



2023-2024 Scholastic Bowl Case Book

RULE 1: Authority

1-C. Appeals or Protests to the IHSA

1-C: CASE #1

A match has ended, and the coach of Team X has determined that the timekeeper was consistently mistiming the bonus questions. The coach contacts the IHSA administrator in charge of Scholastic Bowl, appealing that the match should be replayed.

The protest will either be denied or ignored. In either case, the IHSA will not enter protests regarding match procedure. The only cases which may see a favorable response from the IHSA in some form or another is if there is some impropriety in regard to tournament format of the IHSA tournament. For example, if the tournament manager changes the order or bracketing of teams without approval from the IHSA or forces teams to play rounds that are not scheduled by the IHSA. If this is the case, the IHSA administrator in charge should be contacted immediately, with exact details and names.

The only other case that should involve contacting the IHSA office is in a case of gross negligence or misconduct. In any case this should involve initial communication from the Tournament Director only.

RULE 2: TEAM ORGANIZATION

2-B. Players and Captain

2-B-2: CASE #1

In the middle of a match, a player from Team X suddenly leaves the match in what appears to be a fit of illness. Team X has no substitute players.

2-B-2 is ambiguous in terms of what constitutes "extenuating circumstances", as such, moderators should be extremely liberal in interpreting this rule. While illness may be an obvious extenuating circumstance, discipline may also be an extenuating circumstance (a coach may choose to remove a player for disciplinary reasons).

The game should continue with four players. If the player returns, the player may re-enter the game at the next legal time out (called by either team or half time).

RULE 3: MATCH MECHANICS

3-B. Forfeit Time

3-B-2: CASE #1

A match is scheduled to begin at 3:00. At 3:00, Team X is present, but Team Y is not. The moderator leaves the room to contact the local manager. The local manager arrives a few minutes later to find that Team Y has arrived and is preparing to play.

The manager should NOT declare a forfeit unless it is clear that the team was intentionally attempting to delay the start of the game or made no clear attempt to appear on time. It is the responsibility of a Head Coach to arrive early enough to allow for the team to prepare to play, as well as to permit coaches to greet each other and the local manager to communicate important information. It is considered professional as well as common courtesy to advise a host if a team will be arriving late. Failure to do so may result in an embarrassing situation for the team arriving late.

Obviously, if a team is not present because their previous match ran late, that team should in no way be penalized.



RULE 3: PRE MATCH PROCEDURES

3-C-2f: CASE #1

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing shirts of the same style and color (dark blue, short-sleeved, polo shirts). Most of the five players' shirts have a thin white stripe running along the shoulders and a small, embroidered patch of the school logo on the front. But one of the shirts is missing the logo patch, one of the shirts has the logo patch on the opposite breast, and one of the shirts is missing the white stripe. Ruling: Acceptable.

3-C-2f: CASE #2

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing shirts of the same color, and all have identical logos on the front and back. But, some are short-sleeved T-shirts, some are long-sleeve T-shirts, and some are hooded sweatshirts. Ruling: Acceptable.

3-C-2f: CASE #3

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing shirts with the school name on the front. But, some of the shirts are light red with white lettering, and some of the shirts are dark red with white lettering. Ruling: Acceptable.

3-C-2f: CASE #4

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing variously different shirts, but all five players are wearing identical track pinnies over the shirts. Ruling: Acceptable.

3-C-2f: CASE #5

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing shirts with the school name on the front. But, some of the shirts are red with white lettering, and some of the shirts are white with red lettering. Ruling: Unacceptable; the primary color of the tops should match. Shades do not have to be exact, but white vs. red is not close enough.

3-C-2f: CASE #6

A team of five players is seated to begin a match. All five players are wearing school-issued uniform shirts; in accordance with the school's uniform code, some students are wearing blue shirts and some are wearing gold shirts. Ruling: Unacceptable; the primary color of the tops should match.

3-E. Time Outs

3-E-3: CASE #1

The moderator has just read "Toss-Up #5: Science", when the coach of Team X calls for a time-out.

The moderator should ignore the request, with a polite hand gesture, and continue reading. As long as the attempt to call a time out was not an obvious attempt to intimidate or interrupt the match, no penalty is needed here. If a coach is repeatedly interrupting a match at inappropriate times, and has been warned, a penalty should be invoked.

Moderators, especially with new coaches, should take advantage of a teaching opportunity rather than be quick to penalize, provided that the match is not being held up.

3-E-9c: CASE #1:

The coach of Team X calls a legal time out. The coach sends in a player who is wearing a top that does not appear be similar to the tops of the other players.

Ideally, the tournament director would have noted this before the match began and contacted the local manager. If this was not case, the moderator must stop, and contact the tournament director for a ruling. If the tournament director rules the top to not be matching, then the coach of Team X must send in a player who is wearing a matching top. If this cannot be done, then the substitution will not be allowed. The moderator may not under any circumstance assess any penalties related to similar tops without consulting with the tournament director.

**3-E-9e: CASE #1:**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Science/Chemistry:

"Which element, with atomic number 6, is the focus of organic chemistry?"

The printed answer is: "CARBON"

Player 1 on Team X appears to look down on a list of elements that was left behind by the player that she replaced.

Player #1 rings in and is properly recognized by the moderator.

Player 1 responds: "Carbon"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect"

This is left up to the interpretation of the moderator. If the moderator feels that the player has been aided illegally, then the answer should not be accepted. It is not enough to simply say "illegal material was present, therefore a penalty should be called. It is the responsibility of the moderator to watch players and be able to decide if the player was given illegal assistance. Saying that, it is the player's responsibility to make sure that there are no possible illegal aides left behind after a time out.

3-E-9e: CASE #2:

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Science/Chemistry:

"Which element, with atomic number 6, is the focus of organic chemistry?"

The printed answer is: "CARBON"

There is a list of elements left behind by the player that Player #1 on Team X replaced. Player #1 never looks down at the paper.

Player #1 rings in and is properly recognized by the moderator.

Player 1 responds: "Carbon"

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

The moderator has discretion in determining whether or not a player received illegal aide. If the moderator is confident that no foul has occurred, then points should be awarded accordingly. If there is strong enough reason to doubt that the answer was arrived honestly, but no actual evidence, replace the question. However, no matter what the moderator determines, the moderator's opinion on the matter is final.

RULE 4: DURING THE MATCH**4-A. Communication****4-A-7c: CASE #1:**

The moderator reads a toss-up question. Team X rings in and gives an incorrect answer. The coach for Team Y immediately starts to "air signal," in an attempt to get someone from Team Y to ring in.

The moderator should consider this to be illegal communication, as this may be a prearranged signal between coach and players, or at the very least a distraction to everyone involved. The moderator should not accept any answer from Team Y and should proceed to the next toss-up. Team Y may answer the next toss-up.

If the coach of Team Y had been air signaling, or making other attempts at communication, while the moderator was reading the lead-in or part 1 of the bonus, Team Y would be barred from answering the first bonus part. After Team X was given a chance to rebound, Team Y would be able to answer part 2.



4-B. Answering

4-B-1b: CASE #1

The moderator reads the following question:

"Who was the first president of the United States?"

Player #1 from Team X rings in, and before he is recognized by the moderator blurts out: "Washington".

The moderator responds: "Correct".

As of 2012-13, the so-called "blurt rule", which allowed a player answering correctly without recognition to earn 5 points instead of ten points, is gone. Players do not need to be recognized in order to earn the full point total. While there were some coaches who still supported this rule, the main reasons for its elimination involved inconsistency (sometimes intentionally done) on behalf of moderators. While some moderators simply chose to use their power to denote that a buzz connotes recognition, some moderators would sit there and wait after a buzzer was activated to "trick" a player into answering before recognition. Moderators are within their power to request players wait until they are looking at them or are recognized before answering, but moderators may no longer penalize a player for answering prior to recognition.

For some moderators, this means that they will need to be more attentive: they will need to quickly shift focus from reading to listening very carefully for an answer.

For coaches and players, because some moderators will not be used to this, and will continue to have trouble, any player who mumbles or speaks softly runs the risk of costing their team, if the moderator does not hear them clearly. Coaches should be sure to review this point with players.

4-B-1c: CASE #1:

A player for Team X rings in, but says nothing, and appears to be thinking. The moderator counts to three in her head, and calls time. A split second later, the player gives the correct answer.

The moderator should not accept the answer. If the second team can ring in and answer legally, then they earn ten points and control of the bonus. This is NOT a situation where a replacement question should be used. This same procedure applies to answering a bonus question. It is incumbent on the player to not blurt out answers after time is called. To avoid accusations of inconsistency and favoritism, moderators should perform a consistent visual count of three (not two or four) so that all players, coaches, and spectators are clear on when times is called.

4-B-2: CASE #1:

A player for Team X rings in and is recognized by the moderator. The player begins answering but is stuttering through the answer. In the moderator's opinion, the player has delayed three seconds, and the player has not completed the answer.

The moderator should stop the player's answer and inform him/her that they are incorrect. If the second team has not had an opportunity to ring in, they now have an opportunity. Players must be ready to answer when they are recognized. If they begin answering and are unsure, or if ringing in early before formulating an answer is a part of a strategy, it is wholly incumbent on the player to bear the risk of buzzing early, and potentially giving up part of a correct answer to the opposing team. Moderators should always begin a 3-second count when a player has buzzed in. Never assume that an answer is imminent.

Moderators should be warned that there are players who may be afflicted with a condition that does not allow them to speak so quickly. Coaches are strongly urged to identify such players to the moderator before a match begins. Moderators should use good judgment in accepting answers from these players, realizing that attempting to answer under a handicap is not the same as intentionally delaying.



It is unethical to not inform the player that time has expired while they are answering, and time has run out, and to allow that player to continue answering, knowing the answer will be unacceptable. A moderator who does this should replace and relay the question for both teams. Everyone should be aware that while there will be close calls, moderators should call time when time is up, and not permit a player to continue stumbling through an answer that has clearly caused time to expire.

4-B-3: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Who wrote the lyrics for "Embraceable You", with music composed by his brother?"

The printed answer is: Ira Gershwin

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "Ira Gershwin ... no, I mean George Gershwin"

The moderator should properly state, "Correct" because the correction is ignored.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "George Gershwin ... no, I mean Ira Gershwin"

The moderator should properly state, "Incorrect" because the correction is ignored.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "George ... no, I mean Ira Gershwin"

The moderator should properly state, "Incorrect" because, not only is the correction ignored, even though "George" is only a partial answer, it's neither correct nor prompt able.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "Gershwin ... that is, Ira Gershwin"

The moderator should properly state, "Correct" because it's not a correction, rather it's a self-prompt. Because no part of the player's initial answer was 'corrected', the repeat is allowed.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "Geo ... Ira Gershwin"

The moderator should properly state, "Incorrect" because, the syllable uttered at the start is an obvious start to an incorrect answer, and not a "preliminary word" such as "um ..." or "err ...".

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "Gershwin ... no, I mean Hammerstein"

The moderator should say, "Prompt" and not reveal that the correction is being ignored.

If the player responds with, "Ira" the moderator should properly state, "Correct."

If the player responds with anything else, the moderator should properly state, "Incorrect."

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "George Gershwin the music and Ira Gershwin the lyrics." The moderator should properly state, "Correct" because the player has not made a correction, they've provided a second piece of correct information, without pause, which Rule 4-C-2 permits either on an early buzz, or as additional information that comes from the question.

Rule 4-B-3 (corrections, if attempted, are ignored), Rule 4-B-4 (preliminary words), and Rule 4-B-5 (consider the entire answer) must always be top-of-mind for the moderator as they make decisions; they each provide guidance, but the moderator's own knowledge, listening skills, experience, and professional judgement also have an impact. Even the expression on the player's face as they answer can be a factor as the moderator rules on the answer given. As always, the moderator's decision can be appealed. As always, the moderator can either explain their reasoning and deny the appeal or hear the appeal and either affirm or change their initial decision. As always, the elastic clause ("shall include, but are not limited to") in Rule 4-H (moderator error) can be invoked in appeal, and the question discarded and replaced.

Moderators should not acknowledge an answer as correct too soon. Make sure the player has completed the answer. Some moderators have gotten into trouble when they have interrupted the player to acknowledge an answer is correct, only to have the player suddenly end the answer with incorrect information.



4-B-3: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

A famous Supreme Court case established that a person under arrest must be informed of certain rights under the law. Name either the plaintiff or defendant in this famous case."

The printed answer is: "MIRANDA or the state of ARIZONA" (either one)

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "case", and, looking at the moderator answers: "Oh ... (quietly) New Mexico, Texas, (loudly) ARIZONA!"

The word "Arizona" was spoken before the moderator's three second count is completed.

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect."

In this case, the player is giving information that can be clearly interpreted as part of a given answer. The moderator would do best to say "sorry" after the word "New Mexico". Coaches would do best to coach players in not speaking any words unless they want that to be considered.

However, there is some room for moderator interpretation. Suppose this exact case occurred with the player looking down, and muttering "New Mexico ... Texas", then looked up and said "Arizona". The moderator is within their rights to accept that answer, if the moderator really felt like the player was not making an effort to answer. Still, this does become something left up to the moderator, and it is not protest able. Coaches and players are strongly cautioned to avoid doing this as different moderators in the same scenario may interpret a player's intent differently.

4-B-3: CASE #3:

The moderator asks the following question:

Which war was the first conflict to see nuclear weapons used in battle?

Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "World War World War ... World War Two." The player did not delay more than three seconds, cumulatively.

The moderator should respond: Correct.

As part of their professionalism, moderators must be extremely focused on what a player actually says. As long as the player has not said anything incorrect, they are allowed to repeat themselves on any question. Case #3 deals with a more ambiguous case.

4-B-3: CASE #4:

The moderator asks the following question:

The "Defense of Fort McHenry" was a poem written during which war?

Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: "The War of 18 ... 18 ... 1812" The player did not delay more than three seconds, cumulatively.

The moderator should respond: Incorrect.

Cases #3 and #2 are similar; however, they highlight caution that must come on the player's part: if you aren't sure, the best policy is not to say anything. In this case, it is virtually impossible for the moderator to determine if the player was contemplating the last two digits of the year, or if the player was answering "1818", and hoping that the moderator's reaction and poor knowledge of rules will give the player a second chance if they guessed wrong. Once the answer is wrong, it is wrong, and the player should be notified of this.

**4-B-4: CASE #1:**

The moderator asks the following question:

"Who was the 35th president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: JOHN KENNEDY (both names needed)

Player #1 on Team X rings in and answers: "Oh, I forgot ... OH, John Kennedy".

The moderator should respond: Correct.

This is another example of how "first thing out of the mouth" interpretation is just plain wrong. "Oh, I forgot" was not the correct answer, and it also obviously was not an attempt TO answer. Good moderators know to ignore this (as long as the words don't constitute something unsportsmanlike or an attempt to stall). If the moderator in any way suspects that it was a part of the answer, the moderator must rule against that answer. However, coaches are strongly urged to warn their players to say nothing except for their answer, as, on occasion, it may be difficult to determine where the answer starts.

4-B-5: CASE #1:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Which president served as second president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: "(John) Adams"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and replies "Adams ... John Quincy Adams".

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Rule 4-B-5 can be thought of as a special corollary to Rule 4-B-3. If 4-B-3 is the "once the answer is wrong, it is wrong" rule, 4-B-5 extends that rule by stating "an answer started correctly, and ended incorrectly, is also wrong." It does not matter where in the answer the incorrect information appears, even if the "first thing out of the player's mouth" is correct, later information, offered with or without prompting, which is incorrect makes the entire answer incorrect.

4-B-6: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Identify the full name of the forty-third president of the United States."

The printed answer is: GEORGE WALKER BUSH (full name required)

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and answers: "Bush"

The moderator states: "Prompt."

Player 1 responds: "George Bush"

The moderator should respond: "Prompt."

Player 1 responds: "George W. Bush"

The moderator should respond: "Prompt."

Player 1 responds "George Walker Bush"

The moderator should respond "Correct".

In the past, there were limits placed on a moderator in terms of how many times a player could be prompted for additional information. These limits are now removed. As long as the player is not repeating themselves or giving any incorrect information, the moderator must continue prompting for additional information. This rule was rewritten to remove the ambiguity of whether the moderator has the option to not ask for multiple prompts. The moderator is now absolutely required to do this. Further discussion on prompting is covered by Rule 4-C-1.

4-B-6: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Identify the full name of the forty-third president of the United States."

The printed answer is: GEORGE WALKER BUSH (full name required)

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and answers: "George Bush"

The moderator properly states: "Prompt."

Player 1 responds: "George Herbert Walker Bush"



The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".
Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.
Player 3 states: "George Bush"
The moderator properly states: "Prompt."
Player 3 states: "George Walker Bush"
The moderator should respond: "Correct".

Rule 4-B-6 has no limitations in terms of the number of times a player is prompted, or if the rebounding player is limited in prompting. Prompting for additional information can occur multiple times on the same question, and can apply to both teams.

4-B-7: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:
"Which French artist painted the work 'Impression: Sunrise'?"
The printed answer is: (Claude) MONET [do not accept Édouard Manet]
Player 1 from Team X rings in, and gives an answer that is somewhat difficult to understand.
The moderator says: "Spell, please."
Player 1 responds: "M-O-H-N-A-Y"
The moderator should respond: "Correct".

When considering an answer, the most important criteria to be considered by the moderator are "correctness and completeness". This is not a spelling question, and players are not required to have proper spelling for their answer. However, it is critical that players be able to distinguish between the right answer and similarly confused answers. A player answering "M-O-H-N-A-Y" has clearly demonstrated that they are not referring to Manet, and that they are referring to Monet. The answer should be accepted as long as it is reasonably clear that the player has distinguished the correct answer from competing possibilities.

4-B-8: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:
"One of Shakespeare's plays ends, 'For never was a story of more woe than this'. What was the name of the Friar who helped Romeo and Juliet?"
The printed answer is: (Friar) LAURENCE
In the moderator's meeting prior to the contest, the moderators elected to accept only Friar Laurence as an alternative answer
Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "woe", and is properly recognized.
Player 1 states: "Romeo and Juliet"
The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"
Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.
Player 3 states: "Laurence"
The moderator properly states: "Correct"
The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the question should be replaced, and asked to both teams.

The Coach of Team X is correct. The question should be replaced and replayed.

Rule 4-B-8 attempts to provide some balance between two competing, and not always compatible, goals: the goal for different rooms using the same round of questions to be uniform from room to room, and the goal to properly award points to correct answers and not to incorrect answers. If a particular answer has been discussed in a moderators meeting, and the decision of the officials is to explicitly reject any answer but one (or some small number of variants), the moderator is bound to follow that directive to provide uniformity in the acceptance of answers.

However, that decision by the group of moderators does not remove the option for a coach to challenge the question on the ground that it was misleading in structure. The moderator hopefully recognizes that a question like this is



misleading and is a classic hose question: the question very much appears to be asking about the play in one sentence, and then suddenly asks for a character. In this case, while the moderator was bound to accept only one answer, the moderator is now equally bound and required to replace the question. The decision of moderators before the match does not overrule the right of protest, and does not constrain the moderator in the room to rule on that protest. The moderator's first duty in this case is to reward correct answers.

4-B-8: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Solve for 'x'. $12 = 5x + 3$. Give your answer as a mixed number."

The printed answer is: 1 and 4/5

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "3", and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "1.8"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "1 and 4/5"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted.

The Coach of Team X is correct. In this case, because the first answer given is equivalent to the "printed answer", and Player 1's answer should be accepted for points.

This is an example of a poorly written question hurting players. While it may seem incredulous to some, there are players that could ring in at that point and come up with a legitimate solution in time. Including a restriction on the answer at the end of the question serves to hurt a player who is more knowledgeable, faster, and better experienced. The moderator is *required* to take action in this circumstance.

A common misapplication is in reading one part of Rule 4-B-8, specifically that part that reads: "Moderators have the responsibility to accept or reject alternative answers and different forms of an answer... as long as their decision is not contrary to ... an instruction by the question writer to accept or reject a specific alternative answer." Some moderators have traditionally believed that the part of the question which reads "Give your answer as a mixed number." is an instruction from the question writer. It is not. That statement is part of the question. An instruction is a side note left by the writer as a guide to the moderator to note particular answers that might have a high probability of coming up, and that a moderator may be tempted to consider as correct, but shouldn't (similarly, because of information given in the question these side bar instructions might highlight an acceptable answer that might not be obvious to the moderator).

4-B-8: CASE #3:

The moderator asks the following question:

"This German author, born in 1877, won the 1946 Nobel Prize in Literature. Name this author of The Glass Bead Game and Siddhartha.

The printed answer is: (Hermann) HESSE

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "This German author", and answers: "Goethe"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in after the question is completed.

Player 3 states: "Hesse"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted.

In contrast to the two previous cases, the Coach of Team X is incorrect. Certainly, Goethe is a German author, but in this case, this is a clue that is not uniquely identifying, and keeps many, many possible answers open. Ideally the question would not open with these general clues, but it does happen, and as frustrating as it can be for players, there is little that can be done about it in game play. The question immediately moves to uniquely identify the author after that, and in no way attempted to mislead the player. Not every aggressive attempt to answer constitutes a hose. It is critical that coaches and moderators be familiar with not only when 4-B-8 should be applied, but when it should not be applied.

**4-B-8: CASE #4:**

The moderator asks the following question:

"In which country could you visit the cities: Paris, Montpellier, Saint Paul, Marseille, and Tours?"

The printed answer is: France

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "Montpellier", and answers "United States".

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "France"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted.

The Coach of Team X is correct that action is required, but not in the relief being requested. All of these towns except for Tours can also be found in the United States. Either the question writer was unaware of the deception, or did so intentionally (and unethically). In either case, the player should be protected. In a case where the problem is being caused by a writing error, the question should be discarded, replaced, and replayed.

NOTE: When the wrong answer is printed on the page, this is not a hose, as players who have given the correct answer should be credited with the points. See Rule 4-I-5 for more information about appealing to the moderator in this case.

4-B-8: CASE #5:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Give your answer in inches. What is the combined length of 2 feet and 2 yards?"

The printed answer is: 96 inches

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the question is completed and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states "8 feet"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "96 inches"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that "8 feet" is mathematically equivalent to "96 inches" and should have been accepted as correct, or at the very least, prompted.

The Coach of Team X is incorrect. In this case, the specific form for the answer has already been read, and heard, by players. It is incumbent upon players to pay attention to any such constraints, often and typically given early in a question, and follow them in answering – even if the form or constraint is not repeated later in a possibly-long question. Similarly, if a question begins with "Give your answer as a decimal" or "Give your answer in slope-intercept form", answers not in the requested form should and will be ruled incorrect, without prompting. Only in an instance where the desired form is not perfectly clear should the moderator prompt. While this situation typically occurs with Math questions, it could potentially occur in any category.

4-B-10: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Which first lady was famous for offering a televised tour of the recently renovated White House in the early 1960s?"

The printed answer is (Jacqueline) KENNEDY

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and answers "Jacqueline Bouvier".

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Rule 4-B-10 is an attempt to clear up a gray area about people, places, and things which went by two different names at distinct moments in time (for example: Sarayburnu, Byzantium, Constantinople, Istanbul). While the interpretation on this rule has varied over time, the general consensus today is that the only time a former name should be accepted is if any clue in the question, up to the point where the refers to any point in time when that alternative name was used (and this interpretation is codified into the rule as it stands today).



4-B-10: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Born in 1929, and later married to a Greek shipping magnate, which first lady was famous for offering a televised tour of the recently renovated White House in the early 1960s?"

The printed answer is (Jacqueline) KENNEDY

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and answers "Jacqueline Bouvier".

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

Compare this case to Case #1, and you see why suddenly a small change to the question allows for more possible answers. Now there are clues about her birth (Bouvier) and her last marriage (Onassis), and that allows the moderator to accept any of those answers as correct. In an ideal world, the question writer will prevent the moderator from having to think too much about this, but moderators do need to be open to the idea that in some cases, particular answers referring to the same person, place, or thing, may not be acceptable.

4-B-10: CASE #3:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Starting in 1949, Chang Kai-shek ruled over what nation, relocated from the mainland after a communist revolution?"

The printed answer is: REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states TAIWAN

The moderator should respond: Correct.

Sometimes, names are interchangeable for a variety of reasons, and both are equally valid answers. Taiwan is the commonly associated name of the political entity otherwise known as the Republic of China by some, or as Chinese Taipei to others. Since they are generally interchangeable, they can be accepted for each other. If the question had asked for the name of the island, then Republic of China would have been incorrect.

As a side note, keep in mind that this is different with United Kingdom/Great Britain issues as those terms in proper usage refer to the same entity at different points in history, and are thus not always interchangeable. The nation is "The United Kingdom". The island is "Great Britain" or "Britain", and can also refer to the three countries of Scotland, Wales, and England when considered together. Great Britain can also refer to certain national teams of the United Kingdom representing the U.K. England should never be accepted as an equivalent answer for the UK.

IMPORTANT NOTE: For a special case involving team names, please see the third and fourth cases under Rule 4-C-1c.

4-C. Completeness

4-C-1a: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Who was the 35th president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: JOHN KENNEDY (both names needed)

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Kennedy"

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

One problem that still occasionally plagues matches is question writers attempting to override match rules. Always keep in mind that the IHSAA rules govern match play, *not notes from the question writer*. Even though there is a directive requiring a full name, it is obvious that it is not needed. There was only one president Kennedy, and the first name is not required. The moderator is fully within their power to accept the correctly given answer, as stated, without further comment. If the moderator were uncertain, they can choose to require the full name, and if an improper first name were given, this can be worked out with a protest.

**4-C-1a: CASE #2:**

The moderator asks the following question:

"Who was the 36th president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: LYNDON JONSON (both names needed)

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Johnson"

The moderator should respond: "Prompt".

Player #1 responds: "L. Johnson".

The moderator should respond "Correct".

4-C-1a allows players to substitute proper initials for first and middle names, even if the question writer includes the requirement for the full name. Again, it is important to remember that writers do not govern the game: the rules govern the game, because it is those rules which coaches and players learn. Requirements for a full name are only necessary when it is necessary to differentiate between similar answers. If the player can differentiate this with initials or some similar device (i.e.: George Bush the elder or George Bush the younger), this should be accepted.

4-C-1b-2: CASE #1:

The moderator reads the following question:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. Including proper units, what is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6 units squared, or 6 square units"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "6"

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

While the issue of units is becoming less of an issue because of changes in question writing philosophy, they still occasionally become a problem, and moderators must be able to handle them. Even though the question asks for "proper units", none were given. As a result, none are required. A good moderator would catch this, and accept the numeric answer only. If a player decided to give units, they would have to be the "generic units", since no other units are noted in the question.

4-C-1b-2: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. What is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "6 feet squared".

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Under no circumstance is a player allowed to invent units. It is the player's responsibility to pay attention to what is being asked for (or in this case, what is not being asked for).

4-C-1b-2: CASE #3:

The moderator asks the following question:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. What is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "6 square units".

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

In the absence of units, players are allowed to use "generic units" as filler. No penalty should be given. Moderators should have a general awareness that areas call for square units and volumes for cubic units.

**4-C-1b-4: CASE #1:**

The moderator reads the following question:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 feet and 2 feet. Including proper units, what is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6 feet squared, or 6 square feet"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "6 feet".

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Though it appears to some people that the moderator might prompt for more information, this should not be done. People familiar with units of measure will know that linear units and area units are two completely separate entities. Incomplete units are not promptable.

Moderators should be cautious in this situation to avoid any actions or voice inflections that might indicate the answer was close (such as saying things like: "I'm sorry, I can't accept that answer," or visibly wincing).

4-C-1b-4: CASE #2:

The moderator reads the following question:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. Including proper units, what is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6 units squared, or 6 square units"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "6 units".

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

This case appears contradictory to Case #1 just above, and for older moderators may seem confusing. In more modern math parlance, it is acceptable to refer to an area unit as just a "unit", without adding a "square" notation with it (in this way it is similar to "acres" as an area unit which also lacks an exponent, or "liters" for volume).

Ideally, this is rendered moot in the writing/editing process, or by the moderators before-hand by rewriting the question to include the proper in the question, thus removing the need for players to give them and create potential controversy where it isn't needed.

4-C-1c: CASE #1:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "Florida Marlins"

Player #1 on Team X rings in and answers "Florida".

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

The current interpretation (now codified into the rules) is that either the geonym or team name is all that is required, but not both. There are rare cases when it is necessary to give both (perhaps a question asking about all possible North American sports team names that might require differentiation between, for example, the Arizona Cardinals and the St. Louis Cardinals, or a question about basketball teams would not permit "Los Angeles" as an acceptable answer without prompting, since there are two Los Angeles basketball teams). Moderators should exercise best judgment in the absence of specific instructions, though these cases are extremely rare.

4-C-1c: CASE #2:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "Marlins"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Florida"

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

This case is a further illustration that the moderator not only has the authority, but the responsibility to accept correct answers, even if they don't match what is on the printed page.



This leads to a follow up: what if the moderator didn't know that "Florida" was correct? When in doubt, rule the answer incorrect, and allow the other team to rebound. Do this without giving away any expression as to whether you have doubt. If you are having doubt, and you catch yourself pausing, pretend to be looking up a list of alternative answers. Even if the second team gives an answer that is "correct on the page", you can stop the match and share your concerns at that time.

See Rule 4-K-4 for more information on rulings like this.

4-C-1c: CASE #3:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "Florida Marlins"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Miami"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

This is a special case that involves not only Rule 4-C-1c, but also Rule 4-B-10. Before the 2012 season, the Florida Marlins changed their name to the Miami Marlins. By 4-B-10, there is a requirement to use the name at the time. Because many sports franchises have changed their names over time, this is an important special application to be aware of. Remember, when in doubt, rule the answer incorrect, and allow the other team their chance, then revisit the potential issue.

4-C-1c: CASE #4:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Later managed by Ozzie Guillén, which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "Florida Marlins"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Miami"

The moderator should respond: "Correct".

Like the previous case, this is a special melding of Rule 4-C-1c and Rule 4-B-10. In this case, the writer included a clue that applies to the team after the name change. The inclusion of that one clue creates an ambiguous situation for the player, and in that case the ruling should be to favor the player. Ideally, a question like this would include a note from the writer to accept both answers, but just in case, you should be prepared to rule on a matter like this.

4-C-1d: CASE #1:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Which English monarch was famous for having six wives, only one of which outlived him?"

The printed answer is: "Henry VIII"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "King Henry"

The moderator should respond: "Prompt".

As long as the player can come up with some indication of "8" in three seconds, the answer will be considered correct.

4-C-1d: CASE #2:

The moderator reads the following question:

"Who was the leader of the Aztec Empire when Cortez reached Mexico?"

The printed answer is: "Montezuma"

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "Montezuma the Second"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect."

Team Y does not respond. Time is called, and the Coach of Team X initiates a protest, claiming that "Montezuma the Second" was correct.

This is a case where everyone is acting properly. If the moderator knew that "Montezuma II" was correct, the moderator could have ruled the answer correct and moved on. However, it is likely to be the case that only a small minority of



moderators would actually know that "Montezuma II" is actually correct. The best policy when a moderator is unsure is to rule "incorrect", and move on. Keep in mind that if the moderator is only reasonably sure that the answer was correct, it is still better to rule "incorrect", and then initiate an investigation after the second team has been given a chance to answer (the moderator need not wait for a coach to initiate a protest).

4-C-1g: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:
"What is the name of Marcel Proust's seven-volume novel of his experiences growing up?"
 The printed answer is: *In Search of Lost Time*

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: *"À la recherche du temps perdu"*
 The moderator should properly state, "Correct" because this is the exact title in French.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: *"Remembrance of Things Past"*
 The moderator should properly state, "Correct" because it was published under this name.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: *"Towards the Research of Times Lost"*
 The moderator should properly state, "Incorrect". Although it could be argued that this is a reasonably literal translation, the work has never been published with that English title.

If Player 1 from Team X rings in and answers: *"Recuerdo de las cosas pasadas"*
 The moderator should properly state, "Incorrect". Although this is a correct Spanish translation, and although it may have been published in Mexico as this, it's neither original nor English.

4-C-2: CASE #1:

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Literature/Language Arts:
"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"
 The printed answer is: *"Nathaniel Hawthorne"*
 Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth", and answers: *"The Scarlet Letter, written by Hawthorne"*
 The moderator should respond: "Correct".

Even though the first part of Player #1's answer is not actually the "correct" answer, the answer contains the correct answer, in addition to other correct information that is relevant to the rest of the question. Notice, only two pieces of information were given (book and author). To not allow this is to unduly penalize a player who knows where the answer is going, in favor of a poorly written question. The goal is to not penalize the player for poor question writing, which is often times why a player is tempted to answer this way.

4-C-2: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:
"One-word answer needed. What is the name often applied to the document, dated November 2, 1917, and named for a Foreign Secretary, which served as the British government's official support for establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine". The printed answer is: *"Balfour"*
 Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word 'Secretary' and answers: *"The Balfour Declaration"*
 The moderator should respond: "Correct".

One of the biggest misapplications of any rules in Illinois Scholastic Bowl involves Rule 4-C-2, however it can be very easily summed up: *the question writer cannot override the rules of the game*. Thus, even though the question starts "give a one-word answer", that does not mean that the answer is incorrect if the player gives more than one word as their response. Players and coaches prepare to play under the rules which are written and endorse by the IHSA. An individual writer does not have the power to suddenly eliminate rules from usage for particular questions. It is always permissible for a player to give additional, relevant, correct information.

**4-C-2: CASE #3:**

The moderator asks the following question:

"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"

The printed answer is: "Nathaniel Hawthorne"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth", and answers: "The House of the Seven Gables, by Hawthorne"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Even though both pieces of given information are relatively correct to each other, the inclusion of the novel The House of the Seven Gables has no pertinence to this question. It came out of a student guessing, incorrectly, for the name of a book that he thought might have these characters. This is the case, even though the player's response did have the needed correct answer as part of the response.

4-C-2: CASE #4:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"

The printed answer is: "Nathaniel Hawthorne"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth", and answers: "The Scarlet Letter, written by Hawthorne, who was from Massachusetts."

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect".

Even though all of the information is correct, this player shows no real fine knowledge of what the question is asking. There is a limit of TWO pieces of information in an appropriate answer.

4-C-2: CASE #5:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Banquo, Bassanio, Beatrice, and Benvolio are all characters created by which English author?"

The printed answer is "William Shakespeare"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word rings in after the word "Banquo" and answers: "Much Ado About Nothing by Shakespeare".

The moderator responds: "Correct"

The coach of Team Y initiates a protest claiming that "Banquo was a character in Macbeth, and not Much Ado About Nothing", and therefore the ruling must be incorrect.

The coach of Team Y is, in this case, correct. The moderator should change their decision deduct the points from Team X, and should read a replacement question for Team Y only. Remember: the moderator is always best, when in doubt, to rule incorrect if there is doubt about the first team's answer, and fix that later. Having to fix an improperly ruled answer of "correct" is more complicated. Compare this result to Case #6.

4-C-2: CASE #6:

The moderator asks the following question:

"Banquo, Bassanio, Beatrice, and Benvolio are all characters created by which English author?"

The printed answer is "William Shakespeare"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word rings in after the word "Beatrice" and answers: "Much Ado About Nothing by Shakespeare".

The moderator should respond: "Correct"

The coach of Team Y initiates a protest claiming that "Banquo and Bassanio were not characters in Much Ado About Nothing", and therefore the ruling must be incorrect.



Team Y's coach is incorrect. At the time that the player rang in, a character from that play had been named, and that made the addition of the play's title a relevant piece of additional information.

It is crucial that moderators pay attention to the point in the question where the buzz occurs, as that can sometimes determine whether the response is correct or incorrect. If there is an assistant judge (often times the scorekeeper), it is a good idea to remind them that one of their jobs should be to mark the question when a buzz occurs, so that if a protest is lodged, this information can be objectively and accurately determined.

In leaving the cases for Rule 4-C, it bears reminding to potential moderators: while not every eventuality can be planned for, especially in the middle of the match, this is a good reason as to why questions, whenever possible, should be reviewed in advance to see if any potential areas of concern can be found.

It is also well to remind moderators: when in doubt, rule incorrect. Had this question been caught before the match, the moderator might have noted which plays those characters came from to see when a particular answer becomes acceptable. It is unlikely that most moderators would know all of these characters, and thus it is difficult to determine when an answer should or should not be accepted. In cases like this it is always better to rule incorrect and initiate an investigation after the second team has been given a chance to answer.

4-C-5: CASE #1:

The moderator begins reading the following toss-up:

"This substance names a magnetic system in which all spins are oriented irregularly. Boron trioxide is added to reduce the coefficient of thermal expansion of one form of this substance. Pyrex is an example of what transparent amorphous solid formed by heating and rapidly cooling silica, found in windows and portholes?"

The printed answer is: Pyrex glass (anti-prompt on Pyrex alone after "boron" is read)

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "boron"

Player 1 states "Pyrex"

The moderator prompts by saying, "anti-prompt"

Player 1 states "glass"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The moderator has handled the situation correctly by following the printed instructions. The first clue/sentence does not refer to Pyrex, but the second clue/sentence does. So, in this case, the question writer anticipated that a player hearing 'boron' might think of Pyrex, and therefore included that specific anti-prompt along with the answer.

4-C-5 CASE #2:

The moderator begins reading the following toss-up:

"Books in this category are based on real events. When the subject is a real person, it may be authorized or unauthorized. What literary genre includes owner's manuals and textbooks?"

The printed answer is: nonfiction

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "unauthorized"

Player 1 states "biography"

The moderator prompts by saying, "anti-prompt"

Player 1 states "nonfiction"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The moderator has the authority to anti-prompt if he or she decides it's appropriate. In this case, the question writer did not anticipate this particular early answer. The moderator realized that the answer biography fits the first and second clues, so an anti-prompt is appropriate.

4-D. Toss-Up Questions

4-D-6: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question:

"What is the largest country, by land area, in the world?"



The printed answer is "Russia".

AFTER 5 SECONDS ELAPSE, player #1 for Team X rings in, and answers: "Switzerland".

The moderator replies: "Incorrect".

AT THIS POINT, THERE IS ONE SECOND LEFT ON THE CLOCK.

The moderator should visually count out THREE seconds, during which, the second team may legally ring in to answer. The three seconds is not in addition to the remaining time. Since there was one second remaining on the clock, a count of three seconds will extend for two seconds after the clock runs out. It is best for moderators to get into the habit of starting this timing immediately, and to do this visually for the benefit of players, coaches, and spectators.

4-D-6: CASE #2:

The moderator asks the following question:

"What is the largest country, by land area, in the world?"

The printed answer is "Russia".

Player #1 for Team X immediately rings in, as soon as the buzzer goes off, the moderator begins counting to three. A split second after time expires, player #1 answers: "Russia".

The moderator replies: "Time was up".

The moment time expires, the moderator should give a staccato "Time" call to indicate that time has definitively run out. Answers given after time should not be judged as "correct" or "incorrect". It is up to the other team to decide how they wish to proceed.

Remember, once the time has run out on the first person, you must quickly decide how much time remains for the other team. If it is more than three seconds, allow the time to run down, and give a staccato "Time" when time is up. If there were three or fewer seconds, visually count out the three second that this second team has to answer.

The decision as to whether or not the answer started before or after time expired lies with the moderator. Because this decision is not protest able, it is critical that the moderator be fair, consistent, and within the rules when making calls like this.

4-D-8: CASE #1:

A toss-up in mathematics is asked. Player #1 on Team X rings in. As the moderator begins to count to three, Player #1 continues to calculate by writing. After two seconds, Player #1 begins to answer, and continues to write while continuously answering.

The coach of Team Y protests the player writing while answering.

Team Y's coach is not correct here. The moderator should allow this, as long as the player does not wait, and then stutter through an answer which accounts for over three seconds of delaying (see Rule 4-B-2 for discussions on delaying).

4-E. Bonus Questions

4-E-1b: CASE #1:

A player on Team X has correctly answer the tossup question, and controls the bonus.

The bonus question, on paper looks like this:

Bonus #4

This man owned a plantation called Mount Vernon, and was a Revolutionary War hero.

1. Name this general and first president of the United States.

Answer: George Washington

2. This man who defended the British soldiers involved in the Boston Massacre, was Washington's vice president.



Answer: John Adams Jr.

3. *George Washington nearly dismissed this man from his cabinet over infighting with Alexander Hamilton, but this first Secretary of State voluntarily stepped down.*

Answer: Thomas Jefferson

The moderator will read:

"This man owned a plantation called Mount Vernon, and was a Revolutionary War hero. Part 1: Name this general and first president of the United States.

At this time the moderator begins a visual ten second count. If the count reaches 8, and Team X has not answered, the moderator should give a staccato warning of "Answer". When the count reaches 10, the moderator should issue a staccato "Time". If Team X answers correctly before time is called, they receive ten points, and the moderator immediately moves on to read part 2. If Team X fails to answer, or gives an incorrect response, the moderator should quickly indicate "Incorrect, Team Y", and begin a 3 second count for Team Y. The rebounding team will always have three seconds to answer (even if the remaining time for Team X was greater), and will not be warned with two seconds left. Parts 2 and three are played out similarly.

The key for moderators is to move through bonuses without wasting time, because time wasted can give one team an advantage. As soon as the controlling team is correct on part 1, immediately move on to part 2. If the controlling team is wrong on any bonus part, it is critical that you immediately declare the answer incorrect, and inform the rebounding team that they may answer. Delays in this process give the rebounding team an unfair advantage by giving them too much time.

4-E-2: CASE #1:

While reading the leadin and part 1 to a bonus question, the moderator notices that the captains of both Team X and Team Y are looking around at the papers in front of her teammates, and are quietly talking. As soon as the moderator is done reading the leadin and part 1, the captain of Team X (which had control of the bonus) says "We have no answers".

This is perfectly legal on all parts. There are no longer any restrictions on communication or passing of paper during the reading or answering of any part of the bonus, provided, in the moderator's opinion, communication is not an attempt to distract, delay, or intimidate.

4-E-3a: CASE #1:

A moderator has read the leadin and first part of a bonus. Team X, in control is conferring. At 8 seconds, the moderator says "Answer", and at 9 seconds, the Captain of Team X tells the moderator that the team is deferring to Player #4.

If the captain can get all of that out, and Player #4 answers before the moderator counts "10", then Team X gets ten points. However, all players, coaches, and moderators need to be clear: Deferring does not allow for extra time. By rule, it is the answer which must be started before the ten seconds is over. If a team plans on deferring, it must be sure to allow itself time to defer and answer before the ten seconds has expired. Moderators, it is important that you give a visual indicator of the time so that teams are aware of the time. Players should also be aware that the captain does not need to defer, that the player with the answer may direct it to the moderator at any time, though it helps the moderator to focus on the player with an indication of who is answering.

4-E-3a: CASE #2:

A moderator has read the leadin and first part of a bonus. Team X, in control is conferring. At 8 seconds, the moderator says "Answer", and at 9 seconds, the Captain of Team X tells the moderator that the team is deferring to Player #4 Before Player 4 can begin answering, the moderator reaches a count of ten. Player 4 answers, and the moderator calls time.

Consistency and having a good visual count is critical so that there is no ambiguity here. Time does not expire when the moderator calls time, but when the ten seconds expires. As long as it is clear that a good visual count was made, and that there was no error or subterfuge on behalf of the moderator, this answer should not be accepted, and the other



team should be given an opportunity to answer with a three second clock started immediately. Ideally, the moderator will call time quickly at the "ten" count. The moderator should give benefit of ties to the answering team, but should in no way give the benefit of additional time. Moderators must be fair with timing, but must act with conviction to call time on a team delaying to start or complete their answer (a cumulative delay of 3 seconds while answering).

4-E-3d: CASE #1:

A moderator has read the leadin and first part of the bonus. After 8 seconds, Team X (the controlling team) answers incorrectly. Team Y answers the first bonus part almost immediately.

The moderator should acknowledge that the answer is correct, and move on to the second part, with Team X maintaining control. Answering the toss-up correctly gives a team control of all three parts of the bonus. A team answering one part correctly on the rebound does not displace that control.

4-E-3e: CASE #1:

A moderator has read the leadin and first part of a bonus. Team X is in control, and after five seconds the captain of Team X asks for the question to be repeated.

In the first 25 years of Illinois Scholastic Bowl, captains of the controlling team could ask for the question to be repeated, because teams were often times trying to manage four or five parts of a bonus at a time, and it is possible that they missed something. Now that bonus questions are read one at a time, it should be considerably easier for teams to focus on a single question, and with ten second on each part (instead of 30 seconds), there is no time to repeat the question without giving players an unfair advantage of extra time. Thus, it is critical that moderators are very clear in reading bonus leadins and parts. Mumbling or mispronouncing in a bonus question is going to cause problems.

4-E-3e: CASE #2:

A moderator has read the leadin and first part of a bonus. Team X is in control, and quickly asks for part 1 to be repeated. The moderator shakes her head, and the captain of Team X explains that the bonus could not be understood.

What happens in the event the moderator knows or suspects that they have misread part of the bonus after the moderator has finished reading the bonus part. In this case, the moderator should attempt to fix the mistake quickly. If, in fixing the mistake, it does not give the controlling team time to answer, that part needs to be thrown out, and replaced (most likely after finishing the remaining parts of the bonus).

4-E-4c: CASE #1:

Team X is in control of the bonus. The moderator begins reading the following bonus:

"The son of Eleanor of Aquitaine, this king was responsible for losing Normandy to the French. Part 1, name this English king who signed the Magna Carta."

The printed answer is: "John (Lackland)"

After reading the word "Aquitaine", a player from Team X directs the following answer to the moderator: "Richard III".

The moderator says "Incorrect".

Players from the answering team need not wait for the part to be finished, and may choose to interrupt the moderator with an answer. If the answer is interrupted, and is correct, the moderator can say "correct", and move on to the next part. If the answer is incorrect (as in this case), the moderator should state that the answer is "incorrect", and immediately turn their attention to the rebounding team and begin reading at a convenient point. Once done reading, the moderator begins a 3 second count.

4-E-4d: CASE #1:

Team X is in control of the bonus. The moderator begins reading the following bonus:

"The son of Eleanor of Aquitaine, this king was responsible for losing Normandy to the French. Part 1, name this English king who signed the Magna Carta."

The printed answer is: "John (Lackland)"



After reading the question, the moderator begins a 10 second visual count. After four seconds, a player from Team X who is not the captain, answers: "John".

The moderator says "Correct".

The coach for Team Y protests that the captain did not answer, and thus the answer should not be accepted.

While it is advised that the captain answer, or that the captain designate in some manner who will answer, the moderator will accept the first answer that is unambiguously directed toward the moderator. Coaches and players must be attentive to this detail. Players who are conferring should be sure that they are not looking at the moderator while discussing, and should keep their volume down to prevent a moderator accidentally thinking that a player is answering, when they are not.

If the captain is not required to answer, and designating is not required anymore, why is it still "advised" that the captain answer or designate? On one level, it is a courtesy to the moderator, allowing them to focus on listening to the answer, decreasing the chance that the response will be misheard. It also reduces the chance that two members of the team will answer simultaneously and cause an issue that the captain will need to solve.

4-E-4d: CASE #2:

Team X is in control of the bonus. The moderator begins reading the following bonus:

"The son of Eleanor of Aquitaine, this king was responsible for losing Normandy to the French. Part 1, name this English king who signed the Magna Carta."

The printed answer is: "John (Lackland)"

After reading the question, the moderator begins a 10 second visual count. After four seconds, Player #5 from Team X who is not the captain, answers: "Richard III", while at the same time the captain answers "John".

The moderator says "Captain, which answer do you want".

The moderator should then start a visual 3 second count. This time, the captain must be the person to answer, and the captain must choose the team's answer.

Moderators must also be careful to observe the team preparing to answer. Some teams will use a strategy where, when they are unsure of an answer, have a player mumble an answer. If the moderator answers incorrect, they will state "that isn't their answer" in an attempt to take another chance at an answer. Moderators must be careful that once they believe there is an unambiguously directed answer at them, to rule correct or incorrect on that answer, only changing their mind if the moderator has made an obvious error in interpreting something on the page. If there is doubt as to whether the answer has been directed toward the moderator, the moderator may ask the player to repeat or speak up, but should not indicate whether the answer is correct or incorrect. Making a mistake here will likely cause confusion and require a question to be thrown out. Because this is a situation that comes up very commonly in competition, moderators need to become very practiced at handling these situations. If a team adept at this strategy becomes aware that they can get away with it, the moderator surreptitiously becomes a sixth member of the team. Moderators must be prepared to handle these situations.

Keep in mind that the captain may give the answer, or may designate which player's answer they are choosing. In this case the captain could say "Player #5" or "Richard III" if the captain wants to go with that answer, or "My answer" or "John" if the captain chooses that answer.

4-E-4f: CASE #1:

Team X is in control of the bonus. The moderator reads the following bonus part:

"This English monarch ruled during the peak of the Black Death pandemic."

The printed answer is: "Edward III"

After consultation, Player 1 turns toward the moderator and says "King Edward"

The moderator responds: "Prompt".

After a brief consultation, Player 2 turns toward the moderator and says "the 3rd".



The moderator says "Correct".

After all parts of the bonus have been completed, the coach for Team Y protests that the same player did not provide the prompted information, and thus the answer should not be accepted.

While it is recommended that the same player who gave the answer respond to the prompt, any team member may respond (and may even consult – but not as a delaying tactic). The moderator will accept the first answer that is unambiguously directed toward him or her. Why is this?

Under the rules, any player may answer a bonus part, and the moderator is not required or expected to note which player is actually giving the answer. A prompt should therefore be treated in the same way. Veteran coaches will recall that, in the past, when the captain was required to answer or specifically designate who would answer, answering a bonus and bonus prompts were tightly controlled. Now however, "the team" provides all bonus part answers, as well as prompts. If conflicting responses are provided, the captain will be asked to choose the team's answer.

4-F. Equipment Malfunction

4-F-1: CASE #1:

The moderator is in the middle of reading a tossup, and suddenly a player yells out "BUZZ!" The moderator looks up, and sees Player #1 on Team X wildly pressing their button. There is no other movement apparent from either team.

While the rule is clear on equipment malfunctions, under Rule 1, the moderator has authority over the match to make decisions about situations such as these. If it is clear to the moderator that no other player on the other team was attempting to ring in, the moderator is within their rights to award an opportunity to answer the tossup to Player #1. If the moderator cannot tell whether a player said "Buzz" before another player's buzzer sounded, or if two players yell "Buzz" simultaneously, the best decision is to throw the question out and replace. Moderators have an obligation to use their heads to be fair, and the rules allow for moderators to use their best judgment to assure that fairness.

4-F-2: CASE #1:

The moderator is in the middle of reading a tossup, and suddenly hears two players yell out "BUZZ!" The moderator looks up, and sees Player #1 and Player #2 on Team X wildly pressing their buttons. There is no other movement apparent from either team.

If the "tie" was between two players from both teams, the only recourse is to throw out the question and replace. In this case, the tie exists between two players on the same team. In this case, the team's captain should be told to immediately choose one of the players. No communication favoring the team is permitted (it is still a tossup). The player whom the captain chooses should then answer.

4-G. Penalties

4-G-1: CASE #1:

The moderator has just finished reading a toss-up question when she hears something that appears to be the answer coming from a group of Team X's uniformed players that are not currently playing. She is certain that the current players heard the answer. A few moments later, a player for Team X rings in, is recognized, and gives the correct answer.

Ideally, if the moderator truly suspects that the answer has been yelled out, the moderator should indicate that immediately, and replace and replay the question. However, even in this case, with the delay, the moderator could still act. In addition, both teams should be warned for illegal talking. The moderator may even insist that non-players move further away from the current players.



4-G-3a: CASE #1:

The moderator has just finished reading a toss-up question, and hears the answer come from a group of Team Y's uniformed players that are not currently playing. Both teams have been warned already about illegal communication.

This is illegal communication, and warrants a penalty. The moderator should inform teams that this is illegal, and that Team Y is out of the tossup. Team X may ring in before time expires.

4-G-4: CASE #1:

An audience member, after having been warned, has twice yelled out answers, or has in general been distracting. The audience member has been previously warned.

At this time, the moderator should eject the person. Do not make a show of this. Do what is needed to avoid confrontation, but do not attempt to continue the match until the person is removed from the room. Even if the audience member is wearing a school shirt, the team should not be penalized. If there is further difficulty, you may ask one of the coaches for assistance. If there is a scorekeeper, they should be sent to get the tournament manager or director.

If the person in question is a uniformed player who is not currently playing, the player may be ejected, and the team may be further penalized. This Case also addresses Rule 4-G-5.

A good official does not want to interject themselves into the proceedings of a game. A great official is someone the coaches, players, and spectators do not notice during the game, and forget about once you have left the room. That said, the moderator is also the first and last line in maintaining the integrity of the game. A situation like this is never one that is hoped for, but should it happen, the moderator must be sure to act with total professionalism (in demeanor, in attitude, in speech), and must act in a manner that will maintain the game's integrity, while not trying to embarrass anyone.

Ejecting anyone from a match is a serious matter, and if you should do this, make certain that you are ready to fully explain yourself to the tournament director after the match. You may want to very quickly jot down notes before continuing to keep details of a stressful situation clear.

4-H. Moderator or Timekeeper Error

4-H-1a: CASE #1:

The moderator is about to read Toss-up #12, the last question before halftime, but instead reads Toss-up #13.

If tossup #13 is answered correctly, then bonus #13 should be read as well. The tossup and bonus that were numbered as #12 now become tossup and bonus #13. In this particular case, because questions 12 and 13 are in different halves, it is important that the moderator notify the coaches of what has happened in regards to your error, informing coaches of the relevant categories that the questions come from, since the moderator has now altered the distribution of the questions in each half. No further action is needed.

4-H-1b: CASE #1:

The tossup in the question booklet reads "What does MACH 1 mean?"

The printed answer is: "The speed of sound"

The moderator reads "What does March 1st mean?"

The teams stare blankly at each other.

In this case, the question should be thrown out, and a replacement toss-up in that category should be read. If a replacement in that category is unavailable, use the first available tossup in the replacement set of questions.

**4-H-1c: CASE #1:**

The moderator reads a toss-up: "What three-letter word can be synonymous with the word 'wildebeest'?" and then promptly adds "Oh, that's what a gnu is?"

Replace the toss-up with a toss-up from the same category. If a replacement in that category is unavailable, use the first available tossup in the replacement set of questions.

4-H-1d: CASE #1:

The moderator reads a tossup: What three letter word can be synonymous with the word 'wildebeest'?"

Player #1 on Team X rings in and answers: "yak."

The moderator responds "I'm sorry, the answer is 'gnu'"

Team Y is silent, though the Head Coach of Team Y is trying to get the moderator's attention.

A replacement toss-up should be read for Team Y only, preferably from the same category. If a replacement in that category is unavailable, use the first available tossup in the replacement set of questions.

The problem arises if the replacement question is substantially more difficult or substantially easier. Moderators can lose a great deal of respect for making such an error. Simply put: Don't do it!

4-H-1e: CASE #1:

The moderator accidentally turns the page after tossup #10 is answered correctly, and reads bonus #11.

Because questions #10 and #11 are in the same half, this will not have an effect on the match. Bonus #11 is now bonus #10, and bonus #10 becomes bonus #11. However, if this results in a bonus being paired with a toss-up of the same category, the moderator should rearrange some of the bonus questions to assure that this does not happen.

4-H-1f: CASE #1:

The following bonus question is asked:

"Identify the following countries:

1. The country you live in now. (Answer: USA)
2. The biggest country by area in the world. (Answer: Russia)
3. The country that shares a name with a Southern U.S. state. (Answer: Georgia)

After parts 1 and two have been read and answered, when reading part 3, the moderator accidentally reads "northern" instead of "southern".

If the moderator catches it before either team answers, the moderator may announce the correction, and start the time over for conferring.

If the error is discovered after one or both teams have answered, and it has resulted in the first or both teams missing the question, the part must be replaced. The moderator should find the most appropriate bonus question. In this case, since part 3 was in error, the moderator will read the leadin, the first two parts, with answers, and then ask the third part as the replacement part of the bonus.

4-H-1g: CASE #1:

This bonus question is written in the question packet:

"During this war, communist forces launched a surprise attack called the Tet Offensive. Part 1, What is this war that saw the United States fight a force led by Ho Chi Minh?" The printed answer is the "Vietnam War".

HOWEVER, the moderator, instead, reads the following:

" During this war, Vietnamese communist forces launched a surprise attack called the Tet Offensive. Part 1, What is this war that saw the United States fight a force led by Ho Chi Minh? "

The moderator has accidentally given away the answer to the question by adding a form of the answer to the question. Because this is the first part of the bonus, the proper remedy is to replace the entire bonus.



If the error had occurred in part 2 or part 3 of the bonus, the problem is compounded somewhat. If the part mangled had been part 2, the moderator should note the error, read the part and give the answer, and go on to part 3 normally. After the conclusion of the bonus, the moderator should find the most appropriate bonus, read the leadin, the first part (with answer), and then the second part (which is the part that can be scored)

4-H-1h: CASE #1:

The following bonus question is asked:

"Identify the following countries:

- 1. The country you live in now. (Answer: USA)*
- 2. The biggest country by area in the world. (Answer: Russia)*
- 3. The country that shares a name with a Southern U.S. state. (Answer: Georgia)*

After reading part 2, and starting the 10 second visual count, the moderator says "I thought that was Canada?" in a manner where some players and/or coaches heard that statement.

While Canada was not the correct answer, the moderator has given teams a clue as to what may not be an answer, and that is essentially the same problem. The moderator should acknowledge the correct answer, and read part three, allowing the teams to attempt scoring. After this, the moderator should select the most appropriate bonus, read the leadin, part 1, and then read part 2 to allow teams to score.

4-H-1i: CASE #1:

A difficult tossup question has been asked. The moderator has forgotten to time the tossup, and it is now fairly clear that too much time has passed. Player #4 on Team X rings in, and gives the correct answer.

Moderators need to be aware of the time at each point in the match. Except in rare circumstances, it is not excusable to make this mistake. To help prevent this, moderators should be focused and practiced in keeping time consistently every time. In this case, the answer should not be allowed, and the match should proceed to the next tossup question.

4-H-1i: CASE #2:

The following tossup question is asked:

How big an area is bounded by a square with each side being 3 feet?

The printed answer is "9 square feet."

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers: "9 inches square"

The moderator rules: "Correct." The Coach from Team Y already has her hand in the air to initiate a protest.

Consider this: If the moderator had said "incorrect," there is no problem. Instead, the moderator has now made a mistake that has given the other team a strong hint that the incorrect answer is close (hopefully the moderator has changed his/her ruling when asked by the Coach of Team Y!). As a result, read a replacement toss-up in the same category for Team Y only. If Team Y gets the replacement toss-up correct, they gain control the bonus, and Team X may rebound the bonus.

4-H-1i: CASE #3:

A tossup question is asked with the answer "The Cask of Amontillado":

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "The Casks of Amontillado".

As the moderator hears the word "Amontillado", the moderator responds "correct", but upon realizing that an "s" was added, immediately changes the ruling to "incorrect".

Like with the Case #2 above, the moderator has made an error that has all but given away the correct answer. The proper procedure is to replace the tossup, and read it only for the team that has not buzzed in. While moderators do need to keep the match moving, it is important that the decision making part of the brain is not moving faster than the part of the brain that analyzes language. Make sure that you have heard the correct answer before judging it. Do not fall into



the habit, especially the case when one or both teams are getting a lot of correct answers, of judging the answer too quickly.

4-H-1i: CASE #4:

A tossup question is asked with the answer "The Cask of Amontillado":

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers, very quietly "A Case of Donaldo"

The moderator asks the player to repeat the answer, which he does, and the moderator rules the player "incorrect".

Player #3 on Team Y rings in and answers "The Cask of Amontillado".

After being ruled correct, the coach of Team X protests that this is moderator error, and a replacement tossup should be read for Team Y.

Asking for a player to repeat an answer is not an error, and is not grounds for a replacement to be read. It is wholly contingent on players to speak in a voice that can be heard by moderator, coaches, and players alike. Failure to do so could lead to situations like this, which might give the other team an advantage. Coaches should make sure that players can be heard at a distance, and that players likely to answer can enunciate well enough to be clearly understood.

4-H-1k, 4-H-1l, 4-H-1m, and 4-H-1n

These rules concern issues that arise when a player is ruled incorrect inappropriately. Rules 4-H-1k and 4-H-1l apply when the player's answer was correct as given, and Rules 4-H-1m and 4-H-1n apply when the player's answer was not yet fully correct, but worthy of a prompt. The following Cases are for toss-up questions; similar reasoning should be applied for bonus questions.

4-H-1k:

The following tossup question is asked:

*Name the author of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.*

The printed answer is "Mark Twain."

Player #1 on Team X rings in and answers "Samuel Clemens."

The moderator rules: "Incorrect."

Team Y rings in (or not); if an answer is given, it is ruled correct or incorrect; in any case, the printed answer is revealed.

Team X appeals.

Samuel Clemens is acceptable under Rule 4-B-11, so Rule 4-H-1k applies. Adjust the score appropriately.

4-H-1l:

The following tossup question is asked:

*Name the author of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.*

The printed answer is "Mark Twain."

Player #1 on Team X rings in and answers "Charles Dickens."

The moderator rules: "Incorrect."

Player #1 on Team Y rings in and answers "Samuel Clemens."

The moderator rules: "Incorrect" - and reveals the printed answer.

Team Y appeals.

Samuel Clemens is acceptable under Rule 4-B-11, so Rule 4-H-1l applies. Adjust the score appropriately.

4-H-1m:

The following tossup question is asked:

Name the sixth President of the United States.

The printed answer is "John Quincy Adams", with "Quincy" and "Adams" underlined as required information.

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "Adams."

The moderator rules "Incorrect."

Team Y rings in (or not); if an answer is given it is ruled correct or incorrect; in any case, the printed answer is revealed.



Team X appeals.

Clearly, Team X should have been prompted, so Rule 4-H-1m applies. We do not know whether the prompt would have elicited the correct answer; furthermore, the printed answer will have been revealed during or after Team Y's attempt. Discard and replace the tossup and read it for both teams.

4-H-1n:

The following tossup question is asked:

Name the sixth President of the United States.

The printed answer is "John Quincy Adams", with "Quincy" and "Adams" underlined as required information.

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and answers "Monroe."

The moderator rules "Incorrect."

Player #1 on Team Y rings in and answers "Adams."

The moderator rules: "Incorrect" - and reveals the printed answer.

Team Y appeals.

Clearly, Team Y should have been prompted, so Rule 4-H-1n applies. We do not know whether the prompt would have elicited the correct answer, and once the moderator has revealed the printed answer, prompting is impossible. Discard and replace the tossup. Because Team X has already been ruled incorrect on the original tossup, the replacement tossup is read only for Team Y. If Team Y answers the replacement tossup correctly, the bonus proceeds normally, with Team X eligible to answer rebounded parts.

4-I. Appeals to the Moderator

Before examining examples, players and coaches need to remember that the moderator has the right to reject any and all appeals, even before they are made. Moderators can stop an appeal if they suspect an appeal is imminent. Coaches need to be aware that a moderator who does this is within his/her power.

However, moderators are expected to treat coaches and players with respect and in a professional manner. While moderators may not like handling protests, they are expected to handle them and not dismiss them unless there is good reason to do so. No one likes a person in a game who acts like they are beyond the ability to make a mistake, especially because in an endeavor that involves students, such an attitude sends an inappropriate message. Moderators who exercise an iron grip may find that they will have other problems in dealing with players and coaches, and may find themselves asked not to moderate in the future. In short, moderators are strongly encouraged to listen to legitimate appeals.

4-I-1a: CASE #1:

After a bonus question is completed, and points are awarded, the Head coach of Team X approaches the moderator to ask a question about match procedure. The two continue to talk and the coach is making no progress in pleading his case. The co-coach of Team X now approaches the moderator to add more volume to the argument.

While any player, coach, or official may instigate an appeal, coaches "ganging up" on an official will not be an effective means of communication, and run the risk of making an already decided argument run longer. The moderator may very well ask additional persons to offer input, and there is nothing wrong with a player, coach, assistant coach, or worker to ask to give relevant input, but when the moderator has reached a decision, that should bring an end to discussion. The moderator should politely but firmly tell everyone their decision, and end the conversation.

4-I-1b: CASE #1:

Team X is in control of the bonus.

The moderator reads:

"NAFTA encourages trade between the United States and border nations. Part 1, what is the unit of currency in Mexico?"

After a brief consultation, the captain of Team X says: "pesos"

The printed answer is: "peso"



The moderator responds: "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

The moderator turns towards Team Y and begins a 3 second visual count.

After 2 seconds, the captain of Team Y says: "peso"

The moderator responds: "Correct."

Before the moderator reads part 2, the captain of Team X politely states that she would like to appeal.

While an appeal must be made before the beginning of the next question asked, be it toss-up or bonus, it is not necessary or proper to make an appeal regarding part 1 of a bonus before the beginning of part 2. The appeal should be made after all three parts of the bonus have been completed, but before the next toss-up is read. Experienced teams know this. However, if a player initiates an appeal after part 1 or part 2 of a bonus, the moderator should say, "Noted." Appeals to bonus parts should be initiated, and are handled, after all three parts of the bonus have been completed, and then resume reading the bonus.

4-I-2a: CASE #1:

A toss-up question is asked in the area of history:

"Who was the first president of the United States?"

The printed answer is "Abraham Lincoln".

Player #3 on Team X rings in and says "George Washington."

The moderator states "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Player #2 on Team Y immediately (though politely) gets the moderator's attention, and informs the moderator that she believes the answer of "Washington" to be correct.

Sportsmanship should always be appreciated and not penalized. Acts like this should be strongly considered. If a moderator in a case like this is uncertain, and both teams agree to the same correct answer, the moderator should accept that answer as correct as this not only saves time and promotes sportsmanship, but in a vast majority of cases ends up being the technically correct action. Even if the teams cannot fully agree, this should be enough information for the moderator to begin researching the proper answer.

4-I-4a: CASE #1:

A bonus question begins with the following leadin:

"Identify the following songs performed by Justin Bieber":

The Coach of Team Y immediately stops the moderator, and appeals that a replacement question should be asked because this question is "trivial", "inappropriate", and "insulting to the students".

Sometimes a coach can be right, but not have grounds for a protest, and this question illustrates such a point. Even if in one person's opinion a question is too trivial, too difficult, or otherwise inappropriate, that is not grounds for the coach or player to request that the question be thrown out.

4-I-5: CASE #1:

The moderator asks the following question in Arts:

"Which famous painter painted the painting better known as "The Mona Lisa"?"

The printed answer is: "Michelangelo".

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player #1 answers: "DaVinci".

The moderator responds: "Incorrect".

The coach for Team X politely gets the moderator's attention, and informs the moderator that the answer might be wrong, and that Team X was correct. The coach then asks a player to use their iphone to look up the needed information that shows the painter of the Mona Lisa to be Leonardo DaVinci. The moderator rules that Team X is correct, and proceeds.

This is an example of how a proper appeal should be made. The only problem here is that the Coach of Team X should have waited until the Team Y has answered. In the event the moderator does not change his/her mind, the Coach of Team X has just given Team Y additional time to consider an answer.

**4-I-10: CASE #1**

A moderator reaches a decision about the correctness of an answer, though the coach of Team Y is convinced that this is in error. The coach of Team Y leaves the room, and asks for the Tournament Director to intervene.

While it is becoming more and more common for local tournaments to have games/protest committees or to empower the tournament director to become involved in a protest, this is not allowable in the IHSA state series. The moderator of the match will have the final word on all decisions regarding how the match is conducted. The tournament director and other senior officials do not have the power to overrule a moderator decision regarding the conduct of the match. The moderator must always keep in mind that while, within the match, their decisions cannot be overruled, that does not prevent future discipline from the tournament director or the community at large in terms of being removed from the tournament and future officiating assignments.