

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1968

A Study of Present Basketball Officiating Qualification Practices of Class "A" High Schools in Utah

Paul A. Salvo
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salvo, Paul A., "A Study of Present Basketball Officiating Qualification Practices of Class "A" High Schools in Utah" (1968). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2962.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2962>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



A STUDY OF PRESENT BASKETBALL OFFICIATING QUALIFICATION
PRACTICES OF CLASS "A" HIGH SCHOOLS IN UTAH

by

Paul A. Salvo

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Physical Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1968

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Professor H. B. Hunsaker, whose persistence and encouragement over the years finally culminated the study. I would like to say that he has used firmness and exactness in his approach in my prior years of college life as an undergraduate.

Without Professor Arthur H. Mendini's friendly advice and understanding over the past months, this study might still be on the shelf.

I would like to thank Doctor Basil Hansen and Doctor Eldon Drake who also assisted in the study.

Finally to my wife, Betty, for her tolerance for an intolerant husband, I extend my gratitude for her patience.

Paul A. Salvo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Potential of Presence	17
Official Player Rapport	18
Good Public Relations	18
METHOD OF PROCEDURE	21
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	24
Physical Qualifications	24
Mental Qualifications	29
Previous Experience as an Official and Player	34
Other Related Athletic Experiences	38
Basketball Officiating and Some Existing Problems	39
DISCUSSION	53
CONCLUSIONS	56
RECOMMENDATIONS	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
APPENDIX	63
VITA	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Record of decisions of officials made in five games of a ten-game basketball tournament	12
2. Record of decisions of officials made in five games of a ten-game basketball tournament	13
3. Summary of decisions made in a ten-game basketball tournament--information taken from Tables 1 and 2	14
4. Physical qualifications of officials as reported by coaches and officials of Class "A" High Schools in the State of Utah	25
5. Mental qualifications	30
6. Previous experience as an official and player	35
7. Other related athletic experiences	37
8. Questions directly related to basketball officiating and some existing problems	40

ABSTRACT

A Study of Present Basketball Officiating
Qualification Practices of
Class "A" High Schools
In Utah

by

Paul A. Salvo, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1968

Major Professor: Professor H. B. Hunsaker

Department: Physical Education

The objectives of this study was to obtain data on five aspects of officials qualification practices presently used in Utah and to make some justifiable conclusion.

1. Qualification Data requested.
 - a. Physical Qualification
 - b. Mental Qualification
 - c. Previous Experience as an Official and Player
 - d. Other Related Athletic Experience
 - e. Basketball Officiating and some existing Problems

The survey compiled was sent to all head coaches of class "A" high schools, in Utah, which included 40 coaches in all, and to 60 class "A" high school officials of Regions 1, 2, and 4. The officials were chosen at random

from the Utah High School Activities Association certified officiating bulletin issued yearly.

From the Analysis of the Data the following conclusions were made:

(a) Coaches and officials need to recognize what qualifications are presently used and what has to be done to improve these practices. (b) Physical qualifications as a requirement is only an assumption, not a must. (c) The knowledge that one must receive to make him mentally alert appears to be strong in some areas of the state, while in others it only involves reading the rule book and passing the written test. (d) All the athletic experience that one obtains prior to becoming an official, does have the sanction of all officials and coaches, for without it a person who wants to become an official can only hope for limited work, or assignments. (e) Any athletic sports activity that a person is associated with has many carryover advantages in the overall performance of an official. (f) Officiating problems as expressed by the data received are extensive. A few examples of the problems are listed below:

1. Crowd reaction
2. Coach reaction
3. Judgment and consistency, etc..

(78 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Basketball, from its very beginning in 1891 at Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, by Doctor James A. Naismith, has had some method of enforcing the rules and regulations. Officiating games in the early history of the sport consisted largely of volunteers with no monetary compensation. Local townspeople, sports enthusiasts, and people with no background in the art of officiating were responsible for the overall actions of performers.

The official of today works under circumstances that are in most ways an improvement over what they were years ago. This is not to say that his task is an easier one, or that it demands less in the way of vigilance, administrative ability, and intelligence on his part. However, it is true today that he receives financial remuneration and has a greater percentage of large official-size floors on which to work.

The rapid education of the basketball public has imposed a more comprehensive method of choosing officials. Spectator intelligence in the game should logically tend to improve officiating, but an inflamed, booing crowd that turns on an official because of one or two errors remains as ever the principal manace to the game.

A study will be made to determine present methods of selecting officials in class "A" throughout Utah.

Today, school administrators, principal, and coaches have the responsibility of hiring officials. A school's personal feelings for or against an individual and its prior financial commitment could influence their choice. School personnel who have little knowledge about officiating have been delegated too much authority in picking officials to enforce the rules of a basketball game.

The need for a more exact method of selecting officials is necessary because of the mass spectator participation and the game as played today is highly skilled and technical. In addition, it is believed that such a study will furnish information that will help bring about a more standardized method of officiating throughout the state. Sportsmanship, with educational objectives in mind, should excel in the field of athletics. A better organized group will help to achieve this goal.

The purpose of this study is to determine some of the problems now existing in the selection of basketball officials and whether or not a better method can be devised. The study will be threefold:

1. To examine the current methods used in selecting officials of all regions of class "A" high school in Utah.
2. To devise a systematic approach to the selection of officials.
3. To present all available material that may prove useful to all personnel directly associated with the responsibility of choosing an official for high school games.

Because on-the-spot, individual judgement by an official is still the determining factor in the conduct of any specific game, it is imperative that these officials be chosen with great care and with emphasis upon their training and experience.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Toby (1943) about physical fitness - It will not be possible for a man to be alert and to perform successfully at a high standard throughout a game unless he is in top condition.

Bunn (1960) made this statement: Reaction time - a person who does not possess above average reaction time has little chance of becoming a top grade official.

According to Toby (1943), In no other athletic contest is a game more dependent upon the officiating as in basketball. In few other competitive games are the officials under more pressure, more physical, mental, or emotional strain. To start with, the play is fast, the crowd is usually close to the playing area, in many contests overflowing on to the playing court which often is less than the recommended or even minimum dimensions, a no-body contact game often becomes one of considerable body contact and creates a situation that makes it difficult for officials to know how to adjust to it.

Buehler (1949) makes the statement that: officiating is an important phase of athletics that has been very much neglected until recently. Because poor officiating detracts so much from the enjoyment of spectators and players, the results are dissatisfaction and bitterness, efforts to improve it have increased in recent years.

To produce better officials, amateur and professional sports organizations have studied and conducted research in the officiating of various sports and have organized schools and clinics for officials.

Klein (1935) felt that more reliable officials could be developed by conducting schools. In order to assure better officiating, Westchester County, New York, has conducted school for prospective officials. Anyone wishing to join the officiating board is required to go to school. Each school embraces nine two-hour sessions and covers every theoretical and practical phase of officiating procedure.

The results have been highly satisfactory. Westchester County, as a result of this endeavor, has a steady supply of trained officials--trained the way the school was designed. Secondly, they have obtained a uniform interpretation of the rules, thus eliminating the main fault with most officiating today--the inconsistency of individual interpretation.

Buehler (1949) shows how the Southern California Basketball officials association operates under a constitution in which its purposes are set forth as follows:

1. To encourage and maintain a high standard of officiating in every educational institution and athletic organization.
2. To instruct the public, by good officiating and through other channels, in the proper method in handling a game in accordance with rules and wholesome sportsmanship.

3. To instruct its members in the official interpretation of rules, and in the technique of officiating basketball games.

4. To increase the efficiency and competency of its members by the exchange of ideas and constructive suggestions.

5. To officiate games only within the full meaning and spirit of the rules and for the purpose for which the games was established.

6. Calling fouls made by the dribbler or on him.

Newsom (1938) reports that the Physical Education Department of the University of California is rather fortunate in that it has two intramural leagues in operation during the basketball season. The leagues have been a very valuable situation for their physical education majors to receive some practical experience in a required course, "The Officiating of Basketball and Football."

The nature of the officiating class, in brief, is this: the members of the class meet each Wednesday night for lectures on the mechanics of officiating, demonstrations, study of the rules, and their interpretation. A weekly quiz is given on the rules, a round table discussion follows, and comments are made on errors of omission and commission that occurred in games of the previous week. Each week one member of the class is required to officiate a game.

The Department of Physical Education maintains an employment bureau under Newsom's direction whereby capable student officials have the opportunity to officiate in various industrial, club, and church leagues.

Newsom discovered students while learning to referee were often confronted by the following difficulties:

1. Lack of decisiveness and authority in blowing the whistle.
2. Detecting traveling with ball in connection with the one-two-count stop and pivot.
3. Calling out the decisions in a loud tone of voice.
4. Preventing the game from "running wild."
5. Seeing fouls committed under the basket.
6. Tossing the ball to the correct height on jump ball.
7. Calling fouls made by the dribbler or on him.
8. Assuming the attitude of being cheerful, yet business-like toward the players.

This laboratory work has real individual value because it develops confidence, teaches him how to get along with a group of players in competition and manage them, stimulates his game sense and judgement, and gives him an insight into the habits, reactions and emotions of individuals when they are under the stress of competition.

This writer's observations would indicate that students who have played basketball extensively have an easier time in progressing as officials than those who have played very little.

Mitchell (1949) states that basketball officiating demands of those who handle a game in a satisfactory manner certain characteristics which must be developed or acquired. Most important of all, perhaps, is a

thorough knowledge of the rules of the game and of officiating technique. They should make it a point to attend as many rules meetings as possible. They should be affiliated with at least one of the accredited officials organizations, either local, state, or national, and should attend meetings for discussion of rules and their interpretations. Too often, officials in different sections and even in the same area interpret the same rule in a different manner. Officials should always strive for a more uniform interpretation of the rules.

Webster (1966) states that one of the definitions of art is that it is "Skilled workmanship or skilled execution." If this is so, then basketball officiating is an art. But it is an art that can be acquired. The good official is made not born. He acquired his skill through concentration and by hard work.

Harrlow (1960) made the statement that the importance of the basketball official was recognized at the very beginning of the sport. When Dr. Naismith devised the game of basketball, he recognized the role the official must play. He said, "The position of umpire is a very responsible one and on his rulings depend, to a great degree, the value of the game. If he deliberately overlooks violations of the rules, he is responsible for a great deal of unnecessary roughness and consequent ill feelings, but if he is firm and impartial in his decisions, he will soon win the respect of all, even those who suffered at the time."

Mitchell (1949) stated after a slow beginning which resulted from its being played under a wide diversity of rules, the growth of basketball has been phenomenal. Today it ranks as a major team sport and is the leading indoor spectator sport of the United States. The basketball official has one of the toughest jobs in the world of sports. Many a quick discriminating decision must be made during any basketball game and made in a split second.

Hersley (1936) after complaining to several young officials about the inconsistency of their work in high school games and receiving their reply that they did not quite comprehend the criticism, decided to create several standards by which officials could be judged in operation.

The cardinal principle of the type of officiating that appealed to Hersley lies in the premise that the official shall at no time become the object of the attention of the crowd. He should be an inconspicuous aid and guide to the progress of the game, and should make decisions and control the game without slowing up the action to an appreciable extent. He should make an effort to keep the attention of the game concentrated upon the play of the teams and not upon his own compartment.

The officials who have had transitory or permanent difficulties in their work have had them because their work shifted the audience-attention from the players to themselves. And when the arbiters become the focus of crowd attention, their errors are bound to be magnified by the hundreds of critical eyes.

Petree (1937) expressed four reasons for response from the fans: First, fans enjoy themselves by using up excessive energy; second, many do not fully understand the rules of the game; third, fans get a different perspective from the official who calls a play; and, fourth, officials, through lack of knowledge of the rules, sometimes call play incorrectly.

Petree tried to determine the task the officials have before them when they step on the floor with ten skilled high school basketball players and a divided group of enthusiastic fans in the stands. The statistic charts, Tables 1, 2, and 3, presented on the following pages will show the varied decisions officials made in a ten-game basketball tournament.

Dahl (1935) let it be understood right from the start that he had no intention of trying to tell anyone, official or otherwise, how to officiate a basketball game. He believes that this cannot be done, for the successful method of one official might spell disaster for another. It is true, of course, that general rules of mechanical procedure may be followed, but each official should try to develop a personality and a technique of his own, and these come only from hard work and practice. Above all, no official, or no school of officials, should try to impose a certain type of personality or technique upon any other.

Officials should remember there will be very few games called by any officials after which there will be unanimous opinion that he worked a good game. Therefore, there is but one safe path for the official to follow: to call plays according to the Rule Book and as he sees them. Then, at

least, if criticism is directed at him, his conscience is clear and he knows that his decision was right. Dahl further emphasized to, "Call plays as you see them without fear or favor, and call them according to the rules."

Dahl (1934) stated there is no secret formula for success in officiating. Hard work is more than half the battle and will do much to make for ultimate success; add to that an intense love for and an enjoyment in officiating that transcends any amount of pay received. No official can expect to become extremely successful if he officiates for the pay alone--there must be an enjoyment of the game present at all times, and unless it is present the official becomes as dead tissue. And then, too, pay will never compensate him for the heartache that will follow after a game that, in his own mind, has been poorly worked. It will compensate him for the possible misery that may result from unjust and unfair criticism, but it will never compensate him for the "down-in-the-mouth" feeling that follows when he has worked a poor game which may have some bearing upon the result of that game. The first suggestion, therefore, is this: work hard and continue to work hard if you expect to make a success at officiating.

Clarno (1936) made these suggestions to new officials:

1. Always be in the dressing room at least thirty minutes before game time and one hour before the game if possible. Officials have all learned that driving to a game or getting to the town by train just a few minutes before game time leaves them in a nervous condition. It is important to go on the floor just as calm as the players, for you really are under more of a nervous strain than they are.

Table 1. Record of decision of officials made in five games of a ten-game basketball tournament

Official	Game									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pushing	3	6	5	6	6	7	5	3	4	4
Holding	1	5	5	2	1	7	4	4	6	5
Charging	2	1	1		1	6	8	7	3	1
Hacking		2			2	2	2	4		2
Blocking						1				
Total fouls	6	14	11	8	10	23	19	18	13	12
Traveling		4	2	5	3	1	5	8	2	6
Held balls	7	5	6	4	2	6	19	11	4	7
Dribble		1			1					1
Time out	6		2	1	5			1	2	1
Center violation			1	1					2	
End of quarter	1	1	1	1			1		1	1
Miscellaneous	1						2		1	2
Out of bounds	20	13	18	22	21	15	17	17	13	22
Totals	41	38	41	32	43	45	63	55	38	52

Table 2. Record of decisions of officials made in five games of a ten-game basketball tournament

Official	Game									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pushing	2	5	2	4	5	6		5	5	1
Holding	3	6	2	8	2	3	1	2	3	1
Charging	8	2	2	8	7	1		6	6	1
Hacking	4	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
Blocking										3
Total fouls	17	16	19	21	15	11	3	15	16	7
Traveling	8	3	3	2	4	2	3	4	2	2
Held balls	6	8	3	11	10	3	7	10	2	7
Dribble	1	1	1						2	
Time out	1	2	2		4	1	4		3	1
Center violation					2					
End of quarter			1	1		1	2	1	1	
Miscellaneous			1	1		2	2	1	1	
Out of bounds	20	19	10	9	10	12	14	11	11	16
Totals	53	49	30	45	45	32	35	42	38	33

Table 3. Summary of decision made in a ten-game basketball tournament--
information taken from tables 1 and 2

	Totals
Official	
Pushing	84
Holding	71
Charging	71
Hacking	34
Blocking	4
Total fouls	A-101 B-163-264
Traveling	69
Held balls	133
Dribble	8
Time out	36
Center violation	6
End of quarter	14
Miscellaneous	15
Out of bounds	310
Totals	869

Average decisions per game--86.

2. Always go on the floor neatly dressed.

3. Keep yourself in the best of condition, for you will be moving about the floor more than any of the players. A player can occasionally relax, but there is never a time during a game that an official should allow himself to let down. When he does, something usually happens. If he is not alert, he will be late on the play or miss it entirely, and before long the game will be out of his hands.

4. Be courteous to the players, for they can be a great help to you if you keep them maintaining a friendly attitude toward you.

5. Do not talk back to a spectator who has been "riding" you during the game, for it will only make you lose your head, and before long you will find yourself paying more attention to him than to the game.

6. Keep in mind that you are paid to give your best whether you are officiating a key game or a game of little importance.

7. When the game is over, do not hang around the floor and discuss the game, for no game was ever played that, if discussed long enough, would not result in some point of disagreement.

8. Do not put a coach in an embarrassing position by asking him for games, as he might have personal reasons for not using you.

9. Remember that 90 per cent of basketball officiating is judgement. Always be consistent.

Dahl (1937) felt perhaps the greatest need in basketball officiating is the standardization of interpretation. In a single game an official

will hand down different decisions on what seems to be identical situations. The very nature of basketball exposes it to this inconsistency of interpretation. The condition has been greatly improved in those states and districts where officials and coaches, player and spectators get together for a lecture and demonstration by an authorized representative of the association in control of interscholastic athletics.

Efforts on the part of National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, with the basketball play situation book and active leaders on the national rules committee, have contributed greatly to the cause of common interpretation. But sectional viewpoints tend to persist, and as a result many problems continue to exist.

Carlson (1937) feels that interpretation is blamed for too many shortcomings by coaches, players, and officials. "Misinterpretation" is more appropriate.

Everyone admits that a basketball official has a very difficult job. Much of this difficulty is brought on by the officials themselves. Some fail to keep abreast of code changes. One well-meaning group still call accidental kicking of the ball by an offensive player, others are a year behind on the dribble-fumble change, and some still are floundering with the mid-court line. Inability to be consistent is a human fault which all have, but some officials show extremely wide variations in their meeting of certain situations, and they bring condemnation on themselves. On different nights or at different times in the same game

officials vary in their held ball decision all the way from tagging the ball to a complete wrestling match. Again, when a shooter crashes into a guard on the follow-up, what appears to be an identical situation may be called three different ways.

Bunn (1960) said

The primary job of an official is to cause the game to progress with as little interference as possible on his part. The individual who can develop this art from his potentialities can become a successful official. (Bunn, 1960, p. 388)

Bunn, in his book The Art Of Officiating Sports, considers the following as essential if the official is successfully going to perform his duties.

Potential of Presence

The official who through the influence of his presence causes player to avoid rule violations has attained the perfect relationship to the game. Men are individuals and many reach the same goal, but usually by entirely different routes. In the same respect no two games or situations are alike. The successful official by some combination and through some pattern which may vary from game to game, creates an influence which causes the players to avoid rule infractions. The players somehow seem to sense that here is a man who is on the job, in the right place at the right time, he is consistent, and he understands and senses the significance of each situation.

Official Player Rapport

A personal relationship which breeds friendliness and trust and not antagonism is essential to successful game control.

Right approaches must be used to fit the occasion. Each individual must follow the task which seems to fit best his own personality. The art of being one's self and being able to sense the correct approach to each situation is the secret of establishing the correct rapport.

Good Public Relations

An official may make his influence felt effectively by the players and develop the finest relationships with them but arouse the antagonism of the public. Such a relationship unfortunately creates an undesirable crowd behavior and thus reflects on the contest. He should remember that the sport was created for the player and not for the official. His success can be measured by the degree to which he keeps the game going within the rules, with as little interference as possible on his part.

The art of officiating is largely dependent upon human variables. It is good or bad in accordance with the degree to which each individual has a favorable combination of these variables together with an intelligent understanding of the application of the rules. The more important personal qualities which most authorities agree are necessary in good officials are:

Harrow (1960) made this point on courage - A good official has got to be deaf to the partisan crowd in the stands. The official who lets

their abuse exert the least influence on his decisions is lost.

Healey (1962) concerning Judgement - Consistency and judgement go hand in hand. It's a necessity for flexibility and interpretation of play.

Bunn (1960) felt that Co-operation - In a contest such as basketball which requires two officials, the ability to team with each other is absolutely essential to a well handled game.

Mitchell (1949) said this about Appearance - No man has any right to pose as an official, who is not willing to dress the part.

Harrow (1960) on Self Improvement - In larger leagues and good collegiate conferences, there is usually an observer watching your work and rating you on your ability and improvement.

Hobson (1955) said No one can question the importance of good officiating. It is the responsibility of the coach to obtain the kind of official that is conducive to good play. In addition to the ratings provided by state associations, there are other methods employed by coaches that will assure them of having good officials officiate their games. Many coaches are scouting the opposition. Other coaches use the JV games as a way in which to discover top officials.

Healy (1962) cited Another method used quite frequently by different conferences or leagues is set up like this, each coach will bring his preferred list of officials with him to a meeting. Each coach will draw a number to determine who is to have first, second,

etc. , choices of officials. The games are taken according to the schedules with the low numbers having the opportunity to pick the officials whom they think can be obtained to officiate that particular game. The coaches got together on the selected game and agree on the official. The requested officials are picked in order with the coaches picking third and fourth choices to safeguard themselves if, by chance, the requested first and second choices are not available. These names are then placed on the schedule of games in the spaces provided. The numbers are then drawn for the second game on the schedule and the entire process is repeated until all the officials are selected for all games scheduled. The final list with all the officials selected is furnished each coach and either he or his athletic director contacts the officials for all home games.

Bunn (1960) said that officiating is one of the most difficult jobs related to sports. By many it is considered a thankless task. On the other hand, it produces a dynamic challenge. For the individual who has inherited the necessary attributes which go to make up a high class official and who has developed these traits to the point where he has gained the acclaim of players and spectators for his performance, there is tremendous personal satisfaction.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

In order to gather the necessary data the following successive steps will be taken:

1. All available literature was reviewed.
2. The names of the officials used in the survey will be acquired from a list published by the UHSSA.
3. The names of coaches used in the study will be taken from the Class "A" Athletic Directory.
4. The questionnaire established will cover six areas:
 - a. Physical qualifications.
 - b. Mental qualifications.
 - c. Previous experience as an official.
 - d. Other related experiences.
 - e. Questions relating to basketball officiating and some of the existing problems.

The questionnaire used in this study was submitted to a group of graduate students who, with the help of Professor Hunsaker, added, deleted, shortened, and made recommendations for the revision of the questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire was also presented to coaches and officials in the immediate area for their opinions and recommendations.

After renovation, the questionnaire was referred to the committee, and after few minor changes, a recommendation was suggested as to how the survey should be sent out for expediency measures. The double post card procedure was suggested as a means of saving time and expense. Upon receiving a reply from persons willing to participate a total of 100 questionnaires were sent to coaches and officials. It was felt that a more complete picture of the qualifications of those persons entrusted with officiating present day basketball games, might be accomplished if the population came from two different groups (a) Head basketball coaches; (b) Basketball officials. The questionnaire was then sent to all head coaches of class "A" high schools, which included 40 coaches in all, and to 60 class "A" high school officials of Regions 1, 2, 3, and 4. The officials were chosen at random from the Utah High School Activities Association certified officiating bulletin issued yearly.

An introductory letter accompanied the questionnaire explaining the purpose of the study and the value that could be obtained with a high percentage of response. A month after the questionnaire was sent, a phone call was placed to those who had failed to respond initially. A follow-up post card was later sent in hopes of encouraging a response from those who had not answered the two previous requests.

The questionnaire was first mailed April 12, 1967. The post card was sent a month later. The final response to the study showed 35 out of 40 coaches and 53 out of 60 officials participated in the study.

This represented a participation of 88 per cent of the coaches, and 88 per cent of the officials. The total group representation represented 88 per cent.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study is to determine some of the problems now existing in the selection of basketball officials and whether or not a better method can be devised. The study will be three fold:

1. To examine the current methods used in selecting officials of all regions of class "A" high schools in Utah.
2. To devise a systematic approach to the selection of officials.
3. To present all available material that may prove useful to all personnel directly associated with the responsibility of choosing an official for high school games.

Physical Qualifications

The data in Table 4 indicates the reaction of coaches and officials to the physical qualifications of an official.

Of the 40 questionnaires sent to head coaches, 37 were completed and returned. This represented 88 per cent of coaches of all regions. Sixty questionnaires were sent to the officials of all Class "A" high schools, 53 responded. This in turn represents 88 per cent of the officials.

The coaches (86 per cent) and officials (68 per cent) who responded, felt that no medical examination was required of an official. At tournament time, the returns showed that no examination was needed.

Table 4. Physical qualifications of officials as reported by coaches and officials of class "A" high schools in the state of Utah

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
A. Medical Examination required:						
1. Tournament games	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Examination once a year	5	14	17	32	22	25
3. None	30	86	36	68	66	75
B. Obtain doctors clearance after injury						
1. Yes	2	6	11	21	13	15
2. No	117	49	20	38	37	42
3. Not referred	16	46	27	51	38	43
C. Age limit:						
1. No limit	33	94	48	91	81	92
2. No response	2	6	5	9	7	8
D. Eye Test qualification						
1. None required	33	94	48	91	81	92
2. No response	2	6	5	9	7	8
E. Peripheral vision test:						
1. Yes	1	3	3	0	1	1
2. No	25	71	53	100	78	89
3. Don't know	9	26	0	0	9	10
F. Would poor eye test reading disqualify						
1. Yes	0	0	14	26	14	16
2. No	10	29	31	58	41	47
3. Don't know	25	71	8	15	32	36

Table 4. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
G. Medical examination:						
1. Personal Doctor	5	14	15	28	20	23
2. Organizational Doctor	0	0	2	3	2	2
3. None required	30	86	36	68	66	75
H. Persons qualification decided by:						
1. Doctor	2	6	10	19	12	14
2. Arbiter	38	23	43	81	51	58
3. Don't know	33	94			33	38
L. Must officials keep weight limit:						
1. Yes	4	11	1	2	5	6
2. No	15	43	52	98	67	76
3. Uncertain	16	46			16	18
J. Speed & reaction time used as a qualification:						
1. Yes	3	9	15	28	18	21
2. No	25	71	28	53	53	60
3. Uncertain	7	20	12	23	19	22
K. Official required conditioning program in off season:						
1. Yes	3	9	35	6	6	7
2. No	25	71	45	85	70	80
3. Don't know	7	20	5	9	12	14

Table 4. Continued

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
L. Official required conditioning program in off season:						
1. Yes	3	9	5	9.4	8	9
2. No	30	86	48	90.5	78	89
3. Don't know	2	6			2	2

^aNumber of coaches responding.

^bPer cent of coaches responding.

^cNumber of officials responding.

^dPer cent of officials responding.

^eNumber of total officials and coaches responding.

^fPer cent of total officials and coaches responding.

Note: Some participants checked more than one blank of some of the questions, as a result totals did not always correspond with the total actually responding.

Injuries are not referred to a Doctor. Forty-five per cent of the coaches and 51 per cent of the officials responding, did agree that this was the case. Seventeen coaches (49 per cent) and 20 officials or a representat on of 38 per cent, stated that no Doctor clearnace was necessary after an injury was incurred. Two of 35 coaches or 6 per cent reported that a Doctor's clearance was in order. Only 11 of 53 officials or 21 per cent felt the same.

The questionnaire requested a response to an eye test, and of the 88 participants (coahces and officials) 92 per cent reported that none was required. Another eye examination dealing with peripheral vision (split vision) was pointed out by responding coaches (71 per cent) to the degree that no such test is given. In answer to this same question, 100 per cent of the officials were in agreement.

The data in Table 1 showed that Arbiters, as expressed by 43 out of 53 officials (81 per cent), made the final decision as to who may qualify physically. In response to this same question, 8 of 35 coaches (22.8 per cent) reported that the arbiter decided on the physical qualification of the official, and 94 per cent did not know how they qualified physically. Twelve persons (coaches and officials) or 14 per cent of 88 reporting felt that the Doctor would make the final decision.

As to weight limitation, 15 out of 35 coaches (43 per cent) and 52 out of 53 officials (98 per cent) felt that there was no requirement pertaining to this one area.

Bunn (1960) felt that a person who does not possess above average reaction time has little chance to becoming a top grade official. Over 71 per cent of coaches (25 out of 35) reported that no specific speed and reaction time test was needed to qualify as an official. The officials (53 per cent) indicated that speed and reaction time was not used as a measure of qualification, but 28.3 per cent of the officials and 8.3 per cent of the coaches did report that these two abilities are used.

Toby (1943) believes that a man to be alert and function efficiently throughout a game, must keep himself in top physical condition at all time. Over 80 per cent of the coaches and officials reported that no preseason conditioning program was required. This same group, which included 78 out of 88 responding (89 per cent), reported that no conditioning program was needed to be a member of the officiating association force.

Mental Qualifications

Table 5 concurs the mental qualifications of the officials.

The level of education that one achieved, was not a prerequisite qualification requirement as reported by 89 per cent of coaches and 87 per cent of the officials.

Klein (1935) felt that more reliable officials could be developed by conducting schools. Officiating classes are available throughout the state, but 27 out of 35 coaches (77 per cent) stated that no class was necessary for qualification, while 36 out of 53 officials (68 per cent)

Table 5. Mental qualifications

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
A. Level of education:						
1. High school	3	9	7	13	10	11
2. College	3	9	0	0	3	3
3. None needed	29	83	46	87	75	85
B. Officiating class required						
1. Yes	8	23	36	68	44	50.0
2. No	27	77	4	7	31	35.2
3. Optional	0	0	12	23	12	13.6
C. Who instructs class:						
1. BB officials	7	20	44	83	51	58
2. College instructor	3	9	0	0	3	3
3. Arbiters	3	9	16	30	19	22
4. None	3	9	11	21	14	16
5. Don't know	19	54	11	21	19	22
D. Clinic conducted:						
1. Once a year	10	29	34	64	44	50
2. Twice a year	1	3	8	15	9	10
3. Oftener	6	17	26	49	32	36
4. Don't know	18	51	0	0	18	21
E. Who conducts clinic:						
1. BB officials	5	14	44	83	49	56
2. College instructor	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Arbiters	9	26	11	21	20	23
4. Outside source	4	11	0	0	4	4
5. Don't know	16	46			16	18

Table 5. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
F. Are coaches invited to clinics:						
1. Yes	25	71	44	83	69	78
2. No	6	17	0	0	6	7
3. Uncertain	4	11	9	17	13	15
G. Written test:						
1. Once a year	26	74	46	87	72	82
2. Twice	0	0	6	11	6	7
3. Oftener	0	0	1	2	1	1
4. Never	1	3	0	0	1	1
5. Uncertain	8	23	0	0	8	9
H. Oral test:						
1. Yes	4	11	7	13	11	13
2. No	9	26	27	51	36	41
3. Don't know	22	63	18	34	40	46
I. Organizational meetings prior to testing:						
1. Yes	15	43	34	64	49	56
2. No	10	29	18	34	28	32
3. Don't know	10	29	1	2	11	13
J. Official clinics held:						
1. Locally	25	71	34	64	59	67
2. State mass meeting	9	26	18	34	27	31
3. None	10	29	1	2	11	13

Table 5. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
K. Are officials permitted to officiate if fail to attend clinic:						
1. Yes	17	49	40	76	47	53
2. No	5	14	13	25	18	21
3. Uncertain	13	37	0	0	13	15
L. Personal interview given:						
1. Yes	2	6	9	17	11	13
2. No	19	54	44	83	63	72
3. Uncertain	14	40	0	0	14	16

^aNumber of coaches responding.

^bPer cent of coaches responding.

^cNumber of officials responding.

^dPer cent of officials responding.

^eNumber of total officials and coaches responding.

^fPer cent of total officials and coaches responding.

claim that it was required. The officials (22.6 per cent) also reported that the class was optional.

Buehler (1949) stated to produce better officials, amateur and professional sports organizations have studied and conducted research in the officiating of various sports and have organized school and clinics for officials. Instructors for clinics and classes in officiating, as shown by the survey, significantly show that 83 per cent of the officials maintain that the instructors are comprised of basketball officials. Eighteen out of 35 coaches (51 per cent) reported they did not know who held the class. As for the clinic, 45 per cent of the coaches were in agreement that they did not know who conducted basketball clinics. The survey shows that out of 35 coaches, 19 (29 per cent) reported that clinics are held once a year. The officials (64 per cent) (36 out of 53) also agree that this was the case. Less than 36 per cent or 32 out of 88 coaches and officials reporting, claim that clinics are conducted more often than once a year. The officials, 34 out of 53 (64 per cent), and a large number of coaches, 25 out of 35 or 71 per cent reported that official clinics are held locally. Coaches and officials (27 out of 88) or 31 per cent, also reported that state mass clinic meetings are organized for benefit of all coaches and officials. A question was asked, "are officials permitted to officiate if they fail to attend clinics?" Forty-nine per cent or 17 out of 35 coaches answered "Yes" as did 76 per cent (40 out of 53) of the officials. Only 21 per cent or 18 out of 88 total reporting agree that if an official fails to attend clinics he was not allowed to officiate.

Mitchell (1949) said that officials should make it a point to attend as many rules meetings as possible. They should be affiliated with at least one of the accredited officials organizations. These meetings should be attended for the discussion of rules and their interpretations. Officials and coaches (78 per cent) (69 out of 88) reported that coaches are invited to all officiating clinics. Less than 12 per cent (6 out of 35) of the coaches reported that no clinics were made available to coaches.

Seventy-two coaches and officials were in agreement that officials take written test at least twice a year. As for oral testing, 4 out of 35 coaches (11 per cent) and 7 out of 53 or 13 per cent of officials reported that such tests are necessary. These same combined groups (officials and coaches), 40 out of 88 (45 per cent) did not know of an oral testing program.

It was reported by 54 per cent (19 out of 35) coaches and 44 out of 53 officials (83 per cent), that no personal interviews are given to determine whether a person does or does not qualify as an official.

Previous Experience as an Official and Player

Table 6 presents facts about the backgrounds of people directly concerned with the enforcement of the rules of basketball.

Game experience as a qualification factor, is not required. This was expressed by 20 out of 35 coaches or 52 per cent. Officials, 58 per cent (31 out of 53), stated that game experience was a necessary

Table 6. Previous experience as an official and player

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
A. Basketball game experience necessary						
1. Yes	9	26	31	58	40	46
2. No	20	52	22	42	42	48
3. Don't know	6	17	0	0	6	7
B. Officiating experience required:						
1. College	2	6	2	4	4	5
2. Jr. High	0	0	11	21	11	13
3. High school	24	69	20	38	44	50
4. Other	9	26	10	19	19	22
5. None required	0	0	10	19	10	11
C. Main difference of officiating between states:						
1. Interpretation	2	6	2	4	4	5
2. Mechanics	3	9	10	19	13	22
3. None	3	9	16	30	19	22
4. No remark	35	100	0	0	51	58
D. Level of officiating:						
1. Recreation	14	40	20	38	34	37
2. Church league	20	52	22	42	40	46
3. College	10	29	13	26	23	26
4. High school	0	0	53	100	53	60
5. Jr. High	0	0	25	47	25	28

^aNumber of coaches responding.

^bPer cent of coaches responding.

^cNumber of officials responding.

^dPer cent of officials responding.

^eNumber of total officials and coaches responding.

^fPer cent of total officials and coaches responding.

requirement. Total response (coaches and officials) to this item shows 48 per cent (42 out of 88) reported that game experience is not a necessity. In the same token, 42.5 per cent of the total participating (coaches and officials) felt that game experience is a prerequisite. Coaches and officials, 50 per cent or 44 out of 88 responding showed that high school officiating experience is a requirement. As for college officiating experience, 4.4 per cent of the above groups considered this type of experience necessary. One hundred per cent or 53 out of 53 officials who reported, have officiated on the high school level. Less than 29 per cent of the coaches in the state have officiated college games. The table shows that 84.1 per cent of all coaches and officials have officiated recreation and church basketball games. Of those officials reporting 47 per cent have had junior high officiating experience.

Mitchell (1949) let it be known that today basketball is ranked as a major team sport and is the leading indoor spectator sport of the United States. Many a quick and discriminating decision must be made during any basketball game and made in a split second. There is no significant difference in officiating from state to state as reported by 30.2 per cent or 16 out of 53 officials. The officials (19 per cent) or 10 out of 51 reported that there was a difference in mechanics from one state to another. A very small percentage, 5 per cent of coaches and officials who responded to the question, felt that the interpretation of rules differed from state to state.

Table 7. Other related athletic experiences

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
A. Instructed in other sports:						
1. Yes	35	100	48	91	83	94
2. No	0	0	5	9	5	6
B. Associated with athletics in a supervisory capacity:						
1. Yes	35	100	25	47	60	68
2. No	0	0	22	42	22	25
C. Sport classes in college						
1. Yes	35	100	31	58	66	75
2. No	0	0	22	42	22	25
D. Sport participation:						
1. College	24	69	20	38	44	50
2. Jr. High	20	52	17	32	37	42
3. High School	30	86	22	42	52	59
4. Elementary	10	29	8	15	18	21
5. Recreation	12	34	30	57	42	48
6. None	0	0	0	0	0	0

^aNumber of coaches responding.

^bPer cent of coaches responding.

^cNumber of officials responding.

^dPer cent of officials responding.

^eNumber of total officials and coaches responding.

^fPer cent of total officials and coaches responding.

Other Related Athletic Experiences

To what degree do coaches and officials perform in other related activities which might contribute to a better performance as an official? The Table 7 above indicates that 94 per cent of coaches and officials (83 out of 88) have instructed in other sport activities. Many of the men have acted as supervisors in the field of athletics. The table shows that 100 per cent of the coaches have performed such a function, and 47 per cent or 25 out of 53 officials assume the same responsibility. Fifty-three per cent of the officials have no prior supervisory experience.

College offer many opportunities to obtain credit in all athletic fields of endeavor. In reference to the table, it shows that 100 per cent of the coaches have attended such classes. A fraction of more than half of the officiating group responding (58 per cent), have attended a class at some time or another.

Newsom (1938) made the observation that officials who have played basketball extensively have an easier time in progressing as an official than those who have played very little.

Twenty out of 53 officials (38 per cent) reported that they participated in one or more sports while in college. At this same level, coaches, of which 69 per cent responded, also were active in more than one athletic activity. The high school sports, as reported by 59 per cent of coaches and officials, showed the highest percentage of participation. Junior high and recreation athletics reported the third highest percentage

(48 per cent and 42 per cent) of performance on the part of coaches and officials.

Basketball Officiating and Some Existing Problems

Table 8 indicates some interesting observations and problems now existing in present day basketball games.

A question often asked among many persons closely associated with the game of basketball, "would 3 officials improve the efficiency of all those who are in charge of enforcing the rules"? Of the 19 out of 34 reporting, 54 per cent felt that 3 officials would help enforcement. The officials responding (35 out of 53) or 66 per cent felt that the presence of two officials was sufficient.

Coaches and officials (55 per cent) are in agreement that the officials intelligence on calls is at times questioned.

Hensley (1938) said that the type of officiating that appealed to him lies in the premise that the official shall at no time become the object of the attention of the crowd. The officials who have had transitory or permanent difficulties in their work have had them because their work shifted the audience-attention from the players to themselves. Most coaches, 25 out of 35 (71 per cent), and 30 out of 53 (57 per cent) officials reported that the home court advantage plus crowd reaction were factors which exist in all games and do cause many problems to all officials. Another question related to the above statement, concerns the weight put on the outcome of a game as a result of crowd reaction, twenty-five out of 35

Table 8. Question directly relating to basketball officiating and some existing problems

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
A. Would three officials improve the game:						
1. Yes	19	54	15	58	34	39
2. No	10	29	35	66	45	52
3. No opinion	6	17	3	6	9	10
B. Is intelligence of an official questioned on calls by players and coaches						
1. Yes	3	9	3	6	6	7
2. No	10	29	10	19	20	23
3. Sometimes	12	34	37	70	49	56
4. No comment	10	29	3	6	13	15
C. Home court or crowd caused trouble for an official						
1. Yes	25	71	30	57	55	63
2. No	6	17	20	38	26	30
3. Undecided	4	11	3	7	7	8
D. May an official unconsciously be swayed by the home crowd:						
1. Yes--High School	25	71	33	62	58	66
2. No--High School	10	29	22	42	32	36
3. Yes--College	25	71	41	77	66	75
4. No--College	10	29	12	23	22	25

Table 8. Continued

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
E. Officials chosen for games by:						
1. Arbiters	10	29	37	70	47	63
2. Grades	1	3	12	23	13	15
3. Coaches	10	29	29	55	39	44
4. Principals	14	40	12	23	27	31
5. Experience	15	43	33	62	48	55
6. Personal friendship	25	71	20	38	45	51
7. All the above	15	44	32	60	47	53
F. Have the coaches the authority to change officials:						
1. Yes	17	49	24	45	41	47
2. No	10	29	28	53	38	43
3. No opinion	8	23	1	2	9	10
G. Don't announce officials until game time:						
1. Yes	14	40	49	92	63	72
2. No	14	40	12	23	26	30
3. No opinion	7	20	2	4	9	10
H. Present floor mechanics sufficient:						
1. Yes	18	51	50	94	68	77
2. No	10	29	3	6	11	13
3. Uncertain	7	20	0	0	7	8
I. Are violations called from back of participants:						
1. Yes	20	57	9	17	29	33
2. No	0	0	4	8	4	5
3. Sometimes	13	37	40	76	53	60

Table 8. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
J. Officials tend to watch ball to basket:						
1. Sometimes	19	54	39	74	58	66
2. Often	16	46	14	26	30	34
3. Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
K. Coaches are influenced on choice of officials						
1. Yes	18	51	23	43	41	47
2. No	13	37	30	57	43	49
3. Don't know	4	11	0	0	4	5
L. If official works college games should he be assigned High School games:						
1. Yes	15	43	40	75	55	63
2. No	11	31	13	25	24	27
3. Undecided	9	26	0	9	9	10
M. Are College games officiated differently than H.S. games:						
1. Yes	29	83	40	75	69	78
2. No	3	9	10	19	13	15
3. Don't know	3	9	3	6	6	7
N. Is the term "rabbit ears" over emphasized:						
1. Yes	3	9	44	83	47	53
2. No	23	66	9	17	32	36
3. Undecided	9	26	0	0	9	10

Table 8. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
O. Are officials rated and appraised after each game:						
1. Yes	6	17	18	34	24	27
2. No	16	46	37	70	53	60
3. Undecided	13	37	0	0	13	15
P. Who rates officials:						
1. Arbiters	10	29	16	30	26	30
2. Coaches	20	57	32	60	52	59
3. Principals	5	14	5	9	0	0
4. Others						
Q. Are arbiters paid for assigning officials:						
1. Yes	23	66	50	94	73	83
2. No	0	0	3	6	3	3
3. Limited pay	4	11	0	0	4	5
4. Don't know	8	23	0	0	8	9
R. Unbiased paid group would give a more complete analysis of an officials merits:						
1. Yes	23	66	36	68	59	67
2. No	4	11	10	19	14	16
3. Don't know	8	23	7	13	15	17

Table 8. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
S. Judgement and consistency are these traits inborn:						
1. Yes	20	57	21	40	41	47
2. No	13	37	20	38	33	38
3. Don't know	2	6	12	23	14	16
V. Do officials fail to admit mistakes and tend to blame others:						
1. Yes	10	29	21	40	31	35
2. No	4	11	32	60	36	50
3. Undecided	21	60	0	0	21	24
W. Officials need to accept the fact that they do make mistakes:						
1. Yes	35	100	50	94	85	97
2. No	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. No comment	0	0	3	6	3	2
X. Officials are properly dressed:						
1. Yes	32	52	50	94	80	91
2. No	2	6	0	0	2	2
3. Undecided						
Y. Should penalty be placed on an official for improper language and conduct:						
1. Yes	30	52	50	94	80	91
2. No	3	9	0	0	3	3
3. Undecided	2	6	3	6	5	6

Table 8. Continued

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
Z. Do officials report on time for games:						
1. Yes	23	66	53	100	76	86
2. No	12	34	0	0	12	14
AA. Should officials be dramatic in making calls:						
1. Yes	20	57	33	62	53	60
2. No	15	43	20	38	35	40
BB. Is it difficult to ignore crowd no matter what the abuse:						
1. Yes	30	36	37	70	67	76
2. No	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Don't know	5	14	18	34	23	26
CC. Rating response-what percentage:						
1. Coaches	5	14	4	8	9	10
2. Arbiters	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Principals	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Others	30	36	49	92	79	90
DD. Officials chosen by coaches - is there a tendency for a personal favor:						
1. Yes	15	43	8	15	23	26
2. No	13	37	47	89	60	68
3. Don't know	7	20	6	11	13	15

Table 8. Continued.

Questionnaire items	a	b	c	d	e	f
EE. Should officials ignore coaches antics unless abusive:						
1. Yes	20	57	28	53	48	55
2. No	14	26	25	47	39	44
3. Don't know	1	3	0	0	1	1
FF. Place official on a higher professional level:						
1. Yes	20	83	48	91	77	88
2. No	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Sufficient	6	17	5	9	11	13

^aNumber of coaches responding.

^bPer cent of coaches responding.

^cNumber of officials responding.

^dPer cent of officials responding.

^eNumber of total officials and coaches responding.

^fPer cent of total officials and coaches responding.

or 71 per cent of coaches and 33 out of 53 officials (62 per cent), resulting in total percentage, 63 per cent for the two groups, felt that the situation did cause the swaying of an official in many judgement calls.

Officials are chosen for basketball games from all the following methods; arbiters, grades, coaches, principals, experience, and personal friendship, but 71 per cent of coaches reported that personal friendship held the highest priority. Over 60 per cent of the officials rated arbiters as the most common methods used in assigning officials. Experience was the next choice as expressed by officials (62 per cent). Officials also felt that coaches played a big part in choosing (54 per cent). Officials and coaches (53 per cent, or 47 out of 88) reported that all of the above procedures are used in making assignments. At the request of a coach, the officials initial assignment may be changed to suit the parties involved. In answer to this same question, 47 per cent of all coaches and officials responding agreed, that this does occur quite often. The remainder of this same group (43 per cent) did not conform to this opinion. Forty per cent of coaches and 92 per cent of officials are in agreement that officials should not be announced until game time, yet 40 per cent of the coaches felt that they should be announced, while only 22 per cent of the officials gave this same response.

Floor mechanics has often been an item of dispute among all parties concerned with basketball. In answer to this question, 51 per cent (18 out of 35) of coaches and 94 per cent (50 out of 53) officials felt that present

mechanics would suffice. Twenty-eight per cent of the coaches felt that the mechanics need a revamping.

Watching the ball in flight to the basket by an official when he should be looking at the floor action, was reported as follows: 19 out of 35 (54 per cent) of coaches and 39 out of 53 or 73 per cent are in complete agreement that this does exist at times. Coaches, 45 per cent of them, expressed that this problem occurred quite often.

At times violations are called from the back of players. The officials reaction to this question showed that 76 per cent or 40 out of 53 of them were in full compliance with this statement. Forty per cent (20 out of 35) of the coaches reported that infraction did occur.

How much say or influence does a coach have on the choice of an official? Fifty one per cent or 18 out of 35 coaches, did feel that the position held is a factor in determining the choice of an official. Fifty per cent of the officials responded by saying coaches have no say in the matter.

Coaches (31 per cent) strongly felt that officials should be limited to work only college games if they accept such assignments. Twenty-five per cent of the coaches were undecided in answer to this question. The officials (75 per cent) on the other hand agreed that one should be entitled to work high school games as well. College games, as reported by 83 per cent coaches and 75 per cent of officials, are officiated differently.

"Rabbit ears", a term commonly used in basketball, is a phrase used in reference to an individual who reacts to actions other than the game at hand. To this question, 83 per cent of the officials did feel that too much emphasis was placed upon this statement. While 65.6 per cent of the coaches felt the term was appropriate.

Hobson (1955) said that it was the responsibility of coaches to obtain the kind of official that is conducive to good play. Many coaches get information regarding officials from their scouts and other coaches use the JV games as a way in which to rate top officials.

Over 69 per cent of the officials and 45 per cent of coaches reported that there was no known method of rating an official after each game. Thirty-four per cent (18 out of 53) of the officials did state that a rating is held. Officials when rated, are generally judged by coaches. Fifty-seven per cent (20 out of 35) of coaches and 60 per cent (32 out of 53) of the officials, did report that ratings are conducted in this manner.

Dahl (1934) stated intense love for and enjoyment in officiating that transcends any amount of pay received would do much to make for ultimate success as an official. Eight per cent or 73 out of 88 responding coaches and officials agreed that arbiters, who delegated the responsibility of assigning officials, are paid a small sum of money. Over 67 per cent of the above felt that an unbiased paid group would give a more complete appraisal of an officials capabilities.

Two characteristics, judgement and consistency are shown to have this rating--officials 40 per cent (21 out of 53) and 57 per cent of the coaches (20 out of 35) did agree that these traits are inborn. While 38 per cent of the coaches and officials felt that the traits were acquired with time and experience.

There are circumstances in every basketball game which may cause an official to make mistakes. Sixty per cent of the coaches were undecided about officials making mistakes and then passing the buck on such a situation. Sixty per cent of the officials did not feel that this was the case. Over 97 per cent (35 out of 88) coaches and officials expressed that all officials should accept the fact that they do make mistakes.

The coaches and officials (97 per cent) felt that officials did dress in the proper attire.

Clarno (1936) said that officials be courteous to players, for they can be a great help to you if you can keep them maintaining a friendly attitude towards you.

Officials often times are known to use improper language in the course of a basketball game. Ninety per cent of coaches and officials stated that a penalty should be bestowed if such a problem arose.

Clarno (1936) suggested that officials be at the basketball gym one hour before the contest, and in the dressing room at least thirty minutes before game time.

A large per cent of coaches and officials responding (76 out of 88) agreed that officials do report to games at assigned times. Another interesting fact was that 34 per cent of the coaches expressed that officials at times do not report to games at the proper time.

Hensley (1938) said that the official should be inconspicuous aid and guide to the progress of the game, and should make decisions and control the game without slowing up the action to an appreciable extent. He should make an effort to keep the attention of the game concentrated upon the play of the teams and not upon his own comportment. Dramatizing calls when a violation is committed was favored by 20 out of 35 coaches (57 per cent) and 33 out of 53 officials or 62 per cent. A total of 33 out of 88 (40 per cent) returns did not feel that this action was necessary.

Clarno (1936) said an official should not talk back to spectators who were "riding" you during the game, for it will only make you lose your head, and before long you will find yourself paying more attention to him than to the game. Often times at basketball games officials are exposed to crowd abuse, of which 39 out of 35 coaches or 86 per cent and 37 out of 53 or 70 per cent officials felt that this reaction on the part of spectator was difficult for officials to ignore.

Clarno (1936) mentioned that an official should not put a coach in an embarrassing position by asking him for games, as he might have personal reasons for not using you. Whenever an official is chosen by a coach, 42 per cent of the coaches felt that there was a tendency, inadvertently, for an official to make calls in appreciation for the assignment. In answer

to this statement, 89 per cent (47 out of 53) of the officials expressed that this manner of choosing an official did not cause a person to respond in such a manner.

Fifty-four per cent of coaches and officials combined, did say that an official should ignore the tactics of coaches unless they become abusive. Forty-seven per cent or 25 out of 53 of the officials felt that any type performance by a coach should not be ignored.

A higher professional standard for those persons responsible in carrying out the rules of the game, was sanctioned by 88 per cent (77 out of 88) of the coaches and officials.

DISCUSSION

A total of 100 questionnaires were sent to 40 coaches and 60 officials. Thirty-five out of 40 coaches and 53 out of 60 officials returned completed questionnaires. This represents a total response of 88 out of 100 questionnaires sent.

The questionnaire was designed to cover the areas of (a) physical qualifications, (b) mental qualifications, (c) previous experience as an official and player, (d) other related experiences, (e) basketball officiating and some existing problems.

The "physical qualification" phase of the questionnaire was included to cover the physical condition required of a person in order to qualify as an official.

It was found that a large percentage of coaches and officials said that officials have no set of physical standards they must abide by to officiate basketball games. Some officials did state that they took it upon themselves to be ready physically.

The "mental qualification" portion of the survey was to help determine the method used to prepare an official for his responsibilities. The response to this showed that (coaches and officials) many varied approaches are used to qualify an official, such as schools, clinics, organizational meetings and written test.

Coaches and officials were in disagreement that basketball game experience as a player was necessary for qualification. The officials who reported felt that this type of experience was required. Over 50 per cent of the coaches and officials expressed the fact that some type of officiating on the high school level was required of all officials. The study showed that officials and coaches have performed officiating on many different levels, such as recreation, church, college, high school and junior high school.

Most of the coaches and officials did report that they have had many related experiences in athletics. These experiences included, sports instructor, supervisors, classes taken, and sports participation on all levels of recreation, etc.

The data compiled covered many varied problems in officiating. The more pertinent items covered were: (a) would 3 officials improve the game? Again coaches were in disagreement on this question. Coaches felt that it would, while most of the officials disagreed. (b) Arbiters and game experience were the main factors used for assigning officials, as expressed by the officials. A large percentage of the coaches reported that school principals, experience, and personal friendship were the leading methods used to place an official for a basketball game. (c) Most of the officials and half of the coaches who reported felt that the announcing of officials assigned should not occur until game time. (d) A large percentage of coaches and officials agreed that floor mechanics

presently used are sufficient. (e) A very small per cent of the coaches reported that officials should be allowed to officiate high school games if they participated in college games. A large percentage of officials agreed that this set up should prevail. (f) A great majority of coaches and officials definitely agreed that college games are officiated differently than high school games. (g) The rating of officials by coaches was reported by both the officials and coaches. (h) Over 50 per cent of the coaches and less than half of the officials stated by their response that judgement and consistency were traits that a person was born with. (i) The officials and coaches reported (a large per cent) that officials need to accept the fact that they do make mistakes. (j) When an official uses improper language, the officials and coaches reported that some penalty should be bestowed. (k) Over 80 per cent of the coaches and officials would like to see officiating placed on a higher professional level.

CONCLUSIONS

The state of Utah does not have a specific set of standards that one must attain to officiate high school games other than taking the written test and obtaining a passing grade. There are varied methods used by each individual region. From the data received (coaches and officials) the following conclusions are made:

1. Coaches and officials need to come to a meeting of the minds as to what qualifications are presently used and what has to be done to improve these practices.
2. Physical qualifications as a requirement is only an assumption, not a must.
3. The knowledge that one must receive to make him mentally alert appears to be strong in some areas of the state, while in others it only involves reading the rule book and passing the written test.
4. All the athletic experience that one obtains prior to becoming an official, does have the sanction of all officials and coaches, for without it a person who wants to become an official can only hope for limited work, or assignments.
5. Any athletic sports activity that a person is associated with has many carryover advantages in the overall performance of an official.

6. Officiating problems as expressed by the data received are extensive. The coaches and officials were in complete agreement that this was the case. A few examples of the problems are listed below:
 - a. Crowd reactions
 - b. coach reaction
 - c. Judgement and consistency, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the Utah High School Athletic Association does not have specific rules and regulations to cover the qualifications a person must achieve to become an official, the State Association should adopt a "State Officiating Guide" containing the following guidelines taken from this study:

1. Physical Qualification "Must" spelled out.
 - a. Take physical examination yearly (must be placed on proper examination form).
 - b. Set an age limit. (May be determined by the level of game - church, recreation, etc.).
 - c. Eye test.
 - d. Weight limit must be kept in proportion to body structure as prescribed by Doctor.
 - e. Speed and reaction test must be given.
 - f. All should and must be in a preseason conditioning program.

This conditioning should be kept up in the course of the season.
2. The mental aspect of officiating could be more beneficial by holding more state official conventions and clinics to include all officials and coaches at one or more mass meetings. Presently they are being held sporadically in different regions, and

expressing different interpretation of the rules. As a whole, it appears that work is being done in this area.

3. Playing the game of basketball and officiating as much as possible on all levels will help improve the caliber of officiating. Experience of this nature should be a prerequisite before a person may qualify for officiating.
4. Officiating classes should be attended and instructed by those persons who have a thorough knowledge and interpretation of the rules of basketball. There are too many varied opinions as to how the game should be called and this is the reason for expressing so strongly for a competent instructor in this field.
5. An official must be emotionally stable at all times. Those in charge of qualifying a person to officiate must see to it that the one chosen can withstand the comments and abuse of coaches and crowds.
6. All basketball games must be officiated the same regardless of the level of the game (junior high up to and including college).
7. Leave the assigning of officials to the arbiters or other authorities who have the knowledge and understand the problems of officiating
8. Announce officials assigned only at game time.
9. Officiating ethics must be further promoted.
10. Place officials on a higher professional level, to include the following:

a. Financial

b. Certificate of accomplishment (schooling).

It is suggested that a further study be made on the following recommendations:

1. Peripheral vision testing (split vision)
2. Require all coaches to take test and attend clinics.
3. An official recruiting program is needed. (College would be a good source.)
4. Devise a method to eliminate an official if when chosen he does not perform efficiently.
5. Encourage television stations to televise officiating procedures.

To those persons directly associated with officiating, it is hoped that some value can be derived from the above recommendations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Basketball Player Handbook, 1965-1966. The National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, Chicago, Illinois. 76 p.
- Basketball Case Book, 1965-1966. The National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, Chicago, Illinois. 86 p.
- Basketball Rules, 1965-66. The National Federation of State High School Athletic Association, Chicago, Illinois. 65 p.
- Buehler, J. B. 1949. "School Your Officials." Athletic Journal 16:38, 39, 40. October.
- Bunn, John W. 1960. The Art of Officiating Sports. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 388.
- Carlson, H. C. 1937. "Officiating." Scholastic Coach 6(5):10-25.
- Clarno, L. M. 1936. "Mechanics of Basketball Officiating." Athletic Journal 17:30-32.
- Dahl, Edwin J. 1935. "My Philosophy of Officiating." Athletic Journal 15:40, 42, 43. January.
- Dahl, Edwin J. 1934. "My Philosophy of Officiating." Athletic Journal 15:36-38. February.
- Dahl, Edwin J. 1937. "The Whistle Blows." Scholastic Coach 6(5):10-11-25. January.
- Harrow, Bill. 1960. Basketball Officiating. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- Healey, William A. 1962. High School Basketball. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
- Hensley, Ralph E. 1938. "Standardizing Basketball Officiating." Scholastic Coach 8(3):14-15.

- Hobson, Howard A. 1955. Scientific Basketball. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 250 p. .
- Klein, Irwin. 1940. "School Your Officials." Scholastic Coach 18(2):28-38. September.
- Mitchell, Elmer D. 1949. Sports Officiating. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company. 490 p. .
- Newsom, Heber. 1938. "Training in Officiating at the University of California." Athletic Journal 19:36-37. December.
- Petree, W. L. 1936. "The Basketball Officials Job." Athletic Journal 16:36-37. January.
- Tobey, Dave. 1943. Basketball Officiating. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company. 74 p. .
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 1966. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company. 122 p. .

APPENDIX

184 North Van Buren
Ogden, Utah
February 15, 1967

Officiating, without a doubt, is one of the most important functions of every basketball game. As a graduate student at Utah State University, I am conducting a study to determine present "Basketball Officiating Qualification Practices of all Regions of Class 'A' High Schools in the State of Utah.

Enclosed you will find a self-addressed envelope and a questionnaire relative to officiating. The questionnaire will give you some valuable information on problems which have arisen in your own situation.

If you would like a copy of the results of this survey, please indicate at the bottom of the questionnaire.

I appreciate your time and effort in completing this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Salvo
Weber High School

mh

P. S. This study has been approved by the Physical Education Department of Utah State University.

PRESENT BASKETBALL OFFICIATING QUALIFICATION PRACTICES
OF ALL REGIONS OF CLASS "A" HIGH SCHOOLS
IN THE STATE OF UTAH

I. PHYSICAL QUALIFICATIONS:

1. How often is a medical examination required of an official? Once a season _____ Tournament games _____ None needed _____
2. Does an official get a doctor's clearance after an injury? Yes _____ No _____ Injury not often referred _____
3. Please list an official's age limit. _____ No limit _____
4. What should the eye test reading show before an official may qualify? _____ None required _____
5. Is a peripheral vision test given? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____
6. Would a poor reading on an eye test disqualify an official? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____
7. Who conducts the medical examination? Personal doctor _____ Organizational doctor _____ None required _____
8. Who decides as to who may qualify physically? Doctor _____ Arbiter _____ Don't know _____
9. Must an official keep within a certain weight limit? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain _____
10. Is speed and reaction time taken into account when determining the qualification of an official? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____
11. Is an official required to be in a conditioning program during the off season. Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____
12. Is an official required to be in a conditioning program during the basketball season? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____

II. MENTAL QUALIFICATIONS:

1. What level of education is needed by the official? Elementary _____ High School _____ College _____ None required _____
2. Is an officiating class required? Yes _____ No _____ Optional _____
3. Who instructs class? Basketball Official _____ College Instructor _____ Arbiter _____ None of the above listed _____
4. How often are clinics conducted? Once a year _____ Twice a season _____ Oftener _____
5. Who conducts the clinics? Basketball Official _____ College Instructor _____ Arbiters _____ Outside Source _____
6. Are all coaches invited to clinics? Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain _____
7. How often are written tests given? Once a year _____ Twice _____ Oftener _____ Never _____
8. Are oral tests given? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____
9. What score must an official achieve? Minimum score _____

10. Are organizational meetings conducted prior to testing? Yes ___
No ___ Don't know ___
11. Where are official clinics held? Locally ___ State Mass Meetings ___
None available ___
12. Are officials permitted to officiate if they fail to attend clinics?
Yes ___ No ___ Uncertain ___
13. Is a personal interview given? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___

III. PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS AN OFFICIAL AND PLAYER:

1. Is basketball game experience necessary? Yes ___ No experience
necessary ___
2. What level of officiating experience should be required? College ___
Junior High ___ High School ___ Other ___ None required ___
3. In what state other than Utah have you officiated? _____
4. If you have officiated in another state, what do you feel is the main
difference that exists between the states? Interpretation ___ Mechanics ___
None ___ Other _____
5. What level do you officiate? Recreation ___ Church ___ College ___
High School ___ Junior High ___

IV. OTHER RELATED EXPERIENCE:

1. What activities other than basketball have you officiated? _____
None ___
2. Have you instructed in sports other than basketball? Yes ___ No ___
3. Have you ever been associated with athletics in a supervisory capacity?
Yes ___ No ___
4. Have you ever taken sport classes in college? Yes ___ No ___
5. On what level have you participated in other sports? College ___
Jr. High ___ High School ___ Elementary ___ Recreation ___
None ___

V. QUESTIONS RELATING TO BASKETBALL:

1. Do you feel that three officials would improve the game of basketball?
Yes ___ No ___ No Opinion ___
2. Do player or coaches insult the intelligence of an official when they
question a call? Yes ___ No ___ Sometimes ___
3. Does the home crowd or court cause problems for an official? Yes ___
No ___ Undecided ___
4. May an official be unconsciously swayed by the home crowd? High School--
Yes ___ No ___ College--Yes ___ No ___
5. How is a person chosen to officiate basketball games? Arbiters ___
Test Grade ___ Coaches ___ Principals ___ Experience ___
Personal Friendship ___ All of the above ___
6. Have coaches the authority to change an official after he has been
assigned? Yes ___ No ___ No Opinion ___

30. When officials are chosen by coaches is there a tendency for an official to expect a personal favor? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___
31. Should an official ignore the antics of the coach unless the person becomes abusive? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___
32. Should officiating be placed on a higher professional level? Yes ___
No ___ Sufficient ___

Do you desire a copy of the results of this study when available?

Yes ___ No ___

The following information was placed on a double "Post Card" and sent to officials and coaches.

Dear

A questionnaire is being prepared to "Determine Present Officiating Practices of All Regions of Class "A" High Schools in the State of Utah. "

If you are interested in the study, please return the enclosed post card.

The study might enlighten all persons concerned with what has to be done to help improve present conditions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Salvo

Dear Paul,

I would like to participate in the Officiating study you are conducting.

Sincerely,

Name
Address

The following information was placed on a "Post Card" and sent to officials and coaches

Dear

Sorry to take up so much of your time, but if you still have "The Basketball Questionnaire" available, I would appreciate it very much if you would complete the questions as it would be helpful in completing the data information I am compiling.

Thank you,

Paul Salvo

VITA

Paul A. Salvo

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A Study of Present Basketball Officiating Qualification Practices of Class "A" High Schools in Utah

Major Field: Physical Education

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 24, 1924, son of Frank and Josephine Salvo; married Betty June Scheib, January 15, 1949; six children-- Michael, Bruce, Patrick, Franklin, John, and Lisa Maria.

Education: Attended elementary school in Bridgeton, New Jersey; graduated from Bridgeton High School in 1942; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Utah State University, with a major in Physical Education, in 1951; attended classes at University of Maryland, Glassboro State College, New Jersey; Coaching Schools and clinics at University of Utah, Utah State University, and Major League Baseball Schools; did graduate work in Physical Education at summer school at Glassboro State College but the major portion of the requirements were taken and completed at Utah State University in 1968; upon completion a Master of Science degree in Physical Education was granted; posses Secondary, Elementary, and Driver Training Certificates.

Professional Experience: Teaching--Monmouth Elementary 1 year, Gloucester, New Jersey; Washington Junior High School 2 years, Ogden, Utah; Weber High School 13 years, Ogden, Utah. Coaching--Head Basketball at Washington for 2 years and Weber High for 10 years; Head baseball and assistant football at the same school; student assistant baseball coach at Utah State University, and 3 years as assistant baseball at Weber State College.

Supervised Basketball and baseball programs for Ogden City and Weber county recreation departments; Supervised Intramural programs at Washington Junior High and Weber High School. Officiating--Region 1 for 2 years.