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• Self-efficacy referee scale: An overview
Félix Guillén1, Sylvain Laborde2
1University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain, 2University of Caen, France

Nowadays, with the stakes surrounding sport competitions, the task of referees became very complex and difficult (Guillén, 2001). This complexity is due to the many actions they have to perform, the number of cues they need to attend to, the game speed, the decision-making speed, etc. Moreover, the referees tasks are made even more difficult given the pressure they have to face from players, coaches, fans and media, generating a loss of confidence, a higher anxiety, as well as increased stress levels (Dosseville & Laborde, 2011; Guillén, in press). Self-efficacy is considered to be one of the most influential psychological constructs mediating achievement striving in sport (Feltz, 1988). If it has extensively been studied in athletes, it has so far rarely been studied in referees (Guillén, 2003). This talk presents a conceptual model of referee efficacy, named refficacy (Guillén & Feltz, 2011) and the development of the scale measuring referee self-efficacy (REFS; Myers, Feltz, Guillén, & Dithurbide, 2012). Starting with the conceptual model, we analyze the sources of refficacy information (mastery experience, other significant, physical and mental preparation, and partner qualifications), its dimensions (game knowledge, strategic skills, decision-making skills, psychological skills, communication/control of game, and physical fitness) and its outcomes (satisfaction, performance, stress,…). Subsequently, the construction and development of the scale and translation into other languages is presented. Finally, the development of future research using the refficacy scale is proposed, together with the presentation of ideas regarding training programs for referees.

• Is observational or feedback learning more effective for improving referee decisions?
Geoffrey Schweizer1, Henning Plessner1, Patrick Laier2, Ralf Brand3
1University of Heidelberg, Germany, 2University of Mannheim, Germany, 3University of Potsdam, Germany

Recently, several video based training programs for soccer referees have been introduced both into the scientific literature and into referee training (e.g., Catteeuw, Gilis, Jaspers, Wagemans, & Helsen, 2010; Schweizer, Plessner, Kahlert, & Brand, 2011). However, it is still an open question which feedback mechanisms lead to optimal training results. Specifically, it is unclear whether feedback is necessary at all, or whether training effects may also be obtained by the mere presentation of correct decisions. Research from category learning suggests that feedback training leads to better results for tasks based on associative processing, whereas observation training leads to better results for rule-based categorization tasks (Ashby, Maddox, & Bohil, 2002). As decisions in contact situations are supposed to rely on automatic processing, we hypothesize that for decisions in contact situations feedback training will lead to better learning success than observational training. We tested this hypothesis in two training studies. Participants in both studies took part in a video-training program that lasted for three weeks and consisted of a pretest, a posttest and several training sessions. Participants were randomly assigned to a control group, a feedback-training group and an observational-training group. Participants were soccer players (Study 1) and soccer referees (Study 2). Results suggest that feedback training does lead to better training effects than observational learning, however observational learning is not entirely ineffective. Interestingly, an exploratory analysis of learning effects for decisions on whether to call handballs suggests the opposite effect. We discuss possible theoretical explanations for this finding. Taken together, our findings suggest that different kinds of referees’ decisions may call for different training environments. We discuss ensuing challenges both for the development of training environments and for further research.