



ASSESSMENT OF THE FOOTBALL REFEREES' INTERPRETATIONS ON THE LAWS OF THE GAME

Lale ORTA¹, Yalçın BEŞİKTAŞ¹, Ali KIZILET²

¹Okan University, School of Applied Sciences, Department of Sport Management

²Marmara University, Physical Education and Sports

Abstract: The study was conducted on the 336 referees coming from different cities of Turkey and attending to courses for the Promotion to Super League, Super League Assistant, Classification A, Classification B, Classification C and Classification C Assistant Refereeing Staff for the 2007-2008 football seasons. The distribution of the number of the referees in terms of their regions, and the percentages of their decisions were taken into account and the comments were made considering these values. The participants interpreted on FIFA video recordings consisting of 24 positions. When the answers of the 336 participants were evaluated, the average number of the correct answers given by the referees is 14, and 10 for the incorrect ones per referee. There are several reasons of football referees' making wrong decisions. Lack of education, not being able to take the correct position during the match, being far from the position, tiredness, the pressure by the audience, pressure by the media, pressure by the footballer, wrong perception of the position and interpreting it in a wrong way, the lack of the knowledge of the laws of the game, etc. can be considered as some of these reasons. These reasons may vary. So far, the common view has been that the reasons of the referees' wrong decisions have depended on the negative conditions that the referees have faced during the matches. This study shows that no matter how the negative conditions of the match are cleared away or no matter how clear the referees watch the positions on display, the decisions they make are not the standard ones.

Key Words: Football, Referee, FIFA, The Laws of the Game , Match positions, Referees' interpretations

INTRODUCTION

The role of a referee is really important in the match's being played under the principles of Fair Play, in a cheerful and exciting atmosphere, with many goals scored during and at the end of the game or its being played in an unsystematic, eventful and dis-

puted manner (Orta, 2002a). Refereeing requires knowledge, experience, competence, good personality, form, and concentration. A referee is a person having a regular life style, knowing about psychology and sociology, being able to comment on the human being's individual and social behaviors, and

This study at Cambridge University, the 3rd July 23 to 25, 2012 date Sport and Society Conference, presented as a virtual declaration.

who has to be a good sample in terms of his/ her behaviors both inside and outside the field of the game (Orta, 2002b).

The start of the football refereeing in the world has been in parallel with the start and the expansion of football. Until 1819, the captains of each team had been the referees during the matches (San, Unsi and Var, 1963). It was found out that the institution of refereeing first came into existence in England (Orta, 2002) and it started to get institutional in 1880s (Lineker, 1994). All the changes in the game of football effected the refereeing. In 1881, it was the first time that there were things to be mentioned about a referee in the laws of the game (Babacan, 1972). Referees have become the only authorized person of the matches since 1890 (Artun, 1992).

The systematization and publishing of the laws of the football game first came true in 1896 to create a shared harmony all over the world (Baba, 1992). Refereeing in started to progress after the year 1990 when the retired footballers became the referees of the game (Tezcan, 1964).

It can be seen that the necessary importance has not been attached to the referees who are the most important part of the game together with the regular changes in the laws of the game (FIFA Magazine, 1997) which cause referees to make mistakes. FIFA (Fé-

dération Internationale de Football Association) and IFAB (International Football Association Board) have taken new steps studying on this issue since 1990 (Orta, 2008). Many source was made about implementation of football rules by FIFA to ensure unity and standart. (Laws of the Game, 1995; 1996; 2003)

There are several studies and researches on referees all over the world. Some of these studies are available below:

In recent years many researches are conducted about referees and assistant referees. This researches are especially about physical qualifications of referees. Metabolic stressor is researched effects of performance to referees during the game (Krusstrup, Mohr and Bangsbo, 2002; Castagna, Abt and D'ottavio, 2007; Bird, Nevill and Castagna, 2006). There are lots of research about physical qualification as well as psychological qualification. This researches include effects of psychological stressor to performance and management qualification to psychological stressor (Mascarenhas and Plessner, 2006).

In addition there are few studies about behavioural model of referees whose detection capabilities. Econometric analysis of the Football referees' interpretations with which the behaviors of the football referees on duty were analyzed in Italian Football

League (Series A) was examined. In this study, it is mentioned that the audience exerted social pressure on the referees and this affected the referees' interpretations in favour of the host team (Springer and Verlag, 2007).

In the research named as the perceptions of the football players on injustice and the types of the mistakes done by the referees; the effect of the referee's interpretations, which were perceived as unjust, on the football players was studied (Canovas, Reynes and Ferrand, 2008).

Similar studies have explored the effects of different environmental factors on the performance of the referees. One of these studies is a factor of stress caused by football spectators (Downward and Jones, 2007; Balmer, Nevill, Ward and Fairclough, 2007; Johnston, 2008), in the other explored the effects of altitude on the performance of referee (Kızılet, Topsakal and Orta, 2009)

The main things of referees performance that accuracy and consistency in making decision. There are lots of investigation about this topic. (Catteuw, Helsen, Gils and Wagemans, 2009; MacMahon, Helsen, Starkes and Weston, 2007). Main point of this researches are positive impact of performance about true referees decision.

There are several reasons of football referees' making wrong decisions. Lack of edu-

cation, not being able to take the correct position during the match, being far from the position, tiredness, the pressure by the audience, pressure by the media, pressure by the footballer, wrong perception of the position and interpreting it in a wrong way, the lack of the knowledge of the laws of the game, etc. can be considered as some of these reasons (Orta and Söğütçü, 2004).

These reasons may vary. So far, the common view has been that the reasons of the referees' wrong decisions have depended on the negative conditions that the referees have faced during the matches. In this study, it is aimed to measure whether the referees' interpretations are standardized or not even when all these negative conditions of the match are cleared away and the positions of the match are watched clearly by the referees on display.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

PARTICIPANT GROUPS

The study was conducted on the 336 referees coming from different 41 cities of Turkey and attending to courses for the Promotion to Super League, Super League Assistant, Classification A, Classification B and Classification C Assistant Refereeing Staff for the 2007-2008 football season (Table 1).

The most successful referees in all regions of Turkey are invited to the "Promotion

Courses” by the Central Board of Referees. 336 participants of our study consists of 27 referee candidates of Classification A, 3 Female referee candidates of Classification B, 31 referee candidates of Classification B, 56

referee candidates of Classification C, 191 Assistant referee candidates of Classification C, 9 referee candidates of Super League and 19 Assistant referee candidates Super League (Table 1).

Table 1 The Number of the Referees in terms of their Classifications

The Classifications That The Referees Are The Candidates Of	The Number Of The Referees
Referees of super league	9
Assistant referees of super league	19
Referees of classification A	27
Referees of classification B	31
Referees of classification C	56
Assistant referees of classification C	191
Female referees of classification B	3
Total	336

As the study also shows the success of referees’ interpretations on the positions, it was taken into consideration while promoting their classifications. This was approved by the referees who took the tests.

METHOD

The study consists of 24 match positions prepared in 2007 by Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). Being the uppermost institution of the football in the world, FIFA aims the Laws of the Football Game to be interpreted in a standardized manner. So FIFA desires to remove differences among the interpretations of the referees, the media, the footballers, the interpreters, the audience, the directors, and the others. The videos of the positions

were very clear and they were displayed on a huge screen that everyone could see easily. After giving detailed information to the participants, evaluation sheets were given to the referees. The participants were asked to write their interpretations of the 24 positions recorded by FIFA after watching each of them. There are two parts – technical and disciplinary decision - in the evaluation sheets related to each position. The technical decisions have four and the disciplinary decisions have three choices on this evaluation form. Technical decisions include “No Foul”, “Indirect Free Kick”, “Direct Free Kick” and “Penalty kick”. As for the disciplinary decisions, they consist of “No Card”, “Yellow Card” and “Send off”. The analysis of the match positions which are

prepared by FIFA and directed to 336 referees coming from different cities of Turkey and attending to courses for the Promotion to Super League, Super League Assistant, Classification A, Classification B, Classification C, and Classification C Assistant Refereeing Staff for the 2007-2008 football season are as in the following:

- 1- The player tackles his opponent endangering his health and sliding his one foot in the air.
- 2- The footballer prevents his opponent by using his knee in the penalty area.
- 3- The footballer moves in front of the opponent who is heading towards the goal by the touch line and stops his opponent using his hip.
- 4- The footballer falls down in the opponents' penalty area. There is no contact to the player, but the player does not intend to mislead the referee's decision while falling down.
- 5- The footballer, who is about to score a goal, is pulled from behind outside the opponents' penalty area and is fallen down by his opponent.
- 6- The player kicks his opponent's leg in the midfield
- 7- The player tries to deceive the referee and lays himself down in the opponents' penalty area in an exaggerated manner expecting to have a penalty.
- 8- An intervention from behind is done to the player in the goal area having the obvious goal-scoring opportunity.
- 9- The footballer tackles sliding to gain the ball. He cannot touch the ball but the feet of his opponent. His sliding tackle is not a kind of one endangering his opponent's health.
- 10- The opponent and the goalkeeper are attacking the ball coming back from the goalkeeper. The ball is between both players.
- 11- The player is sliding from the field of play to outside passing the touch line and tackling his opponent outside the field of play. The tackle is completely aiming to the player rather than the ball and it may injure the opponent.
- 12- The goalkeeper is causing his opponent to fall down by touching his legs in the penalty area. However, there is no obvious goal-scoring chance in the position.
- 13- The footballer is tackling his opponent by sliding without intending to play with the ball, but he is not endangering his opponent's health.
- 14- The player prevents his opponent by moving between the ball and his opponent with a contact in the penalty area.
- 15- The player stops his opponent who is moving forward together with the ball by pulling his jersey.

16- The player kicks his opponent's foot from behind off the ball.

17- The player falls down deliberately in the opponents' penalty area to mislead the referee's decision and gain an unfair profit.

18- The player who is heading towards the opponents' goal and having an obvious goal-scoring opportunity is fouled from behind by an opponent.

19- The player is preventing the opponent to meet the ball by handling the ball in order to prevent an obvious attack by the opponent team.

20- Both players are sliding to the ball between them. One of them is kicking the other's knee and injuring him without taking care of his own foot.

21- The player is pushing the opponent from behind using his shoulder in the penalty area.

22- Coming to the front line of the penalty area, the goalkeeper is tackling his opponent without controlling his tackle

23- A sliding tackle is done to the player who passes his opponent with the ball.

24- The player having an obvious goal-scoring opportunity is fallen down by an opponent's tackle from behind in the penalty area.

STATISTICAL METHOD

The distribution of the number of the referees in terms of their regions, and the percentages of their decisions were taken into account and comments were made considering these values.

FINDINGS

The number of the 336 participant referees' in terms of the classifications that they are the candidates of and their percentages were shown Table 2.

Table 2 Number of the Candidates for the Classifications and Their Percentages

The Classifications That Referees Are The Candidates Of	The Number Of The Referees	Percentage
Referees of super league	9	2.7
Assistant referees of super league	19	5.7
Referees of classification a	27	8
Referees of classification b	31	9.2
Referees of classification c	56	16.7
Assistant referees of classification c	191	56.8
Female referees of classification b	3	0.9
Total	336	100

The participants interpreted on FIFA video recordings consisting of 24 positions. When the answers of the 336 participants were

evaluated, the average number of the correct answers given by the referees is 14, and 10 for the incorrect ones per referee

(Table 3).

Table 3 The Interpretation of the FIFA Positions by the Referees on Duty in Turkish Professional Leagues in Turkey

Number of the Referees	Total Number of the Questions	Correct Answers	Wrong Answers
336	8064	4748	3316
Average		14.13	9.87

While 98.2% of the referees interpreted the position in which the player tackles his opponent endangering his health and sliding his one foot in the air as “Direct Free Kick”. They could not the same high percentage in terms of this position’s disciplinary sanction. 58.7% of the referees could not send the player off although the position should be punished by a red card.

76.6% of the referees made the right decision which is “Penalty kick” for the position in which the player prevents his opponent by using his knee in the penalty area. As for the disciplinary sanction 96.3% of the referees interpreted the position correctly by not showing any cards to the player.

93.7% of the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the player moves in front of the opponent who is heading towards the goal by the touch line and stops his opponent using his hip as “Direct Free

Kick”. While 32.9% of the referees believed that “No Card” should be shown, 65.2% of the referees decided on showing “Yellow Card” for the player as a disciplinary sanction. 32.9% of the referees interpreted the position only as “Direct Free Kick” without any cards although they had to show a yellow card to the player.

One of the biggest problems experienced in Turkish Football Leagues is deception. The percentage of the correct answer of “No Infringement” is 71.4 for the player falling down in the opponents’ penalty area. 43.6% of the showed yellow card although no card must be shown for this position as a disciplinary sanction.

The player, who is about to score a goal, is pulled from behind outside the opponents’ penalty area and is fallen down by his opponent. 98.8% of the referees interpreted this position as “Direct Free Kick” and 97.9% of

them as “Send Off”. The referees achieved to give the correct answer with a high level of percentage both as a technical and as a disciplinary sanction in this position having obvious goal-scoring opportunity.

For the position in which the player kicks his opponent’s leg in the midfield, 95.5% of the referees chose the option “Direct Free Kick”. 26.9% of the referees misinterpreted the position and did not send of the player.

The player is trying to deceive the referee and lays himself down in the opponents’ penalty area in an exaggerated manner expecting to have a penalty. Although 88.9% of the referees believed that there is “No Foul”, only 59.6% of the referees are in the opinion of showing a yellow card as the player was trying to deceive the referee. This position was misinterpreted by the referees in the percentage of 40.4.

An intervention from behind is done to the player in the goal area having the obvious goal-scoring opportunity. Out of the 90.8% of the referees interpreting the position as a “Direct Free Kick” and a “Penalty kick” only 60% of the referees sent off the player. 40% of the referees misinterpreted this position.

The footballer tackles sliding to gain the ball. He cannot touch the ball but the feet of his opponent. His sliding tackle is not a kind of one endangering his opponent’s health. While 93% of the referees agreed on “Direct Free Kick” for this position that did not endanger the opponent’s health, only 69.3% of them decided on showing a “Yellow Card”. 30.7% of the referees misinterpreted the position by not showing a yellow card to the player.

Table 4 The Assessment of the 24 FIFA Positions' Technical Interpretations Made by 336 Referees Who are on Duty in Turkish Professional Leagues

Item	No Foul	Indirect Free Kick (IFK)	Direct Free Kick (DFK)	Penalty	FIFA's Decision
1	0.3%	1.5%	98.2%	--	DFK
2	21.9%	0.3%	1.2%	76.6%	Penalty kick
3	3%	3.3%	93.7%	--	DFK
4	71.4%	22.8%	0.9%	4.9%	No Foul
5	0.6%	0.3%	98.8%	0.3%	DFK
6	3%	1.5%	95.5%	--	DFK
7	54%	34.9%	0.9%	10.2%	IFK
8	9.2%	0%	3.6%	87.2%	Penalty kick
9	5%	0.9%	93.2%	0.9%	DFK
10	90.4%	3%	6.6%	--	No Foul
11	77.6%	2.7%	17.7%	2%	No Foul
12	4.8%	0.3%	1.5%	93.4%	Penalty kick
13	0.3%	0.3%	96.4%	3%	DFK
14	55.7%	4.2%	2.1%	38%	Penalty kick
15	0.9%	0.3%	98.5%	0.3%	DFK
16	0.9%	0%	98.5%	0.6%	DFK
17	41.4%	38.9%	1.8%	17.9%	IFK
18	25.4%	2.4%	1.8%	70.4%	Penalty kick
19	0.6%	0.3%	97.6%	1.5%	DFK
20	3.6%	3.3%	93.1%	--	DFK
21	0.3%	0%	5.7%	94%	Penalty kick
22	2.4%	0%	3.9%	93.7%	Penalty kick
23	1.2%	0%	96.4%	2.4%	DFK
24	15.5%	2.1%	2.7%	79.7%	Penalty kick

For the position in which the goalkeeper and the opponent are attacking the ball coming back from the goalkeeper, 90.4% of the referees agreed on "No foul" and 98.2% of them believed that there was no disciplinary sanction. They interpreted the position correctly with a high level of percentage.

In the position in which the player is sliding from the field of play to outside, passing the touch line, tackling his opponent and injuring him outside the field of play; 77.6% of the referees gave correct answers by real-

izing that the contact occurred outside the field of play. As for the disciplinary sanction, the referees' interpretations varied to a great extent. While 48.3% of the referees showed a "Yellow Card", only 34% of the referees interpreted the position correctly by showing a "Red Card". 17.7% of the referees did not show any cards for this position.

In the position in which the goalkeeper is causing his opponent who has no obvious goal-scoring chance to fall down by touching his legs in the penalty area, 93.4% of the

referees interpreted correctly by deciding on "Penalty kick" as a technical sanction. As a disciplinary sanction, 37.8% of them did not show any cards. However, 59.8% showed red cards and interpreted the position correctly. 40.2% of the referees misinterpreted this position in terms of its disciplinary sanction.

As a technical sanction of the position in which the footballer is tackling his opponent by sliding without intending to play with the ball, but he is not endangering his opponent's health, 96.4% of the referees interpreted the position correctly by deciding on "Direct Free Kick". However, the percentage of the referees' correct interpretations is 51.9 for the disciplinary sanction of the position.

As for the technical sanction of the position in which the player prevents his opponent by moving between the ball and his opponent with a contact in the penalty area, 40.1% of the referees correctly interpreted the position as "Direct Free Kick" and "Penalty kick". It was detected that the percentage of the right interpretations which was 24.4 for the disciplinary sanction of a "Yellow Card" was quite low. 74.2% of the referees believed that there must not be any disciplinary sanction for this position.

It was found out that the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the player

stops his opponent who is moving forward together with the ball by pulling his jersey with a high percentage. This position was one of the rare ones for which the referees reached a consensus both in terms of the technical and the disciplinary sanctions. The referees achieved a standard as 98.5% of the referees awarded the position with "Direct Free Kick" and 94.9% of them showed a "Yellow Card".

For the position in which the player kicks his opponent's foot from behind off the ball, 98.5% of the referees interpreted it correctly by deciding on "Direct Free Kick" and 76.5% of them were right by sending the player off. 23.5% of the referees could not send off the player.

In the position in which the player falls down deliberately in the opponents' penalty area to mislead the referee's decision and gain an unfair profit, 19.7% of the referees misinterpreted the position by deciding on "Penalty kick". Moreover, the percentage of the referees who showed their "Yellow Card" as the position's disciplinary sanction is 70.2.

Only 70.4% of the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the player who is heading towards the opponents' goal and having an obvious goal-scoring opportunity is fouled from behind by an opponent by choosing the correct answer of "Penalty

kick". 25.4% of them believed that there were no infringements in the position. Although the correct interpretation of the position was "Send Off" as a disciplinary sanction, only 54.7% of the referees circled this choice. 45.3% of the referees misinterpreted the position.

The position in which the player prevents the opponent to meet the ball by handling the ball in order to prevent an obvious attack is one of those which can be commonly interpreted by the referees in Turkey. 97.6% of the referees with "Direct Free Kick" and 93.3% of them with "Yellow Card" correctly interpreted the position.

Table 5 The Assessment of the 24 FIFA Positions' Disciplinary Interpretations Made by 336 Referees Who are on Duty in Turkish Professional Leagues

Item	No Card	Caution (Yellow Card)	Send Off (Red Card)	FIFA's Decision
1	5.4%	53.3%	41.3%	Send Off
2	96.3%	3.7%	0%	No Card
3	32.9%	65.2%	1.9%	Caution
4	56.4%	43%	0.6%	No Card
5	0.3%	1.8%	97.9%	Send Off
6	4.2%	22.7%	73.1%	Send Off
7	39.1%	59.6%	1.3%	Caution
8	23.1%	16.9%	60%	Send Off
9	21.8%	69.3%	8.9%	Caution
10	98.2%	1.8%	0%	No Card
11	17.7%	48.3%	34%	Send Off
12	37.9%	59.8%	2.3%	Caution
13	1.8%	51.9%	46.3%	Caution
14	74.2%	24.4%	1.4%	Caution
15	5.1%	94.9%	0%	Caution
16	5.2%	18.3%	76.5%	Send Off
17	29.2%	70.2%	0.6%	Caution
18	30%	15.3%	54.7%	Send Off
19	6.4%	93.3%	0.3%	Caution
20	9.5%	34.7%	55.8%	Send Off
21	80%	19.3%	0.7%	No Card
22	12.1%	37%	50%	Send Off
23	1.8%	90.6%	7.6%	Caution
24	23.1%	19%	57.9%	Send Off

While 93.1 percent of the referees decided on “Direct Free Kick” for the position in which two players slide to the ball together and one of them kicks the other’s knee and injures him without taking care of his own foot, only 55.8% of them correctly interpreted it and showed their red cards. 44.2% of the referees could not send off the player.

94% of the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the player is pushing the opponent from behind using his shoulder in the penalty area by choosing the correct option “Penalty kick”. 20% of them misinterpreted the position by showing the footballer either a yellow or a red card.

Although 93.7% of the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the goalkeeper coming to the front line of the penalty area tackles his opponent without controlling his tackle as “Penalty kick”, only 50% of them could send the player off.

In the position in which a sliding tackle is done to the player who passes his opponent with the ball, 96.4% of the referees choosing “Direct Free Kick” and 90.6% of the referees deciding on showing a “Yellow Card” achieved a common interpretation of the position.

While 82.4% of the referees correctly interpreted the position in which the player having an obvious goal-scoring opportunity is fallen down by an opponent’s tackle from

behind in the penalty area by choosing the options “Direct Free Kick” and “Penalty kick”, only 57.9% of them could send the player off.

When 336 referees’ answers given to each position by FIFA are evaluated, the percentages of their answers can be displayed in Table 4 and Table 5.

CONCLUSION

There are several reasons of football referees’ making wrong decisions. Lack of education, not being able to take the correct position during the match, being far from the position, tiredness, the pressure by the audience, pressure by the media, pressure by the footballer, wrong perception of the position and interpreting it in a wrong way, the lack of the knowledge of the laws of the game, etc. can be considered as some of these reasons. These reasons may vary. So far, the common view has been that the reasons of the referees’ wrong decisions have depended on the negative conditions that the referees have faced during the matches. This study shows that no matter how the negative conditions of the match are cleared away or no matter how clear the referees watch the positions on display, the decisions they make are not the standard ones.

When 336 participants’ answers to the FIFA video recordings were evaluated, it has been

found out that the average number of the correct answers given by the referees is 14, and 10 for the incorrect ones per referee.

When FIFA positions are evaluated in terms of the questions asked, the percentage of the referees who correctly decided on both the technical and disciplinary sanctions was 58. Furthermore, the percentage of the referees who made wrong decisions on one or both of the technical and/or disciplinary sanctions was 42.

While the percentage of the correct answers for the technical decisions made by the referees for 24 positions is 83.5, the percentage of the correct answers for the disciplinary sanctions is 67.7.

It can be clearly seen that one of the biggest problems of the referees is the application of the disciplinary sanctions. When 10 positions which require "Caution" are taken into consideration, it has been detected that 32.1% of the referees made mistakes by not showing any cards.

It is obvious that the referees also have some problems in sending the player off. In the 10 positions which require a "Red Card" to be shown, 39.9% of the referees gave wrong answers and did not show a red card to the players. The percentage of the referees' correct answers in sending the players off is 60.1.

The positions for which the referees' in Tur-

key commonly show "Yellow Cards" can be detected as pulling from behind, sliding from the back of a player after the player passes the opponent, and handling the ball to prevent the opponent to meet the ball.

In four positions which do not require any cards to be shown, the referees reached the highest percentage of 82.7. It can be clearly seen that the referees have the tendency not to show any cards.

While 79.8% of the referees correctly interpreted the 3 positions in which there is no infringement thus not requiring a direct or indirect free kick, 20.2% of them misinterpreted the position and decided to award the position with a foul.

In two positions which require indirect free kick, only 36.9% of the referees chose the correct option. In these two positions which require indirect free kick, 47.7% of the referees believed that there was no foul. This shows that the referees misinterpret the positions which have the intentions to deceive the referees. Managing football matches successfully is possible by reducing the number of mistakes and developing an understanding of standardized management. That the referees do not reach a consensus on the positions and interpret the positions differently is the most concrete indicator of referees' different practices either during the match or in the match intervals.

In Turkey, the referees misinterpreting the positions are found guilty of either opportunism or interpreting the positions according to the messages they receive from somewhere. However, even in many countries, professionalization of senior refereeing has still not been able to wipe factor of human beings' making mistakes out.

REFERENCES

ARTUN, T.Ü. and et all. (1992). *Türk Futbol Tarihi* (Ed. E.Arıpınar), C.I, Grafik Sanatlar Printing House, İstanbul, p.10.

BABA, N. (1939). *Beynelmîlel Futbol Kaideleri ve Kaideler Hakkında Sorgular-Cevaplar*, Beden Terbiyesi Genel Direktörlüğü Neşriyatı Futbol No.2, Ankara, p.3.

BABACAN, D. (1972). *Futbol ve Hakem*, Türkiye Futbol Federasyonu Eğitim Yayınları: 4, S.14, İstanbul.

BALMER, N. J. NEVILL, ALAN M., L., ANDREW M., WARD, P., WILLIAMS, A. M., FAIRCLOUGH, S. H. (2007). Influence of Crowd Noise on Soccer Refereeing Consistency in Soccer, *Journal of Sport Behavior*, Vol. 30 Issue 2, 130-145,

BIRD, M., S., NEVILL, A., CASTAGNA, C. (2006). The effect of match standart and referee experience on the objective and subjective match workload of English Premier League Refereeseston, *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 9, 256-262

CASTAGNA, C., ABT, G., D'OTTAVIO, S. (2007). Physical aspect of soccer refereeing Performance and Training, *Sport Medicine* 37(7) 625-646

CATTEEUW, P., HELSEN, W., GILS, B., WAGEMANS, J. (2009). Decision-making skills, role specificity and deliberate practice in elite association football referees, *Journal of Sports Sciences*; 27(11) 1125-1136

DOWNWARD, P., JONES, M. (2007). Effects of crowd size on referee decision: Analysis of the FA Cup, *Journal of Sports Science*, 25(14), 1541-1545

COOPER, K., (ED), (1997). FIFA Magazine, *Published Bimonthly by Federation Internationale de Football Association*, No. 45pages: 6-13.

KIZILET, A., KIZILET, T., TOPSAKAL, N., ORTA, L. (2009). Physical And Physiological Profile Of Elite Soccer Referees In Preparative; On At High Altitude, *14th Annual Congress of the European College of Sports Science*, Oslo, Norway,

KRUSTRUP P, MOHR, M, BANGSBO, J. (2002). Activity profile and physiological demands of top-class soccer assistant refereeing in relation to training status. *J SportsSci.* 20(11):861-71.

LAWS OF THE GAME (1995). *Federation Internationale de Football Association*, Zurich, page:15.

LAWS OF THE GAME (1996). *Federation Internationale de Football Association*, Zurich, page: 17

LAWS OF THE GAME (2003). *Federation Internationale de Football Association*, Zurich, page: 16

LINEKER, G., ED: RADNEDGE, K. (1994). *The Ultimate Encyclopaedia of Soccer*, Carlton THodder&Stoughton Boks Ltd., London, pp: 11-12.

MACMAHON, C., HELSEN,W., STARKES, J.L., WESTON, M. (2007). Decision-making skills and deliberate practice in elite association football referees. *Journal of Sports Sciences*; 25(1), 65-78.

MASCARENHAS, D., O'HARE, D PLESSNER, H. (2006). The psychological and performance demands of association football refereeing, *International Journal of Sport Psychology*,37(2-3), 99-120.

MATTHEW, W., C., CASTAGNA, F. M., IMPELLIZZ E., ERMANNNO, R., GRANTA. (2006). Analysis of physical match performance in English Premier League soccer referees with particular reference to first half and player work rates, *Sports Medicine*, 1440-2440 Australia.

ORTA, L. (2002A). *Türkiye 'de Hakemlik, Top Bir Dünyadır*, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Publication, Ticaret Joint-Stock Company., İstanbul, ss:54-65.

ORTA, L. (2002B). *Dünyada ve Türkiye 'de Futbol Hakemliğinin Başlangıcı ve Gelişimi*, 7th International Congress of Sport Science, SB-012, Seminar Book p.14, 27-29 October, Antalya.

ORTA, L. (2002C). *Futbol Oyun Kurallarının Tarihsel Gelişimi*, 7th International Congress of Sport Scienc, Seminar Book p.230, 27-29 October Antalya.

ORTA, L., SÖĞÜTÇÜ, T. (2004). *Türkiye Profesyonel Liglerinde Görev Yapan Hakemlerin Kural Bilgilerinin Değerlendirilmesi*, 10.ICHPER-SD Europe and 4th International Sports Science Congress Kemer, Antalya

ORTA, L. (2008). Futbol Oyun Kurallarının Evrimi (1863-2008), *Journal of Gazi University İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma*, N: 26, Winter-Spring ISSN:1302-146X, Ankara, 461-476.

CANOVAS, S., REYNES, E., FERRAND,

C. (2008). Types of errors by referees and perception of injustice by soccer players: A preliminary study, *Ammons Scientific*, 99-110.

RON, J. (2008). On referee bias, crowd size, and home advantage in the English soccer Premiership, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26(6): 563 – 568.

SAN, H., ÜNSI, T., VAR, S. (1963). *Futbol Ansiklopedisi*, Ticaret Postası Printing House, İstanbul, 134-140.

TEZCAN, F. (1964). *Futbol*, Bereket Printing House, İstanbul, , pp:32-36.

SPRINGER AND VERLAG, VINCENZO SCOPPA DIPARTIMENTO DI ECONOMIA E STATISTICA, UNIVERSITÀ DELLA CALABRIA, (2007). “Are subjective evaluations biased by social factors Or connections? An econometric analysis of soccer Referee decisions”, Received: 15 May 2005 / Accepted: 15 February 2007 / Published online: 20 June 2007.



FUTBOL HAKEMLERİNİN KURAL YORUMLARININ DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Özet: Bir futbol maçının zevkli, heyecan verici, Fair Play ilkeleri içersinde, bol gollü geçmesinde ve bitmesinde veya düzensiz, olaylı, kavgalı bir hava içersinde oynanmasında hakemin rolü son derece önemlidir. Dünya futbolunun en üst kurumu olan FIFA; Futbol Oyun Kurallarının tüm dünyada standart bir yaklaşımla yorumlanmasını amaçlamaktadır. Böylece futbolda; hakeme, medyaya, futbolcuya, yorumcuya, seyirciye ve yöneticiye göre farklı yorumları ortadan kaldırmak istemektedir. Bu amaçla, Dünya Futbol Federasyonları Birliği FIFA tarafından hazırlanarak ülke federasyonlarına 24 maç pozisyonu gönderilmiş ve bu pozisyonlarda hakemler tarafından verilmesi istenen kararlar belirtilmiştir. Araştırmamız; 2007–2008 futbol sezonu için, Türkiye'nin çeşitli illerinden gelerek Süper Lig, Süper Lig Yardımcı, A Klasman, B Klasman C Klasman ve C Klasman Yardımcı Hakem Kadrolarına Yükselme Kurslarına katılan 336 hakem üzerinde uygulanmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan hakemlere; araştırma ile ilgili ayrıntılı bilgi verildikten sonra, değerlendirme kâğıtları dağıtılmıştır. 24 pozisyondan oluşan FIFA görüntüleri tek tek izlettirilerek, her pozisyondan sonra pozisyonla ilgili yorumlarının kâğıtlara işaretlenmesi istenilmiştir. Pozisyon görüntüleri çok net olup, herkesin rahat görebileceği dev ekranlardan hakemlere izlettirilmiştir. Değerlendirme kâğıtları, her pozisyonla ilgili teknik ve disiplin kararı olmak üzere iki bölümden oluşmuştur. Değerlendirme formu üzerindeki teknik kararlarının dört, disiplin kararlarının ise 3 yanıt seçeneği bulunmaktadır. Teknik kararlar; “Faul Yok”, “Endirekt Serbest Vuruş”, “Direkt Serbest Vuruş” ve “Penaltı” seçeneklerinden, Disiplin Kararları ise; “Kart Yok”, “İhtar” ve “İhraç” seçeneklerinden oluşmaktadır. Hakemlerin her pozisyon için verdikleri kararların yüzdeleri hesaplanmış ve yorumlar bu değerler üzerinden yapılmıştır. 24 pozisyondan oluşan FIFA görüntüleri ile ilgili araştırmaya katılan 336 hakemin verdikleri yanıtlar değerlendirildiğinde; hakem başına düşen doğru yanıt ortalaması 14, yanlış yanıt ortalaması ise 10'dur. Futbol Hakemlerinin hatalı karar vermelerinin çok çeşitli nedenleri bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan bazılarını ele aldığımızda; eğitim eksikliği, maç sırasında iyi pozisyon alamamaları, pozisyona uzak kalmaları, yorgunluk, seyirci baskısı, medya baskısı, futbolcu baskısı, pozisyonu yanlış algılama ve yorumlama, kural bilgisinin yetersizliği, vd. sayılabilir. Bu nedenler çok çeşitlilik gösterebilir. Hakemlerin hatalı karar verme nedenleri hakkında, bugüne kadar var

olan genel kanı, daha çok hakemlerin maçlarda yaşadığı olumsuz koşullara bağlı olduğu yönündeydi. Bu çalışmamız; maçlarda yaşanan bütün bu olumsuz koşullar ortadan kaldırıldığında ve hakemlere ekran başında kuralları çok net olan pozisyonlar izlettirildiğinde, verdikleri kararların da standart olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Futbol, Hakem, FIFA, Oyun Kuralları, Maç Pozisyonları, Hakem Yorumları