University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2010

Perceptions of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics : a study of NCAA men's sport coaches.

Dustin Thorn University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd

Recommended Citation

Thorn, Dustin, "Perceptions of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics : a study of NCAA men's sport coaches." (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 1440. https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1440

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A STUDY OF NCAA MEN'S SPORT COACHES

By

Dustin Thorn B.S., Georgia Institute of Technology, 2001 M.S., University of Louisville, 2004

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Human Resource Education University of Louisville Louisville, Kentucky

May 2010

Copyright 2010 by Dustin Thorn

All right reserved

PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A STUDY OF NCAA MEN'S SPORT COACHES

By

Dustin F. Thorn B.S., Georgia Institute of Technology, 2001 M.S., University of Louisville, 2004

A Dissertation Approved on

December 11, 2009

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Mary A. Hums, Dissertation Co-Chair

Daniel F. Mahony, Dissertation Co-Chair

T. Christopher Greenwell, Dissertation Co-Chair

Anita M. Moorman

Carolyn Rude-Parkins

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my loving wife, Amy, and beautiful daughter, Mallory, who have given me the inspiration, support, and purpose for completing this educational journey. The frustration of spending long nights in the library, missing family dinners and goodnight kisses were always amended by their laughter and smiles of patience and unconditional love. I am forever thankful for having them in my life. I love you both.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Robert and Aleta Thorn, for teaching me the importance of education. It is your guidance that has instilled in me a desire to achieve more and do my very best. My accomplishments are all attributed to you being a father, a mother, and a friend. I love you both.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my sisters, Colleen and Natalie, who have challenged me in being a positive influence. I love you both.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the many people who have helped me along this long process of educational discovery. First I would like to acknowledge my dissertation cochairs, Dr. Mary Hums, Dr. Daniel Mahony, and Dr. Christopher Greenwell. Dr. Hums, you have always been a guiding light for me, continuously pushing me to look for what is not present, rather than what is. You are the example of a scholar I will look to as I begin my academic career. Dr. Daniel Mahony, your efficiency and willingness to working with me over the years has made me forever grateful. You have provided me insight and direction at times when my ambitions and expectations of this study were not achievable. Dr. Christopher Greenwell, your background in methodology proved invaluable to this project. I thank you for your continued efforts in being a consulate, providing the advice necessary in defining the purpose of this study. I also want to acknowledge the other members of my dissertation committee who offered their valuable insights, Anita Moorman and Dr. Carolyn Rude-Parkins,

I would also like to recognize several other people who have assisted me in my knowledge development. To all of my doctoral professors who have taught me how both teach and perform research: Dr. Damon Andrew, Dr. Namok Choi, Dr. John Keedy, Dr. Alexis Lyras, Dr. Simon Pack, Dr. Joseph Petrosko, Dr. John Welsh, and Dr. Paul Winter. To my fellow doctoral students who shared in this experience. You offered support, encouragement, and challenged me to get this done. I am honored to have you as a colleague. Finally, I would acknowledge the coaches who spent the time responding to

iv

this study. Without their contributions, none of this research is possible. Thank you for your time.

v

•

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A STUDY OF NCAA MEN'S SPORT COACHES

Dustin F. Thorn

December 11, 2009

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship among organizational justice components, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment within the intercollegiate athletics setting. Perceptions of three organizational justice components (procedural, distributive, and interactional), overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were gathered from head and assistant coaches of NCAA Division I and III baseball, men's basketball, and wrestling programs.

Findings indicated the following: (a) significant interactional effects were found between sport type and NCAA Division, (b) a significant interactional effect was found between sport type and job title, (c) no significant differences were present on perceptions of overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment, (d) different organizational justice components contributed uniquely to predicting both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among all sport types, and (e) while sport type did not significantly moderate the relationship between distributive justice and overall job satisfaction, marginal means plots did indicate interactions to be present.

The discussion of the findings centers on three points. First, perceptions of organizational justice components among male sport coaches predict overall job

vi

satisfaction and organizational commitment differently. While the focus of intercollegiate athletics typically hovers around the topic of resource distribution, the present study found perceptions of overall job satisfaction and organization commitment of nonrevenue-generating coaches is predicated by procedural and interactional justice. Second, interactional justice was supported as an independent component of organizational justice in the sport setting. Athletic decision makers have the ability to change perceptions of fairness with little organizational change. However, challenges do exists as some athletic decision makers do not have the ability to change their interactional approach. Finally, sport type did interact in the relationship between organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This finding challenges athletic decision makers to seek the use of decision making models that affect all sport types in a positive manner.

Suggestions for practical application by athletic department decision makers, including: (a) focus on interactions with coaches, (b) develop a scoring or tracking system of organizational justice components, and (c) segment sports based on revenue generation. Finally, the present study provides three suggestions for future research: (a) expand the literature of interactional justice, (b) further define of sport type based on revenue generation, and (c) examine these variables outside of intercollegiate athletics.

vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Organizational Justice	3
	Prior Research on Organizational Justice in Intercollegiate Athletics	6
	Job Satisfaction	8
	Prior Research on Job Satisfaction in Intercollegiate Athletics	11
	Organizational Commitment	12
	Prior Research on Organizational Commitment in Intercollegiate Athlet	ics15
	The Relationship among Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and	
	Organizational Commitment	18
	Statement of the Problem	21
	Purpose of the Present Study	22
	Significance of the Study	22
	Research Questions	23
	Delimitations	26
	Limitations	26
	Definition of Terms	27
TT		20
П.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	30
	Organizational Justice	31
	Theoretical Background	35
	Distributive Justice	38
	Procedural Justice	43
	Interactional Justice	48
	Summary of Organizational Justice	49
	Organizational Justice in Sport	51
	Organizational Justice Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics	52
	Organizational Justice in Intercollegiate Athletics	58
	Summary of Organizational Justice in Sport	75
	Job Satisfaction	77
	Theoretical Background	78

Theories of Job Satisfaction	81
Facet Versus Overall Measurement of Job Satisfaction	83
Consequences of Job Satisfaction	85
Summary of Job Satisfaction	86
Job Satisfaction in Sport	89
Job Satisfaction Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics	89
Job Satisfaction in Intercollegiate Athletics	92
Summary of Job Satisfaction in Sport	98
Organizational Commitment	101
Theoretical Background	.102
Foci Versus Overall Measurement of	
Organizational Commitment	.107
Consequences of Organizational Commitment	.108
Correlates of Organizational Commitment	.110
Summary of Organizational Commitment	.111
Organizational Commitment in Sport	
Organizational Commitment Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics	.113
Organizational Commitment in Intercollegiate Athletics	.117
Summary of Organizational Commitment in Sport	.119
Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment.	.121
Relationships Among Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction,	
and Organizational Commitment	.122
Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational	
Commitment in Sport	.129
Summary of Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction and	
Organizational Commitment	.135
Justification for the Present Study	.139
III. METHODOLOGY	.141
Study Purpose and Research Questions	.141
Research Design	143
Participants	.144
Instrumentation	.148
Demographic Questionnaire	.148
Organizational Justice Index (OJI)	.148
Job In General (JIG)	.149
General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC)	.150
Open Ended Questionnaire	.152
Data Collection	.153
Data Analysis	.155
Differences in Coaches' Perceptions of Organizational Justice	.155
Differences in Coaches' Perceptions of Overall Job Satisfaction	
and Overall Organizational Commitment	.158
Relationship between Organizational Justice and Both Job	
Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment	.160
Summary of Methodology	.163

IV. RESULTS	164
Preliminary Statistical Analysis	164
Response Rate	164
Demographic and Mean Scores	165
Representative Population	167
Response Bias	167
Reliability	168
Results Research Question 1	169
Results Research Question 2 & 3	172
Results Research Question 4	174
Multiple Regression Analysis	175
Factorial ANOVA Analysis	178
Marginal Means Plots for Perceptions of Organizational	
Justice and Both Overall Job Satisfaction and	
Organizational Commitment	180
Results Summary	182
V. DISCUSION	185
Findings and Theoretical Significance	186
Coaches' Perceptions of Organizational Justice Components	186
Interactional Effects between Sport Type and	
NCAA Division	187
Interactional effects between Sport Type and Job Title	189
Coaches' Levels of Overall Job Satisfaction and	
Organizational Commitment	190
Main Effects of Overall Job Satisfaction	191
Main Effects of Organizational Commitment	192
The Relationship between Organizational Justice Components	
and both Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational	102
	193
Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction	194
Predictors of Organizational Commitment	196
The Effects Sport Type has on the Relationship between	
Organizational Justice Components and both Overall Job	107
Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment	197
Practical Applications of New Findings	198
Organizational Commitment	100
Urganizational Communent	199
Organizational Justice as an independent Component of	202
Organizational Justice Within Intercollegiate Athletics	203
Organizational Justice Components and Dath Overall Jah	
Organizational Justice Components and Both Overall Job	206
Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment	200
Suggestions for Future Research	208
Future investigation of interactional justice	208

Defining Sport Type in Intercollegiate Athletics	209
Applications of Organizational Justice Outside Intercollegiate	
Athletics	210
Conclusion	211
REFERENCES	213
APPENDICES	227
CURRICULUM VITAE	239

LIST OF TABLES

TA	ABLE PAGE
1.	Population Cell Sizes of Present Study147
2.	Population Cell Sizes of Respondents for the Present Study165
3.	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
4.	Reliability Estimate Measures for Survey Instrument
5.	MANOVA Summary for Organizational Justice Perceptions by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title
6.	ANOVA Summary for Organizational Justice Perceptions by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title
7.	ANOVA Summary for Overall Job Satisfaction by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title
8.	ANOVA Summary for Organizational Commitment by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title
9.	Multiple Regression of Organizational Justice Perceptions Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction for NCAA men's Coaches
10	. Multiple Regression of Organizational Justice Perceptions Predicting Organizational Commitment for NCAA men's Coaches
11	ANOVA Summary of Overall Job Satisfaction by Organizational Justice Components and Sport Type
12	ANOVA Summary of Organizational Commitment by Organizational Justice Components and Sport Type

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of intercollegiate sport has changed over the past 20 years. National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions, at all Divisions (I, II, and III), have drastically increased their athletic operating expenses. The NCAA reported that for the 2006 fiscal year the largest total athletic expenses for a Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institution was \$101,805,000, while the median total expenditure of an FBS institution was \$38,602,000 (NCAA, 2008c). These figures differ dramatically from the 1989 NCAA report which indicated the average Division I-A institution carried athletic operating expenses of only \$9,700,000 (NCAA, 2005a). These figures alone may indicate the intercollegiate athletics sector is performing well financially. However, the 2006 NCAA report also revealed only 19 of the 119 FBS athletic programs reported positive net revenue (NCAA, 2008c). Of programs reporting a net loss, the average deficit was \$8,923,000. Finally, the NCAA reported that the gap between financially successful programs and financially burdened programs continues to increase and has doubled since 2004 (NCAA, 2008c). The same trend holds true for lower NCAA Divisions. The NCAA reported that for Division III institutions with football programs, the average athletics operating expense for the 2003 fiscal year was \$1,570,000, a 185% increase from 1989's average athletics expenditures of \$550,000 (NCAA, 2005b).

The growth in athletic expenditures emphasizes the institutions' need to generate additional revenue, which can be challenging. According to Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) database only three sports generated a profit for Division I FBS institutions in the 2006-07 academic year - football, men's basketball, and men's ice hockey (EADA, 2007). The combination of the EADA data and the NCAA financial reports indicate only a small number of revenue generating sport programs generate sufficient revenue needed to support the escalating expenses of intercollegiate athletics. This scenario creates a burden for athletic department decision makers who appear to be seeking more revenue streams through athletics, yet only a few sport programs seem able to achieve this revenue generating objective. Results of these burdening decisions have lead to changes in institutional support for particular sport programs

Another example of the changing landscape for intercollegiate athletics is the change in number of men's sports offered among NCAA member institutions. For the academic years 1988-89 to 2006-07, across all three NCAA Divisions (I, II, and III), 101 fewer institutions offer wrestling among their vast sport programs. However, during the same period, NCAA member institutions have increased the number of men's basketball programs by 37 (NCAA, 2008a).

Over time, these changes in organizational structure can affect behaviors within an organization as well as, across an industry sector. As the select few revenue generating sports continue to receive more resources than non-revenue-generating-sports, coaches affected by these changes may have different perceptions of fairness in the workplace. Perceptions of fairness have been linked to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Hence, there is a need to examine the

fairness perceptions of revenue and non-revenue-generating sport coaches and the effects those perceptions have on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The present study aims to measure perceptions of fairness and the interactions these perceptions may have with job satisfaction and organizational commitment among revenue and nonrevenue-generating sport coaches. Assessing coaches' perceptions of fairness may provide decision makers within athletic departments with useful information for creating an environment conducive for all sport coaches to be both satisfied and committed and increase organizational success both on and off the playing field. The following chapter will provide justification for the present study by: (a) outlining the existing literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment; (b) establishing a purpose; (c) identifying the significance of the study; (d) establishing research questions; and (c) defining the terms used in the study.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is defined as the study of the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace (Greenberg, 1990). The literature on organizational justice has provided scholars with three distinct research streams. Distributive justice examines an individual's perception of fairness of actual outcomes of the resource distribution process. Procedural justice examines an individual's perception of fairness an individual's perception of fairness in relation to the policies and procedures used by an organization to make decisions. Finally, interactional justice examines an individual's perceptions of fairness in relation to the interpersonal interactions within the organization during the resource distribution process.

The distributive justice literature is grounded in the work of Adams (1963, 1965) and Deutsch (1975). Adams proposed a theory of social inequity, where an individual

perceives job inputs and/or outcomes in an obverse relation to how he/she perceives the inputs and/or outcomes of other employees within an organization. Specifically, individuals will compare their input to outcome ratios with those of others within the organization. Individuals who perceive this ratio to be unequal will alter their behaviors in an attempt to stabilize the perceived imbalance of distribution. Deutsch believed Adams' use of equity as a single determinant of justice was a limited perspective. Therefore, Deutsch introduced two additional methods of resource allocation, equality and need. Equality based distributive justice refers to decision makers choosing to distribute resources equally throughout an organization regardless of contribution. Need based distributive justice refers to decision makers choosing to distribute resources based on a determination of need.

The procedural justice literature is grounded in the work of Thibault and Walker (1975). Thibault and Walker defined procedural justice as an individual's perception of fairness based upon organizational policies and procedures. Thibault and Walker investigated individual reactions to simulated dispute resolution procedures using two types of control, process control and decision control. Process control dealt with the disputant's lack of control over the collection and presentation of evidence bearing on his/her case. Decision control dealt with legal procedures which offer high degrees of input in the decision making process. Thibault and Walker concluded that the amount of "voice" the disputant had in the decision-making process impacted an individual's perception of fairness.

The interactional justice literature is grounded in the work of Bies and Moag (1986). Interactional justice is defined as an individual's perception of fairness based

upon the interpersonal communications with the organization (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005). Through his own interpersonal interactions, Bies noticed the assessment of interpersonal treatment was process focused while the actual interaction was not. Bies and Moag explained that interactional treatment is conceptually different than the structuring of procedures, and can therefore be separated as a unique dimension of organizational justice.

Most research on organizational justice has focused on distributive and procedural justice and their relation to organizational behavior. The use of interactional justice in studies has been limited due to the discussion of whether it is a unique construct of organizational justice or simply a sub-construct of procedural justice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1997). However, several researchers have provided evidence and support for the use of interactional justice as a distinct and unique construct (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Moorman, 1991). Cohen-Charash and Spector provided support for the distinctions among the three organizational justice components in a metaanalysis of justice in organizations. The meta-analysis concluded that while the three components of organizational justice are strongly related, there is sufficient evidence to consider them distinct constructs as each construct had different relationships between each other and their correlates. In another meta-analysis of organizational justice, Colquitt et al. (2001) indicated procedural justice predicted both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This finding was contradicted by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) who found that only organizational commitment was significantly related to procedural justice and trust.

These studies provide a foundation for understanding organizational justice. However, most literature on organizational justice has focused on industries outside of the sport setting leaving many questions regarding the affect fairness perceptions have on sport organizations. The following section will summarize the literature on organizational justice within the intercollegiate athletic context.

Prior Research on Organizational Justice in Intercollegiate Athletics

The literature on organizational justice within intercollegiate athletics has examined athletic directors and administrators (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Mahony, Hums & Riemer, 2002, 2005; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008), athletic board chairs (Mahony et al., 2002, 2005), students (Mahony, Reimer, Breeding, & Hums, 2006), student-athletes (Jordan, Gillentine, & Hunt, 2004; Mahony et al., 2006), and coaches (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Jordan et al. 2004; Whisenant & Jordan, 2006). These studies mainly focused on three independent variables: (a) athletic job position, (b) NCAA Division, and (c) gender.

Studies examining differences in perceived fairness based on athletic job position have revealed two interesting findings. First, studies found little difference among positions within an athletic department with regards to the perception of fairness in intercollegiate athletics (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony et al., 2002, 2005). Second, studies indicated consistency among athletic positions when asked which distributive justice practice was most fair. Most studies indicated distribution practices based on equality and need were perceived as the most fair (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Mahony & Pastore, 1998; Mahony et al. 2002).

Examining NCAA Division level has lead to inconsistent results (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony et al., 2002). Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found no significant difference in perceptions of distributive justice among Division levels with respondents from all three Divisions viewing equality of treatment, need, and equality of results as the most just sub-principles of distributive justice. Mahony et al. (2002) concluded that decision makers at Division I institutions were more likely to select distribution based on contribution, while those at Division III institutions were more likely to select divisional differences with respect to perceptions of need. Division I administrators responded by indicating lack of revenue, competitive success, and Title IX issues were the primary determinants of need. In contrast, Division III administrators responded by indicating high costs of sport, travel, and equipment were the primary determinants of need. These results support using NCAA Division as an independent variable in organizational justice studies in the college sport setting.

The literature on organizational justice in the sport setting has generated several studies indicating significant differences based on gender. Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found that gender was the only independent variable to have significant differences. Males rated contribution significantly higher, while females rated equality of treatment significantly higher in each of six distribution scenarios. Mahony et al. (2006) found that while male and female athletes and students rated equality of treatment and need as the fairest allocation methods, women were stronger supporters of distribution based on equality, while men supported distribution based on need and contribution to the

program. These findings clearly indicated gender differences in organizational justice perceptions exist and warrant further studying.

These studies provide a good first step in understanding organizational justice in a sport context. However, many questions still remain regarding the affect fairness perceptions have on organizational variables like job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Further examination of the relationship among these variables is necessary. The following sections will summarize the theoretical background and application of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment to the sport setting.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most frequently studied topics in management and industrial psychology (Chelladurai, 1999). However, a universal definition of job satisfaction has yet to be established. Chelladurai (1999) defined job satisfaction as an individual's evaluation of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements in his/her job responsibilities. The literature on job satisfaction can be divided in four parts: (a) theoretical background, (b) theories of job satisfaction, (c) facets of job satisfaction, and (d) consequences of job satisfaction. These four parts provide an understanding of the complicated construct of job satisfaction.

The theoretical background on job satisfaction comes from the works of Taylor (1911), Mayo (1933, 1945), and Maslow (1943). Talyor (1911) introduced scientific management theory, stating the success of an organization was dependent upon the success of the employees. Under this theory an organization must identify the needs of the employees and tie the meeting of those needs to organizational outcomes. As a result both the organization and employee prospered. Mayo (1945) later identified a missing

component to scientific management theory (e.g. social sciences such as psychology, sociology, political science, etc.). Mayo understood that interpersonal relationships within an organization existed, yet were often forgotten as a precursor to production, absenteeism, and morale. Therefore, Mayo suggested managers apply an element of social science to the work environment in an attempt to develop both organizational and social skills, as they both applied to an individual's acceptance of work. Finally, Maslow (1943) introduced the hierarchy of needs. This hierarchy explained an individual's development of needs as he or she ventured through life. Maslow later stated that the hierarchy was a fluid model, meaning that individuals' needs change as conditions in their lives change. The ultimate goal for each individual is to reach a state of self-actualization, where all other needs are met and one has reached his/her fullest potential.

The complexity of the construct of job satisfaction has made research on the topic difficult. Two streams of thought have emerged in the literature - job satisfaction as a derivative of facet influence and job satisfaction as an influence on organizational outcomes. Studies focused on the facet influence of job satisfaction have identified numerous facets related to satisfaction with a particular job. The research on facet based job satisfaction resulted in the development of several theories and instruments used to measure job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) proposed a two-factor theory where satisfaction is determined by either "motivating" (intrinsic elements controlled by the individual) or "hygiene" (extrinsic elements controlled by the organization) factors. Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1964) expanded the two-factor theory by establishing the Minnesota Model of Job Satisfaction measuring satisfaction on 20 work-related employee needs. Locke (1976) developed the Value-Based Theory of

Satisfaction claiming individuals derive their satisfaction from matching their values with the outcomes of the job. Lawler's Facet-Satisfaction Model (1973) theorized that individuals perceive satisfaction based on an assessment of work-related facets of the job. Individuals can be satisfied with facets of their job but not their overall job. Finally, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), which was later revised by Balzer, Smith, Kravitz, Lovell, Paul, Reilly, and Reilly (1990), to measure five facets of job satisfaction (assigned work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers). Chelladurai (1999) stated that the JDI is "perhaps the most popular scale for measuring job satisfaction" (p. 242). Each of these instruments has been used to determine how individuals develop their perception of job satisfaction. Another line of research has focused on how an individual's perceptions of job satisfaction relates to organizational outcomes.

Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) performed a meta-analysis on the literature of job satisfaction and identified three classes of satisfaction consequences to an organization: (a) non-work behaviors, (b) work performance, and (c) mental and physical health of workers. Cranny et al. found studies on non-work behaviors have focused on the effect of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction, based on the rationale that individuals who are satisfied are likely not to have negative non-work behaviors. Cranny et al., also found research on satisfaction and performance has shown weak correlations. Finally, Cranny et al. found stress caused by levels of satisfaction affects an individual's mental and physical health. Mental health consequences include poor decision making, withdrawal behaviors, and depression. Physical health consequences included premature aging, high blood pressure, and cardiovascular disease.

Prior Research on Job Satisfaction in Intercollegiate Athletics

Studies examining job satisfaction within intercollegiate athletics have examined the satisfaction of both administrators and coaches. Studies on the job satisfaction of athletic administrators have focused on differences between genders. Robinson, Terick, and Carpenter (2001) analyzed job satisfaction among NCAA Division III athletic directors, finding male athletic directors were more satisfied with the facets of pay and work content, while female athletic directors were more satisfied with co-workers and supervision. Both male and female athletic directors indicated dissatisfaction with promotion, which is understandable given that the highest job role within an athletic department is an athletic director.

Most literature on job satisfaction in the intercollegiate athletics setting focused on the satisfaction of the coach. Evans (1983) concluded that sport type affected job satisfaction among coaches. Specifically, revenue-generating sport coaches rated satisfaction with administration/organization and recognition higher than non-revenue generating sport coaches. Non-revenue generating sport coaches rated work demands higher than revenue generating sport coaches. Both sport types were satisfied with job security, personal initiative, racial balance, and overall satisfaction, while both sport types reported dissatisfaction with pay.

Studies on job satisfaction of coaches in the intercollegiate setting have also focused on gender differences. Snyder (1990) conducted a study investigating the effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. Snyder concluded there were gender differences on the satisfaction of supervision among both full and part-time coaches. Pastore (1994) also examined differences in job

satisfaction of coaches based on the gender. Pastore found female coaches were more satisfied with pay, promotion, and overall job satisfaction than their male counterparts.

Studies have also examined differences among NCAA Division level on the job satisfaction of coaches. Pastore (1993) found Division III coaches were more satisfied than Division I and II coaches. Similarly, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) found significant differences between NCAA Divisions with Division III coaches indicating significantly higher satisfaction with the amount of work than Division I coaches.

Researchers have used several instruments for measuring job satisfaction in the sport setting. Hendon (1983) contributed by developing the Coaches Job Satisfaction Inventory (CJSI) measuring nine factors of job satisfaction. Pastore (1993) used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job In General (JIG) to find sport type may affect the supervision facet of job satisfaction among NCAA coaches of women's teams. Finally, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) developed the Coaches Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Organizational Commitment

Similar to job satisfaction, research on organizational commitment has lead to inconsistencies in developing a universal definition. While there is no formal definition of organizational commitment in the academic literature, Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) definition is commonly used. Porter et al. defined organizational commitment as ". . . the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). This definition is further characterized by three factors of the individual: (a) the individual strongly believes in and accepts the organization's goals and values, (b) the individual is willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (c) the individual has a strong desire to maintain organizational

membership (Porter et al.) The literature on organizational commitment has divided the construct of commitment into six dimensions: (a) components, (b) foci, (c) consequences, and (d) correlates. Each of these dimensions plays a role in the organizational behavior of the employee.

The theoretical background for the construct of organizational commitment has revealed three distinct components and bases of commitment: (a) continuance - the need to be committed, (b) affective – wanting to be committed, and (c) normative – a feeling of having ought to be committed. The theory on continuance commitment is based on studies by Becker (1960) and later defined by Meyer and Allen (1991) as "... an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so" (p. 67). Affective commitment was derived from studies by Buchanan (1974). Buchanan theorized individuals have commitment-relevant experiences in their tenure with an organization, which influence their emotional attachment to the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) defined affective commitment as "... the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so" (p. 67). Normative commitment was developed from Wiener's (1982) suggestion that internalized normative pressures, a person's attitude toward performing a particular act, must be accounted for in examining an individual's commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) defined normative commitment as "... a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization" (p. 67).

Meyer and Allen (1991) combined these three theories together and developed the threecomponent model for organizational commitment. Later, Meyer and Allen (1997) suggested these components are not mutually exclusive and must therefore be analyzed as a collection of commitments which ultimately define an individual's overall commitment.

Components of organizational commitment examine why individuals are committed to an organization. Many of these studies have included antecedents or foci of commitment in an effort to further understand how individuals develop their perception of commitment. Antecedents of commitment can be broken into five categories: (a) personal characteristics, (b) job characteristics, (c) organizational characteristics, (d) group/leader relations, and (e) role states (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Mathieu and Zajac stated job characteristics (e.g. skill, autonomy, scope) offer the most promise as antecedents of organizational commitment. While studies on components and antecedents of commitment offer insight to how an individual formulates his/her perception of organizational commitment, they do not offer an understanding to the consequences of commitment.

Consequences of organizational commitment are important to understand as they focus on the critical outcomes of commitment. The literature on organizational commitment has defined two types of organizational commitment consequences, performance and withdrawal behaviors. Performance has produced weak correlations with organizational commitment (Chelladurai, 1999), while relationships with withdrawal behaviors have shown much stronger correlations. Withdrawal behaviors include poor attendance, lateness, and turnover. Results indicate that involuntary absence and commitment have a significant negative relationship (Gellatly; 1995; Hackett, Bycio, &

Hausdorff, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Somers; 1995). Turnover has shown the strongest relationship with organizational commitment. Employees showing higher intentions to leave the organization are less committed (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Findings of these studies have provided some insight on how commitment affects organizational outcomes. Still, both component and consequence focused research has shown the construct of commitment to be very complex largely due to the number of variables affecting commitment perceptions. A number of these variables have been identified as being correlates of commitment.

The construct of organizational commitment is very complex due to a number of correlates. Six specific correlates of organizational commitment have been identified: (a) motivation, (b) job involvement, (c) stress, (d) occupational commitment, (e) union commitment, and (f) job satisfaction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Of these correlates with organizational commitment, job satisfaction has received the most attention in the literature. Studies have shown both facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction to be highly correlated with organizational commitment. However, results of these studies need to be taken with some caution as both job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been found to be dependent on characteristic of both the job and organization. Therefore, study findings can only be applied to specific jobs or industry segments. Mathieu and Zajac stressed the need for further understanding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment through analysis of different influencing variables (e.g. organizational justice perceptions) and application to different industry segments (e.g. intercollegiate athletics).

Prior Research on Organizational Commitment in Intercollegiate Athletics

While the literature on the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment is limited outside of the sport context, there are even fewer studies within the sport context. Jordan (2001) examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among NCAA Division I and III head basketball coaches. Findings indicated male coaches rated all measures of organizational justice, overall satisfaction, and five facets of job satisfaction higher than female coaches. Divisional differences indicated Division III coaches rated procedural and interactional justice higher, while Division I coaches rated distributive justice higher. Division I coaches also scored higher on overall job satisfaction and all facets of satisfaction, with the exception of supervision.

The literature on organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics has focused on the coach. Raedeke, Granzyk, and Warren (2000) found that coaches were significantly different in regard to burnout and commitment when comparing across three distinct clusters: (a) coaches who are committed to attraction-based factors will have low levels of burnout and high levels of commitment, (b) coaches committed to entrapmentbased factors will have high rates of burnout and low rates of commitment, and (c) coaches who are not committed to either determinant will have low rating for both burnout and commitment. Similarly, Raedeke, Warren, and Granzyk (2002) found significant differences in current versus former coaches. Current coaches reported higher commitment, less attractive alternative options, higher investments, and higher social constraints than former coaches.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) found differences in organizational commitment existed among American intercollegiate coaches and Japanese coaches.

Coaches in the United States indicated more commitment to their occupation, while Japanese coaches were more committed to their organization.

Cunningham and Sagas (2004) studied the influence of age, ethnicity, and organizational tenure on occupational and organizational commitment among NCAA Division IA football coaches. They found ethnic diversity and tenure, along with positive attitudes, contributed significantly towards both occupational and organizational commitment and negatively to turnover intentions. Turner and Chelladurai (2005) examined the multidimensional model of commitment among coaches. Their findings were similar to Cunningham and Sagas, and indicated that both occupational and organizational commitment were significant and negatively correlated with intention to leave.

An understanding of how perceptions of fairness affect an individual's perceptions of job satisfaction and organizational commitment provides several benefits for the organization. First, decision makers who understand how perceptions of fairness affect organizational behaviors have the ability to alter working conditions in an attempt to reduce negative organizational outcomes, such as tardiness, absenteeism, and turnover. This implication has the potential to be very cost effective for the organization as it will reduce costs related to job searches, training, and lost production. Secondly, studies have shown that perceptions of fairness often provide a foundation from which future experiences will be compared (Tremblay, Sire, & Balkin, 2000; Van Den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997). Individuals who have positive organizational experience will be less influenced by negative organizational outcomes. As a result these individuals have higher perceptions of satisfaction and commitment compared to individuals who have negative

organizational experiences. For these reasons it is important to examine how fairness perceptions relate to organizational behaviors like job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The Relationship Among Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment

The literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment has primarily examined each of these constructs separately. Few studies have examined the relationship among these constructs. Part of this literature has focused on the distinction of satisfaction and commitment as independent constructs. The correlations between satisfaction and commitment have lead to inconsistencies in the use of these constructs as independent variables (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Martin and Bennett (1996) used a four model approach to support organizational commitment and job satisfaction as independent constructs.

Researchers have also examined the relationship between fairness perceptions and specific organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results of these studies have been inconsistent in determining how fairness perceptions affect satisfaction and commitment. Many studies have found procedural justice to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Moorman, 1991). However, others have found distributive justice to be the stronger predictor of job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Schappe, 1998). Finally, Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) suggested both distributive and procedural justice, are important determinants of job satisfaction. In summary,

despite a number of studies examining the relationship between fairness perceptions and organizational outcomes, a great deal of disagreement and inconsistency is still present which limits a complete understanding of the relationship. Our understanding of the relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment together is even more limited.

Only a few studies have examined organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment together. However, findings in the studies examining these relationships have been inconsistent. In a study conducted shortly after an organizational restructuring, Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) found that distributive justice predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment more strongly than procedural justice. These findings conflicted with prior studies indicating procedural justice played a stronger role in developing a sense of organizational commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Martin and Bennett (1996) found that an individual's organizational commitment is determined by perceptions of procedural fairness, and both distributive and procedural justice was antecedents to facet-specific job satisfaction. These studies provide a good first step in understanding the relationship of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment outside a sport context.

While the literature on the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment is limited outside of the sport context, there are even fewer studies within the sport context. The majority of the studies examining these constructs have focused on the perceptions of the coach. Turner (2001) examined commitment and satisfaction among NCAA Division I and III coaches. Findings indicated no significant differences between gender, NCAA division, and marital/lifestyle

status. However, all four bases of commitment significantly correlated with intention to leave. Commitment foci also had a greater influence on performance than satisfaction.

Turner and Jordan (2006) found that satisfaction influenced intention to leave more than commitment among coaches. Turner and Pack's (2008) findings indicated turnover intentions and job satisfaction differed among commitment profile groups. Coaches who fell within in the non-committed or continuance commitment groups showed significantly higher ratings of turnover intentions.

Jordan (2001) examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among NCAA Division I and III head basketball coaches. Findings showed that male coaches rated all measures of organizational justice, overall satisfaction, and five facets of job satisfaction higher than female coaches. Divisional differences indicated that Division III coaches rated procedural and interactional justice higher, while Division I coaches rated distributive justice higher. Division I coaches also scored higher on overall job satisfaction and all facets of satisfaction, with the exception of supervision.

These studies provide a good first step in understanding the complex relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the sport setting. Yet, many questions remain regarding the how fairness perceptions affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics. Specifically, the variable of sport type based on revenue generation has received almost no attention in the literature. Further investigation of this relationship in the intercollegiate athletics setting can provide useful information to athletic decision makers.

Statement of the Problem

The structure of intercollegiate athletic departments offers unique challenges to colleges and universities. While the average Division I institution sponsored 19 men's sports in the academic year 2006-07 (NCAA, 2006), only three of these sports actually produced a profit (football, men's basketball and men's ice hockey) (EADA, 2008). These statistics indicate a setting where the revenue potential of only a few sports is financing the majority of the organization. This dynamic within athletic departments, combined with the increased expenses and shifts in sponsored sports, has likely produced different perceptions of organizational justice among revenue and non-revenuegenerating sport coaches. These differing perceptions can lead to a number of different forms of organizational distress such as high turnover, toxic organizational environment, and lower levels of success. Each of these negative effects on an athletic department can indirectly impact the organization's budget through paying contractual obligations to prior coaches, legal fees through potential organizational misconduct, fewer donations and decreased ticket sales due to poor performance. Therefore, the need to understand differences in coaches' perceptions of fairness among revenue and non-revenue generating sports and the impact of these perceptions is paramount to an athletic administrator's ability to effectively support the needs of all department employees.

Purposes of the Present Study

The purposes of the study were fourfold: (a) to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and nonrevenue-generating-decline), (b) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, (c) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall organizational

commitment, and (d) to examine the relationship between organizational justice, and both job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Significance of the Study

The present study provided several significant contributions to the literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. First, the present study was the first comparison of perceptions of organizational justice of revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline intercollegiate sport coaches. Prior studies on organizational justice in intercollegiate athletics focused on athletic position, gender, and division. The present study segmented the participants into three categories based on revenue generation: (a) revenue generating intercollegiate sport, (b) non-revenue-generating-stable sport, and (c) non-revenuegenerating-unstable sport. The present study used men's basketball as the revenue generating intercollegiate sport, baseball as the non-revenue-generating-stable sport, and wrestling as the non-revenue-generating-decline sport. The decision to segment nonrevenue-generating sport in two separate categories (stable and decline) was based on the net changes in sport sponsorship over the past twenty years. Baseball sponsorship across all NCAA Divisions increased by 54 programs from 1988 to 2007 (NCAA, 2008a). Wrestling sponsorship across all NCAA Divisions declined by 101 programs from 1988 to 2007 (NCAA, 2008a). These net changes in sport sponsorship could affect perceptions of organizational justice based on the practice to either increase or decrease the opportunities for coaches within the intercollegiate sector of the sport industry.

Second, findings of the present student could lead to a discussion on how to improve working conditions within intercollegiate athletic departments. These improved
working conditions could lead to lower turnover of coaches and longer tenure, improved productivity (both athletic and academic), and enhanced organizational relationships such as collaboration and support. Improving working conditions could lead to potential economic benefits as well. Lower turnover of coaches is economically beneficial due to fewer resources being spent on job searches, added benefits, and contractual obligations to prior employees. Improved athletic and academic productivity can lead to added indirect revenues in the form of added sponsorships or alumni donations. Finally, enhancing organizational relationships may decrease the amount of money spent on litigation of employee disputes.

A third significance of the present study is that it was the first to examine the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate athletics setting. Prior studies have examined these constructs in different combinations, concluding relationships do exist among them. However, no study has attempted to analyze all three constructs together in a sport setting.

The final significance of the present study was the inclusion of perceptions of assistant coaches. Prior studies on the perceptions of intercollegiate coaches has focused only on the perceptions of head coaches (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Jordan et al. 2004; Raedeke, Granzyk, & Warren, 2000; Whisenant & Jordan, 2006). The present study examined differences of both head and assistant coaches as assistant coaches may have different perceptions that affect both their overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment differently.

Research Questions

The present study had four primary research questions: (a) Do revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline sport coaches have different perceptions of fairness?, (b) Do revenue generating, non-revenuegenerating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline sport coaches have different levels of job satisfaction?, (c) Do revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and nonrevenue-generating-unstable sport coaches have different levels of organizational commitment?, and (d) Does type of sport moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment? These primary research questions were subdivided into the research questions below:

R1a: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable sport coaches)?

R1b: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R1c: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

R2a: Does the overall job satisfaction differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-unstable sport coaches)?

R2b: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R2c: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

R3a: Does the organizational commitment differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-unstable sport coaches)?

R3b: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R3c: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by coaching position (head coach and assistant coach)?

R4a: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall job satisfaction for coaches of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable)?

R4b: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall organizational commitment for coaches of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable)?

R4c: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and job satisfaction?

R4d: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and organizational commitment?

Delimitations

The present study was designed to gather data from revenue and non-revenue generating sport coaches. The decision to separate the non-revenue generating sport category into non-revenue-generating-stable and non-revenue-generating-unstable was made due to the drastic differences in sport sponsorship among non-revenue generating sports. Over the past 20 years the change in sponsorship of men's sports has varied greatly. Wrestling, which in the present study was used as a non-revenue-generating-unstable sport, has seen a decrease in the number of teams sponsored by 101 across all NCAA Divisions. Baseball, which in the present study was used as a non-revenue-generating-unstable sport, has had an increase of teams sponsored by 54 across all NCAA Divisions.

A second delimitation of the present study was the decision to use institutions that sponsored men's basketball, baseball and wrestling. Institutions sponsoring only one or two of these sports were not included in the sample. Because organizational justice perceptions are based on organizational behaviors, institutions that were most similar in their sport sponsorship were used. Gathering data from an institution that sponsored only one or two of the sports may skew the data.

Limitations

A limitation to the present study was the response rate of coaches. Prior research using intercollegiate coaches as the sample has experienced lower response rates than what was traditionally acceptable. The present study aimed at achieving a response rate similar to prior studies which used similar samples. To account for non-response bias, the

researcher used known characteristics of the population to measure for potential response bias (Gratton & Jones, 2004).

A second limitation was the ability to generalize the findings. The present study collected data from coaches of only three of the 19 total NCAA sponsored sports, men's basketball, baseball, and wrestling. Other sport coaches may have experienced different organizational behaviors that have lead to different perceptions of organizational justice.

A final limitation to the present study was the use of only male sports. The decision to use only male sports was based on the focus of the study to compare revenue generating sports to non-revenue generating sports. According to the EADA male sports were the only revenue generating sports across all NCAA Divisions. Therefore, the use of only male sports for both non-revenue-generating-stable and non-revenue-generating-unstable, was done to remove gender as a factor and focus on the impact of revenue generation.

Definition of Terms

<u>Revenue Generating Sport</u> – A revenue generating sport was defined as any sport in which enough revenue was generated to cover the operational expenditures of the particular sport. Using the data from the EADA, only three intercollegiate sports generated enough revenue to cover the operational expenditures, men's basketball, football, and men's ice hockey.

<u>Non-Revenue Generating Sport</u> – A non-revenue generating sport was defined as any sport in which insufficient revenue was generated to cover the operational expenditures of the particular sport.

<u>Non-Revenue-Generating-Stable Sport</u> – A non-revenue-generating-stable sport was define as a sport that had a positive or no net change in sponsorship over the past 20 years. For the present study baseball was used as the non-revenuegenerating-stable sport, as it had experienced a positive net change in sport sponsorship of 37.

<u>Non-Revenue Generating-Unstable Sport</u> - A non-revenue-generating-decline sport was defined as a sport that had a negative net change in sponsorship over the past 20 years. For the present study wrestling was used as the non-revenuegenerating-stable sport, as it had experienced a negative net change in sport sponsorship of 101.

<u>Organizational Justice</u> – An individual's perception of fairness within an organization based on the outcomes, procedures and interactions between the organization and its employees (Greenberg, 1990).

<u>Distributive Justice</u> – An individual's perception of fairness of resource allocations (Greenberg, 1990).

<u>Procedural Justice</u> – An individual's perception of fairness based upon an organization's policies and the processes by which these policies are put into action (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005).

<u>Interactional Justice</u> – An individual's perception of fairness based upon the interpersonal communications with the organization (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005)

<u>Retributive Justice</u> – An individual's perception of negative outcome allocations.

<u>Job Satisfaction</u> – An individual's evaluation of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements of his/her job responsibilities (Chelladurai, 1999).

<u>Organizational Commitment</u> - ". . . the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Porter et al., 1974, p.604).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purposes of the study were fourfold: (a) to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and nonrevenue-generating-decline), (b) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, (c) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall organizational commitment, and (d) to examine the relationship between organizational justice, and both job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The justification for this study emerged from the existing literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the sport setting. The structure of intercollegiate athletic departments offers unique challenges to colleges and universities. While the average Division I institution sponsored 17 team's, eight for men and nine for women, in the academic year 2006-07 (NCAA, 2008a), only three of these sports produced a revenue greater than their operating expenses (football, men's basketball and men's ice hockey) (EADA, 2008). These statistics clearly indicate a setting where the revenue potential of only a few sports is financing the majority of the organization. This dynamic within athletic departments, combined with the increased expenses and shift in sponsored sports, may affect perceptions of organizational justice among revenue and non-revenue generating sport coaches. These differing perceptions can lead to organizational distress in a number of different forms such as high turnover, toxic organizational environment, and lower levels

of success. Each of these forms of distress can negatively affect an athletic department's budget. Therefore, the need to understand differences in coaches' perceptions of fairness among revenue and non-revenue generating sports and the impact of these perceptions is paramount to an athletic department's ability to effectively support the needs of all components.

The following chapter provides a thorough review of the literature in the following areas: (a) organizational justice, (b) organizational justice in sport, (c) job satisfaction, (d) job satisfaction in sport, (e) organizational commitment, (f) organizational commitment in sport, (g) organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, and (h) justification for the present study.

Organizational Justice

Greenberg (1990) defined organizational justice as an individual's perceptions of fairness within an organization. The theory of organizational justice attempts to explain the role fairness has on the functioning of an organization. In fact, individual perceptions of justice within an organization were found by Greenberg (1987, 1990) to be of major importance to an organization's effectiveness. Greenberg also argued these perceptions of fairness have an impact on the personal satisfaction of the individuals an organization employs.

Greenberg and Colquitt (2005) chronicled the progression and development of the organizational justice literature to encompass more influential components of an organization. Greenberg and Colquitt identified three streams of literature within organizational justice. The first, focusing on the perceived fairness of organizational outcomes, was named distributive justice. Adams (1965) equity theory, a beginning to

distributive justice literature, looked at organizational fairness in terms of outcome satisfaction. From this literature a second theory on organizational justice arose focusing on the perceived fairness of an organization's policies and procedures. Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced procedural justice as an assessment of system satisfaction, noting that procedural decisions also impact perceived fairness within an organization. The third stream of literature to develop from the organizational justice literature is the interactional justice theory. Bies and Moag (1986) introduced interactional theory as an individual's perceived fairness based on interpersonal communications with the organization. While interactional justice is the newest and least studied justice dimension, it is argued in the literature as being an integral part of an individual's perception of fairness within the organizational setting (Bies & Moag, 1986).

The importance of fairness in an organization and its application to output production and employee satisfaction are addressed by Greenberg (1987, 1990). Greenberg (1987) presented research categorizing various conceptualizations of justice around a taxonomic scheme. The purpose of Greenberg's taxonomy was to organize prior concepts of organizational justice as well as highlight their interrelationships and importance to the organizational justice literature. The two dimensions of the taxonomy produce a 2x2 model illustrating a reactive-proactive and process-content approach to organizational justice. The reactive-proactive dimension describes the individuals' attempt to attain justice or status (proactive), while others attempt to avoid unfair injustices (reactive). The process-content dimension separates organizations by their approach to assessing outcomes. Process approaches focus on the fairness of procedures used in the decision-making process. Content approaches focus on the distribution of

outcomes. Greenberg then applied the existing organizational justice theories to these dimensions resulting four component theories: (a) reactive content, (b) proactive content, (c) reactive process, and (d) proactive process.

The reactive content theories combine an individual's focus on avoidance of unfair perceptions, while being concerned with fairness of distribution outcomes. Adams (1965) equity theory is used as an example. Equity theory states that an individual will respond to unfair relationships by displaying certain negative emotions (content approach), which will be motivations to escape from the experienced inequity (reactive approach). Proactive content approaches focus on how workers attempt to create fair outcome distribution. Leventhal's (1976, 1980) justice judgment model proposed that individuals attempt to make fair allocation decisions by applying several possible allocation rules to the situations they confront. This model outlines how an individual attempting to create a desired outcome to benefit the organization as a whole could be applied.

Greenberg (1987) described reactive process theories as being embedded within a different intellectual tradition, the law. A specific stream of literature focuses on legal procedures (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The findings in this literature produced the theory of procedural justice. Procedural justice theory states an individual's perception of fairness is dictated by the policies and procedures placed on the individual. In relation to Greenberg's (1987) taxonomy, procedural justice incorporates a focus on the individual's desire to escape unfair situations due to the individual's lack of control over the organizational procedures. Procedural justice also includes an organizations attempt to derive at various outcomes through control over the organization procedures.

Greenberg (1978) described proactive process theories as the least well known due to their lack of application to the organizational decision-making models. As an extension to the justice judgment model, Leventhal (1976) introduced the allocation preference theory. Allocation preference theory involves the perception of fairness based on decisions made about resource allocation. Allocation procedures have been separated from dispute-resolution procedures due to the proactive nature of the approach. Individuals seek a determination of justice based upon the allocation procedures while dispute-resolution procedures attempt to avoid perceived unfair situations.

Organizational justice can also influence organizational identification. Cremer (2005) examined how the interaction between procedural and distributive justice influences organizational cooperation with high identifying employees. A questionnaire developed from previous literature was used to measure distributive justice, procedural justice, organizational identification, and employee cooperation. A hierarchical regression analysis was used to predict cooperation on the main effects. The results indicate high levels of organizational identification were a significant predictor of the interaction between procedural and distributive justice. These findings supported the cognitive nature of organizational justice theory.

Greenberg (1990) recognized future research was needed in the area of organizational justice. As research on both distributive and procedural justice grew, distinctions between the two areas began to come forth. However, serious limitations in the distinctions are still present. The scope of much literature established an argument of bias in the results by focusing solely on negative events relating to perceived justice (Bies & Moag 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Tyler, 1984).

Greenberg (1990) suggested future studies on neutral and positive events are needed to fully understand the components of organizational justice. Greenberg (1990) also noted the setting of many studies have dealt with perceptions of fairness among individuals with organizational issues not immediately confronting them (Bies, Shapiro, & Cummings, 1988; Greenberg, 1986; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987). To fully understand the implications of organizational justice, more studies should incorporate results impacting the direct practice of organizations (Greenberg 1990). Finally, Greenberg (1990) found that many studies failed to provide multiple variables with a lack of strong construct validity. Greenberg (1990) stated researchers should instead measure organizational justice through comparisons and distinctions between perceptions of fairness and satisfaction.

The following sections will provide a detailed outline of the theoretical background and the three dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactive justice) collectively comprising the theory of organizational justice. A summary of these studies will be provided as a link to understanding the role organizational justice has on the athletic industry.

Theoretical Background

Organizational justice theory is grounded in the research of Adams (1963; 1965) and Deutsch (1975). Adams (1963) proposed a theory of social inequity. Adams defined inequity in reference to the terms, "Person" and "Other". The term "Person" represents an individual who perceives either equity or inequity. "Other" refers to an individual or group used by "Person" to make social comparisons based on inputs and outcomes. Adams explained that inequity is defined when "Person" perceives job inputs and/or

outcomes in an obverse relation to what he/she perceives are the inputs and/or outcomes of "Other". To provide support for the theory of social inequity, Adams compared six studies. The results of these studies allowed Adams to collectively conclude support for a general theory of inequity, stating that individuals will perceive unfairness when inputs do not match outcomes when compared to others.

Adams (1965) further developed his theory of inequity by clearly outlining antecedents to inequity. First, Adams described possible inputs which attributed to potential perceptions of inequity. Characteristics such as age, education, experience and skill are all elements possibly contributed by an employee in the exchange process. Adams commented that while each of these principle inputs has an individual impact on the exchange, there are relationships between some variables. One example is the relationship between age and seniority. Seniority typically is given to those who have been with an organization the longest. Hence, the older a person is, the more likely he/she would have seniority over younger employees. Second, Adams defined outcomes in the exchange process. In the work setting, outcomes included pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, supervision, seniority, fringe benefits and job status. These outcomes have the potential to either positively or negatively affect the exchange process. Adams also explained that each outcome can have a different perception. All outcomes will be perceived as either negative or positive. In most cases a combination of perceptions will be gathered by the individual to conclude a final judgment on perception. Adams continued his explanation of antecedents to inequity by introducing emotional facets to the exchange process. Facets including affection, friendship and reliability all play a role

in the final perception of inequity. Concluding this article, Adams stated antecedents of organizational justice were impactors on individual satisfaction.

While Adams (1963, 1965) established a definition of equity and provided an explanation of its existence within organizations, Deutsch (1975) introduced two additional methods of resource allocation. Deutsch said using the theory of equity as the only determinant of justice was a limiting perspective. Equity only addressed justice as it pertained to input-output ratios by an individual. Societal perspectives are not limited solely to economic relationships. Non-economic social relations also exist and have an impact on how people perceive justice.

Deutsch (1975) introduced the idea of resources being allocated in an equal manner. The theory of equality states an individual will perceive the fairness of resource allocation based upon how equally the resources are distributed. Organizations emphasizing relationships and their intrinsic enjoyment, should appeal to a mutual standard of resource allocation. Allocating resources on an equity basis is detrimental and disruptive to social relations because it undermines the bases for mutual respect. Development of an equality based system of resource allocation enhances the relationships and enjoyment between individuals within an organization thereby benefiting the organization by fostering high self-esteem and collaboration among employees.

Deutsch (1975) also noted organizations fostering personal development and welfare (i.e. hospitals, schools, churches) will not benefit from an equity based model. Rather, an organization focused on personal growth should incorporate resource allocation based on the needs of the organization and its individual members. Deutsch

(1975) argued that providing for individuals in need, outweighed the loss taken by those who must assist them. Organizations, which emphasize personal development and welfare, benefit the most from allocating resources on the principle of need. Allocation by any other means would disrupt the purpose and mission of the organization and would result in perceptions of unfairness.

The research of Adams (1963, 1965) and Deutsch (1975) combine to establish the theory of distributive justice, the perceived fairness of an organization based upon the allocation of resources. This theory has been expanded in the literature to include several components which influence an individual's perception of organizational fairness. These other components address the perception of the policies and procedures and interactive relationships within an organization. These components have been combined in the literature to establish the theory of organizational justice.

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice, as defined by Greenberg (1990), is an individual's judgment or perceived fairness of resource allocation, based upon the produced outcomes of the individual compared to the expected inputs. The foundation of this theory is based in Adams' (1963, 1965) theory of inequity. Adams postulated that individuals arrive at a sense of organizational equity or inequity through the comparison of ratio inputs (contributions) and outputs (rewards) to other workers within an organization. In cases of organizations creating a perception of equity within the workplace, workers will be satisfied and content. Equity theory suggests individuals who perceive their ratio of inputs to be lower than the outputs received will feel guilty. In contrast, workers who perceive their ratios of inputs to be higher than the outputs received will feel angry. In

either case, Adams commented that individuals will change their perception of inequity to achieve a status of equity. An individual's changing perceptions has potential to hurt organizational production. An example would be if an individual perceives organizational inequity, then he/she may decrease his/her work to adjust his/her perceived fairness based on outputs.

Using two hypotheses Garland (1973) experimentally tested Adams (1965) equity theory. Garland (1973) hypothesized that underpaid workers will produce more work of lower quality than equitably paid workers and the overpaid workers will produce less work of higher quality than equitably paid workers. Subjects in the study were 36 males and females. Each subject was hired as a proofreader and randomly assigned a payment of either 15, 30, or 60 cents per page. Each subject then met one other subject and was informed that the other subject was receiving 30 cents per page. This introduction stimulated a perception of underpayment, equity payment, or overpayment. The dependent variables were the number of pages read and number of errors detected. Results supported both hypothesis, that both male and female subjects produced more work of lower quality when underpaid and less work of higher quality when overpaid.

Greenberg (1978) gave further support for empirical evidence in equity theory by using subjects in psychology classes to test a modified "win-stay" rule. The "win-stay" rule suggests allocators will continue to give high rewards to improving performances even in the case of individuals already receiving high rewards. Contrastingly, low rewards will not be given to low performers due to the potential to discourage improvement. Subjects were instructed to set pay rates for three salespeople based on a description of past performances and existing received rewards. A 4-factor designed

ANOVA indicated subjects gave high pay to improving performers who were previously paid low and low pay to declining performers who were previously paid high. These results provided evidence that decision-makers use past reward as criteria for maintaining equity and enhancing performance.

Supporting Greenberg and Leventhal (1976), Cowherd and Levine (1992) examined pay influences on productivity in the business setting. Using 102 corporate businesses, Cowherd and Levine, collected data on finances, environment, strategic position, organization, and reward system. Multiple regression analysis revealed both hourly pay equity and lower-level exempt pay equity had a significant positive impact on product quality. This finding supported prior research suggesting increasing pay as a motivational tactic for increased product quality (Greenberg and Leventhal, 1976).

Aquino (1995) continued to show support for Adams (1965) equity theory. Aquino (1995) hypothesized pay inequity would be negatively related to citizenship, while perceptions of procedural and interpersonal justice would be positively related. Employees of five selected organizations and students from the MBA program of a Midwestern business school comprised the sample. Independent variables pay inequity and perceptions of procedural justice were measured using a 5-point agreement scale (strongly disagree = 1, strongly agree = 5) to rate items. The dependent variable, citizenship, used a 5-point scale (never = 1, always = 5) to rate 16 citizenship acts. Factor analysis with varimax rotation produced a three factor loading using 12 of the original 17 items measuring procedural justice. These factors accounted for 59% of the variance. Factor one included four items representing distributive justice elements. Factor two represented four items on interactive justice. Finally, factor three included three items on

procedural justice. A correlation matrix produced a highly significant correlation between organizational citizenship and compliance. These results indicated dissatisfaction with pay was negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

Other studies have indicated multiple factors influencing distributions. Ferber (1974) sampled instructors and administrators at the University of Illinois (N = 278). The sample was chosen to determine if gender influenced the reward structure. Each subject was rated on three areas: (a) productivity (number of papers read, honors, degree attained), (b) financial need (marital status, children, and spousal employment) and (c) longevity (years of professional experience, years in current position, and years at current rank).

Ferber (1974) used a step-wise multiple correlation to analyze the data. Results of the step-wise multiple correlation indicated among males, all three factors (productivity, financial need, and longevity) influenced salary differences within rank. Among women, longevity did not influence salary differences, while productivity and need did. Ferber identified the three major conclusions: (a) scholarly productivity may be a factor in promotion, but did not have an influence on salary differences within a particular rank; (b) longevity was a significant contributor to men's salaries but not women's; and (c) financial need was a minor factor in explaining salary differences.

Gregorio, Lewis, and Wanner (1982) presented another study aimed at distributive justice and salary within academia. Using data gathered in 1972-1973 by the American Council on Education (ACE), the researchers mailed 108,722 questionnaires to 301 institutions of higher learning. The 49% response rate of the sample yielded 53,034 usable questionnaires. The questionnaire categorized 25 measures of predictors of salary

attainment into four (background, merit, need, and attainment). The researchers used structural equation analysis to conclude that experience influenced salary the greatest. Earning a Ph.D. and rank within a department were also significant influencers. These findings suggested movement within a single organization may provide the best opportunity for better pay. Moving from organization to organization may hinder an individual's salary. These implications suggest why organizational justice is important to the individual and why an employee will want to search for fairness given the situation of the organization. If increased salaries are derived from movement within an organization, it makes sense that individuals will want to search for potential fairness. Organizations can also benefit from these findings by creating justice within their organization as a means of keeping employees with their organization.

To expand on Adams' equity theory, Lerner (1975) and Deutsch (1975) introduced a second principle to distributive justice, equality. Equality theory relates allocation of resources to an individual's membership to the group. Each individual receives the same amount of resource allocation regardless of an individual's contribution to the organization. Lerner (1975) illustrated that perceived justice plays a role in human action. As an individual perceives some facet of fairness, the individual will then alter his/her behavior to adjust to such situations. In relation to equity theory, Lerner (1975) explained how basing resource allocation on organizational contribution put some individuals in a state of power over other individuals. This sense of empowerment then manifests in behavior which is conducive to establishment of more power leaving some individuals continuously struggling to obtain a status of power. Equality theory eliminates the power struggle between individuals within a group. By allocating

resources based on equality, power status in never achieved and there is no perceived hierarchy within the group.

Chen, Meindl, and Hui (1998) also examined the concept of equality based resource allocation. The researchers performed a cross-cultural study to examine effects on allocation decisions made by U.S. citizens and Hong Kong Chinese. Chen et al. hypothesized that allocation will be more differential when the goal is productivity, but more "egalitarian" when the goal is solidarity. Subjects for the study were 115 U.S. university undergraduates studying organizational behavior and 126 Hong Kong undergraduates studying psychology. Each subject read a short case study and made recommendations to allocate resources based on the scenario. Results of a hierarchical regression analysis indicated both groups were responsive to the situational factors influencing resource allocations. These results supported the hypothesis and further justified equality theory as a differentiating principle within distributive justice.

A third principle of distributive justice was identified and defined by Homans (1982). Homans (1982) defined need theory as allocation of resources dependent upon the identification of individuals in greatest need. Homans (1982) noted that identification of need is not isolated to present conditions only. Individuals who, in the past, did not receive and equal distribution of resources were inclined to be identified as needing resources. Examples of need theory in the intercollegiate athletic setting would be seen if non-revenue sports received a higher rate of resource allocation based upon previous allocations going to revenue sports.

Procedural Justice

Thibault and Walker (1975) introduced a new component to organizational justice theory, procedural justice. Thibault and Walker defined procedural justice as an individual's perception of fairness based upon organizational policies and procedures. Thibault and Walker investigated individual reactions to simulated dispute-resolution procedures in a legal setting. The procedures used differed with respect to two types of control. The first type of control dealt with the disputant lack of control over the collection and presentation of evidence bearing on his/her case. The second, dealt with legal procedures which offer high degrees of input in the decision-making process. Thibault and Walker concluded that the amount of "voice" the disputant had in the decision-making process impacted an individual's perception of fairness. The more influence the individuals felt they had on the established procedures the more likely they were to perceive them as fair.

The idea that individuals influence an organization's policy and procedures lead to Leventhal's (1980) rules on how to implement fair procedures within an organization to enhance employee perceptions of procedural justice. Leventhal suggested procedural fairness could be influenced or enhanced by: (a) accuracy of information, (b) consistency in applying procedures, (c) representation of group ideals over individual ones, (d) avoiding bias in decision-making process, (e) ethicality of procedures, and (f) a decisionmaker's ability to correct mistakes.

Landy, Barnes, and Murphy (1978) expanded the scope of procedural justice by applying the theory to a broader sample. Landy et al. (1978) examined the perceptions of fairness performance evaluations through a sample of 711 employees at a large manufacturing organization. Distribution of the questionnaire was by mail. The

researchers achieved a 74% response rate. The questionnaire contained 12 items addressing frequency, quality, and consequences of performance evaluation. Responses to the each item differed with a combination of yes/no, four-point, five-point and six-point Likert-type scales. The independent variables in the analysis were demographic information. The dependent variable rated the fairness and accuracy of evaluations.

A regression analysis performed on the data indicated opportunity to express feelings had the largest influence on perceived fairness and accuracy in performance evaluations. Four other independent variables (program, frequency of evaluation, supervisor's knowledge, and plans related to performance) had a significant impact on the dependent variable. Landy et al. (1978) concluded that a workers ability to express feelings during performance evaluations correlated highly with perceived fairness of the evaluation. These findings were supported by Greenberg (1990) as worker voice was defined as an important process variable.

Similar to Landy et al. (1978), Dipboye and de Pontbraind (1981) examined employee reactions to the organization's evaluation system. The researchers used exempt employees (n = 474) in a research and development organization to test employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems within the organization. The questionnaire contained 12 Likert-type scale items and one dichotomous item. Multiple regression analysis indicated employees favored the performance appraisals and system when: (a) they had an opportunity to state their own side of the issues, (b) factors relating to job evaluation were job relevant, and (c) objectives and plans were discussed. Dipboye and de Pontbraind supported the findings by Landy et al. suggesting procedural justice perceptions are positively influenced by the voice of the employee.

Tyler and Caine (1981) provided a distinct breakthrough in the procedural literature by using procedural justice dimensions to explain variance in leadership satisfaction. Tyler and Caine were the first to show procedural justice could explain unique variance in organizational outcomes. The researchers found unique variance for procedural justice by controlling for distributive justice. Tyler and Caine hypothesized that procedures used by leaders to allocate outcomes have an impact on leadership evaluations that is independent of outcome levels or outcome fairness. Results of the study indicated procedural justice had a unique effect on students' evaluations of teachers and individuals' satisfaction with political officials.

Alexander and Ruderman (1987) continued the research on procedural justice as a unique factor impacting organizational outcomes. Alexander and Ruderman used a factor analysis to show which procedural and distributive justice factors uniquely influenced organizational outcomes of 2,800 federal government employees. Results indicated procedural justice factors had unique effects on direct organizational outcomes including job satisfaction, turnover intentions, trust, stress, and satisfaction with leadership.

Folger and Konovsky (1989) conducted a study similar to Alexander and Ruderman (1987) examining decisions made on pay increases within an organization. Participants of the study were 217 employees of a privately owned manufacturing plant. Respondents completed a 26-item questionnaire measuring perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice. A regression analysis procedure was used to determine if distributive or procedural justice principles would be significant predictors of decision outcomes. Results indicated distributive justice was a significant predictor for

only satisfaction with a raise, while procedural justice was a significant predictor for organizational commitment and leadership trust.

McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) continued the research on procedural justice as a predictor of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. The researchers surveyed 1,100 employees of a Midwestern bank. Each respondent answered a 20-item questionnaire derived from existing instruments used to measure distributive justice, procedural justice, organizational outcomes, and personal outcomes. Results of the regression analyses indicated distributive justice was a more important predictor of pay and job satisfaction, while procedural justice was a more important predictor of organizational commitment and subordinate evaluation of supervisor. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) concluded that distributive and procedural justices are clearly distinct aspects of organizational justice. However, they suggested future research should focus on explaining why these organizational justice dimensions differentially affect personal and organizational outcomes.

Procedural and distributive justices were again studied as predictors of organizational satisfaction and commitment by Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996). Two hundred randomly selected employees of a Veterans Administration Medical Center completed a questionnaire measuring distributive justice, procedural justice, job satisfaction, self-reported appraisal feedback, satisfaction with performance appraisal, commitment, and involvement. Similar to Folger and Konovsky (1989) and McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), Tang et al. found distributive justice to be significantly related with pay. Tang et al. also indicated distributive justice was significantly related to promotion, performance appraisal and commitment. The findings on procedural justice indicated

significant relationships with satisfaction of supervision, performance appraisal, commitment and job involvement.

Interactional Justice

A third justice principle within the organizational justice literature, interactional justice, was introduced by Bies and Moag (1986). Interactional justice is defined as the perceived fairness of individuals with organizational interpersonal communications (Greenberg, 2005). Bies developed the theory of interactional justice through his own personal interactions with individuals. He noticed that individual's assessment of interpersonal treatment was process focused, while the actual interaction was not a formal procedure. Bies and Moag (1986) explained that interactional treatment is conceptually different than the structuring of procedures, and can therefore be separated as unique dimension of organizational justice.

Bies and Moag (1986) explained that an individual's perception of interactional justice is dependent upon four rules: (a) truthfulness – managers should communicate their decision-making-procedures in a truthful manner avoiding deception, (b) justification – managers should provide justification for any decision-making-procedures, (c) respect – mangers should show respect to all employees, maintaining consistency, and (d) propriety – managers should avoid making inappropriate comments or questions. These rules were derived from job candidates responding to how they believed organizational recruiters should treat job applicants. Truthfulness was rated the most often by the job applicant, while the remaining three were mentioned less often. Bies and Moag (1986) noted in their conclusion that these interactional justice rules are distinctly different from the procedural justice rules outlined by Leventhal (1980).

Moorman (1991) developed an instrument to measure interactional justice as a separate dimension from either distributive or procedural justice. Moorman (1991) accomplished this by examining organizational citizenship behavior. Results of this study indicated citizenship behavior could be explained by four different interactional justice dimensions: (a) altruism, (b) courtesy, (c) sportsmanship, and (d) conscientiousness. Unfortunately, the instrument was unsuccessful in validating the results of Moorman (1991) in later studies applied to different organizational settings (Niehoff & Mooramn, 1993).

The literature on interactional justice has not grown at the rate of either distributive or procedural justice literature mainly because scholars are currently debating interactional justice's place in the organizational literature. One argument states that procedural justice is comprised of two sub-principles, structural fairness and interpersonal fairness (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1997). The reasoning behind this theory is based on the nature of how procedures are conducted in the organizational setting. A procedure must be carried out by both the organization and an individual. Therefore, an individual's perception of procedural fairness can be dictated by both the structure of the procedure and how the procedure was handled interpersonally. The second argument claims that interactional justice is distinct and unique from either distributive or procedural justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Moorman, 1991).

Summary of Organizational Justice

The literature on organizational justice has provided researchers with three distinct streams of research. Distributive justice examines an individual's perception of

the fairness in relation to inputs and outputs. Procedural justice examines an individual's perception of fairness in relation to the policies and procedures used by an organization to make decisions. Finally, interactional justice examines an individual's perceptions of fairness in relation to the interpersonal interactions with the organization.

Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) provided support for the distinction between the three organizational justice components in a meta-analysis of justice in organizations. The meta-analysis concluded that while the three components of organizational justice are strongly related, there is sufficient evidence to consider them distinct constructs. While correlations among the three types of justice were found, there were different relationships between the three justice types and their correlates. These findings support the need for separate operationalizations of justice (Colquitt, 1999).

The meta-analysis conducted by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) also provided insight into understanding the outcomes of organizational justice. Procedural justice was found to be the best predictor of work performance and counterproductive work behavior. All justice types were good predictors of satisfaction and trust. Using commitment as an outcome, researchers found all justice types predict affective commitment, but stated procedural justice was the best predictor. Procedural and distributive justices were also found to negatively predict continuance commitment. Finally, perceived injustice causes negative emotional reactions in the forms of negative mood and anger.

Researchers have also identified a possible fourth stream of organizational justice. Retributive justice represents the fairness perceived by an individual to negative outcomes (Tornblom & Jonsson, 1987). While it is important to recognize retributive justice as a possible fourth construct to organizational justice theory, it was not used in

the present study. The present study examined distributive, procedural and interactional justice perceptions in the sport setting and how these perceptions impact organizational behavior with sport organizations. Most research on organizational justice has focused on distributive and procedural justice and their relation to organizational behavior. However, interactional justice has been supported as being a distinct and unique construct within organizational justice theory (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). An examination of the literature on organizational justice in the sport setting will provide further support for the use of the three constructs to organizational justice.

Since little research has been conducted on interaction justice in the sport setting, this study will provide enlightenment to the use of interaction justice in the sport literature. Finally, it is also important to note the nature of sport is very interactive. cooperation and competition co-exist in the sport industry. Sport organizations cannot exist in isolation. The nature of the sport industry requires that individuals, teams, and organizations operate both against and with each other to establish meaningful competition (Mullen, Hardy & Sutton, 2007). Therefore, interactional justice will be included as a third dimension to this study.

Organizational Justice in Sport

Research on organizational justice in the sport setting has primarily focused on the role of distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics. Few studies have examined organizational justice in sport outside of the intercollegiate setting. As the purpose of this study is to focus on the intercollegiate sector of sport a review of the literature on organizational justice in sport will examine: (a) organizational justice in sport outside of

intercollegiate athletics, (b) organizational justice in intercollegiate athletics, and (c) a summary of organizational justice in sport.

Organizational Justice Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics

Tornblom and Jonsson (1985; 1987) addressed various distribution methods used in the athletic setting. Tornblom and Jonsson (1985) examined the perceived justness using two principles (contribution and equality), which were divided into six distributive justice sub-components : (a) contribution of effort, (b) contribution of ability, (c) contribution of productivity, (d) equality of treatment, (e) equality of opportunity, and (f) equality of results. The contribution principle deals with how well a person's outcomes match his/her inputs. The principle of equality relates to distribution simply by equal parts based on some form of measurement (treatment, opportunity, and results). The researchers hypothesized that differences among sub-principles existed between methods of contribution and equality.

Tornblom and Jonsson (1985) used female Swedish nursing students (N = 175) as subjects in their study. The subjects responded to a scenario based instrument illustrating distribution methods by a third party to team sport and non-team sport athletes. The third party in each scenario was depicted as using both retributive and distributive methods of allocation. The subjects were randomly assigned to one of eight conditions: (a) distribution/team/individual, (b) distribution/team/group, (c) distribution/nonteam/individual, (d) distribution/non-team/group, (e) retribution/team/individual, (f) retribution/team/group, (g) retributive/non-team/individual and (h) retributive/nonteam/group. Using the eight conditions, Tornblom and Jonsson designed a 2(team vs. non-team) x 2 (distribution vs. retribution) x 2 (individual vs. group) x 6 (sub rules of

equality and contribution) ANOVA. Subjects rated justness on a five-point Likert-type scale (*very unjust* = 1, *very just* = 5).

Results of the ANOVA showed significant main effects for allocation principle and sub-rule within allocation principle, accounting for 7.61% and 25.5% of the variance respectively. Equality of treatment was perceived as just in all eight conditions, while equality of opportunity was perceived as unjust in all conditions. Tornblom and Jonsson concluded equal allocation was considered more just than allocation according to contributions and that allocation according to contributions were seen as less unjust in distribution than retribution.

Expanding on previous work, Tornblom and Jonsson (1987) conducted a second study in the sport setting on distribution and contributions methods. A similar sample of Swedish nursing students (N = 175) responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained scenarios describing a third party allocating positive or negative outcomes to one or several recipients to a team or non-team. Tornblom and Jonsson designed a 2 (distribution vs. retribution) x 2 (team vs. non-team) x 2 (individual vs. group) x 2 equality of treatment vs. contribution of productivity) to examine one equality sub rule (equality of treatment) with a contribution sub-rule (contribution of productivity). Subjects responded to the same five-point Likert-type scale as in the previous study.

Results of the study supported the hypothesis that contributions would be considered just in distribution scenarios involving positive commission. Results also supported the hypothesis that equality would be perceived as just in retribution scenarios involving negative commission.

Stevenson (1989) examined athlete perceptions of national sport team selections. The study was designed to investigate whether athletes perceived the selections to the national team to be fair and whether their perceptions of selection were related to perceptions of procedure. The author identified three procedures for athlete selection currently being used by NGBs: (a) the "board of directors" procedure, selected athletes using operations form within the organizational structure of the sport governing body, (b) the "national coach" procedure, gave the national coach complete autonomy over both the criteria and selection of athletes, and (c) the "mixed" procedure, used a combination of both the "board of directors" and "national coach" approaches. In the Stevenson (1989) study three teams used the "mixed" procedure, two teams used the "national coach" procedure, and one used the "board of selectors" procedure.

Stevenson (1989) sought to associate perceptions of fairness with the three methods of athlete selection. Based on in-depth interviews the researcher suggested athletes differentiated the selection processes using perceptions of four items: (a) image of the selectors, (b) criteria used in selection process, (c) bias, and (d) fairness of the selection outcomes. Results indicated that athletes' perceptions of fairness for the selection of athletes was related to their perceptions of fairness of the selection procedure. Perceptions of the "board of director" procedure for both selection and process were believed to be unfair. Athletes found the "national coach" procedure for selection and process to be fair. Finally, athletes believed the "mixed" procedure to be somewhat fair for both selection and process. Stevenson (1989) concluded that these results may relate to an athlete's dissatisfaction and lack of confidence in the sport system. These implications could lead to a lack of success by the national teams. Stevenson concluded

that national governing bodies need to look into the selection process and understand the affects of athlete perceptions.

Another study examining organizational justice in the sport setting outside of intercollegiate athletics was done by Dittmore (2006). The purpose of the Dittmore (2006) study was to measure the perceived fairness of financial resource allocation among U.S. National Governing Body (NGB) administrators. Seven distributive justice principles were used to measure the perceived fairness: (a) Equality of Treatment (everyone received is the same allocation), (b) Equality of Results (everyone receives the same allocation over a period of time), (c) Equity Based on Medals Won (allocation of resources is based on number of medals won by each NGB), (d) Equity Based on Membership Size (allocation of resources is based on number of members within the NGB), (e) Need Due to Lack of Resources (allocation of resources based on NGB history of under-funding), (f) Need Due to High Operating Costs (allocation of resources based on operating cost associated with each NGB), and (g) Need to be Competitively Successful (allocation of resources based on the NGB's needs to be competitively successful). The researcher also wanted to know which distributive justice principle the administrators believed to be most fair.

Dittmore (2006) used both presidents and executive directors for each of the 39 NGBs as participants in the study (N = 72). A scenario based survey was designed based on prior studies on distributive justice (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a' 1994b; Mahony, Hums, & Riemer, 2002; Mahony, Riemer, Breeding & Hums, 2006; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008). The survey consisted of three distribution scenarios where each participant was asked to rate the perceived fairness of the seven distribution principles on

a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = "very unfair", 7 = "very fair"). The author also asked each participant to identify which distribution principle was most fair and most likely to be used.

Dittmore (2006) identified five main findings in the study. First, NGB administrators rated "need to be competitively successful" as a more fair distributive justice practice than intercollegiate athletic administrators. This finding was related to the fact that the Olympic Games occur only once every four years, while intercollegiate sports have a season every year. Therefore, the need to be competitively successful is more for NGBs. A second finding revealed smaller NGBs preferred the "need to be competitively successful" distribution over all other distribution methods. This finding implies a difference in the definition of "need" between large and small NGBs. Administrators of smaller NGBs may perceive their organizations as having a greater need based on size and ability to gain resources. Therefore, their definition of need is not based solely on competitive success. A third finding identified no major differences between medal-winning and non-medal-winning NGBs. This finding is inconsistent with the assumption that unsuccessful NGBs are envious of successful NGBs. The fourth finding revealed no differences between paid and volunteer administrators. This finding was not surprising to the researcher. NGB presidents are often volunteers who work away from the day-to-day operations and base many of their decisions on advice from the executive staff of the NGB. Therefore, their perceptions are likely to be closely related to those of the paid staff. The final significant finding of the study was the implication of a contradiction of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act. NGB administrators believed the USOC was likely to reward Olympic success rather than equality. The

relevance of Dittmore (2006) to the organizational justice literature was the examination of a new participant base (NGB administrators) and the findings of differences among them and intercollegiate administrators.

Whisenant and Jordan (2006) conducted a study for the purpose of determining if dimensions of organizational justice impacted team performance in sports. The researchers used high school student athletes who participated in a team sport as their sample (n=323). Team performance was measured using win-loss records. Teams with more wins than loses were coded as winning teams, while teams with more loses than wins were coded as losing teams. A modified version of the Justice Measure developed by Colquitt (2001) was used. Items were modified to generate a response based on the participants' perceptions of their coach. Items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 =disagree, 7 = agree). An average score for each dimension was used as the respondent overall perception of fairness. Mean scores that were less than 4 indicated negative perceptions of justice, while scores 4 and above indicated positive perceptions. Independent Samples T-Tests were used to analyze the data. Results indicated that team performance was significantly influenced by only procedural justice (p = .033). Fairness perceptions of individuals on winning teams were higher for both distributive and interactional justice but, were not significant. Further analysis showed that respondents differed significantly by both gender and sport. On the basis of gender, girls (M = 5.78) differed significantly from boys (M = 5.47) in their perceptions of interactional justice, rating their perceptions higher than boys. On the basis of sport, football differed significantly from soccer in perceptions of interactional justice. Individual who played

football (M = 5.41) rated interactional justice significantly lower than individuals who played soccer (M = 6.09).

Organizational Justice in Intercollegiate Athletics

The segment of the sport industry receiving the most attention regarding organizational justice has been intercollegiate athletics. Researcher have conducted studies examining athletic directors and administrators (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Mahony, Hums & Riemer, 2002; Mahony, Hums, & Riemer, 2005; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008), athletic board chairs (Mahony et al., 2002; Mahony et al., 2005), students (Mahony, Reimer, Breeding, & Hums, 2006), student-athletes (Jordan, Gillentine, & Hunt, 2004; Mahony et al., 2006), and coaches (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b).

Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) contributed to the literature on distributive justice in the sport setting by using the model established by Tornblom and Jonsson (1985; 1987). Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) developed an instrument to assess the views of both male and female NCAA coaches and administrators on the principles of distributive justice. The examination of this development began with the construction of a conceptual framework guided by an existing model by Tornblom and Jonsson (1985, 1987). The conceptual model began with the construction of three base principles for distributive justice: (a) equality – resources distributed equally among all parts of the organization, (b) contribution – resources distributed in proportion to the contributions made by particular members or groups in the organization, and (c) need - resources allocated to members or groups who are perceived to have the greatest need. From these three base principles, Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) identified eight sub-principle factors
influencing distributive justice in the sport setting: (a) equality of treatment, (b) equality of results, (c) equality of opportunity, (d) contribution in terms of effort, (e) contribution in terms of ability, (f) contribution in terms of productivity, (g) contribution in terms of spectator appeal, and (h) need. The researchers defined the critical resources for distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics as money, facilities, and support services.

Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) developed their scale in three stages: (a) development of scenarios, (b) a pilot study, and (c) a confirmatory study. In the development of the scenarios the two forms of allocation (distributive and retribution) were combined with three types of resources (money, facilities, and support services) to create six cells. Researchers created eight scenarios for each cell, generating a total of 48 distributive scenarios. Respondents rated each of the eight sub-principles of distributive justice on 7-point Likert-type scale with values ranging from *very unjust* (1) to *very just* (7) for each scenario. In addition to the rating items, respondents also identified one specific sub-principle they perceived as most fair for each scenario. A panel of experts (athletic administrators (n = 6), coaches (n = 6), and professors (n = 4)) evaluated the scenarios and selected 24 of the 48 scenarios for the pilot study.

The participants in the pilot study consisted of a stratified sample of 20 administrators and coaches (10 men and 10 women) from each of the three NCAA divisions (N = 120). The pilot study obtained a response rate of 37% containing 44 usable instruments. Inter-correlations of the eight distributive principles returned significant results for all but one of the sub-principles (equality of opportunity). Researchers decided to use the two highest correlated sub-principles in the final instrument. While respondents successfully rated the principles they did not respond to the second question asking them

to choose the most favorable principle. Therefore, instructions to the instrument were rewritten.

The confirmatory study contained a demographic section along with the 12 scenarios. A stratified sample method selected 100 administrators and coaches from each of the three NCAA divisions to represent the participants in the confirmatory study (N = 600). A total of 328 usable instruments achieved a response rate of 55%. The developed scale achieved internal validity as results indicated significant correlations for all eight of the distributive principles with a mean of .66. Test-retest reliability also achieved significant correlations for all distributive principles with a mean of .64.

The researchers noted the unconventional method used to achieve internal consistency, but felt encouraged by the reliability results. They also finalized three versions of the instrument which used 24, 12, or 6 scenarios. The researchers suggested using at least 12 scenarios for achieving internal consistency.

Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) continued examining principles of distributive justice through a survey of male and female coaches and administrators at all three divisions of the NCAA (1994b). The conceptual framework of this study included an examination of group differences based on gender, divisional membership, and position on the eight sub-principles of distributive justice as applied to both distribution and retribution of money, facilities, and support services. The purpose of their study contained two objectives: (a) to identify and list the possible principles of distribution applicable to intercollegiate athletics and, (b) assess the perceptions of selected constituents of intercollegiate athletics on the justness of the identified principles.

A stratified random sample of 100 athletic administrators and head coaches from each NCAA Division (I, II, and III), collected from the 1991-1992 Blue Book directory of intercollegiate athletics, generated the sample for this study (N = 600). Respondents returned 328 usable instruments, achieving a response rate of 55%. Using the 12 scenarios version of the scale Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) developed, each respondent rated the justness of the eight allocation sub-principles on a 7-point scale. Following scenario rating of each sub-principle, each respondent selected the one sub-principle he/she perceived as most fair and would implement in his/her organization. The data analysis used in the study consisted of both parametric and nonparametric analyses. The parametric analyses included six multivariate (MANOVA) procedures using the eight sub-principles of distribution as the dependent variables, and gender, divisional membership and support services as independent variables. Researchers used repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey post hoc analysis for significant results found in the multivariate analysis. The non parametric analyses included a goodness-of-fit, chi square procedure measuring the deviation from the expected equal distribution among the eight sub-principles.

Results of the six MANOVA procedures indicated only gender differences in the eight ratings of the sub-principles. Results of the repeated measures ANOVA indicated significant effects of gender on the sub-principles and their interactions for all six distributive scenarios. Males rated contribution principles significantly higher, while females preferred equality. The chi-square analysis indicated equality of treatment to be the most preferred principle by females, while males chose need more often. Association based on position indicated for distribution of money, administrators chose need

allocation most often, while coaches chose both need and equality of treatment. Retribution of money generated different results with administrators choosing need and coaches choosing equality of treatment most often. No association between the eight subprinciples and division membership was found.

In summary, it is important to note that while the contribution principles were all rated unjust, this finding is consistent with prior studies supporting the equality-contribution hypothesis. The researchers noted interesting results when comparing coaches to administrators. The two groups showed no significant differences. Researchers attributed this finding to the notion that many administrators were once coaches themselves and still view distributive justice from coaches' perspective rather than looking at "the big picture" of the entire athletic department. The major finding of this study was administrators and coaches at all three NCAA divisions viewed equality of treatment, need, and equality of results as the most just sub-principles for distributive justice.

Extending the literature produced by Hums and Chelladurai (1994a, 1994b), Mahony and Pastore (1998) examined the NCAA Revenue and Expense Reports form 1973-1993 to determine if evidence existed to suggest equality and need were the main principles affecting distributions. Three purposes guided their study: (a) determine if resources were being distributed in accordance with the three principles identified in prior research by Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) within all levels of the NCAA, of if other principles had come to the forefront, (b) determine how legal actions during the 1973-1993 span affected the trends in resource distribution, and (c) present an objective examination of the data presented in the NCAA Revenue and Expense Reports to more

fully understand the trends related to women's sports, men's revenue sports, and men's non-revenue sports. The data used in the analysis came from the annual NCAA Revenue and Expense Reports from 1973 to 1993. The data examined trends and ratios in four categories: (a) revenue, (b) sports offered, (c) participation opportunities, and (d) expenses.

The results showed an increase in percentage of revenue produced by women's sports. However, these revenues were still less than male sports at all levels. These increases did suggest there is still potential to increase revenues through promotion of women's sports. The data supported the argument that male revenue sports produced a profit for the athletic department. At the Division I-A level, athletic programs are profitable through sponsoring male revenue sports (Football and Basketball), while other divisions show a continual loss.

Data on the number of sports offered indicated an 86.07% increase in women's sports offered, while men's sports have experienced a 10.43% decline since 1973. This finding supported the notion that legislation, like Title IX, has impacted intercollegiate athletics. While the overall data showed an increase in women's sports offered, a closer evaluation of the trends indicated reactions by athletic directors coincided with legal judgments at the time. This inference raised the question of whether decisions made by athletic administrators were based on the desire for equality or reactions to a mandated legal judgment. The number of men's sports eliminated by athletic administrators in a response to Title IX legislation supports the theory they were reacting to mandated legal judgment.

Overall participation data showed an increase for both men (11.28%) and women (112.04%). While the increase in women's participation is much larger than the male increase, further evaluation of the data indicated an inconsistency with distribution based on equality for three reasons. First, trends similar to those noted in the number of sports offered triggered by legal legislation indicated reaction to legal mandates rather than changes in business practice. Second, some schools had more female athletes than male. Division III institutions, who did not offer football, had an average female participation opportunity to be 51.27%. The rationale behind this organizational decision not to offer football makes sense given the fact these schools do not earn much revenue from their sport programs. Eliminating or not offering a revenue producing sport at the Division III level does not affect the overall financial situation of the athletic department as it would at the Division I level. Therefore, it is not surprising that some Division III athletic departments were able to reach equality of opportunities given their limited revenue potential. Finally, the number of opportunities within a football program skewed the data. This skewing did not indicate a move toward equality since programs which do not offer football are not meeting the proportionality rule under Title IX. The data also showed schools offering football are not adding enough women's sports to compensate for the disproportionate participation numbers.

Mahony and Pastore (1998) provided several explanations as to why women's expenditures increased over the 20 year span, while men's expenditures increased more. First, these results indicated poor cost containment on the part of the athletic department. Expenses for these programs have risen at a faster rate than the rise in the consumer price index. Secondly, football's high cost of production is unmatched by any other sport for

either women or men. Therefore, these programs are proving the difficulty of trying to provide equal distributions while supporting a football program. Third, men's nonrevenue sports seem to be taking the biggest hit on expenditures. Money from men's revenue sports are being distributed to women's sports. Fourth, cuts made by administrators to men's non-revenue sports does not seem to be consistent with findings that administrators believe need based distribution are the most fair. Finally, trends in expenditures can again be linked to legal legislation.

Mahony, Hums, and Riemer (2002) examined the findings of two previous studies looking at the perceived fairness of distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics. Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found NCAA coaches and administrators perceived equity and need to be the more just distributive justice practices, while Mahony and Pastore (1998) noted at the NCAA Division I level actual practices of administrators were based on contribution rather than either need or equality. The purpose of their study was to better understand the perceptions of fairness and the distribution of resources in intercollegiate athletics by reexamining the sub-principles outlined by Hums and Chelladurai (1994b), while making changes to both the sample and instrument. The study included four research questions: "(a) what distribution principles do athletic directors and athletic board chairs consider most fair?; (b) how do athletic directors and athletic board chairs believe their institution would actually distribute or take away resources?; (c) are the differences between athletic board chairs and athletic directors within the same division regarding their perceptions of fairness and the actual distribution or retribution decision they believe would be made at their institution?; and (d) are there differences between administrators at Division I and Division III institutions regarding their perceptions of

fairness and the actual distribution or retribution decisions they believe would be made at their institution?" (p. 335).

The participants in this study were athletic directors and athletic board chairs at all NCAA Division I and Division III levels who sponsor a men's football program (N =660). For this study, researchers used a modified version of the instrument developed by Hums and Chelladurai (1994b). The modifications of the instrument were justified based on suggestions from prior research on distributive justice in the sport setting. First, the sub-principle of equity based on revenue production was adopted based on suggestions made by Hums and Chelladurai (1994b). Second, the addition of equity percentages (winning percentage) as a sub-principle was based on the common use of incremental budgeting, where all budgets are increased or decreased by an equal percentage. Third, the sub-principle of need was expanded to three sub-principles: (a) need to survive (women's team), (b) need to survive (men's team), and (c) need to be successful. These adoptions were justified by the difficulty respondents were having in interpreting need. Fourth, facility use and support services were dropped as distribution and retribution scenarios. Evidence of actual financial resource distribution is more apparent and easier to interpret than facility use and support services. Fifth, the sample for the study was athletic directors and board chair members. Coaches and lower level administrators were not included due to their lack of power in the actual distribution of resources. Athletic directors and board chairs determine and/or approve resource allocation. Finally, respondents were asked to choose the distribution methods they felt their schools would use. The rationale behind this change is that administrators may have different thoughts on what they believe is fair and how they actually distribute resources.

The researchers divided the modified instrument into two sections. The first section illustrated scenarios describing different distribution principles asking the participants to rate the scenarios on the 12 different sub-principle statements (revenue production, effort, spectator appeal, winning percentage, team and coach ability, financial need to succeed, financial need to survive by a women's team, financial need to survive by a men's non-revenue team, equality of treatment, equality of results, equality of opportunity, and equity) using a five-point Likert-type scale on both fairness and likelihood their institutions would use the principle when making distribution decisions. The scale ranged from 1 (Very Unfair) to 5 (Very Fair) for the fairness scale and 1 (Very Unlikely) to 5 (Very Likely) for the implementation scale. The second section was similar to the first, but changed distribution scenarios to retribution scenarios. Each respondent was asked to rate the same 12 sub-principles for both perception of fairness and likelihood of implementation for each scenario.

The analytical procedures consisted of descriptive statistics using six MANOVA procedures. Mahony et al. (2002) used NCAA level (I-A or III) and position (athletic director or athletic board chair) as nominally scaled independent variables. The dependent variables used in the MANOVAs were the interval ratings of the distributive sub-principles equity, equality, and need as they related to the perception of fairness and likelihood of using principle within their institution. The first two MANOVA procedures used one retribution scenario and one distribution scenario on the five dependent variables of the equity sub-principles (revenue production, effort, spectator appeal, winning percentage, and team and coach ability). The third and fourth MANOVA

variables of the equality sub-principles (equality of treatment, equality of results, equality of opportunity, and equal percentages). The final fifth and sixth MANOVA procedures used one retribution and one distribution scenario on the three dependent variables of the need sub-principles (need for survival for women's team, need for survival for non-revenue men's team, and need to be successful). Hotelling T² and Tukey tests were used as post hoc analyses for any significant MANOVA results in determining group differences.

Results of the MANOVA analysis indicated group differences related to equity and equality for both the evaluation of fairness and likelihood the principle would be used at their institution. The dependent variables of the need sub-principles were not analyzed further because no significant difference existed. Need was rated highest for all groups. Multivariate pairwise group analysis revealed no significant differences between athletic directors and board chairs in their respective Division. However, differences did exist between Division I athletic directors and Division III athletic directors with respect to equity and equality in likelihood of use. Post hoc procedures indicated Division I athletic directors favored equity principles more than Division III athletic directors, while Division III athletic director rated equality more favorably than Division I athletic directors.

Continuing the research on perceptions of distributive justice in the sport industry, Mahony, Hums, and Riemer (2005) conducted a study focusing on defining need from the perspective of both athletic directors and board chairs within intercollegiate athletic departments at the Division I and III levels. Prior research indicated inconsistencies between actual distributions (Litan, Orszag, & Orszag., 2003; Mahony & Pastore, 1998)

and both the fairness perceptions of the stakeholders (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony, et al., 2002) and the principles the decision makers say they use (Mahony et al., 2002). These inconsistencies indicate decision makers within intercollegiate athletics may use a different basis for determining need. These inconsistencies in the literature gave reason to seek a deeper understanding as to how decision makers determine need in the intercollegiate athletics setting.

Mahony et al. (2005) posed four research questions: (a) which sport teams do the decision makers believe have the most needs?; (b) what factors do the decision makers believe make one team's needs greater than another's?; (c) are there differences in perceptions of need by position?; and (d) are there differences in perceptions of needs by division? The participants in the study consisted of athletic directors and athletic board chairs at both Division I-A and Division III schools offering football (N = 261). The participants completed a questionnaire consisting of demographic information along with two study questions concerned with perceptions of teams having the greatest financial needs.

The first instrument question asked the respondent to indicate "Which of your athletic teams currently has the greatest financial needs?" Respondents listed their responses by men's teams, women's teams, and overall. These responses were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics. The second instrument question then asked, "Why do the teams named in Question #1 have the greatest need?" Each researcher examined the second set of responses independently and coded them. They were later compared for similarities and differences and intercoder reliability was 92.85%. A goodness-of-fit, chi

square analysis tested the significance of the relationship between need and group membership. Separate analyses compared division level and position held.

Study findings indicated that athletic directors at both the Division I and III levels, along with athletic chair members at the Division III level, identified football as having the most financial need. Athletic board chairs at the Division I level indicated men's track and field had the most financial need. In response to why these programs have high financial needs, three general categories were derived from the participants' responses: (a) lack of available resources, (b) high costs associated with particular team, and (c) level of resources needed to be competitively successful. The chi square analysis indicated no significant differences in identification of reasons for need based on position. However, significance was found in relation to division membership. Division III administrators were more likely to identify high costs as a reason for financial need, while Division I were more likely to identify related to competitive success.

In a study similar to Mahony et al. (2002), Mahony, Riemer, Breeding, and Hums (2006) sampled Division I undergraduate non-athletes and athletes to explore their perceptions of distributive justice. Utilizing a scenario based survey similar to Hums and Chelladurai (1994b), Mahony et al. (2006) created retributive and distributive scenarios for both the intercollegiate athletic context and private sector sporting goods context. Using the findings of Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) and Mahony and Pastore (1998), Mahony et al. (2006) sought to determine if perceptions among college athletes and nonathletes were different in regard to distributive justice.

The reason for this study was based on the findings of Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) and Mahony and Pastore (1998). While Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found

that athletic administrators and coaches in all three NCAA Division perceived equality of treatment, need and equality of results as the most fair practices of distribution, Mahony and Pastore (1998) found that in actual practice Division I intercollegiate administrators were still distributing resources on an equity basis. Mahony et al. (2006) claimed the findings of Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) may have been affected by the structure of the survey. First, Mahony et al. (2006) suggested revenue production may be an additional distributive sub-principle. Secondly, respondents in Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) may have answered in a politically correct manner. While responses were anonymous, true feelings of how resources should be distributed may not have been reflected due to respondents replying in favorable way rather than with their true feelings.

Mahony et al. (2006) surveyed 150 students at an NCAA Division I university enrolled into sport management classes to examine fairness perceptions. The sample was broken in five segments: (a) 30 male non-athletes, (b) 30 male revenue sport athletes, (c) 30 male non-revenue sport athletes, (d) 30 female non-athletes, and (e) 30 female athletes. Mahony et al. (2006) suggested surveying students, rather than administrators, in an attempt to generate a more genuine response. First, students and student-athletes enrolled in sport management classes are potential aspiring sport administrators and coaches. Therefore, the perception of these students is important to understand, as they will soon be the decision makers within the sport industry. Secondly, students and student-athletes are directly affected by the decisions made in regard to distributive practices within an athletic department.

Using an instrument similar to Hums and Chelladurai (1994b), Mahony et al. (2006) created a scenario-based survey instrument. Researchers included six scenarios

describing both retributive and distributive situations for money, facility usage and support services. Based on a critique of Hums and Chelladurai (1994b), Mahony et al. (2006) added revenue production as a ninth sub-principle to the initial eight (contribution of effort, contribution of ability, contribution of productivity, contribution of spectator appeal, equality of treatment, equality of result, equality of opportunity, and need). Each respondent rated each of the nine sub-principles on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very unfair) to 5 (very fair) for each of the six scenarios. After rating each sub-principle, respondents reported the sub-principle they perceived as being most fair and would implement in their organization in the given scenario.

Researchers used MANOVA procedures to depict significant multivariate relationships between the nine distributive justice sub-principles and independent variables (male non-athletes, male revenue sport athletes, male non-revenue sport athletes, female non-athletes, and female athletes). Results of the MANOVA procedure indicated significant differences in: (a) equality variables in the money scenario and (b) equity variables in the facility variables. Post hoc pairwise group analysis indicated significant differences between female athletes and male revenue sport athletes for the equality variables in the money scenario. Female athletes indicated a significantly higher rating for equality than male revenue sport athletes. For the equity variables in the facility scenario, male non-athletes rated equity or contribution based principles higher than both female non-athletes and male non-revenue athletes. Researchers also reported which dependent variables contributed to the significant for revenue production and equality variables from distribution and retribution were only significant for revenue production and equality

The non-parametric results indicated equality of treatment was the fairest option of the nine sub-principles in all scenarios, except in the retribution support services scenario. Need based distribution was considered the second most fair in these scenarios. For the retribution support services scenario, need was selected as most fair, followed by equality of treatment. Further results show female athletes and female non-athletes perceive retribution of facilities and equality fairer than male non-athletes and male revenue sport athletes.

Using a new sample of 150 students in sport management classes, Mahony et al. (2006) had respondents rate their perceptions of fairness for distributive justice in the private sport business sector as a second part to the same study. The purpose of this instrument was to determine if sport setting played a role in the perception of distributive justice fairness. Participants completed the survey using six scenarios illustrating situations in the private sport business setting. Respondents answered the survey in the same manner as the participants in the first part of the study. Results of the MANOVA procedures indicated no significant results. Non-parametric analyses also indicated no significant differences between groups. Similar to the first study, equality of treatment and need were rated as most fair. No statistical procedure was used to compare the first study results with those in the second study, however a comparison of means showed respondents were more likely to select equity based principles (productivity, effort, and ability) in the private sport business setting than in the college athletics setting. These finding indicated the sport setting may play a role in perceived fairness in terms of distributive justice practices.

Patrick, Mahony, and Petrosko (2008) examined the perceived fairness of distributive practices among athletic directors and Senior Women's Administrators (SWA). The researchers were interested in the effect gender and NCAA division had on an individuals' perception of fairness in regards to equality of treatment, contribution based on revenue production, need due to lack of resources, need due to high operating expense, and need to be competitively successful. Using a scenario based survey, generated from the work and suggestions of Hums and Chelladurai (1994a;1994b), Mahony et al. (2002), and Mahony et al. (2006), Patrick et al. (2008) sought to answer three research questions: (a) did the respondents indicate significant differences in their perception of the fairness of the five distribution principles, (b) were there differences based on gender in preferences for distribution options, and (c) were there differences based on NCAA division in preferences for distribution.

The researchers used ANOVAs to operationalize both the independent (gender and NCAA division) and dependent variables (the five distribution principles). Results indicated significant differences in the perceived fairness of distribution principles based on both gender and NCAA division. Statistical significance in perceived fairness was also found to exist between all five distribution principles. Equality and need due to lack of resources were rated higher across gender and NCAA division. Revenue production was rated lower across gender and NCAA division.

The authors focused on two major findings within the results. First, athletic administrators perceived those having less resources, to have the greatest need, and therefore resources should be allocated accordingly to be most fair. Second, athletic administrators seemed more likely to enhance the budgets of programs with high

operating costs when revenue generation was strong and more likely to decrease those budgets during weaker revenue generation periods.

Summary Organizational Justice in Sport

The literature on organizational justice in sport has mostly focused on distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics. However, some studies that have focused on industry segments outside of intercollegiate athletics. Tornblom and Jonsson (1985; 1987) examined equity and equality principles, finding Swedish nursing students perceived equal allocation of resources to be more just than resources allocated based on contributions. Stevenson (1989) examined athletes' perceived fairness on the selection of national sport teams. Results indicated a "national coach" process for athlete selection was perceived as most fair, while the "board of director" approaches were perceived as least fair. Dittmore (2006) found NGB administrators preferred the "need to be competitively successful" over other distribution methods. Whisenant and Jordan (2006) found that only interactional justice differed significant when measuring perceptions of justice in the team sport setting.

The literature on organizational justice within intercollegiate athletics has examined athletic directors and administrators (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Mahony, Hums & Riemer, 2002, 2005; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008), athletic board chairs (Mahony et al., 2002, 2005), students (Mahony, Reimer, Breeding, & Hums, 2006), student-athletes (Jordan, Gillentine, & Hunt, 2004; Mahony et al., 2006), and coaches (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Jordan et al. 2004; Whisenant & Jordan, 2006). These studies have mainly focused on three independent variables: (a) athletic job position, (b) NCAA division, and (c) gender.

Studies examining differences in perceived fairness based on athletic job position have revealed two interesting findings. First, studies have found little difference among positions within an athletic department with regards to the perception of fairness in intercollegiate athletics (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony et al., 2002, 2005). Second, studies have indicated there is consistency among athletic position when asked which distributive justice practice is most fair. Most studies have indicated distributive practices based on equality and need to be perceived as the most fair (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Mahony & Pastore, 1998; Mahony et al. 2002).

Examining NCAA Division level has lead to inconsistent results (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony et al., 2002). Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found no significant difference in perceptions of distributive justice among division levels with respondents from all three divisions viewing equality of treatment, need, and equality of results as the most just sub-principles of distributive justice. Mahony et al. (2002) concluded that decision makers at Division I institutions were more likely to select distribution based on contribution, while those at Division III institutions were more likely to select distribution based on equality. Mahony et al. (2005) also examined divisional differences with respect to perceptions of need. Division I administrators responded by indicating lack of revenue, competitive success, and Title IX issues were the primary determinants of need. In contrast, Division III administrators responded by indicating high costs of sport, travel, and equipment were the primary determinants of need. These results support using NCAA division as an independent variable in organizational justice studies in the college sport setting.

The literature on organizational justice in the sport setting has generated several studies indicating significant differences based on gender. Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) found that gender was the only independent variable to have significant differences. Males rated contribution significantly higher, while females rated equality of treatment significantly higher in each of six distribution scenarios. Mahony et al. (2006) found that while, male and female athletes and students rated equality of treatment and need as the fairest allocation methods, women were stronger supporters of distribution based on equality, while men supported distribution based on need and contribution to the program. These findings clearly indicate gender differences in organizational justice perceptions exist.

Job Satisfaction

While job satisfaction is one of the most often examined areas in management and industrial psychology (Chelladurai, 1999) a standard definition has not been established. An initial definition of job satisfaction given by Locke (1976) stated that job satisfaction was "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Balzer, Smith, Kravitz, Lovell, Paul, Reilly, and Reilly (1990) defined job satisfaction as the feelings an employee develops about his/her job, based on past experiences, current conditions, and available employment alternatives. Chelladurai (1999) expanded on Balzer et al. (1990) by suggesting that job satisfaction is based on an individual's evaluation of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements to his/her job responsibilities. Cognitive elements refer to an employee's understanding and evaluation of an organization. The evaluation is based on the information and knowledge the employee has generated or gathered on the organization. Emotional elements are feelings

an employee has about his/her organization or job, both positive and negative. Finally, behavioral elements deal with actions an employee takes within his/her organization.

Understanding the effects of these elements by which an individual arrives at a perceived satisfaction level is very important to an organization. While prior research is inconsistent on the relationship between job satisfaction and employee behaviors, Balzer et al. (1990) contends that humanitarian, economic, and theoretical concerns are reasons why organizations should focus on employee job satisfaction. At the humanitarian level, studies have shown correlations with life satisfaction to mental and physical health. The economic concern relates to studies providing evidence supporting the notion that job satisfaction leads to a decrease in operating expenses, turnover and absenteeism. However, job satisfaction has yet to be fully examined in the organizational setting in a theoretical context. Research focused on different facets of job satisfaction can provide a deeper understanding of individual assessments of job satisfaction.

Research on the impact of job satisfaction on the goals and mission of an organization demonstrate why it is important to study job satisfaction within organizations. Jordan (2001) also stated the inconsistencies in findings on whether job satisfaction is a cause, consequence, or symptom related to employee behavior is an additional reason for exploring the benefits job satisfaction has to an organization. The following review of literature on job satisfaction will examine: (a) theoretical background, (b) job satisfaction theories, (c) antecedents of job satisfaction, and (d) summary of job satisfaction. The purpose of this review is to establish a foundation for examining job satisfaction within the sport setting.

Theoretical Background

Job satisfaction literature is grounded in studies by Taylor (1911), Mayo (1945), and Maslow (1943). Taylor (1911) introduced the theory of scientific management as a contradictory theory to the antagonistic relationship between organizations and their employees. Scientific management theory states that an organization's success is dependent upon the success of the employees within. Taylor (1911) further noted an organization cannot exist long term without long term prosperity from the employees. The employees' prosperity can come in the form of wants and needs, such as wages. An organization's prosperity can come in low labor cost, higher production, or efficient manufacturing.

Another scholar who influenced the theoretical background for job satisfaction was Mayo (1933, 1945). Mayo's studies are based on industrial organization and production. Mayo concluded through his studies that the application of physical sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, etc.) far exceed both the knowledge and application of social sciences (psychology, sociology, political science, etc.). Mayo noted that volume of production, amount of absenteeism, and maintenance of morale among employees was a vital, yet neglected, factor in organizations. Mayo suggested both organizations and civilizations have a need to develop and apply social skills. This development and application can lead to a more complete work environment through an understanding of both technical skill and physical sciences.

Maslow (1943) also contributed to the theoretical background of job satisfaction through his development of the hierarchy of needs theory. Maslow theorized that individuals have a variety of needs which could be stimulated at different times throughout life depending upon the individual's personal situation. Maslow developed

these needs into a hierarchy explaining that an individual wishes to move up the hierarchy of needs as each need is obtained. The five levels of needs include: (a) physiological, (b) safety, (c) love/belonging, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization. Maslow noted that individuals will move up and down this hierarchy as different needs are either met or lost. Maslow explained that the ultimate goal of each individual is to find self-actualization. Self-actualization is met when an individual has met all other needs in the hierarchy and has reached one's fullest potential.

As illustrated by Taylor (1911) and Mayo (1945), the need for an organization to understand their employees' needs in order to have that employee perform at the highest level of efficiency and productivity is crucial to the survival and prosperity of the organization. Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs provided organizations an illustrated model of what individuals need for their survival both physically and spiritually. The application of Maslow's hierarchy has been used for decades and continues to be an original source in explaining individual behaviors.

The theories of Taylor (1911), Mayo (1945), and Maslow (1943) have been considered the foundation in the job satisfaction literature. These scholars developed an understanding in which the relationship between an organization and their employees must be mutual in nature for the survival of both parties. As explained by Taylor (1911), the nature of organizational progression is dependent upon the individuals who make up the organization, and vice versa. An organization cannot operate without individuals and individuals cannot prosper without organizations. This mutual relationship illustrates the need to further understand the intrinsic facets which effect an individual's job satisfaction.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

From the theoretical base of job satisfaction a number of theories have developed from the literature. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) purposed a two-factor theory of job satisfaction where satisfaction is derived from two types of factors influencing satisfaction. The first type of factors are intrinsic in nature as they can be controlled by the individual, and were termed "motivators". Motivators included variables such as achievement, recognition, challenging work, responsibility, advancement, and growth. The second type, "hygiene" factors, influence dissatisfaction with work and are thought to be extrinsic in nature, as they are controlled by the organization. Hygiene factors included organizational policies and procedures, working conditions, supervision and interpersonal relationships. While Herzberg et al.'s model offers an initial framework with which to study job satisfaction, scholars have outlined limitations to this theory (Chelladurai, 1985). A major limitation to this theory is that it assumes all employees derive their perceptions of job satisfaction in the same manner. Employees react to organizational situations differently and therefore evaluate influencing factors differently.

Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1964) developed the Minnesota Model of Job Satisfaction identifying 20 work-related needs (ability use, achievement, activity, independence, variety, compensation, security, working conditions, advancement, recognition, authority, social status, co-workers, moral values, social service, company policies, supervision-human resources, supervision-technical, creativity, and responsibility), categorized into six dimensions of job satisfaction: (a) achievement, (b) comfort, (c) status, (d) altruism, (e) safety, and (f) autonomy. The researchers also

developed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, used to measure the extent to which these needs are satisfied in a job. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) consists of 100 items requiring each respondent to indicate the level of satisfaction with each aspect on a five-point scale. A short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire can also be used to measure overall satisfaction with the job.

The Lawler's Facet-Satisfaction Model (1973) theorizes that job satisfaction is derived from an individual's assessment of expected outcomes and actual outcomes. Lawler relied heavily upon Adams (1963) theory of inequity to establish this theory. According to Lawler, job satisfaction is derived through a process in which an individual analyzes expected outcomes with actual outcomes. If actual outcomes meet or exceed expected outcomes, an individual will experience positive job satisfaction. When an individual perceives actual outcomes to be less than expected outcomes, an individual will experience negative job satisfaction. Jordan (2001) identified a limitation to the Facet-Satisfaction Model to be the focus on distributive justice, with no consideration given to procedural or interactional justice.

The final theory in this review was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) and later revised by Balzer et al. (1990). Smith et al. (1969) identified five specific facets related to an individual's perception of job satisfaction: (a) assigned work, (b) pay, (c) promotion, (d) supervision, and (e) co-workers. Researchers developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to measure these facets. Balzer et al. (1990) contributed to the theory by suggesting overall satisfaction could also be measured in sequence with the five facets. A result of this suggestion was the coupling of the JDI and the Job In General (JIG) scale. The JIG measures an individual's overall satisfaction with their job, while the

JDI measures the individual's satisfaction with the five facets of satisfaction. These characteristics were influential in addressing key limitations to prior theories on job satisfaction by incorporating both global and facet-based measurements for satisfaction

Facet Versus. Overall Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction is a complex construct assessed differently by individuals. The use of facet-based models allows researchers to identify influencing facets related to job satisfaction. Locke (1976) indicated that satisfaction is a complex dynamic made up of relations between tasks, roles, responsibilities, and outcomes. While understanding the individual influences these facets have on satisfaction is important, facet-based models do not account for overall satisfaction. Therefore, the use of only a facet-based model for measuring job satisfaction is incomplete, given the fact that an individual may have varying degrees of satisfaction with different work related facets. Individuals may be satisfied with specific work related facets, but not express a satisfaction with the overall job. Researchers must be aware of this circumstance when using a facet-based approach for measuring job satisfaction. An instrument which incorporates both a facet-based and overall job satisfaction response is optimal for studies wishing to evaluate facets of job satisfaction.

The importance in understanding job satisfaction is reflected in the employee's improved quality of life, health, job stability, and cooperativeness. The first step in understanding the construct of job satisfaction is to assess causes and correlates. While researchers agree job satisfaction can be broken down into specific facets, the number of facets used to measure job satisfaction is still debatable (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). This contrast has already been illustrated in comparing the MSQ (twenty facets) to the

JDI (five facets). It is also important to point out that facet-based satisfaction is related to facets of a specific job. Not all jobs have the same facets with which an employee may be satisfied. For example, an intercollegiate coach may be satisfied with the community support he/she receives for both the college and team. However, an individual working at an insurance company may not have any relationship with the community at large. Therefore, his/her satisfaction with the community would not be a facet related to satisfaction with the job.

In contrast to facet based job satisfaction, overall job satisfaction measurement scales aim at finding an individual's overall feeling toward his/her job. This approach is desirable for several reasons. First, most facet based measurement may omit some areas an individual may perceive as being important to estimating overall satisfaction. Second, facet scales may also incorporate facets that are perceived as being unimportant to an individual's satisfaction. Third, facet scales have a tendency to generate a more short-term response as they are typically descriptive in nature and responses reflect recent reactions to these descriptors. Finally, the practice of adding or combining facets to generate an overall satisfaction is inadequate when considering each individual derives their satisfaction in different ways. Overall measurements of satisfaction permits respondents to answer based on what is natural to them and apply the questioning to their specific job (Iron, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989).

The distinction between facet and overall satisfaction is critical to the present study as the purpose is to gauge overall job satisfaction of coaches in different sport, division, and position. While some researchers have stated that facet based measurement is more meaningful from a managerial perspective (Chelladurai, 1999). Smith et al.

(1969) has stated that "facets of a job may help managers identify and rectify problems in the job situation, they do not indicate whether employees are satisfied with the job overall" (p.8). Therefore, a facet based measurement will not appropriately stimulate the necessary response for the present study.

Consequences of Job Satisfaction

Cranny et al. (1992) summarized that satisfaction has been used as both an independent and dependent variables in the job satisfaction literature. Studies using it as an independent variable have used satisfaction as an outcome by itself, while studies using satisfaction as a dependent variable relate to the organizational outcome generated by satisfaction. Cranny et al. (1992) identified three classes of satisfaction consequences: (a) non-work behaviors, (b) work performance, and (c) mental and physical health of workers. This section will illustrate these three classes and provide an understanding for the role job satisfaction plays within each.

Non-work behaviors are defined as behaviors not directly related to the work but, which exist as an integral part of the work environment. These behaviors include attendance, turnover, and sabotage. Attendance is not part of the actual outcome of work, but does play a critical role in the ability of an individual to do work. An individual who is dissatisfied with his/her job may have a tendency to come to work late or voluntarily choose to miss work completely. These individual actions can affect the work done and are dictated by the individual's perception of job satisfaction. The same is true for behaviors like turnover and sabotage. Individuals who are dissatisfied may voluntarily leave the organization or sabotage the work done by others in the organization. In any case, these behaviors are unwanted by an organization. Cranny et al. (1992) point that

studies examining non-work behaviors have focused on the effect of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. This has been done due to the rationale that individuals who are satisfied are likely not to have negative non-work behaviors. Individuals who engage in negative non-work behaviors do so because they are dissatisfied.

The second class of consequences described by Cranny et al. (1992) is work performance, which is related to an individual's quality and quantity of work. Cranny et al. (1992) note that studies have shown weak correlations between job satisfaction and performance. This is illustrated by describing that an individual satisfied with his/her job is not necessarily able to perform better. The individual's capabilities are not reflected in the individual's satisfaction. Also, an individual who is satisfied may not wish to do more work than is necessary. This dilemma impacts the individual's input to outcome ratio. An individual satisfied with his/her job is likely doing an amount of work equal to the expect outcome.

The final job satisfaction consequence is the mental and physical health of workers. Stress plays a key role in the dissatisfaction of an employee, and can lead to poor mental and physical health. Poor mental states caused by stress in the work place can be seen in poor decision making, withdrawal behaviors, and depression. Physically, stress can cause premature aging and cardiovascular problems including heart disease and high blood pressure. An organization's investment in the understanding of both causes and consequences of these classes is evident in both the mental and physical well being of the individual.

Summary of Job Satisfaction

The literature on job satisfaction can be divided in four parts: (a) theoretical background, (b) theories of job satisfaction, (c) facets of job satisfaction, and (d) consequences of job satisfaction. These four parts provide an understanding of the complicated construct of job satisfaction. The following section will summarize the literature of these four elements of job satisfaction.

The theoretical background on job satisfaction is illustrated in the works of Taylor (1911), Mayo (1933, 1945), and Maslow (1943). Taylor (1911) introduced scientific management theory stating the success of an organization was dependent upon the success of the employees. Under this theory an organization needed to identify the needs of the employees in order to generate a necessity to work. As a result both the organization and employee prospered. Mayo (1945) later identified a missing component to scientific management theory. Mayo (1945) understood that interpersonal relationships within an organization existed. Therefore, organizations needed to apply an element of social science to the work environment. Finally, Maslow (1943) introduced the hierarchy of needs. This hierarchy explained an individual's development of needs as s/he ventured through life. Maslow later stated that the hierarchy was a fluid model stating that individuals gain and lose needs as conditions in their lives change. The ultimate goal of each individual is to reach a state of self-actualization, where all other needs are met and one has reached the fullest potential.

From the grounding theories of Taylor (1911), Mayo (1933, 1945) and Maslow (1943) came several theories on job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) proposed a two-factor theory where satisfaction is determined by either "motivating" (intrinsic elements that can be controlled by the individual) or "hygiene" (extrinsic elements controlled by

the organization) factors. A major limitation to this theory is the assumption that individuals derive their perception of job satisfaction in the same manner (Chelladurai, 1985). Dawis et al. (1964) expanded the two-factor theory by establishing the Minnesota Model of Job Satisfaction measuring satisfaction on 20 work-related employee needs. Lawler's Facet-Satisfaction Model (1973) theorized that individuals perceive satisfaction based on an assessment of work-related facets of the job. Individuals can be satisfied with facets of their job but not their overall job. Jordan (2001) pointed that a limitation to this model is the exclusive inclusion of distributive justice and no consideration of procedural or interactional justice. Finally, Smith et al. (1969) developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) which was later revised by Balzer et al. (1990). The JDI in combination with the Job In General (JIG) measures satisfaction with five facets (assigned work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers) of the job as well as overall job satisfaction. Chelladurai (1999) stated that the JDI is "perhaps the most popular scale for measuring job satisfaction" (p. 242).

Based on the theories of job satisfaction that have emerged from the literature two main streams of measurement have formed, facet based satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. Most studies have focused on facet based job satisfaction as it is more easily applicable to managerial practices (Chelladurai, 1999). However, some researchers have argued the use of facet based measurement simply does not accommodate the complexity of the construct (Smith et al., 1969).

Research using job satisfaction as an influence on organizational outcomes, has focused on three classes of organizational consequences: (a) non-work behaviors, (b) work performance, and (c) mental and physical health of workers. Studies on non-work

behaviors have focused on the effect of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. Research on satisfaction and performance has shown weak correlations. Finally, stress caused by levels of satisfaction have been shown to effect individual's mental and physical health. Mental health consequences have been seen in poor decision making, withdrawal behaviors, and depression. Physical health consequences have been seen in premature aging, high blood pressure, and cardiovascular disease.

The literature on job satisfaction has reveled importance to managerial decision makers. Most of the literature has examined the business sector in general. The following will examine how job satisfaction has been examined in the sport sector.

Job Satisfaction in Sport

Research on job satisfaction in sport has been applied to many segments of the sport industry. However, like organizational justice, much of the research has focused on intercollegiate athletics. As the purpose of this study is to focus on the intercollegiate athletics segment of the sport industry, a review of the literature on job satisfaction in sport will examine: (a) job satisfaction in sport outside of intercollegiate athletics, (b) job satisfaction in intercollegiate athletics, and (c) a summary of job satisfaction in sport.

Job Satisfaction Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics

Li (1993) chose to examine job satisfaction and performance of coaches at sparetime sports schools located in China. Based on prior research, Li chose to examine productivity and employee satisfaction as the two major indicators of effectiveness, as evidence has shown these indicators account for a great proportion of variance in effectiveness (Steers, 1977). To measure the appropriate variables, Li (1993) developed a scale based on the suggestions of a panel of professors in physical culture. The panel compiled 12 facets of job satisfaction (job influence, job responsibility, job motivation, incentive system, cooperation of members, communication, interpersonal relationship, hygienic factor, leadership behavior, leadership competency, evaluation, and morale) which were measured by a 76 item questionnaire. Items on the scale were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale using terminology appropriate for the item as anchors. A test-retest pilot study revealed reliable results for the instrument warranted use of the instrument as a measure of job satisfaction and performance. Prior to any analytical analysis, respondents were placed into one of four groups, based on their mean value for the two major indicators: (a) group 1, high satisfaction and high performance, (b) group 2, low satisfaction and high performance, (c) group 3, high satisfaction and low performance, and (d) group 4, low satisfaction and low performance. The analytical procedures used in this study consisted of stepwise multiple-regression using the grouping as the dependent variable.

The findings of the study showed that in group I (high satisfaction and high performance) job responsibility, communication, and leader behavior significantly predicted job satisfaction, accounting for 55% of the variance. Significant predictors of job performance were job influence, responsibility, and motivation, accounting for 23% of the variance. In group II (low satisfaction and high performance) job influence, incentive system, and leader behavior accounted for 38% of the variance as significant predictors of job satisfaction. Job performance included job influence, motivation, and incentive as predictors, accounting for 58% of the variance. An examination of group III (high satisfaction and low performance) showed job satisfaction being predicted by job influence and incentive, accounting for 41% of the variance. Job performance included

job influence, motivation, and incentive, accounting for 23% of the variance. Lastly, an examination of group IV (low satisfaction and low performance) resulted in job motivation and leader behavior as predictors of job satisfaction, accounting for 31% of the variance. Job performance predicted leader behavior, job motivation, and incentive accounting for 22% of the variance. This study concludes that job satisfaction and performance have unique predictors. Also, the intensity of an individual's job satisfaction and performance (high or low) can influence these predictors.

Using a variation of the Coach Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Ogasawara (1997), Leblicq, Hoecke, and Knop (2002) investigated coach satisfaction in Flemish gymnastics clubs. The researchers established three hypotheses based on prior research on coach satisfaction: (a) the internal quality of the club is related to the (dis)satisfaction of the coach, (b) the performance level of the group is related to the degree of (dis)satisfaction of the coach, and (c) the experiences of the coaching job are related to the (dis)satisfaction of the coach. The sample used in the study consisted of 556 coaches from one of four Flemish gymnastics federations. Each respondent was asked to complete a questionnaire containing a demographic section, the modified "Coach Satisfaction Questionnaire", and the "General Index of Work Commitment."

Results of the study showed that Flemish coaches were most satisfied with the coaching job, autonomy, team performance, and security. The researchers explained this result illustrated the intrinsic rewards received from coaching. However, the respondents differed most when asked about their satisfaction with reward. This was explained by the researchers in terms of presence of extrinsic rewards, given that some coaches receive an extrinsic reward, while others do not. Results also indicated significant difference when

comparing age and experience. Younger coaches and less experienced coaches were significantly less satisfied with the job of coaching. This was also true when comparing age and experience to facets of satisfaction. Younger and less experienced coaches were less satisfied with autonomy, team performance, and supervision.

Job Satisfaction in Intercollegiate Athletics

While research on job satisfaction in intercollegiate athletics has been dominated by the examination of coach's perceptions of satisfaction, other studies have examined the satisfaction of athletes. To understand the relationship between productivity, effectiveness and job satisfaction in the sport setting, Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) conducted a study identifying facets of athlete satisfaction. Research on area of athlete satisfaction was necessary for several reasons. First, there was no formal definition of athlete satisfaction. Also, facets of athlete satisfaction had not been filtered or tested. Finally, by determining facets of athlete satisfaction, a scale was developed to measure these facets of athlete satisfaction. As suggested by prior research, the researchers implemented three criteria in selecting the facets of satisfaction. The first criterion was to identify facets in two meaningful categories, outcomes and processes. The second criterion dealt with differences in personal outcomes/processes and team outcomes/processes within the athletics and traditional business contexts. Finally, the researchers considered the outcomes and processes as being task-related and social in nature. Results of this study lead to the development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Athletic administrators have also been a focus of prior research on job satisfaction in the sport setting. Recent studies show an increase in the number of opportunities for

women to participate in collegiate sports over the past two decades. In contrast, this trend has not extended to the coaching and administrative positions within collegiate athletics. Further studies have found reasons explaining why collegiate athletics has continued to be a male-dominated occupation (Knoppers, 1992). However, few studies have made the attempt to find retention strategies for persons within the collegiate athletic setting. For this reason Inglis, Danylchuk and Pastore (1996) developed a model to advance the understanding of factors considered important by coaches and athletic administers for staying in one's position.

The development of the scale was carried out in four stages. Stage one included gathering items for potential use in the scale. The second stage was a validity check of the generated scale. This validity check was performed by a panel of seven men and women, all of whom had experience in coaching and athletic/recreation administration, and provided feedback on the items presented. The third stage was finalizing the scale to include 49 items. The last stage was administering the scale. After the scale was developed, it was administered to a population of intercollegiate administrators and coaches in both Canada and the United States. Each subject was asked to respond to the 49-items scale on two 7-point Likert scales measuring importance and fulfillment for employee retention.

The results were broken down into three factors which influenced retention. The first factor was Work Balance and Conditions. This factor suggests the balance of work and the conditions within the workplace are important factors to one's desired intentions of staying in one's position. An example of this factor would be an organization budgeting an annual amount toward improving working conditions. This could include

new furniture, supplies, or building additions. The second factor indicated by the results was Recognition and Collegial Support. This factor suggests organizations focus on employee recognition and involve colleagues with similar work interests. Organizations could hold quarterly appreciation dinners, or might organize the office setting to group certain jobs close to one another. The final factor was Inclusivity. The items involved in this factor dealt with diversity involved in inclusive work environments. This factor suggests a work environment conducive to interaction among colleagues would be beneficial to awareness, understanding, and respect between employees.

Another study analyzing the job satisfaction of athletic directors was conducted by Robinson, Terick, and Carpenter (2001). These researchers analyzed the job satisfaction of NCAA Division III athletic directors using specific job satisfaction facets and gender as the independent and dependent variables. Findings indicated athletic directors were most satisfied with supervision and least satisfied with promotion. Differences among gender indicated that male athletic directors were more satisfied with the overall job and the facets of pay, promotion, and work content. Female athletic directors indicated more satisfaction with co-workers and supervision. A final analysis of dissatisfaction facets indicated both male and female athletic directors were dissatisfied with promotion. Robinson et al. believed this result was due to the position of athletic directors being the highest position within an athletic department. Therefore, the opportunity for promotion is limited or non-existent.

While the literature on job satisfaction has included studies on athletes and athletic directors, most of the research has focused on the satisfaction of coaches. Ritter (1974) examined job satisfaction among interscholastic head coaches in New Mexico.
The study used a 22-item Job Satisfaction Questionnaire designed to analyze Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Factor Theory (1959). Results of the study indicated a lack of support for Herzberg's theory that individuals receive either satisfaction or dissatisfaction from only the work environment. This was especially true for a job which interacts with external variables, such as public relations. Independent variable differences showed that performance did led to more satisfied coaches.

A study done by Evans (1983) examined the relationship between sport type and job satisfaction. The researchers examined the differences between revenue and nonrevenue coaches among 13 facets of job satisfaction: (a) working demands, (b) working condition, (c) administration organization, (d) pay, (e) job security, (f) personal initiative, (g) recognition, (h) racial matching, (i) organization (j) personal satisfaction, (k) satisfaction with work, (l) work difficulty, and (m) decision making. The survey also allowed for a total job satisfaction rating to be analyzed.

Evans (1983) concluded that sport type did affect job satisfaction among coaches. Specifically, revenue-generating sport coaches rated satisfaction with administration/organization and recognition higher than non-revenue generating sport coaches. Non-revenue generating sport coaches rated work demands higher than revenue generating sport coaches. Both sport types were satisfied with job security, personal initiative, racial balance, and overall satisfaction, while both sport types reported dissatisfaction with pay.

In an attempt to rectify some of the limitations to prior job satisfaction studies, Hendon (1983) developed an instrument to measure job satisfaction of coaches. Hendon (1983) developed the Coaches Job Satisfaction Inventory (CJSI) to assess the job

satisfaction of softball coaches at two-year colleges. Hendon (1983), citing the work of Dawis and Lofquist (1984), identified nine potential factors influencing softball coaches: (a) age, (b) years in coaching, (c) years as a head coach, (d) success in work role, (e) type of sport coaching, (f) annual income, (g) marital status, (h) collegiate division level, and (i) strain. Results indicated that only annual income was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Coaches' marital status, type of sport coached, and collegiate level had no impact on overall job satisfaction or any other factors.

Snyder (1985) conducted a study using gender, employment status, and environmental setting as independent variables to analyze job satisfaction among intercollegiate coaches. Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Snyder sought to explain the impact work environment has on job satisfaction. Results indicated work environment played a key role in coaches' satisfaction. Coaches feeling detachment or lack of administrative support, negatively affected satisfaction with work and supervision. When analyzing differences between genders, male and female coaches differed only on work and supervision.

Continuing his research, Snyder (1990) conducted a study investigating the effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. Prior research has shown leader behavior influences organizational climate, shaping the employees' attitudes and behaviors (Fiedler, 1967; Field & Abelson, 1982; Halpin, 1966; Muchinsky, 1977; Owens, 1981). The research questions posed by the Snyder (1990) were as follows: (a) What are the effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction? (b) Are their

differences between full-time and part-time coaches' job satisfaction? (c) What is the tenability of cognitive dissonance theory to the understanding of coaches' job satisfaction? and (d) Is there a difference between the job satisfaction models for male and female intercollegiate coaches? Participants of this study were 197 full or part-time coaches for 17 California 4-year institutions. Each subject returned an instrument containing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, and the Job Descriptive Index. The researchers conducted a factor analysis, analysis of variance, multiple regression, and path analysis on all data received from the questionnaires.

Examination of the factor analysis indicated six factors were significantly loading on job satisfaction, which were titled by the researcher as: (a) emphasis on consideration, (b) emphasis on structure, (c) intimacy/morale, (d) disengagement, (e) hindrance, and (f) socializing patterns. Other analytical procedures used these factors as independent variables. Results of the multiple regression indicated consideration to be the only significant variable for females, explaining 13% of the variance in job satisfaction. For males, consideration accounted for 19% of the variance, while disengagement explained 10%. Overall, part-time coaches had less satisfaction with pay and promotion than fulltime coaches. Two different models emerged from the study in regard to the effect of leadership behavior on organizational behavior, which would then affect job satisfaction. The female respondents showed considerate athletic directors caused the female coaches to feel more integrated into the organization. The male respondents showed consideration impacted the morale for male coaches. These finding indicated a difference between male

and female coaches in terms of the effects of leadership behavior and organizational climate on job satisfaction.

Gender differences in job satisfaction among NCAA coaches of women's teams were examined by Pastore (1993). Using both the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG), Pastore (1993) analyzed differences between gender, NCAA division, and type of sport as they related to job satisfaction. Results of the study indicated type of sport may affect the supervision facet of job satisfaction. Pastore (1993) concluded that revenue generating sports are under more scrutiny by the athletic administration due to the necessity of generating income. Therefore, revenue generating coaches may perceive that they are more supervised more than non-revenue generating coaches, negatively impacting their job satisfaction. Findings also indicated no difference between gender or NCAA division.

Summary of Job Satisfaction in Sport

The literature on job satisfaction in sport has mainly focused on the perceptions of coaches in intercollegiate athletics. However, there have been studies both outside of intercollegiate athletics and on other personnel within intercollegiate athletics. Li (1993) examined job satisfaction and performance of coaches at spare-time sports schools in China. Li (1993) found that job satisfaction and performance have unique predictors which are influenced by the intensity of an individual's perceptions of satisfaction and performance. Leblicq et al. (2002) examined coach satisfaction among Flemish gymnastic coaches and found that the variables of age and experience led to significant differences in satisfaction. Coaches who were older and had more experience were more

satisfied with the job of coaching and were more satisfied with the facets of autonomy, team performance, and supervision.

Studies examining satisfaction within intercollegiate athletics have examined the satisfaction of athletes, administrators, and coaches. Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) proposed three criteria for classification of facets for athlete satisfaction. The three criteria involve the identification of either an outcome or a process, the difference between a personal or team outcome or process, and whether the outcome or process is task-related or social in nature. Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) used these criteria to establish the "Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire."

Athletic administrators in the intercollegiate athletics segment of the sport industry have also been the focus of studies on job satisfaction. Inglis et al. (1996) developed a scale to measure factors considered important by athletic administrators for staying in their position. The factors included in the scale were work and conditions, recognition and collegial support, and inclusivity. Robinson et al. (2001) analyzed job satisfaction among NCAA Division III athletic directors. Robinson et al. (2001) found that male athletic directors were more satisfied with the facets of pay and work content, while female athletic directors were more satisfied with co-workers and supervision. Both male and female athletic directors showed dissatisfaction in promotion, which is understandable given that the highest job role within an athletic department is and athletic director. Zhang et al. (2004) examined the job satisfaction of mid-level collegiate campus recreation administrators. Zhang et al. (2004) found that institutional classification, affiliation, budget source, and reporting structure were all influencing variables for job satisfaction.

Most of the literature on job satisfaction in the intercollegiate setting has focused on the satisfaction of the coach. Ritter (1974) found that performance did influence satisfaction among coaches. Evans (1983) found that sport type influenced satisfaction among coaches. Hendon (1983) contributed by developing the Coaches Job Satisfaction Inventory (CJSI) measuring nine factors of job satisfaction. Snyder (1985) using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) found that gender differences among coaches only existed with work and supervision. Snyder (1990) continued his research on gender differences with job satisfaction finding differences also existed among leadership behavior and organizational climate. In contrast to Snyder (1985, 1990) Pastore (1993) found no differences between gender in terms of job satisfaction. Pastore did find, using both the JDI and Job In General (JIG), that the sport type may affect the supervision facet of job satisfaction among NCAA coaches of women's teams. Pastore rationalized that revenuegenerating sport coaches are under more scrutiny in terms of production than nonrevenue-generating sport coaches. Therefore, revenue-generating coaches may perceive that they are more closely supervised than non-revenue-generating sport coaches, negatively impacting their job satisfaction. Finally, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) developed the "Coaches Satisfaction Questionnaire". In testing the scale the researchers found significant difference between NCAA Divisions with Division III coaches indicating significantly higher satisfaction with amount of work than Division I coaches.

The results of this literature review indicated that job satisfaction is an important variable to understand within intercollegiate athletics. More significant is the understanding of coaches as they represent the connection between sport and business aspects of athletic programs. The review also identifies several variables that have shown

differences in satisfaction: (a) sport type, (b) gender, and (c) NCAA Division. However, the literature has failed to evaluate differences in revenue generation or coaching position. A purpose of the present study is to expand on the current literature by examining differences intercollegiate coaches overall job satisfaction in terms of revenue generation, NCAA division, and coaching position.

Organizational Commitment

Over the past 50 years commitment has remained a popular topic in organizational research. Interestingly though, the construct of commitment still remains, somewhat unclear, due to a lack of consistency in definition and measurement. Definitions of commitment have taken two different directions. The first, attitudinal commitment, expresses the extent to which an individual's values and goals are congruent with those of the organization. Attitudinal commitment typically has involved the measurement of commitment along with other variables presumed to be the antecedents to, or consequences of, commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Steers, 1977). The second, behavioral commitment, is the process of an individual becoming committed to action of work rather than the organization as a whole. Research on behavioral commitment has centered on discovering the condition under which an individual becomes committed to a course of action (Kiesler, 1971; Salancik, 1977).

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) conducted a review of the commitment literature and concluded there was little consensus on what commitment means. Meyer and Allen (1997) illustrated sample definitions that had been used in academic literature and concluded that while the meaning of commitment has not been consistent, two characteristics are common across definitions. The common themes of defining

organizational commitment are "that commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization" (p. 67).

While the definition and construct of commitment continues to be debated in the literature, one outcome variable has emerged as being equally important to the construct of satisfaction, organizational commitment. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian's (1974) defined organizational commitment as ". . . the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p.604). This definition is further characterized by three factors of the individual (a) the individual has a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) the individual is willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) the individual has a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Porter et al., 1974). The following review of literature will focus on the construct of commitment as it pertains to an organization.

Theoretical Background

The literature on organizational commitment is grounded in the works of Becker (1960); Porter et al. (1974); O'Reilly and Chatman (1986); and Meyer and Allen (1991). Each of these authors has added to the overall construct of commitment. Today, Meyer and Allen's multidimensional model of commitment is the most widely used. An investigation of these studies will provide a strong theoretical background to the overall construct of commitment and the application to an organization.

Becker (1960) illustrated commitment using the notion of side bets, or alternative choices. Prior studies had used commitment as an independent variable to analyze both

individual and organizational behaviors in relation to power, religion, occupational recruitment, bureaucratic behavior and political behavior (Abramson, Cutler, Kautz, & Mendelson, 1958; Becker & Carper, 1956; Howe & Coser, 1957; Selznick, 1953; Wilson, 1959). Becker explained an individual's commitment is dependent upon a series of "sidebets" which cause the individual to make a choice. This choice can either be consistent with prior behavior or can be entirely inconsistent. The degree of the potential outcome of the choice is highly dependent on the decision made by the individual. Becker used the example of a man who decides to take a job with one employer, and two months later has the choice of taking another job. While the man understands this new opportunity is better than his current situation, he feels a need to stay with his current employer because of the negative backlash that might come from the decision to take a new job. The man may consider trust and reputation to be guiding factors in acceptance in the workplace. Taking the new job, only two months after accepting the current position, will have negative effects on the man's trustworthiness and reputation.

Becker (1960) acknowledges, as time goes on, individuals are exposed to multiple side-bets. As they continue to turn these bets down, they are increasing their commitment by enhancing consistent behavior. If side bets are continuously turned down, the individual's perspective of maintaining current behavior is heightened. This only makes the notion of changing behavior more difficult. Becker's contribution to the commitment literature was examination of both conscious and unconscious affects on commitment.

A major criticism of Becker's (1960) study was that the instrument used to measure the side-bet theory measured attitudinal commitment. Meyer and Allen (1984) pointed out that side-bet theory is a behavioral response, not attitudinal. Cohen and

Lowenberg (1990) supported this critique by showing low correlations of side-bet antecedents with organizational commitment.

Another major contribution to the commitment literature was a study done by Porter et al. (1974). The authors' contributions consisted of formally defining organizational commitment, setting criteria to meet the definition and developing an instrument to test the definition. Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment as ". . . the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). This commitment is characterized by three factors: (a) the individual's belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) an individual's willingness to exert considerable effort for the organization; and (c) an individual's strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Researchers operationalized organizational commitment by designing the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The OCQ was a 15-item instrument used to measure "the degree to which subjects feel committed to the employing organization" (p.607).

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) noted that prior studies on organizational commitment had failed to address the underlying dimensions of psychological attachment. The researchers purposed that individuals have psychological attachments based upon three independent foundations: (a) compliance, (b) identification, and (c) internalization. Compliance relates to an individual's involvement with an organization due to the specific, extrinsic rewards gained by being with the organization. Identification is an individual's involvement based on affiliation with the organization. Internalization relates to the individual's acceptance of both individual and organizational values and goals.

While O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) did contribute to the commitment literature, their study has been criticized by other researchers. Most of the criticism has focused on the three dimensions identified by O'Reilly and Chatman. Lack of distinction due to high correlations between identification and internalization has led some to question if these are two distinct variables (Caldwell, Chatman, & O'Reilly, 1990; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Verendberg, Self, & Seo, 1994). The use of compliance as a commitment variable has also received scrutiny. Meyer and Allen (1997) explained that commitment "... serves to maintain behavior in the absence of reward" (p. 15). However, compliance behaviors are done for the purpose of receiving a specific, extrinsic reward. Also, compliance has been found to correlate positively with turnover, while the intent of being committed is to reduce turnover (Mowday et al., 1982).

While the prior works of Becker (1960), Porter et al. (1974), and O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) all contributed to the literature on organizational commitment, the works of Meyer and Allen (1991) have received the most recent attention. Meyer and Allen combined prior theories of commitment to formulate a three-component model of commitment: (a) continuance commitment, (b) affective commitment, and (c) normative commitment. Continuance commitment was derived from Becker's (1960) side-bet theory, stating that individuals maintain their current behavior and becoming more committed due to few or poor alternatives to the current situation. As a result individuals become committed on the basis that "they need to do so" (p.67). Affective commitment was derived for Buchanan's (1974) study supporting the theory that social interactions influence an individual's commitment. In the organizational context individuals who stayed with an organization longer engage in career maintenance behaviors as an attempt

to sustain title or position within the organization. This results in an individual becoming committed because "they want to do so" (p.67). Finally, normative commitment, an individual's commitment based on a feeling "that they ought to remain with the organization" (p.67) was derived from Wiener (1982). Wiener suggested that internalized pressured should be accounted for in examining commitment. Internalized normative pressures are described as a person's attitude toward performing a particular act, as a function of the individual's beliefs concerning the consequences of his/her actions.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment was later extended to include two separate dimensions of continuance commitment. McGee and Ford (1987) first identified two distinct dimensions of continuance commitment. The researchers indicated commitment could be based on few existing employment alternatives. An employee may be committed to an organization due to the lack of employment alternatives. This sub-dimension of continuance commitment is labeled low-alternative, Low-Alt. The second dimension to emerge from continuance commitment is an individual's commitment based on the amount s/he would forego if s/he was to leave an organization. This sub-dimension of continuance commitment is labeled high-sacrifice, Hi-Sac. Later studies found these two sub-dimensions to be significantly independent of each other (Hacket, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment was the first to look at these dimensions as components rather than types. The researchers noted that an individual's commitment is determined by the combined effects of these components. Employees may be committed to their organization based on varying levels

of each component. Therefore, Meyer and Allen suggested future research should seek to understand an employee's relationship with an organization using these three dimensions rather than trying to classify the commitment as one particular type.

Foci Versus Overall Measurement of Organizational Commitment

Commitment foci refer to what an individual focuses his/her commitment on. Prior research analyzed an individual's commitment to the organizational as a whole. However, an individual's commitment may be focused on a particular unit, constituency or hierarchical level within the organization. For example, an intercollegiate athletic department has several units to which an employee may be committed to, such as the marketing department, compliance department, development department, or sports information department. The employee may also be committed to a particular constituency such as the athletes, alumni, the NCAA, or faculty. Finally, the hierarchical levels, the athletic director, associate athletic directors, or even managers of the organization may impact an individual's commitment. Understanding that an individual's commitment is comprised of multiple commitments to different aspects of the organization at different levels is critical. Therefore, commitment can be viewed as a collection of commitments to different foci. Meyer and Allen (1997) point out that this "view raises the possibility that (a) employees can have varying commitment profiles and that (b) conflict can exist among an employee's commitments" (p. 17).

Similar to the prior discussion on satisfaction, foci based measurement is not inclusive of all the factors affecting an individual's perception of commitment. A global approach to commitment allows the researcher the ability to account for factors affecting an individual's commitment that may not be conveyed through a multidimensional

model. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of organizational commitment that resulted in 26 antecedent variables to organizational commitment. The researchers concluded that this list was still not all inclusive and that variance in organizational commitment was still found. As a purpose of the present study is to examine coaches of different sports, divisions and positions, it is necessary to take global approach measuring organizational commitment rather than a focus approach.

Consequences of Organizational Commitment

While antecedents of organizational commitment relate to variables that either develop or affect an individual's commitment, studies examining the consequences of organizational commitment have focused on the critical outcomes of commitment. Mathieu and Zajac's (1990) meta-analysis of organizational commitment summarized the consequences of organizational commitment into performance and withdrawal behaviors.

The relationship between performance and organizational commitment in the literature has been shown to be weak. Chelladurai (1999) noted this weak relationship could be attributed to other organizational factors, such as resources available to employees, task dependency, or organizational policies. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) illustrated that an employee's performance could be moderated by organizational structure like pay policies. For example, an individual whose pay is closely tied to performance (e.g. commission sales) may show a higher correlation between performance and commitment, than an individual whose pay is not tied to performance (e.g. salary). This example stresses the theory that stronger correlations between performance and commitment may be present when role expectations are more clearly defined. The relationship between withdrawal behaviors and organizational commitment has shown to

be much stronger than the performance-commitment relationship. Withdrawal behaviors have been studied using a variety of different variables including: (a) attendance, (b) lateness, and (c) turnover.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reported that more than 75% of the between study variance was accounted for when using commitment as a predictor of attendance. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) noted that Mathieu and Zajac did not distinguish voluntary from involuntary absence. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary absence has shown results supporting a negative relationship between involuntary absence and commitment (Gellatly; 1995; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorff, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Somers; 1995). Similarly, Mowday et al. (1982) theorized a negative relationship between lateness and commitment. However, because of many influencing factors outside of the control of the employee, the relationship has shown weak correlations.

The most significant relationship between commitment and employee consequence has been with turnover. Turnover has been studied using two variables: (a) intention to search for a new job, or (b) intention to leave one's current job. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reported that intention to leave has a stronger positive correlation with commitment than intention to search. However, Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) presented a model purporting that the relationship between behavioral intention and commitment is mediated by other cognitions. Mobley et al. theorized that the work environment influences an employee's affective responses which then initiate withdrawal behaviors. This theory suggests the influence of organizational behavior is mediated by behavioral intentions.

Correlates of Organizational Commitment

The construct of organizational commitment is very complex due to a number of correlates. Six specific correlates have been identified in the organizational commitment literature: (a) motivation, (b) job involvement, (c) stress, (d) occupational commitment, (e) union commitment, and (f) job satisfaction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). The literature has divided motivation into two forms, internal and external motivation. Internal motivation is more highly correlated with affective commitment, while external motivation is more highly correlated with continuance commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Job involvement and occupational commitment have high correlations with affective commitment. This relationship seems rational given an individual's attachment to a job or occupation afforded by an organization (Morrow, 1983). The examination of stress as a correlation variable has produced inconsistent results. Much of this inconsistency can be attributed to how stress is defined and measured. Some studies have used individual components of stress to account for a single stress measure (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Others studies have divided stress into work-related and non-work-related stress (Chassie & Bahagat, 1980; Cook & Wall, 1980). However, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found stress had a negative correlation with commitment.

Finally, organizational commitment has received much attention for being highly correlated with job satisfaction. Both overall satisfaction and facet specific satisfaction have shown positive correlations with organizational commitment. While a great deal of research exists in this area, researchers still stressed the need for further understanding the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Summary of Organizational Commitment

Similar to job satisfaction, the research on organizational commitment has lead to inconsistencies in developing a universal definition. While there is no formal definition of organizational commitment in the academic literature, Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) definition is commonly used. Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment as ". . . the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). This definition is further characterized by three factors of the individual: (a) the individual has a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) the individual is willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) the individual has a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Porter et al., 1974). The literature on organizational commitment has divided the construct of commitment into four areas: (a) components, (b) foci, (c) consequences, and (d) correlates. Each of these dimensions plays a role in the organizational behavior of the employee.

The theoretical background on the construct of organizational commitment has revealed three distinct components of commitment: (a) continuance, (b) affective, and (c) normative. Becker (1992) referred to each component of commitment as having a particular "motive or reason" which creates the perceived commitment. Each component of commitment has a specific base. Continuance commitment is based on an individual's need to remain with an organization because the cost of an alternative is greater than the benefit received. Affective commitment is based on emotional attachment, providing the individual a sense of wanting to be with the organization. Finally, normative commitment

is based on internalization and acceptance of organizational goals, the feeling that s/he ought to stay with the organization.

Organizational commitment foci are separate elements an individual may focus on when generating a perception of commitment. Examples of organizational commitment foci include unit, constituency, and hierarchical level. Studies on organizational commitment foci have shown support for the multi-constituency theory (Becker, 1992; Lawler, 1992; Reichers, 1986). However, foci based measurement does not identify all variables affecting an individual's perceptions of commitment. Further, overall commitment overall commitment has been shown to be a strong predictor of commitment consequences. Therefore, Meyer and Allen (1997) suggest the use of organizational commitment foci only when measuring behavior relevant to specific constituencies.

Consequences of organizational commitment are important to understand as they focus on the critical outcomes of commitment. The literature on organizational commitment has defined two types of organizational commitment consequences, performance and withdrawal behaviors. Performance has produced weak correlations with organizational commitment (Chelladurai, 1999), while relationships with withdrawal behaviors have shown much stronger correlations. Withdrawal behaviors include attendance, lateness, and turnover. Results indicate that involuntary absence and commitment have a significant negative relationship (Gellatly; 1995; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorff, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Somers; 1995). Turnover has had the strongest relationship with organizational commitment. Employees who have shown higher intentions to leave the organization are less committed (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Finally, organizational commitment has received much attention for being highly correlated with job satisfaction. Both overall satisfaction and facet specific satisfaction have shown positive correlations with organizational commitment. While a great deal of research exists in this area, researchers still stressed the need for further understanding organizational commitment as a single entity, as well as the relationship it has with job satisfaction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). One area lacking this research is the sport industry, and specifically, intercollegiate athletics.

Organizational Commitment in Sport

Research on organizational commitment in the sport setting has focused on several roles within the sport industry. Studies have examined athletes but the focus of these studies has mainly been on the athlete's commitment to the sport, not an organization (Carpenter, Scanlan, Simons, & Loble, 1993; Raedeke, 1997, Scanlan, Carpenter, Simmons, Schmidt, & Keeler, 1993a' 1993b; Scanlan, Russel, Beals, & Scanlan, 2003a, 2003b). However, student workers (Dixon, Cunningham, Turner, Sagas, and Kent, 2005; Turner, Jordan, & Dubord, 2005) and coaches (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; 2006; Raedeke, Granzyk, & Warren, 2000; Raedeke, Warren, & Granzyk, 2002; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005) have been examined on their commitment to an organization in the sport setting. As the purpose of this study is to focus on the intercollegiate segment of the sport industry, a review of the literature on organizational commitment in sport will include: (a) organizational commitment in sport outside of intercollegiate athletics, (b) organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics, and (c) a summary of organizational commitment in sport.

Organizational Commitment Outside of Intercollegiate Athletics

Dixon, Cunningham, Turner, Sagas, and Kent (2005) investigated the antecedents of affective organizational commitment among undergraduate interns in the sport industry. Based on prior research the researcher developed three hypothesis related to the organizational commitment of non-paid workers: (a) job challenge will be associated positively with affective organizational commitment, (b) supervisor support will be positively associated with affective organizational commitment, and (c) role stress will be associated negatively with affective organizational commitment.

Dixon et al. (2005) surveyed final-semester senior undergraduate students who were in the process of completing their internship in the sport industry. Results of the study indicated support for all three hypotheses. Job challenge, supervisor support and roles stress combined to account for 35% of the variance affecting affective organizational commitment among undergraduate interns. In conclusion the researchers identified job challenges as having the largest impact on commitment among interns.

Turner, Jordan, and Dubord (2005) studied the importance of organizational commitment in the retention of student workers within a sport organization. The researchers noted that the turnover rate within campus recreation departments is high because of the dependence on student workers, who are most likely at an institution for only four years. Researchers measured the student workers commitment using the four dimensional model by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). Results indicated tenure and type of supervision to significantly affect the student's commitment. Those students who had been working for the recreation department longer showed significantly high levels of commitment. Students who were supervised by a professional member of the recreation department staff showed significantly higher levels of commitment than those who were

supervised by their peers. A final analysis indicated that affective and continuance-highsacrifice commitment were significant determinants of a student's desire to remain employed. In their discussion the researchers stated the need for recreation departments to stress the professional staff/student relationship as a means to heighten the affective commitment of the student. This will enhance the student's connection with the organization and will in affect also heighten the student's sense that leaving the organization would result in a high-sacrifice for another job.

The commitment of coaches has been another area of concentration of literature in the sport setting. Raedeke, Granzyk, and Warren (2000) examined swimming coaches to determine if profiles reflecting entrapment, attraction, and low commitment characteristics could be identified based on determinants of commitment. The researchers also examined if any profiles determined a difference among coaches on burnout and commitment perspectives. In the sport setting, leaving an organization or job has been related to the idea of employee burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1984).

The instrument used in the study was based on and Rusbult and Farrell's (1983) method for measuring constructs of personal relationships and work settings. Variables included (a) benefits, (b) costs, (c) satisfaction, (d) investments, (e) attractiveness of alternatives, and (f) commitment to coaching. Five-point Likert scales were used to measure all variables. The researchers used a two-step analysis approach including a cluster analysis followed by a multivariate analysis. The researchers gathered Cronbach's alpha scores to determine internal consistency for each variable.

Study findings revealed three unique profiles from the cluster analysis. These profiles coincided with the three predicted hypotheses. The one-way MANOVA using the

clusters as independent variables indicated significant differences between the clusters on burnout and commitment. This analysis found 38% of the variance in group differences was explained. Post hoc ANOVA analysis revealed differences between clusters on burnout and commitment. Tukey comparisons showed entrapped coaches reported significantly higher burnout than either of the other two clusters. Also, less interested coaches reported significantly lower scores on burnout than less attracted coaches.

In a study similar to Raedeke et al. (2000), Raedeke, Warren, and Granzyk (2002), examined coaching commitment and turnover in a comparison of current and former coaches. The study had three main purposes: (a) to examine whether the hypothesized commitment model provided an adequate fit to the data, (b) to examine whether current and former coaches differed on commitment and theoretical determinants of commitment, and (c) to describe current and former coaches on specific benefits and costs associated with coaching. Study participants included 469 current and former USA Swimming coaches. Respondents completed a questionnaire containing sections on demographics, specific coaching benefits and costs, general benefits and costs, satisfaction, alternative options, investments, and social constraints. Each item was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

Analytical procedures included a test of internal consistency, structural equation modeling (SEM), and analysis of variance. Cronbach alpha scores testing internal consistency showed only one item to have not met the .70 acceptable criterion. The structural equation modeling assessed a fit of the purposed model to the data and a relationship between the hypothesis and the commitment model. Results of the SEM indicated the model was a good fit to the data. Also, all loadings and uniqueness

measurements of the model were significant, revealing satisfaction and investment as being positively related to commitment. The determinants of commitment accounted for 65% of the variance in commitment levels. The SEM, when applied to the alternative model, also indicated a goodness-to-fit. However, neither costs nor benefit were significant predictors on commitment. The multivariate analysis revealed significant differences between current and former coaches in the hypothesized model. This correlation explained 10% of the variance in commitment and showed significant differences in all variables except general costs and benefit items.

Organizational Commitment in Intercollegiate Athletics

The literature on organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics has focused on the coach. Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) found differences in organizational commitment existed among American intercollegiate coaches and Japanese coaches. Coaches in the United States indicated more commitment to their occupation, while Japanese coaches were more committed to their organization.

Cunningham and Sagas (2004) studied the influence of age, ethnicity, and organizational tenure on occupational and organizational commitment among NCAA Division IA football coaches. They found ethnic diversity and tenure, along with positive attitudes, contributed significantly towards both occupational and organizational commitment and negatively to turnover intentions.

Turner and Chelladurai (2005) conducted a study involving the assessment of coaches' commitment. The researchers conducted a study concerned with the commitment of intercollegiate athletic coaches to their organization and occupation as a coach. The study had three objectives: (a) assess organizational commitment from a

multidimensional perspective as outlined by Meyer and Allen (1991), (b) apply the multidimensional model of organizational commitment to occupational commitment as proposed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993), and (c) relate the components of coaches' commitment to the organization and occupation to the outcome measures of coaches' intention to leave and their performance. The participants in the study were head coaches at NCAA Division I (N = 156) and III (N = 172) levels. The participants completed a questionnaire measuring commitment to both the organization and occupation, intentions to leave, their team standings, and perceptions of their performance.

The independent variables in this study were: affiliation level (Division I or III), gender (male or female), and marital status (single or married). The dependent variables for the study were participant rating of organizational commitment, occupational commitment, intention to leave, and performance. All dependent variables were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), except for performance which was measured by 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = poor, 5 = outstanding). The researchers used two MANOVAs to determine the effects of the four subscales on the dependent variables. Post hoc ANOVAs were used where significance was determined. Correlations were also computed among the four subscales of organizational and occupational commitments, intention to leave, and performance. Two multiple regression analyses were used to assess the effects of the four subscales of organizational commitment on intention to leave. Finally, four multiple regression analyses were used to determine effects of organizational commitment on performance.

Study findings showed while significance was found for the impact of the interaction between gender and marital status on organizational commitment, the effect size was small. The researchers concluded that no practical subgroup differences existed in organizational or occupational commitment. The relationships among variables showed all bases for both organizational and occupational commitment were significant and negatively correlated with intention to leave. The regression analysis was significant for both organizational and occupational commitment, explaining 23.7% and 23.1% of the variance in intention to leave respectively. Although organizational commitment only explained about 5% of the variance in performance, the nature of intercollegiate athletics suggests this data is substantial to the industry. Researchers noted that sport is zero sum industry where there is a winner and loser for every outcome. This factor makes sport unique in the assessment of performance by managerial decision makers. It is also critical to the intercollegiate sport organization's revenue potential through ticket sale, donations, and marketing.

Summary of Organizational Commitment in Sport

The literature on organizational commitment in sport has focused on the sport setting outside of intercollegiate athletics. Scanlan et al. (1993a; 1993b) created and validated the Sport Commitment Model to assess commitment factors in the sport setting. Carpenter et al. (1993) tested the Sport Commitment Model and found the model accounted for 68% of the variance in the commitment of athletes. Sport enjoyment, involvement opportunities, personal investments, and social constraints were all significant predictors of sport commitment. Scanlan et al. (2003a) further tested the Sport Commitment Model by examining the influence of social support on sport commitment.

Results indicated further validation of the Sport Commitment Model along with the suggestion that social support should be added to commitment in the sport setting. Other studies examined the commitment of the athlete in regards to the consequences of commitment. Raedeke (1997) examined athlete commitment in relation to athlete burnout. Raedeke (1997) found that athletes cluster into four distinct groups based on their commitment: (a) enthusiastic, (b) malcontented, (c) obligated, and (d) indifferent. Findings also indicated that athletes who fell within the indifferent and malcontented clusters had higher burnout scores, indicating sport participation and commitment were factors influencing burnout.

Studies have also examined the organizational commitment of volunteers in the sport setting. Dixon et al. (2005) examined the commitment of undergraduate interns in the sport industry. They found that job challenge, supervisor support, and role stress accounted for 35 % of the variance in affective organizational commitment. Turner et al. (2005) examined the importance of organizational commitment in the retention of student workers in a sport organization. This study showed that tenure and type of supervision significantly affected commitment among students. Specifically, students who had been with the organization longer and were supervised by a professional staff member were more highly committed to the organization.

Commitment of coaches has also been examined the literature. Raedeke et al. (2000) found that coaches were significantly different in regard to burnout and commitment when comparing across the three distinct clusters: (a) coaches who are committed to attraction-based factors will have low levels of burnout and high levels of commitment, (b) coaches committed to entrapment-based factors will have high rates of

burnout and low rates of commitment, and (c) coaches who are not committed to either determinant will have low rating for both burnout and commitment. Similarly, Raedeke et al. (2002) found significant differences in current versus past coaches.

Studies examining organizational commitment within the intercollegiate setting have focused on the commitment of coaches. Cunningham and Sagas (2004) studied the influence of age, ethnicity, and organizational tenure on occupational and organizational commitment among NCAA Division IA football coaches. They found that ethnic diversity and tenure, along with positive attitude, contributed significantly towards both occupational and organizational commitment and negatively to turnover intentions. Turner and Chelladurai (2005) examined the multidimensional model of commitment among coaches. Their findings were similar to Cunningham and Sagas (2004), and indicated that both occupational and organizational commitment were significant and negatively correlated with intention to leave.

Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The constructs of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment have been studied extensively as single entities, but few studies have focused on the relationships shared by all three, especially in the sport setting. The importance of understanding the relationship among these constructs is critical to an organization given the possible consequences resulting from negative perceptions of the organization (i.e. turnover, withdrawal). Much of the controversy related to the distinction among these constructs has focused on the constructs of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Studies have shown these constructs are correlated, leading to the question, are they distinct, are they one-in-the-same, or is one the antecedent of the

other? Other studies have analyzed the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The following review will focus on two streams of literature, studies focused on the distinction among the three variables and studies illustrating the relationship of these three variables in the sport setting. A summary of the literature will conclude this section.

Relationships Among Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment

Studies examining the relationship of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment have focused on the distinction between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results of these studies have provided evidence of both strong correlations and unique independence. Mowday, et al. (1982) made the distinction that organizational commitment is an effective response to beliefs about the organization, while job satisfaction is a response to experiencing specific job tasks. Due to the broad definition of commitment, it is understandable why these variables would be correlated. However, Mowday et al. (1982) also notes the variables independence by offering the example of an employee with positive beliefs toward the organization's goals and mission, yet having negative feelings toward his/her individual work and tasks. The reverse of this scenario is also true. In this example, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are two independent variables.

Other studies have used Mowday et al. (1982) to clarify the distinction between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Glisson and Durick (1988) provided evidence that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are two conceptually distinct concepts. Results of their study indicated each variable has a different set of

predictors explaining the variation. However, Martin and Bennett (1996) outlined four competing models explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment: (a) job satisfaction is an antecedent to organizational commitment, (b) organizational commitment is an antecedent to job satisfaction, (d) organizational commitment and job satisfaction are reciprocally related, and (e) organizational commitment and job satisfaction are independent.

The model outlining job satisfaction as an antecedent to organizational commitment can be illustrated by explaining how an employee's sense of job satisfaction can enhance his/her commitment to the organization. An employee whose performance within an organization warrants both internal and external benefits experiences a sense of job satisfaction. This satisfaction can be associated with the organization and, therefore, enhances the individual's commitment to the organization. Martin and Bennett (1996) supported the rationale that job satisfaction could be a cause of organizational commitment with three major findings: (a) job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been found to be positively correlated, (b) organizational commitment has been found to correlate more highly with measures of turnover than measures of job satisfaction, and (c) job satisfaction develops more rapidly than organizational commitment.

Based on Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory, Martin and Bennett (1996) suggested organizational commitment could also be an antecedent to job satisfaction. Festinger (1957) hypothesized that individuals can perceive conflicting thoughts at the same time. This phenomenon is explained when an individual experiences a conflict between new information which conflicts with preconceived knowledge,

attitudes, emotions, beliefs, or behaviors. Martin and Bennett (1996) explained that individuals use their preconceived level of commitment to develop their level of satisfaction. In this case, the causal relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is one in which organizational commitment is an antecedent to job satisfaction.

The third model presented by Martin and Bennett (1996) states that job satisfaction and organizational commitment share a reciprocal relationship. Both variables influence the other in similar ways, making the determination of a causal relationship difficult. Due to the complexity of the relationship, this model is not used to explain causation and is not used in determining differences between the variables.

The final model suggested by Martin and Bennett (1996) shows job satisfaction and organizational commitment as independent of one another. This model illustrates how each variable has unique influencers and neither has a causal effect on the other. Martin and Bennett's (1996) study supported this final model.

Studies have also attempted to distinguish organizational justice from organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Dailey and Kirk (1992) isolated the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment variables to fully understand their relationship as it relates to outcomes affecting the organization. Results of their study indicated ineffective performance appraisal and planning systems contributed to unfair perceptions of procedural justice, which was significantly related to intention to quit. The researchers explained this result by noting how an individual may rationalize his/her intention to quit in relation to some externalization of causality. This external cause stems from the organization's actions and not the individual's. The

researchers suggested allowing employee input can potentially avoid an increase in intention to quit. This promotes a positive relationship between the organization's systems and the employee's perception of fairness.

McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) examined how distributive and procedural justice predicted job satisfaction and affected organizational outcomes. Organizational outcomes were divided into personal outcomes (pay level and job satisfaction) and organizational outcomes (organizational commitment and subordinate's evaluation of supervisor). Using a regression analysis, results indicated both distributive and procedural justice were predictors of work outcomes. Further analysis showed that distributive justice was a stronger predictor of individual outcomes, while procedural justice predicted organizational outcomes. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) also reported that perceptions of distributive and procedural justice had interactive effects on organizational outcomes. The interaction analysis revealed that unfair procedures and low distributive justice produced lower rating of outcomes. However, regardless of distribution perceptions, individuals who had high perceptions of procedural justice indicated high commitment and supervisor evaluations. These results indicated an individual's perception of fairness is more closely related to an organization's procedures than distributions. An individual who perceives an organization to be procedurally just may, however, still be dissatisfied with individual outcomes.

Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) conducted a study to measure how distributive and procedural justice perceptions related to performance appraisal and to identify if these perceptions predicted satisfaction. The researchers found that distributive and procedural justice were related to different facets of satisfaction. Distributive justice

related to satisfaction with pay, promotion, performance appraisal, and commitment. Procedural justice related to satisfaction with supervision, performance appraisal, commitment, and job involvement. Overall, Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) noted both distributive and procedural justices are important in predicting an employee's individual satisfaction and organizational commitment. The identification of multiple factors influencing perceptions of procedural justice supports the rationale that employers have some control over employee perceptions. This suggests the possibility of an organization implementing policies and practices aimed at enhancing these factors. Specifically, the researchers pointed to two-way communication as a means of enhancing employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Enhancement of two-way communication can establish a better understanding of needs, desires, and expectations of both the employee and organization.

Another study related to explaining the relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment was conducted by Schappe (1998). Schappe tried to determine the amount of variance in job satisfaction explained by distributive and procedural justice. Results indicated distributive justice to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction. Prior studies had found that procedural justice was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Moorman, 1991). Shappe's (1998) result may have been due to the use of two forms of procedural justice, structural and interpersonal. This is significant due to the continuing debate of whether interpersonal (interactional) justice is part of procedural justice or a unique variable on its own. Inconsistencies in the literature

provide evidence for the continuing need to study the relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Other studies have produced inconsistent results regarding the relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of organizational justice. Colquitt et al. (2001) suggested that informational and interpersonal justice were distinct constructs separate from both distributive and procedural justice. While a regression analysis indicated that both informational (β =.29) and interpersonal justice (β =.11) contributed significantly to the variance of procedural justice, the correlation among the variables was not high enough to warrant the inclusion of informational and interpersonal justice as part of procedural justice. These findings contradicted Shappe's (1998) use of interpersonal justice as a sub-principle of procedural justice. The researchers also found that procedural justice was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This finding is contrary to Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996), who found distributive justice to be the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) also performed a meta-analysis of organizational justice. Their findings both complied with and contradicted Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis of organizational justice. Like Colquitt et al., Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found evidence to merit the distinction of three organizational justice principles. However, Cohen-Charash found satisfaction to relate to all justice types, while organizational commitment was related to procedural justice and trust.

Only a few studies have examined organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment together. However, none have examined them in the sport setting. Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) examined the effects of distributive and procedural justice perceptions on both satisfaction and organizational commitment among university administrative and support personnel. Participants included 138 non-faculty employees of a medium-sized state university. Each subject was asked to complete an instrument incorporating two measures of outcomes (subjective and objective), two predictors of outcomes, a 26-item procedural justice scale, two satisfaction items, and the Negative Affectivity (NA) Scale. Findings indicated aspects of outcomes were stronger predictors of satisfaction and commitment than aspects of procedures. Procedural and distributive justice accounted for 71% and 85% of the variance in satisfaction when using objective and subjective measures respectively. When examining commitment, procedural and distributive justice only accounted for 28% and 23% of the variance.

Martin and Bennett (1996) also examined the relationship between distributive and procedural justice and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The researchers examined this relationship using a model illustrating the antecedents to both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Referent cognitions, distributive justice, and procedural justice were used as predictors of job satisfaction. Procedural justice, job importance and age were used as predictors of organizational commitment. Using procedural justice as a predictor of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment is consistent with the findings of McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), who found procedural to be a stronger predictor of organizational outcomes, yet indicated an interaction with

distributive justice which only predicted individual outcomes. Researchers prepared a model to represent the tested relationships among the studied variables.

The study supported the model of using organizational commitment and job satisfaction as independent measures. Further, procedural fairness was found to be a more direct cause of organizational commitment than distributive fairness. These findings are consistent with McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), indicating an individual's organizational commitment is determined by his/her perceived fairness of the organization's policies and procedures, rather than the individual's received distributions. Finally, the findings suggested both procedural and distributive justices are antecedent to facet-specific job satisfaction. Both procedural and distributive justice perceptions contributed to satisfaction with pay, benefits, performance, and performance appraisal.

Both inconsistencies and lack of research in the athletic setting suggest the need to further understand the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Therefore, a focus on studies examining their relationship in the sport setting will follow.

Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment in Sport

Few studies have examined the relationship between organizational justice and either job satisfaction or organizational commitment in the sport setting. Even fewer have examined all three streams of literature together. Due to the lack of support in using interactional justice as an independent measure, researchers have focused on distributive and procedural justice as determinants of organizational justice. The focus of many studies has been on the perceptions of coaches while others have examined athletes and student workers. The following review of literature will examine how organizational

justice has been studied in relation to both job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the sport setting.

Whisenant (2005) wanted to determine the effect of organizational justice on the commitment of high school student-athletes. Students completed a modified version of Colquitt's (2001) Justice Measure, to measure all three organizational justice dimensions. Respondents also were asked their level of agreement on a 7-point scale (1=disagree, 7=agree) on whether, "you will continue to play this sport in high school?" (p. 347). This question was used to determine the students' rate of commitment. Results indicated that the organizational justice dimension did influence a student's intent to continue to play a particular sport, but unique variances of each fairness perception were low (distributive $(R^2=.05)$, procedural $(R^2=.03)$, and interactional $(R^2=.07)$). Subgroup differences on sex, ethnicity, grade level and sport were also examined. Boys' perceptions of distributive justice were higher than girls, yet girls' perceptions of interactional justice were higher than boys. Freshmen students indicated significantly lower levels of procedural justice than both sophomores and juniors. Freshmen also indicated significantly lower levels of interactional justice than sophomores. When comparing sports, only football and track indicated significant differences. Football players perceived significantly lower levels of procedural justice than track athletes.

Jordan, Turner, and DuBord (2007) studied organizational justice as a predictor of job satisfaction among student recreation department workers. Researchers used the Organizational Justice Index (OJI) to measure the respondents' perceptions distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. The researchers used only a single item measure to measure job satisfaction. Noting the debate over single-items measures, the researchers
stated that single-item measures of overall job satisfaction have been found to be reliable. Results indicated that perceptions of interactional justice were significantly higher than those of both distributive and procedural justice. Both tenure and type of supervision revealed significant main effects. Those students who were in their first year with the organizational had significantly higher perceptions of procedural justice. Students who were supervised by professional staff members reported significantly higher ratings of all three justice measures compared to those supervised by peers. Using a regression analysis, 33.1% of the variance in overall job satisfaction was accounted for by the three organizational justice measures. Males indicated that both distributive and procedural justice were stronger predictors of overall satisfaction than females. Students supervised by either professional staff members or peers indicated that both distributive and procedural justice predicted job satisfaction. Finally, for those students who had worked for the recreational department for longer than a year distributive and procedural justice predicted job satisfaction more strongly than for those who had worked less than one year.

In a study using the constructs of both satisfaction and commitment, Turner (2001) examined the multidimensionality of commitment in the intercollegiate athletics setting. Two commitment foci, the organization and occupation, two consequences of commitment, withdrawal behaviors and performance, along with a correlate of commitment, satisfaction, were studied among intercollegiate coaches. A sample of 318 head coaches of NCAA Division I and III teams completed the Commitment of Coaches Questionnaire. Results indicated intercollegiate coaches rated their commitment to both the organization and occupation highest in regards to affective commitment. Continuance

commitment-low alternatives received the lowest rating among coaches. Subgroup differences indicated no significant difference between gender, NCAA division, and marital/lifestyle status. Consequences of commitment revealed that all four bases of organizational commitment significantly correlated with intention to leave, explaining 27.2% of the variance. All but continuance commitment-high sacrifice significantly correlated with intention to leave in terms of occupational commitment. Results on performance indicated low levels of variance for both occupational and organizational commitment yet; both commitment foci had a greater influence on performance than satisfaction. Satisfaction influenced a coach's feelings on intention to leave more than did the four bases of organizational commitment.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) analyzed differences between intercollegiate coaches in the United States and Japan. The purpose of their study was to develop a scale to measure facets of satisfaction specific to sports coaching, and provide a cross-cultural comparison between Japanese and U.S. coaches with respect to satisfaction with their job and their organizational occupational commitment. This study provided a major contribution to the literature on job satisfaction within the sport setting as it used both job satisfaction and organizational and occupational commitment.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) developed the Coach Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) using items from Reimer and Chelladurai's (1998) Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire. Any item that related to both athlete and coach were used. Wording for each question was altered to reflect the coaches' perspective when answering the questionnaire. A panel of experts was used to confirm validity of the 81item instrument. Respondents were asked to rate each item on a 9-point Likert type scale,

from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 9 (very satisfied). The General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC) was also used to measure occupational and organizational commitment.

Results of the study indicated the 14-component solution explained 69.9%, 65.5%, 64.6% of the variance in Division I, Division III, and Japanese coaches. Further analysis of the components revealed that 11 of the 14 components were of the same content in all three data sets. Therefore, only 11 of the 14 were retained for further analysis.

The results of the subgroup differences among job satisfaction facets revealed that Japanese coaches experienced lower satisfaction levels with supervision, coaching job, autonomy, team performance, colleagues, athlete academic performance, and job security. Division III coaches indicated significantly higher satisfaction with amount of work. Differences in organizational and occupational commitment indicated Japanese coaches to be significantly more committed to their organization than Division I and Division III coaches. However, Japanese coaches also expressed significantly lower ratings of occupational commitment than Division I and Division III coaches. The results of this study provide a significant contribution to the literature on job satisfaction among intercollegiate coaches. The development of CSQ, measuring 11 elements of job satisfaction is coaching, was significant. The researchers point that further validation of this instrument is needed.

Turner and Jordan (2006) conducted a study examining the commitment and satisfaction of intercollegiate coaches. The researchers wanted to identify if commitment or satisfaction was more important in the retention and performance of coaches. Results indicated that satisfaction influences intention to leave more than commitment. However,

commitment influenced performance more than satisfaction. These results support the rationale that satisfaction and commitment are two distinct constructs. Coaches who are dissatisfied with their job are more likely to leave, yet satisfaction does relate to performance. Therefore, athletic directors who wish to retain their coaches should focus on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, but understand that each is influenced by different factors.

Turner and Pack (2008) also studied commitment and satisfaction in the sport setting. The researchers noted that prior studies had not examined all three bases of commitment simultaneously in the sport setting. Findings of the study showed that athletic administrators clustered on six commitment profiles: (a) non-committed, (b) highly committed, (c) neutrals, (d) affective commitment-normative commitment (AC/NC) dominant, (e) affective commitment (AC) dominant, and (f) continuance commitment (CC) dominant. The six commitment profiles were then used to determine differences in turnover intentions and job satisfaction. Results indicated both turnover intentions and job satisfaction differed among commitment profile groups. Group differences in regards to turnover intentions revealed that the non-committed and CC dominant groups showed significantly higher ratings, while the AC/NC dominant group was significantly lower than all but the AC dominant group. Group differences in regards to job satisfaction showed the AC/NC dominant group was significantly more satisfied than the neutrals, CC dominant, and non-committed groups, while the CC dominant was significantly lower than all groups except the non-committed.

Other studies have examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in the sport setting. Jordan (2001) examined perceptions of organizational

justice and job satisfaction experienced by NCAA Division I and III head basketball coaches. The instruments used by the author were the Organizational Justice Index, a measurement of organizational justice perceptions; the Job In General Index (JIG), a measurement of overall job satisfaction; and the Job Descriptive Index, a measurement of five facets related to job satisfaction. Results based on gender revealed men scored higher on all measures of organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, and five facets of job satisfaction. Comparisons by division indicated Division III coaches scored higher on procedural and interactional justice. Division I coaches scored higher on distributive justice. Division I coaches also scored higher on overall job satisfaction and all facets of job satisfaction, with the exception of supervision.

Summary of Organization Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment

The literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment has focused on each of these constructs as a single entity. Few studies have examined the relationship between two of these constructs. Even fewer have examined all three together. Part of this literature review focused on distinguishing them as unique constructs. Mowday et al. (1982) distinguished commitment and satisfaction by stating that commitment was an effective response to beliefs about the organization, while satisfaction is a response to experiences of specific job tasks. Glisson and Durick (1988) continued with Mowday et al.'s (1982) distinction by testing the predictors of commitment and satisfaction. Results indicated that commitment and satisfaction had different predictors, thus providing evidence of the distinction. Martin and Bennett (1996) provided further evidence of the distinction by testing the relationship between

commitment and satisfaction using a four model approach: (a) job satisfaction as antecedent to organizational commitment, (b) organizational commitment as antecedent to job satisfaction, (c) organizational commitment and job satisfaction are reciprocally related, and (d) organizational commitment and job satisfaction are independent. Testing these models provided support that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are independent.

Studies have also attempted to distinguish organizational justice from organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Dailey and Kirk (1992) found that ineffective performance appraisal and planning systems contributed to unfair perceptions of procedural justice, which was significantly related to intention to quit. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) found that both distributive and procedural justice predicted work outcomes. Further analysis revealed that distributive justice predicted individual outcomes, while procedural justice predicted organizational outcomes. Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) found that distributive and procedural justices were related to different factors of satisfaction. Researchers suggest an organization can influence these factors by establishing policies and practices that positively enhance perception. Shappe (1998) found that procedural justice was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction, contradicting prior studies. However, the inclusion of interactional justice as a form of procedural justice may have caused these inconsistencies.

Other studies have produced inconsistent results in the relationship among organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Colquitt et al. (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of organizational justice suggesting the distinction of interactional justice as a unique form of organizational justice. The researchers also found

that procedural justice predicted both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In another meta-analysis of organizational justice, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) agreed with Colquitt et al. (2001) that interactional justice should be treated as a third dimension of organizational justice. However, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) contradicted Colquitt et al. (2001) finding that satisfaction related to all justice types, while organizational commitment was significantly related to procedural justice and trust.

Only a few studies have examined organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment together. Lowe and Vodanovich (1995) found that aspects of outcomes predict satisfaction and commitment stronger than aspects of procedures. Martin and Bennett (1996) found that an individual's organizational commitment is determined by perceptions of procedural fairness and both distributive and procedural justices are antecedents to facet-specific job satisfaction.

The constructs of organizational justice, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been studied relatively lightly in the sport setting. The majority of the studies examining these constructs have focused on the perceptions of the coach, yet others have examined the athlete or student worker. Whisenant (2005) examined the effect of organizational justice on commitment of high school student-athletes. The study showed that organizational justice dimensions did influence student intent to continue to play a particular sport. Subgroup difference showed that boys rated distributive justice higher than girls, freshmen students rated procedural justice lower than sophomore students, and athletes who played football perceived procedural justice lower than track athletes. Jordan et al. (2007) examined organizational justice as a predictor of job

satisfaction among student recreation department workers. Findings indicated that both tenure and type of supervision influenced job satisfaction.

Turner (2001) examined commitment and satisfaction among NCAA Division I and III coaches. Findings indicated no significant differences between gender, NCAA division, and marital/lifestyle status. However, all four bases of commitment significantly correlated with intention to leave. Commitment foci also had a great influence on performance than satisfaction.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) developed and validated the Coach Satisfaction Questionnaire, measuring 11 facets specific to the job of coaching. They tested the questionnaire using both U.S. and Japanese intercollegiate coaches. Findings showed that Japanese coaches experienced lower satisfaction levels with 7 facets of job satisfaction. However, Japanese coaches were more committed to their organization than U.S. coaches.

Turner and Jordan (2006) found that satisfaction influenced intention to leave more than commitment among coaches. Turner and Pack's (2008) findings indicated turnover intentions and job satisfaction differed among commitment profile groups. Coaches who fell within in the non-committed or continuance commitment groups showed significantly higher ratings of turnover intentions. The AC/DC dominant group showed the highest rating of satisfaction and was significantly different than neutrals, continuance dominant, and non-committed coaches.

Jordan (2001) examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction among NCAA Division I and III head basketball coaches. Findings showed that male coaches rated all measures of organizational justice, overall satisfaction, and

five facets of job satisfaction higher than female coaches. Divisional differences indicated that Division III coaches rated procedural and interactional justice higher, while Division I coaches rated distributive justice higher. Division I coaches also scored higher on overall job satisfaction and all facets of satisfaction, with the exception of supervision.

Justification for the Present Study

The structure of intercollegiate athletic departments offers unique challenges to colleges and universities. While the average Division I institution sponsored 17 team's, eight form and nine for women, in the academic year 2006-07 (NCAA, 2008a), only three of these sports actually produced a profit (football, men's basketball and men's ice hockey) (EADA, 2008). These statistics indicate a setting where the revenue potential of only a few sports is financing the majority of the organization. This dynamic within athletic departments, combined with the increased expenses and shifts in sponsored sports, has likely produced different perceptions of organizational justice among revenue and non-revenue-generating sport coaches. These differing perceptions can lead to organizational distress in a number of different forms such as high turnover, toxic organizational environment, and lower levels of success. Each of these negative effects on an athletic department can indirectly impact the organizations budget through paying out of contractual obligations to prior coaches, legal fees through potential organizational misconduct, and fewer donation and ticket sales due to poor performance. Therefore, the need to understand differences in coaches' perceptions of fairness among revenue and non-revenue generating sports and the impact of these perceptions is paramount to an athletic department's ability to effectively support the needs of all components within.

There is also considerable evidence in the literature to examine job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the sport setting. Prior studies have focused on examining either job satisfaction or organizational commitment in the sport setting. The literature has also shown factors predicting both organizational commitment and job satisfaction are related to organizational justice perceptions (Colquitt et al., 2001; & Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). However, prior research has yet to develop a framework for analyzing the relationship of these three constructs together in the sport setting.

The literature on organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment lends support for further examination of these constructs as they relate to intercollegiate coaches. Specifically, few studies have examined the difference between revenue and non-revenue generating sport coaches in intercollegiate athletics (Evans, Johnson, & Ramsey, 1983; Jordan, 2002; Pastore, 1993). Therefore, he purposes of the study were fourfold: (a) to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline), (b) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, (c) to determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Understanding each of these constructs and their relationship can lend support for applicable suggestions to improve the organizational behavior within an intercollegiate athletic department.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to detail the methodology of the present study. The present study examines the constructs of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate sport setting. This chapter will include the following sections: (a) study purpose and research questions, (b) research design, (c) participants, (d) instrumentation, (e) data collection, (f) data analysis, and (h) summary of methodology.

Study Purpose and Research Questions

The present study had four primary purposes. First, this study was to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable). To address this purpose, the following research questions are presented:

R1a: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable sport coaches)?

R1b: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R1c: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

Second, the study examined differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction. To address this purpose, the following research questions are presented:

R2a: Does the overall job satisfaction differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-unstable sport coaches)?

R2b: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R2c: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

Third, the study examined differences in coaches' levels of overall organizational commitment. To address this purpose, the following research questions are presented:

R3a: Does the organizational commitment differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-unstable sport coaches)?

R3b: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R3c: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by coaching position (head coach and assistant coach)?

Finally, the study examined the relationship between organizational justice, and both job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. To address this purpose, the following research questions are presented:

R4a: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall job satisfaction for coaches of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable)?

R4b: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall organizational commitment for coaches of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable)?

R4c: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and job satisfaction?

R4d: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and organizational commitment?

Research Design

The present study used a quantitative research design to examine the perceptions of revenue and non-revenue generating sport intercollegiate coaches. A quantitative research design was chosen over a qualitative design for several reasons. First, the goal of the present study is to objectively determine the perceptions of coaches and determine if these perceptions relate to job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment. A quantitative research design allows for objectivity in discussing results. Second, a quantitative design allows the research greater ability to generalize across industry

segments. Third, a quantitative design provides for a standardized collection and interpretation of the data through surveys and statistical software. Finally, a quantitative design will build on application in prior studies related to organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational justice in the sport setting (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a; Leblicq, Hoecke, & Knopp, 2002; Li, 1993; Mahony, Hums & Riemer, 2002; Snyder, 1990; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004).

Participants

The target population of the present study consisted of coaches at intercollegiate institutions that sponsored men's basketball, baseball, and wrestling at the NCAA Division I and III levels (N = 152 (Division I = 67, Division III = 85)). The selected institutions were gathered from the NCAA sport sponsorship database (NCAA, 2008). As stated in the delimitations, these institutions were chosen because organizational justice perceptions are based on organizational differences such as budget, organizational size, division of labor, and organizational goal. Therefore, to reduce the variance in generalizibility, institutions that were most similar in their sport sponsorship were used.

A purpose of the present study was to examine differences among coaches of different sport types based on revenue generation. For the present study sport type was been divided into three categories: (a) revenue-generating sport, (b) non-revenuegenerating-stable sport, and (c) non-revenue-generating-unstable sport. While prior studies have used the sport to categorize sport type (Hambleton, 1989; Pastore, 1993), the present study wishes to analyze sport type based on revenue generation. Due to the makeup of the intercollegiate sector of the sport industry in terms of revenue-generating sports, male sports are generally the only sports that produce enough revenue to be

profitable. For the fiscal year 2006, only three NCAA sponsored sports reported a positive financial gain, football, men's basketball and men's ice hockey (EADA, 2008). These sports, for the purpose of this study, are labeled as revenue-generating sports. The remaining sports sponsored by NCAA institutions can be identified as non-revenue generating sports. However, the non-revenue-generation cohort can be further divided based upon changes in sponsorship over the past 20 years. In baseball there has been a total increase in total sponsorship across all NCAA Divisions of 54 programs since 1988 (NCAA, 2008a). This represents a relatively stable non-revenue sport. Other non-revenue sports have not experienced the same stability as baseball. Wrestling teams have declined by 101 in the total number of teams maintained across all NCAA Divisions (NCAA, 2008a). Wrestling represents a non-revenue sport in decline. Because revenue generation and the potential for profitability was a key factor in this study, the author decided to focus only on male sports. However, future research should examine women's sport. Even in this case, it appears likely that men's and women's sports are viewed and treated differently, and that may be related to revenue generation possibilities (Mahony et al., 2005).

Another purpose of this study was to examine differences among coaches based upon NCAA Division association. The present study chose to examine only Division I and Division III. This decision was made due to the differences in institutional missions and objectives. Division I stresses increased competition and revenue generation through minimum attendance and sport related financial aid requirements. Division III has a more education and inclusive focus on student-athlete development, as the NCAA states "Division III athletics departments place special importance on the impact athletics on the

participants rather than on the spectators. The student-athlete's experience is of paramount concern." (NCAA, 2007). These differences in missions and objects lead to the potential differences in perceptions among coaches.

Another purpose of this study was to examine differences among coaches based on coaching positions. The present study used both head and assistant coaches as participants in order to examine differences due to coaching position. When examining organizational justice, other studies have explored potential differences based upon an individual's location within an organizational chart (Hums & Chelladurai, 1997b; Mahony, Hums, & Riemer. 2002, 2005; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008). Head coaches have potentially more access and interaction with athletic directors because of their position. Therefore, head coaches may perceive organizational justice differently. For this reason, the present study chose to examine differences between head and assistant coaches.

Participants of the study included both head and assistant coaches of men's basketball, baseball, and wrestling from NCAA Division I and III institutions that sponsored all three sports (n=1,463). This selection resulted in 67 institutions from the NCAA Division I and 85 from Division III. To achieve statistical power and a 95% confidence level the following steps were taken in selecting the participants. First, Dillman (2000) suggests a sample of 269 cases is needed to achieve 95% confidence level. This is also sufficient to achieve statistical power. To achieve statistical power, a minimum of 20 cases is needed per cell. The present study uses 12 cells (2 NCAA Divisions x 3 sport types x 2 job positions). Therefore, a minimum of 240 cases are needed to achieve statistical power for the present study.

Finally, prior research on intercollegiate coaches has generated low response rates. Therefore, the present study has taken action to account for a potential low response rate. The present study is aiming at achieve a response rate of 40%. Using this response rate given the 269 cases needed to achieve a 95% confidence level, 673 cases are needed to been sent to the target population. To obtain the necessary responses the entire population (N=1463) will be surveyed.

In the case of unequal cell sizes, assumptions will be tested for each statistical procedure. If any assumptions are violated, random deletion of responses will be used to reduce the data to the necessary amount to meet all statistical assumptions. To account for non-response bias, the researcher will use known characteristics of the population to measure for potential response bias (Gratton & Jones, 2004). The following table shows the cells sizes of each subgroup based on NCAA division, sport type and job position within the population surveyed.

Coaching Position	Sport			
	Basketball	Baseball	Wrestling	Total
Head coaches				
Division I	67	67	67	201
Division III	85	85	85	255
Assistant coaches				
Division I	138	195	120	453
Division III	207	181	166	554
Total	497	528	438	1463

Population Cells Sizes of Present Study

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study consisted of six major sections: (a) demographic questionnaire, (b) the Organizational Justice Index (OJI), (c) the Job In General (JIG), (d) General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC) and (e) an open ended questionnaire.

Demographic Questions

The demographic questions collected participant data on the following items: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) ethnicity, (d) education, (e) sport coaches, (f) NCAA Division, (g) conference affiliation, (h) job position, (i) years in current position, (j) year with current organization and (k) total years of coaching experience.

Organizational Justice Index (OJI)

Rahim, Magner, and Shaprio (2000) developed the Organizational Justice Index (OJI) to measure the three components of organizational justice: (a) distributive, (b) procedural and (c) interactional justice. The OJI is a 23-item questionnaire used to measure the perceived fairness of the respondent. The eight distributive justice items focus on the respondent's perceived fairness of outcomes provided by the organization for which they work. The seven procedural justice items measure the respondent's perceived fairness of the formal decision–making policies and procedures used by the organization. Finally, the eight interactional justice items measure the respondent's perceived fairness on the treatment received by the respondent from his/her immediate supervisor. Each item is measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. (1= Strongly Disagree; 7= Strongly Agree). Mean scores from each subscale are then compared against each other to determine the relative influence of each subscale on the respondent's output for the respondent's overall perception of organizational justice.

Rahim, Magner, and Shapiro (2000) used a components factor analysis to validate the 23-item OJI. The initial OJI tested 38 items against a sample of undergraduate business students. A factor analysis revealed three factors had eigenvalues of greater than one. Rahim et al. (2000) retained all items within these factors generating a factor loading greater than .50. The 23 items retained items were then tested using a principle components factor analysis with a sample of undergraduate management students. Results indicated consistency with both the emergence of the three original factors and the 23 items making up each factor (Rahim et al., 2000). Rahim et al. (2000) used a test of internal consistency to determine the reliability of the OJI. Results indicated the reliability estimates of the OJI were .96 for distributive justice, .85 for procedural justice, and .94 for interactional justice, each exceeding the minimum .70 suggested by Nunnally (1978).

The OJI has also been used in to measure perceptions of organizational justice in the sport setting. Jordan (2001) used the OJI to test the perception of fairness of head intercollegiate basketball coaches. Reliability estimates for the study were .97 for distributive justice, .93 for procedural justice, and .97 for interactional justice. Jordan et al. (2007) reported similar reliability estimates when examining perceptions of student workers in sport recreational departments. Reliability estimates were .91 for distributive justice, .83 for procedural justice, and .90 for interactional justice. Both studies were consistent with Rahim et al. (2000) and met the suggested benchmark of .70 for reliability estimates set by Nunnally (1978).

Job In General (JIG)

The Job in General (JIG) Scale was developed by Ironson, Smith, Brannick,

Bison, and Paul (1989) to measure and individual's global satisfaction independent from satisfaction with facets. The 18-item scale uses a series of adjectives and short phrases to identify positive and negative feelings about the respondent's job. Respondents are asked to respond to each item with a "yes", "no", or "?". A response of "yes" indicates a respondent's agreement with the item and their current job. A response of "no" indicates a respondent's disagreement with the item and their current job. A response of "?" indicates the respondent is undecided about the item describing their current job. Scoring for the JIG is done by giving each "yes" response a score of 3, "no" responses a score of 0 and "?" a score of 1. Scores are then added to achieve a range of 0 to 54. Respondents scoring 27 or higher are deemed satisfied with their current job. Scores below 27 are deemed dissatisfied.

Reliability of the JIG has consistently been reported as ranging from .82 to .94 (Fields, 2002). In the sport setting, Jordan (2001) used the JIG to measure global job satisfaction among intercollegiate head basketball coaches and reported a Cronbach's Alpha level of .89. Validity of the JIG has also consistently found global job satisfaction to be positively correlated with other global organizational variables. Most relevant to the present study, Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) found global job satisfaction to be correlated with perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice, using the JIG.

General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC)

Blau, Paul, and St. John (1993) developed the General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC) to distinguish work commitment facets that were analogous to the job satisfaction facet design of the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin,

1969). The GIWC measures four facets of work commitment: (a) occupational commitment, (b) job involvement, (c) value of work, and (d) organizational commitment. The 11 occupational commitment items focus on the importance of the career to the respondent. The seven job involvement items focus on the degree to which the individual identifies with a job. The seven items measuring value of work focus on the centrality of work in a respondent's life. Finally, the six items measuring organizational behavior focus on the devotion and loyalty of the respondent to the organization. Each item is measured on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Moderately Disagree, 3= Slightly Disagree, 4= Slightly Agree, 5= Moderately Agree, and 6= Strongly Agree). Mean scores from each facet are then compared against each other to determine the relative influence of each facet on the respondent's overall work commitment.

Blau, Paul, and St. John (1993) validated the 31-item GIWC by using an exploratory factor analysis. Blau et al. (1993) emphasized reducing measurement redundancy for work commitment facets. The initial 59-item scale was tested with part-time MBA students. The analysis revealed 31 items loading on five factors with eigenvalues greater than one. The fifth factor that emerged from the factor analysis reflected negative outlooks on work. These items did not produce stable loadings across time periods and was therefore dropped as a factor. The four remaining factors (occupational commitment, job involvement, value of work, and organizational commitment) were then retested to confirm unique factor loadings and validate the 31-item GIWC (Blau et al., 1993).

Reliability of the GIWC was established using Cronbach's alpha scores of the four work commitment facets. Alpha scores revealed all four facets to be reliable: (a)

occupation commitment = .91, (b) job involvement = .83, (c) value of work = .81, and (d) organizational commitment = .82. Correlations between facets ranged from .26 - .31. The GIWC has also been shown to be reliable in the sport setting. Ogasawara and Chelladurai (2003) used the GWIC to measure occupational and organizational commitment only, among Division I, Division III, and Japanese athletic coaches. Results indicated reliability for Division I and III as follows: (a) Organizational Commitment Division I = .80, (b) Organizational Commitment Division III = .81, (c) Occupational Commitment Division I = .87, and (d) Occupational Commitment Division III = .85.

A purpose of the present study is to measure the difference of organizational commitment on revenue and non-revenue-generating sport coaches. Therefore, only the six organizational commitment items are used for the present study. While Ogasawara and Chelladurai (2003) did not find significant differences between Division I and III in regards to organizational commitment, differences may exist between sport types. In addition the decision to use a multi-item scale was based upon the findings of Jordan and Turner (2005) who only found partial support for using a single-item measure for overall organizational commitment.

Open ended Questionnaire

An open ended question will conclude the instrument. The purpose of the question is to gather any other information potentially affecting the variables tested that was not accounted for in the original surveys. The open ended question will ask: The following space is provided for you to express opinions on organization justice, job satisfaction, or organizational commitment you may have. Please use this space to

express any additional opinions that may not be conveyed by the questions already asked in the survey.

Data Collection

Dillman (2000) provided the method for data collection for the present study. The survey instrument for this study was administered by email through a third-party online company, SurveyMonkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com). Dillman (2000) describes several advantages of using a web-based survey design. First, by using the internet to administer the survey the researcher can eliminate paper, postage, mail out, and data entry costs. Second, the time required for survey implementation can be reduced from weeks to days, or even hours. Finally, internet administration offers the potential for dramatically reducing the close correspondence between sample size and survey costs. The cost of surveying additional participants is much less when using web-based surveys, compared to both telephone and postal designs.

Dillman (2000) also noted several disadvantages to using internet administration of the survey instrument. First, the researcher does not know the technological literacy of the respondent. This factor limits the potential response rate based on a participant not responding due to their inability to do so. In the present study, detailed instructions on how to administer and submit the survey will be provided for the respondent. Second, organizations vary in terms of what technologies they use. Therefore, there is potential to have formatting differences between respondents based on organizational or personal configurations of the technology. The present study will use a web-based survey administrator to eliminate the possibility of formatting error. Third, email distribution is unstandardized, as participants may have more than one email address. The present study

will use only the email address supplied by the university. Finally, participants may not use email as their primary form of communication. While this is true, it is impossible to know prior to distributing the survey what type of communication each respondent prefers. In addition, only email distribution was used to standardize the data collection.

Dillman (2000) outlined several principles for designing a web-based survey: (a) utilize a multiple contact strategy; (b) personalize all email contacts; (c) introduce the Web survey with a welcome screen that is motivational, emphasizes the ease of responding, and instructs respondents about how to proceed to the next page; (d) provide specific instructions on how to take each necessary computer action for responding to the questionnaire, and give other necessary instructions at the point where they are needed; (e) keep cover letter brief to enable the respondent to get to the first question without having to scroll down the page; (f) the first question should be interesting and easy to answer; (g) present each questionnaires; (h) do not require respondents to provide an answer to each question before being allowed to answer any subsequent ones; and (i) inform respondents of alternative ways to respond, such as printing and sending back their response.

Dillman (2000) recommended five steps to maximize the response rate: (a) send a pre-notification e-mail message two to three days prior to the survey administration, (b) administer the initial survey via e-mail with cover letter and instructions, (c) send a thank you/reminder e-mail notification, (d) administer a second survey via e-mail to only those participant who have not yet responded, and (e) send a final contact thanking the participants for participating.

Based on the recommendations of Dillman (2000) the first process in data collection was to pre-notify each member of the selected sample. The pre-notification (Appendix A) was sent by e-mail. Approximately one week after the pre-notification e-mail was sent, the first initial survey (Appendix B) was sent via e-mail, accompanied with an introductory letter (Appendix C) with instructions for completion. The instrument was formatted and administered through an on-line website, www.SurveyMonkey.com. All data was collected by the website and later converted to SPSS for data analysis. One week after the initial distribution of the instrument, a thank you/reminder e-mail notification (Appendix D) was sent. This notification served two purposes, first, to thank those coaches who had already taken part in the study and second, to remind those who had not completed the survey to do so. Approximately three to four days later a second administration of the instrument was done using the same procedure as the initial survey. A final contact (Appendix E) thanking the participants was sent one week following the final administration of the survey.

Data Analysis

The present study will use multiple statistical procedures to analyze the data. The following description of the data analysis will broken down by study purpose: (a) differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice, (b) differences in coaches' level of overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment, (c) relationship between organizational justice, and both job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, and (d) a summary of the methodology.

Differences in Coaches' Perceptions of Organizational Justice

The first purpose of the present study was to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches. Differences were examined using sport type, NCAA Division, and coaching position as independent variables. To examine these differences the present study will use one factorial Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) procedure.

MANOVA is defined by Vogt (2005) as, an extension of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), allowing ". . . the simultaneous study of two or more related dependent variables while controlling for the correlation among them" (p.147). The ability for a MANOVA procedure to use multiple dependent variables allows the researcher to gain a more powerful test of difference among means. A MANOVA procedure is necessary for the present study due to the correlations among the dependent variables and organizational justice components.

In order to use a MANOVA procedure three assumptions must be met. First, observations must be independent of each other. The violation of independence is considered to be very serious. The present study ensured this assumption was met by the data collection method used. Each respondent individually completed and returned a single questionnaire. Second, normality of distribution assumes that the observations of the dependent variables are normally distributed in each group. Violation of this assumption can cause skewness in the level of significance or power. This assumption was tested using graphic modeling, such as histograms of the data. Finally, homogeneity of variance assumes that the variance among groups is equal. This assumption was tested using Levene's test of equality (Stevens, 2002). In cases where significant differences

between groups were found, post hoc ANOVA procedures were used to find unique effects.

As stated earlier, a factorial MANOVA design is necessary to address differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice based on sport type, NCAA Division, and coaching position. Factorial research designs are used when the independent variables have two or more levels. This design allows the researcher to understand any potential interaction effects among the independent variables (Stevens, 2002). The present study will use one 3 x 2 x 2 factorial MANOVA procedures to determine effects of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-decline), NCAA Division (I and III), and coaching position (head and assistant coach) on the perceptions of the three organizational justice components. The independent variables for the factorial MANOVA procedure will consist of the three levels of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and nonrevenue-generating-decline), the two levels of NCAA Division (I and III), and the two levels of coaching position (head and assistant coach). The dependent variable for the factorial MANOVA procedure will be the three organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice). The factorial MANOVA procedures will address the following research hypotheses:

R1a: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline sport coaches)?

R1b: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R1c: Do perceptions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

Differences in Coaches' Perception of Overall Job Satisfaction and Overall Organizational Commitment

A purpose of the present study was to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches. Differences will be examined using sport type, NCAA Division, and coaching position as independent variables, and overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment as dependent variables. To examine these differences the present study will use two factorial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures.

Vogt (2005) defines analysis of variance (ANOVA) as, "a test of statistical significance of the differences among the mean scores of two or more groups on one or more variables" (p. 7). An ANOVA procedure is necessary for the present study to examine differences in overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment based on sport type, coaching position, and NCAA division.

In order to use an ANOVA procedure three assumption must be met. First, observations must be independent of each other. The violation of independence is considered to be very serious. The present study ensured this assumption was met by the

data collection method used. Each respondent individually completed and returned a single questionnaire. Second, normality of distribution assumes that the observations of the dependent variables are normally distributed in each group. Violation of this assumption can cause skewness in the level of significance or power. This assumption was tested using graphic modeling, such as histograms of the data. Finally, homogeneity of variance assumes that the variance among groups is equal. This assumption was tested using Levene's test of equality (Stevens, 2002).

The present study will use two 3 x 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA procedures to determine effects of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline), NCAA division (I and III), and coaching position (head and assistant coach), on the perceptions of overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment. The independent variables for both ANOVA procedures will consist of the three levels of sport type, the two levels of coaching position, and the two levels of NCAA Division. The dependent variable for the first factorial ANOVA procedure will be overall job satisfaction. The dependent variable for the second factorial ANOVA procedure will be overall organizational commitment. The factorial ANOVA

R2a: Does the overall job satisfaction differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline sport coaches)?

R2b: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R2c: Does the overall job satisfaction differ by coaching position (head coaches and assistant coaches)?

R3a: Does the organizational commitment differ among coaches of different sport types (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-decline sport coaches)?

R3b: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by NCAA Division (Division I and Division III)?

R3c: Does the overall organizational commitment differ by coaching position (head coach and assistant coach)?

Relationship between Organizational Justice, and Both Job Satisfaction and

Organizational Commitment

The final purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The present study will examine which organizational justice components best predict overall satisfaction and overall commitment among intercollegiate male coaches. To examine this relationship a multiple regression analysis will be used.

Vogt (2005) defines multiple regression as a regression analysis using "two or more predictor variables (independent variables) to predict a single criterion variable (dependent variable)" (p.146). Multiple regression analysis is necessary because a purpose of the present study is to identify if organizational justice components predict facets of job satisfaction, overall job satisfaction, or overall organizational commitment among intercollegiate coaches.

The four assumptions for multiple regression are independence, normality, linearity, and homoscedactisity. The assumptions of independence and normality are assured using the same techniques under MANOVA. Individual completion and return of single questionnaire and the use of scatterplots and histograms prevent the violation of independence and normality. Linearity requires the relationship between dependent and independent variables by linear in nature. If the relationship between independent and dependent variables is non-linear, the regression analysis can underestimate the true relationship between variables. Underestimation of the relationship can increase the chance of a type I error in multiple regression. Linearity can be tested by observing the scatterplot of standardized residual. Finally, homoscendasticity requires the variance of errors to be the same across all levels of the independent variable. Homoscendasticity can be checked in the same way as linearity, by visual examination of a scatterplot diagram of the standardized residuals by the regression standardized predicted value (Stevens, 2002).

The present study will conduct a total of six multiple regression analyses using the grouping variable of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline). The three organizational justice components (distributive, procedural, and interactive) will be used as independent variables for each multiple regression. The first three multiple regressions will use overall job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The last three multiple regressions will use overall organizational commitment as the dependent variable. The multiple regression procedures will address the following research hypotheses:

R4a: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall job satisfaction for coaches

of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline)?

R4b: Which organizational justice components (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) best predict overall organizational commitment for coaches of each sport type (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline)?

The present study also examines the potential moderation effects of sport type on the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction and between organizational justice and organizational commitment. The present study will examine the moderating effects using a factorial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) design. Assumptions for ANOVA, as described earlier, were tested.

The present study will use six 3 x 2 factorial ANOVA procedures to determine if sport type moderates the relationship between organizational justice components and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The independent variables for the factorial ANOVA procedures will consists of the moderator: the three levels of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generatingunstable) and the main effect: two levels of distributive justice (high and low), two levels of procedural justice (high and low), and two levels of interactional justice (high and low). Levels of each organizational justice component will be determined using a median split of the data. The dependent variable for the first three factorial ANOVA procedures will be overall job satisfaction. The dependent variable for the final three factorial ANOVA procedures will be overall organizational commitment. The factorial ANOVA

R4c: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and job satisfaction?

R4d: Does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice, and organizational commitment?

Summary of Methodology

In summary, the purpose of the present study was to examine perceptions of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate setting using the following grouping variables: (a) sport type, (b) coaching position, and (c) NCAA division. Participants of the study included head and assistant coaches of both NCAA division I and III from the sports of men's baseball, basketball, and wrestling. Each participant completed a questionnaire containing items used to measure: (a) descriptive statistics, (b) perceptions of organizational justice, (c) overall job satisfaction, and (d) overall organizational commitment. Dillman's suggestions (2000) were used for data collection. The data was analyzed using factorial MANOVA, factorial ANOVA, and multiple regression. Assumptions of each statistical procedure were tested.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purposes of the study were to: (a) determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenuegenerating-decline), (b) determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, (c) determine differences in coaches' levels of overall organizational commitment, and (d) examine the relationship between organizational justice, and both overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The following chapter will report the results of the present study as described by the methodology in Chapter 3.

Preliminary Statistical Analysis

Response Rate

The present study surveyed both head and assistant coaches of baseball, men's basketball, and wrestling programs at NCAA Division I and III institutions. The survey was only administered to coaches of universities that sponsored all three sport programs. This methodology gave the present study a population of N=982. Two-hundred-seventy-two participants responded to the survey yielding a response rate of 27.7%. Of the 272 respondents, 39 were excluded due to incomplete responses to the survey, yielding a final response rate of 23.7% (n=233). The breakdown of respondents by NCAA Division, coaching position and sport is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Coaching Position	Sport			
	Baseball	Basketball	Wrestling	Total
Head coaches				
Division I	8	7	15	30
Division III	17	12	34	63
Assistant coaches				
Division I	23	26	30	79
Division III	25	31	5	61
Total	73	76	84	233

Population Cell Sizes of Respondents for the Present Study

Demographic and Mean Scores

The descriptive analysis of the present study included the following demographic data: (a) age, (b) ethnicity, (c) education, (d) assistant level, (e) years in current position, (f) years with current organization, and (g) total years coaching. The age of the participants ranged from 22 to 75 with a mean of 37.09 (SD = 10.93) years. The ethnicity of respondents showed 246 (90.4%) were Caucasian/White, 19 (7.0%) were African American/Black, 1 (.4%) was a Pacific Islander, and 4 (1.5%) reported other. Reported educational levels showed 134 (49.3%) of respondents had completed a bachelor's degree, 127 (46.7%) had completed a master's degree, 6 (2.2%) had completed a doctoral degree, 1 (.4%) had completed an associate's degree, and 1 (.4%) had received a high school diploma. Of the 163 assistants who participated 129 (79.1%) were full-time, 27 (16.6%) were part-time, and 7 (4.3%) were volunteers. Finally, years in current position ranged from 1 to 45 with a mean of 6.81 (SD = 7.80) years, years with current organization ranged from 1 to 45 with a mean of 7.48 (SD = 8.28) years, and total years

coaching ranged from 0 to 50 with a mean of 13.59 (SD = 10.51) years. A breakdown of

the demographic data is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Variable	N	%	Mean
Age			37.09
22 – 29	75	29.9	
30 – 39	102	38.0	
40 - 49	41	15.3	
50 – 59	34	12.7	
60 - 67	10	3.7	
Ethnicity			
African American/Black	19	7.0	
Asian American	0	0	
Caucasian/White	246	90.4	
Hispanic	0	0	
Native American	0	0	
Pacific Islander	1	.4	
Other	4	1.5	
Education			
High School Diploma	1	.4	
Associate's Degree	1	.4	
Bachelor's Degree	134	49.4	
Master's Degree	127	46.7	
Doctoral Degree	6	2.2	
Assistant Level			
Volunteer	7	2.6	
Part-Time	27	9.9	
Full-Time	129	47.4	
Year in Current Position			6.18
1 – 9	216	76.6	
10 – 19	44	16.3	
20 - 29	12	4.5	
30 - 39	5	1.9	
40 – 45	2	.7	

Demographic	Characteristics	of Respondents

Year with Current Organization
1 – 9	177	75.7	
10 – 19	43	16.1	
20 - 29	11	4.1	
30 - 39	9	3.4	
40 – 45	2	.7	
Total Years Coaching			13.59
0-9	126	46.5	
10 – 19	76	28.0	
20 - 29	39	14.4	
30 - 39	23	8.5	
40 - 50	7	2.6	

Representative Population

Chi square analyses were performed to determine if the respondents were representative of the population. Three independent variables were chosen for the analyses based on common elements of each institution: (a) institution enrollment, (b) number of male student-athletes, and (c) 2007 athletic revenue. Data on each institution was gathered from the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) website using the institutional database. The chi square analyses showed a significant fit between the study participants and the non-respondents for each of the independent variables: (a) institution enrollment ($X^2 = .034$, df = 1, p > .001), (b) number of male student athletes ($X^2 = .467$, df = 1, p > .001), and (c) 2007 athletic revenue generated ($X^2 = 2.042$, df = 1, p > .001). These chi-square results indicate that the final sample appears to be representative of the population for the present study.

Response Bias

A regression analysis was conducted to determine if there were differences between respondents and non-respondents of the study. Prior research has indicated late respondents are similar to non-respondents. Therefore, a regression analysis was conducted to determine if differences existed between early and late respondents on all five independent variables: (a) procedural justice, (b) distributive justice, (c) interactional justice, (d) organizational commitment, and (e) overall job satisfaction. Since the present study issued the survey at three times, the regression analysis compared first respondents to third respondents as these groups have the likelihood of being most different. Results of the regression analysis revealed the overall regression equation to not be significant $(R^2 = .031, \text{ adjusted } R^2 = .010, F(5, 223) = 1.440; p = .211)$. The results revealed no significant differences in any of the independent variables: (a) procedural justice (p = .642), (b) distributive justice (p = .069), (c) interactional justice (p = .559), (d) organizational commitment (p = .552), and (e) overall job satisfaction (p = .303). These results indicated no significant differences between early and late respondents supporting the idea that there was not a response bias among the respondents and that respondents of the survey are representative of the population in their perceptions of organizational justice components, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Reliability

The present study used three instruments validated through previous research, as stated in Chapter 3. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated to determine the reliability of the Organizational Justice Index (OJI), the Job In General (JIG), and the General Index of Work Commitment (GIWC). Alpha coefficients were also necessary for each subscale of the OJI (procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice). As shown in Table 4, Cronbach's alphas for this sample ranged from .729 to .966, indicating all scales and subscales exceed the recommend value of .70 by Nunally and Bernstien (1994).

Table 4

Scale	Alpha Level
Organizational Justice Index	.958
Procedural Justice (OJI subscale)	.905
Distributive Justice (OJI subscale)	.955
Interactional Justice (OJI subscale)	.966
Job In General	.729
General Index of Work commitment	.855

Reliability Estimate Measures for Survey Instrument

Results Research Question 1

The first research question examined if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-decline). To test this research question, a 3x2x2 factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed for the interaction of sport, NCAA Division, and job title on perceptions of organizational justice. Assumptions for using MANOVA were tested and met. Independent observations were taken by each participant completing a single survey. Levene's test of equality of error variances was not significant at the .05 level for each dependent variable (procedural justice, distributive justice, and organizational justice). Normality of distribution was tested comparing a histogram of result to the normal distribution curve. The result or the factorial MANOVA revealed no main effects for the three interdependent variables. However, significant interactional effects existed between sport and NCAA Division [F(6, 436) = 2.692; p = .014; $\eta^2 = .036$] and sport and job title [F(6, 436) = 3.002; p = .007; $\eta^2 = .040$] on coaches' perceptions of organizational justice.

Because these interactions were significant, the between-subjects effects were analyzed.

A complete MANOVA table can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

<u> </u>	Wilks'		Нуро.	Error		
Source	Lambda	F	df	df	p	η^2
Intercept	.069	976.161	3	218	.000**	.931
Sport	.979	.774	6	436	.591	.011
NCAA Division	.990	.758	3	218	.519	.010
Job Title	.989	.812	3	218	.488	.011
Sport x NCAA Division	.930	2.692	6	436	.014*	.036
Sport x Job Title	.922	3.002	6	436	.007**	.040
NCAA Division x Job Title	.972	2.072	3	218	.105	.028
Sport x NCAA Division y Job Title	x .969	1.150	6	436	.332	.016

MANOVA Summary for Organizational Justice Perceptions by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title

Note. Computed using alpha = .05.

*p < 05. **p <.01

The between-subjects test on the interaction between sport and NCAA Division on coaches' perceptions of organizational justice revealed significant interactions on all three organizational justice components; procedural justice [F(2, 220) = 5.140; p = .007; $\eta^2 = ..045$], distributive justice $[F(2, 220) = 5.780; p = .004; \eta^2 = .050]$, and interactional justice $[F(2, 220) = 3.142; p = .045; \eta^2 = .028]$. The profile plots of the estimated marginal means for procedural justice indicate a disordinal interaction between sport and division among all three components. The profile plots for procedural and distributive justice were similar, Division I baseball and men's basketball coaches rated procedural and distributive justice higher than their Division III counterparts. For wrestling, Division III coaches rated procedural and distributive justice higher than Division I coaches. The profile plots for interactional justice revealed different interactions. Division III baseball and wrestling coaches rated interactional justice higher than Division I, while Division I men's basketball coaches rated interactional justice higher than Division III coaches.

The between-subjects test on the interaction between sport and job title on coaches perceptions on organizational justice revealed only one significant interaction with interactional justice $[F(2, 220) = 5.426; p = .005; \eta^2 = .047]$. The profile plots of the estimated marginal means for interactional justice indicated a disordinal interaction between sport and job title. The pattern of interaction revealed that head baseball coaches perceived interactional justice higher than assistant coaches. However, men's basketball and wrestling, assistant coaches perceived higher interactional justice than head coaches. The plot also revealed the separations between job title in the sports of baseball and wrestling were much broader than men's basketball. Complete between-subjects test can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

000 11110							
0		Sum of	16	Mean			2
Source		Squares	<u>a</u> 1	Square	F	p	η
Corrected Model	РJ	29.007	11	2.637	1.598	.101	.074
	DJ	45.087	11	4.099	1.660	.084	.077
	IJ	47.461	11	4.315	2.056	.025*	.093
Intercept	РJ	3577.202	1	3577.202	2167.709	.000**	.908
	DJ	2845.261	1	2845.261	1152.507	.000**	.840
	IJ	5273.508	1	5273.508	2512.949	.000**	.920
Sport	РJ	.525	2	.263	.159	.853	.001

ANOVA Summary for Organizational Justice Perceptions by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title

	DJ	4.230	2	2.115	.857	.426	.008
	IJ	.151	2	.075	.036	.965	.000
NCAA Division	PJ	1.361	1	1.361	.825	.365	.004
	DJ	.769	1	.769	.312	.577	.001
	IJ	.392	1	.392	.187	.666	.001
Job Title	PJ	1.546	1	1.546	.937	.334	.004
	DJ	.058	1	.058	.023	.879	.000
	IJ	2.347	1	2.347	1.118	.291	.005
Sport x	PJ	16.963	2	8.482	5.140	.007**	.045
NCAA Division	DJ	28.537	2	14.268	5.780	.004**	.050
	IJ	13.187	2	6.594	3.142	.045*	.028
Sport x Job Title	РJ	3.079	2	1.540	.933	.395	.008
•	DJ	4.485	2	2.243	.908	.405	.008
	IJ	22.773	2	11.386	5.426	.005**	.047
Job Title x	PJ	10.348	1	10.348	6.270	.013*	.028
NCAA Division	DJ	5.953	1	5.953	2.411	.122	.011
	IJ	4.568	1	4.568	2.177	.142	.010
Sport x	PJ	2.881	2	1.441	.873	.419	.008
NCAA Division x	DJ	10.693	2	5.347	2.166	.117	.019
Job Title	IJ	.243	2	.121	.058	.944	.001

Note. Computed using alpha = .05.

*p < 05. **p <.01

Results Research Questions 2 & 3

The second and third research questions asked if differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment were present among sport types, NCAA Divisions, and job titles. To test these research questions two 3x2x2 factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were performed for the interaction of sport, NCAA Division, and job title on overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Assumptions for using ANOVA were tested and met. Independent observations were taken by each participant completing a single survey. Levene's test of equality of error variances was not significant for each dependent variable at the .05 level (overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment). Normality of distribution was tested comparing a histogram of result to the normal distribution curve. The results of the factorial ANOVAs revealed no significant differences based on sport type, NCAA Division, or job title in overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment as shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7

	Sum of		Mean			
Source	Squares	df	Square	F	р	η^2
Corrected Model	645.820 ^a	11	58.711	.697	.740	.034
Intercept	321979.429	1	321979.429	3824.462	.000**	.946
Sport	125.350	2	62.675	.744	.476	.007
NCAA Division	13.004	1	13.004	.154	.695	.001
Job Title	19.447	1	19.447	.231	.631	.001
Sport x NCAA Division	275.925	2	137.962	1.639	.197	.015
Sport x Job Title	194.514	2	97.257	1.155	.317	.011
Job Title x NCAA Division	206.723	1	206.723	2.455	.119	.011
Sport x NCAA Division x Job Title	6.438	2	3.219	.038	.962	.000

ANOVA Summary for Overall Job Satisfaction by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

^a R Squared = .034 (Adjusted R Squared = -.015).

**p < .01

Table 8

1 1110	Sum of		Mean			
Source	Squares	df	Square	F	р	η^2
Corrected Model	9.882 ^a	11	.898	.809	.631	.039
Intercept	2761.760	1	2761.760	2487.234	.000**	.920
Sport	.757	2	.378	.341	.712	.003
NCAA Division	.504	1	.504	.454	.501	.002
Job Title	.908	1	.908	.818	.367	.004
Sport x NCAA Division	3.748	2	1.874	1.688	.187	.015
Sport x Job Title	1.178	2	.589	.531	.589	.005
Job Title x NCAA Division	.243	1	.243	.219	.641	.001
Sport x NCAA Division x Job Title	.135	2	.766	.960	.503	.006

ANOVA Summary for Organizational Commitment by Sport, NCAA Division, and Job Title

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

^a R Squared = .039 (Adjusted R Squared = -.009).

**p < .01

Results Research Question 4

The fourth research question examined the relationship between organizational justice, and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This research question was examined using two types of data analysis. First, six multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine which organizational components best predicted both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the three sport types. Second, six 3 x 2 factorial ANOVAs were conducted to determine if sport type

moderated the relationship between each organizational justice component and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Multiple Regression Analyses

Prior to the interpretation of the multiple regression analyses, case ratios and assumptions were tested and met. Stevens (2002) suggests a sample size of at least 15 cases per independent variable used in the regression equation. The present study used three independent variables, requiring a minimum sample size of 45. The sample size for baseball (N = 70), men's basketball (N = 76), and wrestling (N = 83) met the required minimum to use a regression analysis. The four assumptions of multiple regression, as described by Shavelson (1996), are independence, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Individual completion and return of single questionnaire met the assumption of independence. Normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were all checked through the examination of scatterplot diagrams produced by SPSS. Finally, collinearity was tested using the tolerance and Variance inflation factor (VIF) produced by SPSS for each regression analysis. Vogt (1999) stated the closer a tolerance level is to 1, the more unique predictability of the regression equation. The closer the tolerance level is to 0, the more collinearity there is among the predictors. For all sport types, all independent variables had a tolerance level ranging from .378 to .690. Fox (1991), suggested an acceptable VIF score should be below four. For all sport types, all independent variables had a VIF score ranging from 1.449 to 2.643.

Three of the multiple regression analyses examined which organizational justice components best predicted overall job satisfaction for the three sport types (baseball, men's basketball, and wrestling). Results of these regression analyses revealed significant

overall equations. The linear combination of organizational justice scores explained over 45% ($R^2 = .454$, adjusted $R^2 = .429$, F(3, 66) = 18.297; p < .001) of the variance in overall job satisfaction for baseball coaches. Results of the regression equation revealed distributive justice (p = .028) and interactional justice (p = .002) significantly contributed to the prediction of overall job satisfaction among baseball coaches. For men's basketball coaches, the linear combination of organizational justice scores explained over 38% ($R^2 = .382$, adjusted $R^2 = .356$, F(3, 72) = 14.814; p < .001). Results of the regression equation revealed distributive justice (p < .001) and interactional justice (p = .014) significantly contributed to the prediction of organizational justice scores explained over 32% ($R^2 = .320$, adjusted $R^2 = .294$, F(3, 73) = 12.395; p < .001) of the variance in overall job satisfaction for wrestling coaches. Results of the regression equation revealed procedural justice (p = .032) and distributive justice (p = .044) significantly contributed to the prediction of overall justice (p = .044) significantly contributed to the prediction among wrestling coaches.

The other three multiple regression analyses examined which organizational justice components best predicted organizational commitment for the three sport types. Results of all multiple regression analyses revealed significant overall equations. The linear combination of organizational justice scores explained over 31% ($R^2 = .313$, adjusted $R^2 = .282$, F(3, 66) = 10.045; *p* <.001) of the variance in organizational commitment for baseball coaches. Results of the regression equation revealed only procedural justice (*p* = .004) significantly contributed to the prediction of organizational commitment among baseball coaches. For men's basketball coaches, the linear combination of organizational justice scores explained over 19% ($R^2 = .198$, adjusted R^2

= .164, F(3, 66) = 5.907; p < .001) of the variance in organizational commitment. Results of the regression equation revealed only distributive justice (p = .033) significantly contributed to the prediction of organizational commitment among men's basketball coaches. Finally, the linear combination of organizational justice scores explained over 19% ($R^2 = .198$, adjusted $R^2 = .167$, F(3, 79) = 6.488; p < .001) of the variance in organizational commitment for wrestling coaches. Results of the regression equation revealed only distributive justice (p = .008) significantly contributed to the prediction of organizational commitment among wrestling coaches. Complete regression tables can be found in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9

Variable	В	SE B	β
Baseball ^a			
Procedural Justice	1.086	1.186	.135
Distributive Justice	1.872	.831	.298*
Interactional Justice	2.501	.789	.362**
Men's Basketball ^b			
Procedural Justice	718	.834	107
Distributive Justice	2.603	.603	.510**
Interactional Justice	1.677	.665	.281*
Wrestling ^c			
Procedural Justice	1.985	.909	.308*
Distributive Justice	1.420	.693	.243*
Interactional Justice	.604	.670	.108

Multiple Regression of Organizational Justice Perceptions Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction for NCAA Men's Coaches

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

^a $R^2 = .454$, Adjusted $R^2 = .429$. ^b $R^2 = .382$, Adjusted $R^2 = .356$. ^c $R^2 = .320$, Adjusted R^2 = .294. *p < 05. **p <.01

Table 10

Multiple Regression Results for Purpose of Organizational Justice Perceptions Predicting Organizational Commitment for NCAA Men's Coaches

Variable	В	SE B	β
Baseball ^a			
Procedural Justice	.387	.130	.491**
Distributive Justice	.108	.091	.176
Interactional Justice	093	.087	137
Men's Basketball ^b			
Procedural Justice	.149	.120	.177
Distributive Justice	.188	.086	.292*
Interactional Justice	.029	.095	.038
Wrestling ^c			
Procedural Justice	.131	.120	.167
Distributive Justice	.249	.091	.350**
Interactional Justice	041	.088	061

Note. Computed using alpha = .05 ^a. $R^2 = .313$, Adjusted $R^2 = .282$. ^b $R^2 = .198$, Adjusted $R^2 = .164$. c. $R^2 = .198$, Adjusted $R^2 = .167.$ *p <.05. **p <.01

Factorial ANOVA Analysis

The previous regression results suggest sport type may moderate the relationship between organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Six factorial ANOVA procedures were conducted to determine if the moderation existed. Prior to performing this procedure, frequency tables were developed to determine the median split for each of the organizational justice components. The median point for procedural justice was 4.83, the median point for distributive justice was 4.00, and the median point for interactional justice was 6.00.

To test whether sport type moderated the relationship between organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment, six 3x2 factorial ANOVAs were performed. The independent variables for the procedures were the three levels of sport type (revenue generating, non-revenue generating-stable, non-revenue-generating-unstable) and the main effect: two levels of procedural justice (high and low), two levels of distributive justice (high and low) and two levels of interactional justice (high and low). The first three factorial ANOVAs tested overall job satisfaction, while the remaining three tested organizational commitment. Assumptions for using ANOVA were tested and met. Independent observations were taken by each participant completing a single survey. Levene's test of equality of error variances was not significant at the .05 level for each dependent variable (overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment). Normality of distribution was tested comparing a histogram of result to the normal distribution curve.

The first three factorial ANOVA analyses revealed significant main effect among the three organizational justice components. The significant main effects showed differences in all three organizational justice components, procedural [F(1, 223) =45.253; $p \le .001$; $\eta^2 = .169$] distributive [F(1, 223) = 52.701; $p \le .001$; $\eta^2 = .191$] and interactional [F(1, 223) = 37.622; $p \le .001$; $\eta^2 = .144$] justice. These findings show coaches who perceive organizational justice components high report significantly

different levels of overall job satisfaction than those coaches who perceive organizational justice low. Complete ANOVA results can be found in Table 11.

The other three factorial ANOVA analyses revealed significant main effects among the three organization justice components. This significant main effect showed differences in all three organizational justice components, procedural [F(1, 223) =30.363; $p \le .001$; $\eta^2 = .120$] distributive [F(1, 223) = 32.608; $p \le .001$; $\eta^2 = .128$] and interactional [F(1, 223) = 9.769; p = .002; $\eta^2 = .042$] justice These findings show coaches who perceive organizational justice components high report significantly different levels of organizational commitment than those coaches who perceive organizational justice low. Complete ANOVA results can be found in Table 12.

Marginal Means Plots for Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Both Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The ANOVA procedures on both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment did not reveal significant interactions among any of the three organizational justice components and sport type. While these findings indicate sport type is not a significant moderator between organizational justice components and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment, analyses of the marginal means plots did reveal evidence of interactions among sport type and perceived justice. This finding combined with the multiple regression findings, indicate sport type did affect the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Chapter 5 will discuss how future studies should continue to explore sport type based on revenue generation as a potential moderating variable.

Table 11

		Mean			
Source	df	Square	F	p	η^2
Procedural Justice (PJ) ^a					
PJ	1	3149.866	45.253	.000**	.169
Sport	2	114.826	1.650	.194	.015
PJ x Sport	2	105.322	1.513	.222	.013
Distributive Justice (DJ) ^b					
DJ	1	3599.765	52.701	.000**	.191
Sport	2	78.675	1.152	.318	.010
DJ x Sport	2	4.188	.061	.941	.001
Interactional Justice (IJ) ^c					
IJ	1	2692.286	37.622	.000**	.144
Sport	2	46.618	.651	.522	.006
IJ x Sport	2	71.561	2.023	.135	.018

ANOVA Summary of Overall Job Satisfaction by Organizational Justice Components and Sport Type

Note. Computed using alpha = .05. ^a R Squared = .179 (Adjusted R Squared = .161). ^b R Squared = .195 (Adjusted R Squared = .177). ^c R Squared = .156 (Adjusted R Squared = .137). *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 12

<u> </u>					
		Mean			_
Source	df	Square	F	р	η^2
Procedural Justice (PJ) ^a					
PJ	1	29.943	30.363	.000**	.120
Sport	2	.642	.651	.522	.006
PJ x Sport	2	.390	.395	.674	.004
Distributive Justice (DJ) ^b					
DJ	1	31.872	32.608	.000**	.128
Sport	2	.447	.457	.634	.004
DJ x Sport	2	.011	.012	.988	.000
Interactional Justice (IJ) ^c					
IJ	1	10.494	9.769	.000**	.042
Sport	2	.587	.546	.580	.005
IJ x Sport	2	.136	.126	.881	.001

ANOVA Summary of Organizational Commitment by Organizational Justice Components and Sport Type

Note. Computed using alpha = .05.

^a R Squared = .123 (Adjusted R Squared = .104). ^b R Squared = .131 (Adjusted R Squared = .112). ^c R Squared = .045 (Adjusted R Squared = .024). *p < .05. **p < .01.

Results Summary

The results of the present study revealed several important findings. The results indicated no significant differences among sport type, NCAA Division, and job title on coaches' perceptions of each organizational justice components (procedural, distributive, and interactional). However, significant interactional effects did exist. The interaction between sport type and NCAA Division was significant for all organizational justice components. Division I men's basketball coaches perceived all organizational justice components higher than Division III coaches. Division I wrestling coaches' perceived all organizational justice components lower than Division III coaches. Division I baseball coaches perceived higher levels of procedural and distributive justice but lower levels of

interactional justice than Division III coaches. The interaction between sport type and job title revealed significant differences in only interactional justice. While head baseball coaches perceived higher levels of interactional justice than assistant coaches, both men's basketball and wrestling assistant coaches perceived higher levels than head coaches.

The results of the two factorial ANOVA procedures indicated all coaches perceived the same overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment regardless of sport type, NCAA Division, or job title.

A series of multiple regression analyses revealed different organizational justice components predicted both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In predicting overall job satisfaction among baseball and men's basketball coaches, both distributive and interactional justices were significant predictors. However, interactional justice was a stronger predictor for baseball coaches, while distributive justice was a stronger predictor for men's basketball coaches. Results for wrestling coaches revealed both procedural and distributive justice to be significant predictors, with procedural justice being the stronger predictor. Regarding predictors of organizational commitment among men's basketball and wrestling coaches, distributive justice was the single significant predictor. In contrast, procedural justice was the single significant predictor of organizational commitment among baseball coaches.

Finally, six factorial ANOVA analyses revealed significant main effects exist between all organizational justice components and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These results indicate coaches who perceive high levels of organizational justice have significantly different levels of both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment, compared to coaches who have low perceptions of

organizational justice. Results did not indicate sport type to be a significant moderator. However, analyses of marginal means plots indicated several disordinal interactions. These interactions provide evidence that sport type does affect the relationship between organizational justice components and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSION

The purposes of the study were to: (a) determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among different types of intercollegiate male sport coaches (revenue-generating, non-revenue-generating-stable, and nonrevenue-generating-decline), (b) determine differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction, (c) determine differences in coaches' levels of overall organizational commitment, and (d) examine the relationship between organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Previous studies have examined organizational justice components, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate setting. However, no study has used sport type, based on revenue generation, as an independent variable to assess differences among any of these constructs. The current revenue structure of intercollegiate athletics has created a dichotomy of revenue generating and non-revenue generating sport programs. Coaches of these programs have experienced different organizational justices through organizational decisions like budget and sport sponsorship. Understanding the impact perceptions of organizational justice has on coaches of these programs is critical to organizational decision makers as these perceptions may affect both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The present study examined fairness perceptions of intercollegiate male sport coaches and the relationship of those perceptions with both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Study participants included head and assistant coaches of baseball, men's basketball, and wrestling programs from both NCAA Division I and III member institutions. Statistical procedures used to analyze the data included multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multiple regression. Chapter 4 described the statistical significance of these results. This chapter will discuss the theoretical significance, practical applications, and suggestions for future research based on the findings of the present study.

Findings and Theoretical Significance

The results of the present study allow researchers to interpret the findings from the four research questions as they apply to the intercollegiate athletics segment of the sport industry. The purpose of this discussion is to provide a rational understanding to the present study's research questions and results.

Coaches' Perceptions of Organizational Justice Components

The first purpose of the study was to determine if differences in coaches' perceptions of organizational justice were present among different categories of intercollegiate male sport coaches. The research questions used to address this purpose were: (a) Do perceptions of organizational justice differ among coaches of different sport types?, (b) Do perceptions of organizational justice differ by NCAA Division?, and (c) Do perceptions of organizational justice differ by coaching position?

The main effect results indicated no significant differences among the three independent variables. Regarding differences in coaching position and NCAA Division

the present findings are consistent with prior research which has found little difference in perceptions of fairness (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994b; Mahony, Hums, & Riemer, 2002, 2005; Patrick, Mahony, & Petrosko, 2008). However, the present study was the first to examine sport type based on revenue generation as an independent variable. The finding that sport type had no direct impact on justice perceptions indicates coaches of different sports perceive justice similarly. This is interesting given the business of intercollegiate athletics, especially at the Division I level, where revenue generating sports seem to receive greater distributions in the forms of salary, budget, etc. The fact that no differences were found could indicate coaches of different sports possibly accept the differences in distribution and therefore do not allow them to affect their justice perceptions. While no main effects among the independent variables were found, two interactional effects were found. The following sections will focus on interpreting these interactions.

Interactional effects between sport type and NCAA Division.

The disordinal interaction between sport type and NCAA Division provided three interpretations of the findings. First, procedural justice and distributive justice were perceived most similar by Division I and III baseball and men's basketball coaches, with Division I coaches perceiving higher levels of justice than Division III coaches. This finding is not surprising, given that baseball and men's basketball are both well supported among most Division I intercollegiate athletic departments. In addition, the gap between all justice components was greatest among Division I and III men's basketball coaches. A possible reason for the large gap could be the high level of support given to men's basketball programs at the Division I level inflates the perceived justice levels among

coaches, while the distribution of resources within Division III is more even among when compared to the other sports sponsored by the athletic department.

Second, Division III baseball coaches perceived higher interactional justice than Division I baseball coaches. This result could indicate that Division I baseball coaches have higher expectations of interactions given the amount of support offered to their programs. As mentioned above, many baseball programs receive a generous amount of support. However, the fairness of organizational interactions these coaches are experiencing appear to be less than expected, resulting in lower interactional justice perceptions compared to Division III baseball coaches. The size of the athletic department may be another indication of this finding. Division I athletic departments, on average, are larger than Division III athletic departments. As a result the division of labor is greater at the Division I level, resulting in potentially less interaction from organizational decision makers.

Finally, Division I wrestling coaches had lower perceptions than Division III wrestling coaches for all organizational justice components. One possible reason Division I wrestling coaches experience lower justice than Division III coaches is the past history of lower institutional support. Division I wrestling programs have experienced the greatest reduction of programs among NCAA male sports over the past 20 years (EADA, 2007). Dropping these programs has often been a result of decisions to budget more for programs with more revenue generating potential. This practice exemplifies the organizational direction of increased revenue, high commercialism, and emphasis on winning, that is projected by many Division I athletic departments. However, Division III athletic departments use elements of inclusion and participation in their mission as a basis

for decision making. Therefore, fewer Division III wrestling programs have been dropped which may reflect the coaches' higher perceptions of all organizational justice components.

Interactional effects between sport type and job title.

A disordinal interaction effect between sport type and job title on interactional justice perceptions was found between sport type and job title. Results indicated head baseball coaches perceived higher levels of interactional justice than assistant baseball coaches. However, for men's basketball and wrestling, assistant coaches perceived higher levels of interactional justice than head coaches. These findings are interesting when examining the hierarchy of intercollegiate athletic departments. Head coaches are more closely connected than assistant coaches to decision makers within athletic departments. This would lead one to infer that head coaches may have a higher perception of interactional justice based solely on their hierarchical position within the athletic department. However, the finding that assistant coaches of men's basketball and wrestling perceive higher levels of interactional justice prompts discussion for understanding how assistant coaches interpret interactional justice.

An explanation to this finding could be based on the type of interactions assistant coaches have with athletic department decision makers. Since the head coach is ultimately responsible for a program's success, their interactions with athletic department decision makers may incorporate more organizational discussions including team performance, personnel, program budget, academics, or community involvement. Assistant coaches' interactions with athletic department decision makers may be limited to discussions not pertinent to the job or organization (e.g., social interactions).

Another explanation to this finding could be assistant coaches assessing interactional justice based on their direct superior, the head coach, instead of athletic department decision makers. Assistant coaches will likely have daily interactions with head coaches on topics including both organizational and social interactions. Head coaches, however, will likely have fewer interactions with athletic decision makers. This difference in the coaches' assessment of interaction could explain why assistant coaches experience higher levels of interactional justice. These findings provide more evidence of the necessity to examine interactional justice, not only as an independent organizational component, but also potential types of interactions that may play a role in how coaches' perceive justice.

Coaches' Levels of Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The second and third purposes of the study were to determine if differences in coaches' levels of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment were present among different categories of intercollegiate male sport coaches. The research questions used to address these purposes were: (a) Does overall job satisfaction differ among coaches of different sport types?, (b) Does overall job satisfaction differ by NCAA Division?, (c) Does overall job satisfaction differ by coaching position?, (d) Does organizational commitment differ among coaches of different sport types?, (e) Does organizational commitment differ by NCAA Division?, and (f) Does organizational commitment differ by coaching position?

Main effects of overall job satisfaction.

Most of the literature on job satisfaction in the intercollegiate athletics setting has focused on the satisfaction facets of the coach, rather than overall job satisfaction. Prior

research has shown intercollegiate coaches differ on several facets of job satisfaction, including: (a) job performance (Ritter, 1974), (b) work and supervision (Snyder, 1985), (c) leadership behavior and organizational climate (Snyder, 1990), and (d) amount of work (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003). While these finding offer unique contributions to the literature, facet-based models of satisfaction only address how the respondent feels about a particular facet of the job, not the job as a whole. An individual may determine his/her overall job satisfaction using a combination of facets, both positive and negative. While prior studies have shown coaches to differ on facets of job satisfaction, the present study indicates the job of coaching intercollegiate athletics overall is quite satisfying.

Results of the present study indicated only 12 of 232 coaches responded as being dissatisfied with their job. Overall satisfaction was determined by the summed scores for the Job In General (JIG) scale. Respondents scoring 27 or higher were deemed satisfied while respondents scoring below 27 were deemed dissatisfied. This finding indicates the job of coaching intercollegiate athletics overall is satisfying. An explanation for this result may be due to the use of an overall scale. An overall scale approach to satisfaction allows the respondent to dictate what facets affect his/her perception of satisfaction. While prior studies have indicated coaches differ on facets of job satisfaction, facets in which coaches are the same may contribute more to the overall satisfaction of the coach. It is also possible facet-based models used in prior research are simply inadequate in assessing overall satisfaction by being unable to incorporate all facets necessary to examine overall job satisfaction. Therefore, the present study provides evidence that coaches perceive the overall job of coaching intercollegiate athletics as satisfying.

The main effects of overall job satisfaction indicated no significant differences among coaches' overall job satisfaction based on sport type, NCAA Division, or jot title. Each of the selected independent variables contained elements of potential differences in the job of coaching. Coaches of different sport types may have different resources to perform their job. Differences in the mission of NCAA Divisions may dictate how a coach is to perform his/her job. Job title may specifically indicate the job description and expectation of being a coach. While each of these variables contain potential attributes that may affect the job of coaching, this result appears to indicate that while attributes of coaching intercollegiate athletics may be different, the effect they have on overall satisfaction is not significant to alter the coaches' overall perception of satisfaction.

Main effects of organizational commitment.

Prior research centered on a foci approach to commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Similar to studies examining facets of job satisfaction, the foci approach to commitment does not address all the components from which an individual derives commitment. These studies offered few practical implications to the intercollegiate sport setting as they can only address the specific foci included in those studies. The purpose of the present study was to examine the construct of commitment from a global perspective, enabling the researcher to provide more global practical applications to the athletic department as a whole.

The present study found no significant differences among coaches' organizational commitment based on sport type, NCAA Division, or job title. To explain this finding, the researcher offers two potential explanations. First, coaches' commitment to the organization may not be based on characteristics of the job. Sport types and job title were used as grouping variables in the present study. These variables are characteristics of the job and not the organization. It appears these job characteristics do not play a role in contributing to organizational commitment among intercollegiate coaches.

Second, the present study used NCAA Division as a grouping variable. The findings indicate coaches of different NCAA Divisions do not have significantly different perceptions of organizational commitment. This is interesting given the differences in NCAA Divisions is related to the role athletics has within the institution. Division I institutions focus on athletics as a revenue generator in order to afford larger facilities, athletic scholarships, and high salary coaching staffs. Division III institutions tie athletics more closely to education and focus on creating opportunities for participation. These differences in the organizational purpose of athletics within the overall institution would seem to indicate possible differences in coaches' organizational commitment. However, results indicated mean commitment levels to be high for both NCAA Divisions (Division I = 4.0698, Division III = 4.1474) and no significant difference between the two Divisions. This finding seems to indicate coaches of intercollegiate athletics are highly commitment regardless of NCAA Division. An explanation to this finding may be that coaches choose specific jobs based on his/her individual understanding and agreement with the institutional mission and the role athletics has within the institution.

The Relationship between Organizational Justice Components and Both Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The fourth purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between organizational justice, and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on sport type. The research questions used to address this purpose were: (a) which

organizational justice components best predict overall job satisfaction for coaches of each sport type?, and (b) which organizational justice components best predict overall organizational commitment for coaches of each sport type?

The present study used six multiple regression analyses to determine which organizational components best predicted both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among sport types. The findings of these analyses indicated the following: (a) each sport type had a different main contributor to predicting overall job satisfaction, (b) distributive justice was a unique predictor of overall job satisfaction among all sport types, and (c) only one organizational justice component for each sport type was a unique contributor in predicting organizational commitment.

Predictors of overall job satisfaction.

The findings of the present study indicated organizational justice components contributed significantly to the variance in overall job satisfaction. More specifically, each sport type had a different main contributor in predicting overall job satisfaction. This finding offers three contributions to the literature on organizational justice in intercollegiate athletics. First, the combination of organizational justice components accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall job satisfaction for each sport type. Organizational justice components accounted for 45% of the variance in overall job satisfaction for baseball coaches, 38% for men's basketball coaches, and 32% for wrestling coaches. These results support prior research indicating perceptions of fairness in organizational policies, resource distribution, and interactions uniquely contribute to perceptions of overall job satisfaction (Martin & Bennett, 1996; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Schappe, 1998). In the intercollegiate athletics literature, the present study's use of

multiple sport types further expands on prior studies that have focused on coaches of one sport (Jordan, 2001).

Second, interactional justice was shown to be the strongest predictor of overall job satisfaction among baseball coaches. Prior research has argued whether interactional justice is a unique component (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1997) or a sub-component to procedural justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Moorman, 1991). The findings of the present study support the argument that interactional justice is a unique organizational justice component in intercollegiate athletics. This finding is also unique in that prior studies have found only procedural justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Moorman, 1991), distributive justice (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Schappe, 1998) or a combination of both (Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996) to be a predictor of overall job satisfaction.

Finally, based on sport type, male coaches used perceptions of justice differently in determining their overall job satisfaction. Baseball coaches indicated interactional justice was the highest contributor to overall job satisfaction, while men's basketball coaches indicated distributive justice, and wrestling coaches indicated procedural justice. These findings indicate perceptions of justice may be sport specific to the effect on job satisfaction. As the focus of intercollegiate athletics typically hovers around the topic of resource distribution, athletic decision makers need to have the ability to understand how organizational justice decisions affect perceptions of satisfaction through means other than resource allocation. This finding should be a consideration among all intercollegiate

athletic decision makers as resource decisions could affect the satisfaction levels of all coaches within their organization.

Predictors of organizational commitment.

The findings of the present study also indicated one organizational justice component uniquely contributed to predicting organizational commitment for each sport type used in the study. This finding offers several unique considerations. First, distributive justice was the strongest predictor of both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among men's basketball coaches. Second, wrestling coaches indicated distributive justice was the single predictor of organizational commitment and both procedural justice and distributive justice were predictors of overall job satisfaction. Finally, baseball coaches indicated procedural justice was the single predictor of organizational commitment and indicated both distributive and interactional justice were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction. Collectively these findings indicate the impact of organizational justice on both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment differs for coaches of different sport types.

Perceptions of organizational justice components among male sport coaches predict overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment differently. As stated prior, resource allocation is often discussed as a mechanism for satisfaction and commitment among coaches. However, the present study indicates athletic decision makers must focus on all three organizational components, as each effects satisfaction and commitment differently among different sports. In practice, athletic decision makers do not necessarily need to focus on increasing resource distribution to non-revenuegenerating coaches, rather they need to focus on establishment of fair policy and

constructive interaction to positively affect overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The Effect Sport Type has on the Relationship between Organizational Justice Components and both Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The final purpose of the present study was to determine if sport type moderated the relationship between organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The research questions used to address this purpose were: (a) does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice and overall job satisfaction?, and (b) does sport type moderate the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment?

The present study used six 3x2 ANOVA procedures to determine if sport type moderated the relationship between each organizational justice component and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The independent variables for these ANOVA procedures included three levels of sport type (revenue generating, nonrevenue-generating-stable, and non-revenue-generating-unstable), two levels of each organizational justice component (procedural, distributive, and interactional) separated by high and low respondents. The high and low separation was based on the median split for each organizational justice component. The findings of these analyses indicated the following: (a) differences existed among all organizational justice components for overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and (b) while sport type did not significantly moderate the relationship between distributive justice and overall job satisfaction, marginal means plots did indicate a small interaction to be present. These results provided unique contributions to the literature on the relationship between

organizational justice components and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment within the intercollegiate athletic setting.

The first finding indicated differences existed between coaches who perceived high and low levels of organizational justice among all organizational justice components for both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This indicated coaches with higher perceptions of organizational justice have significantly higher perceptions of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The second finding indicated sport type affected the interaction between each organizational justice component and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. While the ANOVA analysis did not reveal the interactions to be significant, the analysis of the marginal means plots showed sport type did affect the relationships. Specifically, the interactions of procedural justice and interactional justice with both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment were disordinal, while the interactions of distributive justice were ordinal. This finding indicates as perceptions of organizational justice increase, the increase in either overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment is somewhat dependent upon sport type.

The theoretical significance of these findings contribute to the literature as no study has yet examined the relationship of organizational justice and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment using sport type based on revenue generation as a moderating variable. This contribution to the literature opens a path for future studies to further investigate the distinction of sport types and how decisions of justice affect coaches' perceptions of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Practical Applications of New Findings

The present study revealed several findings that have been discussed as they pertain to the existing literature. The purpose of this section is to address the new findings and provide a discussion of the practical applications within the intercollegiate athletics setting. Three new findings of the present study will be discussed: (a) organizational justice components predict overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment differently for male sport coaches, (b) interactional justice was supported as an independent component of organizational justice, and (c) interaction in the relationship between organizational justice components and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on sport type.

Understanding Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The present study revealed organizational justice components predicted overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment differently for male sport coaches. Perceptions of multiple organizational justice components appear to uniquely contribute to predicting overall job satisfaction. Baseball coaches indicated interactional justice as the most significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. Men's basketball coaches indicated distributive justice was the most significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. While, wrestling coaches indicated procedural justice was the most significant predictor of overall job satisfaction.

Practical applications of this finding are challenging for athletic department decision makers in that each sport type appears to perceive overall job satisfaction in different ways. While the focus of intercollegiate athletics typically hovers around the topic of resource distribution, the present study found perceptions of overall job satisfaction was most influenced by procedural and interactional justice for non-revenue sport coaches. Therefore, athletic decision makers do not necessarily need to focus on increasing resource distribution, rather they need to focus on establishment of fair policy and engaging in interaction with their non-revenue-generating sport coaches.

Athletic decision makers focused on enhancing overall job satisfaction of baseball coaches, should engage in social interactions with the baseball coaches. This can be done though formal social engagements like company picnics or less formal "water cooler" discussions about topic not related to the organization but meaningful to the coaches. Finally, athletic decision makers should provide consistent and truthful interactional experiences to baseball coaches. Bies and Moag (1986) identified that truthfulness and consistency were the two most rated qualities affecting perceptions of interactions.

For basketball coaches, athletic department decision makers should focus on perceptions of resource allocation practices. However, the present study did not examine types of resource distribution (i.e. equity, equality, and need) identified in prior research (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a). An understanding of which resource distribution type respondents of the present study were basing their perception of distributive justice could change the managerial approach of resource allocation for athletic decision makers. For example, if basketball coaches, in this study, were basing their answers on equitable distribution, then athletic decision makers should allocate resources to those programs that generate revenue (e.g. men's basketball). If men's basketball coaches were basing their answers on distribution of need, then men's basketball coaches were indicating their acceptance of resource distribution to programs in need of resource assistance (e.g. wrestling). These examples offer very different managerial approaches for athletic

department decision maker wanting to enhance the overall job satisfaction of men's basketball coaches. Yet, a consistent approach athletic decision makers can use is to ensure resource distribution is linked to outcomes of a program as individual perceptions of distributive justice are based on the fairness of the input of the individual to the output of the organization.

Finally, athletic department decision makers wanting to enhance the overall job satisfaction of wrestling coaches should focus on establishment and practice of fair organizational policy. This can be done by integrating organizational support with sport type, ensuring organizational policy does not contribute to unfair resource allocation, and by making fair policy development a continuing practice within the athletic department. Another practical application would be to allow wrestling coaches the ability to contribute in organizational decision making. Allowing wrestling coaches a voice in both program and organizational decision making will enhance the coach's perception of organizational justice as they will feel as though they contributed to the overall discussion of organizational issues.

Organizational justice components also appear to uniquely contribute to organizational commitment among intercollegiate coaches. Revenue generating and nonrevenue generating-decline coaches indicated only distributive justice predicted organizational commitment, while non-revenue-generating-stable coaches indicated only procedural justice was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Athletic decision makers should therefore make efforts to apply formal organizational policies aimed at fairly distributing resources throughout the organization when trying to enhance organizational commitment among coaches.

For example athletic department decision makers can create policies combine resource distribution to specific commitment outcomes (e.g. performance, withdrawal behaviors, turnover). Turner and Chelladurai (2005) showed performance significantly contributed to organizational commitment in the intercollegiate athletics setting. Therefore, athletic department decision makers can establish policies that stipulate pay (i.e. resource distribution) be closely tied to performance (e.g. winning record, championships, graduation rates). Organizational practices like these may result in coaches having higher perceptions of both procedural and distributive justice, which may correlate higher with commitment than coaches whose pay is not tied to performance (e.g. salary). However, it is important to note, organizational practices like these are currently being used in the intercollegiate athletics setting. The issue is that the percentage of pay attributed to performance is often small in comparison to guaranteed compensation. Athletic department decision makers wanting to increase both perceptions of organizational justice and organizational commitment should strive to create policy increasing resource distribution that is correlated with commitment outcomes like performance.

A difference between the practical applications for enhancing overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment is the exclusion of interactional justice as a predictor of overall job satisfaction. Procedural and distributive justice components are unique in that they can be objectively measured. Establishing formal policies and distributing resources are both variables athletic department decision makers can objectively communicate to employees. However, interactional justice is more subjective in nature where "people are sensitive to the quality of interpersonal treatment" (Bies &
Moag, 1986, p.44). The quality of the treatment can be perceived in a number of different forms such as the type of information, method of communication, and tone (Chelladurai, 1999). Therefore, athletic department decision makers wishing to enhance organizational commitment among coaches can take a more objective approach in showing how fairness has been implemented within the athletic department. However, this may not be as successful for enhancing job satisfaction among baseball and men's basketball coaches as interactional justice was found to be a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. This is especially true for baseball coaches who indicated interactional justice as the strongest predictor of overall job satisfaction.

Athletic department decision makers can also take a more global approach. The complexity among overall job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational justice components causes a need for athletic department decision makers to be very organized as they try to impact organizational justice perceptions within their athletic department. This can be done by creating a system of scoring or tracking how each organizational justice component is communicated to each individual coach. A system such as this can provide an athletic department decision maker a visual mechanism for creating the organization's strategy and objectives. It can also be used by the coach to understand and hold athletic department decision makers accountable for their decisions.

Interactional Justice as an Independent Component of Organizational Justice within Intercollegiate Athletics

The present study also supported the use of interactional justice as an independent component of organizational justice within intercollegiate athletics. Prior studies have

debated whether interactional justice is an independent organizational justice component (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1997) or a subcomponent to procedural justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Moorman, 1991). The present study included several findings supporting the use of interactional justice as an independent organizational justice variable in the intercollegiate athletics setting. The present study found interactions between both sport type and NCAA Division and sport type and job title to be significant in coaches' perceptions of interactional justice. Also, unique contributions of interactional justice were found when predicting overall job satisfaction among baseball coaches. Each of these findings provides evidence that athletic department decision makers need to consider their interactions with sport coaches in order to enhance perceptions of fairness.

A unique aspect of the interactional justice component is the subjective nature perceptions are based on. Resource distribution and policy development can be clearly measured making these variables more objective in nature. Altering the organizational practices of these organizational justice components would mean changes must be made in ways (e.g. budget, personnel, policy, etc.) that impact the organization and its direction. However, the subjective nature of interactional justice allows athletic department decision makers the opportunity to enhance coaches' perceptions of fairness more easily from a managerial perspective.

Athletic department decision makers can take a number of different approaches to increase positive perceptions of interactional justice. Bies & Moag (1986) identified four interactional characteristics that positively enhance an employee's interactional justice perceptions: (a) truthfulness, (b) justification, (c) respect, and (d) propriety. Outside of

the athletic setting, truthfulness has been identified as having more impact on perceptions of interactional justice. Athletic department decision makers should focus their efforts on being truthful in their interactions with coaches.

Athletic department decision makers can also increase positive interactional justice perceptions by simply altering topics of conversation, using a different tone in communicating, or increasing frequency of interaction. Each of these suggestions is cost effective and has little risk for major organizational change, yet provides opportunities for athletic department decision makers to have lasting impacts on coaches' perceptions of fairness.

It must be pointed out that while interactional justice is subjective and can be altered with little objective impact on the organization, the practice of implementing changes to interactions is not easy. Each athletic department decision maker is different in his/her managerial approach and the personality makeup of each athletic organization is different as well. These organizational conditions make the job of altering interactional practices difficult for some athletic department decision makers. Some athletic department decision makers may be intimidated or fearful of changing their interactional approach to particular coaches within the organization. Other athletic decision makers may have differing personal opinions from their coaches that may affect the interactions. Also, some athletic decision makers may simply lack the ability to initiate alternative approaches to interacting with coaches. To some athletic decision makers, these limitations may contribute to the potential inability to enhance their interactional relationship with coaches. This point must not be taken as a reason for not changing the interactional climate of an athletic department, but rather an understanding of the

necessity to recognize the importance of making an effort to control perceptions of interactional justice within intercollegiate athletics.

The Effect of Sport Type on the Relationship between Organizational Justice Components and Both Overall Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

A new finding in the present study was that sport type contributed to the differences in perceptions of organizational justice. These findings are unique as this was the first study to explore categorizing of sport type by revenue generation as a potential moderating variable. While the findings did not indicate sport type to be a significant moderator, the contribution of sport type to differences in perceptions offers implications for athletic department decision makers.

Athletic department decision makers need to understand how perceptions of organizational justice affect coaches of sports with different revenue generating potential. Coaches of different sport types indicated perceptions of organizational justice affected their perceptions of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment in different ways. Understanding these differing affects can allow athletic decision makers the opportunity to better convey organizational decisions that ultimately affect each sport program within the athletic department and result in positive organizational outcomes (e.g. low turnover and higher productivity). The present study presents an initial profile of how perceptions of organizational justice affect overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment by sport type. Revenue generating sport coaches indicated distributive justice was the strongest predictor of both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Non-revenue generating-stable coaches indicated interactional justice was the strongest predictor of overall job satisfaction, while

procedural justice was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment. Nonrevenue-generating-decline coaches indicated procedural justice was the strongest predictor of overall job satisfaction, while distributive justice was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment. Athletic department decision makers can use profiles such as these to convey organizational decisions to different sport types, rather than individual sports teams.

An example of an organizational practice athletic department decision makers can use, to affect organizational justice perceptions, is the implementation of a rotating decision making model. With a rotating decision making model, the beneficiary of the decisions changes from decision to decision. In intercollegiate athletics, the trend has shown revenue-generating sport programs are often the beneficiary of organizational decisions, especially within Division I institutions. This is evident in the present findings indicating perceptions of distributive justice most strongly predict both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among revenue generating coaches. However, the present findings indicate decision making practices such as these do not significantly affect overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment in the same way for non-revenue-generating-stable or non-revenue-generating-decline coaches. Therefore, athletic department decision makers should seek to use decision making models that affect all sport types in a positive manner. A specific example can be offered by setting policy dictating the buying of new equipment for all sport programs based solely on a rotating schedule. Decision making models such as this eventually benefits all sport programs and relates to all organizational justice components.

The use of rotating decision making practices over time has many benefits for an athletic department decision maker. However, this practice is not always the most beneficial for the organization's objectives. As previously stated, the trend in Division I athletic departments is to make decisions benefiting sport programs with more revenue generating potential. Division I institutions appear to be in an arms race to acquire resources that allow their sport programs the ability to compete in recruiting the best players, attracting the best coaches, and generating the most revenue. Rotating decision making practices are not always the most appropriate for all decisions. However, athletic department decision makers should attempt to institute decision making practices that spread benefits over all sport types, as these practices will positively affect organizational justice perceptions.

Suggestions for Future Research

The present study aimed to contribute to the literature on organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment within the intercollegiate athletics setting. While some study findings were aligned with the literature and the results offered practical applications, areas of future research also emerged. The following section will detail three areas scholars should address in the future to better understand the complex relationship of organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate athletics setting.

Future Investigations of Interactional Justice

Future research on organizational justice in intercollegiate athletics should focus on further investigation of interactional justice as a unique component of organizational justice. The current literature on interactional justice is scarce compared to the literature on procedural and distributive justice. A reason for this may be the debate over interactional justice as a unique component of organizational justice. The present findings offer support for the use of interactional justice as a unique component. Further, the present research supports the theory of Bies and Moag (1986) that interactional justice may actually be a larger component with several sub-components. Future research should take a similar approach to the literature on distributive justice (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994a) by examining potential sub-components such as interpersonal and informational interactions. Research of this type could identify different types of interactions (e.g. social or informational) which will provide athletic department decision makers a deeper understanding of how their interactions with coaches affect both satisfaction and commitment.

Defining Sport Type in Intercollegiate Athletics

The findings of the present study supported the rationale of using revenue generation of sport programs as a means of defining sport type. Sport type significantly interacted with both NCAA Division and job title on coaches' perceptions of organizational justice components. Sport type also indicated interactions between organizational justice perceptions and both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment exist. Future studies should focus on further defining sport type based on revenue generation. The present study was only a snapshot of the intercollegiate athletics setting. If the current trends in resource distribution practices of intercollegiate athletic departments continue, a longitudinal approach of measuring perceptions of fairness can provide data on how the growing gap between revenue generating and non-revenuegenerating sport programs might affect coaches' perceptions of organizational justice

Future studies should also incorporate women's teams. The current literature provides little information on the perceptions of coaches of women's teams. While defining sport type by revenue generation limits the use of women's teams, as they are all traditionally non-revenue sport programs, some cases do exist where women's programs are a significant revenue generator for the athletic department (e.g. Tennessee women's basketball). Future research could provide a more comprehensive understanding of fairness perceptions and their impact on satisfaction and commitment within the intercollegiate athletics setting as they would incorporate a more complete makeup of athletic departments that have both male and female coaches. This data could also be used to compare not only female and male coaches but coaches of female and male sport teams.

Applications of Organizational Justice Outside Intercollegiate Athletics

The present study found unique contributions of organizational justice components on coaches' perceptions of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate sport setting. The findings provide support for studies examining these variables outside of intercollegiate athletics. Potential areas outside of intercollegiate athletics include: (a) international sport, (b) high school sport, (c) sport for development programs, and (d) recreational sport programs.

International sport studies can evaluate organizational justice perceptions within club teams. The club system used by many European sport's is quite different form intercollegiate athletics, in that opportunities for participation are provided for many skill levels (i.e. amateur and professional) and membership largely consists of habitants of the

local community. Studies can expand the research by examining perceptions of fairness by coaches, players, and the community.

High school sport studies can also examine the perceptions of coaches. The unique difference in examining coaches' perceptions of organizational justice at the high school level is that many coaches are also faculty members. As a faculty member first, and coach second, decisions that affect organizational justice may play a different role in contributing to the overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Understanding how these perceptions affect overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be beneficial to both athletic directors and principles of high schools.

Sport for development studies should focus on citizens' perceptions of fairness and the affect on satisfaction with and commitment to, national sport teams. Decision makers of sport development programs can use results to reduce the risk in decision making as an effort to enhance social movement through sport programming

Finally, future studies with recreational sport organizations should focus on parental perceptions of fairness. As many parents make the decisions for their child's participation in a particular sport, the importance of understanding perceptions of fairness, satisfaction, and commitment are imperative to participant retention. The potential for future studies outside of intercollegiate athletics is great as the body of literature on these other sport segments is small.

Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship among organizational justice components, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment within the intercollegiate athletics setting. Perceptions of three

organizational justice components (procedural, distributive, and interactional), overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were gathered from head and assistant coaches of NCAA Division I and III baseball, men's basketball, and wrestling programs. Findings indicated the following: (a) significant interactional effects were found between sport type and NCAA Division, (b) a significant interactional effect was found between sport type and job title, (c) no significant differences were present on perceptions of overall job satisfaction or organizational commitment, (d) different organizational justice components contributed uniquely to predicting both overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment among all sport types, and (e) while sport type did not significantly moderate the relationship between distributive justice and overall job satisfaction, marginal means plots did indicate interactions to be present.

These findings contribute to the existing literature on organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the intercollegiate athletics setting. These findings also provide suggestions for practical application by athletic department decision makers, including: (a) focus on interactions with coaches, (b) develop a scoring or tracking system of organizational justice components, and (c) segment sports based on revenue generation. Finally, the present study provides three suggestions for future research: (a) expand the literature of interactional justice, (b) further define of sport type based on revenue generation, and (c) examine these variables outside of intercollegiate athletics.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, E., Cutler, H. A., Kautz, R. W., & Mendelson, M. (1958). Social power and commitment: A theoretical statement. *Sociological Review*, 23, 1, 15-22.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-36.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, *1*, 177-98.
- Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships among pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 8, 21-34.
- Balzer, W. K., Smith, K. C., Kravitz, D. A., Lovell, S. E., Paul, K. B., Reilly, B. A., & Reilly, C. E. (1990). User's manual for the job descriptive index (JDI) and the job in general (JIG) scales. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Becker, H. S., (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32-40.
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? Academy of Management Journal, 35, 232-244.
- Becker, H. S. & Carper, J. (1956). The elements of identification with an occupation. *American Sociological Review*, 21, 341-348.

- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations: Vol. 1*, 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. Academy of Management Journal, 31, 676-85
- Bies, R. J., Shapiro, D. L., & Cummings, L. L. (1988). Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: Is it enough to say it's not my fault? *Communication Research*, 15, 381-99.
- Blau, G. J., Paul, A., & St. John, N. (1993). On developing a general index of work commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 298-314.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Building organizational commitment: A multi-firm study. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 245-261.
- Carpenter, P. J., Scanlan, T. K., Simons, J. P., & Lobel, M. (1993). A test of the sport commitment model using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 15, 119-33.
- Chassie, M., & Bhagat, R. S. (1980). Role stress in working women: Differential effect on selected organizational outcomes. *Group and Organization Studies*, *5*, 224-233.
- Chelladurai, P. (1985). Sport management: Macro perspectives. London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999). Human resource management in sport and recreation. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Chelladurai, P. & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 63-72.
- Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1997). A classification of facets of athlete satisfaction. Journal of Sport Management, 11, 133-59.
- Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hui, H. (1998). Deciding on equity or parity: A test of situational cultural and individual factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 115-29.

- Cohen, A. & Lowenberg, G. (1990). A re-examination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 1015-1050.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A metaanalysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86, 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52
- Cowherd, D.M., & Levine, D.I. (1992). Product quality and pay equity between lowerlevel employees and top management: An investigation of distributive justice theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*, 302-321.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). Job satisfaction: How people fell about their jobs and how it affects their performance. New York: Lexington Books.
- Cremer, D. D. (2005). Procedural and distributive justice effects moderated by organizational identification. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20, 4-13
- Cropanzano, R., & Floger, R. (1989). Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy: Beyond equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 293-99.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. G. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. cooper & I. T. Roberson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 12, 317-372. New York: John Wiley.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2004). Group diversity, occupational commitment, and occupational turnover intentions among NCAA division IA football coaching staffs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 236-254.
- Dailey, R. C., & Krik, D. J. (1992). Distributive justice and procedural justice as antecedents of job satisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45, 305-317.
- Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1964). A psychological theory of work adjustment. In *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, XV. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, Work Adjustment Project.

- Dawis, R. V. & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual-differences model and its applications. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-49.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dipboye, R. L., & de Pontbriand, R. (1981). Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 248-51.
- Dittmore, S. W. (2006). Examining fairness perceptions of financial resource allocations in U.S. Olympic sport. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.
- Dixon, M. A., Cunningham, G. B., Turner, B. A., Sagas, M., & Kent, A. (2005). Challenge is key: An investigation of organizational commitment in interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80, 172-180.
- EADA. (2008). The equity in athletics data analysis cutting tool: Get aggregated data for a group of institutions. Retrieved from http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/GetAggregatedData.aspx
- Evans, V. (1983). Differences in job satisfaction of athletic coaches in revenue and nonrevenue sports. Presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance Conference. Minneapolis, MN.
- Fields, D.L. (2002). Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ferber, M. A. (1974). Professors, performance, and rewards. *Industrial Relations, 31*, 69-77.
- Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Field, R., & Abelson, M. (1982). Climate: A reconceptualization and proposed model. *Human Relations*, 35, 181-201.

- Folger R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reaction to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-30.
- Fox, J. (1991). Regression diagnostics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Garland, H. (1973). The effects of piece-rate underpayment and overpayment on job performance: A test of equity theory with a new induction procedure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *3*, 325-34.
- Gellatly, I. R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *16*, 469-485.
- Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33 (1), 61-81.
- Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2004). *Research methods for sport studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Greenberg, J. G. (1978). Equity, motivation and effects of past reward on allocation decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4,* 131-134.
- Greenberg, J. G. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 340-42.
- Greenberg, J. G. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12, 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. G. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. G., & Colquitt, J. A. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Greenberg, J. G., & Leventhal, G. S. (1976). Equity and the use of over reward to motivate performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 179-190.
- Gregorio, D. I., Lewis, L. S., & Wanner, R. A. (1982). Assessing merit and need: Distributive justice and salary attainment in academia. *Social Science Quarterly*, 63, 489-505.
- Hacket, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23

Halpin, A. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan.

- Hendon, C. F. (1983). Job satisfaction of softball coaches at California two-year colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Ugene.
- Hertzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Homans, G. C. (1982). In J. Greenberg and R.L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Howe, I., & Coser, L. (1957). *The American Communist Party: A critical history, 1919-*57. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hums, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1994a). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: Development of an instrument. *Journal of Sport Management 8 (3)*, 190-99.
- Hums, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1994b). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: The views of NCAA coaches and administrators. *Journal of Sport Management* 8, 200-17.
- Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M. & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 193-200.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. (1996). Understanding retention factors in coaching and athletic management positions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 237-49.
- Jordan, J. (2001). The relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction: An examination of NCAA basketball coaches. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Jordan, J. S., Gillentine, J. A., & Hunt, B. P. (2004). The influence of fairness: The application of organizational justice in a team sport setting. *International Sports Journal*, *8*, 139-49.
- Jordan, J. S., Turner, B. A., & DuBord, R. R. (2007). Organizational justice as a predictor of satisfaction: An examination of university recreation department student employees. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 32-54.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.
- Kiesler, C. A. (1971). The psychology of commitment: Experiment linking behavior to belief. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Knoppers, A. (1992). Explaining male dominance and sex segregation in coaching: Three approaches. *Quest*, 44, 210-27.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698-708.
- Landy, F. J., Barnes, J. L., & Murphy, K. R. (1978). Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 751-54.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). Motivation in work organizations. Pacific Grove, CA: JAI Press.
- Lawler, E. J. (1992). Affective attachment to nested groups: A choice process theory. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 327-339.
- Leblicq, S., Hoecke, J. V., & Knop, P. D. (2002). Coach satisfaction in the traditional sport system. *International Journal of Sport Management*, *3*, 229-46.
- Lerner, M. J. (1975). The justice motive in social behavior: Introduction. *Journal of* Social Issues, 31, 1-19.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). Fairness in social relationships. In J. W. Thibaut, J. T. Spence, & R. C. Carson (Eds.), *Contemporary topics in social psychology* (pp.211-239). Morris town, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp.27-55). New York: Plenum.
- Li, M. (1993). Job satisfaction and performance of coaches of the spare-time sports schools in China. *Journal of Sport Management*, 7, 132-40.
- Litan, R. E., Orszag, J. M., & Orszag, P. R. (2003). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An interim report*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lowe, R. H., & Vodanovich, S. J. (1995). A field study of distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction and organizational commitment. Journal of Business and Psychology, 10, 99-114.

- Mahony, D. F., Hums, M. A., & Riemer, H. A. (2002). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of athletic directors and athletic board chairs. *Journal of Sport Management 16* (4), 331-55.
- Mahony, D. F., Hums, M. A., & Riemer, H. A. (2005). Bases for determine need: Perspectives of intercollegiate athletic directors and athletic board chairs. *Journal* of Sport Management, 19 (2), 170-192.
- Mahony, D. F., & Pastore, D. (1998). Distributive justice: An examination of participation opportunities, revenues, and expenses at NCAA institutions 1973-1993. Journal of Sport and Social Issues 22, 127-52.
- Mahony, D. F., Riemer, H. A., Breeding, J. L., Hums, M. A. (2006). Organizational justice in sport organizations: Perceptions of college athletes and other college students. *Journal of Sport Management 20*, 159 – 89.
- Martin, C., & Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group and Organization Management*, 21, 84-104.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 171-194.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual: applications in organizational settings* (Vol. 5, pp. 133-153). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50, 370-396.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictor of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 35, 626-37.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D (1997). Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 83-99.
- McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the affective and continuance commitment scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 638-642.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-51.
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 493-522.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-55.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. (1982). Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Muchinsky, P. (1977). An assessment of the Litwin and Stringer questionnaire. *Personnel Psychology*, 29, 371-92.
- Mullen, B J., Hardy, S., & Sutton, W. A. (2007). *Sport marketing*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- NCAA, (2008a). NCAA Sports sponsorship and participation rates report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- NCAA, (2008b). Schools sponsoring NCAA sports. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved July 24, 2008 from http://ncaa.org/sponsorships.

- NCAA, (2008c).2004-06 NCAA revenues and expenses of Division I intercollegiate athletics programs report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- NCAA. (2007). What's the difference between Divisions I, II and III? Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?key=/ncaa/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/membership/div_ criteria.html
- NCAA, (2005a). 2002-2003 Revenues and expenses of division I and II intercollegiate athletics programs report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- NCAA, (2005b). 2002-2003 Revenues and expenses of division III intercollegiate athletics programs report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy* of Management Journal, 36, 527-56.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 492-499.
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 487-499.
- Owens, R. (1981). Organizational behavior in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pastore, D. L. (1993). Job satisfaction and female college coaches. *Physical Educator*, 50, 216-221.
- Patrick, I. S. C., Mahony, D. F., & Petrosko, J. M. (2008). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: An examination of equality, revenue production, and need. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 165-84.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational Commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 59, 5, 603-609.
- Raedeke, T. D. (1997). Is athlete burnout more than just stress? A sport commitment perspective. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19, 396-347.

- Raedeke, T., Granzyk, T. L., & Warren, A. (2000) Why coaches experience burnout: A commitment perspective. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 22, 85-105.
- Raedeke, T. D., Warren, A. H., & Granzyk, T. L., (2002). Coaching commitment and turnover: A comparison of current and former coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73 (1), 73-86.
- Rahim, M., Magner, N., & Shapiro, D. (2000). Do justice perceptions influence styles of handling conflict with supervisors?: What justice perceptions, precisely? *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11, 9-13.
- Reichers, A. E. (1986). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10, 465-476.
- Reimer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998, June). Development of the athlete satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ). Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 20, 127-56.
- Ritter, J. E. Jr. (1974). Factors which affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of male and female interscholastic head coaches. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.
- Robinson, M., Tedrick, R., & Carpenter, R. (2001). Job satisfaction of NCAA Division III athletic directors: A descriptive analysis and an examination of gender differences. *International Sports Journal, Winter*, 25-32.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Farrell, D. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 429-439.
- Salancik, G. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief.
 In B. Staw & G. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior (pp. 1-54). Chicago: St. Clair.
- Scanlan, T. K., Carpenter, P. J., Simons, J. P., Schmidt, G. W., & Keeler, B. (1993a). An introduction to the sport commitment model. *Journal of sport & Exercise Psychology 15*, 1-15.
- Scanlan, T. K., Carpenter, P. J., Simons, J. P., Schmidt, G. W., & Keller, B. (1993b). The sport commitment model: Measurement development of the youth-sport domain. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 15, 16-38.
- Scanlan, T. K., Russell, D. G., Beals, K. P., & Scanlan, L. A. (2003a). Project on elite athlete commitment (PEAK): I. Introduction and methodology. *Journal of Sport* & Exercise Psychology, 25, 377-401.

- Scanlan, T. K., Russell, D. G., Beals, K. P., & Scanlan, L. A. (2003b). Project on elite athlete commitment (PEAK): II. A direct test and expansion of the sport commitment model with elite amateur sportsmen. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 25, 377-401.
- Schappe, S. (1998). Understanding employee job satisfaction: The importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *12*, 493-503.
- Selznick, P. (1953). TVA and the grass roots. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sheppard, B. H., & Lewicki, R. J., (1987). Toward general principles of managerial fairness. *Social Justice Research*, *1*, 161-76.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Snyder, C. J. (1985). The effects of organizational climate and leader behavior on coaches' job satisfaction in selected departments of intercollegiate athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Snyder, C. J. (1990). The effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 59-70.
- Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: an examination of direct and indirect effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *16*, 49-58.
- Steers, R. M., (1977). Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Stevens, J.P. (2002). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Stevenson, C. L. (1989). Perceptions of justice in the selection of national teams. Sociology of Sport Journal, 6, 371-379.
- Tang, T., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. SAM Advanced Management Journal, Summer, 25-31.
- Taylor, F. W., (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Norwood, MA: The Plimpton Press.

- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tornblom, K. Y., & Jonsson, D. S. (1985). Subrules of the equality and contribution principles: Their perceived fairness in distribution and retribution. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48, 249-61.
- Tornblom, K. Y., & Jonsson, D. S. (1987). Distribution vs. retribution: The perceived justice of the contribution and equality principles for cooperative and competitive relationships. *Acta Sociological*, *30*, 25-52.
- Tremblay, Sire, & Balkin (2000). The role of organizational justice in pay and employee benefits satisfaction, and its effects on work attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, 25, 269-290.
- Turner, B. A. (2001). *Commitment among intercollegiate athletic coaches*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Turner, B. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2005). Organizational and occupational commitment, intention to leave and perceived performance of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 179-197.
- Turner, B. A., & Jordan, J. S. (2006). Commitment and satisfaction of coaches: Which is more important in the retention and performance of coaches? *Journal of International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance, 42, 42-49.*
- Turner, B. A., Jordan, J. S., & DuBord, R. R. (2005). Retaining student workers: The importance of organizational commitment. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 29(2), 117-126
- Turner, B. A. & Pack, S. (2008). Multidimensional commitment of intercollegiate student-athletes: Its effects on intention to leave and satisfaction. *Journal for the Study of Sport and Athletes in Education 1 (3).*
- Tyler, T. R., (1984). The role of perceived injustice in defendants' evaluation of their courtroom experience. *Law and Society Review*, 18, 51-74.
- Tyler, T. R., & Caine, A. (1981). The influence of outcomes and procedures on satisfaction with formal leaders. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 642-55.
- Van Den Bos, K., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. (1997). Procedural and distributive justice: What is fair depends more on what comes first than on what comes next. *Journal* of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 95-104.

- Vogt, W. P. (1999). Dictionary of statistics & methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whisenant, W. (2005). Organizational justice and commitment in interscholastic sports. *Sport, Education and Society, 10,* 343-357.
- Whisenant, W., & Jordan, J. S. (2006). Organizational justice and team performance in interscholastic athletics. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 21, 55-82.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. Academy of Management Review 7, 418-428.
- Wilson, B. R. (1959). An analysis of sect development. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 3-15.
- Zhang, J. J., DeMichele, D. J., & Connaughton, D. P. (2004) Job satisfaction among midlevel collegiate campus recreation program administrators. *Journal for Sport Behavior*, 11 (2), 46-57.

APPENDICIES

.

APPENDIX A

PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A STUDY OF NCAA MEN'S SPORT COACHES

Thursday, April 15, 2010

Dear Participant:

You are being invited to participate in a research study by answering the attached survey about organizational justice perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics. There are no known risks for your participation in this research study. The information collected may not benefit you directly. The information learned in this study may be helpful to others. The information you provide will help decision makers within intercollegiate athletic programs understand how perceptions of organizational justice can affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Your completed survey will be stored at The University of Louisville. The survey will take approximately 10-15 of your time to complete.

Individuals from the Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Human Resource Education, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Human Subjects Protection Program Office (HSPPO), and other regulatory agencies may inspect these records. In all other respects, however, the data will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Should the data be published, your identity will not be disclosed.

Taking part in this study is voluntary. By completing this survey you agree to take part in this research study. You do not have to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to be in this study you may stop taking part at any time. If you decide not to be in this study or if you stop taking part at any time, you will not lose any benefits for which you may qualify.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research study, please contact: Dustin Thorn at (502) 852-5909 or Dr. Mary Hums at (502) 852-5908.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Human Subjects Protection Program Office at (502) 852-5188. You can discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject, in private, with a member of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may also call this number if you have other questions about the research, and you cannot reach the study doctor, or want to talk to someone else. The IRB is an independent committee made up of people from the University community, staff of the institutions, as well as people from the community not connected with these institutions. The IRB has reviewed this research study.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research or research staff and you do not wish to give your name, you may call 1-877-852-1167. This is a 24 hour hot line answered by people who do not work at the University of Louisville.

Sincerely,

Dustin Thorn Doctoral Candidate University of Louisville

Mary Hums, Ph.D. Professor University of Louisville

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEASURING ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION, AND OVERALL ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

<u>Part 1</u>

Please respond to the following questions by circling the appropriate responses or by writing in the space provided.

Age:	Gender:	Male	Fem	nale		
What is your ethnicity:	African Americ Asian Americ Caucasian/Wh Hispanic Native Americ Pacific Islande Other (please	ican/Black an hite can er specify): _				
What is the highest deg	ree you have?	High Sch Associate Bachelor Master's Doctoral	ool I e's D 's De Degi Degi	Diploma egree egree ree ree		
What sport do you coac	h? Baseball	Me	n's B	asketball	Wrestling	
What NCAA Division i	s your institute	a member	r of:	Division I	Division III	
What is your sport prog	ram's conferen	ice affiliat	ion: _			_?
Your job title: Head C	oach Assis	stant Coacl	h			
If you are an assistant c	oach, what leve	el of assist	ant c	oach are you?	Full-time Part-time Volunteer	
Number of years in curr	rent position: _		_			
Number of years with c	urrent organiza	tion:				
Total years of coaching	experience:		-			

<u>Part 2</u>

In this section we are interested in your opinion about the organization where you work. The following statements are related to a person's attitudes toward their perceptions of organizational justice. Please indicate the extent to which you **agree** or **disagree** with each of the statements by **circling** the appropriate choice on the right hand side (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). Your spontaneous and honest response to each item is critical to the study.

	Stro	ngiy d	isagre	e		Strong	giy Ag	гее
1.	My organization's formal decision-making procedures are carried out in the same way each time they are used.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	My organization has in place formal channels that allow employees to express their views and opinions before decisions are made.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I believe that my supervisor's actions show that s/he respects me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I believe that my rewards accurately reflect my contributions to the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Formal procedures exist in my organization to ensure that officials do not allow personal biases to affect their decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	There are formal means by which employees in my organization can challenge decisions that they feel are erroneous.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	The most productive employees in my organization receive the highest rewards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	The rewards I receive from my organization are in accord with my level of performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I believe that my organization provides me with the rewards I deserve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	I feel that my supervisor strives to be honest in his/her dealings with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	My supervisor treats me in a kindly manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	In my relationship with my supervisor, s/he shows a concern for the impact that her/his actions will have on me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13.	My supervisor behaves in a manner that demonstrates a regard for my personal dignity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	I feel that I receive adequate rewards from my organization when I consider the rewards that other employees receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	I am satisfied with the rewards I receive from my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	My supervisor behaves in a way that fosters trust on my part.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	My rewards are consistent with those I could get from other organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	All employees are treated similarly by the formal decision-making procedures that exist in my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	My organization's formal procedures ensure that decisions are made in an ethical and moral manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	My supervisor takes care to deal with me in a truthful manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	My organization has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information on which to base their decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	The rewards I receive from my organization meet my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	In dealings with my supervisor, I find him/her to be polite.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part 3

In this section we are interested in your opinion about your job in general. The following statements are related to a person's attitudes toward their perceptions of job satisfaction.

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? For each of the following words or phrases, circle:

.

- 1. For "YES" if it describes your job
- 2. For "NO" if it does not describe your job
- 3. For "?" if you cannot decide

Your spontaneous and honest response to each item is critical to the study.

	Ye	S	No	?
1.	Pleasant1		2	3
2.	Bad1		2	3
3.	Ideal1		2	3
4.	Waste of time1		2	3
5.	Good1		2	3
6.	Undesirable1		2	3
7.	Worthwhile1		2	3
8.	Worse than most1		2	3
9.	Acceptable1		2	3
10.	Superior1		2	3
11.	Better than most1		2	3
12.	Disagreeable1		2	3
13.	Makes me content1		2	3
14.	Inadequate1		2	3
15.	Excellent1		2	3
16.	Rotten1		2	3
17.	Enjoyable1		2	3
18.	Poor1		2	3

<u>Part 4</u>

In this section we are interested in your opinion about your commitment to your organization. The following statements are related to a person's attitudes toward their overall organizational commitment. Please indicate the extent to which you **agree** or **disagree** with each of the statements by **circling** the appropriate choice on the right hand side (1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree). Your spontaneous and honest response to each item is critical to the study.

	Stron	strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
1.	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my college/university.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2.	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this college/university.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3.	The college/university has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4.	I do not feel like "part of the family" at this college/university.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5.	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my working days with this college/university.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6.	I really feel as if the problems of this college/university are my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	

<u>Part 5</u>

The following space is provided for you to express opinions on organization justice, job satisfaction, or organizational commitment you may have. Please use this space to express any additional opinions that may not be conveyed by the questions already asked in the survey.

APPENDIX C

June 2, 2009

Dear Head/Assistant Coach,

Last week a questionnaire seeking your responses of fairness perception, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment was e-mailed to you. Your name was gathered from an NCAA database of head and assistant coaches of Men's Basketball, Baseball, and Wrestling programs of Division I and III institutions.

If you have already completed the questionnaire and submitted it through the website link,

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please try to find time to complete the survey. We are especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your perceptions that we can understand how fairness perceptions affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

If you did not receive a link to the questionnaire or the link did not work, please contact me immediately so that we may make the appropriate adjustments to allow you to contribute to the study.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Dustin Thorn Doctoral Candidate University of Louisville 502-852-5909 d.thorn@louisville.edu

APPENDIX D

April 15, 2010

Dear Head/Assistant Coach,

Two weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your responses of fairness perception, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment was e-mailed to you. Your name was gathered from an NCAA database of head and assistant coaches of Men's Basketball, Baseball, and Wrestling programs of Division I and III institutions.

If you have already completed the questionnaire and submitted it through the website link,

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please try to find time to complete the survey. We are especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your perceptions that we can understand how fairness perceptions affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

If you did not receive a link to the questionnaire or the link did not work, please contact me immediately so that we may make the appropriate adjustments to allow you to contribute to the study.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Dustin Thorn Doctoral Candidate University of Louisville 502-852-5909 d.thorn@louisville.edu

APPENDIX E

June 15, 2009

Dear Head/Assistant Coach,

During the past month we have sent you several e-mails regarding an important research study we are conducting at the University of Louisville.

The purpose of the study is to understand the fairness perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of head and assistant coaches in the intercollegiate setting.

The study is drawing to a close, and this is the last contact that will be made with the sample we consider relevant to the study.

We are sending this final contact by e-mail, again to help in the efficiency of administering the questionnaire and reduce the effort needed on your part to participate.

We wanted to again assure of the confidentiality of the responses taken from this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to answer questions or withdraw from completing the questionnaire at any time. Your answers will be completely confidential as the questionnaires will not be made available to anyone outside the study. Any discussion of results will be based on group data. It is estimated that the questionnaire will 10-15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, please follow the website instructions for submitting your questionnaire.

Finally, we appreciate your willingness to consider our request as we conclude this effort to better understand fairness perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among intercollegiate coaches. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dustin Thorn Doctoral Candidate University of Louisville 502-852-5909 d.thorn@louisville.edu
CURRICULM VITAE

Dustin F. Thorn

Curriculum Vitae

Work Address: Department of Health and Sport Sciences University of Louisville HP/Studio Arts Building, Room 104 Louisville, KY 40292 (502) 852-5909 – Office d.thorn@louisville.edu <u>Home Address:</u> 3002 Radiance Road Louisville, KY 40220 (502) 290-4077 – Home (502) 727-7137 – Cell dthorn17@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Educational Leadership & Organizational Development - Sport Administration University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Spring 2010

Dissertation Title: Perceptions of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics: A study of NCAA men's sport coaches. Chairpersons: Mary A. Hums, Ph.D., Daniel F. Mahony, Ph.D., & T. Christopher Greenwell, Ph.D. Defense Date: December 11, 2009

M.S. Sport Administration University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, May 2004

B.S. Business Management - Marketing Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, August 2001

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

Instructor, August 2005 – Present

Department of Health & Sport Sciences, Sport Administration Program University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

- Teach undergraduate courses in Principles of Sport Administration, Sport Marketing, Current Trends in Sport, Sport Governance, Financial Principles in Sport, & Event Management: Ryder Cup
- Advise approximately 90 undergraduate Sport Administration students
- Director of undergraduate and graduate Sport Administration Internships
- Faculty Advisor to the student guest liaisons for the 2008 Ryder Cup
- Participate in University, College, and Program recruiting
- Utilize multimedia teaching and academic tools such as Blackboard and PeopleSoft
- Assisted in curriculum modifications for undergraduate Sport Administration program
- Meet with prospective undergraduate students and parents

- Interview potential graduate students
- Attend and participate in all doctoral meetings with both current and incoming doctoral students

Graduate Assistant, August 2004 – July 2006

Center of Research in Mathematic & Science Teacher Development, College of Education University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

- Assessed middle-school math teacher development
- Helped develop middle and elementary math assessment tests
- Wrote statistical analysis for publication consideration

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

My teaching philosophy is to provide knowledge and experience in an environment most conducive to the learning process by creating a mutual relationship between the teacher and student. The function of the teacher is to provide the educational material in a manner aimed at stimulating the student to engage in a discussion. It is critical that the teacher continuously challenge the student to understand the material through thought and expression of personal views. The function of the student is to participate in the conversation/lecture, providing him/her the ability to complete the learning process through assimilating the information using both theoretical and practical application of the material. It is essential that the teacher use both a theoretical and practical approach to inform and assess the student. In a society driven by outcomes, it is necessary to concentrate on giving the student an understanding of both educational forms. I believe the establishment of the relationship described above is the most efficient method of teaching, providing utility to both the teacher and student.

TEACHING ACTIVITIES

University of Louisville

Undergraduate Courses Taught

SPAD 381 - Principles of Sport Administration

SPAD 383 - Sport Marketing

SPAD 384 - Current Trends in Sport

SPAD 390 - Sport Governance

SPAD 402 – Undergraduate Internship in Sport Administration

SPAD 404 – Financial Principles in Sport

SPAD 525 – Event Management: Ryder Cup

Graduate Courses Taught

SPAD 525 – Event Management: Ryder Cup SPAD 692 – Graduate Internship in Sport Administration

Courses Developed SPAD 525 – Event Management: Ryder Cup

Student Evaluations of Teaching (based on the Student Evaluation of Instruction, 5.0 maximum)

2009-2010 Academic Year – TBA 2008-2009 Academic Year – 3.9 2007-2008 Academic Year – 4.02 2006-2007 Academic Year – 4.12

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY INTEREST

My primary research focus is on Organizational Behavior practices and their application to the sport setting. Specifically, I am interested in the areas of Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction & Organizational Commitment. My secondary research interest is involved in the practice of Sport Marketing tools and how they affect Consumer Behavior. Other research interests are in Diversity and the Olympic Movement.

PUBLICATIONS

Published Abstracts and Presentations for Refereed Conferences

Crawford, S., McDonogh, M., Thorn, D., Mahony, D. & Robinson, G. (2006, June 3). Examining career paths in Intercollegiate athletic coaching: An analysis of NCAA Division I-A football coaches. Presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Annual Conference, Kansas City, MO.

Abstracts Submitted to Referred Conferences

- **Thorn, D.F.**, Hums, M. A., & Mahony, D. A., (accepted). Perceptions of organizational justice: A study of sport type in intercollegiate athletics. Submitted to the 2010 North American Society for Sport Management Annual Conference: Tampa, FL.
- **Thorn, D.F.**, Hums, M. A., & Mahony, D. A., (accepted). Organizational justice as a predictor of overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study distinguishing organizational justice components. Submitted to the 2010 North American Society for Sport Management Annual Conference: Tampa, FL.

Scholarly works in Progress

- **Thorn, D.F.** (In progress) Perceptions of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in intercollegiate athletics: A study of NCAA men's sport coaches. (*Dissertation will be defended November 2009*)
- **Thorn, D. F.** & Simmons, J. (In progress). The use of likeness in sport video games: An examination of consumer perceptions. (*Authors are completing abstract and methodology*).
- Crawford, S.Z., McDonogh, M.O., **Thorn, D.F.**, Robinson, G., & Mahony, D.F. (In progress) Career paths in intercollegiate athletic coaching: An examination of racial similarities and differences. (*Authors are completing the manuscript*)

SERVICE

Professional Service

Member - North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), 2004 - Present

College Service

Chair – Internship Committee, College of Education, 2009 – Present Member – NCATE Self-Study Group (Assessment & Analysis), College of Education, 2006 – 2008

Departmental Service

Internship Director – Sport Administration Program, 2009 – Present Member – Search Committee, Sport Administration Program, Summer 2009 Interviewer - Graduate Admissions, Sport Administration Program, 2008 - Present

HONORS AND AWARDS

March 2010, 2008, & 2007 – Nominated by student-athlete to attend Red & Black Faculty Honors Banquet and Awards Ceremony for inspiration to excel in the classroom.

SPORT PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

Sport management professional with experience in event management; Considerable experience in the coordination and implementation of marketing promotions; Staff management skills; Knowledge of NCAA rules and bylaws.

Faculty Advisor, July, 2008 - September, 2008

2008 Ryder Cup - Valhalla Golf Club, Louisville, KY

- Responsible for scheduling of student shifts for event
- Created and taught event management course focusing on elements that effect major sporting events including: process of event management, hospitality, sport tourism, and economic impact.
- Acted as a liaison between the Professional Golf Association of America (PGA) and student staff

Compliance Graduate Assistant, August 2005 – December 2007

University of Louisville Athletic Department, Louisville, KY

- Coordinate NCAA Clearinghouse and Enrollment records for incoming freshman for Fall 2006 & 2007
- Research NCAA rulings and interpretations using LSDBi
- Prepared academic performance rate reports
- Assisted in updated Camps and Clinics manual for 06-07 academic year
- Audit Camps and Clinics of all 19 sports
- Use of Compliance Assistant updating recruiting logs
- Maintain student-athlete Financial Aid data on team squad lists
- Evaluate academic records of incoming prospects for on-campus visits
- Develop material for monthly compliance newsletter for both staff and student-athletes

Assistant to the Conference Commissioner, August 2003 - April 2004

Mid-South Conference, Louisville, KY

Tournament Director for the MSC Volleyball Championship, November 2003

- Supervise all tournament activities
- Coordinate volunteers and schedule
- Arrange for officials
- Work with host site
- Promote and publicize results with local media resources

Other responsibilities

- Develop and coordinate the MSC Extramural Sports Championship, Spring 2004
- Assist Marketing Director with sales and marketing of MSC Radio Network & Conference Championships
- Compile reports of Conference results for weekly radio show
- Generate Schedule Matrixes (Baseball, M & W Basketball, Football, M & W Soccer, Softball, and Volleyball)
- Coordinate All-Conference nomination and ballots for fall semester sports (Football, M & W Soccer, and Volleyball)

• Assist with office management tasks

Assistant Marketing and Operations Manager, October 2001 – August 2002

Georgia Tech Athletic Association, Atlanta, GA

- Develop, execute, and critique marketing plans for all 15 varsity sports (Baseball, M & W Basketball, M & W Cross Country, Football, M Golf, Softball, M & W Swimming & Diving, M & W Tennis, M & W Track & Field, and Volleyball)
- Assist with planning and execution of all athletic events
- Oversee all in-game promotions for all athletic events
- Coordinate and execute all internal and external promotional programs; including sport clinics, reading programs, youth days, athlete school visits, etc.

ACTIVITIES

Extracurricular

Registration Chairman, January 2003 - April 2003

6th Annual University of Louisville Sport Administration Golf Tournament

- Responsible for all registration activities
- Delegate tasks to registration assistants
- Take part in initial decision making in tournament and operations planning

Student-Athlete, August 1997 – March 2001

- Georgia Tech Varsity Swim Team
 - 4 year Letterman

Volunteer

Volunteer Swim Coach, University of Louisville Varsity Swim Team, August 2002 – December 2007

Mid-South Conference Softball Championships, Announcer, April 2005

NAIA Cross Country National Championships, November 2003

Tutor, University of Louisville Athletic Department, August 2002 – May 2003

Student-Athlete Mentor, Centennial Place Elementary School, August 1998 - May 2000