

Sajjad Ali Gill*, Muhammad Zafar Iqbal Butt**, Badar Mohy ud Din***

A Comparative Study of Referee and General Self-Efficacy between Football & Hockey Elite Referees of Pakistan

Abstract:

The main objective of this study was to analysis of perception about referee and general self-efficacy in Pakistan elite officials and athletes. Referee and technical officials are important for organized sports contest. But now a day's sports administrators are facing a problem. Day by day the number of qualified sports referees is on the decline. The insufficient number of technical officials may directly have negative impact on the quality and quantity of sports. The sample of this study was referees football male (n=85) and female (n=2) and hockey male (n=45) and female (n=5) from Pakistan. Referee self-Efficacy Scale (REFS) and General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) scale utilized to measure these variables. The data analysis were completed through SPSS and it indicated that sub-dimension referee self-efficacy physical fitness, game knowledge, decision making, communication and referee self-efficacy indicated that football referees had significantly better mean score than hockey referees. The results also indicate that football and hockey referees had similar level of general self-efficacy with having little pressure than football referees during match. The correlation coefficients between all variables are significant except decision making and pressure, communication and GSE. The results of this study concluded that football referee and technical officials have high level of physical fitness, game knowledge, decision making, communication and referee self-efficacy score than hockey referees. Although, football and hockey referees have same level of self-efficacy, but hockey referees had more pressure than football.

Key words: Sports, Referees, Technical Officials, Self- efficacy.

Introduction:

Human resources (HR) are remarkably and crucially essential for every organization now-a-days. Referee and technical officials are important for organized sports contest^{1,2,3}. But now a day's sports administrators are facing a problem that the number of qualified sports referees is on the decline. The lack of technical officials may directly have a negative impact on the quality and quantity of sports. It is a common practice that if technical officials are not accessible for competition then competitions are postponed and rescheduled⁴.As in the U.S.A some of the state school sports associations are dropping the games due to shortage of technical officials⁵. Furthermore, when veteran referees and officials are engaged due to their workload, in that situation new referees beyond their current knowledge and skill are impelled to perform duty as official in sports competitions; The quality of experiencing that competition for players as well as spectators is influenced negatively⁶.The president of the National Association of Sports Officials, Barry Mano stated that there is need to develop more interest in male and female regarding technical officials work because employing new referees is difficult nowadays⁵.

Generally, sport psychology emphasizes around trainers and peer athletes. The role of referees is very crucial in sports, however, disregarded in the current literature. It is stated that after the study of last ten years, 1.12% of articles found relatively to officiate according to four noteworthy sports psychology journals⁷.In every game, team players, coaches, and spectators criticize the technical officials because they considered that the role of referee in each game was a key factor which plays a crucial role in sports. Individual with high level of self-efficacy can perform all difficult assignments. They set themselves for higher objectives and stick with the objectives, exceedingly self-efficacy individuals contribute more exertion and persevere higher than those have little self-efficacy⁸.The person who has a high or strong self-efficacy has an ability to get success by improving himself and changing his procedure without ascribing⁹.

Experience is considered to be a major significant predictor of the referee performance. The skill of technical officials is directly related to the total number of years of officiating¹⁰. In evaluating video recorded tasks, technical officials of football did more precise decisions than football players. Technical officials create decisions via involvement, preparation and direct experience¹¹. Football match referees and linemen carry out good responsibilities according to their duties¹⁰. Due to individual decisions, most of the studies show officiating unfair. Several studies indicated home crowd pressure on technical officials at home matches¹². To check out the legality of

* Dr Sajjad Ali Gill, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, The University of the Punjab, Lahore Pakistan.

** Dr Muhammad Zafar Iqbal Butt, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, The University of the Punjab, Lahore Pakistan.

*** Badar Mohy ud Din, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, The University of the Punjab, Lahore Pakistan.

the penalty after the match in case of fouls for the sake of fair play¹⁴. The phenomena is observed in most of the games and country leagues such as England Premiere League (EPL) and National Basketball Association NBA¹³.

Objectives

1. To check the relationship between referee and self efficacy in Pakistan.
2. Does self efficacy has an effected on different games through referees (football and hockey)

Hypothesis

The self efficacy has an effect on the performance of referees

Methods:

In the current study, quantitative approach with convenience sampling sports referees and technical officials were selected. Therefore, in this study researcher used a survey method for gathering the quantitative information. In this study the targeted population consisted of two different sports federation of Pakistan which comprised on hockey and football referees. The sample size of the current research was (n=137), male referees (n=130) and female referees (n=07), Similarly, Football male (n=85) and female (02) and Hockey male (n=45) and female (5) Respectively. The data was calculated through RAOSOFT (sample size calculator)¹⁵. Referee Self-Efficacy Scale (REFS)¹⁶ and General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)¹⁷ were utilized for this research. The (English and Urdu) language questionnaires were distributed to referees personally by the researcher after taking the time from the referees, the researcher also prepared the Google forms and sent it to different referees and sports technical officials with plenty of space for respondent. In current study the researcher personally visited all those places where referees existed and distributed the questionnaires to the sports referees and technical officials. In the current study researcher applied independent t-test on different sub dimensions (physical-fitness, game-knowledge, decision-making, pressure and communication of REFS and General self-efficacy) (GES) on both games and checked Pearson correlation of sub-dimensions of REFS and GSE.

Results:

Table 4.1: Distribution of total respondents according to gender status

Gender	Football N%	Hockey N%
Male	85(97.7)	45(90)
Female	2(2.3)	5(10)
Total	87(100)	50(100)

gender-wise distribution of the respondents among the total respondent, In which referees male majority 85(97.7%) and female 2(2.3%) for football and 45 (90%) and 5(10%) respectively.

Table.4.2: Distribution of total respondent’s year of experience as referee

Group (years)	Football N (%)	Hockey N (%)
5 years or below	11(12.6)	9(18)
6-10 year	21(24.1)	22(44)
11-15 years	46(52.9)	10(20)
16 year & above	9(10.3)	9(18)
Total	87(100)	50(100)

Table 4.2. depicted that the game-wise frequency of football and hockey respondent, as per their experience, concluded along with their percentage that more than 5 years or below experience of (football = 11(12.6%), hockey= 9(18%) and in the second group 6-10year, football= 21(24.1%) hockey = 22(44), third group 11-15-year, football = 46(52.9) hockey 10(20%), fourth group 16 year & above and football 9(10.3%) hockey 9(18%).

Table 4.3 Results of t-test of football and hockey referees regarding of sub-dimensions of REFS and GSE.

Variable	Game	N	Mean	SD	t	df	P-value
Physical Fitness	Football	87	22.61	2.57	2.89	135	.005***
	Hockey	50	21.08	3.60			
Game Knowledge	Football	87	14.24	1.85	4.20	135	.000***
	Hockey	50	12.80	2.07			
Decision Making	Football	87	14.36	1.49	5.04	135	.000***
	Hockey	50	12.90	1.84			
Pressure	Football	87	13.49	1.89	3.63	135	.000***
	Hockey	50	11.96	3.05			
Communication	Football	87	18.77	2.11	3.78	135	.000***
	Hockey	50	17.02	3.31			
Referee Self -Efficacy	Football	87	83.47	7.71	4.72	135	.000***
	Hockey	50	75.76	11.36			
General Self Efficacy	Football	87	35.33	3.68	1.26	135	.210
	Hockey	50	34.48	4.05			

Accordingly, to physical fitness variable results indicated that football referees had significantly greater mean score 22.61 ± 2.57 as compared with hockey referees 21.08 ± 3.60 with significant value < 0.01 . The results also indicate that football referees had high level of physical fitness average as compared with hockey respectively.

Similarly, to game knowledge variable results indicated that football referees had significantly greater mean score than hockey whose value is 14.24 ± 1.85 and 12.80 ± 2.07 . The results also indicate that football referees had high level of game knowledge as compared with hockey.

Moreover, to decision making variable results indicated that football referees had significantly greater mean score than hockey referees (i.e., Football vs. Hockey 14.36 ± 1.49 vs. 12.90 ± 1.84 , p-value < 0.01). Similarly, football referees had high level of decision making power than hockey referees. Furthermore, the pressure variable value indicates that football referees had significantly more mean score than hockey. The results depicted that hockey referees had low level of pressure handling than football referees. However, the communication variable resulted that football referees had significantly better mean score than hockey referees which indicated that football referees had high level of communication than hockey.

As the referee self-efficacy variable value indicated that football referees had significantly better average score than hockey referees (i.e., Football vs. Hockey 83.47 ± 7.71 vs. 75.76 ± 11.36 , p-value < 0.01) and had better results as compared both values. Additionally, general self-efficacy variable value indicated that football referees had not significantly better mean score than hockey referees; on the other hand it was almost similar.

Table 4.4 Pearson Coefficient of correlation of sub dimensions of REFS and GSE

n=137	Physical fitness	Game knowledge	Decision-making	Pressure	Communication	REFS	GSE
Physical fitness	-	.567**	.595**	-.320**	-.820**	.940**	.257**
Game knowledge		-	.673**	.308**	-.179*	.482**	.476**
Decision-making			-	.163	-.306**	.570**	.339**
Pressure				-	.695**	-.445**	.236**
Communication					-	-.925**	-.018
REFS						-	.190*
GSE							-

**Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlation coefficients relationship among football and hockey referees, sub dimension of referee self-efficacy physical fitness, game knowledge, decision making, pressure, communication and general self-efficacy were shown in Table 4.4. The correlation coefficients between all variables were significant except decision making pressure, communication and GSE. whereas there was a relationship between and within sub dimensions of REFS. The highest positive correlation found between total score of referee self-efficacy and physical fitness ($r = .94$, $p < .01$), while lowest relationship between pressure and decision making ($r = .16$, $p < .01$).

Discussion:

As sub-dimension of referee's self-efficacy, physical fitness, game knowledge, decision making, communication and total referee's self-efficacy score results indicated that football referees had significantly better mean score than hockey referees (p -value < 0.01). The results of current study were supported by different research studies¹⁶. It also indicated that football and hockey referees had analogous level of general self-efficacy and hockey referees which had a little pressure than football referees during match. It might be possible that there could be a lot of reason behind these indications; the main thing is that the game of football had a lot of opportunities as Pakistan Football Federation (PFF), but Pakistan Hockey Federation had not given proper opportunities, refresher courses and training. The game of football is playing in every ground of Pakistan. But this is not possible with hockey because deficiency of grounds and essential equipments.

The correlation coefficients between all variables are significant except decision making and pressure, communication and GSE. Whereas there was a relationship between and within sub dimensions of REFS, the highest positive correlation found between total score of referee self-efficacy and physical fitness, while lowest relationship between pressure and decision making; all the results are highly supported with the previous study^{16,18}.

Conclusions:

The result concluded that the average value of football referees is greater than the hockey referees. Furthermore, at two components hockey referees are better than football referees in terms of performance (pressure and decision making). Although, all the components have equal importance but pressure handling and decision making are ahead of that between these two officiating community.

References:

1. AYPAY A. The Adaptation Study of General Self-Efficacy (GSE) Scale to Turkish. Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education (INUJFE). 2010 Aug 1;*11*(2):113-132.
2. Bandura A. Theoretical perspectives. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. 1997:1-35.
3. Boyko RH, Boyko AR, Boyko MG. Referee bias contributes to home advantage in English Premiership football. Journal of sports sciences. 2007 Sep 1;*25*(11):1185-94.
4. Catteuw P, Helsen W, Gilis B, Wagemans J. Decision-making skills, role specificity, and deliberate practice in association football refereeing. Journal of Sports Sciences. 2009 Sep 1;*27*(11):1125-36.
5. Cuskelly G, Hoye R. Sports officials' intention to continue. Sport Management Review. 2013 Nov 1;*16*(4):451-64.
6. Hoye RS, Cuskelly G, Evans G. Problems and issues in the recruitment and retention of sports officials.
7. Karaçam A, Pular A. Examining the Relationship between Referee Self-efficacy and General Self-efficacy Levels of Basketball Referees in Terms of Certain Variables. Journal of Education and Training Studies. 2017 Jul 3;*5*(8):37-45.
8. Kim MC, Hong E. A red card for women: Female officials ostracized in South Korean football. Asian Journal of Women's Studies. 2016 Apr 2;*22*(2):114-30.
9. MacMahon C, Helsen WF, Starkes JL, Weston M. Decision-making skills and deliberate practice in elite association football referees. Journal of sports sciences. 2007 Jan 1;*25*(1):65-78.
10. McInman AD. Where are all the sport psychology umpire studies. In 32nd Annual Conference of the Australian Psychological Society, Cairns, Australia 1997 Oct.
11. Myers ND, Feltz DL, Guillen F, Dithurbide L. Development of, and initial validity evidence for, the Referee Self-Efficacy Scale: A multistudy report. Journal of sport and Exercise Psychology. 2012 Dec;*34*(6):737-65.
12. Omair A. Sample size estimation and sampling techniques for selecting a representative sample. Journal of Health Specialties. 2014 Oct 1;*2*(4):142.
13. Plessner H, Betsch T. Sequential effects in important referee decisions: The case of penalties in soccer. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology. 2001 Sep;*23*(3):254-9.
14. Ridinger LL, Kim KR, Warner S, Tingle JK. Development of the referee retention scale. Journal of Sport Management. 2017 Sep 1;*31*(5):514-27.
15. Spencer BD. Self-efficacy and Performance in Volleyball Referees. Michigan State University. Kinesiology; 2015.
16. Stevens T. Abusive fans make it tougher to recruit high school sports refs. The News Observer. 2016.
17. Topp B. Sports officials becoming endangered species. The National Association of Sports Officials. 2001.
18. Yildirim F, Ilhan İÖ. The validity and reliability of the general self-efficacy scale-Turkish form. Turk Psikiyatri Dergisi. 2010 Dec 1;*21*(4):1-7.