

Technical Skills And Competence Of Sports Officiating Officials: Basis For An Action Plan

Dr. Susan Lopez-Saballo¹, Dr. Mery Jean A. Tiauzon², Mylene A. Bautista³, Guarin S. Maguate⁴

Assistant Professor, STI West Negros University

Instructor, STI West Negros University

OIC School of Graduate Studies, STI West Negros University

Secondary Science Teacher, Department of Education, Philippines

Abstract

This research was conducted to determine the level of the technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials in schools division office of Escalante City during the School Year 2020-2021. Further, the study wanted to determine the level of the technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials when respondents are grouped and compared according to selected variables. Moreover, the result of the study also sought for an action plan. In view of the nature of the objectives of this study, the descriptive research design was used. A total of 82 sports officiating officials served as respondents of the study in the schools division office of Escalante City. The research instrument used in gathering data was a self-made questionnaire. To determine the profile of the respondents, data frequency and percentage were used. The study revealed that as assessed by the sports officiating officials when they are grouped according to the study's variables, the results show a "high level" in all areas. Furthermore, the assessment of the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in terms of areas indicated no significant difference when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables. While the assessment on the level of competence of sports officiating officials in terms of areas of skills according to the level of accreditation and number of years as sports officiating officials indicated a significant difference and same is through in terms of area of training that all indicated with a significant difference when being grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables. Based on the findings of the study, the following relevant recommendations were advanced for consideration of those concerned: the findings of the study will be forwarded to the schools division office of Escalante City for them to be aware of the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials. There is a strong need to improve certain areas in order that urgent and alternative measures can be planned and implemented. The division office can use the findings of this study in crafting interventions or proposing a plan of activities to satiate its policy lapses if there are any. School heads and supervisors in the schools division office of Escalante City may recommend doable interventions and propose a plan of activities via an action plan in order to formulate a viable roadmap to provide a clear guide to plans and programs to improve the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials. Also, the proposed action plan must be considered in order to improve the said the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials in the schools division office of Escalante City.

Keywords: Action Plan, Officiating Officials, Sports, Technical Skills,

Introduction

Sports is now increasingly popular to spend free time, take care of one's health and physical and mental condition, and be entertained, especially with educators' burdensome heavy workloads of the new normal. It is a tool for molding and developing characteristics that are desirable. However, several disciplines may raise concerns because of the potential danger to the participants, such as extreme sports, particularly combative sports (Meller, 2020). Per 2019 Regional Memorandum No. 029, it aims to capacitate sports officiating officials in various sports events and is supported by the division memorandum. It underpins the

need for public school teachers to enhance their technical skills and be competent as well in the science and art of sports officiating. Locally, sports officials, which include referees, umpires, and judges, are just a few to mention as important stakeholders in sports, without whom competitive sports would not exist, for they are responsible for ensuring competitiveness, eliminating the chance of injuries, and enforcing the rules of the game (Hancock et al., 2020). In international sports events such as the Special Olympics, a sports officials should undergo intensive and complete training and certification processes like National Governing Body (NGB) officials' certification or International Sports Federations (ISF) officials' certification, and any necessary rules and sports equipment modifications, and which entails officiating 10 hours or five Special Olympic events, with a time commitment of 24 hours per event plus 2 hours of training with complete Special Olympics "Class A" background check and have knowledge and experience officiating the sports. At the same time, the implementation of the sports program in the schools division office of Escalante City is apparent as to the clear guiding principle of sustaining school sports supremacy. And yet, sports officiating officials-being, the implementing agents-are hardly been struggling and far-left out in the spotlight for more than a decade now since the support of the Department of Education is not fairly regulated and implemented at the ground level as to some circumstances may even be affected in the political sense and the power of peoples connection. In a personal sense, valuing mental health and having a mantra through sports enabled sports officiating officials to turn things around, combative sports in general, and in the new normal sports settings where every point is a new point and a new chance. Using this mantra throughout the sports performance is enormously helpful to sports officials to pick themselves up from where they are left out in the spotlight of the highly global sports competitiveness. This study had the potential to bridge the gap to a better environment for sports officiating officials in the combative arena by exposing the factors that contribute to them being left out of the spotlight in sports and serve as a wake-up call to youth sports administrators and other interested individuals in determining what technical skills and level of competence are most beneficial to those considering a career in sports officiating. Further, equipped with this information, the researcher, a national accredited sports officiating official, national events facilitator, and regional resource speaker specializing in wushu events, intends to conduct a pioneer study in the school's division office of Escalante City that will serve as the basis to convey how technically skillful and competent sports officiating officials are, and that may significantly aid sufficient for others who are thoroughly involved in the same study or research, especially in a hands-on manner, and delve deeper into the general understanding of the sports science behind sports officiating officials. Hence, this study was conducted.

Methodology

Research Design

This descriptive survey method of research was employed in the study. According to Bhandari (2020), descriptive research involves collecting and analyzing numerical data to find patterns and averages, test hypotheses, test causal relationships, and generalize results to wider populations about the present state of the topic being studied.

As Selamat (2017) stressed, survey research was the process of gathering information on one or more groups of individuals — qualities, views, attitudes, or prior experiences – by asking them questions and tabulating their responses. The ultimate objective was to learn about a huge population by surveying a representative sample of that group.

This study outlined how respondents viewed the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials in the schools division office of Escalante City.

Equally, the descriptive research design conducted fact-finding measures directed on current situations and dealings, ongoing practices, beliefs held, effects felt, or emerging trends. This was ideal for determining the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials as a basis for an action plan. The researcher settled that the descriptive research design was the appropriate tool to use.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were the eighty-two sports officiating officials of elementary and secondary assigned to officiate in combative sports events in the schools division office of Escalante City. In

determining the number of respondents, the researcher used purposive sampling to identify the population of each category of schools within the schools division office of Escalante City.

Data Gathering Instrument

The self-formulated questionnaire incorporated and identified the areas of concern relative to the level of technical skills and competence of sports officiating officials in schools division office of Escalante City, Negros Occidental during the School Year 2020-2021.

The questionnaire is made up of two parts. Part I contains queries on respondents' profiles. Part II contains the different issues on the level of technical skills and the level of competence in the schools division office of Escalante City. Each variable contains ten (10) issues that could be rated with numbers 1 to 5, 5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest.

Further, each of the descriptions will be interpreted using the five-point Likert's scale, which contains the following scores: 5 – Very High level; 4 – High level; 3 – Moderate level; 2 – Low level and 1 – Very Low Level.

However, before the survey was properly conducted, the researcher secured written permission from the schools division office of Escalante City.

The researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the via google forms to those who had a strong internet connection. It enabled the researcher to clarify issues that would be asked by the respondents relative to the line items and in accordance with their alternative working arrangement schedule (AWA) and of strict adherence to health protocol set by the IATF. The duration of the survey lasted for 3 weeks. Data were tabulated and subjected to statistical analysis.

Validity

Validity, according to Katzin (2020) in his study, is intended to measure the validity of the research instrument which must yield the kind of result it needs. A test is valid if it yields scores that would help accomplish its intended purpose. For the content and face validity of the questionnaire, the self-formulated questionnaire was presented to the adviser, then, to the panel member experts called "jurors" to examine the individual items for critiquing and validation. The content validation to confirm the criteria developed for evaluating the survey questionnaire set forth by Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates was used. The interpretation are as follows: Excellent (4.04 – 5.00); Very Good (3.28 - 4.03); Good (2.53 – 3.27); Fair (1.76 – 2.52); Poor (1.00 – 1.75).The researcher sought the expertise of five jurors knowledgeable, expert, and qualified to pass judgment on the appropriateness, suitability, and mechanics in the construction of the items would be consulted. The first validator was a Philippine Sports Commission (PSC) Visayas Cluster Director and an international technical official/coach. Validator two is presently a Principal IV and ASEAN games Chief Referees' Assessors. Validator three is an Education Program Specialist II of the Bureau of Learner Support Services-School Sports Division (*BLSS-SSD*) and a 2019 Southeast Asian games technical official. Validator four, is a Bacolod City LGU Sports Development Officer, an ASEAN Games B license, general coordinator, and team technical adviser. Lastly, validator five is an international arnis resource speaker as well as an author of an international journal of sports science. The members of the panel of jurors gave suggestions and comments which were carried over by the researcher on the finalization of the instrument. The researcher was able to contact the jurors via Messenger since some of them were co-tournament managers of the researcher in different sports affiliations; former resource speakers, and co-participants during the conduct of Special Program in Sports (SPS) held in Pangasinan for three (3) consecutive years; co-representative to the Philippine Sports Commission Visayas chapter; and the recent sports learning facilitators' chairman. The five jurors have been in the government service for more than a decade.

The overall validation rating is 4.91, interpreted as "excellent," which means that the survey instrument is valid.

Reliability

To Middleton (2021), reliability is the consistency with which a method measures something. The extent to which the interpretations of the results of a test were warranted depends on the particular use of the test it

was intended to serve. Meanwhile, reliability needed to be established since the researcher used a self-made instrument. To establish the reliability of the research instrument, Cronbach Alpha was used. Cronbach Alpha is a measure of internal consistency: how closely related a set of items were as a group. It was considered to be a measure of scale reliability. A "high" value for alpha does not imply that the measure was unidimensional. For the instrument to be reliable, it should be within the very high range of reliability coefficient. This instrumentation was subjected to a reliability test from a sample of 30 sports officiating officials in the schools division office of Sagay City who was not part of the actual respondent population of the study. Their responses were tallied and subjected to statistical treatment using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software. For an instrument to be reliable, the correlation should be within the range of 0.70 to 1.00. According to Carlson (2008), a coefficient of 0.890 indicates high reliability. The processed result from Cronbach Alpha resulted to a value of 0.978 for technical skills and 0.960 for competence are interpreted as "excellent". Results implied that an instrument is a reliable tool for gathering data relevant to the specific objectives set.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure started with the formulation of the research instrument. After establishing the validity and reliability of the research instruments, copies of the questionnaire were reproduced. Permission to conduct the survey and the administration of the questionnaire to the actual respondents were secured from the schools division office of Escalante City. Also, ethical considerations were established in this study through proper channeling of requests from authorities in – charge of different levels of capacity. Finally, the researcher then personally distributed and, through google forms, the self-made questionnaire to the respondents in their respective areas of interest in combative sports during their alternative work accomplishment schedule, which enabled the researcher to explain the purpose of the study. The accomplished questionnaires were retrieved on a given date. The respondents were assured that their answers will be dealt with strict confidentiality. The estimated week to finish the survey instrument was three weeks. Upon completion, the questionnaires were retrieved and subjected to statistical computation.

Analytical Schemes

The analytical schemes employed to achieve the study's objectives were determined by the nature of the research problems. Based on the concerns of this investigation, the following schemes were employed based on the research objectives, which were descriptive and comparative.

Objective No. 1 aimed to determine the profile of respondents in terms of the following variables: area of interest, level of accreditation, and the number of years as sports officiating; the descriptive-analytical scheme was used.

A descriptive-analytical scheme was used to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. These methods aimed to describe "what exists" concerning situational variables (Israr, 2016).

Objective No. 2 aimed to determine the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in terms of the following areas; a descriptive-analytical scheme was used. This scheme describes the condition or status, and pattern of the problem under study.

Objective No. 3 aimed to determine the level of competence of sports officiating officials in terms of the following areas; a descriptive-analytical scheme was used. This scheme describes the condition, status, and pattern of the problem under study.

Objective No. 4 aimed to determine the technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped according to variables, using a descriptive-analytical scheme. This scheme describes the condition, status, and pattern of the problem under study.

Objective No. 5 aimed to determine the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped according to the aforementioned variables and also used a descriptive-analytical scheme.

Objective No. 6 aimed to determine the significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, using a comparative analytical scheme. This scheme describes the condition or status, and pattern of the problem under study.

Objective No. 7 aimed to determine the significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables and also used a comparative analytical scheme. This scheme describes the condition, status, and pattern of the problem under study.

Statistical Tools

For the analysis of data, the following statistical tools were utilized depending on the nature of the problems and the hypothesis of the studies.

Objective 1 aimed to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of the following variables: area of interest, level of accreditation, the number of years as sports officiating official, frequency count, and the percentage used. In the study, percentages were used to determine what part of the whole comprises the respondents' profile according to the categories.

Categorical data are best described by counting how many of the subjects' responses fall within each category in frequency distribution and by calculating their percentages or proportions, that was, the number of times each response was given by the total number (Baylor, 2014).

Hence, tests were appropriate to determine the distribution of the respondents in terms of the aforementioned variables.

Objective 2 aimed to determine the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials; the mean was used. The mean is the average used to derive the central tendency of the data in question and the average of all integers (Apuhin, 2019). It was determined by adding all the data points in a population and then dividing the total by the number of points. The resulting number was known as the mean or the average (Forsanno, 2016).

Ranges	Verbal Interpretation
4.50 – 5.00	Very High level
3.50-4.49	High level
2.50-3.49	Moderate level
1.50-2.49	Low level
1.00-1.49	Very Low level

Objective 3 aimed to determine the level of competence of sports officiating officials in terms of the following areas; the mean was used.

Ranges	Verbal Interpretation
4.50 – 5.00	Very High level
3.50-4.49	High level
2.50-3.49	Moderate level
1.50-2.49	Low level
1.00-1.49	Very Low level

Objective No. 4 aimed to determine the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials; when grouped according to variables, the mean was used.

Objective No. 5 aimed to determine the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped according to the aforementioned variables, also used mean.

Objective No. 6 aimed to determine the significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis were used.

Mann-Whitney U test is a non-parametric alternative test to the independent sample t-test. It was a non-parametric test used to compare two sample means that came from the same population and used to test whether the two sample means were equal. Usually, the Mann-Whitney U test was used when the data were ordinal or when the assumptions of the t-test were not met (Collins, 2017). Thus, Mann-Whitney U Test is an appropriate tool to derive analysis from the demographic variables, specific area of interest, level of accreditation, and the number of years as sports officiating officials. If the P-value is small, the researcher can reject the null hypothesis where the difference was due to random sampling and conclude instead that the populations were distinct. If the P-value is large, the data did not give the reseracher any reason to reject the null hypothesis.

Further, Kruskal Wallis is an appropriate tool to derive analysis from the demographic variables, specifically on the area of interest.

Objective No. 7 aimed to determine the significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, using the Mann-Whitney U test at 0.05 level of significance and Kruskal Wallis on the variable area of interest.

Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents According to the Variables, Area of Interest, Level of Accreditation, and Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Table 2. Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	42.70
	Boxing	13	15.90
	Taekwondo	18	22.00
	Wushu	16	19.50
	Total	82	100
Level of Accreditation	Lower (School, Division, Area)	52	63.40
	Higher (Provincial, Regional, National)	30	36.60
	Total	82	100
Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials	Shorter (below 4 years)	60	73.20
	Longer (4 years and above)	22	26.80
	Total	82	100

As presented in table 2, 35 or 42.70% of the respondents are into arnis, followed by boxing with 13 or 15.90%, taekwondo with 18 or 22.00% respondents, and 16 or 19.50% are into wushu. For the variable - level of accreditation, 52 or 63.40% belong to the lower level of accreditation, while 30 or 36.60% belong to the higher level of accreditation. Further, for the number of years as sports officiating officials, there are 60 or 73.20% who belong to a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials, while 22 or 26.80% belong to a longer number of years as sports officiating officials.

Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Communication Skills, Decision-Making Skills, and Sports Management.

Table 3. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Communication Skills

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>		
1. gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience	3.91	High Level

2. communicate by transmitting complete and correct information regarding the implementation of rules and regulations prior to the sports competition	4.20	High Level
3. master the ability to interact successfully with coaches and athletes	4.10	High Level
4. recognize barriers and keep the communication simple and specific	4.12	High Level
5. know when not to speak in relation to the task I am assigned	4.32	High Level
6. remain active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials	4.37	High Level
7. communicate ideas and concepts to an audience, or instruct them on the do's and don't's during sports competition	4.26	High Level
8. get to the point without using unneeded words or images	4.12	High Level
9. present information in a logical sequence during solidarity meeting with coaches	4.10	High Level
10. make certain that spectators, coaches, and athletes understand my point of view in a calm, specific and clear manner.	4.18	High Level
Overall Mean	4.17	High Level

As shown in Table 3, the overall mean score is 4.17, interpreted as "high level." The respondents obtained the highest mean score of 4.37 on Item No. 6, which states, "remain active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes and co-officiating officials," interpreted as "high level." On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.91 is on Item No. 1, which states "gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience," interpreted as "high level."

This implies that sports officiating officials should use simple and concise words to be understood even in giving instructions and announcements during sports clinics, solidarity meetings, or during sports competitions at their level. It may encourage active participation from the audience as well.

Table 4. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Decision-Making Skills

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>		
1. am preparing the mind to react correctly to each movement in order to arrive at a wise decision	4.29	High Level
2. am observing a situation, make a judgment and then take a decision consistent with the time	4.21	High Level
3. am having a clear understanding that a wrong decision can result from smaller errors, incorrect knowledge, or information	4.33	High Level
4. am making decisions in accordance with the accepted and agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting.	4.39	High Level
5. am making decisions based on the national implementing rules and regulations	4.35	High Level
6. am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines	4.11	High Level
7. am having a full understanding that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact	4.35	High Level
8. am keeping in mind that participants' opinions are significantly more driven by their personal interests, which is why my judgment should be based on fair play	4.20	High Level
9. am making split-second decisions given in an intense game competition based on all the stimuli received, observed, and analyzed during a game	4.13	High Level

10. am collaboratively working with other sports officials on the final results of the winning team or coaches	4.20	High Level
Overall Mean	4.26	High Level

As divulged in table 4, the overall mean score is 4.26, interpreted as "high level." The respondents obtained the highest mean score of 4.39 on Item No. 4, which states, "am making decisions in accordance with the accepted and agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting," interpreted as "high level." On the other hand, the lowest mean of 4.11 is on Item No. 4 which states, "am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and regulations" interpreted as "high level."

Table 5. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Sports Management

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>		
1. focus on my breathing and work to drown out all other distractions such as a crowded audience	4.17	High Level
2. make sure that the facilities and equipment are ready before or a day before the sporting event	4.44	High Level
3. maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches	4.46	High Level
4. make it sure to meet and expose myself to a variety of knowledgeable sports officiating officials who share the same perceptions	4.20	High Level
5. maintain peace and order during sports competition	4.48	High Level
6. surround myself with people who make wise decisions, especially in officiating endeavors	4.37	High Level
7. set to work to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation	4.15	High Level
8. manage time pressure and ambiguity of the situations during sports competition	4.17	High Level
9. conduct orientation to athletes and coaches	4.23	High Level
10. comply with and make game results transparent	4.34	High Level
Overall Mean	4.30	High Level

Table 5 reveals the data on the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in the area of sports management with an overall mean score of 4.30, which is interpreted as "high level."

As revealed in the table, the respondents obtained the highest mean score of 4.48 on Item No. 5, which states "maintain peace and order during sports competition" interpreted as "high level." On the other hand, the lowest mean of 4.15 on Item No.7, which states "set to work to pacify disputes among athletes or co-officials with minimum effort as required by the situation," is interpreted as "high level."

This implies that sports officiating officials must set an objective which is to establish a secure and engaging environment for athletes and co-officials to interact based on shared interests and passions. It must be settled as quickly as possible at the lowest level. However, if a grievance cannot be resolved, possibly at the lowest level, an aggrieved party must convey their grievance in steps, following the hierarchy of roles. The aggrieved party must be free of pressure, discrimination, retaliation, and discriminatory action on the grievance.

Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas, Knowledge, Skills, and Training

Table 6. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Knowledge

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I am competent...		
1. to officiate combative events from lower to higher athletic meet	3.89	High Level
2. to manage the sports events with excellent performance	4.07	High Level
3. to re-echo, as well as to provide any implementing rules and regulations revisions and updates during the sports clinic and solidarity meeting	4.02	High Level
4. to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating	3.87	High Level
5. to denote an understanding of basic sports principles and initial everyday task	4.04	High Level
6. to upholding strong policies against all forms of cheating, malpractices, and unethical behaviors such as unfair advantages among sportspersons	4.16	High Level
7. to adhere to the legal rights and responsibilities of an official involved with youth sports	4.27	High Level
8. to make it a point of treating other people with respect while maintaining a cultured image	4.38	High Level
9. to perform with honesty and integrity	4.44	High Level
10. to act professionally with tact and skill and abiding the standard code of ethics	4.41	High Level
Overall Mean	4.15	High Level

As reflected in Table 6, the overall mean score is 4.15, interpreted as "high level." The respondents got the highest mean score of 4.44 on Item No. 9, which states, "to perform with honesty and integrity," interpreted as "high level." On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.87 on Item No. 4, which states, "to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating," is interpreted as "high level."

This implies that the Division Sports Officer (DSO) should provide one-on-one consultations with tournament managers (TMs) as rating officials regarding individual performance appraisal survey forms, focusing on sports officiating officials who must obtain satisfactory ratings for their annual performance appraisals. TMs walk through the individual performance appraisal survey forms step by step, clarifying the requirements and offering recommendations based on compliance criteria.

Table 7. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Skills

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I demonstrate...		
1. expertise in my calls and gestures as performing as a platform referee during sports events	3.62	High Level
2. experience a series of actual sporting events, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.67	High Level
3. spent numerous hours in the actual field, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.71	High Level
4. applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration	3.79	High Level
5. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational sports competition	3.74	High Level
6. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through higher invitational sports competition	3.48	Moderate Level

7. enhance my expertise by subjecting myself to a yearly sports accreditation	3.52	High Level
8. signal participants and other officials when infractions occur or regulate play or competition	3.49	Moderate Level
9. officiate several sports competitions with a minimal error during sports competition	3.27	Moderate Level
10. perform three or more varied duties in sports events, such as refereeing, table officials, and judging	3.34	Moderate Level
Overall Mean	3.56	High Level

Table 7 displays the results with an overall mean score assessed by respondents as 3.56, interpreted as "high level." As displayed in the table, respondents got the highest mean score of 3.79 on Item No. 4, which states, "applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration" interpreted as "high level," while Item No. 9 which says, "Officiate several sports competition with a minimal error during sports competition" as the lowest mean score of 3.27 interpreted as "moderate level."

Table 8. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Training

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I attended seminars/trainings		
1. in a school level	3.93	High Level
2. in a barangay/local government unit (LGU)	3.56	High Level
3. in a division level	3.62	High Level
4. in a provincial level or Negros Athletic Sports Association	2.55	Moderate Level
5. in a Regional level	2.02	Low Level
6. in a National Educators' Academy of the Philippines (NEAP)	1.54	Low Level
7. in a Bureau of Learner Support Services-School Sports Division (BLSS-SSD)	1.67	Low Level
8. in a sponsored agency such as the Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)	1.51	Low Level
9. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Sports Commission (PSC)	1.63	Low Level
10. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy	1.39	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	2.34	Low Level

As presented in Table 8, respondents perceived the results on the level of competence of sports officiating officials in the area training with an overall mean score of 2.34 interpreted as "low level." The respondents perceived the highest mean score of 3.93 on Item No. 1, which states, "in a school level," interpreted as "high level," while Item No. 10, which states, "in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy" as the lowest mean score of 1.39 interpreted as "very low level."

Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas, Communication Skills, Decision-Making Skills, and Sports Management when grouped according to the Variables, Area of Interest, Level of Accreditation, and Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Table 9. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Communication Skills According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. gear the language to the appropriate level for the audience	3.77	High Level	3.92	High Level	3.83	High Level	4.31	High Level
2. communicate by transmitting complete and correct information regarding the implementation of rules and regulations before the sports competition	4.03	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.39	High Level	4.44	High Level
3. have the ability to interact successfully with coaches and athletes	3.91	High Level	4.38	High Level	3.89	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
4. recognize barriers and keep the communication simple and specific	4.09	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.44	High Level
5. know when not to speak in relation to the task I am assigned	4.23	High Level	4.31	High Level	4.22	High Level	4.63	Very High Level
6. am an active and good listener to any discussion	4.40	High Level	4.46	High Level	4.11	High Level	4.50	Very High Level

and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials								
7. communicate ideas and concepts to an audience, or instruct them on the do's and don't's during sports competition	4.14	High Level	4.23	High Level	4.33	High Level	4.44	High Level
8. get to the point without using unneeded words or images	4.00	High Level	4.15	High Level	4.11	High Level	4.38	High Level
9. present information in a logical sequence during solidarity meetings with coaches	3.97	High Level	4.15	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.44	High Level
10. make certain that spectators, coaches, and athletes understand my point of view in a calm, specific and clear manner	4.17	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.19	High Level
Overall Mean	4.07	High Level	4.18	High Level	4.12	High Level	4.43	High Level

As revealed in Table 9 on the data of the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in the area communication skills according to an area of interest, the arnis respondents got the overall mean scores of 4.07 interpreted as "high level." The arnis respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.40 on Item No. 6 which states, "am an active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials," interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 1 which says, "gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience" interpreted as "high level."

Table 10. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Decision-Making Skills According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. I am preparing the mind to react correctly to each movement in order to arrive at a wise decision	4.31	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.39	High Level	4.31	High Level
2. I observe a situation, make a judgment and then take a decision consistent with the time	4.17	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.39	High Level	4.19	High Level
3. I have a clear understanding that a wrong decision can result from smaller errors, incorrect knowledge, or information	4.31	High Level	4.15	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.56	Very High Level
4. I make decisions in accordance with the accepted and agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting.	4.31	High Level	4.54	Very High Level	4.33	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
5. I make decisions based on the	4.34	High Level	4.62	Very High Level	4.17	High Level	4.38	High Level

national implementation rules and regulations								
6. am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines	4.14	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.11	High Level	4.13	High Level
7. fully understand that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact	4.31	High Level	4.31	High Level	4.17	High Level	4.69	Very High Level
8. should keep in mind that participants' opinions are significantly more driven by their personal interests, which is why my judgment should be based on fair play	4.31	High Level	3.92	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.38	High Level
9. make split-second decisions given in an intense game competition based on all the stimuli received, observed, and analyzed during a game	4.17	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.17	High Level	4.06	High Level
10. collaborativel	4.23	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.22	High Level	4.25	High Level

y work with other sports officials on the final results of the winning team or coaches								
Overall Mean	4.26	High Level	4.18	High Level	4.22	High Level	4.34	High Level

Table 10 depicts the data on the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in the areas of decision-making skills according to the area of interest. As depicted in the table, arnis respondents perceived the overall mean score of 4.26 as a "high level." Arnis respondents assessed the highest mean score of 4.34 on Item No. 5, which states, "make decisions based on the national implementing rules and regulations" interpreted as "high level" while the lowest mean score of 4.14 which states "am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines and interpreted as "high level."

Table 11. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Sports Management According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. focus on my breathing and work to drown out all other distractions such as a crowded audience	4.20	High Level	3.92	High Level	4.33	High Level	4.13	High Level
2. make sure that the facilities and equipment are ready before or a day before the sporting event	4.57	Very High Level	4.15	High Level	4.33	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
3. maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches	4.54	Very High Level	4.46	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
4. am able to	4.20	High Level	4.15	High Level	3.94	High Level	4.50	Very High

meet and expose myself to a variety of knowledgeable sports officiating officials who share the same perceptions								Level
5. maintain peace and order during sports competition	4.54	Very High Level	4.54	Very High Level	4.17	High Level	4.63	Very High Level
6. am surrounding myself with people who make wise decisions, especially in officiating endeavors	4.29	High Level	4.46	High Level	4.17	High Level	4.69	Very High Level
7. am able to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation	4.26	High Level	4.23	High Level	3.94	High Level	4.06	High Level
8. manage time pressure and ambiguity of the situations during sports competition	4.29	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.11	High Level	4.06	High Level
9. conduct orientation to athletes and coaches	4.09	High Level	4.31	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.44	High Level
10. comply with and make game results transparent	4.20	High Level	4.62	Very High Level	4.33	High Level	4.44	High Level

Overall Mean	4.32	High Level	4.29	High Level	4.19	High Level	4.39	High Level
---------------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------	-------------------

Table 11 presents the data on the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in the area of sports management according to the area of interest.

As presented in the table, arnis respondents perceived the response with an overall mean score of 4.32 interpreted as "high level." Arnis respondents assessed the highest mean score of 4.57 on Item No. 2, which says "make sure that the facilities and equipment are ready before or a day before the sporting event," interpreted as "very high level," while Item No. 9, which says, "conduct orientation to athletes and coaches" with a lowest mean score of 4.09 interpreted as "high level."

Table 12. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Communication Skills According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience	3.85	High Level	4.03	High Level
2. communicate by transmitting complete and correct information regarding the implementing rules and regulations prior to the sports competition	4.12	High Level	4.33	High Level
3. have the ability to interact successfully with coaches and athletes	3.98	High Level	4.30	High Level
4. recognize barriers and keep the communication simple and specific	4.06	High Level	4.23	High Level
5. know when not to speak in relation to the task I am assigned	4.23	High Level	4.47	High Level
6. am an active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials	4.33	High Level	4.43	High Level
7. communicate ideas and concepts to an audience, or instruct them on the do's and don't's during sports competition	4.29	High Level	4.20	High Level
8. get to the point without using unneeded words or images	4.12	High Level	4.13	High Level
9. present information in a logical sequence during solidarity meeting with coaches	4.02	High Level	4.23	High Level
10. make certain that spectators, coaches, and athletes understand my point of view in a calm, specific and clear manner.	4.19	High Level	4.17	High Level
Overall Mean	4.12	High Level	4.25	High Level

As depicted in Table 12, sports officiating officials with a lower level of accreditation assessed an overall mean of 4.12, interpreted as "high level." The respondents with a lower level of accreditation assessed the highest mean score of 4.33 on Item No. 6, which says, "am an active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials," interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 1

which says, "gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience" got the lowest mean score of 3.85 interpreted "high level."

Table 13. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Decision-Making Skills According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. am preparing the mind to react correctly to each movement in order to arrive at a wise decision	4.21	High Level	4.43	High Level
2. observe a situation, make a judgment and then take a decision consistent with the time	4.15	High Level	4.30	High Level
3. have a clear understanding that a wrong decision can result from smaller errors, incorrect knowledge, or information	4.35	High Level	4.30	High Level
4. make decisions in accordance with the accepted and agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting	4.35	High Level	4.47	High Level
5. make decisions based on the national implementing rules and regulations	4.37	High Level	4.33	High Level
6. am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines	4.10	High Level	4.13	High Level
7. fully understand that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact	4.38	High Level	4.30	High Level
8. should keep in mind that participants' opinions are significantly more driven by their personal interests, which is why my judgment should be based on fair play	4.19	High Level	4.20	High Level
9. make split-second decisions given in an intense game competition based on all the stimuli received, observed, and analyzed during a game	4.06	High Level	4.27	High Level
10. collaboratively work with other sports officials on the final results of the winning team or coaches	4.12	High Level	4.33	High Level
Overall Mean	4.23	High Level	4.31	High Level

As shown in the table 13, respondents with a lower level of accreditation perceived the overall mean score of 4.23 interpreted as a "high level." As assessed by the respondents with a lower level of accreditation, Item No. 7, which says, "fully understand that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact," got the highest mean of score 4.38, interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 9 which says, "make

split-second decisions given in an intense game observed and analyzed during a game" got the lowest mean score interpreted as "high level."

Table 14. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Sports Management According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. focus on my breathing and work to drown out all other distractions such as a crowded audience	4.13	High Level	4.23	High Level
2. make sure that the facilities and equipment are ready before or a day before the sporting event	4.48	High Level	4.37	High Level
3. maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches	4.52	Very High Level	4.37	High Level
4. am able to meet and expose myself to a variety of knowledgeable sports officiating officials who share the same perceptions	4.13	High Level	4.30	High Level
5. maintain peace and order during sports competition	4.40	High Level	4.60	Very High Level
6. am surrounding myself with people who make wise decisions, especially in officiating endeavors	4.33	High Level	4.43	High Level
7. am able to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation	4.08	High Level	4.27	High Level
8. manage time pressure and ambiguity of the situations during sports competition	4.19	High Level	4.13	High Level
9. conduct orientation to athletes and coaches	4.13	High Level	4.40	High Level
10. comply with and make game results transparent	4.13	High Level	4.70	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.25	High Level	4.38	High Level

Table 14 shows the data on the perceived responses from respondents with a lower level of accreditation, having an overall mean score of 4.25 interpreted as "high level."

As shown in the table, respondents with a lower level of accreditation assessed Item No. 3, which says, "maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches," got the highest mean score of 4.52, interpreted as "very high level." In contrast, Item No. 7, which says, "am able to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation," got the lowest mean score of 4.08, interpreted as "high level."

Table 15. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Communication Skills According to Number of Years

as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>				
1. gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience	3.87	High Level	4.05	High Level
2. communicate by transmitting complete and correct information regarding the implementing rules and regulations prior to the sports competition	4.20	High Level	4.18	High Level
3. have the ability to interact successfully with coaches and athletes	4.02	High Level	4.32	High Level
4. recognize barriers and keep the communication simple and specific	4.05	High Level	4.32	High Level
5. know when not to speak in relation to the task I am assigned	4.25	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
6. am an active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials	4.30	High Level	4.55	Very High Level
7. communicate ideas and concepts to an audience, or instruct them on the do's and don't's during sports competition	4.27	High Level	4.23	High Level
8. get to the point without using unneeded words or images	4.10	High Level	4.18	High Level
9. present information in a logical sequence during solidarity meeting with coaches	4.03	High Level	4.27	High Level
10. make certain that spectators, coaches, and athletes understand my point of view in a calm, specific and clear manner.	4.17	High Level	4.23	High Level
Overall Mean	4.13	High Level	4.28	High Level

As depicted in Table 15, respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials perceived responses with an overall mean score of 4.13 interpreted as "high level."

As assessed by respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials assessed, Item No. 6, which says, "am an active and good listener to any discussion and feedback from coaches, athletes, and co-officiating officials," has the highest mean score of 4.30 interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 1 which says, "gear the language to the appropriate level of the audience" consistently labeled as the lowest mean score of 3.87 interpreted as "high level."

Table 16. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Decision-Making Skills According to Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>				
1. am preparing the mind to react correctly to each movement in order to arrive at a wise decision	4.23	High Level	4.45	High Level

2. observe a situation, make a judgment and then take a decision consistent with the time	4.17	High Level	4.32	High Level
3. have a clear understanding that a wrong decision can result from smaller errors, incorrect knowledge, or information	4.27	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
4. make decisions in accordance with the accepted and agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting	4.30	High Level	4.64	Very High Level
5. make decisions based on the national implementing rules and regulations	4.23	High Level	4.68	Very High Level
6. am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines	4.08	High Level	4.18	High Level
7. fully understand that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact	4.30	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
8. should keep in mind that participants' opinions are significantly more driven by their personal interests, which is why my judgment should be based on fair play	4.15	High Level	4.32	High Level
9. make split-second decisions given in an intense game competition based on all the stimuli received, observed, and analyzed during a game	4.10	High Level	4.23	High Level
10. collaboratively work with other sports officials on the final results of the winning team or coaches	4.12	High Level	4.41	High Level
Overall Mean	4.20	High Level	4.42	High Level

Table 16 presents the responses from the respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials with an overall mean score of 4.20 interpreted as “high level.” Moreover, respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials assessed Item No. 4 and 7 which state, “make decisions in accordance with the accepted” and “agreed-upon rules and regulations established at the solidarity meeting and fully understand that all of the immediate consequences of my decision have a long-term impact” respectively, with the highest mean score of 4.30, both interpreted as “high level” while Item No. 6 which states, “am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines” as the lowest mean score of 4.08, interpreted as “high level.”

This implies that respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials, while highly assessing the item that states am adhering to the most recent and up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines, need to improve it in order to be considered as experienced and qualified sports officiating officials, particularly in combative sports, as participating in training that specializes mostly on simulation scenario means being part of an activity to improve performance as that will serve the foundation to use their decision-making skills decisively. They need to take time to develop the skills to count on themselves to do the right thing, and just like any other skill, it takes time to learn and refine their abilities.

Gilmore (2021) stressed judges have had extensive training in the discipline of judging but are miserably poor at explaining why they made a certain choice. However, they are in the sports world, in which they should make decisions while also accepting that their knowledge of themselves and others is faulty and

limited, yet they must commit to actions based on those decisions. Thus, reflecting on your decisions will help them make better judgments and enhance your decision-making abilities with practice.

Essentially, respondents with a longer number of years as sports officiating officials perceived responses with an overall mean score of 4.42 interpreted as "high level" and assessed Item No. 5, which states, "make decisions based on the national implementing rules and regulations" as the highest mean score of 4.68, interpreted as "very high level." The lowest mean score of 4.19 refers to Item No. 6, which states, "am adhering to the most recent, up-to-date sports implementation rules and guidelines" as the lowest mean score of 4.18, interpreted as "high level."

Table 17. Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Sports Management According to Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a sports officiating official, I...</i>				
1. focus on my breathing and work to drown out all other distractions such as a crowded audience	4.22	High Level	4.05	High Level
2. make sure that the facilities and equipment are ready before or a day before the sporting event	4.43	High Level	4.45	High Level
3. maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches	4.45	High Level	4.50	Very High Level
4. am able to meet and expose myself to a variety of knowledgeable sports officiating officials who share the same perceptions	4.15	High Level	4.32	High Level
5. maintain peace and order during sports competition	4.42	High Level	4.64	Very High Level
6. am surrounding myself with people who make wise decisions, especially in officiating endeavors	4.35	High Level	4.41	High Level
7. am able to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation	4.15	High Level	4.14	High Level
8. manage time pressure and ambiguity of the situations during sports competition	4.23	High Level	4.00	High Level
9. conduct orientation to athletes and coaches	4.22	High Level	4.27	High Level
10. comply with and make game results transparent	4.37	High Level	4.27	High Level
Overall Mean	4.30	High Level	4.30	High Level

Table 17 presents the responses from the respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials with an overall mean score of 4.30 interpreted as "high level."

As shown on the table, respondents assessed Item No. 3, which says, "maintain a healthy relationship with other sports officiating officials and coaches," as the highest mean score of 4.45, interpreted as "high level." In contrast, Item No. 4 and 7 say, "am able to meet and expose myself to a variety of knowledgeable sports officiating officials who share the same perceptions" and "am able to pacify disputes among athletes or co officials with minimum effort as required by the situation" got the lowest mean score of 4.15 and 4.30 respectively, both interpreted as "high level."

Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas, Knowledge, Skills, and Training when grouped according to the Variables, Area of Interest, Level of Accreditation, and Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Table 18. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Knowledge According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. to officiate combative events from lower to higher athletic meet	3.80	High Level	3.85	High Level	4.17	High Level	3.81	High Level
2. to manage the sports events with excellent performance	4.03	High Level	4.31	High Level	4.11	High Level	3.94	High Level
3. to re-echo, as well as to provide any implementing rules and regulations revisions and updates during the sports clinic and solidarity meeting	3.80	High Level	4.23	High Level	4.11	High Level	4.25	High Level
4. to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating	3.83	High Level	4.15	High Level	3.83	High Level	3.75	High Level
5. to denote an understanding of basic sports principles and initial everyday task	3.94	High Level	4.00	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.00	High Level

6. to uphold strong policies against all forms of cheating, malpractices, and unethical behaviors such as unfair advantages among sportspersons	4.09	High Level	4.08	High Level	4.22	High Level	4.31	High Level
7. to adhere to legal rights and responsibilities of an official involved with youth sports	4.17	High Level	4.31	High Level	4.28	High Level	4.44	High Level
8. to make it a point of treating other people with respect while maintaining a cultured image	4.20	High Level	4.54	Very High Level	4.33	High Level	4.69	Very High Level
9. to perform with honesty and integrity	4.31	High Level	4.54	Very High Level	4.39	High Level	4.69	Very High Level
10. to act professionally with tact and skill and abiding the standard code of ethics	4.29	High Level	4.38	High Level	4.61	Very High Level	4.50	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.05	High Level	4.24	High Level	4.23	High Level	4.24	High Level

Table 18 presents the arnis respondents with the perceived responses of an overall mean score of 4.05, interpreted as "high level," and assessed the highest mean score of 4.31 on Item No. 9, which states "to perform with honesty and integrity," interpreted as "high level" while Items No. 1 and 3 which say, "to officiate combative events from lower to higher athletic meet" and "to re-echo, as well as to provide any implementing rules and regulations revisions and updates during the sports clinic and solidarity meeting" got the lowest mean score of 3.80, both interpreted as "high level."

Table 19. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Skills According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As sports officiating official, I demonstrate ...								
1. expertise in my calls and gestures as performing as a platform referee during sports events	3.51	High Level	3.85	High Level	3.67	High Level	3.63	High Level
2. experience a series of actual sporting events, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.66	High Level	3.77	High Level	3.61	High Level	3.69	High Level
3. spent numerous hours in the actual field, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.43	Moderate Level	4.46	High Level	3.56	High Level	3.88	High Level
4. applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration	3.51	High Level	4.46	High Level	3.67	High Level	4.00	High Level
5. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational	3.63	High Level	4.23	High Level	3.50	High Level	3.88	High Level

sports competition								
6. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through higher invitational sports competition	3.40	Moderate Level	3.92	High Level	3.44	Moderate Level	3.31	Moderate Level
7. enhance my expertise by subjecting myself to a yearly sports accreditation	3.46	Moderate Level	3.85	High Level	3.28	Moderate Level	3.69	High Level
8. signal participants and other officials when infractions occur or regulate play or competition	3.29	Moderate Level	3.92	High Level	3.28	Moderate Level	3.81	High Level
9. officiated several sports competitions with a minimal error during sports competition	3.00	Moderate Level	3.46	Moderate Level	3.17	Moderate Level	3.81	High Level
10. performed three or more varied duties in sports events, such as refereeing, table officials, and judging	3.11	Moderate Level	3.69	High Level	3.22	Moderate Level	3.69	High Level
Overall Mean	3.40	Moderate Level	3.96	High Level	3.44	Moderate Level	3.74	High Level

Table 19 shows the perceived responses from arnis respondents with an overall mean score of 3.40 and assessed Item No. 2 which state, "experience a series of actual sporting events, all of which are directly related to expertise," with the highest mean score of 33.66, interpreted as "high level" while the lowest mean

score of 3.00 on Item No. 9 which states, "officiated several sports competition with a minimal error during sports competition" interpreted "moderate level."

Table 20. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Training According to Area of Interest

Items	Arnis		Boxing		Taekwondo		Wushu	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I attended seminars/trainings								
1. in a school level	3.83	High Level	4.00	High Level	3.83	High Level	4.19	High Level
2. in a barangay/local government unit (LGU)	3.34	Moderate Level	3.69	High Level	3.67	High Level	3.81	High Level
3. in a division level	3.34	Moderate Level	4.00	High Level	3.22	Moderate Level	4.38	High Level
4. in a provincial level or Negros Athletic Sports Association	2.37	Low Level	3.23	Moderate Level	2.39	Low Level	2.56	Moderate Level
5. in a Regional level	1.86	Low Level	2.85	Moderate Level	1.89	Low Level	1.88	Low Level
6. in a National Educators' Academy of the Philippines (NEAP)	1.37	Very Low Level	2.38	Low Level	1.61	Low Level	1.13	Very Low Level
7. in a Bureau of Learner Support Services-School Sports Division (BLSS-SSD)	1.31	Very Low Level	2.62	Moderate Level	1.61	Low Level	1.75	Low Level
8. in a sponsored agency such as the Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)	1.26	Very Low Level	2.38	Low Level	1.56	Low Level	1.31	Very Low Level
9. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Sports Commission (PSC)	1.29	Very Low Level	2.62	Moderate Level	1.61	Low Level	1.63	Low Level

10. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy	1.03	Very Low Level	2.54	Moderate Level	1.50	Low Level	1.13	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	2.10	Low Level	3.03	Moderate Level	2.29	Low Level	2.38	Low Level

Table 20 presents the perceived responses from arnis respondents with an overall mean score of 2.10 interpreted as "low level," and as shown in the table, the highest mean score of 3.83 on Item No. 1, which says, "in a school level" got the highest mean score of 3.83 interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 10 which says, "in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy" got the lowest mean score of 1.03 interpreted as "very low level."

This implies that arnis respondents viewed a very low level to the item which says in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy. It depicts that the competence skills of the respondents need to be highly improved by attending training not just sponsored by the Department of Education but also by other sponsoring agencies that will help them grow as sports officiating officials.

Pursuant to regional training for officials of certain sporting events is outlined in Regional Memorandum No. 029, s. 2019 item no. 2 specified the goals of the training, which included updating officiating officials on current trends and strategies in officiating.

On the other hand, boxing respondents perceived responses with an overall mean score of 3.03 interpreted as "moderate level" and assessed Item No. 1 and 3, which says, "in a school level" and "in a division-level" got the highest mean score of 4.00, interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 6 and 8 which say, "in a National Educators' Academy of the Philippines (NEAP)" and "in a sponsored agency such as Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)" got the lowest mean score of 2.38, interpreted as "low level."

Table 21. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Knowledge According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I am competent...				
1. to officiate combative events from lower to higher athletic meet	3.73	High Level	4.17	High Level
2. to manage the sports events with excellent performance	3.94	High Level	4.30	High Level
3. to re-echo, as well as to provide any implementing rules and regulations revisions and updates during the sports clinic and solidarity meeting	3.85	High Level	4.33	High Level
4. to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating	3.69	High Level	4.17	High Level
5. to denote an understanding of basic sports principles and initial everyday task	3.96	High Level	4.17	High Level
6. to upholding strong policies against all forms of cheating,	4.13	High Level	4.20	High Level

malpractices, and unethical behaviors such as unfair advantages among sportspersons				
7. to adhere to the legal rights and responsibilities of an official involved with youth sports	4.29	High Level	4.23	High Level
8. to make it a point of treating other people with respect while maintaining a cultured image	4.37	High Level	4.40	High Level
9. to perform with honesty and integrity	4.35	High Level	4.60	Very High Level
10. to act professionally with tact and skill and abiding the standard code of ethics	4.33	High Level	4.57	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.06	High Level	4.31	High Level

Table 21 presents the data on perceived responses from the respondent with a lower level of accreditation, having an overall mean score of 4.06 interpreted as "high level" and assessed the highest mean score of 4.37 on Item No. 8 which states, "to make it a point of treating other people with respect while maintaining a cultured image" interpreted as "high level". In contrast, Item No. 4 which states, "to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating" got the lowest mean score of 3.69, interpreted as "high level."

Table 22. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Skills According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I demonstrate...				
1. expertise in my calls and gestures as performing as a platform referee during sports events	3.48	Moderate Level	3.87	High Level
2. experience a series of actual sporting events, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.46	Moderate Level	4.03	High Level
3. spent numerous hours in the actual field, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.38	Moderate Level	4.27	High Level
4. applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration	3.52	High Level	4.27	High Level
5. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational sports competition	3.54	High Level	4.10	High Level
6. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through higher invitational sports competition	3.27	Moderate Level	3.83	High Level
7. enhance my expertise by	3.37	Moderate	3.80	High Level

subjecting myself to a yearly sports accreditation		Level		
8. signal participants and other officials when infractions occur or regulate play or competition	3.35	Moderate Level	3.73	High Level
9. officiate several sports competitions with a minimal error during sports competition	3.19	Moderate Level	3.40	Moderate Level
10. performed three or more varied duties in sports events, such as refereeing, table officials, and judging	3.31	Moderate Level	3.40	Moderate Level
Overall Mean	3.39	Moderate Level	3.87	High Level

Table 22 shows the data on the perceived responses from the respondents with a lower level of accreditation, having an overall mean of 3.39 interpreted as "moderate level" and assessed Item No. 5, which states, "expose myself with direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational sports competition" as the highest mean score of 3.54 interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 9 which says, "officiated several sports competition with a minimal error during sports competition" got the lowest mean score of 3.19 interpreted as "moderate level."

Table 23. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Training According to Level of Accreditation

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I attended seminars/trainings				
1. in a school level	3.71	High Level	4.30	High Level
2. in a barangay/local government unit (LGU)	3.40	Moderate Level	3.83	High Level
3. in a division level	3.31	Moderate Level	4.17	High Level
4. in a provincial level or Negros Athletic Sports Association	2.17	Low Level	3.20	Moderate Level
5. in a Regional level	1.63	Low Level	2.70	Moderate Level
6. in a National Educators' Academy of the Philippines (NEAP)	1.37	Very Low Level	1.83	Low Level
7. in a Bureau of Learner Support Services-School Sports Division (BLSS-SSD)	1.35	Very Low Level	2.23	Low Level
8. in a sponsored agency such as the Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)	1.31	Very Low Level	1.87	Low Level
9. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Sports Commission (PSC)	1.33	Very Low Level	2.17	Low Level

10. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy	1.19	Very Low Level	1.73	Low Level
Overall Mean	2.08	Low Level	2.80	Moderate Level

Table 23 presents the data on the perceived responses from the respondents with a lower level of accreditation with an overall mean score of 2.08 interpreted as "low level" and assessed Item No. 1, which states, "in a school level" with the highest mean score of 3.71 and interpreted as "high level" while Item No. 10 which states, "in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy" with a lowest mean score of 1.19 interpreted as "very low level" interpreted as "low level."

Table 24. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Knowledge According to Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. to officiate combative events from lower to higher athletic meet	3.82	High Level	4.09	High Level
2. to manage the sports events with excellent performance	3.98	High Level	4.32	High Level
3. to re-echo, as well as to provide any implementing rules and regulations revisions and updates during the sports clinic and solidarity meeting	3.88	High Level	4.41	High Level
4. to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating	3.70	High Level	4.32	High Level
5. to denote an understanding of basic sports principles and initial everyday task	4.00	High Level	4.14	High Level
6. to upholding strong policies against all forms of cheating, malpractices, and unethical behaviors such as unfair advantages among sportspersons	4.18	High Level	4.09	High Level
7. to adhere to the legal rights and responsibilities of an official involved with youth sports	4.27	High Level	4.27	High Level
8. to make it a point of treating other people with respect while maintaining a cultured image	4.27	High Level	4.68	Very High Level
9. to perform with honesty and integrity	4.37	High Level	4.64	Very High Level
10. to act professionally with tact and skill and abiding the standard code of ethics	4.35	High Level	4.59	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.08	High Level	4.35	High Level

Table 24 presents the data on the perceived responses of respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials respondents having an overall mean score of 4.08, interpreted as 'high level' and assessed Item No. 9, which states, "to perform with honesty and integrity" with a highest mean score of 4.35, interpreted as "high level" while the lowest mean score of 3.70 on Item No. 4 which says, "to annually have undergone performance appraisal with a very satisfactory rating" interpreted as "high level."

Table 25. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Skills According to Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I demonstrate...				
1. expertise in my calls and gestures as performing as a platform referee during sports events	3.55	High Level	3.82	High Level
2. experience a series of actual sporting events, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.58	High Level	3.91	High Level
3. spent numerous hours in the actual field, all of which are directly related to expertise	3.52	High Level	4.23	High Level
4. applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration	3.62	High Level	4.27	High Level
5. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational sports competition	3.62	High Level	4.09	High Level
6. expose myself to direct experience of sports officiating through higher invitational sports competition	3.33	Moderate Level	3.86	High Level
7. enhance my expertise by subjecting myself to a yearly sports accreditation	3.38	Moderate Level	3.91	High Level
8. signal participants and other officials when infractions occur or regulate play or competition	3.35	Moderate Level	3.86	High Level
9. officiated several sports competitions with a minimal error during sports competition	3.25	Moderate Level	3.32	Moderate Level
10. perform three or more varied duties in sports events, such as refereeing, table officials, and judging	3.17	Moderate Level	3.82	High Level
Overall Mean	3.44	Moderate Level	3.91	High Level

Table 25 depicts the data on the perceived responses of respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials, having an overall mean score of 3.44, interpreted as a "moderate level." As

shown in the table, a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials respondents assessed Item No. 4 and 5, which state, "applied my learning expertise through attending sports clinic actual demonstration" and "expose myself with direct experience of sports officiating through local invitational sports competition" with a highest mean score of 3.62, interpreted as "high level." In contrast, Item No. 10, which states, "perform three or more varied duties in sports events, such as refereeing, table officials and judging," got the lowest mean score of 3.17, interpreted as "moderate level."

Table 26. Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Training According to Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a sports officiating official, I attended seminars/trainings				
1. in a school level	3.82	High Level	4.23	High Level
2. in a barangay/local government unit (LGU)	3.43	Moderate Level	3.91	High Level
3. in a division level	3.47	Moderate Level	4.05	High Level
4. in a provincial level or Negros Athletic Sports Association	2.28	Low Level	3.27	Moderate Level
5. in a Regional level	1.85	Low Level	2.50	Moderate Level
6. in a National Educators' Academy of the Philippines (NEAP)	1.50	Low Level	1.64	Low Level
7. in a Bureau of Learner Support Services-School Sports Division (BLSS-SSD)	1.52	Low Level	2.09	Low Level
8. in a sponsored agency such as the Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)	1.37	Very Low Level	1.91	Low Level
9. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Sports Commission (PSC)	1.40	Very Low Level	2.27	Low Level
10. in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy	1.37	Very Low Level	1.45	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	2.20	Low Level	2.73	Moderate Level

Table 26 presents the data on perceived responses of respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials with an overall mean score of 2.20 interpreted as "low level." As shown in the table, respondents with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials assessed Item No. 1, which states, "in a school level," with the highest mean score of 3.82 interpreted as "high level" while the lowest mean score of 1.37 on Item No. 8 and 10 which state, "in a sponsored agency such as Bureau of Curriculum Development (BCD)/Sports Program in Sports (SPS)" and "in a sponsored agency such as Philippine youth games-Batang Pinoy" interpreted as "very low level." While the respondents with a longer number of years as sports officiating officials perceived an overall mean score of 2.73, interpreted as a "moderate level." The respondents showed a highest mean score of 4.23 on Item No. 1, which states "in a school level," interpreted as "high level." In contrast, the lowest mean score of 1.45 on Item No. 10, which states, "in a sponsored agency such as Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy," interpreted as "very low level."

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Communication Skills, Decision-Making Skills, and Sports Management when grouped and compared according to the Variables, Area of Interest, Level of Accreditation, and Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials.

Table 27. Difference in the Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas of Communication Skills According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	37.50	637.50	4.847	0.183	0.05	Not Significant
	Boxing	13	42.15					
	Taekwondo	18	38.75					
	Wushu	16	52.78					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	38.76	637.50		0.169		Not Significant
	Higher	30	46.25					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	39.72	553.00		0.261		Not Significant
	Longer	22	46.36					

As shown in table 27, on a variable area of interest, the computed H was 4.847 with a p-value of 0.183, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as "not significant." Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the area of interest" is accepted.

With regard to a variable level of accreditation, the computed U was 637.50 with a p-value of 0.169, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus interpreted as "not significant." Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the level of accreditation" is accepted. Further, for the variable of the number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U was 553.00 with a p-value of 0.261, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, hence, interpreted as "not significant." Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the number of years as sports officiating officials" is accepted.

Table 28. Difference in Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas Decision-Making Skills According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	42.17	696.00	1.231	0.746	0.05	Not Significant
	Boxing	13	36.88					
	Taekwondo	18	39.50					
	Wushu	16	46.03					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	39.88	696.00		0.417		Not Significant
	Higher	30	44.30					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	38.81	498.50		0.090		Not Significant
	Longer	22	48.84					

Table 28 reveals the statistics on the significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials in the area of decision-making skills according to the area of interest, level of accreditation, and the number of years as sports officiating officials.

As revealed in the table, on a variable area of interest, the computed H is 1.231 with a p -value of 0.746, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the area of interest" is accepted.

With regards to a variable level of accreditation, the computed U is 696.00 with a p -value of 0.417, which is also greater than the 0.05 level of significance, hence, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to "level of accreditation" is accepted. Moreover, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 498.50 with a p -value of 0.090, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the number of years as sports officiating officials" is accepted.

Table 29. Difference in the Level of Technical Skills of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Sports Management According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	40.91	685.50	0.325	0.955	0.05	Not Significant
	Boxing	13	43.19					
	Taekwondo	18	39.58					
	Wushu	16	43.56					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	39.68	616.00		0.362	0.644	Not Significant
	Higher	30	44.65					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	40.77	616.00		0.644	0.644	Not Significant
	Longer	22	43.50					

As presented in the table 29, on a variable area of interest, the computed H was 0.325 with a p -value of 0.955, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as "not significant." Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the area of interest" is accepted.

Moreover, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 616.00 with a p -value of 0.644, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the level of accreditation" is accepted.

Hence, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 616.00 with a p -value of 0.644, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of technical skills of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the number of years as sports officiating officials" is accepted.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Areas of Knowledge, Skills, and Training when grouped and compared according to the Variables Area of Interest, Level of Accreditation, and Number of Years as Sports Officiating Officials

Table 30. Difference in the Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Knowledge According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	38.24	597.50	1.247	0.742	0.05	Not Significant
	Boxing	13	45.65					
	Taekwondo	18	43.06					
	Wushu	16	43.50					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	37.99	597.50		0.078		Not Significant
	Higher	30	47.58					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	39.17	520.00		0.142		Not Significant
	Longer	22	47.86					

Table 30 exhibits the statistics on a variable area of interest. The computed H is 1.247 with a p -value of 0.742, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, so interpreted as not significant. Then, a 0.05 level of significance is thus, interpreted as "significant." Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when they are grouped and compared according to the area of interest" is accepted.

Regarding a variable level of accreditation, the computed U is 597.50 with a p -value of 0.078, which is also greater than the 0.05 level of significance, hence, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the level of accreditation" is accepted.

Also, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 520.00 with a p -value of 0.142, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, consequently interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when they are grouped and compared according to the number of years as sports officiating officials" is accepted.

Table 31. Difference in the Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Skills According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	37.09	467.50	4.196	0.241	0.05	Not Significant
	Boxing	13	51.12					
	Taekwondo	18	38.89					
	Wushu	16	46.28					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	37.44	569.00		0.042		Significant
	Higher	30	48.53					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	38.29	467.50		0.044		Significant
	Longer	22	50.25					

As presented in Table 31, the data show the variable area of interest with the computed H is 4.196 with a p -value of 0.241, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, hence, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, “there is no significant difference in the level of competencies of sports officiating officials when they are grouped and compared according to the area of interest” is accepted.

In the variable level of accreditation, the computed U is 569.00 with a p -value of 0.042, which is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, interestingly interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competencies of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the level of accreditation" is rejected.

Likewise, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 467.50 with a p -value of 0.044, which is also lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, “there is no significant difference in the level of competencies of sports officiating officials when they are grouped and compared according to the number of years as sports officiating officials” is also rejected.

This implies that respondents assessed the area of interest as the only, not significant variable, which means that they shared the same significant views of assessment regardless of their designated sports might it be in arnis, boxing, taekwondo, or wushu, where sports officiating officials were designated to, particularly in terms of using their skills which was more of simulation or game-like manner being applied during sports certification or accreditation and because of the whole year round exposure of their skills in the locality like division athletic meet and local sports invitational competitions.

Agreeing, Livingston & Forbes (2017) mentioned that the requirement within sports is to keep up with skill developments not just to the referee but also to the whole sports officiating officials.

Furthermore, it also implies that in terms of the variable level of accreditation, the data resulted significantly in which sports officiating officials with a lower level of accreditation got the lowest mean rank than those with a higher level of accreditation through interpreted both as high level yet it did not suffice when it comes to their competence. That is why the sports management required the level of certification to have a very satisfactory rating in the performance appraisal in order to officiate specifically in a higher level of sports competition. In that sense, some of the combative skills could be learned through theories and joining sports certification to perform repeated set like calls and gestures, imprinting the correct technique to be qualified in higher sports competitions.

In addition, Sandifer (2018) stated that one should reflect on their task and utilize skill evaluation tools such as joining or participating in a sports certification to learn more about their talents or skills needed as sports officiating officials able to officiate in a higher level of sports competition.

Table 32. Difference in the Level of Competence of Sports Officiating Officials in the Area Training According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	Kruskal Wallis H test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Area of Interest	Arnis	35	34.33	405.00	8.552	0.036	0.05	Significant
	Boxing	13	56.15					
	Taekwondo	18	41.44					
	Wushu	16	45.34					
Level of Accreditation	Lower	52	34.29	455.00		0.000		Significant
	Higher	30	54.00					
Number of Years as sports officiating officials	Shorter	60	38.08	455.00		0.032		Significant
	Longer	22	50.82					

Table 32 exhibits the statistics that shows a variable area of interest with the computed H is 8.552 with a p -value of 0.036, which is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, henceforth interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the variable area of interest" is rejected. While, in the variable level of accreditation, the computed U is 405.00 with a p -value of 0.000, which is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, remarkably, interpreted as significant too. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the variable level of accreditation" is rejected. Similarly, on the variable number of years as sports officiating officials, the computed U is 455.00 with a p -value of 0.032, which is also lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "there is no significant difference in the level of competence of sports officiating officials when grouped and compared according to the variable area "number of years as sports officiating officials" is rejected.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: In terms of variable areas of interest, most of the respondents were arnis. Thus this study concludes that the online accreditation conducted by the PEKAF for arnis anyo judges and technical officials with the support of the school sports division achieved its objective through implementing a system of capacity building for public school teachers involved in sports. On the other hand, on variable levels of accreditation, the respondents were highly dominated by a lower level of accreditation. Thus this study concludes that attending a series of sports accreditation glued with direct exposure and experience will confidently represent themselves with correct, skillful, complete, and competitive in performing the task and a higher chance to officiate in higher sports competition. Likewise, on the variable about the number of years as sports officiating officials, the respondents were highly dominated with a shorter number of years as sports officiating officials. Thus, this study concludes that for them to be explicitly seasoned enough in intense combative sports, they should engage in different sports training, sports clinic, solidarity meeting, and several sports competitions, for it is through direct exposure and experience that they will professionally grow in sports. Even so, the findings in the level of technical skills when all areas were considered got high level; thus, this study concludes that the respondents were able to perform technically in a crucial task and able to keep up with the match dynamics when officiating and highly execute resiliency in unfavorable situations, regardless of criticism. Further, the level of competence when all areas were considered also got a high level except for training. Thus this study concludes that there was a lack of competence on the part of the respondents since the pandemic arose, and they need highly to improve themselves by attending training not just sponsored by the department of education but also by sponsoring agencies and even personally invest time and money that will help them grow professionally in sports. Furthermore, when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, the level of technical skills got a high level. Thus, this study concludes that sports officiating officials were technically good as being manifested and perceived in their responses but can still be improved. Moreover, the level of competence when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables got high level except for skills with moderate and high level, and with training which got moderate and low level. Thus this study concludes that their competence in terms of knowledge was highly manifested in their factual information and on how to use it to generate action; hence sports officiating officials made substantial contributions to organized sports, but scientific information to support their specialized training and skills instruction at various levels had been lacking. Also, by attending training sessions, referees can get a formal sports certification and competently execute skills. Whereas the findings showed no significant difference in the level of technical skills, thus this study concludes that technically all sports officiating officials manifested the same and perceived views, but it can still be improved. However, the findings also showed no significant difference in the level of competence in the area of knowledge. Yet, it showed a significant difference in skills on the variable level of accreditation and number of years as sports officiating officials. Thus this study, as mentioned earlier, concludes that their competence in terms of knowledge was highly manifested in their factual information and on how to use it to generate action; hence sports officiating officials made substantial contributions to organized sports, but scientific information to support

their specialized skills instruction at various levels had been lacking. Also, by attending training sessions, referees and all sports officiating officials could get a formal sports certification and competently execute skills. Nevertheless, it also showed a significant difference in the level of competence in the area of training. It could be concluded that sports officiating officials could not get sports certification because of limited and unavailability of training sessions and activities wherein an aspiring referee can learn more about game rules and play, refereeing skills, and the understanding of the methods of a league in training clinics sponsored by sports organizations.

References

1. A beginner's Guide: How to become a Sports Manager.
<https://managerskills.org/sports/become-sports-manager/>
2. Abiodun-Oyebanji, Olayemi. (2017). Research variables: types, uses and definition of terms
3. Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411
4. Article: The importance of Communication in Sports, 2018.
Arkansas State University
5. Balyi, Istvan. Article. Long-term Athlete Development: The System and solutions. www.coach.ca/a-test/crep.html
6. Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.
7. Bersamin, Ryan. (2018). BWF Technical Officials' Resources: Line Judges' Manual. Badminton World Federation
8. Benjamin Schwamberger, M. C.-S. (2017). Influence of a training programme on a preservice teacher's ability to promote moral and sporting behaviour in sport education. *Google Scholar*.
9. Binayao, 2021: Educating DepEd Teachers on Knowledge and Skills in Sports (KSS).
10. Blanco, Dennis. (2017). Sports Governance: Issues, Challenges and Perspectives. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*. 17. 105-111.
11. Bo, H, (2019). Importance of Communication in Sports. *Athlete Assessment.com: Performance through people*
12. Channon, A. (2022): 'The man in the middle': mixed martial arts referees and the production and management of socially desirable risk, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, DOI:10.1080/2159676X.2022.2027810
13. Chen, X., Zhang G., Yin X., Li Y., Cao G., Gutierrez-Garcia, C., & Guo L. (2019). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Aggressive Behavior in Boxers: The Mediating Role of Self Control. *Front. Psychol.* 10, 212. Doi: 10.3389/psyg.2019.00212
14. Clark, H. J., Camiré, M., Wade, T. J., & Cairney, J. (2015). Sport participation and its association with social and psychological factors known to predict substance use and abuse among youth: A scoping review of the literature. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 8(1), 224–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2015.1068829>
15. Commission on Higher Education and Department of Education. Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU). 2022
16. Cunningham, Ian., Mergler, Jason, & Wattie, Nick (2022). Training and Development in Sports Officials: A Systematic Review
17. Cynarski, Wojciech (2019). Martial Arts and Combat Sports: Towards the General Theory of Fighting Arts. The Lykeion Library series, Vol. 25
18. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Social Inclusion. (2020). <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/2020/05/covid-19-sport/>
http://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/05/PB_73.pdf

19. DepEd Memorandum No. 13, s. 2019.
The Philippine Sports Commission (PSC), in partnership with the Department of Education (DepEd), will conduct the 2019 Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy
20. Department of Education-Region VI. (2019). Regional Memorandum No. 029. <http://region6.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2019/03/RM-No.-029-s.-2019-Regional-Training-for-Officiating-Officials-of-the-Selected-Sports-Events.pdf>
21. Doyle, A. (2020). How to Get Skill Sets What Is a Skill Set? Definition and examples of a Skill Set
<https://www.thebalancecareers.com/what-is-a-skill-set-2062103>
22. Doyle, A. (2021). Important Technical Skills with Examples. *the balance careers*.
23. Edwards, T., Spiteri, T., Piggott, B., Haff, G. G., & Joyce, C. (2018). A Narrative Review of the Physical Demands and Injury Incidence in American Football: Application of Current Knowledge and Practices in Workload Management. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 48(1), 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-017-0783-2>
24. Eilers, C. (2017). An Article: Communication Skills.
25. Executive Order No. 44. Philippine Youth Games-Batang Pinoy
26. Farley, J.B., Stein, J., Keogh, J.W.L. *et al.* The Relationship Between Physical Fitness Qualities and Sport-Specific Technical Skills in Female, Team-Based Ball Players: A Systematic Review. *Sports Med - Open* 6, 18 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-020-00245-y>
27. Febrianita, Roziana & Hardjati, Susi. (2019). The Power of Interpersonal Communication Skill in Enhancing Service Provision. *JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH*. 14. 3192-3199. 10.24297/jssr.v14i0.8150.
28. Floresca, Jocelyn Alberto and Uy, Gilda Lasat, ‘Road to the Belt’ of a Female Mixed Martial Arts Fighter (October 30, 2019). *Education Quarterly Reviews*, Vol.2 No.4 (2019), Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3478401>
29. Frost, J. L., (2018). Characteristics Contributing to the Success of a Sports Coach. *The sports journal*. A peer-reviewed journal of sports. United States Sports Academy
30. Gilmore, H (2021). Sports Analytics and Data Science: Psychology Explained (Part 2) <https://www.outputsports.com/new-blog/2021/1/18/decision-making-in-sport>
31. Godin, P. (2022). Why Communication Is So Important for Leaders“ Sport Mediation: Mediating High-Performance Sports Disputes,” *Harvard Negotiation Journal* Vol. 33: 25-51) at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nejo.12172/full> © 2017 Paul Godin
32. Goldsmith, Wayne (2020). Sports Skills: The 7 Sports Skills Steps You Must Master in Every Sport. <https://wgcoaching.com/sports-skills/>
33. Gonzalez, J. J., & Torneo, A. R. (2021). Diaspora diplomacy: Weapon of mass dispersion. In *Routledge Handbook of Asian Diaspora and Development* (pp. 253-267). Routledge.
34. Guiriba, R. A. M., Cruz, L. A. D., & Camarador, R. A. Sports competitive anxiety and burnout level among collegiate athletes. *International Journal of Health, Physical Education & Computer Science in Sports*, 78.
35. Hancock, David & Bennett, Samantha & Roaten, Hannah & Chapman, Kyle & Stanley, Caleb. (2020). An Analysis of Literature on Sport Officiating Research. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 92. 1-11. 10.1080/02701367.2020.1756198.
36. Hargie, O (2019). *The Handbook of Communication Skills Fourth Edition*. Nevada State Athletic Commission
<https://Routledge> by Taylor and Francis Group
37. Harris, A. & Sen, M. (2018). Bias and Judging.
<https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/msen/files/bias-judging-arps.pdf>
38. Hill, Jon Gregory, "High Performance: Exploratory Study into the High

- Performance Model and Qualitative Secondary Analysis of Elite Sport Management in the United States" (2021). Theses and Dissertations-- Education Sciences. 87. https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edsc_etds/87Synthesis
39. iArnis guidelines, 2020.
 40. IvyPanda. (2020, January 17). *Sports Event Management*. <https://ivypanda.com/essays/sports-event-management-dissertation/>
 41. Karpman, S., Reid, P.C., Phillips, L.A., Qin, Z., & Gross, D.P. (2016). Combative Sports Injuries: An Edmonton Retrospective. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*, 26, 332–334.
 42. Kasper, Corey MD Sports Training Principles, Current Sports Medicine Reports: April 2019 - Volume 18 - Issue 4 - p 95-96doi: 10.1249/JSR.0000000000000576
 43. Kent, S., Devonport, T. J., Lane, A. M., Nicholls, W., & Friesen, A. P. (2018). The Effects of Coping Interventions on Ability to Perform Under Pressure. *Journal of sports science & medicine*, 17(1), 40–55.
 44. Khan, A., Khan, S., Ul-Islan, S. Z., & K, M. (2017). Communication Skills of a Teacher and Its Role in the Development of the Students' Academic Success. *Journal of Education and Practice*
 45. Li, Shu MB; Cao, Meijuan PhD; Zhu, Xuejiao PhD* Evidence-based practice, *Medicine*: September 2019 - Volume 98 - Issue 39 - p e17209 doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000017209
 46. Lim, T., & O'Sullivan, D. M. (2016). Case Study of Mental Skills Training for a Taekwondo Olympian. *Journal of human kinetics*, 50, 235– 245. <https://doi.org/10.1515/hukin-2015-0161>
 47. MacCharles, Jeffrey, "Covering All Their Bases: An Investigation Into Identity Covering in the Sport Workplace" (2020). Doctoral Dissertations. 2052. <https://doi.org/10.7275/18830280> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/2052
 48. Magalona, J. C., Tangkudung, J., & Rungduin, T. (2020). Personal Training Traits, Training Competence And Motivation As Predictors To Sports Performance Of Paralympiada Athletes In Negros Island, Philippines. *Journal of Indonesian Physical Education and Sport*, 6(2), 44.
 49. Megan Lorains, Kevin Ball & Clare MacMahon (2013) Performance analysis for decision making in team sports, *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*, 13:1, 110-119, DOI: 10.1080/24748668.2013.11868635
 50. Peter Gröpel & Christopher Mesagno (2019) Choking interventions in sports: A systematic review, *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 12:1, 176-201, DOI: 10.1080/1750984X.2017.1408134
 51. Ponce, M., Camarador, R., Torres III, A.A. Evaluation of Sports Training Program of Marikina Polytechnic College as Perceived by the Coaches and Athletes. *International Journal of Health, Physical Education and Computer Science in Sports*.
 52. Rafael, D., & Kim, S. (2020). Can scoring in boxing be fixed? It's not an easy problem to solve. *Espn.com.boxingstory* . *International Taekwon-do Federation Tournament Rules* <http://universaltaekwon-do.com.au/tournament-rules/>
 53. Raguindin, P. Z. J. (2020). Integrating Concepts and Expressions of Inclusion in the K-Curriculum: The Case of the Philippines. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 305-317.
 54. Roxas, L, Viuya, P., & Vallejo, O. (2018). *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 8, Issue 10, October 2018 442 ISSN 2250-3153 DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.8.10.2018.p8258 <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.8.10.2018.p8258>
 55. Sanchez, D. T., Peconcillo Jr, L. B., Wong, R. L., Panzo, R. C., Flores, M. C. A., Labrado, O. A., & Godinez, J. A. T. (2020). Exploring The Lived Experiences Of Young Arnisadors: The Curricular & Co-Curricular Challenges. *Solid State Technology*, 6467-6480.
 56. Serrano, J.A., Serano, S. , Camarador, R. *International Journal of Health, Physical Education and Computer Science in Sports Exploring the mental toughness and sports performance among college student-athletes. Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines.*

57. Silva, Ana & Conte, Daniele & Clemente, Filipe. (2020). Decision-Making in Youth Team-Sports Players: A Systematic Review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 17. 3803. 10.3390/ijerph17113803.
58. *Sports Management Review* (2017). Editor Article Selection: Sport Governance. Elsevier
59. The AAU Taekwondo Commitment. (2021). Amateur Athletic Union United States of America <https://www.teamusa.org/USA-Taekwondo/V2-Coaching/Coach-Selection-Procedures> ©2021 United States Olympic & Paralympic Committee.
60. Vidal, M. A. B., Berdan, G. S., De Rosas, M. R. V., & Go, J. V. F. (2017). Development And Acceptability Of Instructional Module In Arnis In Physical Education College Faculty In The University Of Rizal System.
61. YourDissertation. (2022). *The Sports Management Techniques*. Retrieved from <https://yourdissertation.com/dissertation-examples-sports-management-techniques/>