check the items under NEEDS IMPROVEMENT. (See reverse side of this card for explanation of 15 points.)
- Complete the bottom two lines of this card.
- Mail to the KSHSAA, Box 495, Topeka, Kansas, after each game or immediately after your last game for this sports season.

OFFICIAL NEEDS IMPROVEMENT IN (See back for explanation)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OUR SCHOOL (CHECK ONE) WON _____ LOST _____ TIED _____

SCHOOL _____ PRINCIPAL _____ COACH _____

DATE _____ OPPONENT _____ SPORT _____

Fig. 1. A duplicated copy of the front of the coach's IBM card for rating an official.

1. Knowledge of the rules.
 2. Promptness and sureness of decisions.
 3. Impartiality and fairness.
 4. Care in supervising and signalling fouls and violations.
 5. Extent to which his decisions are affected by comments of spectators, players or coaches.
 6. Ability in following the play or match. (Hustle)
 7. Extent to which he maintains complete control of the game or match.
 8. Strictness and consistency in his decisions and interpretations.
 9. Self control and poise during the event.
 10. Neatness of appearance at contests.
 11. Personal equipment such as proper uniform, whistle, etc.
 12. Character and conduct a worthy example to those under his supervision.
 13. Promptness and business like attitude in matters pertaining to his contract.
 14. Tactfulness and modesty (as opposed to being overbearing and boastful).
 15. Smoking on field enclosure or in the gymnasium in the presence of players or spectators.
- Official's Signature _____
- Location of rules meeting attended _____

IBM 440183

Fig. 2. A duplicated copy of the back of the coach's IBM card for rating an official.

checks a number five unsatisfactory rating he should not only check the items for improvement, but he must send a written report explaining his rating. He is then instructed to send the card to the Kansas State High School Activities Association after each game or immediately after his last game of the present sports season.

The official's card for rating the coaches is not so exclusive in its rating. The official has just one card to rate both the visiting school and the home school. And he rates not only the coach for each, but also the spectators, players, and administration. For the home school he also rates the facilities.

They are all rated on a five point scale similar to the one that rates the official, but the categories are not explained so specifically. They are simply one-superior, two-above aver-

**K.S.H.S.A.A. ATHLETIC OFFICIAL'S WORK CARD
FOR RATING SCHOOLS AND TEAMS**

Game Date _____ Sport _____

Visiting School—Score	Home School—Score
------------------------------	--------------------------

Use the following scale for rating the below categories: (1-SUPERIOR, 2-ABOVE AVERAGE, 3-AVERAGE, 4-BELOW AVERAGE, 5-UNSATISFACTORY.)

Visiting School Ratings	Home School Ratings
	Facilities _____
Spectators _____	Spectators _____
Players _____	Players _____
Coach _____	Coach _____
Administration _____	Administration _____

Visiting Coach's Signature

Home Coach's Signature

Fig. 3. A duplicated copy of the officials' card for rating the coaches.

age, three-average, four-below average, and five-unsatisfactory. Again to avoid duplication, both the visiting coach and the home coach must sign the card.

Another topic which deserves mentioning in the introduction because of its importance in the following report are the license requirements for officials. At the present time in Kansas a prospective official must pass an open book test on the rules of the sport he wishes to officiate and pay a fee of \$15.00 to become a licensed official.

Purpose

Through coaching experience and informal conversation with other coaches and officials, the writer became aware of dissatisfactions among them toward certain aspects of the IBM card rating system, and, what they termed, the "leniency" of the license requirements for officials.

To gain further information as to the extent of their dissatisfaction, the writer decided to prepare a questionnaire for both coaches and officials. The questionnaire included questions about the areas in which he felt they needed, or wanted, improvement or clarification. Two equal groups of coaches and officials were selected and a survey was sent to each individual. The purpose of this report was to compile, record, and discuss the results of the survey as accurately as possible.

Method of Study

The information for this report was gained from the results of one-hundred questionnaires prepared and mailed in February of 1971. A selected group, including fifty coaches and fifty officials was chosen and each was sent a survey questionnaire asking for his opinion on each of twelve questions. All of the questions, except for number two, were the same for both the coaches and the officials, but they were re-worded to apply to the recipient, either coach or official. A copy of the coach's questionnaire and a copy of the official's questionnaire are included in the appendix.

Of the one-hundred questionnaires that were mailed seventy-three were returned, thirty-nine from the coaches and thirty-four from the officials. This report was prepared from the results of these seventy-three questionnaires.

Many more questions about the IBM card rating system and license requirements for officials could have been included in this coaches' and officials' survey. However, because of the time required for answering, it was felt that possibly a lengthy questionnaire would discourage replies. Therefore, only the questions that it was felt most concerned both groups were included. These questions dealt mainly with opinions about two areas, possible improvements for the system and requirements, and clarifications of the rating procedure.

Four questions were included in the survey that suggested possible improvements. The first was a question which asked, "Would a mid-season report of an official's personal rating, pointing out strengths and weaknesses, be beneficial to him?" Since at the present time, an official does not receive a rating report until the sport's season is concluded, he has no time allowed him to correct or improve his areas of weakness.

The second question that dealt with improvements asked, "Should coaches be required to attend the officials' area supervisor meetings concerning official mechanics?" At the present time, coaches attend their own rules meetings, but they are not required to attend any of the officials' meetings on mechanics. This attendance would not only further familiarize the coaches

with official mechanics, but provide them with an atmosphere for friendly conversation and argument with officials, which could greatly improve their working atmosphere.

The third question which dealt with improvements asked, "To obtain a license, officials must only pass an open book test and pay a fee. Should requirements be stricter?" Since much discussion pro and con on this subject had been heard, it was thought the answers to this question were very important to the survey. The question itself was self-explanatory and led to the next question which asked, "Should officials be required to officiate an actual game under supervision before they are registered?"

The question stated in the above paragraph is an improvement in licensing procedures that would require a great deal of organization and financial help. But, as the licensing requirements are now, a young official must begin without any practical experience. Therefore, it was felt necessary to have both sides', coaches and officials, opinions on this suggestion.

Clerification of the rating procedure is probably of most concern to the coaches and officials. They understand the informational topics listed on the cards and the procedure for filling them out, but they want to know how much outside factors affect their rating. For instance, the officials rate the coach's conduct and a survey question asks the official, "Does a team's victory or defeat affect your rating of their coach?" Both coaches and officials are asked four other questions about the coach's rating. The first asked, "Do you give a coach a lower

rating if he asks for a clerification of the call?" The next asked, "If a coach receives a technical foul does this affect an official's rating of him?" Another asked again for their opinion, "Does the booing of the coach's home fans affect the official's rating of him?" And finally the last question asked, "Does the attitude of his players toward the officials affect the coach's rating?"

Two outside factors which might affect an official's rating are the outcome of the game and the calling of his partner. One question asked only the coaches, "Does your team's victory or defeat affect your rating of the official?" Another asked both the coaches and the officials, "In your opinion, does the calling of his partner influence the official's rating by the coach?"

Are the suggested improvements in the rating system and licensing requirements workable? Do outside influences affect the coach's and official's rating? The survey answered these questions in the opinion of seventy-three coaches and officials. And now the questions are presented with their results and with the actual comments made on each question by the coaches and the officials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Question 1. Would a mid-season report of their personal official rating, pointing out strengths and weaknesses, be beneficial to officials?

Table 1. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not a mid-season report of the official's rating would be beneficial.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	34	87	28	82
No	4	10	5	15
No answer	1	3	1	3

This question was asked of the coaches and officials to determine whether they thought it would be helpful to officials for the Kansas State High Schools Activities Association to prepare a mid-season rating report for them. This would be a possible addition to the present rating system. At the present time officials do not know how the coaches have rated them until the particular sport's season is over. Possibly this would give the officials an opportunity for improvement.

Both coaches and officials were mostly positive in their answers. Only nine negative answers were given and no reasons were stated for these answers. This question was not controversial and did not draw many comments, except for one official who thought that this would be more beneficial for a beginning official.

Coach's Question 2. Do you feel that your team's victory or defeat affects your rating of the official?

Table 2. Opinions of the coaches as to whether or not the outcome of the game affects their rating of the official.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent
Yes	3	8
No	36	92

Official's Question 2. Do you feel a team's victory or defeat affects your rating of their coach?

Table 3. Opinions of the officials as to whether or not the outcome of the game affects their rating of the coach.

Opinions	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	1	3
No	31	91
No answer	2	6

This is the only question on the survey that was different for coaches and for officials. That is why the results were recorded on separate tables.

The results of this question show that, at least, each coach and official tries to be objective in his ratings. The two officials that didn't give a yes or no answer each explained why. One said that the only way victory or defeat would affect his rating of a coach would be the action of either coach before, during, or after the ball game. The other said that he didn't think it should, but he did believe that the losing coach took this defeat into consideration when making his report.

This question probably holds part of the answer to the

question, "Why do coaches and officials have to wait twenty-four hours before filling out their IBM rating cards?" Basketball is an emotional sport and both groups must try to be as unbiased as possible. The results show that the majority of this group tries to be unbiased.

Question 3. In your opinion, does the calling of one official affect the rating of his partner?

Table 4. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not the calling of one official affects the coach's rating of his partner.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	22	56	24	70
No	17	44	6	18
No answer	0	0	4	12

Although the results are about the same, there is a great discrepancy here between how the coaches feel about this issue and how the officials do. The answers of the coaches showed that more than half actually felt and admitted that the calling of one official affected the rating of the other. Although it was not mentioned in the question, this could possibly mean both favorably and unfavorably. The comments of the officials showed they felt it shouldn't, but the results of the survey said it probably did.

One coach answered honestly, "This question is difficult for it's just like the game itself---one bad one can make the

whole team look bad---officials are the same."

Some interesting comments from the officials were:

"If the way I call or work a ballgame affects my partner's rating by a coach, the coach had better have his eyes, ears, and nose checked. He should rate each official as he sees them and not as a set."

"Our whole crew was marked down in football for not handling our contracts properly, when I was the only one to contract the game. If we did something wrong, I should have been the only one to be marked down for it."

Question 4. Do you feel that a coach receives a lower rating from an official if he asks for a clerification of a call?

Table 5. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not the asking for a clerification of a call lowers the coach's rating by an official.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	19	49	0	0
No	17	43	32	94
No answer	3	8	2	6

Many coaches are reluctant to question an official for fear of antagonizing him. As can be seen from the results, slightly less than half believe they receive a lower rating if they do. As can be seen from the officials' results, however, they gave a completely negative response to the question. They said it

does not lower the coach's rating.

One coach was unsure of an answer and replied, "I have always been in doubt about how officials rate us. What do they look for? I only questioned one set of officials last year and got a 2.36 rating. I would like to have this explained."

Two other coaches answered this question with, "I hope not!"

One said, "I think it depends on the attitude."

One official quoted the rule, "Rule 2--Section 10 of the National Federation Rules Book, allows for any error and how it is to be corrected. How an official interprets a ruling should not be questioned by a coach. The clerification of a ruling should not be questioned during a ball game, but during the half time or at the end of the game. This should not affect the rating of either the coach or the official, unless abusive language is used or things get out of hand."

Others said:

"Not if he does so in a respectful way."

"It's how he goes about asking."

"Depends if it is in a sportsmanship-like manner."

One said, "I think the coach is entitled to a clerification of the rule and not a call. There are too many ways of looking at the call."

Through the spontaneous comments of the officials and the results of the questionnaire, it can be said that asking for the clerification of a call does not lower the coach's rating, unless his attitude is unsportsmanlike.

Question 5. If a coach receives a technical foul, does this affect his rating by an official?

Table 6. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not the receiving of a technical foul affects the coach's rating by an official.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	25	64	22	65
No	11	28	9	26
No answer	3	8	3	9

Three coaches commented that they had never received a technical foul so they could not answer this question through experience, but it was interesting in that of these three, one answered yes, one said no, and one gave no answer.

The officials who answered yes said:

"If the technical foul is for unsportsmanlike conduct."

"Depends on what the technical is for."

"This depends on the nature of the technical foul."

"Depends what the technical foul is for. If for mouthing off, yes. Failing to get the right number on the score book, no."

"If the coach earns a technical he most certainly must be given a lower rating."

"Depends."

The officials who said no gave these reasons:

"The game of basketball is a very emotional sport and I

realize it is hard for a coach to stay on the bench. I never give a technical foul unless he gets personal."

"Perhaps."

"Depends on the reason for receiving the technical. Ninety-five per cent of the time it does not affect his rating."

The officials who gave no answers commented:

"Only if the technical was given for an act toward the official."

"Would depend upon the type of technical."

Obviously from the comments of the officials a technical foul does affect their rating of the coach and the affect is unfavorable. The degree to which it is detrimental depends upon the attitude of the coach, but it is detrimental. Most of the coaches agreed that they thought it did, so this finding would not surprise them.

Question 6. Does the booing of the coach's home fans affect his rating by the official?

Table 7. Opinions of the coaches and officials as to whether or not the booing of the home fans affects the official's rating of their coach.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	21	54	2	6
No	15	38	31	91
No answer	3	8	1	3

Three coaches were rather emphatic in their answer to this

question, "Our fans don't boo!"

The officials comments were:

"There is a place on the rating sheet for both the home town and visitors. This should in no way affect the rating of a coach, unless his actions excite or make the crowd get out of hand. He can do alot in controlling the crowd, just by the way he controls his own actions."

"No, unless the coach may have influenced the fans by his actions."

"Yes, if his conduct has affected their reaction."

"No, it would be a low rating toward the crowd behavior."

"No, not him, but it will affect the superintendent or administration rating."

"No, but it will affect the rating of the principal."

"No, only the spectator rating."

"Possibility."

The results of this question possibly would surprise the coaches, as more than half, about fifty-four per cent, felt the booing of their fans did affect their personal rating. Ninety-one per cent of the officials answered no, this would not affect the coach's rating and then continued to give diverse answers as to whose rating it would affect. The administration might be surprised by the officials placing of the responsibility for the crowd's booing on them.

Question 7. Does the attitude of his players toward the official affect the coach's rating?

Table 8. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not the attitude of his players toward the officials affects the coach's rating.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	24	61	19	56
No	14	36	12	35
No answer	1	3	3	9

Sixty-one per cent of the coaches thought yes their boys' attitude toward the official did affect their rating by the official, but only fifty-six per cent of the officials affirmed this belief and some of these qualified their answers. Since even some of the no's were qualified, from the comments the following conclusion might be drawn. The boys' attitude would affect the coach's rating by some of the officials, if they felt their coach was responsible for this attitude.

One coach said about this question, "I have always been in doubt about how officials rate us, what do they look for? Does the conduct of our boys affect our rating? What does our action towards our boys do to our rating?"

The following are the officials' comments on this question:

"Officials should make every effort not to let the crowd action, player action, or any other action other than that of the coach himself affect their rating. Generally, however, a coach's attitude is reflected in the crowd and player reaction. There is usually a positive correlation."

"There is a place on the rating sheet for both the home

team and the visiting team, for their actions and attitude. Their respective coaches can however control their teams. This in turn can affect my rating of a coach."

"Yes, if the coach encourages it or does nothing about it."

"No, but the attitude of the players, to some extent, reflects the type of coach."

"Yes, I hold the coach responsible for the attitude of his players, and the administration for the coaches."

"Yes, if not directly, it will indirectly."

"Yes, the coach should be in charge of his players."

"Yes, it is my feeling and has been my experience that players usually reflect the coach's attitude. If I am aware that the coach is making a conscientious attempt to control his players then their attitudes do not affect my rating."

"Yes, the players are under his control and guidance."

"No, it affects only the rating of the players."

"No, the attitude of the players does not affect the rating of the coach, unless his attitude is passed on to the players."

Question 8. To obtain a license, officials must only pass an open book test and pay a fee. Should requirements be stricter?

Table 9. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not license requirements for officials should be stricter.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	27	69	15	44
No	12	31	16	47
No answer	0	0	3	9

Only two coaches explained their answer to this question:

"No, I feel the system we now have is working pretty well. I am afraid if we make the qualifications tougher for officials we will have trouble getting officials. The only requirement for coaching is a college degree or a teaching certificate. Should we make it tougher for officials?"

"No, I would be in favor of a tougher exam, etc., but we have a difficult time obtaining officials now."

The officials said:

"To be a registered official he must pay a fee, take an open book exam, and attend a Kansas State High School Activities Association rules meeting, prior to validation of their license and receipt of IBM rating cards. I do believe we should have more supervision of younger officials by older experienced officials."

"I definitely feel that an official to be certified should have to take a closed book test. Both coaches and officials should take a closed book test."

"No, if stricter requirements are made, I don't believe

you would have any officials."

"Yes, (underlined only), our officials work much harder than this sounds."

One official didn't check yes or no, but answered, "Not more strict, just be sure the present requirements are met."

Sixty-nine per cent of the coaches thought that official requirements should be stricter, but none of these positive answerers explained further with comments. The officials were divided in their answers. A majority of officials' answers was not obtained either positively or negatively on this issue. Both officials and coaches seemed concerned that stricter requirements might make it even more difficult to obtain officials.

Question 9. Should officials be required to officiate an actual game under supervision before they are registered?

Table 10. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not officials should be required to officiate a game under supervision before they are registered.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	26	67	17	50
No	11	28	12	35
No answer	2	5	5	15

Only one coach commented on this question and he said, "No, not with the present system of ratings."

Since this question concerned the officials more than the coaches, their comments were more numerous:

"I believe if the officials have done the above and passed the required he should be able to work junior varsity, freshman, and junior high games. He should after the second year be able and prepared to work varsity games, unless he has already done the above in another state previously."

"Yes, using the "B" and freshman game for experience."

"Yes, one year of B-team and freshman ball."

"Yes, beginning official only."

"Yes, it would be an ideal situation to evaluate the skills of a prospective official before he actually begins to work, but realistically I don't believe it could be worked out."

"No, supervision by an experienced official could be helpful in certain cases, but not as a requirement."

"No, I feel this might be a good idea, but it probably is not possible."

The officials who checked neither yes nor no said:

"Beginners maybe, but who would supervise and where?"

"I think it would help."

"Might be a good idea."

Exactly two-thirds of the coaches and one-half of the officials were in favor of requiring officials to officiate an actual game under supervision before they were registered. Many who commented, however, were in doubt as to the feasibility of such a requirement. Would this be possible to arrange? Some gave possible suggestions about how this supervision could be managed. Even though half of the officials' answers were negative or un-

sure, this question might be a suggestion that would improve the officiating in Kansas.

Question 10. Are coaches qualified to rate officials?

Table 11. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not coaches are qualified to rate officials.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	32	82	18	53
No	6	15	12	35
No answer	1	3	4	12

The coaches answered:

"Yes, who else?"

"Yes, if they know the rules well enough."

"Yes, most coaches would be qualified to rate officials due to the officiating courses they had in college plus their knowledge of the rules."

"Yes, but I think the scorekeeper or timer would look at him more objectively."

The officials replied:

"Yes, most coaches are able to rate officials, but there are some that I feel aren't qualified."

"Yes, but I think all coaches should have to have refereed before coaching."

"Yes, they are if they study the rules and mechanics. Our good coaches do."

"No, they are only qualified to rate officials on a neat appearance and a respectful and non-partisan attitude."

"No, few coaches are really up on the rules and they want any questionable decision their way."

"This question could be answered yes and no. Since the game of basketball is a very emotional sport, I feel the coach shouldn't do the grading. I believe another member of the school or person who has had experience in the officiating field should. I think the most important part of officiating is the mechanics of an official along with the knowledge of the rules. I think too many coaches will give you a one rating and then mark several checks on the IBM card as to what he needs to improve on. Then the next coach will give you a four or five and not mark any items as to what the official should improve on. I remember the first year the IBM cards came out; some coach marked me for smoking. I don't even smoke. At the time I was very unhappy."

"No. Some are; some aren't; most aren't."

"No, but in some cases this answer could be reversed. It depends entirely on the individual."

"No. I wouldn't say that coaches are not qualified to rate officials, but I think the administration would have a more impartial attitude. If a technical foul is called (especially on the coach) I feel it invariably brings a four rating, not a five because a coach will not write an explanation with it. Unless the whole game was called unusually bad, an official should not be penalized for enforcing the rules."

The officials who did not give a specific yes or no explained:

"If the coach is doing his job, he does not have the time or the opportunity to observe both of the officials all of the time. He cannot give them a fair rating. The rating should be done by a neutral observer."

"In most cases, yes."

"Some coaches yes and the others no. The top coaches I think are qualified."

Coaches rate officials' skills on a five point scale and then check topics under needs improvement. The survey asked if the coach was qualified to rate the officials. Eighty-two per cent of the coaches answered yes and about one-half, fifty-three per cent, of the officials answered yes. This question was controversial and even though majorities of both groups thought that coaches were qualified, the comments showed that many wanted to qualify their answers.

Some felt that most coaches were qualified, but that they were handicapped in their ratings by impartiality, emotional involvement, unfamiliarity with the rules and mechanics of officiating, inexperience in actual refereeing, or inopportunity for adequate observation. Candidates for possible neutral raters were the scorekeeper, the timer, or a member of the administration.

Question 11. Are officials qualified to rate coaches?

Table 12. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not officials are qualified to rate coaches.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	32	82	27	79
No	7	18	5	15
No answer	0	0	2	6

The officials were quite verbal on question number ten about the qualifications of the coach for rating them. But surprisingly, the coaches did not even comment on this question about the qualifications of the officials as their raters. Instead the majority agreed that the officials were qualified and they seemed satisfied with this rating procedure.

However, perhaps feeling they must defend themselves, the officials had more to say about their qualifications as raters. Stated below are their comments:

"Yes, on the present questions, but not his coaching ability."

"Yes, on conduct."

"Yes, we rate only their actions and conduct, not their coaching ability."

"Yes, but in some cases the answer could be reversed. It depends entirely on the individual."

"No, if an official is doing his job, he does not have the time or opportunity to observe the coach during the entire ball game. He can rate the coach only on his actions prior to the

start of the game, maybe during a time out, and after the game is over. During the calling of a foul and while giving the information to the scorer's table, the official also may see the coach's reaction. Rating should be up to a neutral person."

"No, only on bench decorum and sportsmanship."

The officials who checked neither answer had this to say:

"In most cases."

"I don't know who else can do it. I work for the players and coach."

The officials, in the present rating system, rate only the coach's conduct. Their comments showed that they wanted to make this perfectly clear. Only one official thought that a neutral person should do the rating; otherwise, a majority of both the coaches and the officials agreed that the official was qualified to do the rating. Both seemed satisfied with this arrangement.

Question 12. Should coaches be required to attend the officials' area supervisor meetings concerning official mechanics?

Table 13. Opinions of coaches and officials as to whether or not the coaches should be required to attend the officials' area supervisor meetings on mechanics.

Opinions	Number of Coaches	Per Cent	Number of Officials	Per Cent
Yes	14	36	23	68
No	25	64	10	29
No answer	0	0	1	3

The majority of the coaches were negative in their response to this question. The no's did not seem to feel a need to comment, but some of the yes's wished to explain their answers in the following direct quotations:

"Yes, a good idea, but I wonder if it is practical."

"Yes, maybe one time."

"Perhaps one or two; I do not have time for more."

"Yes, all coaches and officials should have to attend a school on the rules where the rule book and case book were read through together, explained, and discussed, until everything was explained so everyone understood it and could recognize the right and wrong of the play situations. Once all the coaches and officials knew the game and understood all about the contact part of the game the other areas would be simple and it would become the game of skill it should be instead of 'bare legged football' that it becomes some nights. Many coaches don't know the game well enough to coach their players so they can play a whistle-free game and no referees no matter how good could make it look like a basketball game some nights."

The officials' were positive in their responses and they wrote:

"Yes, but not so much in mechanics, I have run into too many coaches that I feel don't understand the rule changes from year to year. I've found a few who I don't think have even bothered to read the book thoroughly."

"Yes, at least one of the area meetings."

"Yes. I think all coaches should be required to attend at least one area meeting and a meeting held for only answering questions as to what coaches should expect out of officials. They should go over the rules and the mechanics the officials use. I judge a good official by his mechanics and also his attitude on and off the court."

"Yes, and should be required."

"Yes. I would also recommend they take the test to keep up on rule interpretation."

"Yes, this could be a very beneficial time for coaches to be brought up on rule interpretation as well as the mechanics. If the coach is to rate the official, how can the official receive a fair or honest rating if the coach doesn't know the mechanics or rule interpretations."

"No, not concerning official mechanics."

"No, coaches have too many things to attend now without adding area meetings. I feel both coaches and officials should have to take a closed book test on the rules and every coach should have to officiate as part of his schooling."

The official who gave neither answer replied, "I believe the coaches of all sports should also attend all the same meetings officials attend, not just the rules or mechanics. If you walk in someone's shoes, you see why they limp."

The coaches and officials did not agree on this survey question, but the argument against attending these meetings was lack of time and this does not seem to be a valid reason. The

coaches could surely find one or two open nights to attend these meetings. Their attendance would not only increase their knowledge of official mechanics, but, perhaps, help increase understanding between the coaches and officials and improve their working atmosphere.

Recommendations

The IBM card rating system, like all evaluative systems, has its inadequacies, and it is felt that no innovative ideas for a new system can be given at this time. However, after analyzing the results of the survey, it should be recommended that coaches be required to attend one or two of the officials' area supervisor meetings, not so much to become acquainted with the mechanics of officiating as to provide an opportunity for the coaches and officials to discuss the rating system. Since each one is concerned about the affect of outside factors, such as the outcome of the game, on their ratings; time is needed to discuss these troublesome questions. Each group should be cautioned at this time to be as fair and honest in their ratings as possible.

Also if the coaches and officials attended a joint meeting the feasibility of a mid-season report of an official's rating, stricter requirements for officials, and the supervision of beginning officials could be discussed and new ideas could be shared.

In the area of supervision of beginning officials it was suggested by one coach that perhaps if each team or conference

in the state would co-operate by allowing a third official for B-games, our new officials could be required to serve a year's apprenticeship in Jayvee, junior high, grade school, or B-team games. This would enable new officials to break-in with experienced officials and also allow the varsity officials some rest time for they would have to officiate only one-half of the B-game.

Also it was suggested by one official on the questionnaire that the state activities association should use more supervisors, so they could see all of the officials work at least once during the season. This would serve to evaluate the official's work and his evaluation could be included in the rating report the official receives from the coaches. The fee that is now charged for the license could be used to reimburse the superintendent for his expenses.

CONCLUSIONS

It is hoped that the results of this survey of the IBM card rating system and the license requirements of officials may be used as guidelines for discussion at an officials' area supervisor meeting with the coaches in attendance.

It is felt that these four areas should be discussed and then adopted by the state as further additions to the present requirements for coaches and officials: a report of the official's personal rating should be sent to him at least once during the sport's season; the coaches should be required to attend at least one of the officials' area supervisor meetings; more constructive supervision should be given young officials; and an impartial observer should evaluate the official at least once during the sport's season.

APPENDIX

Dear Official:

With the 1970-71 basketball season now well underway, I am conducting a survey of coaches and officials regarding their opinions of the present state basketball rating system. Some questions about the license requirements for officials will also be included. The wording will be different, but the same basic questions will be asked of both coaches and officials.

Please find time to read and answer these questions thoughtfully and honestly. Return them in the enclosed envelope. If you have any personal comments please include them at the bottom of the page.

1. Would a mid-season report of your personal official rating, pointing out strengths and weaknesses, be beneficial?
yes ____ no ____
2. Does a team's victory or defeat affect your rating of their coach?
yes ____ no ____
3. In your opinion, does the calling of your partner influence your rating by the coach?
yes ____ no ____
4. Do you give a coach a lower rating if he asks for the clarification of a call?
yes ____ no ____
5. If a coach receives a technical foul, does this affect your rating of him?
yes ____ no ____
6. Does the booing of the coach's home fans affect your rating of him?
yes ____ no ____
7. Does the attitude of his players toward you affect your rating of the coach?
yes ____ no ____
8. To obtain a license, officials must only pass an open book test and pay a fee. Should requirements be stricter?
yes ____ no ____
9. Should officials be required to officiate an actual game under supervision before they are registered?
yes ____ no ____
10. Are coaches qualified to rate officials?
yes ____ no ____
11. Are officials qualified to rate coaches?
yes ____ no ____
12. Should coaches be required to attend the officials' area supervisors' meetings concerning official mechanics?
yes ____ no ____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Professor Raymond A. Wauthier and Professor T. M. "Mickey" Evans for the advice and help they gave throughout this report. Sincere appreciation is also extended to the seventy-three Kansas coaches and officials who returned their questionnaires. Without their thoughtful and honest answers to the survey, this report would not have been possible.

A SURVEY OF COACHES AND OFFICIALS CONCERNING THE KANSAS
IBM CARD RATING SYSTEM AND LICENSE REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICIALS

by

DENNIS LEE ERKENBRACK

B.S., Kansas State University, 1967

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Physical Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

This survey was conducted in February of 1971 to gather the opinions of coaches and officials concerning the Kansas IBM card rating system and the license requirements for officials. Through coaching the writer found reason to believe that both coaches and officials were not satisfied with the rating system and licensing of officials. Therefore, he decided to conduct this survey to ascertain as accurately as possible the feelings of these two groups. The preceding report was an attempt to organize and compile this information into as concise and understandable a form as possible.

One-hundred surveys of twelve questions each were sent to fifty Kansas coaches and fifty Kansas officials. All the questions, except one, were the same, but they were written in a different form for coaches than for officials. Of these one-hundred questionnaires the coaches returned thirty-nine and the officials returned thirty-four. Although the officials' replies were fewer, they were more verbal, which indicated that they were probably either more dissatisfied with the system or requirements, or they wanted to make sure their answers were understood.

The twelve questions re-written in a concise form are as follows:

1. Would a mid-season report of his personal rating be beneficial to an official?
2. (This question was different for coaches and officials.)

Does your team's victory or defeat affect your rating of an official?

Does a team's victory or defeat affect your rating of their coach?

3. Does the calling of one official affect his partner's rating?
4. Does the coach's asking for a clerification of a call affect his rating?
5. Does the receipt of a technical foul affect a coach's rating?
6. Does the booing of his home fans affect a coach's rating?
7. Does the attitude of a coach's players affect his rating?
8. Should license requirements be stricter for officials?
9. Should officials be required to officiate a game before they are registered?
10. Are coaches qualified to rate officials?
11. Are officials qualified to rate coaches?
12. Should coaches be required to attend officials' area supervisor meetings concerning official mechanics?

The information that was compiled from the answers to these questions was both interesting and surprising. The sample questions with accompanying tables of results are included in the report. These are followed by a detailed explanation of each question complete with actual comments from these coaches and officials. Recommendations for possible improvements in both the rating system and official's license requirements conclude the report.