

JOE KNOWS AYSO

Fall 2005

Joe Eldridge, National Referee Administrator

AYSO frequently receives questions regarding rules, regulations, policies, interpretation of FIFA Law and AYSO modifications. In my position as National Referee Administrator, I am often asked to respond. The following are some of the interesting questions I recently received. If you have questions, please contact me, Joe Eldridge, at (888) 686-2976 or by e-mail at joeeldridge@ayso.org.

Question:

Joe, during the attempt to take a corner kick, but before the kick is taken, the keeper pushes an opposing player, who was standing nearby, to the ground...

1. Is this considered an infraction by the keeper since it occurred during inactive play?
2. If it is an infraction, what is the re-start? Penalty Kick or Corner Kick since the infraction occurred during in-active play.

This incident occurred last fall, but was not recognized by the referee. Neither the Assistant Referee nor the Center Referee "witnessed" the push. I'm curious to learn, if they had witnessed the push, what they should have called.

I believe that the Keeper should have been cautioned and the opposing team awarded a Penalty Kick for a cautionable offense in the Penalty Area.

Wayne

Answer:

Thank you for your question Wayne. Regarding infractions which occur when the ball is not in play, the Laws of the Game make an important distinction between fouls and misconduct. "Fouls" can only be committed by players (not substitutes), on the field of play, while the ball is in play. If one or more of these conditions is not met, they the infraction can only be considered "Misconduct". This is a very important distinction because it has a significant effect on the resulting restart.

In the situation you describe, because the ball was not in play at the time the goalkeeper pushed the opponent, this is considered "Misconduct" and is punishable by a caution (yellow card) or a send-off (red card) depending upon the circumstances. The restart would still be the corner kick because the "Misconduct" occurred while the ball was out of play.

I hope this answers your question. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.

Thanks, Joe

Question from Richard:

Joe, in recent discussions and mainly due to differences of interpretations, traditions, etc. (which I'm sure comes to you as no surprise) we have indulged in a friendly professional query on the proper application of the following statement (from the Laws of the Game) when determining a match winner?

"If, after both teams have taken five kicks, both have scored the same number of goals, or have not scored any goals, kicks continue to be taken in the same order until one team has scored a goal more than the other from the same number of kicks"

The query is centered around after both teams have taken five kicks and both teams have the same number of goals (or no goals) then does "kicks continue to be taken in the same order" suggest:

1. A player from Team A (of the remaining 6 team players on the field) kicks on goal and then one player from Team B (of the remaining 6 team players on the field) kicks on goal. If after both players kick for a goal, Team A scores and Team B fails to score then the winner is Team A. If neither player scores (or both players score) then the process is continued back-n-forth between teams until one team scores more than the other team (where no player is allowed to kick a second time until all players on the field have kicked once) or
2. Does the procedure imply that another 5 players from each team are selected (from the remaining 6 players/team) to kick and the winner is determined from the summary results of the additional five players/team (different from the "one for one" scenario described in item #1)?

Example:

The game is still tied after each team has alternately taken five kicks, then

Team A	Team B
Selected Player #6 scores then	selected Player #6 misses
Selected Player #7 misses then	selected Player #7 scores
Selected Player #8 scores then	selected Player #8 misses
Selected Player #9 misses then	selected Player #9 scores
Selected Player #10 misses then	selected Player #10 scores

Under the first scenario Team A is determined the winner of the match (and selected players 7- 10 would not have been required to kick) yet by the second scenario, Team B is the winner... which is the correct interpretation?

Many Thanks, Richard

Answer:

Good question Richard. The logic of those in your discussion group who support scenario #1 is consistent with the intentions of FIFA and the wording contained in the Laws of the Game. Additionally, during the first five kicks, "If, before both teams have taken five kicks, one has scored more goals than the other could score, even if it were to complete its five kicks, no more kicks are taken". For example, if Team A scores three goals in succession and Team B misses three goals in succession, then kicks would stop because it is mathematically impossible for Team B to score more goals than Team A within the first five kicks. If the number of goals scored by each team is the same after each has taken five kicks then an additional kick is taken by a new kicker

from each team in the same rotational order until one team scores and the other team misses. This allows the same number of kicks by each team but not necessarily an addition group of five kicks.

Discussions like this are very good for referees to sort out and understand correct interpretations and applications of the Laws. Hopefully, the discussions occur in relaxed atmospheres where points and counterpoints can be debated among referees and a common and correct consensus agreed upon in advance of games rather than having the debates among the referees in actual game situations when the emotions of the participants and spectators are high and referees should present a confident and correct interpretation.

Good for you and your discussion group. You are modeling exactly the kind of professionalism and dedication that makes AYSO volunteers successful. Keep it up!

Thanks, Joe