View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Texas A&M Repository

WORK QUALITY IN THE AVOCATION OF SPORTS OFFICIATING AS DETERMINED BY SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SPORTS OFFICIALS

A Record of Study

by

MICHAEL ANTHONY THORNTON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2007

Major Subject: Physical Education

WORK QUALITY IN THE AVOCATION OF SPORTS OFFICIATING AS DETERMINED BY SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SPORTS OFFICIALS

A Record of Study

by

MICHAEL ANTHONY THORNTON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved by:

Chair of Committee, Michael Sagas
Committee Members, Paul Batista
Greg Bennett
Steve Stark
Head of Department, Robert Armstrong

May 2007

Major Subject: Physical Education

ABSTRACT

Work Quality in the Avocation of Sports Officiating as Determined by Selected Members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials. (May 2007)

Michael Anthony Thornton, B.A., Northwestern State University;

M.Ed., Northwestern State University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Michael Sagas

The major purpose of this study was to examine work quality in the avocation of sports officiating, as determined by selected Texas High School Sports Officials. Specifically, the study investigated work quality indicators and the relationship between those indicators and the officials overall perception of the avocation of Texas High School sports officiating.

To accomplish this purpose, two different survey methods were used. A convenience sample of 125 sports officials participated in a qualitative questionnaire. Usable data was obtained from 114 officials. Utilizing both the qualitative research and information gathered from relevant literature, a web-based survey was constructed and used to contact selected members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials. A total of 1075 responses were received.

The web-based instrument integrated items related to basic demographic information, as outlined by Quinn and Staines, (1979). These items included, but were not limited to the following: gender, age, economic information, marital status, educational background, ethnic background and primary occupation.

The instrument also investigated the following indicators of work quality: Vocational and avocational information, work environment, personal health and well-being, organizational and administrative support, and organizational commitment and officiating career outcomes. These indicators were further explored through the development of work quality constructs, which related to each indicator. The constructs were further studied as to their relationship with certain demographic information.

The results of this study indicate that although there are significant work quality issues as they relate to sports officiating, the majority of the constructs studied showed little negative impact on the sports officials' perception of the work quality of the officiating avocation.

DEDICATION

This Record of Study is dedicated to my greatest accomplishments: my wife Kim, and my children, Hailey, Allison, and Ryan. Kim- Thank you for your love, support, dedication to the family, your prayers and for your patience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Michael Sagas, for his guidance and “prodding” of my completion of this document. Thanks for your support and for pushing me back into the academic fray.

Thanks also to my committee members, Dr. Paul Batista, Dr. Greg Bennett, and Dr. Steve Stark, for their support, guidance and counsel.

Thanks also to the many people, too numerous to name, who have supported me throughout this extensive process. In particular, Dr’s. Leonard and Linda Ponder, Mrs. Joan Read and the Deerfoot Youth Camp staff, the James Carter Bible Study Group, the PEAP faculty, Dr. Walt Stenning and my officiating cohorts have my utmost gratitude.

Thanks to the TASO Board and its membership for their participation in this study. The service they provide is done primarily out of a love for the “game”.

An extremely large Thank You and I Love You goes out to my family- Dad, Mom, Ray, Cindy, Alicia. Thanks for your unwavering support and dedication to what I’ve been trying to accomplish for some time. Dad and Mom, you are my heroes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each year in the state of Texas, the University Interscholastic League (UIL), will sanction tens of thousands of athletic contests. For these athletic contests to be sanctioned by the UIL, each athletic contest must be officiated with officials who are registered members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials (TASO). According to the UIL's Constitution and Contest Rules (2004-2006, sec. 1204 b), "… participant schools shall use officials registered with the Texas Association of Sports Officials or the UIL in all varsity contests."

According to an Officials Shortage Survey conducted by the National Association of Sports Officials (NASO), 90% of state associations (54 of 60) indicated a shortage of officials (Is there an officials shortage?, 2001). Reasons for officials not re-registering were also addressed by the respondents. Poor sportsmanship by spectators had the highest response, while poor sportsmanship by participants (players and coaches) had the second highest response, followed by career demands, family demands and difficulty in advancing ("Not enough refs," 2001). A similar survey by the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) reported that officiating turnover was attributed to career/job demands, poor sportsmanship, time away from family/friends, and low game fees ("Officials cite," 2003).

This record of study follows the style and format of the *Journal of Sport Management*.

Additionally, anecdotal evidence from personal interviews conducted with local basketball and volleyball assignment secretaries in the state of Texas, has indicated that some 15-20 varsity and sub-varsity volleyball matches, as well as some 25-30 varsity and sub-varsity basketball games were un-officiated or under-officiated (games officiated with fewer than the requested/required) officials in the 2004-2005 seasons (D. Williams, personal communication, February 18, 2005, S. Lankford, personal communication, August 12, 2005).

There have also been studies which have investigated an official's turnover intention relative to sports officiating. These studies typically addressed an area of concern associated with work quality and not work quality as a whole. One area of concern with officiating retention, deals with the growing number of abusive actions being taken against sports officials. Barry Mano, President of NASO stated, "There appears to be a growing trend toward players, coaches and fans assaulting sports officials. That problem needs to be stopped before it gets out of control (assuming that it is not already too late)". (National Association of Sports Officials, 2002, p. 2)

Rainey & Duggan (1998), conducted a statewide survey of 1500 basketball referees in the state of Ohio, and 13.6 percent of the respondents "reported that they had been assaulted at least once while officiating" (p. 113). Rainey also reported that the most common assailants were players (41%), followed by spectators (35%) and coaches (19%)" (p. 113).

Seidler, Scott & Hughes conducted a survey with 1125 certified Mississippi high school officials in the sports of football and basketball, asking officials to rate the

seriousness of misconduct based on personal officiating experiences (2004). The results of the study indicated that verbal misconduct by coaches and spectators in the sports of football and basketball in the state of Mississippi, are perceived to be a problem by high school sports officials. The primary concern is that 18% of the responding officials indicated they have considered terminating their services, and 46% indicated that they would likely quit if misconduct worsens. Even though Seidler et al., found no significant relationship between official's ratings of misconduct and their reported likelihood to quit officiating, they do suggest that there may be other factors (e.g. age, compensation, time, travel, health, etc.) which contributes to an official's turnover intent, and should be investigated further.

The study of the quality of employment in the United States has been ongoing for a number of decades and has taken on both a social and financial indicator approach (e.g., salaries, unemployment rates), and a working environment approach (e.g., job satisfaction, job security, work-life balance, discrimination) (Quinn & Staines, 1979; Wallace, 1996).

Understanding the quality of one's employment through a working environment approach is critical for understanding the frequency and severity of problems related to work, (Quinn & Staines, 1979). Evaluating and understanding the quality of an employee's work environment has become an extensive and major research undertaking, with vast amounts of research detailing the value and benefits of healthy work environments for employees and their organizations. In a recent article, author and noted quality of work researcher, Graham Lowe states that

> We know healthy jobs and workplaces contribute to an individual's physical, mental, spiritual and social well-being. We also know that a healthy workplace can result in higher job satisfaction, lower absenteeism and turnover, improved job performance, lower accident rates, and reduced health benefit and workers' compensations costs (Lowe, 2004, p. 1).

It is for these reasons that organizations are beginning to place more value on testing and understanding the quality of work they provide to their employees. The benefits of high work quality can be measured in the financial costs to the organizations. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) defines a healthy organization as "one whose culture, climate and practices create an environment that promotes employee health and safety as well as organizational effectiveness."(Lowe, 2004, p. 1). The Employment Policy Foundation (2002, p. 1), states that "Human resource managers know that turnover is a major cost and significantly impacts the corporate bottom line."

Statement of the Problem

Current data, both empirical and anecdotal, suggest that there is a state-wide and national problem associated with the lack of high school officials. While there has been some research on the status of employment and issues of concern among high school officials [NASO Special Report, (2001); see also NASO, Issues Facing Officials Today, (2005); NFHS, (2001); Seidler, Scott, & Hughes (2005); several studies, Rainey, (1995), (1999)], little rigorous research has specifically examined quality of work indicators, and the impact of work quality on the avocation of officiating.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was exploratory in nature. This study investigated work quality in the avocation of Texas High School Sports Officiating. It was proposed that through the identification and subsequent study of work quality indicators, methods of improving work quality for officials could be suggested. This study addressed the above mentioned lack of research connecting high school sports officiating with work quality issues. This study also sought to identify work quality indicators as defined by sports officials, and how those indicators impacted the quality of work experienced by Texas High School sports officials. In addition, the data was disaggregated based upon certain demographic variables, such as, gender, ethnicity, age, education and socio-economic status to determine what role, if any, these factor variables played in the quality of work perceptions of Texas High School sports officials.

Research Questions

In the attempt to identify work quality indicators and how they relate to the quality of work experience of Texas High School Officials, this study sought to answer the following research questions.

1. What are the work quality indicators related to sports officiating as identified by selected members of TASO?
2. What is the work quality experience of officiating as determined by selected members of TASO?
3. How do selected demographic variables impact the work quality experience of officials, as determined by selected members of TASO?

Delimitations

Delimitations as related to the scope of this study include the following factors:

1. Male and female officials of TASO sports were used.

2. Only the sports of volleyball and basketball were targeted.

3. The survey was conducted via the internet, so only those officials with access participated in the study.

Limitations

Limitations as related to the scope of the study include the following factors:

1. The officials used in this study did not represent any outdoor sports.

2. The subjects participated voluntarily.

3. The participants in this study did not represent officials from other associations other than the Texas Association of Sports Officials.

Assumptions

Assumptions as related to the scope of the study include the following:

1. The participants answered the questionnaire honestly and sincerely.

2. Officials to whom the questionnaire was sent had the knowledge to answer each question.

Operational Definitions

The following definitions and concepts are presented to aid the reader in developing a knowledge base, and for the purpose of this study.

Quality of work: The overall work experience, encompassing the individual's wants/needs and their perception of the work environment.

Texas Association of Sports Officials: (TASO) The non-profit organization which provides leadership for the different sports officials in the state of Texas.

University Interscholastic League: (UIL) The UIL is the largest inter-school organization of its kind. The UIL is a non-profit organization which exists to provide educational extracurricular contests, including athletics, in the state of Texas.

National Association of Sports Officials: (NASO) NASO is the world's largest organization for sports officials working at every level and all sports. NASO provides opportunities to grow professionally, share ideas, practice officiating skills and network with colleagues.

Supervisor: As pertaining to this document, the supervisor is an official's Chapter President and/or Assignment Secretary, who is responsible for an official's game schedule.

Work quality indicators: Those items which can be used to determine the work quality of an organization, whether that is positive or negative.

Job satisfaction: The overall perception of an official's sports officiating experience, as determined by current sports officials, which acts as a part of the work quality experience.

Avocation: A form of vocation that is not considered a primary source of income, and which is often undertaken as a "hobby" or for personal satisfaction.

Sportsmanship: Fair conduct; conduct considered fitting for a sportsperson, defined as players, spectators and coaches, including observance of the rules of fair play, respect for others, and graciousness in losing.

Organizational Commitment: Devotion or dedication, for example, to a cause, person or relationship, such as high school sports officiating.

Administrative Support: In this study, administrative support is defined in two constructs: (1) perceived support to the official by their administrator (2) the support for the administrator by the official.

Sports Official: For purposes of this study, a sports official is an individual who acts as a representative of TASO by performing the duty of officiating extra-curricular high school athletic events.

Significance of the Study

This study provided empirical research which will help quantify anecdotal observations related to the quality of work in the avocation of officiating Texas High School Sports. It also connects anecdotal observations and recent officiating research in the avocation of officiating with relevant work quality research. Through the identification of quality of work indicators as they relate to sports officials, state and local associations should be able to better understand the work quality issues associated with the avocation of officiating. This study identifies work quality indicators and at the same time, provides an illustration of an official's perception of their officiating work quality. It is through the identification of quality of work indicators and the subsequent analysis of an official's perception of work quality in the avocation of officiating, that this study provides to state and local officiating associations, possible quality of work interventions. The link between high quality of work and increased organizational outcomes is clearly established in the literature. Conversely, lower quality of work has

also been linked to potentially negative outcomes, such as high turnover intention, recruitment issues, low job satisfaction, and decreased general health and well being.

Contents of the Record of Study

The record of study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I introduces the scope of the study and the applied significance of the project. Chapter II identifies relevant literature pertaining to work quality research, sports officiating research and important quality of work related outcomes for the avocation of sports officiating. Theoretical frameworks explaining work quality and work quality indicators are also presented in this chapter. Chapter III details the research methodologies used to conduct the study. Chapter IV contains the results of the data analyses and Chapter V presents the conclusions and implications of the study, as well as potential future research endeavors.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Organization

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the literature and theoretical frameworks related to the objectives of the study. It is important to the understanding of this chapter and to the research study in general, that the researcher points out that only literature that was deemed relevant to establishing this current study were used. For instance, job satisfaction research in the arenas of business, public school teachers, administrator's, etc., were excluded from review by the researcher. Likewise, in the area of work stress, much literature was omitted from this study. The literature in job satisfaction and work stress is limited to how it is directly related to the current study.

This chapter contains many subsections, but the overall chapter organization is simple. First, an introduction into the literature of the work quality framework of job satisfaction, along with the examination of organizational commitment is provided. Second, issues related to general job satisfaction are presented. Third, literature detailing specific areas of job satisfaction research in sports officiating is discussed. Fourth, officiating stress and its relationship to work quality are discussed. Lastly, the researcher discusses some apparent gaps in the research literature as it specifically relates to this arena of research involving sports officials and work quality issues.

Introduction to Literature

Dormann and Zapf (2001), assert that job satisfaction is a concept that has become one of the best-researched areas in the arenas of work and organizational psychology, and for two primary reasons: One, job satisfaction's relevance to the subjective evaluation of working conditions (i.e., responsibility, task variety, or communication requirements), and two, the concern with job satisfaction and such outcome variables as absenteeism, fluctuation, organizational inefficiency, or sabotage. The integration of these two perspectives places job satisfaction as a central concept in mediating the relationship between working conditions and the organizational/individual outcomes of work (2001).

One counterargument to working conditions as a major cause of job satisfaction is the role of personality variables. Staw and colleagues (Staw et al., 1986; Staw and Ross, 1985) suggest that underlying dispositions, which might be genetically determined, could create a reflection of job satisfaction, which would challenge the use of job satisfaction for the assessment of work and organization. Despite the plausibility of underlying dispositions and their impact on job satisfaction, much intensive discussion regarding the significance of personality dispositions in the development of job satisfaction has developed (e.g., Arvey et al., 1989, 1993; Judge and Hulin, 1993; Keller et al., 1992, Watson and Slack, 1993). The central issue raised through the discussions is concerned with the extent to which an individual's job satisfaction can be changed or mediated through the use of organizational measures (2001).

Several studies have been conducted which attempt to explain the relationship of job satisfaction with personality traits (e.g., Brief et al., 1988; Brief and Roberson, 1989; Munz et al., 1996, Spector et al., 1999). These studies suggest that personality traits affect which job a person gets and, by this, affect the working conditions, which in turn affect job satisfaction (2001). Even if job satisfaction is a reaction to workplace working conditions, individuals with certain dispositions who are exposed to poor/bad working conditions, could experience an improvement of working conditions independent of dispositions, thus leading to higher levels of job satisfaction.

Dormann and Zapf (2001) suggest that research on the role of personality traits and its relationship to job satisfaction can be distinguished on their use of a direct or indirect approach. The direct approach tries to explicitly identify certain dispositions as determinants of job satisfaction, whereas indirect approaches demonstrate that some satisfaction or dissatisfaction related to an unspecified disposition is likely to exist. A meta-analysis by Dormann and Zapf (2001), suggest that indirect approaches explain about 30 per cent of variance in job satisfaction, while direct approaches explain 10 to 20 per cent of variance in most cases.

Work values and organizational commitment are other areas of research, which like job satisfaction, contribute to overall work quality. Meyer, Irving, and Allen (1998), investigated the influence of early work experiences on organizational commitment, and found that positive work experiences do not always have the strongest effect on commitment among those who value such experiences. Although there has been less research conducted that examines the link between personal characteristics, particularly

personal dispositions, and commitment, this does not necessarily imply that such characteristics do not play a role in the development of organizational commitment (1998). Mathieu and Zajac, 1990, argued that individual differences might serve to moderate the influence of situational variables on commitment. The key postulate in 'person-job fit' theories has been that personal and situational variables might combine to influence commitment (see Edwards (1991) for an historical review). Yet, only a few studies have examined how personal and situational variables might pertain to the development or maintenance of organizational commitment (e.g. Blau, 1987; Melino, Ravlin and Adkins, 1989; Vancouver and Schmitt, 1990; Edwards and Parry, 1993).

Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer and Allen (1991) identify three forms of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment deals with the employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization, continuance commitment involves recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organization, and normative commitment reflects employee's feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Meyer, Irving and Allen, 1998).

Studies conducted by Brooke, Russell and Price, 1998, as well as Mathieu and Farr, 1991, indicated that job satisfaction is distinguishable from, but related to, affective commitment. Therefore, findings from the field of job satisfaction research might have implications on the findings of organizational commitment.

Issues Related to Work Quality

The literature reflected here is a review of the major findings and theories in the general area of work quality, specifically job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is just one part of the overall work quality experience. An article by Lowe, states that "We know healthy jobs and workplaces contribute to an individual's physical, mental, spiritual, and social well-being. We also know that a healthy workplace can result in higher job satisfaction, lower absenteeism and turnover, improved job performance, lower accident rates, and reduced health benefits and worker's compensation costs." (Lowe, 2004, p. 1)

Healthy organizations are defined by scientists at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), as an organization "whose culture, climate and practices create an environment that promotes employee health and safety as well as organizational effectiveness," (Lowe, 2004, p. 1). In an effort to create 'healthy organizations', practitioners must move toward a process of organizational change instead of just the introduction of new programs, and develop a strategy that pays close attention to the change process (Lowe, 2004).

Lowe, (2004), identifies three key steps toward the development of healthy organizations. The first is a careful examination of the risk factors, i.e. indicators, or the underlying job characteristics which can enhance or impair the work environment. The second is to identify and target desired outcomes, and the third is to identify actions which address the indicators and which aid in achieving the desired outcomes.

Social indicators have been broadly defined as "instruments for the regular observation and analysis of social change." (Noll, 1998). "They are generally normative

measures oriented towards societal goals, such as progress, modernization, well-being or quality of life, and are defined in such a way that an increase or decrease in a social indicator score can be taken as a step in the ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ direction. (Dataquest Consulting, 1999).

Indicators of one’s work environment were utilized by Quinn and Staines, (1979) in their report on the status of the national perception of the working environment. Some of the indicators they identified included health and safety, discrimination, supervision and participation, work and family, motivation and job content.

In a Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) - Ekos survey of 2500 Canadian workers titled “Changing Employment Relationships Survey 2000” (2000), fifteen different indicators of what Canadian workers consider very important in a job were investigated. Over 70% of respondents indicated that being treated with respect was very important in the job setting. Approximately 70% of respondents felt the job should be interesting, that good communication should exist among coworkers, that the job gives a feeling of accomplishment and that the job allows for a balance between work and family.

Just over 60% of the respondents described a good job as one that allows you to develop your skills and abilities, has friendly and helpful coworkers, where you are allowed the freedom to do your job, is a job that pays well, provides good job security and provides the training necessary to do the job effectively (2000).

Over 50% of the respondents believed that good work benefits, receiving recognition for work well done, and career advancement opportunities were important in

a job. Also, just over 30% of the workers felt that the ability to choose one's own schedule was important in a job.

The dimensions of job quality were further discussed in a CPRN study which investigated job quality in non-profit organizations. McMullen and Schellenberg (2003), state that "there is no single indicators of job quality since a wide range of factors go into making a 'good job'. McMullen and Schellenberg provide a list of eight dimensions that could be used to measure job quality, and also provide the key indicators that could be included in each of these dimensions (2003). Those dimensions include extrinsic rewards, such as earnings, benefits and job security; intrinsic rewards, such as interesting work, a sense of accomplishment and the use of creativity and initiative; employment relationships, including issues of respect, communication, trust and commitment and fairness; hours and scheduling, dealing with work hours, including overtime, flexibility and work-life balance; organizational structure, such as employee influence, participation in decision-making and information sharing; skill use and development, such as training and learning opportunities, opportunities for promotion and use of technology; job design, dealing with autonomy and control, feedback and resources; health and safety, dealing with physical work environment, the physical demands of the job and the psychological demands of the job (McMullen and Schellenberg, 2003).

JobQuality.ca (2006), another component of CPRN, also list several themes and indicators associated with job quality. Those themes are schedules, relationships, job demands, pay and benefits, training and skills, influence, rewards, security, job design, environment and special indicators (JobQuality.ca, 2006).

In a National Federation of High Schools, Official's Association, press release, Mary Struckhoff (2001) discusses reasons, ie, indicators, of why officials leave officiating. The indicators included poor sportsmanship by participants in the sport, poor sportsmanship by spectators, time away from family/friends, low game fees, and career/job demands (Struckhoff, 2001).

A National Association of Sports Officials' survey also discussed indicators specific to officiating. The indicators represented by the survey were issues/concerns with advancement, travel, costs, career demands, lack of training, low pay, medical reasons, issues with sportsmanship, issues with local assignor or association, retirement, family, and other (2001),

Lowe also identifies several job and workplace risk factors, or indicators, which can compromise or enhance the work environment.

> Job factors include physical working conditions, ergonomic aspects of a job, temporal aspects of the work day and tasks, actual work content, job autonomy, co-worker relations, quality of supervision, financial and economic aspects. Workplace factors refer to organizational structures, work climate and culture, communications, management practices, leadership, labor-management relations, existing workplace health promotion and occupational health and safety activities, (Lowe, 2004, p. 2).

In a paper presented to the European Commission's Mid-Term Review of the Social Policy Agenda: Achievements and Perspectives, Lowe discusses three trends permeating the European Workforce policies as a starting point for building the case for investing in the quality of work: responding to workforce ageing, the importance of life-long learning, and the improvement of worker health and well-being (Lowe, 2003). In effect, Lowe argues that workforce

policies are in part, being influenced by these three factors. The loss of qualified and experienced workers through the aging process, thus creating an influx of under-qualified and less experienced younger workers has an impact of the effectiveness of the organization. The definitive link between work quality and learning, as it is the work environment that either inhibits or enables learning activities. Work quality is also linked to health and safety, as the costs for the organization related to unhealthy and/or unsafe work environments, are rising.

Quality of work should be the policy ‘umbrella’ under which trends of workforce ageing, life-long learning and health and well-being can be understood and acted upon (Lowe, 2003). Lowe then identifies those characteristics or indicators, which could be used to identify an employee’s self-reported quality of work. Indicators which would include, intrinsic job quality, skill and career development, learning opportunities, health and safety, flexible work designs, job security, work-life balance, worker involvement, gender equity and discrimination, contributions to innovation and performance, and employee trust, commitment and communication (Lowe, 2003).

JobQuality.ca is a job quality information site that is maintained by the Work Network of Canadian Policy Research Networks. JobQuality.ca lists several themes they recognize as important to job (work) quality, and additionally they provide job quality indicators which correspond with those themes. Themes are categorized as follows: schedules, relationships, job

demands, pay and benefits, training and skills, influence, rewards, security, job design, environment, and a theme of special indicators (2006).

The Families and Work Institute (FWI) is a nonprofit center, who since it's founding in 1989, has researched issues in four major areas: the workforce and workplace; education, care and community; parenting; and youth development. The 2002 FWI's research project, When Work Works, discusses issues related to creating an effective workplace (Bond, Galinsky, Hill, 2002). Work related aspects (indicators) of workplace effectiveness, include job autonomy, learning opportunities and challenges on the job, supervisor support for job success, coworker team support for job success and involvement in decision-making (Bond, Galinsky, Hill, 2002). Bond, Galinsky, and Hill (2002) also look at four outcomes of importance to employers, as they relate to developing effective workplaces. The four outcomes are job engagement and commitment, job satisfaction, employee retention and employee mental health (2002).

> Our expectation was that employees who work in what we hypothesize are "more effective workplaces"—where responsibility is shared between managers and workers, where workers are supported in developing and exercising their skills, and where workers have greater flexibility to manage their work, personal, and family lives—will be more committed and engaged in their jobs, experience greater job satisfaction, be more likely to remain with their current employers, and exhibit better mental health. (Bond, Galinsky, and Hill, 2002, pg. 6).

Lowe, Schellenberg, and Shannon (2003) investigated the importance of the employees' perceptions of the work environment. A prominent theme in

literature related to workplace research, is “that workers’ perceptions of the quality of their work environment are critical for outcomes ranging from job satisfaction, commitment, and absenteeism to performance (Lowe, Schellenberg, and Shannon, 2003)”. The results of the study indicated that the strongest correlate of a healthy work environment was a scale of good communication and social support. The study also indicated that employees in a self-rated healthier work environment had higher job satisfaction, commitment and morale, and lower absenteeism and intent to quit.

> This study suggests that health promotion practitioners should not only pay attention to helping workers with lifestyle choices. They also should focus on employment conditions and the way work is organized, as both sets of factors are key correlates of the extent to which workers perceive their work environment to be healthy. Management can be told that perceptions of the healthiness of the workplace are strongly related to measures reflecting organizationally performance (Lowe, Schellenberg, and Shannon, 2003).

The importance of effective workplaces, for increasing the job quality of an organization and for enhancing work quality, is also apparent in the potential costs to the organization. The Employment Policy Foundations, 2002 hrBenchmarks publication, provides critical information relating to the costs associated with employee turnover. Employee turnover is a critical cost driver for American business (Potter, 2002, pg. 2). Costs include recruiting new employees, filling vacancies, lost productivity, operating costs associated with training new employees, the reduction of output and profits (2002). The three primary elements of turnover cost include staffing, vacancy and training. Staffing costs

include the costs include recruiting, screening of applicants, personnel service search fees, relocation expenses and signing bonuses. Vacancy cost the organization productivity, through the loss of the employee and the now issue of a short handed organization. Training costs include the necessary tools and resources necessary to equip the new employee to promote efficiency and facilitate the transition to the new job (2002).

Work Quality Issues in Officiating

Stress in Officiating

The U.S. Department of Labor published an "Occupational Outlook Handbook" in which they discussed the profession/avocation of sports officiating.

> Umpires, referees, and other sports officials officiate at competitive athletic and sporting events. They observe the play, detect infractions of rules, and impose penalties established by the sport's rules and regulations. Umpires, referees, and sports officials anticipate play and position themselves to best see the action, assess the situation, and determine any violations. Some sports officials, such as boxing referees, may work independently, while others such as umpires-the sports officials of baseball-work in groups. Regardless of the sport, the job is highly stressful because officials are often required to make a decision in a matter of a split second, sometimes resulting in strong disagreement among competitors, coaches, or spectators (US Dept. of Labor, 2004).

The literature related to research on sports officiating tends to present research based on particular areas, or indicators, of officiating work quality, and not the overall work quality environment. Rainey (1995) investigated sources of stress, burnout, and intention to terminate among baseball/softball umpires. 782 of 1500 umpires (52%) responded to the questionnaire. Contrary to previous

results based on soccer officials, age and role/culture conflict were not predictors of burnout or termination, but time pressure did predict burnout (Rainey, 1995, pg. 312). Rainey suggests the possibility of common sources of stress existing among sports officials of different sports.

> Fear of failure (worries about performing poorly) and interpersonal conflict (confrontations with players, fans, etc.) may be sources of stress for officials of many different sports. At the same time, it is clear that some sources of stress affect officials in some sports but not in others, and it is very likely that other important sources of stress have not yet been identified. (Rainey, 1995, pg. 318)

Rainey suggests a direction for future research which examines the relationship between burnout and officials termination, as to provide practical implications for those managing official's organizations (1995).

Rainey (1999) investigated sources of stress, burnout, and intention to terminate among high school basketball referees, using a revised version of the Ontario Soccer Officials' Survey (OSOS). 721 respondents (664 male, 57 female) provided the data for the research. Five factors related to the sports officials' sources of stress were identified; performance concerns, fear of physical harm, interpersonal conflict, time pressure, and lack of recognition

Performance concerns, interpersonal conflict, time pressure, and lack of recognition were all rated as only "mild" sources of stress, and fear of physical harm was essentially identified as a factor that "did not" contribute to the referees' stress (Rainey, 1999). Rainey also states "that the identified sources of stress and/or burnout may be related to unfortunate consequences other than

termination. For example, it seems plausible that these variables may be related to satisfaction, somatic symptoms, and even performance."(1999, pg. 588-589).

Kaissidis-Rodafinos (1994), investigated the sources of stress in sport and the ways in which psychological dispositions and situational appraisals influence the cognitive and behavioral responses of basketball referees and players to acute stress, which is (short term) stress occurring in response to a person's sudden exposure to stimuli or events that are perceived as unpleasant or challenging.

The study was conducted in three parts: First, the experiment assessed the sources of stress experienced by officials during a game. Secondly, the experiment examined the approach and avoidance coping responses of basketball referees during in-game, acute stress situations. Lastly, the experiment developed a situation-specific Coping Style Inventory (CSI) for acute stressors. (1994).

In a similar study, Anshel and Weinberg (1996) investigated the coping strategies of basketball referees, in an attempt to determine the manner in which the officials used problem-focused (behavioral) and emotion-focused (cognitive) techniques to respond to stress. 137 basketball referees from the United States (n=75) and Australia (n=62) responded to a self-report survey, the Basketball Officials Sources of Stress Inventory (BOSSI). The samples were compared using deductive content analysis to determine their behavioral and emotional coping responses to 15 acute stressors. According to Anshel and Weinberg (1996), "Examples of acute stressors for officials, common in the anecdotal literature include making a 'wrong' call, verbal abuse and threats of physical

abuse from coaches, players and spectators, pain from an injury, criticism in the media, and evaluation by a supervisor, among others" (p. 181).The ability to effectively cope with stressors is critical to effective officiating, but also serves as a buffer to officiating burnout.

The results of the study indicated that many of the coping strategies leaned more toward behavioral-focused than emotionally-focused categories, and appeared to be a combination of both personal and situational factors. Anshel and Weinberg (1996), also suggest that, given the extent to which sports officials are exposed to acute stressors, it is essential for researchers to study the coping processes of sports officials and the effectiveness of such strategies in managing stress. Such research has the potential of enhancing the performance of the sports official and reducing the sports officials' turnover intention.

In an extension of their previous study, Anshel and Weinberg (1999) re-examine the issue of officiating stressors. 137 basketball referees from the United States (n=75) and Australia (n=62) responded to a self-report survey, the Basketball Officials Sources of Stress Inventory (BOSSI). The samples were compared using deductive content analysis to determine their behavioral and emotional coping responses to 14 acute stressors. The study further investigated, not only coping strategies, but looked more closely at coping styles. While coping strategies involve immediate reactions to stressors, coping style deals with the consistency, or preferred manner in which an individual deals with stressful events.

Coping styles are useful predictors of future coping behavior, which provides the opportunity to provide the individual with stress management techniques that take into account their preferred, consistent, coping repertoire (Anshel and Weinberg, 1999). “If coping style can be accurately identified, then sport psychology consultants can teach the referee (or coach, or athlete) more effective coping strategies that are compatible with the individual’s disposition and situational demands.” (p. 156).

Sundell, (1999) investigated the relationship of job congruence (agreement between personality type and occupational environment), job satisfaction, and social support on the mental and physical health of officials. 125 high school officials in the state of Iowa acted as participants. The participants responded to five different questionnaires: the Vocational Preference Inventory, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Social Support Questionnaire, the Ontario Soccer Officials’ Survey, and the Symptom Checklist 90-R. The results of the study indicated that officiating should lead to high levels of mental and physiological stress, where job congruence, job satisfaction, and the quality of social support should lead to lower levels of mental and physiological stress. (1999). The suggestions developed with this study promote the importance of job congruence, job satisfaction, and social support as potential coping mechanisms for officiating stress, thus reducing the health risks which are associated with high stress levels.

Burke, Joyner, Pim, & Czech (2000) investigated basketball officials perceptions of anxiety experienced before, during and after a contest. Twenty-five male high school and college officials were given a modified version of the Competitive State Anxiety -2. The questionnaires were completed within thirty minutes of the start, during half-time, and within fifteen minutes after the completion of the game.

Burke, et al. (2000) hypothesized that officials would experience more stress and anxiety before and after the game, than during the competition itself.

> Before the game officials may be anxious about their impending performance, while after the game they may be anxious about the calls they should have made or were less certain of. Unlike before or after a game when officials can choose to think about a game for significant amounts of time, at half time there is less time (just ten to fifteen minutes) to focus on possible mistakes because attention will need to be redirected to officiating the remainder of the game. (Burke, et al., 2000, pgs. 13-14).

The results of the study indicated officials feeling significantly less cognitive anxiety after a contest in comparison to before the contest and, after the game in comparison to halftime (Burke, et al. 2000). Another conclusion was officials remained relatively confident and experienced low levels of physiological anxiety during an entire contest (2000).It's possible to gather from this data the assumption that officiating only causes low levels of anxiety, or that based on the experience of the officials, effective coping strategies have been developed, which lead to lower levels of anxiety and stress.

Gender and Stress in Officiating

There are some studies which look at the issue of females in officiating and their coping strategies for anxiety or stress, as well as some literature which compares female officials' coping strategies with male officials' coping strategies. Casey (1992) discussed female officials and the affect of Title IX on female officials, particularly at the collegiate level. Prior to Title IX, most athletic contests between women, regardless of sport, were officiated by women. The Division of Girls and Women in Sport (DGWS) provided local DGWS groups the training, certification, and organization to serve local high schools, colleges, and universities. Since Title IX there have been some changes related to women officials. One of the positive changes would be monetary compensation increases, which have began to come into closer proximity to the compensation for officiating men's athletic competitions.

However, since the inception of Title IX, female officiating tends to follow the trend of female athletic administrators. The merging of the athletic programs left more than half the coaching jobs and 85% of the administrative posts to men (Casey, 1992). This trend is also reflected in the officiating assignments for women's regional and national tournaments, which are officeated predominately by male officials.

Casey (1992) offers three suggestions to help increase the number of women officials.

1. Launch a concerted effort by national and regional sport organizations to address this issue.

2. Establish a mentorship program to serve as a model for recruiting and retaining women officials.

3. Provide documented information and research into the reasons why women choose not to officiate or choose to leave, and why some women choose to stay in officiating.

Toco (1996), investigated the relationship between gender, personality type and occupational choice for adults in the avocation of basketball officiating. 137 participants completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and a questionnaire of personal and professional demographics. The sample of officials included 49 female officials and 87 male officials, with an average age of 42 years. Significant differences in gender were found for age, where female officials in the sample tended to be younger than their male counterparts, for annual income, where males earned more in annual income than females, and in number of games officiated per year, where males officiated more games than did female officials.

Female officials showed a much greater propensity to be employed in occupations which could be classified as social-realistic-enterprising (SRE) occupations. Females also tended to be evenly oriented between thinking preference types and feeling preference types.

Brennan (2001), investigated the coping methods of male and female Division I basketball officials, while under stressful game conditions. Two hundred and twelve officials (male = 167: female = 45) participated in the study which was conducted in two phases. In phase 1 of the study, officials completed the Coping Behaviors Survey- Form R. The coping methods examined in this study were emotional support, venting, humor, relaxation, religion/spiritual beliefs, positive self-talk, goal setting, concentration, substance abuse and visualization/imagery.

The results of Phase I indicated that although males and females utilized many of the same coping methods, i.e. positive self-talk, goal setting, visualization, humor, emotional support, and religion/spiritual beliefs, females reported using the techniques more often. This could be interpreted to indicate that females are less able to handle the stress of officiating. Brennan refutes this notion, stating "This finding was enlightening because it seemed to indicate more of a willingness on the part of female referees to utilize coping techniques as often as deemed necessary to carry them through pressure game situations" (2001, pgs. 173-174).

In Phase II of the study, a qualitative analysis was conducted to add depth and scope to the initial findings. This analysis indicated that males experienced twice as many stress symptoms as females, one by-product being males taking longer to fall asleep after a stressful game than females. The analysis identified

positive self-talk as the most utilized and recommended stress coping technique (Brennan, 2001).

The effects of gender and rating level on trait anxiety and socialization into sport among collegiate volleyball officials was the focus of a study conducted by Stratton, 2002. Three hundred and twenty seven participants completed the on-line questionnaire, which consisted of the Stratton Volleyball Officials Inventory (SVOI) and a modified version of the Sport Competition Anxiety Test for Adults (SCAT-A). The results indicated a significant effect for gender with competitive trait anxiety scores, as female trait anxiety scores were significantly higher than male scores.

Sportsmanship Issues in Officiating

One area of concern with officiating retention, deals with sportsmanship and the growing number of abusive actions being taken against sports officials. Rainey & Duggan (1998) conducted a statewide survey of 1500 basketball referees in the state of Ohio. Out of the 721 respondents (664 men and 57 women), 13.6 percent “reported that they had been assaulted at least once while officiating” (p. 113). Rainey also reported that the most common assailants were players (41%), followed by spectators (35%) and coaches (19%)” (1998). 52% of the assaults occurred at the high school level, with the rest occurring at various other levels of competition, ranging from youth leagues to collegiate level competitions. “While many of the assaults were relatively minor incidents, such as pushing (43%) or spitting (2%), others took more serious forms, such as

hitting or punching (28%), throwing objects—most commonly the ball or chairs—(19%), or choking (4%) (1998, p. 117). Interestingly, although the relationship between seriousness of the assault and seriousness of the consequence was statistically significant, the relationship was substantively small, indicating that assaults on referees were lightly punished, or not at all (1998).

Barry Mano, President of NASO stated, "There appears to be a growing trend toward players, coaches and fans assaulting sports officials. That problem needs to be stopped before it gets out of control (assuming that it is not already too late)". (National Association of Sports Officials, 2002, p. 36) Mano re-addresses this concern when he states

> Today the health of our games is being attacked by the cancer of bad behavior, much of it occurring in full view of our young people who participate in organized sports. We must do something to send a clear signal that such behavior will not be tolerated and we need to do so for two reasons. First, the men, women, boys and girls who give their time and energy to officiate not only deserve our collective respect, they must have complete confidence that they will be able to carry out their responsibilities in a safe environment. Without this confidence we will lose the best and brightest in our field. Second, as a society we need to act on our belief that respect for authority, whether you agree with it or not is critical to living, working and playing together. Sports needs to be a beacon, highlighting positive accomplishments and the need for strong sanctions against those who engage in bad behavior at sporting events. (Mano, 2005, p. 1).

The NFHS's Mary Struckhoff (2001) also discusses the issue of sportsmanship and its effect on officiating turnover. Poor sportsmanhip by participants and poor sportsmanship by spectators were listed as the second and third reasons that officials left officiating, behind only career demands. "I think

most people expected poor sportsmanship to be the top reason why people were leaving the officiating ranks, … so our focus needs to be on sportsmanship issues…"(Struckhoff, 2001, pg. 1).

Seidler, Scott & Hughes conducted a survey with 1125 certified Mississippi high school officials in the sports of football and basketball, asking officials to rate the seriousness of misconduct based on personal officiating experiences (2004). The results of the study indicated that verbal misconduct by coaches and spectators in the sports of football and basketball in the state of Mississippi, are perceived to be a problem by high school sports officials. The primary concern is that 18% of the responding officials indicated they have considered terminating their services, and 46% indicated that they would likely quit if misconduct worsens. Also of concern was the number of officials who claimed to have experienced verbal and/or physical misconduct after or away from the actual competition site, suggesting on-field officiating decisions might lead to confrontations, harassment and/or physical violence in their private lives.

Even though Seidler et al., found no significant relationship between official's ratings of misconduct and their reported likelihood to quit officiating, they do suggest that there may be other factors (e.g. age, compensation, time, travel, health, etc.) which contributes to an official's turnover intent, and should be investigated further.

A similar study in New Mexico had similar findings. Hughes (2001) investigated New Mexico high school sports officials' perceptions of sportsmanship in the competitive sport environment. 462 officials participated in the self-reported survey, which investigated four areas of officials' perceptions: misconduct, legal aspects,

modeling, and leadership. The area of misconduct was the area of most concern for the majority of officials, particularly for basketball officials. Spectator on official verbal and non-verbal misconduct was a major concern for all officials.

When asked the final question “Should your perception of the sport climate during athletic competition progressively worsen in the next few years, would you consider terminating your officiating services?” (Hughes, 2001, p. 97), 85.7 percent of the officials indicated they would seriously consider terminating their officiating services, should they perceive the environment worsening.

Gaps in the Literature

The issue of work quality as it relates to avocational work is limited. The literature and research which investigates the total quality of work for an official are also limited. Most of the literature and research focuses on particular areas of the field, i.e., stress, health and well being, safety, sportsmanship, but doesn’t conform to a total work quality approach. Little research exists on how various work quality constructs might interact with one another to impact an official’s perception of their avocational work quality.

Summary of the Literature

The literature clearly suggests that work quality is a vigorous area of research. The commitment to work quality research can lead to increased awareness of the work quality issues that might lead to turnover, absenteeism, lowered productivity and overall lack of job satisfaction. Yet, that same research might also point toward areas in the work place where work quality is high, thus

providing an environment which is conducive for higher productivity, increased job satisfaction and lowered intent to quit.

Literature in sports officiating tends to focus on two areas: recruitment/retention issues, and the personal health issue of work stress. Although these are two important areas of concern in officiating, the literature would suggest that other variables of work quality also play important roles in how officials might perceive their officiating work quality. Through the investigation of officiating work quality, areas of concern can be addressed, while sources of high work quality can be utilized as a recruitment method for new officials and retention method for current officials.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides an outline of procedures used to examine the perceived quality of work experience of Texas High School sports officials. The chapter is divided into three major sections, made up of Research Design, Study One and Study Two. Each of the major sections is then further detailed into segments consisting of the Sample, Procedure and Data Analysis for Study One and for Study Two. In addition, this chapter addresses Research Question One.

Research Design

The methodology of this study follows research outlined by quality of work scholar Graham Lowe (2000) (see also Data-Quest Consulting, 1999). This typology for work quality indicator selection involved two phases- a subjective approach and an outcomes-based approach. As a result of this methodology, two studies (Study One and Study Two) were used to obtain the relevant data. The population surveyed consisted of a sample of selected members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials. Study One was a qualitative study conducted as a pencil and paper instrument, conducted as a group-administered questionnaire. Study Two was a quantitative study conducted as a web-based survey design.

The subjective approach was used to gather the preferences, opinions, and values of workers in a particular industry (e.g. high school sports officiating), which were subsequently used to structure a comprehensive research agenda with the purpose of pursuing the outcomes-based approach (Study One). The outcomes-based approach

entailed the use of research literature on health and well-being, job satisfaction, career goals and outcomes, work-family balance and organizational support as the starting point for work quality. The outcomes-based approach also provided literature relevant to the field of sports officiating, including sport commitment, stress, sportsmanship issues, and the recruitment/retention of officials.

The final research method (Study Two) was a web-based survey (WS), described as Gunn (2002) as "an attempt having a profound influence on survey methodology" (p. 1). Given the large frame, a faster response, and easier process to send a questionnaire, the web-based survey was the most appropriate form for the study. Although some issues concerning web-based surveys have been discussed, the researcher recognizes these are some of the limitations associated with utilizing this form of research design.

Study One

Sample

The qualitative phase of data collection solicited responses from a convenience sample of 124 local TASO members. The questionnaire used for Study One is depicted in Appendix A. Nine of the surveys were returned with no or incomplete information. The final usable responses rate for this phase was 115 of 124 (89%) responses from local high school sports officials. Table 1 depicts the overall demographic breakdown of the sample, by gender, age, race, and experience. Males made up 90.43% (104 of 115) of the respondents, while females made up 9.57% (11 of 115). 92 of the respondents (80%) categorized their race as Caucasian, 18 (15.65%) represented themselves as African-American and 5 (4.35%) classified themselves as Hispanic. The average of the

officiating sample was 36.02 years (SD = 13.96), with a lowest reported age of 18 years and an oldest reported age of 74 years. The average level of experience was 7.98 years (SD = 8.65), with a lowest reported level of experience as 0 years, and a highest reported level of experience of 34 years.

Table 1 Demographic Data for Study One

Variables	Groups	Frequency	Percentages
Gender	Males	104	90.43
	Females	11	9.57
Race	White	92	80.00
	Black	18	15.65
	Hispanic	5	4.35
Age (years)	Mean	36.02	___
	Oldest	74	___
	Youngest	18	___
	Std. Dev	13.96	___
Experience (years)	Mean	7.98	___
	Minimum	0	___
	Maximum	34	___
	Std. Dev	8.65	___

Further, the respondents represented an array of sports officiated. Table 2 depicts the descriptive demographic data of the four clusters of officials in the sample, basketball only, baseball only, volleyball only and multiple sports.

Basketball only officials (n = 29, 25%) were represented by 27 males and 2 females. The average age of basketball only officials was 33.5 years (SD = 12.72). Of the 29 basketball only officials, 18 classified themselves as Caucasian, 9 as African-American and 2 as Hispanic. The average experience among basketball officials was 8.73 years (SD = 10.73).

Baseball only officials (n = 28, 24%) were represented by males only. The average age of this cluster was 29.54 years (SD = 14.38). 24 of the officials classified themselves as Caucasian, 3 as African-American and 1 as Hispanic. The average experience of baseball only officials was 2.07 years (SD = 2.99).

Volleyball only officials (n = 15, 13%) were represented by 8 males and 7 females. The average age of this cluster was 35.4 years (SD = 13.36), and was comprised of 14 Caucasian and 1 African-American. The average level of experience was 4.67 years (SD = 3.81).

The multiple sports officiated cluster (n = 43, 37%) was represented by 41 males and 2 females. The average age of this cluster was 42.36 years (SD = 12.50). 26 classified themselves as Caucasians, 5 as African-Americans and 3 as Hispanics. The average level of experience was 12.57 years (SD = 8.49).

Table 2 Demographic Data for Study One by Sport

Demographics		Basketball Officials	Baseball Officials	Volleyball Officials	Multiple Sports
Gender	Male	27	28	8	41
	Female	2	0	7	2
Total (%)		29 (25%)	28 (24%)	15 (13%)	43 (37%)
Age		33.5 (12.72)	29.54 (14.38)	35.4 (13.36)	42.36 (12.50)
Race	Caucasian	18	24	14	26
	African-American	9	3	1	5
	Hispanic	2	1		3
Experience	Years	8.73 (10.73)	2.07 (2.99)	4.67 (3.81)	12.57 (8.49)

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Procedure

As a manner of purposive, convenience sampling, local sports officiating chapters of the College Station, TX, region were contacted regarding participation in the survey. Members of the officiating chapters for the sports of Basketball, Volleyball, and Baseball participated in the survey. The researcher approached each chapter's president and was given permission to distribute the questionnaire during regularly scheduled meetings. Due to the nature of the officiating season, the volleyball survey was given at the last chapter meeting, while the basketball and baseball chapters were surveyed at the

first of their meetings. The surveys were distributed by the researcher and filled out anonymously by the respondents, and then returned to the chapter president, who then returned them to the researcher.

The data collected through the survey instrument was then analyzed in two parts: (1) a descriptive study of the demographic information gathered (see Table 1 and Table 2) and (2) the qualitative information was measured through a form of the process of grounded theory content analysis techniques (Crocker & Algina, 2000). Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials—case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individuals' lives (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p.2).

This process was conducted in the following stages:

1. The qualitative data was extracted from the questionnaires and placed on index cards.

2. The qualitative data was sorted and "stacked" based on its relevance.

3. The sorted stacks were then coded into major categories, developed in part from the literature.

4. Once the major categories were developed, the cards were remixed.

5. The remixed cards were then re-sorted and re-stacked based on relevance.

6. The cards were once again coded or recoded based on previous themes or new themes which emerged through the coding process.

Table 3 illustrates the qualitative data set and the themes which emerged from the analysis of that data set.

Table 3 Qualitative Inquiry Themes

Theme	Cards
Pay/Finances	109
Enjoyment	86
Health/Physical Fitness	44
Upward Mobility/Advancement	40
Camaraderie/Co-workers	31
Love of Sport	26
Work Environment	26
Working with Youth	22
Enjoyment of Sport	17
Excitement/Challenge	17
Administrative Politics	16
Time/Hours	14
Travel	13
Teaching/Training	12
Self-Benefits	9
Family	8
Burnout	7
Misc.	12

Research Question One

These themes were then developed into major categories of work quality indicators, with sub-categories. Once the indicators of work quality were established, those indicators were then compared to work quality indicators that emerged through the

outcomes-based approach of literature review relevant to work quality and officiating. By establishing work quality indicators through the subjective and outcomes-based approaches, measures related to each indicator were then developed or adapted from established sets of data measurement which have been validated in there ability to measure the different aspects of work quality. Table 4 illustrates the major work quality indicators which emerged and the validated instruments used to analyze those indicators. These indicators and the subsequent constructs which emerged, answer Research Question One, “What are the work quality indicators related to sports officiating as identified by selected members of TASO?”

The questionnaire asked for specific demographic information, using eight items adapted from Quinn and Staines (1979). These items included relevant information regarding age, gender, race, marital status, years officiated, sports officiated, level of education, and household/family information.

Table 4 Sports Officiating Questionnaire Validated Constructs

Quality of Work Indicator/Construct	Instrument Selected to Measure
Demographic Information	8 items adapted from Quinn and Stains, (1979)
1. Vocational and Avocational Information	
Hours worked per week, hours per year in training, games worked	7 items adapted from Quinn and Staines, (1979)
Job satisfaction	4 items adapted from Spector, (1985)
2. Work Environment	
Co-worker satisfaction	3 items adapted from Spector, (1985)
Work satisfaction	4 items adapted from Spector, (1985)
Discrimination (race, gender, and general)	5- items Perceived Discrimination Scale (Levin et al., 2002)
Work values	3-item Perceived Person-Organization Fit (Cable & Judge, 1996)
Politics in the workplace (general political, get ahead items, pay and promotion)	7-item Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (Kacmar & Farris, 1991)
Rewards related to performance inputs	2 items adapted from Distributive Justice Index (Price and Mueller, 1986)
3. Personal Health and Well-Being	
Work-Family Conflict	6 items adapted from Work-Family Conflict Scale (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996)
Family-Work Conflict	3 items adapted from Family-Work Conflict Scale (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996)
Job Satisfaction	3 items adapted from Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983)
Stress	Job Stress Scale (5 items- Anxiety stress) Parker & Decotis (1983)
Work commute	3 item Work Commute Scale (Kluger, 1998)

Table 4. (*continued)*

Quality of Work Indicator/Construct	Instrument Selected to Measure
4. Organizational/Administrative Support	
Organizational Concern for Well-Being	7 items adapted from Perceived Organizational Support measure (Eisenberger, et al., 1986)
Administrative Support	5 items adapted from Supervisory Support scale (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley 1991)
Satisfaction with Administration	4 items Supervisory Satisfaction (Spector, 1985)
5. Organizational Commitment and Officiating Career Outcomes	
Officiating career	2 items adapted from Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley, 1991)
	3 items adapted from Promotion Satisfaction measure (Spector, 1985)
Commitment to organization	7 items adapted from Organizational Commitment measure (Cook and Wall, 1980)

The survey was then constructed to ask questions pertaining to the 5 major indicators established from Study One:

1. Vocational and avocational information, which contained two sub-themes (a) hours worked per week, hours per year in training, number of games worked (7 items), and (b) Job satisfaction (4 items).

2. Work Environment, which contained six sub-themes (a) Co-worker satisfaction (3 items), (b) Work satisfaction (4 items), (c) Discrimination (5 items), (d)

Work values (3 items), (e) Politics in the workplace (7 items), and (f) Rewards related to performance outputs (2 items).

3. Personal Health and Well-Being, which contained five sub-themes (a) Work-Family conflict (6 items), (b) Family-Work conflict (3 items), (c) Job satisfaction (3 items), (d) Stress (5 items), and (e) Work commute (3 items).

4. Organizational/Administrative Support, which contained three sub-themes (a) Organizational concern for Well-Being (7 items), (b) Administrative Support (5 items), and (c) Satisfaction with Administration (4 items).

5. Organizational Commitment and Officiating Career Outcomes which contained two sub-themes (a) Officiating career (5 items) and (b) Commitment to Organization (7 items).

This questionnaire was then distributed to and analyzed by a panel of ten members, which included academic experts (n=5) and current TASO members (n=5). This panel assessed the instrument for (a) face validity (i.e., does it look like it will measure what it claims to) (b) thoroughness or content validity (i.e., are there other aspects of officiating and work quality which should be included) and (c) clarity, (i.e., do any of the items need to be revised for the officiating sample). These experts then also provided suggestions and recommendations for revisions and corrections to the instrument. The final version of the questionnaire was a result of the above procedures and was the instrument used to complete Study Two.

Study Two

Sample

In Study Two, two groups of officials were contacted; officials who were current members of good standing with TASO volleyball, and officials who were current members of good standing with TASO basketball. Using information from Krejcie & Morgan (1970) 306 volleyball officials (n=1500) and 327 basketball officials (n=2200), a total sample size of 633 officials would be the sample size needed for the sample proportion to be within $\pm$ .05 of the population proportion with a 95 percent level of confidence. Prior studies conducted utilizing sports officials at the collegiate, international, and high school levels have had response rates which ranged from 30 to 50 percent. Based on the population being contacted and the method of distributing the instrument, a 40% response rate was deemed desirable.

The final sample size of the project was 1075 officials, or approximately a 30% return rate. Table 5 depicts the overall descriptive demographic data of the sample. Males (n = 905) made up the largest portion of the sample, at 84.2%. Females (n = 158) made up 14.7% of the sample. 60.7% of the respondents (n = 649) classified their race as Caucasian, while 22.5% (n = 241) classified as African-American and another 15.4% (n = 165) classified as Hispanic.

36.9 % of officials (n = 396) occupied the 41-50 years old division, 28.3% of officials (n = 303) occupied the 51-60 years old division, 18.9% (n = 214) occupied the 31-40 years old division, 7.6% (n = 79) occupied the 21-30 years old division, 5.9% (n =

62) occupied the 61-70 years old division, 1% (n = 10) occupied the 20 and less years old division, and only .4% (n = 4) occupied the over 70 years old division.

Table 5 Demographic Data for Study Two

Variable		Frequency	Valid Percentage
Gender	Male	905	85.1
	Female	158	14.9
Race	Caucasian	649	60.7
	African-American	241	22.5
	Hispanic	165	15.4
	Other	14	1.4
Age (Years)	20 and less	10	1
	21-30	79	7.6
	31-40	214	18.9
	41-50	396	36.9
	51-60	303	28.3
	61-70	62	5.9
	Over 70	4	0.4
Experience (Years)	0-5	408	37.9
	6-10	236	22
	11-15	152	14.1
	16-20	109	8.1
	21-25	57	5.3
	26-30	53	4.9
	Over 30	42	4
Sports Officiated	Basketball	461	43.4
	Volleyball	156	14.7
	Multiple	385	36.3
	Other	59	5.6

Officials with 0-5 years experience (n = 408) made up 37.9% off the sample, with 6-10 years of experience (n = 236) making up 22% of the sample. Officials with 11-15 years experience (n = 152) made up 14.1% of the sample, officials with 16-20 years of experience (n = 109) made up 8.1% of the sample, with 21-25 years of experience (n = 57) representing 5.3% of the sample. 26-30 years of experience (n = 53) made up 4.9% of the sample, and officials with over 30 years of experience (n = 42) made up 4% of the final sample. Based on this information, officials with 5 or less years of experience make up nearly 38% of the sample, officials with over 20 years experience make up nearly 15% of the sample, with nearly 44% of the officials having between 6-20 years of experience.

Basketball only officials (n = 461) represented the largest portion of the sample at 43.4%, while officials who worked multiple sports (n = 385) made up 36.3% of the sample. Volleyball only officials (n = 156) made up 14.7% of the sample, and officials of other sports (n = 59) made up 5.6% of the sample.

Procedure

The sample of volleyball and basketball officials was chosen in an attempt to provide information from officials who worked indoor sports. Some of the common concerns between the sports occur as a result of their indoor court status. The contact information for the officials surveyed was obtained via the TASO member database and provided to the researcher by the TASO organization. A broadcast email was sent via the TASO web-site to all members of TASO volleyball and basketball informing them of the opportunity to participate in the survey and providing the information on how to access

the survey instrument. A follow-up email was sent two weeks later, and a “last chance to participate” email was sent after another two weeks.

Data Analysis

The data was collected utilizing an on-line web survey. The survey was an on-line replication of the questionnaire developed as a result of study one. The on-line survey was analyzed for content, face and construct validity by an outside panel, who viewed the on-line version of the survey (see Appendix D)**.** Once the data was collected, it was then input into the SPSS statistical system. The data was interpreted and explained through the use of descriptive statistics and simple graphic analysis. Based on the information gathered, the results of the data were analyzed to provide descriptive data and summary statistics (sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and/or frequencies) in an effort to illuminate any indicators of work quality deemed relevant to Texas high school sports officiating. All of the work quality constructs were subjected to a reliability analysis (Cronbach Alpha) (see Appendix C). Those constructs meeting the reliability test were then further analyzed to develop the results discussed in Chapter IV. Relevant demographic information was also addressed as to its contribution to the work quality experience of Texas high school officials.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive data analysis was conducted to determine which of the variables in the study met accepted reliability standards. The acceptable reliability estimates (Cronbach's Alpha) range for each of the work quality constructs was $r = .70$, $p < .001$, to $r = .95$, $p < .001$. Four of the variables failed to meet this range, although one, work satisfaction, had a reliability estimate of $r = .69$, $p < .001$, and was included by the researcher as a reliable variable. Table 6 illustrates the unused variables and the questions used to form each construct.

The co-worker satisfaction items had a reliability of $r = .61$, $p < .001$, not much removed from the considered valid reliability of $r = .70$, $p < .001$. The work politics construct had a reliability estimate of $r = .43$, $P < .001$, well below the required $r = .70$, $p < .001$. The personal health construct reliability estimate was much lower, $r = .19$, $p, < .001$, than the required estimate of $r = .70$, $p < .001$.

Table 6 Unused Work Quality Constructs

Construct	Reliability	Questions
Co-worker Satisfaction 3 items adapted from Spector, (1985)	0.61	I like the people I officiate with. I find I have to work harder at officiating than I should because of the incompetence of the people I work with. I enjoy my co-officials.
Work Politics 7-item Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale, (Kacmar & Farris, 1991)	0.43	One group always gets their way. There is one influential group no one crosses. Favoritism not merit gets people ahead. Advancement goes to top performers. Rewards come to hard workers. Advancement and schedule policies are not politically applied. Advancement and schedule decisions are consistent with policies.
Personal Health 2 items developed for questionnaire	0.19	I enjoy officiating for the physical exercise I receive. I often consider leaving the officiating avocation due to physical health issues, not related to officiating.

Table 7 illustrates the means, standard deviations, correlations and reliability estimates of the work quality constructs used as variables in the study. There were 18

work quality variables which were utilized, representing the 5 different work quality indicators which emerged from Study One.

First, it is interesting to note, contrary to the researcher's expectations, that there were no significant correlations between pay satisfaction and the other constructs of work quality. Nor were there any significant correlations between the construct of performance rewards and the other constructs of work quality. This tends to indicate that for high school sports officials, work quality has little to do with pay or with performance rewards.

Work satisfaction was positively correlated to officiating satisfaction ($r = .56$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($r = .30$, $p < .001$) and organizational commitment ($r = .50$, $p < .001$). Work satisfaction also had negative correlations to work stress ($r = -.33$, $p < .001$), sportsmanship ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$), work travel ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$) and officiating commitment ($r = -.41$, $p < .001$).

Discrimination was negatively correlated with the variables of organizational support ($r = -.31$, $p < .001$), supervisor satisfaction ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$), supervisor support ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$) and officiating promotion ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$). The construct of work values was positively correlated with organizational support ($r = .50$, $p < .001$), supervisor satisfaction ($r = .52$, $p < .001$), supervisory support ($r = .49$, $p < .001$), officiating career ($r = .30$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($r = .35$, $p < .001$) and organizational commitment ($r = .39$, $p < .001$). Work family conflict was positively correlated to family work ($r = .72$, $p < .001$), work stress ($r = .48$, $p < .001$), sportsmanship ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), and work travel ($r = .47$, $p < .001$). Family work conflict was positively correlated to work stress ($r = .41$, $p < .001$), sportsmanship ($r = .36$, $p < .001$), and with work travel ($r = .42$, $p < .001$).

Table 7 Descriptives, Correlations And Reliability Estimates for Study Two

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Pay Satisfaction	___								
2. Work satisfaction	.09	___							
3. Discrimination	-.17	-.16	___						
4. Work values	.13	.22	-.27	___					
5. Performance rewards	-.01	-.08	-.02	.13	___				
6. Work family conflict	-.16	-.23	.13	-.10	.10	___			
7. Family work conflict	-.13	-.26	.10	-.13	.08	.72	___		
8. Work Stress	-.10	-.33	.12	-.05	.08	.48	.41	___	
9. Sportsmanship	-.20	-.30	.15	-.06	.05	.40	.36	.48	___
10. Work travel	-.25	-.30	.17	-.19	.03	.47	.42	.42	.34
11. Officiating satisfaction	.14	.56	-.16	.24	-.01	-.21	-.25	-.30	-.22
12. Organizational support	.23	.23	-.31	.50	.13	-.17	-.18	-.11	-.16
13. Supervisor satisfaction	.20	.20	-.32	.52	.13	-.10	-.13	-.08	-.11
14. Supervisor support	.20	.20	-.30	.49	.15	-.15	-.16	-.07	-.14
15. Officiating career	.10	.22	-.21	.30	.13	-.12	-.15	-.13	-.13
16. Officiating promotion	.25	.30	-.32	.35	.10	-.13	-.16	-.16	-.19
17. Officiating commitment	-.16	-.41	.23	-.24	.05	.26	.28	.36	.27
18. Organizational commitment	.12	.50	-.26	.39	.03	-.21	-.28	-.22	-.24
Mean	3.46	6.28	3.04	5.07	4.48	3.13	2.54	2.87	3.56
Standard deviation	1.12	.65	1.35	1.17	.97	1.19	1.11	1.03	1.53
Reliability	.71	.69	.84	.86	-.74	.86	.83	.71	.85

Note. $r > \pm .30$ significant at $p < .001$.

Table 7 (*continued*)

Construct	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
10. Work travel	___								
11. Officiating satisfaction	-.30	___							
12. Organizational support	-.27	.28	___						
13. Supervisor satisfaction	-.20	.30	.86	___					
14. Supervisor support	-.24	.26	.87	.83	___				
15. Officiating career	-.20	.30	.45	.43	.48	___			
16. Officiating promotion	-.25	.31	.66	.60	.64	.53	___		
17. Officiating commitment	.32	-.44	-.39	-.36	-.34	-.25	-.36	___	
18. Organizational commitment	-.33	.50	.52	.48	.45	.30	.46	-.63	___
Mean	2.83	6.26	4.83	5.14	4.52	5.26	4.76	2.48	5.83
Standard deviation	1.19	.68	1.33	1.26	1.33	1.29	1.34	1.27	0.73
Reliability	.80	.75	.94	.90	.90	.95	.84	.88	0.7

Note. $r > \pm .30$ significant at $p < .04$

The variable of work stress was positively correlated with sportsmanship ($r = .48$, $p < .001$), work travel ($r = .42$, $p < .001$), and officiating commitment ($r = .36$, $p < .001$). Work stress was also negatively correlated with the construct of officiating satisfaction ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$). Sportsmanship had a positive correlation with work travel ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), and work travel had a negative correlation with officiating commitment ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$).

Officiating satisfaction had positive correlations with supervisor satisfaction ($r = .30$, $p < .001$), officiating career ($r = .30$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($r = .31$, $p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($r = .50$, $p < .001$). Officiating commitment also had a negative correlation with officiating commitment ($r = -44$, $p < .001$). Organizational support was positively correlated with supervisor satisfaction ($r = .86$, $p < .001$), supervisor support ($r = .87$, $p < .001$), officiating career ($r = .45$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($r = .66$, $p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($r = .52$, $p < .001$). There was a negative correlation between organizational support and officiating commitment ($r = -.39$, $p < .001$).

Supervisor satisfaction had positive correlations with supervisor support ($r = .83$, $p < .001$), officiating career ($r = .43$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($t = .60$, $p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($r = .48$, $p < .001$). Supervisor satisfaction was also negatively correlated with officiating commitment ($r = -36$, $p < .001$). Supervisor support was positively correlated with officiating career ($r = .48$, $p < .001$), officiating promotion ($r = .64$, $p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($r = .45$, $p < .001$).

Supervisor support was negatively correlated with officiating commitment ($r = -.34$, $p < .001$).

Officiating career was positively correlated with officiating promotion ($r = .53$, $p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($r = .30$, $p < .001$). Officiating promotion was negatively correlated to officiating commitment ($r = -.36$, $p < .001$), but was positively correlated with organizational commitment ($r = .46$, $p < .001$). Officiating commitment was negatively correlated with organizational commitment ($r = -.63$, $p < .001$)

Research Question Two

Research question two, "What is the work quality experience of officiating as determined by selected members of TASO?" was addressed with a one-sample t-test to determine if there were any differences between the mean of each variable and the mid-point of the scale. Table 8 illustrates the resulting information regarding the t-test. As indicated by the results, all variables were significantly different from the mid-point of the 7 point Likert scale, which was 4. This suggests that in each area of work quality studied, there were perceptions of work quality which were stronger toward satisfaction or toward dissatisfaction, and not neutral on the issue.

Table 8 One-Sample T-Test, and Descriptives for Study Two

Variable	*N*	Mean	*SD*	*t value*	*p value*
Pay Satisfaction	1048	3.46	1.12	-15.63	.000
Work satisfaction	1029	6.28	.65	113.00	.000
Discrimination	1029	3.04	1.35	-22.68	.000
Work values	1028	5.07	1.17	29.33	.000
Performance rewards	1029	4.48	.97	15.94	.000
Work family conflict	1002	3.13	1.19	-23.12	.000
Family work conflict	1002	2.54	1.11	-41.64	.000
Work stress	1002	2.87	1.03	-34.46	.000
Sportsmanship	1002	3.56	1.53	-9.15	.000
Work travel	1000	2.83	1.19	-31.21	.000
Officiating satisfaction	1001	6.26	.68	104.75	.000
Organizational support	975	4.83	1.33	19.58	.000
Supervisor satisfaction	975	5.14	1.26	28.23	.000
Supervisor support	975	4.52	1.33	12.26	.000
Officiating career	957	5.26	1.29	30.09	.000
Officiating promotion	957	4.76	1.34	17.53	.000
Officiating commitment	958	2.48	1.27	-37.23	.000
Organizational commitment	958	5.83	.73	77.36	.000

Research Question Three

Research question three, “How do selected demographic variables impact the work quality experience of officials, as determined by selected members of TASO?” was addressed through the use of ANOVA tests, using each of the demographic variables to determine their effect with the work quality constructs. It is interesting to note that the demographic of marital status (Table 9) had no significant effect with any of the work quality constructs. Effects of significance ($p \geq .001$) are examined in the following pages.

Table 9 ANOVA for Marital Status

Variable	Married	Mean	*SD*	Single	Mean	*SD*	Co-habiting	Mean	*SD*
Pay Satisfaction	n=787	3.45	1.13	n=206	3.53	1.06	n=37	3.34	1.23
Work satisfaction	n=773	6.29	0.63	n=201	6.26	0.68	n=37	6.22	0.60
Discrimination	n=773	3.04	1.35	n=201	3.07	1.42	n=37	2.98	1.13
Work values	n=773	5.07	1.19	n=200	5.04	1.09	n=37	5.26	0.98
Performance rewards	n=773	4.50	0.99	n=201	4.41	0.89	n=37	4.43	0.89
Work family conflict	n=755	3.15	1.20	n=192	3.01	1.13	n=37	3.19	1.22
Family work conflict	n=755	2.56	1.13	n=192	2.46	1.00	n=37	2.39	1.08
Work Stress	n=755	2.83	1.04	n=192	3.01	1.05	n=37	2.94	0.88
Sportsmanship	n=755	3.59	1.52	n=192	3.51	1.53	n=37	3.25	1.68
Work travel	n=754	2.84	1.20	n=191	2.82	1.14	n=37	2.49	1.09
Officiating satisfaction	n=754	6.27	0.64	n=192	6.18	0.81	n=37	6.39	0.70
Organizational support	n=741	4.84	1.32	n=184	4.78	1.32	n=36	5.01	1.47
Supervisor satisfaction	n=741	5.14	1.27	n=184	5.12	1.28	n=36	5.41	1.16
Supervisor support	n=728	4.50	1.35	n=184	4.53	1.29	n=36	4.89	1.18
Officiating career	n=728	5.28	1.28	n=179	5.11	1.34	n=36	5.49	1.09
Officiating promotion	n=728	4.76	1.36	n=179	4.75	1.28	n=36	5.05	1.26
Officiating commitment	n=729	2.51	1.27	n=179	2.38	1.24	n=36	2.31	1.23
Organizational commitment	n=729	5.84	0.72	n=179	5.78	0.77	n=36	5.98	0.74

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

Table 9 (*continued*)

Variable	Other	Mean	*SD*	*F*
Pay Satisfaction	n=15	2.98	0.83	1.34
Work satisfaction	n=15	6.24	0.65	0.24
Discrimination	n=15	3.00	1.13	0.06
Work values	n=15	4.67	1.33	0.96
Performance rewards	n=15	4.60	1.09	0.63
Work family conflict	n=15	3.34	1.46	0.80
Family work conflict	n=15	2.58	1.39	0.60
Work Stress	n=15	2.91	1.05	1.59
Sportsmanship	n=15	3.49	1.66	0.65
Work travel	n=15	2.93	1.42	1.10
Officiating satisfaction	n=15	6.18	0.71	1.44
Organizational support	n=13	4.52	0.93	0.57
Supervisor satisfaction	n=13	4.77	1.06	0.93
Supervisor support	n=13	4.24	1.07	1.17
Officiating career	n=13	4.96	1.36	1.43
Officiating promotion	n=13	4.28	1.35	1.11
Officiating commitment	n=13	2.51	1.34	0.70
Organizational commitment	n=13	5.86	0.81	0.49

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

Summary of the Results

With regard to participant gender, the only difference of significance noted was on the construct of work stress, $F(1, 991) = 20.47$, $p < .001$ (Table 10). Female officials demonstrated that they felt more stress in officiating (M=3.23, SD=1.11) than did their male counterparts (M=2.81, SD 1.01).

When the work quality variables were grouped by race, i.e., African-American, Hispanic, and Caucasians, six areas in which the groups had significantly different effects were evidenced (Table 11). In the variable of discrimination, $F(2, 1012) = 22.48$, $p < .001$, the Sidak post hoc test indicated that African-Americans (M=3.53, SD=1.21) demonstrated a significantly greater perception of discrimination than did their Caucasian officiating counterparts (M=2.85, SD=1.35). For the work and family conflict variable, $F(2, 985) = 41.80$, $p < .001$, both African-Americans (M=2.65, SD=1.02) and Hispanics (M=2.75, SD=1.15) indicated significantly less perceptions of conflict than did Caucasian officials (M=3.38, SD=1.19). A similar trait was exhibited in the family and work variable as well, $F(2, 985) = 21.60$, $p < .001$, with African-Americans (M=2.19, SD=.99) and Hispanics (M=2.30, SD=1.09) exhibiting less of a perception of conflict than Caucasians (M=2.71, SD=1.13).

Table 10 ANOVA for Gender

Variable	Men	Mean	*SD*	Women	Mean	*SD*	*F*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 885	3.42	1.13	n = 153	3.71	1.01	8.72
Work satisfaction	n = 867	6.30	0.64	n = 152	6.16	0.66	6.13
Discrimination	n = 867	3.05	1.36	n = 152	3.04	1.34	0.00
Work values	n = 866	5.08	1.19	n = 152	4.99	1.07	0.74
Performance rewards	n = 867	4.48	0.98	n = 152	4.50	0.92	0.08
Work family conflict	n = 843	3.13	1.19	n = 149	3.11	1.20	0.02
Family work conflict	n = 843	2.55	1.10	n = 149	2.46	1.49	0.82
Work Stress	n = 843	2.81	1.01	n = 149	3.23	1.11	20.47*
Sportsmanship	n = 843	3.58	1.53	n = 149	3.45	1.52	0.92
Work travel	n = 841	2.82	1.19	n = 149	2.89	1.18	0.45
Officiating satisfaction	n = 842	6.27	0.68	n = 149	6.17	0.68	2.86
Organizational support	n = 822	4.81	1.32	n = 144	4.95	1.36	1.43
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 822	5.12	1.29	n = 144	5.27	1.13	1.74
Supervisor support	n = 822	4.50	1.35	n = 142	4.65	1.23	1.62
Officiating career	n = 806	5.24	1.30	n = 142	5.32	1.25	0.48
Officiating promotion	n = 806	4.76	1.35	n = 142	4.79	1.31	0.05
Officiating commitment	n = 807	2.45	1.26	n = 142	2.63	1.33	2.30
Organizational commitment	n = 807	5.84	1.26	n = 142	5.78	0.79	0.74

Note. * = significant at $p < .001$.

Race demonstrated an effect on the variable of work stress, $F(2, 985) = 18.19$, $p < .001$, as Caucasians ($M=3.02$, $SD=1.06$) perceived significantly more stress in officiating, than did African-Americans ($M=2.62$, $SD=.93$) and Hispanics ($M=2.30$, $SD=1.09$). Sidak post hoc results reported in the variable of sportsmanship, $F(2, 985) = 20.11$, $p < .001$, a significant difference in the perception of sportsmanship existed between African-Americans ($M=3.03$, $SD=1.45$), who were less impacted by sportsmanship issues, and Caucasians ($M=3.77$, $SD=1.49$). Race also effected the variable of work travel, $F(2, 983) = 9.78$, $p < .001$, where a Sidak's post hoc indicated that Caucasians ($M=2.93$, $SD=1.20$) perceived to have more work travel concerns than did Hispanics ($M=2.49$, $SD=1.16$).

Table 11 ANOVA for Race

Variable	Caucasian	Mean	*SD*	African-American	Mean	*SD*	Hispanic	Mean	*SD*	*F*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 636	3.43	1.12	n = 323	3.55	1.19	n = 163	3.44	1.03	0.95
Work satisfaction	n = 631	6.24	0.66	n = 221	6.32	0.60	n = 161	6.38	0.63	3.73
Discrimination	n = 630	2.85	1.35	n = 222	3.53	1.21	n = 161	3.14	1.40	22.48*
Work values	n = 629	5.11	1.15	n = 222	5.02	1.08	n = 161	4.99	1.34	0.94
Performance rewards	n = 630	4.49	0.95	n = 222	4.49	1.00	n = 161	4.42	1.04	0.36
Work family conflict	n = 617	3.38	1.19	n = 213	2.65	1.02	n = 156	2.75	1.15	41.80*
Family work conflict	n = 617	2.71	1.13	n = 213	2.19	0.99	n = 156	2.30	1.09	21.60*
Work Stress	n = 617	3.02	1.06	n = 213	2.62	0.93	n = 156	2.61	0.97	18.19*
Sportsmanship	n = 617	3.77	1.49	n = 213	3.03	1.45	n = 156	3.42	1.65	20.11*
Work travel	n = 617	2.93	1.20	n = 211	2.73	1.13	n = 156	2.49	1.16	9.78*
Officiating satisfaction	n = 617	6.22	0.71	n = 212	6.32	0.61	n = 156	6.35	0.65	3.53
Organizational support	n = 609	4.84	1.34	n = 205	4.94	1.17	n = 149	4.62	1.47	2.55
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 609	5.19	1.22	n = 205	5.20	1.17	n = 149	4.86	1.52	2.55
Supervisor support	n = 609	4.49	1.30	n = 205	4.73	1.31	n = 149	4.34	1.42	4.18
Officiating career	n = 601	5.24	1.27	n = 199	5.15	1.38	n = 145	5.48	1.23	3.03
Officiating promotion	n = 601	4.72	1.37	n = 199	4.94	1.21	n = 145	4.66	1.34	2.51
Officiating commitment	n = 601	2.47	1.27	n = 200	2.49	1.16	n = 145	2.52	1.42	0.09
Organizational commitment	n = 601	5.84	0.71	n = 200	5.84	0.78	n = 145	5.80	0.80	0.17

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

For avocational experience, four areas of significant difference in work quality were found (Table 12). For pay satisfaction, $F(3, 940) = 13.00$, $p < .001$, a Sidak's post hoc test indicated that the group of officials with 0 to 5 years experience (M=3.7, SD=.94), had a significantly higher perception of pay satisfaction than did the 11 to 20 years of experience (M=3.19, SD=1.09) and the over 21 years of experience group (M=3.19, SD=1.34). In the variable of performance rewards, $F(3, 923) = 7.40$, $p < .001$, a Sidak's post hoc illustrated that the over 21 years of experience group (M=4.70, SD=1.07) exhibited a much greater perception of rewards than did the 0 to 5 years group (M=4.38, SD=.86) and the 6 to 10 years of experience group (M=4.36, SD=.91).

In work family conflict, $F(3, 898) = 11.35$, $p < .001$, Sidak's post hoc indicated that the 11 to 20 years of experience group (M=3.46, SD=1.18) exhibited a significantly different perception than the 0 to 5 years of experience group (M=2.90, SD=1.05). This trait was also replicated in the variable of sportsmanship, $F(3, 898) = 9.07$, $p < .001$, where officials with 11 to 20 years of experience (M=3.92, SD=1.51) had a much higher perception than did the officials with 0 to 5 years of experience (M=3.26, SD=1.37).

Table 12 ANOVA for Years of Experience

Variable	0-5	Mean	*SD*	6-10	Mean	*SD*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 356	3.70	0.94	n = 212	3.42	1.16
Work satisfaction	n = 347	6.25	0.67	n = 207	6.29	0.60
Discrimination	n = 347	2.90	1.19	n = 208	3.11	1.39
Work values	n = 347	5.05	1.12	n = 208	5.01	1.20
Performance rewards	n = 347	4.38	0.86	n = 208	4.36	0.91
Work family conflict	n = 338	2.90	1.05	n = 200	3.21	1.23
Family work conflict	n = 338	2.48	1.01	n = 200	2.50	1.10
Work Stress	n = 338	2.82	0.94	n = 200	2.92	1.10
Sportsmanship	n = 338	3.26	1.37	n = 200	3.63	1.65
Work travel	n = 338	2.80	1.15	n = 199	2.86	1.20
Officiating satisfaction	n = 338	6.23	0.67	n = 199	6.25	0.72
Organizational support	n = 324	4.92	1.19	n = 196	4.72	1.38
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 324	5.26	1.13	n = 196	5.10	1.27
Supervisor support	n = 324	4.64	1.23	n = 196	4.41	1.35
Officiating career	n = 313	5.19	1.26	n = 192	5.24	1.16
Officiating promotion	n = 313	4.87	1.21	n = 192	4.68	1.37
Officiating commitment	n = 313	2.40	1.16	n = 193	2.40	1.18
Organizational commitment	n = 313	5.77	0.71	n = 193	5.86	0.71

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

Table 12 (*continued*)

Variable	11-20	Mean	*SD*	21 and over	Mean	*SD*	*F*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 239	3.19	1.09	n = 134	3.20	1.34	13.00*
Work satisfaction	n = 236	6.23	0.64	n = 134	6.39	0.64	2.17
Discrimination	n = 235	3.27	1.47	n = 134	2.89	1.46	4.10
Work values	n = 234	5.07	1.20	n = 134	5.14	1.20	0.32
Performance rewards	n = 235	4.70	1.07	n = 134	4.58	0.99	7.40*
Work family conflict	n = 229	3.46	1.18	n = 132	3.28	1.25	11.35*
Family work conflict	n = 229	2.74	1.17	n = 132	2.61	1.07	2.94
Work Stress	n = 229	3.00	1.06	n = 132	2.79	1.07	1.78
Sportsmanship	n = 229	3.92	1.51	n = 132	3.62	1.56	9.07*
Work travel	n = 229	3.02	1.23	n = 132	2.74	1.26	2.00
Officiating satisfaction	n = 229	6.20	0.68	n = 132	6.45	0.57	4.41
Organizational support	n = 225	4.74	1.43	n = 131	5.07	1.29	2.75
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 225	5.04	1.36	n = 131	5.20	1.32	1.55
Supervisor support	n = 225	4.38	1.44	n = 131	4.65	1.26	2.64
Officiating career	n = 225	5.23	1.34	n = 129	5.64	1.29	4.09
Officiating promotion	n = 225	4.52	1.46	n = 129	4.99	1.32	4.68
Officiating commitment	n = 225	2.62	1.36	n = 129	2.45	1.37	1.69
Organizational commitment	n = 225	5.77	0.82	n = 129	6.04	0.64	4.75

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

The demographic of age (Table 13) had an effect with one work quality variable, pay satisfaction, $F(4, 1030) = 5.60$, $p < .001$. A Sidak's post hoc test shows that the 30 and less age group ($M=3.78$, $SD=1.01$), had a more significant perception of pay satisfaction than did the 51 to 60 age group ($M=3.26$, $SD=1.11$).

Table 13 ANOVA for Age

Variable	30 and less	Mean	*SD*	31-40	Mean	*SD*	41-50	Mean	*SD*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 84	3.78	1.01	n = 197	3.63	1.05	n = 390	3.43	1.14
Work satisfaction	n = 80	6.17	0.72	n = 188	6.33	0.59	n = 387	6.26	0.63
Discrimination	n = 80	3.02	1.25	n = 189	3.13	1.29	n = 387	3.13	1.40
Work values	n = 80	4.88	1.17	n = 189	5.00	1.14	n = 387	5.03	1.16
Performance rewards	n = 80	4.38	0.90	n = 189	4.46	0.84	n = 387	4.52	0.97
Work family conflict	n = 75	3.20	1.08	n = 183	3.11	1.16	n = 379	3.14	1.27
Family work conflict	n = 75	2.59	1.04	n = 183	2.67	1.18	n = 379	2.58	1.17
Work Stress	n = 75	3.28	1.07	n = 183	2.87	0.94	n = 379	2.80	1.04
Sportsmanship	n = 75	3.92	1.47	n = 183	3.57	1.51	n = 379	3.51	1.58
Work travel	n = 75	3.00	1.15	n = 182	2.70	1.13	n = 378	2.84	1.22
Officiating satisfaction	n = 75	6.24	0.75	n = 182	6.27	0.63	n = 379	6.26	0.65
Organizational support	n = 67	5.08	0.94	n = 172	4.78	1.35	n = 375	4.83	1.28
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 67	5.48	0.94	n = 172	5.14	1.31	n = 375	5.15	1.20
Supervisor support	n = 67	4.85	1.04	n = 172	4.56	1.35	n = 375	4.51	1.32
Officiating career	n = 64	5.15	1.08	n = 166	5.25	1.27	n = 369	5.29	1.28
Officiating promotion	n = 64	5.04	1.16	n = 166	4.92	1.33	n = 369	4.74	1.33
Officiating commitment	n = 64	2.31	1.02	n = 167	2.40	1.18	n = 369	2.45	1.28
Organizational commitment	n = 64	5.79	0.74	n = 167	5.80	0.77	n = 369	5.83	0.72

Note: * = significant at $p \leq .001$

Table 13 (*continued*)

Variable	51-60	Mean	*SD*	61 and over	Mean	*SD*	*F*
Pay Satisfaction	n = 295	3.26	1.11	n = 65	3.56	1.17	5.60*
Work satisfaction	n = 293	6.28	0.67	n = 65	6.34	0.71	1.38
Discrimination	n = 292	2.93	1.37	n = 65	2.84	1.30	1.16
Work values	n = 291	5.22	1.16	n = 65	5.18	1.27	2.15
Performance rewards	n = 292	4.43	1.03	n = 65	4.65	1.11	1.08
Work family conflict	n = 285	3.20	1.13	n = 65	2.77	1.11	1.87
Family work conflict	n = 285	2.48	1.03	n = 65	2.10	0.87	3.57
Work Stress	n = 285	2.93	1.03	n = 65	2.74	1.16	3.94
Sportsmanship	n = 285	3.60	1.49	n = 65	3.38	1.52	1.40
Work travel	n = 285	2.84	1.18	n = 65	2.90	1.26	0.97
Officiating satisfaction	n = 285	6.27	0.69	n = 65	6.23	0.85	0.08
Organizational support	n = 284	4.78	1.41	n = 64	4.95	1.47	0.92
Supervisor satisfaction	n = 284	5.04	1.35	n = 64	5.17	1.42	1.66
Supervisor support	n = 284	4.38	1.35	n = 64	4.63	1.48	1.92
Officiating career	n = 281	5.20	1.37	n = 64	5.48	1.27	0.76
Officiating promotion	n = 281	4.60	1.37	n = 64	4.85	1.42	2.39
Officiating commitment	n = 281	2.58	1.25	n = 64	2.54	1.57	1.03
Organizational commitment	n = 281	5.84	0.75	n = 64	5.97	0.63	0.68

Note. * = significant at $p \leq .001$

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of the present study was to assess the perceptions of Texas high school sports officials on the work quality issues in the avocation of Texas high school sports officiating. To accomplish this end, TASO members' perceptions of selected work quality variables were assessed. A secondary purpose of the study was to evaluate basic demographical differences between the variable outcomes. The purposes of the study were met through a detailed analysis of three research questions. Each research question is reviewed in this section and discussions relevant to the findings of each question are presented.

Summary and Discussion of Research Questions

Summary and Discussion of Research Question One

Research question one asked "What are the work quality indicators related to sports officiating as determined by selected members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials?" The qualitative study and subsequent analysis of that study yielded the foundation for the subsequent study that was completed to answer research questions two and three. The avocational themes which emerged through the analysis of the qualitative data set, or indicators of officiating work quality, were comparable to the vocational work quality themes or work quality indicators which were found in the work quality literature (e.g. Quinn and Staines, 1979; Lowe, 2004; JobQuality.ca, 2006; CPRN, 2000; Bond, Galinsky and Hill, 2002). Similar sport officiating themes were

used in studies conducted by the National Federation of High Schools (Struckhoff, 2001) and the National Association of Sports Officials (NASO, 2001).

The researcher did take some liberties in applying vocational work quality themes to the avocation of sports officiating. Yet, the qualitative data suggests that similar concerns exist among the participants in the avocation of sports officiating, as exist in the literature related to vocational job settings. The primary distinction between the avocational themes and the vocational themes was the use of specific sport officiating language, relevant to the avocation. Participants were asked to associate themes of work quality to the context of the sport officiating environment. For example, the theme of work environment adapted questions from the vocational field which dealt with co-workers, and applied it to the context of co-officials. One of the items related to the theme of personal health and well-being, was adapted to address how family-work and work-family conflict created by the officiating avocation affected the official's perception of work quality.

Summary and Discussion of Descriptive Data

When examining bivariate correlations among the work quality variables, two interesting lack of correlation did present themselves. The variable of pay satisfaction and the variable of performance rewards, demonstrated no significant correlation with any of the other work quality variables. This is somewhat in contrast to the literature, which suggests that low pay, which would translate into a lowered pay satisfaction, is a reason that officials have lowered perceptions of work quality (Stuckhoff, 2001). In work quality/job satisfaction literature (e.g., Lowe, several studies; Bond, Galinsky and

Hill, 2002; 2005), performance rewards rank as one of the determinants of high work quality and job satisfaction. The conclusion drawn by the researcher is the anomaly exists as a by-product of the avocational nature of sports officiating. It is possible that the participants' do not view pay and performance rewards related to officiating as a necessary component of officiating work quality.

There were several significant correlations that were identified in the descriptive data, but of particular interest to the researcher, were the variables of discrimination and sportsmanship. Discrimination had a negative correlation with the variables of organizational support, supervisor satisfaction, supervisor support and officiating promotion. It is of interest that the correlations of significance deal with organizational or supervisory components of work quality perceptions. Further research might investigate how discrimination is perceived, when controlling for specific forms of discrimination (e.g., general, gender and ethnic, see Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, and Taylor 2002). Casey (1992) investigates and supports the gender discrimination effect in sport officiating.

Sportsmanship held a significant negative correlation with work satisfaction, suggesting that the greater an official's perception toward sportsmanship issues, the less the perceived positive work satisfaction. Sportsmanship issues created by spectators, fans and coaches were listed as one of the top two reasons that officials left the avocation (Struckhoff, 2001). Seidler, Scott, and Hughes (2005) also investigated perceptions of "misconduct", or sportsmanship issues. Sportsmanship did exhibit positive correlations with the variables of work-family conflict, family-work conflict,

work stress and work travel. Brennan (2001) supports the correlation between sportsmanship and work stress. It would be of further research to investigate where the significance between sportsmanship and the variables of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and work travel is derived from.

Summary and Discussion of Research Question Two

Research question two asked, “What is the work quality experience of officiating as determined by selected members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials?” An s one-sample t-test was used to assess if and where differences might exist among the groups. All variables demonstrated significance in that they all varied from the mid-point of the seven point Likert scale, which was 4. This suggests very little variability among the groups in how they responded to the perception of work quality indicators.

Summary and Discussion of Research Question Three

Research question three asked, “How do selected demographic variables impact the work quality experience of officials, as determined by selected members of the Texas Association of Sports Officials?” The demographic variables studied for this question were marital status, participant gender, participant race, officiating experience and participant age.

The variable of marital status held no significant relationship with the indicators of work quality. This would suggest that an official’s marital status doesn’t create a conflict in their perception of officiating work quality. Officials who were married, as well as those who were single, living with significant others, divorced and widowed all had similar work quality perceptions. In some areas of work quality which were

presented, this lack of a significant relationship for marital status seems unusual. It would seem feasible that there would be some significance in the area of work-family, family-work conflict, particularly for the married status. It is possible that this lack of significance could be attributed to the avocational structure of high school officiating. Officials tend to view officiating as a part-time “hobby” which they can leave at any time of their choosing, thus possibly reducing any strain that might be associated with their marital status commitments.

The variable of participant gender impacted the work stress variable. Female officials demonstrated that they felt more stress in officiating (M=3.23, SD=1.11) than did their male counterparts (M=2.81, SD 1.01). This is somewhat in contrast to a study by Brennan (2001), which showed male college basketball officials experienced more stress symptoms, but it also suggested that females tended to utilize stress coping mechanisms more often than males.

A suggestion for future study would be to consider stress in officiating, not only by gender, but also by sport. It would seem feasible to speculate that the officiating of a sport such as basketball, which is predicated on quick decisions and very often emotional responses by fans, coaches and participants, would produce more stress than the sport of volleyball, which is played primarily by females and which is a sport which typically has less emotional responses from spectators, participants and coaches in reaction to officiating calls.

When the work quality variables were grouped by race, that is, African-American, Hispanic, and Caucasians, six areas in which the groups had significantly

different effects were apparent. Studies related to discrimination based on general, gender and ethnic dimensions (see Levin, et al, 2002), as well as a study by Casey (1992) investigate and support a similar discrimination effect in sport officiating.

In the variable of discrimination, African-Americans (M=3.53, SD=1.21) demonstrated a significantly greater perception of discrimination than did their Caucasian officiating counterparts (M=2.85, SD=1.35). The more interesting finding here is that Hispanic officials showed no significant impact differences on discrimination. One possible explanation for this might be that the majority of Hispanic officials tend to be located in highly Hispanic areas of the state of Texas, where they work with officials and for coaches/teams of similar race. For the work and family conflict variable, both African-Americans (M=2.65, SD=1.02) and Hispanics (M=2.75, SD=1.15) indicated significantly less perceptions of conflict than did Caucasian officials (M=3.38, SD=1.19), although all three groups indicated that work and family conflict was not an issue which had a negative impact on their perception of work quality. A similar trait was exhibited in the family and work variable as well, with African-Americans (M=2.19, SD=.99) and Hispanics (M=2.30, SD=1.09) exhibiting less of a perception of conflict than Caucasians (M=2.71, SD=1.13

Race held a significant effect on the variable of work stress, as Caucasians (M=3.02, SD=1.06) perceived significantly more stress in officiating, than did African-Americans (M=2.62, SD=.93) and Hispanics (M=2.30, SD=1.09). Although several studies have looked at sports officiating and stress, those studies do not address the role that race may or may not play in an official's perception of stress in officiating. Even

though Caucasians exhibit a greater perception of stress in officiating, the mean indicates that it tends to not have a negative impact on their perception of officiating work quality.

A significant difference on the sportsmanship variable existed between African-Americans (M=3.03, SD=1.45), who were less impacted by sportsmanship issues, and Caucasians (M=3.77, SD=1.49). Seidler, et al. (2005), investigated perceptions of "misconduct", or sportsmanship issues. It is possible that the difference in perceptions of sportsmanship could be attributed to different definitions or perceptions of what constitutes sportsmanship that might exist between races or cultures.

Race also affected the variable of work travel, as Caucasians (M=2.93, SD=1.20) perceived to have more work travel concerns of significance than did Hispanics (M=2.49, SD=1.16). If this construct is also viewed in relationship with work-family and family-work constructs from previous interpretations, it is possible that the concern of travel is a by product of issues related to family.

For avocational experience, four significant differences in work quality were found. Lowe (2003) and Bond, et al. (2002) have also investigated the variable of experience and its effect on work quality. The construct of pay satisfaction, indicated that the group of officials with 0 to 5 years experience (M=3.7, SD=.94), had a significantly higher perception of pay satisfaction than those with 11 to 20 years of experience (M=3.19, SD=1.09) and the over 21 years of experience group (M=3.19, SD=1.34). It would seem feasible that this suggests that more veteran officials have a more negative perception of pay satisfaction than do those officials with 0 to 5 years experience. Factors that might lend to this perception might be the changes in pay that

more veteran officials have experienced. It is reasonable to assume that a young official would be happy with any pay they receive, especially if they are not able to compare that pay with past years of pay.

In the variable of performance rewards, the over 21 years of experience group (M=4.70, SD=1.07) exhibited a much greater perception of rewards than did the 0 to 5 years group (M=4.38, SD=.86) and the 6 to 10 years of experience group (M=4.36, SD=.91). It should be pointed out here that performance rewards were not defined by this research instrument, so it is possible that the differences in perception with this construct could be related to what more experienced officials view as rewards for performance. Less experienced officials are likely to see fewer opportunities to officiate high level games or playoff games, as those games tend to be reserved for veteran, respected officials.

For work family conflict, the 11 to 20 years of experience group (M=3.46, SD=1.18) exhibited a significantly different perception than the 0 to 5 years of experience group (M=2.90, SD=1.05). Even though years of experience did not specifically equate to age and family/marital status, it is reasonable to assume that the 0 to 5 years of experience officials are younger officials who do not have the same commitments of family that older, more experienced officials might have.

This trait was also replicated in the variable of sportsmanship, where officials with 11 to 20 years of experience (M=3.92, SD=1.51) had a much higher perception of sportsmanship issues than did the officials with 0 to 5 years of experience (M=3.26, SD=1.37). I would suggest that the possibility of generational differences lend to the

difference in perceptions here. Older, more experienced officials tend to become more distanced from the high school generation, which could lead to a greater negative perception of sportsmanship issues.

The demographic of age had an effect with one work quality variable, pay satisfaction. The 30 and less age group (M=3.78, SD=1.01), had a more significant perception of pay satisfaction than did the 51 to 60 age group (M=3.26, SD=1.11). This seems to coincide with the demographic of experience, in that the more experienced group and the older group both had a more negative perception of pay satisfaction than did younger or less experienced officials.

Discussion and Recommendations for Future Study

It is evident from the literature reviewed and from the data analysis that work quality in the avocation of Texas high school sports officiating has implications that can be investigated through the use of vocational work quality instruments. However, there does seem to be some areas of the avocation that seem to be contrary to vocational research. This suggests that a need for further research in avocational work quality is needed to more sufficiently explain the perceptions that exist in the avocation of sports officiating. Now that an area of sports officiating indicators for work quality have been identified, those individual indicators could be further explored in an effort to better identify how each indicator might impact an official's perception of work quality. Future studies related to sports officiating and work quality should expand to include other sports, primarily sports which involve outdoor, seasonal activity. Future studies should also be conducted which focus on why certain perceptions found in this study

might exist. Future research should include demographic data which further investigates the issues of discrimination, work (officiating) stress and coping mechanisms and organizational commitment to officiating.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, **63**, 1-18.

Anshel, M. H., & Weinberg, R. S. (1996). Coping with acute stress among American and Australian basketball referees. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **19**, 180-204.

Anshel, M. A., and Weinberg, R. S. (1999). Re-examining coping among basketball referees following stressful events. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **22,** 144-161.

Bond, S. T., Galinsky, E., & Hill, E. J. (2002). *When work works*. New York, NY: Family and Works Institute.

Brennan, S. J. (2001). *Coping methods of male and female NCAA division 1 basketball referees under stressful game conditions*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE.

Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **73**, 139-145.

Burke, K. L., Joyner, A. B., Pim, A., & Czech, D. (2000). An exploratory investigation of the perceptions of anxiety among officials before, during and after the contest, *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **23**, 11-19.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **67**(3), 294-311.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. Mirvis & C. Camman (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures and practices.* (p. 84) New York: John Wiley.

Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN). (2001). *What's a good job? The importance of employment relationships.* (CPRN study No. W105). Ottawa, ON: Renouf Publishing, Ltd.

Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN). (2003). *Job quality in the non-profit organization.* Ottawa, ON: author.

Casey, A. (1992). Title IX and women officials-how have they been affected? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance,* **63**(3), 45-47.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need for non-fulfillment. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology,* **53**, 39-52.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (2000). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

DataQuest Consulting. (1999). *A feasibility study on the quality of employment in Canada.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dormann, C. & Zapf, D. (2001). Job satisfaction: a meta-analysis of stability, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **22**, 483-504.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **71**, 500-507.

Employment Policy Foundation. (2002). *Employee turnover-a critical human resource benchmark.* **12**, 3. Washington, DC: Author.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, A., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**(1), 64-86.

Gunn, H. (2002). Web-based surveys: changing the survey process. *FirstMonday*, **7**(12). Retrieved September 28, 2006, from http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_12/gunn/index/html

Hughes, S. (2001). *New Mexico high school sports officials' perceptions of athlete, coach, and spectator conduct.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.

Kacmar, K. M., & Farris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, **51**, 193-205.

Kaissidis-Rodafinos, A. N. (1994). *Sources of and responses to acute stress in sport as a function of selected personal dispositions, situational appraisals and cultural differences.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia.

Kluger, A. N. (1998). Commute variability and strain. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **19**, 147-165.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* **30** (3), 607.

Levin, S., Sinclair, S., Veniegas, R. C., & Taylor, P. L. (2002). Perceived discrimination in the context of multiple group memberships. *Psychological Science,* **13**(6), 557-560.

Lowe, G. S. (2000). *The quality of work: A people centered agenda.* Oxford: University Press.

Lowe, G. S. (2003). *The case for investing in high quality work.* Paper presented at the European Commissions mid-term Review of the Social Policy Agenda, Brussels, Belgium.

Lowe, G. S., Schellenberg, G., & Shannon, H. S. (2003). Correlates of employees perceptions of a health work environment. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, **17**(6), 390-399.

Lowe, G. S. (2004). *Building healthy organizations takes more that simply putting in a wellness program.* Retrieved November, 11, 2004, from http://www.nqi.ca/article_details.

Mano, B. (n.d.). Issues facing official's today-assaults against sports officials. Retrieved, September 14, 2005, from http://www/eway.com/NASO/issues.html.

Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment, *Psychological Bulletin,* **108**, 171-194.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, **1**, 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., Irving, G. P., & Allen, N. J. (1998). Examination of the combined effects of work values and early work experiences on organizational commitment, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **19**, 29-52.

National Association of Sports Officials. (2001). *Is there an official's shortage*? Racine, WI: Author.

National Association of Sports Officials. (2001). *National meeting to focus on finding sports officials.* Racine, WI: Author.

National Association of Sports Officials. (2002). *Officials under assault: Update 2002.* Racine, WI: Author.

National Association of Sports Officials. (2004). *Issues facing officials today.* Racine, WI: Author.

National Federation of High Schools. (2003). *Officials cite career/job demands as top reasons for leaving high school officiating.* Indianapolis, IN: Author.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2004). *'STEPS' for workplace health, productivity are focus of October symposium.* Washington, DC: Author.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **75**(2), 148-158.

Parker, D. F., & Decotiis, T. A. (1997). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **32**, 160-177.

Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfied, MA: Pittman.

Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1979 quality of employment survey.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Rainey, D. W. (1995). Stress, burnout, and intention to terminate among umpires. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **18**(4), 312-324.

Rainey, D.W. & Duggan, P. (1998). Assaults on basketball referees: A statewide survey. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **21**(1), 113-121.

Rainey, D. W. (1999). Sources of stress, burnout, and intention to terminate among basketball referees. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **22**(4), 578-590.

Seidler, T.L., Scott, D. K., & Hughes, S. (2004). Mississippi high school sports officials' perceptions of misconduct and reported intention to terminate. *The Sport Coaching Journal*, **1**(1), 1-4.

Spector, P. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **13**, 693-713.

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Van Katwyk, P. T. (1999). The role of negative affectivity in employee reactions to job characteristics: bias effects or substative effects, *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, **72**, 205-208.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: a lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **31**, 56-77.

Stratton, M. B. (2002). *Effects of gender and rating level on perceived trait anxiety and socialization into sport among collegiate volleyball officials*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Sundell, P. J. (1999). *The relationship of job congruence, job satisfaction and social support on the mental and physical health of sport officials*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

University Interscholastic League. (2004). *Constitution and Contest Rules*. (sec. 1204-b). Austin, TX: Author.

U. S. Department of Labor. (2004). *Athletes, coaches, umpires and related workers.* Retrieved August 18, 2005, from http://stats.bls.gov/oco/ocos251.html.

Wallace, (1996). *1995-1996: Indiana quality of employment (IQES).* Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana, Institute of Social Research

APPENDIX A

Descriptive Statistics for all Work Quality Constructs

Appendix A Means, Standard Deviations, Bivariate Correlations And Reliability Estimates of Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Pay Satisfaction	___										
2. Co-worker satisfaction	-.06	___									
3. Work satisfaction	.09	.16	___								
4. Discrimination	-.17	.04	-.16	___							
5. Work values	.13	.11	.22	-.27	___						
6. Work politics	-.19	.01	-.14	.39	-.35	___					
7. Performance rewards	-.01	.10	-.08	-.02	.13	-.02	___				
8. Work family conflict	-.16	.05	-.23	.13	-.10	.12	.10	___			
9. Family work conflict	-.13	-.02	-.26	.10	-.13	.11	.08	.72	___		
10. Work stress	-.10	.04	-.33	.12	-.05	.14	.08	.48	.41	___	
11. Sportsmanship	-.20	.07	-.29	.15	-.06	.11	.05	.40	.36	.48	___
12. Work travel	-.25	.01	-.30	.17	-.19	.20	.03	.47	.42	.42	.34
13. Officiating satisfaction	.14	.19	.56	-.16	.24	-.15	-.01	-.21	-.25	-.30	-.22
14. Organizational support	.23	.06	.23	-.31	.50	-.55	.13	-.17	-.18	-.11	-.16
15. Supervisor satisfaction	.20	.06	.20	-.32	.52	-.50	.13	-.10	-.13	-.08	-.11
16. Supervisor support	.20	.08	.20	-.29	.49	-.51	.15	-.15	-.16	-.07	-.14
17. Officiating career	.10	.11	.22	-.21	.30	-.30	.13	-.12	-.15	-.13	-.13
18. Officiating promotion	.25	.05	.29	-.32	.35	-.51	.10	-.13	-.16	-.16	-.19
19. Officiating commitment	-.16	-.07	-.41	.23	-.24	.28	.05	.26	.28	.28	.27
20. Organizational commitment	.12	.13	.50	-.26	.39	-.34	.03	-.21	-.28	-.22	-.24
21. Personal Health	.09	.01	.30	.02	.04	-.05	-.10	-.22	-.16	-.32	-.17
Mean	3.46	5.12	6.28	3.04	5.07	3.93	4.48	3.13	2.54	2.87	3.56
Standard deviation	1.12	.59	.65	1.35	1.17	.79	.97	1.19	1.11	1.03	1.53
Reliability	.71	.61	.69	.84	.86	.43	-.74	.86	.83	.71	.85

Note. $r > \pm .30$ significant at $p < .05$

Appendix A, cont.

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
12. Work travel	___									
13. Officiating satisfaction	-.30	___								
14. Organizational support	-.27	.28	___							
15. Supervisor satisfaction	-.20	.29	.86	___						
16. Supervisor support	-.24	.26	.87	.83	___					
17. Officiating career	.29	.29	.45	.43	.48	___				
18. Officiating promotion	.31	.31	.66	.60	.64	.53	___			
19. Officiating commitment	-.44	-.44	-.39	-.36	-.34	-.25	-.36	___		
20. Organizational commitment	.50	.50	.52	.48	.45	.30	.46	-.63	___	
21. Personal Health	-.23	.33	.07	.06	.08	.05	.13	-.34	.26	___
Mean	2.83	6.26	4.83	5.14	4.52	5.26	4.76	2.48	5.83	5.76
Standard deviation	1.19	.68	1.33	1.26	1.33	1.29	1.34	1.27	.73	1.00
Reliability	.80	.75	.94	.90	.90	.95	.84	.88	.70	0.19

Note. $r > \pm .30$ significant at $p < .05$

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire for Study One

Identifying the Quality of Work in High School Officiating

Please provide responses to the following statements:

1. What is your age? ____ 2. What is your gender? ___ Male ___ Female

3. What is your race? ____ Caucasian ____ African-American ____ Hispanic __ Other

4. How many years have you been a high school official? _____ year(s)

5. What high school sport(s) do you currently officiate?

__ Baseball ___ Basketball ____ Football ___ Volleyball ___ Softball ___ Track Other _____

6. What is your primary occupation outside of officiating? _____

7. What is your estimated annual income, not including officiating? _____

   a. less that 10,000 c. 30,001-60,000 e. greater than 90,000

   b. 10,001-30,000 d. 60,001-90,000

8. What is your highest level of education? _____

   a. less than 12th grade d. attending/attended 4yr. College/university

   b. High School graduate e. College/university graduate

   c. technical school/community college graduate f. advanced degree: Masters,Doctorate

I became involved in officiating, because …

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

If I were to leave high school officiating, it would be for the following reasons …

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

I continue to officiate high school sports for the following reasons …

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Please provide any additional comments you feel relevant to work quality and officiating.

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for you time and responses.

APPENDIX C

Web-Based Survey Consent Form

Dear Official,

Your participation in a state-wide survey on the work quality of High School Sports Officials is needed. I am a Doctoral student at Texas A&M University in the Department of Health and Kinesiology. I am preparing for my Doctoral thesis and I am interested in studying work quality issues as they relate to Texas High School Sports Officials. This survey has been approved by TASO and the UIL in an attempt to collaborate on the improvement of Officiating in the state of Texas.

To meet the aims of this study, I am using the enclosed researcher developed and validated questionnaire to survey 600 TASO members during the 2005-2006 season. The enclosed questionnaire represents the results of a pilot work that was used to develop a *Quality of Work in Officiating* instrument and conceptual model.

Participation will require about 15-20 minutes answering the questionnaire. You may refuse to answer any question on the survey if it makes you feel uncomfortable. All data will be dealt with confidentially and no individual taking part in the study will be identified. The questionnaire has been enclosed in anticipation of your participation. A postage paid self-addressed envelope is also enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. There are no foreseeable risks associated with the completion of this study, and participation provides no direct benefits.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, the Institutional Review Board may be contacted through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, IRB Coordinator, Office of the Vice-President for Research at (979)458-4067 (mwbuckley@tamu.edu). Any questions or concerns related to the completion of this survey may also be addressed to Dr. Mike Sagas, at (979) 458-3350 in the Dept. of Health and Kinesiology, TAMU 4243, College Station, TX, 77843 or at msagas@hlkn.tamu.edu.

Hopefully you will find time in your busy schedule to participate in this study. If you have any comments or concerns with the study, please contact me at the number or email listed below.

Thanks in advance for your time and participation, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Mike Thornton
Lecturer, Texas A&M University
EdD student, Texas A&M University
Dept. of Health and Kinesiology
TAMU 4243
College Station, TX 77843
mthornton@hlkn.tamu.edu

APPENDIX D

Web-Based Survey

QUALITY OF WORK IN THE AVOCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS OFFICIATING

A survey on the perceived quality of work in Texas High School Sports officiating, conducted by the Sport Management Department of Texas A&M University in cooperation with the UIL and TASO.

Thank you for your participation.

YOUR DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. What is your age? _____ 2. What is your gender? _____Male _____Female

3. Which of the following best describes your race?

_____ Caucasian _____African-American _____Asian _____Hispanic Other_____

4. How many years have you been a Texas High School sports official? _____ year(s)

5. What Texas High School sport(s) do you currently officiate?

___Baseball ___Basketball ___Football ___Volleyball ___Softball ___Track _____Other

6. Which of the following best describes your highest level of education?

____ Less than 12th grade ____High School Graduate ____ High School Equivalency (GED)

____ Attending Technical/Community College ____ Technical/Community college graduate

____ Attending College/University ____ College/University graduate

____ Advanced degree: Master's, Doctorate

7. Which of the following best describes your marital status?

____Married ____Single _____Living with significant other _____ Other

8. How many children under the age of 18 do you have living in your household?

____0 ___1 ____2 ____3 ____4 ____5 ____6 or more

VOCATIONAL AND AVOCATIONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your primary occupation outside of officiating? _____

2. What is your estimated annual income, not including officiating?

____ Less than $10,000 ____ $10,001-30,000 ____ $30,001-60,000

____$60,001-90,000 ____ $90,000 - $100,000 ____ Greater than $100,000

3. How many hours do you work in a typical week in your non-officiating work?
(For students, include hours involved in school related activities and part-time work)

In-season (from your first scrimmage to last scheduled game)

___<20	___31-40	___51-60	___71-80
___21-30	___41-50	___61-70	___81 or more

Out of season (when not officiating high school ball)

___<20	___31-40	___51-60	___71-80
___21-30	___41-50	___61-70	___81 or more

4. How many games a season did you work in your last completed season?
___0-(1st season) ___21-30 ___41-50 ___61-70 ___81-90
___<20 ___31-40 ___51-60 ___71-80 ___91 or more

5. How many hours did you spend last year in training for your non-officiating work?
___<20 ___31-40 ___51-60 ___71-80
___21-30 ___41-50 ___61-70 ___81 or more

6. How many hours did you spend last year in training for your officiating avocation?
(Include camps, other officiating assignments, i.e., AAU, Rec ball)
___<20 ___31-40 ___51-60 ___71-80
___21-30 ___41-50 ___61-70 ___81 or more

7. How much money did you earn in your TASO officiating avocation in your last season?
___$0- first season ___$201-500 ___$801-1100 ___$1301-1500 ___$1801-2100 ___$2301-2600
___<$200 ___$501-800 ___$1101-1300 ___$1501-1800 ___$2101-2300 ___>$2600

Circle the most appropriate response based on the following scale
1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree

8. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the officiating that I do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Game fee raises are too few and far between	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am unappreciated by the organization (UIL) when I think about what they pay me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I feel satisfied with my chances for game check increases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

WORK ENVIRONMENT

Circle the most appropriate response based on the following scale
1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree

1. I like the people I officiate with	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I find I have to work harder at officiating than I should because of the incompetence of the officials I work with	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I enjoy my co-officials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I sometimes feel that officiating is meaningless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I like doing the things I do when officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I feel a sense of pride about officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Officiating is enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I experience discrimination in the officiating profession because of my ethnicity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. Other members of my ethnic group experience discrimination in the officiating profession	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I experience discrimination in the officiating profession because of my gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Men experience discrimination in the officiating profession because of their gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Discrimination against me in officiating will impose barriers to my future officiating outcomes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Discrimination against others like me will impose barriers to their careers in officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. My values "match" or fit those of my current officiating chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. The values and "personality" of my officiating chapter reflect my values and personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. My values match those of the current officials in my officiating chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. One group always gets their way	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. There is one influential group no one crosses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Favoritism not merit gets people ahead	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Advancement goes to top performers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Rewards come to hard workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Advancement and schedule policies are not politically applied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Advancement and schedule decisions are consistent with policies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I think that my current (or most recent) level of games scheduled is fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

PERSONAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

Circle the most appropriate response based on the following scale

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree

1. The demands of officiating interfere with my home and family/friend life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. The amount of time I spend officiating takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family/friend responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands officiating puts on me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My officiating produces strain that makes it difficult to make changes to my plans for family/friend activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Due to officiating-related activities, I have to make changes to my plans for family/friend activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The demands of my family or spouse/partner/friends interfere with officiating-related activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I have to put off officiating because of demands on my time at home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Things I want to do with officiating don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner/friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. My home life interferes with my officiating responsibilities, such as getting to games/meetings on time, accomplishing game tasks, and working extra games	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Friend/family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform officiating-related duties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. All in all, I am satisfied with officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. In general, I don't like officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. In general, I like officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I feel guilty when I take time off from officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I have often felt fidgety or nervous as a result of officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. There are lots of times when officiating drives me right up a wall	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Officiating gets to me more than it should	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Sometimes when I think about officiating I get a tight feeling in my chest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I resent the length of my game commutes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I resent the hassles my game commutes cause me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. My game commutes affect my officiating in a negative way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22. Poor sportsmanship by players makes it difficult for me to be an official.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Poor sportsmanship by coaches makes it difficult for me to be an official.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Poor sportsmanship by fans/spectators makes it difficult for me to be an official.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ORGANIZATIONAL/ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Circle the most appropriate response based on the following scale

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree

1. My officiating administration values my contribution to the organization's well-being	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. My officiating administration fails to appreciate any extra effort from me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My officiating administration would ignore any complaints from me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Even if I did the best job possible, my officiating administration would fail to notice me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. My officiating administration shows very little concern for me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. My officiating administration really cares about my well-being	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. My officiating administration cares about my general satisfaction in officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Consider your immediate supervisor (e.g., Chapter President, assignment secretary, etc) and indicate your agreement with questions 8-16.

8. My supervisor takes the time to learn about my career goals and aspirations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. My supervisor provides game assignments that give me the opportunity to develop and strengthen new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. My supervisor cares about whether or not I achieve my goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. My supervisor is fair to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. My supervisor shows interest in the feelings of subordinates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I like my supervisor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. My supervisor supports my attempts to acquire additional training or education to further my officiating career skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTMENTAND OFFICIATING CAREER OUTCOMES

Circle the most appropriate response based on the following scale

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree

1. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. There is really little chance for promotion in officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Those who do well in officiating stand a fair chance of being promoted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I am satisfied with my chances for promotions in officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I frequently think about leaving the officiating profession	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I will likely search for another avocation to replace officiating in the next year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. It is likely that I will explore career avocational opportunities other than officiating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I will likely leave officiating within the next year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is that I work for	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I sometimes feel like leaving officiating for good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I’m not willing to put myself out just to help the chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I feel myself to part of the chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. In my work I like to feel I am making some effort, not just for myself, but for the chapter as well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I would not recommend a close friend to join our chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the chapter would please me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. At what age do you foresee yourself leaving the officiating profession?
___<20 years old ___26-30 years old___36-40 years old ___46-50 years old ___56-60 years old ___66-70 years old
___20-25 years old ___31-35 years old___41-45 years old ___51-55 years old ___61-65 years old ___>70 years old

VITA

Name:	Michael Anthony Thornton
Address:	3109 Pleasant Grove Drive, College Station, TX 77845
Email Address:	mthornton@tamu.edu
Education:	B.A., English, Northwestern State University, 1992 M.Ed., Sports Administration, Northwestern State University, 1996