



A referee's phrasebook

(created by Ian Allanach)

What to say and when

The "accepted" explanations





Why? 1

- Player is entitled to a brief explanation
- Guideline G19: "may be appropriate to explain the decision....referee may give a concise explanation..."
- Agreed phrases offer consistency to players
- A timely response gives players confidence





Why? 2

- Agreed phrases prevent awkward referee silences
- Agreed phrases stop referees "making something up" in heat of moment
- A timely response shows referee knowledge, understanding and control
- Agreed phrases show consistency among referees





And in 3 referee system?

 The giving of explanations by central referees is to be discussed at this very conference at a later session

<u>However</u>

 This phrasebook is still necessary to help referees arrive at their decisions

"No let" decisions 1— request made by striker



- There was no interference
- Interference was minimal (and did not prevent you getting to and playing the ball)
- You made the interference <u>or</u> you played the person, not the ball <u>or</u> you were taking an indirect line to the ball
- You would not have reached the ball



"No let" decisions 2 (cont)



- You were not making every effort to reach the ball
 or You need to make more effort to play the ball
- You accepted the interference <u>or</u> you went past the interference and could have played the ball
- The ball was past you <u>or</u> you were not in a position to play the ball
- It was a winning shot (by your opponent)

"Stroke" decisions – request by non-striker(unhappy at stroke)



He had no shot to the front wall

 You made no effort to clear <u>or</u> you were unable to clear

 You prevented your opponent's swing/shot/ winning shot <u>or</u> you were in his swing <u>or</u> you are crowding your opponent <u>or</u> you must give your opponent freedom of swing

"Yes let" decisions – request from striker (looking for stroke)



- You had room to play <u>or</u> your opponent was clear
- Interference was some distance from ball
- There was interference on your swing/shot it was not prevented
- You were still preparing your shot <u>or</u> you had not fully prepared
- The ball was too tight <u>or</u> you could not have played a winning shot

"Yes let" decisions – request from non-striker (unhappy at let)



There was interference

You interfered with your opponent's swing

He would have reached the ball

There was a fear of injury <u>or</u> it is a safety let





Caution

- Try not to personalise explanations or imply negatives in player's game e.g.
- "It was a weak shot"
- "You were too slow"
- "You are not that <u>tall</u>" (on a lob)
- "You made the wrong choice of shot"





Confirming calls

- If questioned about an out, down, not up, etc.
- Play a let if genuinely unsure
- Use phrases such as "I <u>saw</u> the ball good, down, out", etc. – better than " It was out, down", etc.
- "I <u>saw</u> it good" who can argue???





Player views

If both players agree a ball was up, down, etc.,
 accept it, thank them, and alter a call if necessary.

If, after giving an interference decision eg "stroke to ...", players say "we are happy with a let", do not change the decision – better to say "Thank you, but as referee, I saw a stroke situation" – and then stick with your decision