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ABSTRACT

A majority of the literature regarding employee-organization relationships has focused on perceived organizational support (POS) (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). POS is defined as employees’ formation of global beliefs pertaining to how much the organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions. Therefore, in accordance with Eisenberger et al. (1986) the overarching purpose of the current study was to investigate athletic administrators’ POS. More specifically, the primary purposes of this study were to: (a) examine the antecedents of POS; (b) examine the consequences of POS, including, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention; and (c) assess gender differences in regard to these antecedents and consequences, and (d) develop and test a comprehensive model of POS, applicable to intercollegiate athletic administrators.

Two athletic administrators (one female and one male) at each of the 327 NCAA Division I institutions ($N = 654$) were asked to respond to the Athletic Administrator Questionnaire. A total of 222 athletic administrators completed and returned the questionnaire for a response rate of 34%. Of the 222 respondents, 53.6% were female and 46.4% male. After testing for overall reliability and internal consistency, statistical analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses advanced in this study.
Results showed that combined, the antecedents (participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) accounted for 78% of the variance in POS. However, growth opportunity was not a significant predictor of POS. In addition, athletic administrators’ POS was positively related to both affective commitment and job satisfaction. Further examination using multiple regression analysis showed that affective commitment and job satisfaction had a significant, negative relationship with turnover intention for athletic administrators. Both collectively explained 35% of the variance in turnover intention. Affective commitment, however, was a better predictor of turnover intention than job satisfaction. Finally, POS did not have a direct relationship with turnover intention for athletic administrators; rather, it was partially mediated by affective commitment and job satisfaction.

Female respondents’ perceptions of all variables in this study were nearly identical to male athletic administrators and were relatively high considering the lack of female representation at the top levels of intercollegiate athletic administration. In summary, this study suggests that athletic administrators (female and male) as well as their athletic departments obtain favorable outcomes based on administrators’ perceptions of favorable treatment. In other words, athletic administrators who are treated well are more likely to be affectively committed to their athletic department, satisfied with their job, and ultimately, less likely to leave. The results of this study are consistent with Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of POS but applied to athletic administrators. Thus, the traditional concepts of social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity have been shown to hold credence within an intercollegiate athletics context.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Within the last 15 years an abundance of organizational behavior and human resource management research has focused on the exchange relationships between employees and their organizations (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). This research suggests that organizations obtain favorable outcomes based on employees’ perceptions of favorable treatment. For instance, employees who are treated well are more likely to be affectively committed to their organization (e.g., Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001) and less likely to withdraw from their organization (e.g., Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003). More specifically, a bulk of the literature regarding employee-organization relationships has focused on perceived organizational support (POS) (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).

Consistent with Eisenberger et al. (1986), POS is defined as employees’ formation of global beliefs pertaining to how much the organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions. This concept is based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Social exchange theory explains why employees feel obligated to reciprocate actions directed toward them...
by the organization. Moreover, POS is associated with this exchange in that employees will reciprocate favorable treatment when they trust that the organization will reward them.

Organizational Support

Within the realm of sport management research there has been a mounting interest regarding the bases of employees’ organizational commitment. Industrial and organizational psychology scholars have deemed such relationships as an exchange of effort and loyalty for material or social rewards (e.g., Blau, 1964; Etzioni, 1961; Gould, 1979; Gouldner, 1960; Levinson, 1965; March & Simon, 1958; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). The development of employees’ POS has received considerable attention in the industrial and organizational psychology literature. While POS may appear to fall under the broad designation of other constructs such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, there is substantial evidence to the contrary (Aquino & Griffeth, 1999; Settoon, Bennett, & Lidem, 1996; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

An overwhelming majority of studies concerning POS conducted under the auspices of Organizational Support Theory (OST) have established the unidimensionality of the support construct. For instance, Eisenberger et al. (1986) reported that employees demonstrated a steady pattern of agreement with regard to statements pertaining to the type of treatment received under certain circumstances (e.g., future illness, mistakes, exceptional performance). Thus, while POS is a response to the organization as a whole, it is also considerably influenced by attitudes, policies, procedures, and decisions of the organization (Shore & Tetrick, 1991).
It is beneficial for NCAA Division I athletic departments as well as directors of athletics to be cognizant of the role of POS. Moreover, human resource practices may not directly affect turnover, but may signal to employees that the organization values and cares about their well being and contributions. This may in turn result in various favorable outcomes for both the organization and employees. As Shore and Shore (1995) suggested, the history of treatment an employee received from an organization may have more of an impact on voluntary turnover decisions than the implementation of a particularly favorable human resource practice.

However, athletic administrators, the focus of this study, may not alter their perception of support in reaction to favorable human resource practices if their department and supervisor treated them unfavorably for an extended period of time. This study will introduce POS in a sport management context in addition to contribute to the turnover intention literature in sport management. POS is a critical link between the actions and behaviors of organizations and employees. When applied to an intercollegiate athletics setting, organizational support provides a greater understanding of athletic administrators’ voluntary turnover intentions, affective commitment, and job satisfaction.

Although POS has been deemed a concept closely associated with organizational commitment, it is a departure from the traditional organizational commitment and retention lines of inquiry. As such, POS measures the degree of commitment the organization demonstrates towards its employees as opposed to the commitment employees demonstrate toward their organization. Moreover, Eisenberger et al. (1986) found evidence for the argument that POS is an antecedent of organizational commitment. In addition, several researchers have also found POS to be related to the
following constructs: affective commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Settoon, Bennett, & Lidem, 1996; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991), continuance commitment (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), leader-member exchange (Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), supervisor support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Malatesta, 1995; Shore & Tetrick, 1991), perceived organizational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999), organizational justice (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001); participation in decision making (Allen et al., 2003); and job satisfaction (Aquino & Griffeth, 1999; Eisenberger, Cummings, Aremeli, & Lynch, 1997; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

Statement of the Problem

Although industrial and organizational psychology scholars have found POS to increase the commitment of employees to the organization and thus increase employees’ expectancy of being rewarded for superior effort (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986), there is no comparable indication of the impact of employees’ POS within sport organizations. For instance, POS has been found to elicit certain outcomes within particular organizational settings (e.g., private high schools, postal offices, credit bureaus, manufacturing plants), however, no empirical evidence exists within the sport management literature linking POS with outcomes such as affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. In particular, there is no study within an intercollegiate context that tests the applicability of organizational support theory among athletic administrators. This notion echoes Slack’s (1996) edict that sport management researchers have not kept pace with advances in management theory. While several
sport management scholars have examined specific antecedents and outcomes of organizational support such as organizational justice (e.g., Hums & Chelladurai, 1994), affective commitment, (e.g., Turner & Chelladurai, 2005; Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004; Chang & Chelladurai, 2003), job satisfaction (e.g., Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003), and retention (e.g., Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 1996), there is no empirical evidence regarding a comprehensive framework of the antecedents and consequences of POS.

Despite this lack of a specific literature base, sport management research regarding organizational behavior has focused on how employees, particularly coaches and administrators, are satisfied with their jobs, committed to their organization, and committed to their particular profession (e.g., Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003). Understanding retention factors for coaches and administrators within the intercollegiate work environment has also continued to be an issue for scholars and practitioners alike (e.g., Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 1996). An additional issue within NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics is the lack of female representation at the highest administrative level (i.e., director of athletics). In accordance with this predicament, Pastore, Goldfine, and Riemer (1996) hypothesized that a lack of administrative support led to female coaches voluntarily leaving the profession.

In regard to athletic administrative positions, Acosta and Carpenter (2004) described a lack of high level administrative opportunities for females. However, Acosta and Carpenter did not identify POS as a means of retaining, promoting, and satisfying female athletic administrators. Hence, POS has not been specifically identified as a
means to achieving certain employee and organizational outcomes for athletic
departments and male and female athletic administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The employee-organization relationship among athletic administrators has been
understudied, despite the fact that administrative support has been a determining factor in
the retention of athletic administrators (Pastore et al., 1996). Considering the tremendous
growth of intercollegiate athletics, it is quite evident that in a highly competitive job
market sport organizations must demonstrate the significance of employees so as to
garner certain outcomes such as employee commitment, satisfaction, and retention. With
this in mind, much of these outcomes can be attributed to employees’ perceptions of
support.

Therefore, in accordance with Eisenberger et al. (1986) the overarching purpose
of the current study was to investigate athletic administrators’ perceptions of
organizational support. In particular, this study examined how the supportive human
resource practices of sport organizations impacted employees’ perceptions of support and
ultimately influenced individual and organizational outcomes (i.e., affective commitment,
job satisfaction, turnover intention). This line of inquiry is a departure from the
traditional human resource management and organizational behavior research where the
focus is frequently on the commitment of employees toward their respective organization.

To this end, the specific purposes of this study were to: (a) examine the
antecedents of POS; (b) examine the outcomes of POS, including, affective commitment,
job satisfaction, and turnover intention; (c) assess gender differences in regard to these
antecedents and consequences; and, most importantly, (d) develop and test a
comprehensive model of POS, applicable to intercollegiate athletic administrators that is grounded in the social exchange ideology of employee-organization relationships. This research is important because of the lack of literature within this area in sport management and the potential implications for sport organizations that realize the benefits achieved through employees’ perceptions of support from their organization.

Moreover, within a sport management context (i.e., NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics) it is beneficial for research on commitment to extend from the commitment of coaches and administrators to the organization to the department’s commitment toward its employees. Within the realm of sport management research, there has been a mounting interest regarding employees’ organizational commitment. Industrial and organizational psychology scholars have deemed such relationships as an exchange of effort and loyalty for material or social rewards (e.g., Blau, 1964; Etzioni, 1961; Gould, 1979; Gouldner, 1960; Levinson, 1965; March & Simon, 1958; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). It is beneficial for directors of athletics to be cognizant of the role of POS in terms of retention and other human resource strategies. Moreover, certain supportive human resource practices (e.g., growth opportunity, supervisory support, etc.) may signal to employees that the department values and cares about their well-being and contributions. This may, in turn, result in various favorable outcomes for both the organization and employees.

Conceptual Framework and Research Hypotheses

The ideas presented through organizational support theory have received considerable backing within the field. However, there are still limitations regarding the complex, causal relationships among the antecedents and consequences of organizational
support. One such limitation concerns the lack of a comprehensive model to incorporate these antecedents and consequences to the field of sport management. The proposition stemming from a framework of this nature is that organizations’ supportive human resource practices will impact certain employee and organizational outcomes through the establishment of POS.

The conceptual framework proposed in this study focuses on the role of certain human resource practices as integral to establishing employees’ POS. Thus, that perception of support potentially leads to reduced turnover intention (alternative model in Figure 1), but more plausibly is mediated by affective commitment and job satisfaction. Figure 1 outlines these relationships in a diagrammatic form. The following sections present an overview of how these variables are related and a discussion of additional variables relevant to the framework. Hypotheses for each of these relationships are also put forth in the following sections, but a more detailed description of the rationale for these hypotheses is presented in Chapter 2.
Human Resource Practices

- Part. Decision Making
- Supervisory Support
- Growth Opportunity
- Distributive Justice
- Procedural Justice
- Interactional Justice

Perceived Organizational Support

- Affective Commitment
- Job Satisfaction
- Turnover Intentions

Figure 1: A proposed framework of the antecedents and consequences of NCAA athletic administrators’ perceived organizational support (1 participation in decision making)
Supportive human resource practices are instrumental in establishing employees’ perception of organizational support. Traditionally, researchers established links between supportive human resource practices and firm performance (e.g., Huselid, 1995). However, the relationships proposed in this framework are unique in that supportive human resource practices are related to employees’ perception of organizational support. Regarding the relationship between organizations’ human resource practices and employees’ POS, the framework focuses on human resource practices that indicate investment in employees and recognition of employee contributions (Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne et al., 1997). In the proposed framework the following human resource practices are antecedents of POS: (a) participation in decision making, (b) supervisory support, (c) growth opportunity, and (d) organizational justice (i.e., procedural, distributive, and interactional justice). These antecedents of organizational support are largely based on the different forms of favorable treatment offered to employees by their organization. Based on these observations the following hypotheses were advanced:

Hypothesis 1: The linear combination of human resource practices (participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) will be significantly and positively related to POS.

Hypothesis 1a: Participation in decision making will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1b: Supervisor support will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1c: Growth opportunity will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.
Hypothesis 1d: Distributive justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1e: Procedural justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1f: Interactional justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Perceived Organizational Support

Employees that benefit from these supportive human resource practices will increasingly feel a sense of support from their organization. In other words, POS is an employee’s formation of beliefs of how much the organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions. Employees must gain this sense of support prior to their reciprocation of supportive human resource practices. In addition, the sincerity of the organization’s supportive human resource practices is weighed through employees’ determination of whether or not to reciprocate. Lastly, a felt obligation in employees to care about the organization’s well-being and to help the organization reach its objectives is created through POS. Based upon the literature discussed above the following hypotheses were put forth:

   Hypothesis 2: POS will be positively related to affective commitment.

   Hypothesis 3: POS will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Employee Outcomes of Support

In the proposed framework, the establishment of POS is gained through supportive human resource practices and ultimately results in employee outcomes. When employees feel as though their organization cares for their contributions and well-being
(i.e., POS), they will reciprocate those feelings through increased job satisfaction and affective commitment and reduced turnover intentions. These consequences of organizational support outline Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of the benefits derived from the employee-organization relationship. A vast body of literature also exists regarding the relationship between POS and outcomes for both individual employees and the organization as a whole (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Thus, maximizing the outcomes derived from healthy employee-organization relationships benefits both employees and the organization as a whole. Regarding the relationship between the employee outcomes of POS and turnover intention the following hypotheses were advanced:

Hypothesis 4: The linear combination of the POS outcome variables (affective commitment and job satisfaction) will be significantly and negatively related to turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4a: Affective commitment will contribute significantly to the variance explained in turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4b: Job satisfaction will contribute significantly to the variance explained in turnover intention.

Mediated Model

Baron and Kenny (1986) stated that in a mediated relationship among variables, an independent variable will affect a dependent variable only through its relationship with a third, intervening variable. Therefore, if Figure 1 is a mediated model, the results will suggest that POS will not have a direct affect on turnover intention, but rather will only directly influence affective commitment and job satisfaction and this will, in turn, influence turnover intention. If the mediating variables (affective commitment and job satisfaction) are held constant, no significant variance in the outcomes will be explained.
Allen et al. (2003) tested a similar mediated model in regard to sales persons and insurance agents, but to date no such model has been advanced regarding sport organizations. Thus, the following hypotheses regarding mediation were put forth:

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between POS and turnover intention will be mediated by affective commitment.

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between POS and turnover intention will be mediated by job satisfaction.

**Gender Differences**

One of the stated purposes of this study concerns the differences, based on gender, of athletic administrators’ perceptions of support, including the antecedents and consequences of support. This notion is consistent with Acosta and Carpenter’s (2004) research concerning the lack of upward mobility for female athletic administrators. However, Acosta and Carpenter do not suggest that female administrators perceived their organizations’ supported them less than their male counterparts. Therefore, it is not known whether male and female administrators share similar perceptions concerning the degree of support their athletic department provides as well as the antecedents and consequences of support. Hence, the following hypothesis related to gender differences is advanced:

Hypothesis 7: There will be gender differences between senior woman administrators and male athletic administrators on POS, and the antecedents and consequences of POS.
Limitations of the Study

The researcher acknowledges the following seven limitations and will undertake procedures to manage their effects:

1. The use of a single questionnaire might have produced data that has limited utility. The data might have reflected only a moment in time and thus may have been influenced by recent events or incidents.

2. Athletic administrators might have inflated their organization’s organizational support scores if the organization was perceived as being effective and might have underestimated them if the organization was perceived as being ineffective. The same limitation may have existed with regard to the antecedents of organizational support.

3. The data reported on the outcomes of organizational support were self-reported, and therefore may not be a completely accurate reflection of reality.

4. Despite assurances of confidentiality, participants in the study may have been hesitant to provide accurate information due to perceived negative consequences associated with providing critical responses.

5. Although all athletic administrators were employed within NCAA Division I institutions, variations in institutional size and structure may have affected the ability of participants to provide a true assessment of organizational support.

6. Participants in this study may not have understood the importance of this research, and therefore may not have devoted sufficient time or thought to their responses.
This study was limited by the restrictions imposed by the validity and reliability of the selected measures.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The researcher delimited the scope of this study in the following ways:

1. This study was limited to the organizations that function under the guidelines for NCAA Division I institutions.

2. Organizational support was only measured for the following athletic administrators: senior woman administrator and senior associate, associate, and assistant directors of athletics.

**Definition of Terms**

This section contains the definitions of important terms used throughout this document. These definitions are intended to give the reader an understanding of the terminology associated with this study.

*Affective commitment*

Affective commitment is defined as an “employee’s identification with an organization and emotional attachment to that organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67).

*Athletic Administrator*

In this study, this term is given to those that fill the positions of senior associate, associate, and assistant director of athletics as well as the senior woman administrator. It is assumed that these positions answer directly to the director of athletics and carry significant responsibilities within the athletic department.
Distributive Justice

Distributive justice is the degree to which rewards (and punishments) are related to performance (Price, 1997). Another definition of distributive justice described it as the extent to which employees have been fairly rewarded based on responsibilities, experience, effort, performance, and the strains of the job (Kim, Price, Mueller, & Watson, 1996).

Growth Opportunities

Growth opportunities are defined as “the expected utility of one’s present job for future attainment of valued career outcomes” (Bedeian, Kemery, & Pizzolatto, 1991, p. 335). Furthermore, growth opportunities are employees’ perceptions of the extent of potential knowledge and skill acquisition for the purpose of career advancement.

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice largely deals with interpersonal treatment within an organization. More specifically, Bies and Moag (1986) proposed that individuals’ judgments of fairness are based on the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the implementation of certain procedures.

Job satisfaction

Constitutively, job satisfaction has been defined as the feelings an employee develops about his or her job based on past experiences, current conditions, and available employment alternatives (e.g., Balzer, Smith, Kravitz, Lovell, Paul, Reilly, & Reilly, 1990).
**NCAA Division I**

Division I member institutions have to sponsor at least seven sports for men and seven for women (or six for men and eight for women) with two team sports for each gender. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. In addition, Division I institutions must meet minimum financial aid awards for their athletics program, and must not exceed maximum financial aid awards for each sport (NCAA, 2004).

**Participation in Decision Making**

This term refers to the extent of employee involvement in the adoption of major policy decisions that affect the organization and its employees (Blunt & Jones, 1992). Participation in decision making (PDM) is defined as mutual influence of supervisors and subordinates in organizations (Vroom, 1960; T.R. Mitchell, 1973; Wagner & Gooding, 1987).

**Perceived organizational support**

This construct is constitutively defined as an employee’s global perception of the extent to which an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

**Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice refers to a specific form of organizational justice in which employees’ perceive that work-related decisions are based on the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeals process (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). More specifically, Price (1997) noted that procedural justice “exists to the degree that rights are applied universally to all members of an organization” (p. 424).
Supervisor Support

This construct is defined as employees’ belief that a supervisor values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988).

Turnover intention

Turnover intent is constitutively defined as global cognitions of employees which consist of thoughts of quitting, search intentions, and desire to leave the organization (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993).

Overview of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter 2, the review of literature, contains a thorough review of previously published work pertaining to the antecedents and consequences of organizational support theory. This chapter provides critical background information regarding the use and measurement of the model presented in the current research design.

Chapter 3 provides a complete description of the methodology employed in the study. In addition to describing the type of research designs available and the current research employed, it explains potential sources of error and how those will be minimized. The chapter also provides a rationale for the subjects and instruments utilized in the current study. Finally, it provides a description of the statistical methods employed to analyze the data.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the study, both statistically and inferentially. It presents the raw data, analysis, and interpretations of the findings. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the findings. In this section, results are interpreted in lieu of the proposed hypotheses with implications given for researchers, practitioners, and future research opportunities.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature pertaining to the variables in this study. The review is presented in six sections which include:

(a) Introduction to Organizational Support Theory; (b) Antecedents of Organizational Support; (c) Consequences of Organizational Support; (d) Gender Differences and Organizational Support; (e) Contributions of Organizational Support to Sport Management; and (f) Summary.

Introduction to Organizational Support Theory

Increasing concern has arisen with regard to the factors that impact the strength and concentration of employees’ commitment to their organization. Consistent with this notion, several scholars have emphasized employment as an exchange of effort and loyalty for material or social rewards (e.g., Blau, 1964; Etzioni, 1961; Gould, 1979; Gouldner, 1960; Levinson, 1965; March & Simon, 1958; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Organizational support theory encompasses employees’ formation of global beliefs pertaining to how much the organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions. Eisenberger et al. (1986) based the formation of organizational
support theory on Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory and Gouldner’s (1960) notion of the norm of reciprocity. Social exchange theory explains why employees feel obligated to reciprocate actions directed toward them by the organization. Moreover, POS is associated with this exchange in that employees will reciprocate favorable treatment when they trust that the organization will reward them. While social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) underscores the necessity for detecting employee motives and the relationship of those motives to achieving the goals of the organization; the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) is the tendency to respond to the actions of others with similar actions. These and other collective works were the foundation for the development of a “social exchange interpretation of organizational commitment” (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 500).

This subsequent combination and expansion of organizational commitment theory spawned the social exchange approach to examining employee-organization relationships. Hence, the underlying premise behind organizational support theory is that employees form a set of beliefs concerning whether their organization cares about their well being and values their contributions. This set of beliefs is referred to as perceived organizational support (POS) and is associated with this exchange in that employees reciprocate when they trust that the organization will reward them. As a result, this determines employees’ perceptions of their organization’s willingness to properly reward increased work effort and meet socioemotional needs (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

In accordance with organizational support theory (OST), Eisenberger et al. (1986) maintained that POS is facilitated by employees’ propensity to assign the organization humanlike characteristics. Levinson (1965) first suggested the notion that actions of
organizational agents (e.g., supervisors) are seen by employees as the intent of the organization and not as the personal motives of those particular organizational agents. Furthermore, Levinson suggested three rather intuitive factors that encourage employees to associate agents’ actions to organizational actions. First, there are legal, moral, and financial ramifications that bind the organization to the actions of organizational agents. Secondly, the culture of the organization sets certain parameters for the organizational agents to follow. Lastly, the agents wield power over subordinate employees by merely their position in the organization. Therefore, in lieu of these organizational personification attributes, employees deem positive or negative treatment from the organization as a signal of whether the organization views them either positively or negatively (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003).

The discretionary nature of favorable treatment from the organization is also a facet of employees’ perceptions of support. Discretionary decisions, in this sense, are voluntary choices the organization makes about rewarding employees. Conversely, there are certain decisions organizations must make that are mandated or required by law or organizational policy. For example, employees’ perceptions of a discretionary pay-raise are more strongly related to an increase in POS than if that pay raise was legally mandated (e.g., increase in the minimum wage) (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997). This is also consistent with the argument extended by social exchange theorists that rewards perceived as discretionary are seen as more highly valued (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). However, this idea becomes more complex when outcomes of POS such as job satisfaction are considered. While a mandated organizational pay-raise may ultimately increase job satisfaction, a similar increase in POS may not follow.
As previously mentioned, OST holds that POS emerges through employees’ formation of general beliefs regarding how much the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Thus, POS determines the extent to which employees will reciprocate that support. Common forms of reciprocation include commitment to the organization, job satisfaction, increased work effort, and extra-role performance. Moreover, POS is increased when an employee receives praise or approval. However, employees have a keen sense of the genuine sincerity of organizational praise and approval. Blau (1964) placed a great deal of importance on employees’ perception of the nature of praise and in this sense, spurious praise or approval may actually reduce POS. This is in accordance with the notion that an employee has received a favorable evaluation because increases in material and symbolic rewards also increase POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Socioemotional needs on the job such as compassion and admiration are also said to be satisfied by POS (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Lynch, 1998). The higher the level of support offered to employees, the more protected employees are from the negative effects of stressful situations and reduced self-esteem (George, Reed, Balard, Colin, & Fielding, 1993). If an organization communicates to employees that there is a sense of caring, this in turn fulfills employees’ socioemotional needs. This sense of caring for the well-being of employees by the organization creates an obligation to repay or reciprocate that behavior. In a sample of police patrol officers, Armeli et al. (1998) found that POS fulfilled a variety of socioemotional needs. Furthermore, officers with high socioemotional needs reciprocated POS by increasing their work effort. This increased performance was measured by an upsurge in driving-under-the-influence (DUI)
arrests and speeding citations. However, officers with weak or low socioemotional needs and high POS did not demonstrate similar, increased levels of performance. These results suggest the presence of Harkins and Szymanski’s (1987) notion of “social loafing” (p. 168). Since police officer pay-increases are generally based on seniority and not on discretionary treatment by the organization, it is rather natural to maintain a minimum level of work effort in the absence of a felt obligation for reciprocation. Hence, discretionary treatment is viewed as a strong indicator in the POS-performance relationship.

In addition to fulfilling employees’ socioemotional needs, POS satisfies the need for self-esteem, affiliation, emotional support, and social approval (Armeli et al., 1998). Employees that possess a heightened desire for the aforementioned needs should be appropriately satisfied with organizational support. However, Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) described the employee-employer relationship as extremely dynamic as employees respond to their perception of the level of commitment the organization has demonstrated toward them. Rhoades et al. (2001) also presented evidence that POS played a crucial role in explaining how such work experiences can influence commitment and retention. Based on the treatment of employees by the organization, employees have to make a determination as to whether or not they are obligated to care about the organization and to make a contribution to achieving organizational objectives.

Although POS has been deemed a concept closely associated with organizational commitment, it is a departure from the traditional organizational commitment and retention lines of inquiry. As such, POS measures the degree of commitment the organization has for its employees as opposed to the commitment employees have toward
their organization. Moreover, Eisenberger et al. (1986) found evidence for the argument that POS is an antecedent of organizational commitment. While few scholars have argued against the ability of OST to measure POS, there is some dissension regarding the causal relationship between the antecedents and outcomes of POS. Despite this, POS has been found to be related to, but distinct from several worked related antecedents and outcomes (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

In suggesting that POS is antecedent to organizational commitment, Eisenberger et al. (1986) presented a measure of employer commitment called the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS). The SPOS has demonstrated good psychometric properties, and researchers have continued to test the construct validity of the scale (Hutchison, 1997; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Shore and Tetrick (1991) used confirmatory factor analysis to demonstrate that POS is empirically distinct from affective and continuance commitment. Hutchison (1997) advanced previous research on the construct validity of the SPOS and found POS to be empirically distinct from supervisor support, organizational dependability, and affective commitment. Although the SPOS and other organizational behavior scales (e.g., Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1979; Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), Meyer & Allen, 1984) draw on similar content areas, results from Hutchison’s construct validity suggested that employees distinguish between actions of management (i.e., supervisors) and the organization itself.

One of the benefits of OST is that it offers explicit, readily testable predictions regarding the antecedents and outcomes of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). As
previously mentioned, empirical research has revealed that POS is highly related to the aforementioned constructs, but empirical research has revealed that POS is also distinguishable from these constructs (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

In summary, OST serves to address the psychological consequences of POS. Based on Gouldner’s (1960) norm of reciprocity, POS functions by creating a felt obligation in employees to care about the organization’s well-being and to help the organization reach its objectives. This emotional commitment to the organization is established through increased confidence and a belief that the organization can be counted on in a time of need. The caring, approval, and respect indicated by POS fulfill employees’ socioemotional needs, which in turn, lead employees to incorporate membership and role status into their social identity. Also, POS was shown to strengthen employees’ belief that the organization acknowledges and rewards superior performance (i.e., performance-reward expectancies). These processes have favorable outcomes both for individual employees (e.g., increased job satisfaction and heightened positive mood) and for the organization as a whole (e.g., increased affective commitment and performance, reduced turnover) (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Antecedents of Organizational Support

In their meta-analysis of over 70 studies pertaining to POS, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) suggested three main antecedents of POS (i.e., fair organizational procedures, supervisor support, and favorable rewards and job conditions). However, other scholars (e.g., Allen et al., 2003; Wayne et al., 1997) focused on similar human resource practices (i.e., participation in decision making and growth opportunities) that
signal an organization’s investment in employees and recognition of employee contributions. Antecedents of organizational support are largely based on the different forms of favorable treatment the organization offers employees. The antecedents discussed in detail in the following sections include: (a) participation in decision making, (b) supervisor support, (c) organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice), and (d) growth opportunity.

**Participation in Decision Making**

Research regarding employee participation in decision making (PDM) has been at the forefront of organizational behavior research for years (Glew, O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, Van Fleet, 1995). Despite this continued focus on PDM, scholars have defined PDM in several ways (e.g., Vroom & Jago, 1988; Yukl, 1981). For instance, Yukl (1981) defined PDM as “the involvement of subordinates in a manager’s decision” (p. 108). On the other hand, Vroom and Jago (1988) concentrated on an important omission in Yukl’s definition, the influence the subordinate has on decisions as opposed to mere involvement in decisions. Thus, Vroom and Jago stated that “the amount of an individual’s participation in a given decision made by a group or organization is represented by the amount of influence that person has on the plans or decision agreed upon” (p. 15). With this in mind, it is important to discern PDM from that of authoritarian decision making and from delegation. Authoritarian decision making is when managers make decisions whereas delegation is when subordinates are granted the power to make decisions.

Empowering employees through PDM is seen as a key element in achieving optimal organizational outcomes. However, there are mixed views on the impact of PDM in terms of productivity and satisfaction (Bass, 1990; Dachler & Wilpert, 1978; Gabris &
Giles, 1983; Locke & Schweiger, 1979; T. Mitchell, 1996; Yukl, 1981). Nevertheless, Heilman, Hornstein, Cage, and Herschlag (1984) recommended the use of PDM for maximizing productivity and satisfaction. Also, PDM has been linked to employee and organizational outcomes such as job performance (Steel & Mento, 1987), organizational citizenship behavior (VanYperen, van den Berg, & Willering, 1999), and intrinsic rewards (DeCharms, 1968; Deci, 1975; Lepper & Greene, 1978). Moreover, the absence of PDM has been linked to employees’ intent to withdraw from the organization (Hirshman, 1970).

Sashkin (1984) reiterated the importance of PDM with his contention that PDM should be an ethical obligation for organizations. However, Locke, Schweiger, and Latham (1986) asserted that PDM is not an ethical imperative but rather a technique for managers to employ in certain circumstances. More specifically, Locke and his colleagues rejected Sashkin’s contention and stated that there are times that PDM may be helpful and other times when it may not be helpful. The environment for which PDM may be helpful mainly depends on motivational and cognitive mechanisms. For example, some motivational mechanisms include aspects such as trust, greater control of work, increased ego involvement in the job, and increased goal acceptance. Cognitive mechanisms, on the other hand, include such factors as increased upward communication and better job understanding by employees (Locke et al., 1986).

The types of PDM and effects of PDM on work related outcomes have become increasingly challenged by researchers (Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck, 2002). In terms of the specific types of PDM, Cotton and his colleagues (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, & Jennings, 1998) identified six forms of PDM: (a) participation in work
decisions, (b) consultative participation, (c) short-term participation, (d) informal participation, (e) employee ownership, and (f) representative ownership. The controversy surrounding PDM is based on the various effects the aforementioned types of PDM have on work related outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and commitment. Each PDM type and its relationship to specific work outcomes is discussed in the following sections.

**Participation in work decisions.** This form of PDM is considered formal in nature, direct, and long-term (Cotton et al., 1988). The emphasis of participation mainly focuses on the work itself. Furthermore, Cotton et al. reported that this type of PDM has shown consistent, positive effects on production and performance. However, the effect of participation in work decisions on job attitudes such as job satisfaction has been less consistent (Latham & Yukl, 1975). Employees’ participation in work decisions such as payment procedures also showed limited positive effects on performance and satisfaction.

**Consultative participation.** Similar to participation in work decisions, consultative participation is formal, direct, and long-term. The difference, however, is that instead of focusing on the work itself, consultative participation is focused on job issues (Cotton et al., 1988). Additionally, within consultative participation employees do not have the veto power they would have in participation in work decisions. Consultative participation is generally achieved through the use of Scanlon plans and quality circles. Scanlon plans concern the distribution of financial bonuses for making productivity improvement suggestions whereas quality circles do not consist of the financial rewards. A considerable amount of theory exists contending Scanlon plans increase work related outcomes such as productivity and motivation (e.g., Ruh, White, & Wood, 1975).
However, few studies have been conducted on the impact of Scanlon plans on work related attitudes such as job satisfaction. Research is inconsistent in this area and further empirical testing is needed to assess the impact of consultative participation on work related outcomes and attitudes.

**Short-term participation.** This form of PDM is discernible from others based on its duration. Duration is the only difference between short-term participation and participation in work decisions. As with other forms of PDM, the effects of short-term participation on performance, satisfaction, and motivation have been mixed (e.g., Wexley, Singh, & Yukl, 1973). Based on these mixed results, short-term participation may not be an optimal choice for managers selecting a PDM type.

**Informal participation.** Informal participation takes place through interpersonal relationships between managers and subordinates (Cotton et al., 1988). A majority of studies examining the relationship between informal participation and job satisfaction and productivity found positive relationships. Although the findings demonstrate a positive relationship, the causal nature of these relationships is always in question. For instance, highly satisfied and productive employees may be awarded informal participation as opposed to the awarding of informal participation leading to these outcomes.

**Employee ownership.** This form of PDM is considered a combination of formal and indirect PDM (Cotton et al., 1988). The formal aspect of employee ownership concerns employees’ rights as shareholders while the indirect aspect pertains to the ownership by shareholders but operation by management. Long (1980) found considerable support for the positive relationship between employee ownership and
satisfaction, commitment, and motivation. The mixed results of PDM are further emphasized in the literature as certain employees desire less PDM (Cotton et al., 1988). This notion echoes the difficult nature of employing PDM initiatives in an organization.

Representative participation. An elected board of directors is responsible for formally conducting and facilitating this form of PDM (Cotton et al., 1988). Employee influence is also lower in this form of PDM than that of employee ownership. In addition, inconclusive relationships between representative participation and performance and satisfaction exist. Cotton and colleagues cited research which improved efficiency, decreased efficiency, and had no effects concerning the relationship between representative participation and work related outcomes. Hence, further research is needed concerning the impact of this specific form of PDM on work related outcomes.

In particular, Cotton et al. (1988) distinguished PDM based on the following attributes: (a) formal versus informal, (b) direct versus indirect, (c) short-term versus long-term, (d) degree of influence, and (e) content of decisions. As demonstrated by the varying results observed within the previously mentioned participation forms, the relationship between PDM and work related outcomes is rather ambiguous. In a highly critical response to Cotton and his colleagues’ review of the forms of PDM, Leana, Locke, and Schweiger (1990) rebuked their classification stated that “any conclusions based on such an analysis add nothing to our knowledge of participation in decision making” (p. 141). This critical review placed an emphasis on the need for researchers to continually emphasize an understanding of the classification and implications of the various forms of PDM.
Regarding the relationship between PDM and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), VanYperen, van den Berg, and Willering (1999) found support for a model which tested the mediating relationship of supervisor support in the PDM-OCB relationship. As an employee participates in decision making, they feel a considerable amount of support from their direct supervisor and thus often reciprocate in the form of OCB. Based on Gouldner’s (1960) norm of reciprocity and Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory, employee-supervisor relationships are enhanced by PDM and ultimately result in OCB. Hence, PDM is associated with supervisor support but is viewed as a distinct construct.

In summary, PDM has implications for supervisors, subordinates, and the organization as a whole. Of primary importance is the influence that PDM has on employees’ perception of support from the organization and subsequent reciprocation of that support. In addition to the aforementioned review, herein lies the rationale for the inclusion of PDM as a positively related antecedent of POS. It is of utmost importance that managers experiment with a wide array of PDM initiatives (Glew et al., 1995). Despite inconsistencies in the literature, managers must commit to purposeful, long-term initiation of employee PDM because of the potential for positive results. Furthermore, research should go beyond simply examining the outcomes of PDM and shift to the motives and implementation of PDM programs (Glew et al., 1995).

Supervisor Support

While it has been shown that employees perceive a certain degree of appraisal from their organization, employees also form a general opinion pertaining to the degree their supervisor values their contributions and well-being. This concept is referred to in the literature as supervisor support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Supervisor support is
consistent with Levinson’s (1965) proposition that employees view their supervisors’ positive or negative evaluations as an indication of organizational support. Moreover, supervisor support suggests that although employees experience exchange relationships with supervisors, these are distinct from those employees develop with their organization (Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003). Subordinates also equate the treatment by their supervisor as an indication of favorable organizational policies, practices, and procedures (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001).

Employees are generally aware that supervisors communicate their evaluations to upper level management. As this communication becomes pervasive throughout the organization, the idea of the personified organization adds strength to the relationship between supervisor support and organizational support or POS. However, Eisenberger et al. (2002) found the relationship between supervisor support and organizational support to be moderated by employee perceptions of supervisors’ status in the organization. In other words, employee evaluations from supervisors that were thought to be highly favored within the organization would have a greater impact on POS. Eisenberger et al. (2002) based employees’ perceptions of their supervisors’ status in the organization on employee judgments concerning various domains. These domains are explained in the following section.

The first domain concerned employees’ perceptions of the organization’s positive valuation of their supervisor. Secondly, employees perceived supervisors’ status in the organization to be based on the evaluation of supervisors’ influence over important organizational decisions. The third domain for which employees base their perception of
supervisors’ status in the organization concerns the authority and autonomy allotted supervisors to carry out their job responsibilities (Eisenberger et al. 2002). Therefore, supervisors’ status in the organization, approximated by employees, moderates the relationship between supervisor support and organizational support. In a similar vein, nominal employee perceptions of supervisor status in any one of the aforementioned domains would decrease the moderating impact of supervisor status on the relationship between supervisor support and perceived organizational support.

While favorable job conditions (e.g., rewards) may increase employees’ perceptions of support from a direct supervisor or the organization, supervisor support is further delineated from organizational support based on employees’ evaluation of job conditions. Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003) distinguished favorable job conditions as either intrinsically or extrinsically satisfying. Extrinsically satisfying job conditions were attributed to the organization while intrinsically satisfying conditions were attributed to the actions of supervisors. Consequently, there are inherent limitations to the extent of power supervisors have for increasing intrinsically satisfying conditions. This is also exacerbated by employees’ perceptions of supervisors’ status in the organization. For example, if a supervisor is not perceived to have a high level of status in an organization and subsequently increases intrinsically satisfying conditions that will most likely have a negligible impact on POS.

Greller and Herold (1975) found that employees relied more heavily on evaluations from supervisors as opposed to those of co-workers or organization. To empirically test the perceptions of employees regarding supervisor support, Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) developed the Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support (SPSS). The
SPSS demonstrated psychometric characteristics similar to that of Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) SPOS. The SPSS and SPOS consisted of the same items, but the referent ‘organization’ in the SPOS was replaced with ‘supervisor’ in the SPSS. Although the two instruments share similar characteristics, Kottke and Sharafinski found the correlation between the two instruments to be low (r = .13), which demonstrates very little overlap between the SPSS and SPOS.

Eisenberger et al. (2002) also found a positive relationship between employees’ perceptions of supervisor support and temporal changes in perceptions of organizational support. This also revealed the ability of supervisors’ evaluations to contribute to POS. Therefore, the causal direction of the relationship between supervisor support and POS is consistent with OST and further validates the contribution of positive evaluations from a supervisor to feelings of support an employee perceives from his or her organization. Thus, based on the Eisenberger et al.’s (2002) results and the rationale outlined above, supervisor support was included in this study as an antecedent of POS and it is hypothesized that there will be positive relationship between supervisory support and POS.

Organizational Justice

An organization’s compensation system is a central tenet of human resource practices. Moreover, fairness within that system is a justice perception pertaining to certain aspects of the organization. Rewarding employees in an organization has been the subject of research and discussion for many years. A reward system involves strategies, rules, and procedures relevant to compensation distribution. Workplace justice, from an individual employee’s perspective, portrays a perception of fairness in treatment acquired
from an organization and behavioral reactions to such perceptions (James, 1993). Workplace justice has been group into three categories: (a) distributive, (b) procedural, and (c) interactional. While distributive justice is the perceived fairness of the outcomes employees receive, procedural justice is the perceived fairness of the means used to determine those outcomes. In addition, interactional justice involves the quality of interpersonal treatment received by decision-makers (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The three types of organizational justice are discussed in further detail in the following sections.

**Distributive justice.** This concept conveys the perceived ratio of work outcomes (e.g., rewards) to perceived work inputs (e.g., contributions) in comparison to that of the corresponding ratio for a co-worker (Greenberg, 1990; Homans, 1961). While inputs from employees vary, the most universal are hard work, experience, and education (Price & Mueller, 1986). In essence, distributive justice focuses on employees’ perceptions of fairness or equity of rewards (e.g., compensation) based on their investments in their job. This notion was first put forth by Adams’ (1963, 1965) equity theory which is also rooted in cognitive dissonance theory advanced by Festinger (1964). Equity theory states that if one perceives their ratio of inputs to rewards as similar to that of a chosen co-worker, then reward distribution is deemed fair or equitable. Based on the selection of this referent other, employees’ satisfaction with their particular ratio may vary. However, to mitigate objectionable feelings of injustice employees may alter their own input or outcome ratio or that of their referent other to achieve a more agreeable state (Greenberg, 1984). The fundamental, empirically tested observation of Adams’ (1963, 1965) equity
theory is that employees will receive rewards in direct proportion to their contributions toward organizational goals.

Lerner (1977) and Deutsch (1975) suggested an alternate concept of fairness termed “equality” which maintains that all participants should receive an equal share of a good regardless of their contribution. Equality theory does not take into consideration individual employee contributions for the distribution of resources. Conversely, Homans (1982) proposed an additional distribution principle called need theory. In terms of allocating resources, this theory takes need into account for distribution purposes. Additionally, if an employee did not receive an appropriate portion of a particular resource in the past their need would be based on prior inequities (Homans, 1982).

When considering employees’ contributions to organizational goals, Tornblom and Jonsson (1987) deemed three areas necessary for evaluation: (a) effort, (b) productivity, and (c) ability. Determining contribution and subsequent rewards based on effort is based on the amount of energy employees contribute to organizational goals. Contribution based on ability is confirmed by rewarding employees with the highest degree of skill. Lastly, rewarding employees based on productivity is the process by which the organization compares one employee’s inputs to those of others in the organization. Therefore, the employees with the greatest contribution to the organization receive the largest portion of rewards. Despite the distinct nature of these three contributions (effort, ability, productivity), it is likely for employees to contribute to the organization based on a combination of all three.

Regarding organizational support, several research endeavors have found a relationship between POS and distributive justice (Fasolo, 1995; Wayne et al., 2002).
However, the relationship was not strong as expected which alludes to the influence of
the discretionary nature of rewards. For POS to be improved, employees must perceive
organizational rewards to be positive and discretionary in nature (Eisenberger et al. 1997). Thus, employees’ perceptions of justice regarding discretionary treatment have
been shown to indicate POS therefore substantiating the inclusion of distributive justice
as a potential antecedent to POS in this study.

Procedural justice. Although previous research has found distributive justice to
be related to POS, procedural justice has been found to have a stronger relationship with
POS and subsequent work related outcomes. While distributive justice is concerned with
the fairness of a distribution of resources, procedural justice is concerned with the
fairness of the procedures used to make those distribution decisions. Thibaut and Walker
(1975) are credited with developing procedural justice theory and subsequent iterations of
procedural justice theory have led to its application in diverse settings such as sport
management and more specifically intercollegiate athletics (e.g., Hums & Chelladurai,
1994).

Leventhal (1980) proposed the following six means by which employees can
evaluate the fairness of organizational procedures: (a) accuracy of information used, (b)
consistency in applying procedures, (c) representation of all parties affected by
procedures, (d) ability of decision-makers to suppress personal bias, (e) ethicality of
procedures, and (f) the ability to correct mistakes. In addition to these six means for
employees to gauge procedural fairness, Thibaut and Walker (1975) also suggested
employees’ perceptions of fairness are determined by the voice one is given in the
organization. Thus, the aforementioned means by which employees perceive procedural
fairness encompass both structural and social characteristics and there is a distinction within procedural justice between structural and social aspects (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

While the structural aspects of procedural justice involve formal rules and polices, the social aspects involve the quality of treatment received during the implementation process. To establish support among employees, the organization must offer ample notification prior to the formation and implementation of policies. Therefore, with precise information employees should have a voice and input (PDM) in this implementation process. To satisfy the social aspects of procedural justice, the organization must treat employees with dignity and respect throughout the process. In summary, the aforementioned description of procedural justice bolsters the rationale for its inclusion as antecedent to POS and having a positive relationship with POS.

Interactional Justice. Another element of workplace justice, interactional justice, is the degree of fairness an employee perceives regarding interactions with the organization while performing their jobs (Greenberg, 1990). This justice principle is cultivated when decision-makers treat employees with respect and thoroughly explain the rationale for decisions. Interactional justice largely deals with interpersonal treatment within an organization. More specifically, Bies and Moag (1986) proposed that individuals’ judgments of fairness are based on the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the implementation of certain procedures. Organizational theory scholars have also suggested certain behaviors that influence interactional justice such as politeness and sensitivity (e.g., Clemmer, 1993). While the principles of interactional
justice are important in determining the degree of employees’ perceptions of fairness, it has not received the same attention as the distributive and procedural justice principles.

While the distinction between procedural and distributive justice has been widely supported in the literature (e.g., Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Gilliland, 1994; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), there is considerably less accord concerning the distinction between interactional justice and procedural justice (e.g., Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001; Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Moorman, 1991). To extend this debate, interactional justice is considered to be related to affective and behavioral reactions toward organizational representatives (e.g., supervisors), but not to the organization as a whole. Therefore, employees’ work-related outcomes such as affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention associated with interactional justice are linked to their supervisors (Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). In summary, the rationale for interactional justice as an antecedent of POS is quite valid.

Research has consistently found the three dimensions of organizational justice to be related to employee work-related attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001). Since employees are involved in an exchange relationship with supervisors and the organization as a whole, outcomes of workplace justice have been examined in terms of a particular exchange partner. Shore and Shore (1995) maintained that perceptions of justice resulted from decisions made by the organization concerning an increase in a variety of rewards and job conditions. Employees’ perceptions of fair organizational procedures pertain to the amount and impartiality by which resources are distributed. Hence, rewards that symbolize trust and recognition are highly related to organizational support. Other
researchers have substantiated the use of the justice principles as antecedent to POS. For instance, Fasolo (1995) found the presence of organizational justice principles to signify that an organization cares about the well-being of employees and thus is willing to invest in them. Rhoades et al. (2001) found that employees’ perception of fairness in organizational rewards predicted POS. Therefore, athletic administrators’ perception of organizational justice is quite relevant in accessing their subsequent levels of POS.

Only recently has research addressed mechanisms, such as organizational support, through which workplace justice is related to work-related outcomes (Aryee & Chay, 2001; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998). As an organization repeatedly demonstrates this fairness in decisions, employees reciprocate their feelings of being cared for by increasing their perception of support. In accordance with OST, favorable rewards contribute to POS (Rhoades et al., 2001). Shore and Shore (1995, p. 159) asserted that justice perceptions create a “global schema of history of support” which is attributed to the research hypotheses advanced within this study that states human resource practices such as justice are antecedent to POS and subsequent employee outcomes.

**Growth Opportunity**

The dynamic landscape faced by organizations has led to the realization that employees are a source of competitive advantage (Pfeffer, 1994). To most appropriately utilize this advantage, organizations are increasingly offering employees opportunities to acquire “portable and marketable skills” (Chay & Aryee, 1999). The intent is for the organization to signal to employees its investment in the social exchange relationship
between the two parties. Therefore, the organization’s provision of employee growth opportunities is considered an antecedent of POS. Similar to other forms of fairness perceptions (e.g., rewards), growth opportunity is deemed a discretionary action taken by the organization (Aryee & Chen, 2004).

Since growth opportunities are intended to enhance skills, employees can then increase their contribution to the organization and ultimately enhance their own job security. As previously mentioned, growth opportunities are a major tenet in the social exchange relationship and thus are viewed as the organization’s expression of mutuality of organizational and individual interests (Aryee & Chen, 2004; Chay & Aryee, 1999). In regard to individual interests, Bedeian et al. (1991) found that if employees are committed to a particular career and not to the organization, they will remain with that organization as long as growth opportunities are available. Therefore, growth opportunities are linked to the expectations employees bring to a job and if the expectation for growth opportunities are met, employees will remain in that organization irrespective of their commitment.

Expectations also include future expectations of organizational support through employees’ perceptions of fair human resource practices. Ashford and Cummings (1983) put forth a similar framework entitled feedback theory, which suggested that employees are particularly conscientious of information that is relevant to personal goals (e.g., career advancement). Furthermore, Wayne et al. (1997) found a positive relationship between developmental experiences (e.g., formal training program) and POS. These results add further support to the inclusion of growth opportunities as an antecedent of POS in this particular study regarding athletic administrators. In addition, this adds credence to
Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of the role of POS in the relationship between discretionary treatment by the organization and employee outcomes.

In sum, the antecedents of organizational support outline Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of the employee-organization relationship. This relationship is one of exchange in which employees trade effort and loyalty for such gestures of organizational support as material and social rewards. In accordance with the aforementioned antecedents of organizational support, exchange relationships have been observed to be characterized by economic and social factors. Blau (1964) hypothesized that when making a distinction between economic and social exchange, both entail an expectation of future returns for contributions. However, the nature of expectations and the time frame are different. Economic exchanges are generally contractual in nature, of a specific time frame, and entail transactions that are valued independent of the exchange. Conversely, a social exchange is an informal, open-ended or long-term exchange of favors which is based on an unwritten obligation to reciprocate (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Increasing organizational support through the aforementioned antecedents is one way of increasing the commitment of employees and ultimately retaining highly satisfied and productive employees.

Consequences of Organizational Support

From an organization’s perspective, the maximization of employees’ perceptions of support is critical to the reciprocation of positive treatment of employees. When employees feel as though their organization cares for their contributions and well-being they will reciprocate those feelings. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) identified several consequences of organizational support (e.g., organizational commitment, job-related
affect, job involvement, performance, retention, strains, job satisfaction). Reciprocation of support is ultimately indicated through these employee outcomes. The consequences discussed in detail in the following sections include: (a) organizational commitment (b) job satisfaction, and (c) turnover intention.

**Organizational Commitment**

Commitment is a complex, psychological variable that has been the subject of a vast amount of organizational behavior research (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1996; Mowday et al., 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 1993). Mowday et al. (1982) defined organizational commitment as “… the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 27). Allen and Meyer (1996) advanced another definition of organizational commitment as “… a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (p. 252). These rather concise definitions of the commitment construct have not diminished the perplexing nature of commitment in an organizational context. However, commitment has received consistent, empirical relationships with positive organizational outcomes (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982).

Within organizational commitment research, a distinction has been made between behavioral and attitudinal commitment. While behavioral commitment deals with the “process by which employees get locked into a certain organization and how they deal with that situation” attitudinal commitment is “a mind set in which individuals consider the extent to which their own values and goals are congruent with those of the
organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 9). The attitudinal aspects of organizational commitment have been further distinguished into three themes including: (a) affective, (b) normative, and (c) continuance commitment. Initially, Allen and Meyer (1990) outlined only two components of commitment, affective and continuance commitment. Continuance commitment is defined as a less intense relationship with the organization and focuses on the individual’s sunk costs that bind him or her to the organization. Affective commitment concerns employees’ “emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization” and establishes their desire to remain with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 7). Allen and Meyer also proposed a third commitment component, normative commitment. Normative commitment relates to employees’ sense of obligation to remain with the organization.

The conceptualization of all three commitment components was subsequently labeled Meyer and Allen’s (1991) Three-Component Model of Commitment. The rationale for such a model was derived from the distinct relationships the components had with specific individual and organizational outcomes (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). For example, affective commitment was found to be positively related to OCB, but continuance commitment had a negative relationship with OCB (Meyer et al., 2002). Moreover, each commitment component concerns a degree of conscientious decision-making by employees concerning their continuation or voluntary termination of employment with the organization. For instance, employees that are affectively committed to their organization continue employment because of a want or desire. However, employees that are linked to the organization through continuance
commitment remain because of need. Furthermore, those that are linked to the organization because of normative commitment, remain because they feel as though they have a specific obligation to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

In addition to organizational commitment being linked to outcomes such as OCB and performance, there is substantial evidence for the “heuristic value of viewing organizational commitment as the result of social exchange processes” (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 506). Hence, OST is viewed as a means to elucidate employees’ emotional attachment to the organization. The relationship is the result of employees’ felt obligation to reciprocate care and concern, in the form of support, received from the organization. Thus, felt obligation should, in turn, increase employees’ level of commitment to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

Consistent with OST, affective commitment has been identified as an outcome of POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Further evidence of this relationship was demonstrated by Rhoades et al. (2001) in a study using a diverse sample of employees from a variety of organizations. The authors found that POS mediated the positive relationship between work experiences (i.e., organizational rewards, procedural justice, supervisor support) and affective commitment. Therefore, it was concluded that employees can determine the positive nature of certain work experiences and then sum those to establish POS which then brings about affective commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001). Despite this, there is still uncertainty as to the causal nature of such findings. To reduce this degree of uncertainty, Rhoades et al. (2001) tested the role of POS against the
presence of changes in affective organizational commitment. POS was found to be positively related to changes in affective commitment, thus providing further evidence of a POS-affective commitment relationship (Rhoades et al., 2001).

Further, organizational support may lessen employees’ perceptions of being trapped or bound to an organization because of their sunk costs (i.e., continuance commitment). Shore and Wayne (1993) found that POS was a better predictor of OCB than affective or continuance commitment. Additionally, continuance commitment was found to be associated with lower levels of OCB. These results suggest that employees that feel bound to an organization by financial constraints are less likely than those bound by social exchanges to perform OCBs (Shore & Wayne, 1993). In other words, those employees bound by social exchanges will perform OCBs, despite not being rewarded for those behaviors.

POS, as an important determinant of employee behaviors, has been advanced quite frequently in the literature (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Employees that feel they are supported by their organization will have a greater sense of purpose and meaning through their affective commitment to the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Empirical evidence gleaned from Rhoades and Eisenberger’s (2002) meta-analysis and other studies (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993) revealed that POS is strongly associated with affective commitment but the two are distinct constructs. Based on Gouldner’s (1960) norm of reciprocity, employees feel as though they have a sense of indebtedness that they must repay to their organization through affective commitment. In sum, the establishment of employees’ POS is manifested into
an affective commitment to the organization, a desire to help the organization achieve its
goals, and an enhanced expectancy that performance will be noticed and justly rewarded
(Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shore & Shore, 1995). Based on
the previous literature, affective commitment was advanced as a consequence of POS in
this study, and was hypotheses as having a positive relationship with POS.

Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction construct is one of the most highly researched in industrial
and organizational psychology. However, despite the vast amount of studies related to job
satisfaction, there continues to be discrepancies surrounding the definition of job
satisfaction (e.g., Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992; Rice, McFarlin, Bennet, 1989).
Furthermore, Herzberg, Mauser, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) identified characteristics
of work that contributed to the psychological well being of employees. Based on these
characteristics, the authors determined that ten common factors attributed to job
satisfaction. These ten factors were divided into five motivational factors (achievement,
recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement) and five hygiene factors. The
five hygiene factors, which are specifically related to physical conditions at work,
include: (a) company policy and administration, (b) supervision, (c) salary, (d)
interpersonal relations, and (e) working conditions. Through a synthesis of these
characteristics, Herzberg, Mauser, and Snyderman (1959) developed the Motivational-
Hygiene Theory (M-H Theory).
The M-H Theory was found to be a credible means of assessing work satisfaction throughout the 1960s (e.g., Herzberg & Hamlin, 1963). While the presence of motivational factors typically leads to satisfaction, the absence of these motivational factors indicates a neutral state rather than dissatisfaction. However, the absence of hygiene factors does, in fact, lead to dissatisfaction while the presence of these factors leads to a neutral state. Another difference between the two factors is the element of control. Motivational factors are generally under the control of the individual employee while hygiene factors are influenced by the organization. Despite the extensive use of M-H Theory, there are two specific limitations that must be addressed. The first limitation of the theory is that it does not take into account the different ways in which employees may react to their jobs and the diverse criteria for which employees develop job satisfaction. A second and highly significant limitation to the M-H theory is that it assumes employees performing the same job will experience similar levels of job satisfaction (Evans, 1986; Kanfer, 1990).

Subsequent to Herzberg et al.’s (1959) M-H Theory, job satisfaction theories began to focus more on the discrepancies between expected and actual outcomes. Hence, Lawler (1969) proposed an additional theory of job satisfaction. This theory posits that if an employee receives outcomes that match what was anticipated, that employee will experience job satisfaction. Employee expectancy is based upon the aforementioned internal and external referent sources. However, if the organization does not meet employee expectations then that employee will experience low job satisfaction. Despite the intuitive nature of this theory, it also has significant limitations. The first limitation is in regard to the principles of organizational justice. While Lawler’s theory focuses
mainly on distributive justice it does not consider the influence of either procedural or interactional justice. Hence, an organization may place more emphasis on the distributive nature of justice as opposed to the other principles of justice. Employees that value procedural and interactional justice will experience a lower level of job satisfaction if their organization focuses solely on distributive justice.

In addition to the previously mentioned theories of job satisfaction, there has been considerable work conducted in regard to employee need fulfillment (e.g., Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1964). The premise of these need-based theories is that when employees’ needs are not met by the organization they are less likely to experience job satisfaction. In contrast to the other theories mentioned, need-based theory assumes that employees have different needs and in turn employees performing the same tasks may actually experience different levels of job satisfaction. Therefore, the need-based theories of job satisfaction endeavor to identify the diverse needs of employees and the extent to which these needs are being satisfied. One such theory based on employee need fulfillment, the Minnesota Model of Job Satisfaction, was proposed by Dawis et al. (1964). This model outlined 20 different employee needs within the following six categories: (a) achievement, (b) comfort, (c) status, (d) altruism, (e) safety, and (f) autonomy. Satisfaction of employees is based on the degree to which each need within the specific categories is met by the characteristics of the job itself and the organization.

Regarding employee values, Locke’s (1976) Value-Based Theory of Satisfaction suggested that employees place value on certain job outcomes. Thus, employees base satisfaction on varying criteria such as the value placed on the different job outcomes which include pay, prestige, and environment. Locke’s theory posits that job satisfaction
is based on the degree to which job outcomes match those outcomes that employees value. As opposed to other theories of job satisfaction which focus solely on distributive justice, Locke’s theory considered job outcomes related to all of the justice principles (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional justice).

In time, the thrust of the research regarding job satisfaction became on how to determine the characteristics of a good job and devise a standard measure of job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, Hulin, 1969). Through their work, Smith et al. (1969) devised an index to measure the following five specific facets of work and job satisfaction: (a) assigned work, (b) pay, (c) promotion, (d) supervision, and (e) co-workers. These facets make up what is termed the Job Description Index (JDI). The basis for the facet approach was to measure jobs as a set of interrelated tasks, roles, relationships, and rewards (Locke, 1976). Consistent with this notion of facets, an employee may be satisfied with his or her co-workers but concurrently dissatisfied with pay and promotion. Therefore a chance for discrepancy in measurement with the facet approach still exists. For instance, measuring only specific facets might not provide an accurate measure of overall job satisfaction. Thus, Balzer et al. (1990) added the Job in General Index (JIG) which is more of a global measure of job satisfaction and contributed to the conception of measuring both facet specific and overall satisfaction.

A benefit of measuring both facet specific and overall job satisfaction is the conflicting nature of time. Balzer et al. (1990) suggested that facet specific measures are more focused on short term job evaluations while overall measures rely more on long term evaluations. Therefore, an employee that has recently received an unattractive work assignment may indicate a lower level of satisfaction with the facet of work content.
Conversely, that same employee might be satisfied with the overall job and the history of prior content of work assignments from the organization. These conflicting long and short term feelings support Balzer et al.’s suggestion for using both specific and global measures of job satisfaction.

As echoed by the previously mentioned consequences of POS, the more supportive the organization, the greater the likelihood a particular consequence will be realized. Because of the negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997), it is relevant for supervisors to understand the consequences of supportive behavior. Moreover, increased support will positively influence work attitudes such as job satisfaction.

Although Eisenberger et al. (1997) stated that organizational support and job satisfaction are highly related but distinct constructs, these results must be taken in context. For example, if an organization does not have the financial resources to appropriately reward its employees this will most likely not reduce POS, but may decrease job satisfaction. On the other hand, nondiscretionary actions taken by the organization to reward employees and improve facilities may increase overall job satisfaction but may not be accompanied by increased POS. Furthermore, voluntary actions on the part of the organization are instrumental in establishing POS and related consequences such as job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Therefore, if employees believe positive organizational decisions emerge from voluntary actions, as opposed to external constraints or regulations, there will be a greater contribution to POS (Eisenberger et al., 1997). This is consistent with the subsequent notion put forth in this study that POS will be positively related to job satisfaction.
Satisfaction, an affective reaction to various elements of work, is directly affected by POS (Shore & Tetrick, 1991). The intricate facets involved in the makeup of job responsibilities must be supported by the administration for both employees and organizations to experience and reap the benefits of job satisfaction. Employees expect their needs to be fulfilled and when those needs go unfulfilled both the employees and the organization will experience the detrimental effects of decreased job satisfaction. In addition to creating employees’ obligation to help the organization, POS serves as a critical socioemotional function (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Although this may depend on individual differences, employees with a heightened sense of POS will find their job to be more gratifying and will be less likely to withdrawal or turnover from the organization. Unfortunately, the eventual result of employees’ lack of satisfaction is withdrawal or turnover from the organization. This consequence and the role of POS in the turnover process are discussed in the following section.

Turnover Intention

Turnover is defined as “the degree of individual movement across the membership boundary of an organization” (Price, 1977, p. 4). Existing research has consistently shown turnover intention as an excellent indicator of employees’ actual turnover behavior (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). In addition, Steel and Ovalle’s (1984) suggested that turnover intention and turnover were related and that turnover intention was better at predicting turnover than job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This also suggested that turnover intention was a valuable concept as it was linked with actual turnover behavior.
Regarding turnover, Eisenberger et al. (1990) reported employees with high levels of POS would be less likely to seek out and accept jobs with alternative organizations. Research has also compared the independent and joint impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intention. Arnold and Feldman (1982) indicated that both satisfaction and commitment correlated significantly with turnover intention; however, organizational commitment had the stronger relationship. Peters, Bhagat, and O'Connor (1981) also concurred with these results as they found organizational commitment had a stronger association with turnover intention than job satisfaction. On the other hand, Tett and Meyer (1993) found that turnover intention was predicted more strongly by satisfaction than by commitment, and satisfaction and commitment each were independent contributors in the prediction of turnover intention. Hence, there is little disagreement that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are strongly related to turnover or turnover intention (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986); however, based on the mixed findings the order and strength is not completely understood.

Similar to job satisfaction, research regarding turnover intention has been prevalent in the industrial and organizational psychology literature. There is, however, a distinction between voluntary and involuntary turnover. Voluntary turnover is that which is initiated by an employee, whereas involuntary turnover is generally initiated by the organization in the form of dismissals and layoffs. Initially, measurement problems arose with turnover research as it often did not take into account for involuntary turnover. The more commonly studied of the two turnover types and the focus of this section is voluntary turnover. Furthermore, contemporary research on turnover has focused more on
developing and empirically testing comprehensive theories of turnover as opposed to predicting and controlling turnover (Hom & Griffeth, 1995).

The justification for studying employee turnover concerns the direct and indirect costs incurred by organizations when employees leave (Hom and Griffeth, 1995). It is widely known that a group of core models (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, Meglino, 1979; Mobley, Horner, Hollingsworth, 1978; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Price, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981; Steers & Mowday, 1981) developed between 1977 and 1981 have shaped turnover theory (Steel, 2002). Despite continued attempts to redefine these models, scholars have merely extended these models through testing their implications. Moreover, turnover literature is generally divided into studies that focus on the antecedents that predict turnover or the consequences turnover has on the organization (Campion, 1991).

Some of the direct costs for organizations are associated with recruiting, hiring, and training employees (Bannister and Griffeth, 1986; Dess and Shaw, 2001; Mobley, 1982; Price, 1989). Also, turnover has been shown to be associated with reductions in financial performance (Huselid, 1995) and efficiency (Alexander, Bloom, and Nuchols, 1994). Moreover, within organizations, consequences exist such as decreased employee satisfaction and productivity, less effective channels of communication between staff members, and increased workloads for the remaining staff (Price, 1989).

The aforementioned core models, which illustrate turnover as an individual motivated choice behavior, share several common thrusts including affect (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment), behavioral intention, and job search mechanisms (Steel, 2002). In addition, theoretical developments have arisen regarding
the association between job conditions and turnover (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). Price (1977) demonstrated the relationship between job characteristics, job satisfaction, turnover intention, and actual turnover behavior among nurses. A recent suggestion for reducing organizational turnover has focused on organizational practices that indicate an investment in employees and their development (Allen et al., 2003). This suggestion is consistent with Huselid’s (1995) notion that human resource practices that contribute to employee development and motivation have a negative relationship on turnover. Also, Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta (1998) suggested that human resource practices that indicate an investment in facets of human capital such as pay and benefits systems as well as those that are intended to enhance organizational commitment (e.g., procedural fairness, participation) should also reduce voluntary turnover.

However, despite the aforementioned benefits of certain human resource practices, each is related to organizational turnover and not individual turnover (Allen et al., 2003). Furthermore, Campbell (1999) argued that it is also vital to clarify the relationship between organizational human resource practices and turnover at the individual level. In this regard, it is appropriate to analyze the employee-organization relationship based on a social exchange ideology (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). These two ideas emphasize an obligation to return or repay favorable treatment received from the organization. Hence, a means of fulfilling that obligation is through continued employment with the organization or retention. Eisenberger et al. (1990) noted that POS promotes membership in an organization as a vital component of employees’ self-identity. In sum, employees that perceive a
heightened degree of support would be less likely to leave the organization or search for alternative employment.

In a similar vein, Wayne et al. (1997) emphasized that a history of reciprocation between the employee and organization forms over time upon which employees that perceive a low level of support will ultimately leave the organization. Hom and Griffeth (1995) cited this as an extension of March and Simon’s (1958) inducement-participation model. March and Simon’s model stands as the seminal work for which the aforementioned core models are based. Furthermore, this model posits that employees will continue participation in the organization if the balance between inducements and expected employee contributions is sufficient. Therefore, an employee that perceives more inducements in relation to expected contributions would be less likely to voluntarily depart from the organization. Employees may also perceive organizational support as inducements and in turn desire to reciprocate that support with continued employment with the organization (Allen et al., 2003).

In summary, an integration of March and Simon’s (1958) inducements-participation model, Blau’s (1964) ideology of social exchange, and Gouldner’s (1964) norm of reciprocity is relevant to comprehend the role of POS in the turnover process. However, there are still some inconsistencies and varying results within the literature. For instance, Hom and Griffeth (1995) suggested that commitment and satisfaction mediate the relationship between POS and turnover while Allen et al. (2003) suggested that POS and turnover may be directly related. Turnover intention has also been found to be an outcome of organizational commitment (e.g., Blau, 2000; Meyer et al., 1993). Moreover,
turnover intention is included in the overall category of withdrawal behaviors (e.g., tardiness, absenteeism, voluntary turnover) (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Rhoades and Eisenberger’s (2002) meta-analytic review found that POS was negatively related to withdrawal behaviors and the current study sets out to test a similar hypothesis concerning turnover intention. In addition, researchers have substantiated the relationship between affective commitment and POS in the turnover process (e.g., Wayne et al., 1997). To further extend these varying results, Rhoades et al. (2001) established commitment as a mediator in the relationship between POS and turnover. Thus, employees with strong feelings of commitment to their job and a perception of support from the organization will have less intent to leave than employees that lack either of these attitudes. Herein is the rationale for a subsequent hypothesis regarding the negative relationship between POS and turnover intention and the mediation of job satisfaction and affective commitment in the POS-turnover relationship.

The aforementioned consequences of organizational support outline Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of the benefits derived from the employee-organization relationship. These outcomes are a result of an exchange relationship in which employees trade effort and loyalty for material and social rewards. When employees feel as though their organization cares for their contributions and well-being they will reciprocate those feelings through increased job satisfaction and affective commitment, and reduced turnover intention. Thus, maximizing the outcomes derived from healthy employee-organization relationships, benefits both employees and the organization as a whole. However, for the purpose of this study the aforementioned industrial and organizational psychology literature is adapted to a sport management context. More specifically, the
constructs outlined in the preceding review of literature are applied to the role of POS in the relationship between human resource practices and employee outcomes for NCAA Division I athletic administrators.

Gender Differences and Organizational Support

A considerable amount of research has been advanced to examine work related outcomes based on gender differences for male and female managers. Although, turnover has been one of the most common variables examined, other research has focused on particular correlates of turnover such as career advancement, satisfaction, rewards, and commitment (e.g., Chusmir, 1982; Hulin, 1991; Huselid & Day, 1991; Schneer & Reitman, 1995; Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, 1996). For example, Stroh et al. (1996) suggested that female managers may leave organizations for similar reasons as male managers, which included dissatisfaction with work or rewards, lack of commitment to the organization, and perceptions of limited opportunity for career advancement. Conversely, Chusmir (1982) concluded that women are, in fact, committed to their job through the same mechanisms as men, but female managers’ contextual situations differ and thus so does their level of commitment and satisfaction.

These and other conceptualizations of managers’ gender differences outline the antecedents and consequences of POS discussed within this paper. Additionally, differences based on gender regarding employees’ POS have emerged in sport management literature as a facet of the employee-organization relationship. Although the majority of sport management research regarding gender differences applies to the coaching profession, various scholars have also extended this line of inquiry to administrative positions (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2004; Pastore et al., 1996; Pastore,
Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1996; Sagas, & Cunningham, 2004a). Despite these efforts, this literature base omits POS and thus no true theoretical underpinnings have emerged. For example, Acosta and Carpenter’s (2004) research concerning the lack of upward mobility for female athletic administrators does not suggest that female administrators possess lower levels of perceived organizational support than their male counterparts. Therefore, it is not known whether male and female administrators share similar perceptions concerning the degree of support their athletic department provides. Because demographic variables can often be misleading, the proposed study and subsequent model attempts to delve deeper into the attitudinal variables that are related to female athletic administrators work related behaviors. Further, the proposition that gender differences will exist in terms POS and its antecedents and consequences is later hypothesized in the study.

Organizational Support and Sport Management

Although support can come in various forms and the perception of support is often individualized, it still remains a fundamental element in fostering desirable employee behaviors. Despite the continued research efforts of industrial and organizational psychologists, there still lacks an integration of OST into mainstream sport management research. However, several sport-related research studies substantiate the benefit of certain facets of administrative support on commitment, performance, satisfaction, and retention within an intercollegiate athletics context. For example, Stier (1985) attributes athletic department success to the nurturing relationship between coaches and administrators. Moreover, Priest (1990) stated that lack of administrative
support is the primary reason for turnover among coaches and thus the responsibility is on athletic administrators to establish an encouraging work environment.

Further, Appenzeller (1993) emphasized the importance of support through encouragement and morale boosting of coaches by directors of athletics. Inglis, Danylchuck, and Pastore (1996) developed a retention framework for coaches and administrators that included recognition and collegial support and then identified those as important factors for retaining employees within a particular organization. Understanding recognition and collegial support as well as other retention factors within the intercollegiate work environment has continued to be an issue concerning both coaches and administrators.

Pastore et al., (1996) identified the following six areas in which administrators can provide support to other athletic department employees: (a) game management, (b) decision making, (c) nondiscriminatory work environment, (d) job benefits/salary, (e) program support, and (f) evaluations. While top level administrators (e.g., directors of athletics) have generally been the focus of a majority of intercollegiate athletics research regarding organizational behavior, lower and mid-level athletic administrators (senior woman administrators, assistant, associate, and senior associate directors of athletics) have received far less attention. Also, collegiate coaches have garnered the focus of several studies on retention, commitment, and satisfaction. Thus, a lack of research and theory still exists in regard to how the organization (institution or athletic department) is committed to athletic administrators.

Hence, there is a need to refocus research on commitment in sport management from the commitment of an employee to his or her organization to the commitment the
organization demonstrates toward employees. The relationships proposed in this paper incorporate the relevant industrial and organizational psychology literature to form an illustrative framework to serve researchers and sport managers alike. Also, specific antecedents and outcomes of POS are identified for athletic administrators. The research setting is the NCAA Division I intercollegiate collegiate athletics context because of the importance POS factors into athletic administrators’ decision to remain with a particular institution.

Summary

This review sought to examine the constructs that make up the relationship between certain human resource practices, POS, and other social exchange variables such as affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. The exploration of these antecedents and consequences of POS is extremely vital to NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic departments. Most importantly, the degree of POS an athletic administrator perceives can ultimately impact their decision to remain with the department. This is particularly relevant because of the lack of female athletic directors at the NCAA Division I level. Perhaps, a lack of supportive human resource practices, particularly supervisory support and growth opportunities, is a catalyst for a potential lack of POS and eventual dissatisfaction with the job, lack of commitment, and intent to quit, seek alternative positions, and ultimately leave. Directors of athletics and university policy makers must further develop competitive human resource practices to retain valuable athletic administrators.
While this study does not prescribe particular modifications to procedures for NCAA Division I athletic departments, there is considerable value in accessing administrators’ POS. While a vast amount of literature exists in regard to female coaches’ propensity to leave the profession or seek alternative coaching opportunities (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2004; Pastore, 1991, 1994; Pastore, Inglis, & Danylichuk, 1996), there are no such studies of the same nature for either male or female athletic administrators. Acosta and Carpenter’s (2004) longitudinal study is clearly the exception as it included demographic information regarding the percentage of female administrators employed within all NCAA divisions. However, the present study attempts to uncover the specific attitudes and perceptions within NCAA Division I athletic departments which may be related to the under representation and sometime marginalization of female athletic administrators (i.e., a promotion from senior woman administrator to director of athletics).

Despite the apparent gender differences based on demographic figures, there is still a lack of literature concerning male athletic administrators’ propensity to seek similar positions within another institution. These horizontal position changes from one institution to another as opposed to vertical position changes within the same institution may also be related to POS. It is hypothesized in this study that POS may subsequently lead to the demonstration of commitment, satisfaction, and desire to remain with the department. These employee outcomes are equally as important in retaining employees and uncovering the reasons for why employees voluntarily turnover.
In summary, there exists a need for assessing the role of POS in the relationship between human resource practices and employee outcomes for athletic administrators. A close examination of the aforementioned sport related studies concerning the various forms of support demonstrates the dearth of literature regarding the specific role of athletic administrators’ POS in the human resource practices-employee outcomes relationship. An analysis of the antecedents and consequences in the study coupled with a realization of the importance of POS for organizations and institutions adds credibility to the application of OST to this specific facet of sport, intercollegiate athletics.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate the antecedents and consequences of organizational support within an intercollegiate athletics context. The chapter is presented in five sections which include: (a) Research Design; (b) Sample; (c) Instrumentation; (d) Data Collection; and (e) Data Analysis.

Research Design

Types of Research

Two general categories of educational research exist, qualitative and quantitative research. Quantitative research uses objective measurement and numerical analysis to assess data collected from respondents. This data is used to attempt explanations for the causes of social phenomena. Generally, quantitative research begins with hypotheses or research questions that will be tested or answered by the data (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). While the goal of quantitative research is to identify causes or relationships, the goal of qualitative research is to gain a complete understanding of the phenomena under
investigation. To achieve this end, observations and interviews are employed in qualitative research to document and portray the everyday experiences of all individuals relevant to the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Although both types of research are valuable, only quantitative research is discussed in further detail in the following section because of its use in the present study.

**Quantitative Research**

Quantitative research can be either experimental or non-experimental in nature. Experimental research is characterized by the administration of a treatment (independent variable) to different groups and then comparing the effects of that treatment on a dependent variable. Effects of the treatment are determined by comparing the group that received the treatment to a group that did not receive the treatment (control). Ary et al. (2002) described the three basic components of experimental research as: (a) the manipulation of an independent variable, (b) holding all variables constant except the independent variable, and (c) observation of the effects of the manipulation of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

Conversely, non-experimental research does not attempt to manipulate variables but rather attempts to observe the relationships between variables. Hence, Thomas and Nelson (1990) referred to non-experimental research as descriptive research. As opposed to manipulating variables, non-experimental research examines phenomena which have already occurred (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). The three types of non-experimental research that are to be discussed in the following sections are: (a) causal-comparative, (b) correlational, and (c) survey research.
Causal-comparative. Causal-comparative research is conducted to determine the cause or consequences of differences between groups of respondents (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Moreover, this design is similar to experimental research but since the independent variable has already occurred it is not manipulated (Ary et al., 2002). Causal-comparative studies are intended to compare groups that differ on the independent variable to identify an effect on the dependent variable. For instance, a causal comparative design would be used to determine the effect of participation in high school athletics on college students’ level of physical fitness. The participation in high school athletics has already occurred and thus cannot be manipulated. However, the results of the different groups, on the dependent variable (level of physical fitness), are compared to determine a causal relationship.

There are limitations to causal-comparative research based on the lack of conclusively in determining whether the independent variable is truly the cause of the behavior observed in the dependent variable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Considering the previous example, it is possible that an event that occurred either before or after high school athletic participation could be a better determinant of college students’ level of physical activity. Therefore, because of the inability of causal-comparative research to control for other variables, results must be interpreted with caution (Ary et al., 2002). Despite these limitations, Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) cite causal-comparative research as a valuable means to determine possible causes of observed behavioral variances.

Correlational. Causal-comparative and correlational research are quite similar in that both are classified as association research. Correlational research is conducted to determine the relationship between two or more variables and the degree of this
relationship is expressed in a numerical index (Thomas & Nelson, 1990). In both causal-comparative and correlational research two or more variables are studied to determine relationships without the researcher attempting to manipulate the variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). While both types of research are descriptive in nature, causal-comparative research generally studies two or more groups and correlational research requires a score on each variable from all respondents (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Also, correlational research examines two or more quantitative variables through the use of a correlation coefficient while causal-comparative research contains at least one categorical variable. For example, correlational research would be used to assess the relationship between administrators’ perceptions of growth opportunities and their level of organizational commitment. The relationship between these two variables would be examined through the quantitative responses administrators provided to items concerning growth opportunities and organizational commitment.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) cite the following two reasons for conducting correlational research: explaining human behaviors and predicting likely outcomes. It has also been suggested that a purpose of correlational research is to elucidate the comprehension of phenomena through distinguishing relationships among variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). The predictive value of correlational research is also highly beneficial if there is a significantly strong relationship between two variables for which the score of one variable is known and the other is not. However, it is important to note that correlational research does not establish a cause and effect relationship. Rather, correlational research identifies potential relationships between observed phenomena.
Survey. The last research design discussed in this section is survey research. This research design uses survey instruments or questionnaires to glean information from groups of respondents (Ary et al., 2002). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described survey research as “an attempt to obtain data from members of a population (or a sample) to determine the current status of that sample with respect to one or more variables” (p. 672). Additionally, Thomas and Nelson (1990) noted that survey research allows the investigator to obtain and summarize demographic information on a group being measured. Unlike correlational and causal-comparative research, survey research does not attempt to identify relationships among variables. When using survey research, Dillman (2000) suggested that researchers account for the following errors: (a) sampling error, (b) coverage error, (c) measurement error, and (d) nonresponse error. Procedures for avoiding these four errors are discussed in subsequent sections.

For this study, the goal of the research was to address specific hypotheses concerning how human resource practices relate to employee and organizational outcomes. Therefore, since the purpose of this study is descriptive in nature, the variables were not manipulated in any way. Research methods employed in this study were consistent with Fraenkel and Wallen’s (2003) description of survey research. In addition to being a cross-sectional, survey design this study is also correlational in nature because it is concerned with the relationships between several variables. The variables under investigation are the antecedents (i.e., participation in decision making, organizational justice, growth opportunity, supervisor support) as well as the consequences (i.e., affective commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions) of organizational support within NCAA Division I athletic departments.
The researcher quantitatively measured the antecedents and consequences of organizational support as perceived by athletic administrators. Survey research was deemed the most appropriate methodology for the following reasons: (a) descriptive nature of the study, (b) large frame, (c) nature of constructs, and (d) available quantitative instruments for measuring the constructs. Moreover, the researcher recognized that there are certain limitations of survey research such as the cross-sectional and superficial nature of responses and the potential for measurement error (Dillman, 2000; Kerlinger, 1986).

Sample

Sampling refers to the process of selecting individuals from a population to participate in a study (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2003). The purpose of sampling is to gather a representative group from a population to which the researcher wants to generalize results (Ary et al., 2002). Ary and colleagues also noted the importance of two initial steps in sampling: identifying a target population and identifying an accessible population.

In general, the two classifications of sampling procedures are probabilistic and non-probabilistic. While the probabilistic method utilizes some form of random selection, non-probabilistic procedures do not. However, this does not mean that non-probabilistic samples are not representative of the population under study. The four strategies discussed in the following section in regard to probabilistic (random) sampling procedures are: (a) simple, (b) stratified, (c) systematic, and (d) cluster. In addition, the three non-probabilistic sampling procedures discussed include: (a) convenience, (b) purposive, and (c) proportional.
Simple random sampling is a basic technique in which a group of subjects (a sample) are selected for study from a larger group (a population) (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Each individual is chosen entirely by chance and each element in the population has an equal chance of being selected at any stage in the sampling process. Stratified random sampling, on the other hand, involves dividing the population into homogeneous subgroups and then taking a simple random sample from each subgroup. It is generally required that the proportion of each stratum in the sample should be the same as in the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Also, stratified random sampling has more statistical precision than simple random sampling as it assures that a sample will represent not only the overall population, but also key subgroups of the population. This sampling method is also sometimes referred to as proportional or quota random sampling (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

The other two probabilistic sampling methods are systematic and cluster sampling. Using systematic random sampling entails determining a random starting point then sampling the entire population by some predetermined, systematic means. For example, from a list of subjects a random subject is selected and then every subject that falls within the predetermined interval is subsequently selected. However, it is necessary to know the size of the population and how many subjects are needed for the sample. The last probabilistic sampling procedure to be discussed in this section is cluster sampling. This is a sampling technique in which the entire population is divided into groups, or clusters, and a random sample of these clusters is selected. All observations in the selected clusters are included in the sample. Cluster sampling is typically used when the
researcher cannot get a complete list of the population under study but can get a complete list of groups or clusters of the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

As for the non-probabilistic sampling procedures, the most common is convenience sampling. This method uses the most accessible subjects who fit the eligibility criteria of the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Although this is one of the most widely used sampling procedures, it is also considered the weakest because there is no way to control for biases that exist. Thus, there is no way to ensure that this sample is an accurate representation of the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Despite these inherent flaws, convenience samples can provide a researcher with useful information, especially in a pilot study. Purposive sampling is another non-random sampling procedure in which respondents are specifically sought out. In a similar vein, a proportional sampling technique is conducted to represent the major characteristics of the population by sampling only a proportional amount of the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). However, the issue with both purposive and proportional sampling is that the researcher must decide the specific characteristics on which to base quotas. With the aforementioned sampling procedures in mind, the most ideal sampling procedure to be employed is random sampling because of the ability to estimate sampling errors and the confidence of findings (Best, 1981). The sampling procedures employed for both the pilot and main study are discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

Panel of Experts and Pilot Study

After permission was secured from the Behavioral/Social Sciences Institutional Review Board (IRB), a panel of experts was selected to examine the instrument for face and content validity. In addition, the panel of experts was used to determine whether the
proposed questionnaire included an adequate sample of items to obtain the desired results. Since most of the scales on this instrument had been previously used in published research, the panel was asked to thoroughly examine the questionnaire for the wording of items, instructions, and the overall appearance and applicability of the instrument. The panel included current and former athletic administrators ($n = 2$), professors from sport management ($n = 10$) and counselor education ($n = 1$), and individuals well-versed in the research on organizational support and commitment ($n = 2$). Comments from these individuals were recorded and taken into consideration prior to any changes being made to the instrument.

After the revisions, a pilot test was conducted using a convenience sample of athletic administrators ($N = 59$) holding various positions (e.g., senior associate athletic director, director of event management, assistant director of development) at a large, Midwestern NCAA Division I institution. In addition to the instrument, these administrators received a cover letter explaining the study (see Appendix A for pilot study cover letter). The campus mail system was used to distribute the questionnaires and for the respondents to return to the researchers. A total of 19 usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 32.2%.

The pilot study questionnaire assessed multiple components of athletic administrators’ POS and thus the antecedents and outcomes of support were assessed by several items. For each subscale, Cronbach’s alphas were calculated to determine internal consistency. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) ranged from .76 to .96 for the six subscales for the independent variables and from .86 to .93 for the three subscales for the dependent variables. Lastly, the subscale for organizational support had an internal
consistency of .85. All reliability estimates for the pilot study are reported in Table 3.1. These estimates are considered acceptable (Ary et al., 2002) and comparable to those reported in the literature and therefore no substantive changes were made to the instrument.

**Sampling Method**

Data for the main study were collected from one female (senior woman administrator) and one male (i.e., senior associate, associate, and assistant director of athletics) athletic administrator employed at each of the 327 NCAA Division I institutions \( N = 654 \). While the pilot employed a convenience sampling technique, the main study employed two different sampling techniques. For selection of the senior woman administrator, census sampling was used, whereas purposive sampling was employed for selection of the male athletic administrator. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined census sampling as “an attempt to acquire data from each and every member of a population” (p. 662). Census sampling procedures also control for sampling and coverage errors (Dillman, 2000). On the other hand, purposive sampling, a nonprobability sampling method, entails sampling with a purpose in mind. In this particular study, the purpose was to garner results from male athletic administrators that satisfied the following criterion: (a) rank below the director of athletics, (b) first male athletic administrator listed below the director of athletics in the *2004-2005 National Directory of College Athletics*, and (c) hold the title senior associate, associate, or assistant director of athletics.

In sum, this study included two athletic administrators (one male and one female) from each NCAA Division I institution \( N = 327 \), as listed in the Men’s and Women’s
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support (3 items)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities (2 items)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making (5 items)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support (8 items)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (6 items)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (4 items)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention (2 items)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Scale reliability measures for the pilot study
Editions of the 2004-2005 National Directory of College Athletics. The male athletic administrator, described above, was selected in a slightly different manner than the female athletic administrator. More specifically, each senior woman administrator was selected from the Women’s Edition and each male administrator from the Men’s Edition. However, the male athletic administrator selected from the Men’s Edition was selected based on listing, in hierarchical order, below the director of athletics. For instance, if the first administrator listed directly below the director of athletics was a female senior assistant director of athletics, then the next highest ranking male administrator would be selected for inclusion in the study. In certain instances the first administrator listed below the director of athletics was either a male associate director of athletics or an assistant director of athletics. This being the case, this male administrator would be selected with no further movement down the list necessary.

As each institution retains a particular policy for bestowing position titles, the administrator listed directly below the director of athletics may carry the title “senior associate director of athletics” or “associate director of athletics.” Therefore, selection of the male administrator was based on the listing in the Men’s Edition as the most senior administrators are listed immediately below the director of athletics. Based on the aforementioned structure of the Men’s Edition, the researcher deemed this an adequate sampling method for selecting a male athletic administrator for inclusion in this study.

Selection of athletic administrators (both female and male) that rank below the director of athletics also permits the investigation of constructs that may not be pertinent for top level administrators such as participation in decision making, growth opportunity, and supervisor support. Additionally, the selection of two athletic administrators was
based on the researcher’s intent to draw a similar number of males and females. To further illustrate this point, the NCAA (2002a) reported that 92% of the directors of athletics within Division I intercollegiate athletics are male. However, when the NCAA created the position “senior woman administrator” in 1990 each Division I institution employed one such female athletic administrator. In summary, a sample that includes senior associate, associate, and assistant athletic administrators will also serve as a departure from the majority of sport management research that has focused strictly on the director of athletics.

Subject Description

The first task in selecting a sample for a study is defining the population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Therefore, the target population for this study was athletic administrators from the 327 institutions that are presently members of the NCAA Division I. As previously mentioned, Division I institutions must meet minimum financial aid awards for their athletics program, and must not exceed maximum financial aid awards for each sport these institutions sponsor (NCAA, 2004). The athletic administrators included in this study were senior woman administrators and male senior associate, associate, or assistant directors of athletics.

Since an intercollegiate athletic department at the NCAA Division I level mirrors an industrial organization, the hierarchal levels among athletic departments are quite similar (Slack, 1997). The use of solely Division I institutions in this study was done based on the hierarchal levels within Division I athletic department as well as the organizational complexity, size, and structure. For example, just as a business organization is headed by a chief executive officer and other departments within that
business (e.g., marketing, public relations, accounting) are headed by individual managers, NCAA Division I athletic departments are headed by a director of athletics and each individual unit (e.g., compliance, student athlete support services, operations, marketing) is headed by a separate athletic administrator. These athletic administrators are generally responsible for specific organizational units (e.g., marketing, facility management, finance, ticket operations). Similar to other types of organizations, several athletic administrators rank below the director of athletics in the organizational hierarchy. This is generally not the case at the smaller, Division II and III institutions, hence their exclusion from this study.

The variables under study in this particular research endeavor necessitate the use of athletic administrators in highly structured, hierarchal environments with several levels of accountability. For instance, to gain insight on the participation in decision making and supervisor support of athletic administrators, they must have certain standing with the organization. Although the budgets of several NCAA Division I institutions may vary significantly, there are still organizational similarities that make the study of the variables used in this research quite pertinent. These operational similarities, or isomorphic tendencies, have not only been found within NCAA Division I, but also within Canadian interuniversity athletic departments and NCAA Division III athletic departments as well (e.g., Cunningham & Ashley, 2001; Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999; Pack, in press; Slack & Hinings, 1995).

In more specific terms, the positions under investigation are the senior woman administrator and a comparable male athletic administrator. The senior woman administrator is defined by the NCAA as “the highest-ranking female administrator
involved with the conduct of a member institution’s intercollegiate athletics program” (NCAA, 2004). The position is intended to ensure representation of women’s interests, experience, and perspective of intercollegiate athletics (NCAA, 2002b). The male athletic administrator selected for this study was defined as a senior associate, associate, or assistant director of athletics. Each had significantly responsibilities within an individual department or unit and was one of the highest ranking males in the athletic department directly below the director of athletics. Furthermore, the NCAA (2002a) reported that within Division I, 64.5% of associate and 67% of assistant directors of athletics were male.

Instrumentation

Using an unreliable instrument is only one of the many sources of measurement error in research (Gay & Diehl, 1992). In order to control for measurement error, an instrument should possess validity and reliability. While a valid instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, a reliable instrument is one that obtains consistent results (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). The specific validity and reliability procedures employed in this study are elucidated more clearly in a later section. Based on Dillman’s (2000) suggestions for controlling measurement error, the instrument used in the current study was a questionnaire adopted from Allen et al.’s (2003) study concerning the role of POS and supportive human resource practices in determining turnover behaviors for insurance agents and department store salespeople. The application of Allen et al.’s instrument for this study was preferable because of the benefits gleaned from previous expert input.

Since the scales used in Allen et al.’s (2003) instrument have demonstrated high validity and reliability in various settings, including sport management, the design of this
study was strengthened and the chance for measurement error reduced. Questionnaires were distributed to the two aforementioned athletic administrators at each NCAA Division I institution and consisted of items to ascertain athletic administrators’ level of agreement with the statements presented (see Appendix B and Appendix C for final sample cover letter and questionnaire). A corresponding 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) was also employed for all scales.

**Study Variables**

A variable expresses some concept or construct and thus the research process is concerned with the relationships that exist between these variables (Ary et al., 2002). Variables take on different values depending on the study; however, there is always variation between individuals and groups. Whereas the independent variables are the antecedents in the study, the dependent variables are the consequences. For the purpose of this study, each variable is a representation of a concept or construct and must be defined.

Several levels of investigation are required to test the proposed model. The first stage of analysis addressed the independent variables (participation in decision making, growth opportunity, supervisor support, procedural justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice) as they influenced the dependent variable, POS. In the second stage of analysis, POS was treated as the independent variable and affective commitment and job satisfaction as dependent variables. Next, affective commitment and job satisfaction were treated as independent variables of turnover intention. Finally, both affective commitment and job satisfaction were tested as mediators of the relationship between
POS and turnover intention. The following sections provide the operational definitions as well as the scales used for each of the variables under investigation.

_Participation in decision making._ Participation in decision making (PDM) represents a form of social exchange believed to induce employee reciprocation in the form of organizational support. Furthermore, an organization allowing employee participation should signal that employee contributions are valued. This variable was measured using five items originally developed by Siegel and Ruh (1973) and has been subsequently used by Lam et al. (2002). As an indication of the wide use of the PDM construct, Allen et al.’s (2003) study also incorporated PDM, but with an instrument developed by Steel and Mento (1987). For the purpose of the present study, the Siegel and Ruh instrument was selected over the Steel and Mento instrument because of the high internal consistency reported in Lam et al. (α = .95). A sample item is: “In this organization (athletic department), I can participate in setting new policies.” It is important to note that the original referent ‘organization’ from Siegel and Ruh’s scale was replaced with the referent ‘athletic department’ in the scale used in this study.

_Organizational Justice._ For the purpose of this study, organizational justice included three separate scales for procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. The inclusion of these three organizational justice constructs as antecedents of organizational support is consistent with the findings of Wayne et al. (2002) and Fasolo (1995). Wayne et al. (2002) also found high internal consistency for procedural justice (α = .88) and distributive justice (α = .92)

Procedural justice is the perception that work-related decisions are based on the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeals process.
(Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). More specifically, Price (1997) noted that procedural justice “exists to the degree that rights are applied universally to all members of an organization” (p. 424). In this study, procedural justice was measured with four items from Rahim et al.’s (2000) revised version of the Organizational Justice Index (OJI). Distributive as well as interactional justice items were also measured using the revised version of the OJI as it has shown internal consistency in Rahim et al.’s study. More specifically, Rahim et al. found internal consistency estimates of .85 for procedural, .96 for distributive, and .94 for interactional justice. A sample procedural justice item from the scale is: “The athletic department’s decision-making procedures are carried out in the same way each time they are used.”

Distributive justice is the degree to which rewards (and punishments) are related to performance (Price, 1997). Another way of describing distributive justice is the extent to which employees have been fairly rewarded based on responsibilities, experience, effort, performance, and the strains of the job (Kim et al., 1996). Furthermore, distributive justice principle was measured using the four-item scale on the revised version of the OJI. As previously mentioned, this subscale has been found to have high internal consistency for measuring distributive justice. A sample item is as follows: “I am satisfied with the rewards I receive from the athletic department.”

Interactional justice constitutes judgments of fairness based on the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the implementation of certain procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986). As with the other justice principles, interactional justice was measured using the four-item scale on the revised version of the OJI. A sample for interactional justice is: “I feel that my primary supervisor attempts to be honest with me.”
Growth opportunities. Based on Wayne et al.’s (1997) conclusions, growth opportunities signify the organization recognizes and values the employee’s contributions and may also indicate future support from the organization. Wayne et al. (1997) also found a significant positive relationship between job promotions and POS. Growth opportunities were measured with two items developed by Bedeian et al. (1991). The scale’s alpha reliability was found to be .77 in Bedeian et al.’s study. Furthermore, Chay and Aryee (1999) reported a coefficient alpha of .88 for Bedian et al.’s scale in their study. The two items for this scale are: “My present job is relevant to growth and development in my career” and “I feel that my present job will lead to future attainment of my career goals.”

Supervisor Support. This variable was measured with three items from the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (SPSS; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). These items were originally from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS; Eisenberger et al., 1986) but were reworded by previous researchers for use in the SPSS. Rhoades et al. (2001) found the SPSS to have high internal reliability with coefficient alpha of .90. A sample item from the SPSS is: “My immediate supervisor is willing to extend him/herself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.”

Perceived organizational support. POS was measured using the eight-item, short version of the SPOS developed by Eisenberger and colleagues (1986). This shortened version of the SPOS has demonstrated high internal reliability and unidimensionality in finance, insurance, and industrial settings (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; α = .97). Subsequent internal consistency reliability estimates for the SPOS has been reported to be between .74 and .97 (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Additionally, SPOS items have
been found to load highly on the main factor and, most importantly, seemed applicable to athletic administrators. A sample item adapted for this study is: “The organization (athletic department) fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.” The same procedure of replacing the referent ‘organization’ with ‘athletic department’ was also used with the items comprising the SPOS.

**Affective commitment.** Affective commitment was measured using six items from Meyer et al.’s (1993) occupational commitment instrument. Reliability estimates of Meyer and Allen’s (1991) instrument ranged from .73 to .85. In a recent meta-analysis by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), affective commitment was strongly and positively related to POS. A sample item using the referent ‘athletic department’ instead of ‘organization’ is: “I feel as if the athletic department’s problems are my own.”

**Job satisfaction.** Operationally, job satisfaction has been measured using various instruments within industrial organizational psychology and sport management research. For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction was measured using a three-item scale employed by Eisenberger et al. (1997). However, this scale was originally developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974). While Quinn and Shepard reported an internal consistency of .72, Eisenberger et al. (1997) reported higher internal consistency of .85 for this scale. Although a strong, positive relationship existed between job satisfaction and POS in Eisenberger et al.’s (1997) study, the authors deemed the two constructs distinct. Subsequent studies have also attested to the internal reliability of the scale (e.g., Balzer et al., 1990; Rice, McFarlin, Hunt, & Near, 1985). A sample item for the job satisfaction scale used in this study is: “If a good friend of mine told me that he/she was interested in working in a job like mine I would strongly recommend it.”
Turnover intention. Existing research has consistently shown turnover intention as the single best indicator of actual turnover behavior (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). In addition, Steel and Ovalle (1984) suggested that turnover intention and turnover were related and that turnover intention was better than affective variables, namely job satisfaction and organizational commitment, in predicting turnover. Turnover intention was measured by two-items adapted from a scale developed by Meyer et al. (1993). The items used were: “I frequently think about leaving the athletic department” and “I will likely leave the athletic department for another athletic administrative position within the next two years”.

Demographic Variables. Respondents were asked to provide the following information: (a) age; (b) race/ethnicity; (c) gender; (d) occupational tenure; and (e) institutional tenure. Differences among these demographic subgroups for athletic administrators were tested for significance through ANOVAs. Results of these tests are reported in Chapter 4.

Instrument Validity

Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998) defined validity as “the ability of a construct’s indicators to measure accurately the concept under study” (p. 584). Hence, the types of validity examined for the current study were face validity and content validity (i.e., panel of experts, pilot test).

Face validity. Face validity is a subjective means of determining whether the instrument is measuring what it was developed to measure. The aforementioned panel of
Content validity. Content validity refers to the representativeness of the items on an instrument as related to the entire domain (Kirk & Miller, 1986). This type of validity is sometimes qualitative in nature and thus may not allow for numerical measurement. Furthermore, Messick (1995) noted content validity as evidence of content relevance, representativeness, and technical quality. The most common methods of testing for the content validity of an instrument is also through the use of a panel of experts and a pilot test consisting of subjects similar to those in the proposed population (Kirk & Miller, 1986). The panel of experts and the pilot test were both used in this study and were discussed in a previous section.

Data Collection

One week prior to the day of first postal mailing of the complete survey packets, an electronic mail (e-mail) prenotification was sent to the athletic administrators included in the final sample. E-mail addresses were obtained from the Men’s and Women’s Editions of the 2004-2005 National Directory of College Athletics or, when necessary, the NCAA website or the University’s website. The e-mail prenotification was an invitation to participate in the study and a means of introducing the purpose of the study (see Appendix D for e-mail prenotification). Next, packets containing a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study, a self-addressed and stamped return envelope, and the questionnaire booklet were mailed via United States postal service. In addition, each potential respondent was assured the highest degree of confidentiality. As previously
mentioned, Division I was selected on the basis of accessibility and the availability of senior woman administrators and male senior associate, associate, and assistant directors of athletics.

After one week elapsed, an e-mail reminder was sent to non-respondents. Then, after three weeks from the day of the initial mailing date the remaining non-respondents were sent an e-mail with an electronic version of the instrument attached. This second, online method was coded differently than the first packet to distinguish it as that of an online respondent. Still, an additional e-mail reminder was sent to the remaining non-respondents after four weeks. Although this non-response protocol satisfies Dillman’s (2000) suggestions for controlling non-response bias, it does vary slightly. The intended purpose of the variations was to minimize costs while maximizing the response rate for this study. In addition, to help control for non-response error early respondents were compared to late respondents (Miller & Smith, 1983). For the purpose of this study, early respondents were those that returned their questionnaire before the deadline indicated on the cover letter whereas late respondents where those that returned either the paper and pencil or online version of the questionnaire after the deadline. In accordance with Miller and Smith (1983), late respondents are assumed to be similar, if not the same, as non-respondents.

T-tests for independent means were used to verify whether there was a statistical difference between the means of the early and late respondents (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). The concern for sampling error was further mitigated by the use of a census sampling procedure for senior woman administrators. In regard to non-response error, respondents who returned the questionnaire early (n = 111) were compared to those that
returned the questionnaire late \( n = 111 \) (i.e., after the stated deadline). This was conducted in accordance with Miller and Smith’s (1983) suggestion that late respondents are often similar to non-respondents. \( T \)-tests for independent means were performed on all variables to determine whether there was a statistical difference between the means of the two groups. The results of these \( t \)-tests are reported in Appendix E showed no significant differences between early and late respondents on all variables in the study. In sum, it can be concluded, with caution, that non-respondents were no different than respondents.

**Data Analysis**

The data received from the questionnaires were analyzed using the software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0. A 95% confidence interval was used for all analyses based on the exploratory and descriptive nature of the study. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations) and internal reliability scores (Cronbach’s alphas) were calculated using SPSS and were reported for all facets of the questionnaire.

Hypothesis 1, which predicted that human resource practices (i.e., participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunities, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) would be significantly and positively related to POS, was tested through multiple linear regression analysis. Furthermore, follow-up analyses were used for Hypotheses 1a-1f to determine which human resource practices contributed significantly to the variance in POS. Hypotheses 2 and 3, which predicted that POS would be positively related to affective commitment and job satisfaction, were also each tested using separate simple linear regression analyses. Hypothesis 4 which predicted that
affective commitment and job satisfaction would be significantly and negatively related to turnover intention was tested using multiple linear regression, while follow-up analyses were conducted to test hypotheses 4a and 4b.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 which predicted that affective commitment and job satisfaction would mediate the relationship between POS and turnover intention were tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) steps for mediation. This process entailed three steps: (a) the mediator is regressed on the independent variable, (b) the dependent variable is regressed on the independent variable, and (c) the dependent variable is regressed simultaneously on both the independent variable and the mediator (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Mediation is achieved if the independent variable has a significant effect on the mediator in the first regression, the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable in the second regression, the mediator has a significant effect on the dependent variable in the third regression, and finally, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable is less in the third regression than in the second regression. Lastly, hypothesis 7 was advanced to test for gender differences. To achieve this, an ANCOVA for each dependent variable was conducted while controlling for any demographic variables that were deemed to have a significant impact on the variables in the study. On the back on the questionnaire respondents had an opportunity to answer an open-ended item eliciting comments concerning their experiences as intercollegiate athletic administrators.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter contains the results of the quantitative data analysis procedures conducted for this study. The data were collected using the Athletic Administrator Questionnaire, which contained items designed to measure the aforementioned concepts among NCAA Division I athletic administrators. Results are presented in five sections which include: (a) Study Sample; (b) Subgroup Differences; (c) Reliability Analysis; (d) Correlations; and (e) Hypothesis Testing.

Study Sample

Two athletic administrators at each of the 327 NCAA Division I institutions \((N = 654)\) were mailed packets containing a cover letter, instrument, and a pre-stamped return envelope. A total of 222 athletic administrators completed and returned the questionnaire for a response rate of 33.9%. Of the 222 respondents, 200 responded to the paper and pencil version of the questionnaire while 22 responded to the online version. Respondents were asked to provide the following demographic information: (a) age, (b) race/ethnicity, (c) gender, (d) occupational tenure (i.e., years as athletic administrator), and (e) institutional tenure (i.e., years employed at current institution).
The mean age of the athletic administrators that returned the questionnaire was 44.1 years ($SD = 9.95$). In regard to race/ethnicity, the majority of respondents (86.3%) indicated Caucasian/white, while 10% indicated African American/black, 2.3% Hispanic, and less than 1% for each of the Native American and Other categories. Gender composition was more evenly distributed as 53.6% of respondents were female and 46.4% male. The mean occupational tenure was approximately 12.7 years ($SD = 8.05$) while the mean institutional tenure was 11.8 years ($SD = 9.51$). The demographic information is further expanded in Table 4.1. In addition, means, which ranged from 3.30 to 5.81, and standard deviations for each of the scales are reported in Table 4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>$M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational tenure</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional tenure</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Frequency distribution of demographic variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All items are on a 7-point scale (*1* = “strongly disagree” and *7* = “strongly agree”)

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics for scales
Subgroup Differences

As mentioned in Chapter 3, differences among respondents on the following demographic variables were tested for each of the variables in the study: (a) age, (b) race/ethnicity, (c) gender, (d) occupational tenure, and (e) institutional tenure.

Using ANOVAs to test whether age had a significant main effect on any of the variables in the study, significant main effects were found on growth opportunities, \( F(4, 218) = 9.97, p < .001 \), and turnover intention, \( F(4, 220) = 7.40, p < .001 \). Based on Cohen’s (1988) conceptualization, the effect sizes for the main effects of age with growth opportunities (\( \eta^2 = .16 \)) and turnover intention (\( \eta^2 = .12 \)) were considered small. However, because of the presence of these effect sizes the determination was made to control for age in all subsequent analyses. In terms of race/ethnicity, no main effects on any of the study variables were found. Similarly, the same was true of institutional tenure; no main effects on any of the study variables were found.

Occupational tenure, however, did have main effects on growth opportunities, \( F(4, 216) = 5.54, p < .001 \), procedural justice, \( F(4, 218) = 2.49, p = .044 \), participation in decision making, \( F(4, 218) = 3.59, p = .007 \), and turnover intention, \( F(4, 218) = 3.43, p = .010 \). Again, based on Cohen’s conceptualization, effect sizes existed for the impact of occupational tenure on turnover intention (\( \eta^2 = .06 \)), participation in decision making (\( \eta^2 = .06 \)), procedural justice (\( \eta^2 = .04 \)), and growth opportunities (\( \eta^2 = .10 \)). In summary, because of these large effect sizes it was also determined that occupational tenure was to be used as a control for all subsequent analyses. It is of note that gender was subsequently tested in hypothesis 7 while controlling for both age and occupational tenure.
Reliability Analysis

The reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for POS, the antecedents of POS (participation in decision making, supervisory support, growth opportunities, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice), and consequences of POS (affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention) are reported in Table 4.3.

Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) eight-item version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .93 in this study. The six scales used for the antecedents of support produced Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .76 to .94. The scales used to measure job satisfaction and affective commitment produced Cronbach’s alphas of .78 and .81, respectively, while the two-item scale for turnover intention produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .70. The internal consistency of all the scales falls within Nunnally’s (1978) level of acceptability ($\alpha = .70$) for exploratory or early stage research. Therefore, based on the exploratory nature of this study, the researcher proceeded without refinement to any of the scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities (2 items)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making (5 items)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice (4 items)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support (3 items)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support (8 items)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (6 items)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (3 items)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention (2 items)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Scale reliability measures for the final instrument
Correlations

Table 4.4 illustrates the correlations that were performed on all variables in the study. As expected, each of the six human resource practices (participation in decision making, growth opportunities, supervisor support, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) held significant, positive correlations with POS. Furthermore, each of these six independent variables was significantly correlated with each other. Using a tolerance index cutoff threshold of less than .10 and a variance inflation factor (VIF) of greater than 10, the problem of multicollinearity was not present. Next, using POS as the independent variable, there were significant, positive associations with both affective commitment and job satisfaction. In addition, both affective commitment and job satisfaction held significant, negative correlations with turnover intention. Although affective commitment and job satisfaction were significantly correlated with one another, multicollinearity was again not present in this study.
### Table 4.4: Correlations between all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PJ</td>
<td>.662*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IJ</td>
<td>.878*</td>
<td>.595*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DJ</td>
<td>.641*</td>
<td>.562*</td>
<td>.553*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GO</td>
<td>.455*</td>
<td>.466*</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.374*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PDM</td>
<td>.667*</td>
<td>.595*</td>
<td>.666*</td>
<td>.526*</td>
<td>.511*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. POS</td>
<td>.835*</td>
<td>.692*</td>
<td>.781*</td>
<td>.693*</td>
<td>.459*</td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AC</td>
<td>.579*</td>
<td>.530*</td>
<td>.554*</td>
<td>.514*</td>
<td>.291*</td>
<td>.536*</td>
<td>.616*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. JS</td>
<td>.614*</td>
<td>.456*</td>
<td>.591*</td>
<td>.598*</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>.550*</td>
<td>.635*</td>
<td>.590*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TI</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>-.475*</td>
<td>-.537*</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.410*</td>
<td>-.556*</td>
<td>-.598*</td>
<td>-.505*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

**Note.** (SS – supervisor support; PJ – procedural justice; IJ – interactional justice; DJ – distributive justice; GO – growth opportunities; PDM – participation in decision making; POS – perceived organizational support; AC – affective commitment; JS – job satisfaction; TI – turnover intention)
Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the linear combination of human resource practices (i.e., participation in decision making, supervisory support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) would be significantly and positively related to POS. As predicted, (while controlling for age and occupational tenure) the linear combination of human resource practices were significantly and positively related to POS, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. As seen in Table 4.5, the overall fit of the model was found to be statistically significant ($F(6, 207) = 135.72, p < .001$) and accounted for 78.3% of the variance. In regard to hypotheses 1a-1f, positive relationships between the individual human resource practices and POS did exist with all but one of the six hypothesized antecedents (see also Table 4.5). In support of hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, and 1f, participation in decision making ($\beta = .26, t(207) = 5.43, p < .001$), supervisor support ($\beta = .32, t(207) = 4.32, p < .001$), distributive justice ($\beta = .20, t(207) = 4.68, p < .001$), procedural justice ($\beta = .13, t(207) = 2.92, p = .004$), and interactional justice ($\beta = .13, t(207) = 1.99, p = .048$) were all significant contributors to the variance explained in POS. On the other hand, hypothesis 1c regarding growth opportunities ($\beta = .01, t(207) = .28, p = .780$) as a significant contributor was not supported. In regard multicollinearity, none of the variables were under the tolerance level of .10 or exceeded a VIF of 10.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 concerned the relationship between POS and affective commitment and job satisfaction. Using age and occupational tenure as controls, both hypotheses were supported and the results are shown in Table 4.6. POS had significant,
positive relationships with affective commitment, $F(1, 215) = 124.70, p < .001, R^2 = .36,$
and job satisfaction, $F(1, 213) = 162.43, p < .001, R^2 = .43.$

Next, in hypothesis 4, the relationship between the employee outcomes of POS
and turnover intention were examined. The overall hypothesis stated that the linear
combination of the POS outcome variables, affective commitment and job satisfaction,
would be significantly and negatively related to turnover intention. As reported in Table
4.7, while controlling for age and occupational tenure, the overall fit of the model was
statistically significant, $F(2, 212) = 70.44, p < .001,$ and explained 34.6% of the
variance. In regard to hypotheses 4a and 4b, significant, negative relationships between
affective commitment and job satisfaction and turnover intention did exist. In support of
hypotheses 4a and 4b, affective commitment ($\beta = - .38, t(212) = - 5.95, p < .001$) and job
satisfaction ($\beta = - .28, t(212) = - 4.41, p < .001$) each contributed significantly to the
variance explained in turnover intention.
### Table 4.5: Regression of POS on participation in decision making, supervisory support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables entered</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>ADJ $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$BETA$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>135.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4.68***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.99***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. in Decision Making</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$

### Table 4.6: Regressions of affective commitment on POS and job satisfaction on POS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>ADJ $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>124.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>162.43***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables entered</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>ADJ $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>70.44***</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-5.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-4.41***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$

Table 4.7: Regression of turnover intention on affective commitment and job satisfaction

Hypotheses 5 and 6 which predicted that affective commitment and job satisfaction would mediate the relationship between POS and turnover intention were tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for testing mediation. For the purpose of this study, affective commitment and job satisfaction were each treated as a separate mediator of the relationship between POS and turnover intention. Thus, Baron and Kenny’s procedure was performed on each variable while controlling for age and occupational tenure. Two diagrammatic representations of the results of these mediations are reported in Figure 4.1.

In the first step, a simple regression was performed to test for the relationship between POS and turnover intention. Significance was achieved in this first step as POS was negatively related to turnover intention ($\beta = -.28$, $t = -4.41$, $p < .001$). The next step was to show that POS is related to each of the mediators (affective commitment and job satisfaction). This was previously achieved in hypotheses 2 and 3 and so to restate those results, POS had significant, positive relationships with affective commitment ($F (1, 215)$...
The third step entailed testing the relationship between the two mediators (affective commitment and job satisfaction) and the outcome variable (turnover intention) while controlling for POS in each step. Figure 4.1 diagrams the relationships between POS and turnover intention with both affective commitment and job satisfaction as separate mediators.

In accordance with Shrout and Bolger (2002) one way to describe the amount of mediation is in terms of the proportion of the total effect that is mediated. In other words, using the unstandardized regression coefficients from Figure 4.1, the equation for the mediation of affective commitment is 
\[
\frac{(.557*-548)/-734} = -.416.
\]
To interpret these results, 41.6\% of the total effect of POS on turnover intention is mediated by affective commitment. In regard to job satisfaction, the equation is 
\[
\frac{(.645*-405)/-734} = .356.
\]
Therefore, 35.6\% of the total effect of POS on turnover intention is mediated by job satisfaction. It should be indicated that this method is simply a means of describing the amount of mediation rather than a way to test the significance of the mediated effect (Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004). Using the Sobel calculator (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2001) to test whether these were significant mediators, the effects were significant at the .001 level. As this was the case for both affective commitment and job satisfaction, each was a significant mediator.

Finally, hypothesis 7 predicted that differences would exist between senior woman administrators and male athletic administrators on all variables in the study. To control for age and occupational tenure, ANCOVAs were performed. The results of these
ANCOVAs were quite consistent and are as follows: participation in decision making, $F(1, 214) = .97, p = .32$; growth opportunities, $F(1, 213) = .31, p = .58$; supervisor support, $F(1, 212) = .05, p = .82$; procedural justice, $F(1, 214) = .04, p = .84$; distributive justice, $F(1, 214) = .20, p = .66$; interactional justice, $F(1, 213) = .37, p = .55$; POS, $F(1, 214) = 1.35, p = .25$; affective commitment, $F(1, 214) = .83, p = .36$; job satisfaction, $F(1, 212) = .05, p = .83$; and turnover intention, $F(1, 214) = .11, p = .74$. As can be ascertained from these results, no significant differences were reported on any of the variables and thus, hypothesis 7 was not supported. Table 4.8 reports the means and standard deviations of all variables in this study for both senior woman administrators and male athletic administrators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All items are on a 7-point scale (*1* = “strongly disagree” and *7* = “strongly agree”)

Table 4.8: Descriptive statistics for scales by gender
Note 1. All numbers reported are unstandardized regression coefficients  

Note 2. (POS – perceived organizational support; AC – affective commitment; JS – job satisfaction; TI – turnover intention)

Figure 4.1: Graphic representation of mediation effect of affective commitment and job satisfaction on turnover intention
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The primary purposes of this study were to: (a) examine the antecedents of POS; (b) examine the consequences of POS, including, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention; (c) assess gender differences in regard to these antecedents and consequences; and, most importantly, (d) develop and test a comprehensive model of POS, applicable to NCAA athletic administrators. As such, this chapter is presented in four sections. The first section assesses the instruments used in this study. Second, discussion of the results for each of the hypotheses is presented. Finally, the chapter concludes with sections on the practical implications for sport management and recommendations for future research.

Instrument

Prior to the summary and discussion of the hypotheses a corresponding summary and discussion outlines the psychometric properties of the scales utilized in this study. In regard to the antecedents of POS, six highly reliable and widely implemented scales were employed in this study. As for POS, Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) SPOS was employed in this study based on its high reliability and the increasing relevance of the construct within
the realm of sport management research and practice. Lastly, the three consequences of
POS have been extensively studied within the literature of both sport management and
industrial and organizational psychology. Two of the three consequences were examined
with scales that have been previously implemented in a sport management context. The
psychometric properties of the respective scales for the antecedents and consequences of
POS and for POS are provided in further detail in the following sections.

*Participation in decision making.* This variable was measured using five items
originally developed by Siegel and Ruh (1973) and later used by Lam et al. (2002). The
Cronbach’s alpha reported in this study ($\alpha = .92$) suggests that this instrument is highly
reliable in the context of sport management. Siegel and Ruh’s instrument demonstrated a
similarly high internal consistency ($\alpha = .95$). Although this instrument has not been
widely used in the sport management literature, these results only endorse the further use
of this construct.

*Organizational Justice.* The justice principles included three separate scales for
procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. Each of the three justice constructs
were measured with four items (12 items total) from Rahim et al.’s (2000) revised
version of the OJI. Rahim et al. found internal consistency estimates of .85 for procedural
justice, .96 for distributive justice, and .94 for interactional justice. The results of the
reliability assessments in this study yielded internal consistency scores of .77, .89, and
.94 for procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice, respectively.
Again, these results were acceptable and consistent with previous research.

*Growth opportunities.* This construct was measured with two items developed by
Bedeian et al. (1991). The scale’s alpha reliability was found to be .77 in Bedeian et al.’s
study and other research endeavors have reported high coefficient alphas for Bedian et al.’s scale (Chay & Aryee, 1999; $\alpha = .88$). In this study, the items from Bedian et al.’s instrument demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .76$), which was consistent with previous research. Based on Acosta and Carpenter’s (2004) research concerning the under representation of female athletic administrators, it was quite intuitive to include a measure of growth opportunities, especially one with high internal consistency. Since this scale has not been previously used within a sport management context, further analysis of the relevance of this construct is warranted. As outlined in a subsequent discussion regarding the inclusion of this variable, some of the items from this scale may not have pertained to athletic administrators or intercollegiate athletics.

**Supervisor Support.** This variable was measured with three items from the SPSS (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). These items were originally adapted from the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Rhoades et al. (2001) found the SPSS to have high internal reliability with a coefficient alpha of .90. Similarly, the coefficient alpha of the items from the SPSS used in this study was .91. This high internal consistency for the SPSS items used in this study can be attributed to the similarities between the SPSS and the SPOS. Again, further research within a sport management context is needed for these scales to be more readily employed in sport management research.

**Perceived organizational support.** POS was measured using the eight-item, short version of the SPOS developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). This shortened version of the SPOS has demonstrated high internal reliability and unidimensionality in finance, insurance, and industrial settings (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; $\alpha = .97$) but has yet to be implemented in a sport management context. Subsequent internal consistency reliability
estimates for the SPOS have been reported to be between .74 and .97 (e.g., Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Consistent with the aforementioned studies, the eight-item short version of the SPOS had a Cronbach’s alpha of .93 in this study. Suggestions for further inclusion of the POS construct in sport management research are outlined in the recommendations section of this chapter.

Affective commitment. Affective commitment was measured using six items from Meyer et al.’s (1993) occupational commitment instrument. Prior research has found reliability estimates for Meyer and Allen’s (1991) instrument ranged from .73 to .85. From a sport management perspective, Turner and Chelladurai (2005) applied this same scale to intercollegiate coaches and found the reliability to be .68. For this study of athletic administrators, the internal reliability was considerably higher (α = .81).

Job satisfaction. For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction was measured using the three-item scale used by Eisenberger et al. (1997). However, this scale was originally developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974). While Quinn and Shepard reported an internal consistency of .72, Eisenberger et al. (1997) reported a higher internal consistency of .85 for this scale. Subsequent studies have also attested to the acceptable internal reliability of the scale (e.g., Balzer et al., 1990; Rice et al., 1985). In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha of the job satisfaction scale was .78, again advancing the application of this scale to similar sport management studies.

Turnover intention. Turnover intention was measured by two-items adapted from a scale originally developed by Meyer et al. (1993). While Turner and Chelladurai (2005) found the reliability of this scale to be quite acceptable with coaches (α = .80), the reliability was slightly lower for the athletic administrators in this study (α = .70). It is
also of note that the Cronbach’s alpha for the turnover scale on the final study was much lower than the same scale for the pilot study ($\alpha = .93$). One possible explanation for this difference in internal consistency is the use of a convenience sample for the pilot study that consisted of administrators all employed at the same institution.

Discussion of Results

For this study, six antecedents (also termed human resource practices) and three consequences of POS were examined for NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic administrators. To this end, several a priori hypotheses were generated based on the extant sport management and industrial and organizational psychology literature. The subsequent summary and discussion of the results are presented in regard to the seven hypotheses advanced and the variables controlled for throughout this study.

Subgroup Differences

As previously stated in Chapter 4, age had significant main effects on growth opportunities ($\eta^2 = .16$) and turnover intention ($\eta^2 = .12$). Since about 32% of the respondents were over the age of 50, these large effect sizes are intuitively expected as older athletic administrators may have considerably less need for growth opportunities and might be less disposed to turnover intentions. Occupational tenure also had main effects on turnover intention ($\eta^2 = .06$), participation in decision making ($\eta^2 = .06$), procedural justice ($\eta^2 = .04$), and growth opportunities ($\eta^2 = .10$). Due to these effect sizes, both age and occupational tenure were used as controls for all subsequent hypothesis testing. Gender, however, was separately tested in hypothesis 7, also with age and occupational tenure as controls.
Furthermore, these effect sizes might be more aptly explained by the notion of *job embeddedness* advanced by Mitchell, Holton, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001). Job embeddedness is characterized by a net or web of factors that entangles employees to their particular positions. From a sport management perspective, Fink, Cunningham, and Sagas (2003) applied job embeddedness to determine if it could explain the variance in coaching turnover beyond traditional attitudinal measures such as job satisfaction and commitment. In their sample of Division III softball coaches, job embeddedness predicted a significant amount of variance (42%) in turnover intentions beyond gender, job satisfaction, and commitment. In summary, like coaches, athletic administrators may also sense this notion of job embeddedness as it applies to turnover intention.

Concerning the main effects of occupational tenure on participation in decision making, this implies that the longer an athletic administrator is employed with their athletic department the more they are granted participation in decision making. Therefore, the most senior members within athletic departments have more say in decisions regarding the policies of the department and of the responsibilities and duties of their own jobs. Hence, the more control one has over their own job the more satisfied one should be in that job. Athletic departments at the NCAA Division I level should devise strategies to prevent turnover by placing a significant emphasis on methods such as participation in decision making and growth opportunities so as to retain athletic administrators.
Antecedents of Perceived Organizational Support

The following hypotheses pertain to the relationship between certain human resource practices and POS:

Hypothesis 1: The linear combination of human resource practices (participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) will be significantly and positively related to POS.

Hypothesis 1a: Participation in decision making will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1b: Supervisor support will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1c: Growth opportunity will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1d: Distributive justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1e: Procedural justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Hypothesis 1f: Interactional justice will contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS.

Human Resource Practices

The multiple regression analysis used to address hypothesis 1 indicated that there was a significant relationship between human resource practices and POS. Combined, the six human resource practices (participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunity, and procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) accounted for 78% of the variance in POS. Therefore, it can be determined that such supportive human resource practices are instrumental in establishing athletic administrators’ POS.
These human resource practices indicate investment in athletic administrators by their athletic departments and recognition of their contributions to the department. Also, the relationship between human resource practices and POS is largely based on the different forms of favorable treatment offered to athletic administrators by their athletic department. The findings here are also consistent with studies conducted outside the realm of sport management (i.e., Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne et al., 1997).

While Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) suggested three main antecedents of POS (fair organizational procedures, supervisor support, and favorable rewards and job conditions), this study expanded upon that by including Allen et al.’s (2003) antecedents (participation in decision making and growth opportunities) to fully encompass the POS construct for athletic administrators. Antecedents of POS are largely based on the different forms of favorable treatment the organization offers employees and signal an organization’s investment in employees and recognition of their contributions. This is of particular interest as the retention of top athletic administrators, especially female athletic administrators, is of the utmost importance to NCAA Division I athletic departments (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004b).

Although, human resource practices may not determine an athletic administrators’ turnover intention, they do indeed signal to administrators that the athletic department values and cares about their well being and contributions. This may, in turn, result in various favorable outcomes for both the athletic department and the individual administrators. While economic exchanges are generally contractual in nature, a social exchange such as POS is an informal, open-ended, or long-term exchange of favors.
which is based on an unwritten obligation to reciprocate (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). In sum, the antecedents of organizational support outline Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of the employee-organization relationship for NCAA athletic administrators.

**Participation in Decision Making.** In terms of hypothesis 1a, participation in decision making significantly contributed to the variance explained in POS. It can be determined that athletic administrators experience a wide array of PDM initiatives from their athletic departments (Glew et al., 1995). The potential for positive results from these PDM initiatives are realized through POS. Furthermore, research should go beyond simply examining the outcomes of PDM and shift to the motives and implementation of PDM programs within NCAA Division I athletic departments (Glew et al., 1995).

**Supervisor Support.** Although hypothesis 1b significantly contributed to the variance explained in POS, it is of note that the antecedent supervisor support was the most highly correlated ($r = .84$) to POS. Although the tolerance level and VIF for multicollinearity were not violated, such a high correlation should be mentioned in this discussion. Furthermore, the correlation between supervisory support and POS in this study contradicts Kottke and Sharafinski’s (1988) results as they found the correlation between the two to be quite low ($r = .13$).

This finding, although not hypothesized, is of importance for athletic administration. One explanation for this high correlation is that athletic administrators also equate treatment by their supervisor (e.g., director of athletics) as an indication of favorable organizational policies, practices, and procedures (Eisenberger et al. 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001). In other words, the director of athletics serves as a personification
of the athletic department as a whole. Levinson (1965) first suggested the notion that actions of organizational agents (e.g., supervisors) are seen by employees as the intent of the organization and not as the personal motives of those particular organizational agents. Therefore, it is understandable that the athletic department and the director of athletics may often be characterized as the same or highly related entities.

*Growth Opportunities.* Taking a closer look at the individual human resource practices (specifically hypothesis 1c), the results of a simple regression indicated that growth opportunities did not contribute significantly to the variance explained in POS. As previously mentioned, growth opportunities are deemed a discretionary action taken by the organization (Aryee & Chen, 2004). The results of this study indicate that athletic departments are not using the appropriate level of discretion in offering opportunities for athletic administrators to enhance their skills and thus increase their contribution to the department.

Furthermore, Bedeian et al. (1991) found that growth opportunities are linked to the expectations employees bring to a job. Therefore, without having explored the particular expectations of the athletic administrators in this study it is difficult to ascertain incongruence between their expectations and what their athletic departments provide. It is of note that expectations also include future expectations of POS. With this in mind, the descriptive, cross-sectional nature of this study may have also confounded the impact of growth opportunities on POS. This bodes well for future studies of a more longitudinal nature.

Lastly, in regard to growth opportunities, Ashford and Cummings’ (1983) conceptualization of feedback theory suggested that employees are particularly
conscientious of information that is relevant to personal goals (e.g., career advancement). Applying this to the athletic administrators in this study, it can be ascertained that they are quite aware of what their respective athletic departments are doing in terms of growth opportunities. With this in mind, it can also be surmised that what NCAA athletic departments are providing in terms of growth opportunities is not sufficient. This perceived lack of contribution for growth opportunities on POS, in conjunction with other variables, may ultimately have an impact on prospective athletic administrators’ intentions to enter into the sport management profession (Cunningham, Sagas, Dixon, Kent, & Turner, 2005).

Organizational Justice. The hypotheses regarding the contribution of the three justice constructs to POS (hypothesis 1d – distributive justice, hypothesis 1e – procedural justice, and hypothesis 1f – interactional justice) were each supported. These findings are consistent with Rhoades et al. (2001) and thus athletic administrators’ perception of fairness in organizational rewards predicted POS. Therefore, athletic administrators’ perception of organizational justice is quite relevant in accessing their subsequent levels of POS. As athletic departments repeatedly demonstrate fairness in decisions, rewards, and procedures, athletic administrators reciprocate their feelings of being cared for by increasing their perception of support.

In summary, the best contributors of POS were supervisory support ($\beta = .32$) and participation in decision making ($\beta = .26$). Consequently, directors of athletics at NCAA Division I institutions must realize their role as supervisors in the employee-organization exchange relationship. Continued, formalized occasions for athletic administrators to participate in athletic department decisions are catalysts for establishing POS. As
previously mentioned, directors of athletics are viewed by athletic administrators as a personification of the athletic department and the actions of the director are often viewed as a direct reflection of the department’s actions. In this instance, a high regard for the supportive nature of a director of athletics equates to a high regard for the supportive nature of the athletic department.

Support from a current director of athletics is seen as career mentoring and grooming. Similarly, Baird and Kram (1983) asserted that subordinates’ careers can be enhanced through a supportive relationship with a supervisor, which can take the form of career guidance, feedback on performance, or the assignment of challenging work assignments. This finding is also noteworthy because it holds predictive ability for the career outcomes of these athletic administrators (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004b).

The three justice principles (distributive justice: $\beta = .20$; interactional justice: $\beta = .13$; procedural justice: $\beta = .26$) each resulted in smaller but significant contributions to POS than supervisory support and participation in decision making. These findings are consistent with Ambrose and Schminke’s (2003) suggestion that “different forms of justice will be differentially important under varying conditions” (p. 296). In other words, based on the structure of the organization different justice principles will be more salient at different times. Although each of the athletic departments was classified as NCAA Division I, the hierarchal structure of athletic administrative positions might vary slightly from institution to institution. This explanation, albeit plausible, is counterintuitive to previous claims of institutional isomorphism within NCAA Division I (e.g., Cunningham & Ashley, 2001). Therefore, further investigation into the relationship of all three forms of organizational justice and POS for NCAA Division I institutions is warranted.
Consequences of Perceived Organizational Support

The following hypotheses were developed pertaining to the relationship between POS and affective commitment and job satisfaction:

Hypothesis 2: POS will be positively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis 3: POS will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 were supported as athletic administrators’ POS was positively related to both affective commitment and job satisfaction. Therefore, when athletic administrators feel as though their athletic department cares about their contributions and well-being they will reciprocate those feelings. Based on Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory and Gouldner’s (1960) notion of the norm of reciprocity, athletic administrators reciprocate favorable treatment when they trust that their athletic department will reward them in return.

Affective Commitment

In terms of affective commitment, the results of this study regarding the relationship between POS and affective commitment mirror several others from the field of industrial and organizational psychology (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993). In other words, athletic administrators that feel they are supported by their athletic department will have a greater sense of purpose and meaning through their affective commitment to the athletic department (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Consistent with Gouldner’s (1960) norm of reciprocity, athletic administrators may even feel as though they are indebted to their department and must repay their department through affective
commitment. This establishment of athletic administrators’ POS is manifest into an affective attachment the athletic department.

Job Satisfaction

Similar to affective commitment, the more supportive the organization, the greater likelihood job satisfaction will be realized for athletic administrators. Satisfaction has been found to be directly affected by POS through Shore and Tetrick’s (1991) research. The present study confirms those results as athletic administrators with a heightened sense of POS will find their job to be more gratifying. However, it is noteworthy to mention that the intricate facets involved in the makeup of athletic administrators’ jobs must be supported by the athletic department for both administrators and the department to experience the benefits of administrators’ job satisfaction. Hence, POS serves as a critical socioemotional function for athletic administrators (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Pertaining to the relationship between POS and affective commitment and job satisfaction, POS had a slightly stronger relationship with job satisfaction ($R^2 = .43$) than affective commitment ($R^2 = .36$). This is a unique finding since voluntary actions on the part of the organization are instrumental in establishing POS and related consequences such as job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al. 1997). For example, if an athletic department does not have the financial resources to appropriately reward athletic administrators this will most likely not reduce POS, but may decrease job satisfaction. On the other hand, nondiscretionary actions taken by the athletic department to reward athletic administrators and improve facilities may increase overall job satisfaction but may not be accompanied by increased POS. Furthermore, voluntary actions on the part of the
organization are instrumental in establishing POS and related consequences such as job satisfaction and affective commitment (Eisenberger et al. 1986). An athletic department must weigh the positive benefits of POS in terms of turnover intention. It has been reported that employees with a heightened sense of POS will find their job to be more gratifying and will be less likely to withdrawal or turnover from the organization (Eisenberger et al. 1997).

**Turnover Intention**

Since research has consistently shown turnover intention as an excellent indicator of employees’ actual turnover behavior (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986), it can be determined that turnover intention is a relevant predictor of actual turnover behavior for NCAA Division I athletic administrators. Regarding the relationship between the aforementioned consequences (affective commitment and job satisfaction) and POS as well as turnover intention, the following hypotheses were advanced:

**Hypothesis 4:** The linear combination of the POS outcome variables (affective commitment and job satisfaction) will be significantly and negatively related to turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 4a:** Affective commitment will contribute significantly to the variance explained in turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 4b:** Job satisfaction will contribute significantly to the variance explained in turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 5:** The relationship between POS and turnover intention will be mediated by affective commitment.

**Hypothesis 6:** The relationship between POS and turnover intention will be mediated by job satisfaction.
The results of this study supported each of the aforementioned hypotheses. Further examination using multiple regression analysis showed that affective commitment and job satisfaction had a significant, negative relationship with turnover intention (hypothesis 4). Affective commitment and job satisfaction collectively explained roughly 35% of the variance in turnover intention. Follow up analyses (hypotheses 4a and 4b) showed that both affective commitment and job satisfaction were significant predictors of turnover intention.

As a result, affective commitment was a better predictor of turnover intention than job satisfaction. These findings concur with Meyer and Allen (1997) and Mathieu and Zajac (1990) as both found affective commitment to be the best predictor of turnover intention. In addition, Arnold and Feldman (1982) indicated that both satisfaction and commitment correlated significantly with turnover intention; however, organizational commitment had the stronger relationship. Peters, Bhagat, and O'Connor (1981) also concurred with these results as they found organizational commitment had a stronger association with turnover intention than job satisfaction. Athletic administrators’ emotional attachment to their athletic departments seemed to play a major role in their turnover intention. Thus, for athletic departments it is important to realize the affective commitment and job satisfaction of athletic administrators as each are significant predictors of turnover intention.

Furthermore, hypotheses 5 and 6 predicted that affective commitment and job satisfaction would each independently serve as mediators in the relationship between POS and turnover intention. As depicted in Figure 4.1, hypotheses 5 and 6 were supported and each served as a partial mediator in the relationship between POS and
turnover intention. To a degree, athletic administrators’ POS is explained through affective commitment and job satisfaction. These feelings of affective commitment and job satisfaction, in turn, relate to turnover intention.

Although neither affective commitment nor job satisfaction was a complete mediator, each significantly explained the connection between POS and turnover intention. Therefore, as opposed to POS having a direct relationship with turnover intention for athletic administrators, the relationship is mediated by affective commitment and job satisfaction. In accordance with these findings, Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro (1990) reported employees with high levels of POS would be less likely to seek out and accept jobs with alternative organizations. The justification for including athletic administrators’ turnover intention in this study relates to the direct and indirect costs incurred by athletic departments when administrators leave (Hom and Griffeth, 1995).

Gender Differences

One of the stated purposes of this study concerned the differences, based on gender, of athletic administrators’ POS, including the antecedents and consequences. This notion is validated through Acosta and Carpenter’s (2004) work regarding the under representation of female athletic administrators in NCAA Division I. As such, the following hypothesis was put forth:

Hypothesis 7: There will be gender differences between senior woman administrators and male athletic administrators on POS, and the antecedents and consequences of POS.
Acosta and Carpenter, however, do not suggest that female administrators perceived their athletic departments supported them less than their male counterparts, these variables had yet to be tested with athletic administrators. Therefore, it was not known whether male and female administrators shared similar levels of support from their athletic department. In addition, the antecedents and consequences of support are equally important to the literature and research regarding female representation and retention in athletic administration.

Understanding retention factors for coaches and administrators within the intercollegiate work environment has been widely studied (e.g., Inglis et al., 1996), but little attention has been given to POS. Consequently, the results of this study do not support hypothesis 7 and thus no significant differences were found between male and female athletic administrators on any of the variables. This counters Pastore et al.’s (1996) research that found a lack of administrative support led to female coaches voluntarily leaving the profession. Although the results of previous hypotheses in this study could be related to both coaches and athletic administrators, this is not the case with gender differences and the POS of athletic administrators.

More specifically, the results illustrated in Table 4.8 showed female and male athletic administrators were nearly identical on all variables. Since age and occupational tenure were controlled for in this hypothesis, it can be inferred that female athletic administrators do sense high levels of support from their athletic departments, but this support is not different than that of their male counterparts. Despite the similarities between female and male athletic administrators, it is still important for athletic
departments to continue demonstrating support for their female athletic administrators so as to glean outcomes such as increased satisfaction and decreased turnover intention.

The result of hypothesis 7 is important in that POS affects female athletic administrators’ turnover intention. To this end, female athletic administrators that perceive support from their athletic departments and directors of athletics are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and less likely to leave the department and possibly the profession (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004b). In other words, the support directors of athletics and the athletic department as a whole provided to female athletic administrators has bearing on their retention. This notion coincides with the work of Pastore et al. (1996) as they also found support provides a means for retaining female athletic administrators.

The idea that the same holds true regarding support for both men and women is a relatively new idea for sport management. Respondents’ perceptions of growth opportunities were nearly identical and were relatively high considering the lack of female representation at the top levels of intercollegiate athletic administration. Since Knoppers (1992) suggested that coaching was dominated by males, it has been rather erroneous to imply the results of studies dealing with the coaching profession to those dealing with athletic administrators. The findings of this study must be further analyzed and refined to continue a distinct line in sport management research between the coaching profession and the athletic administration profession.

Summary

The exchange relationship between employees and their organizations has received considerable attention in the literature (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003; Robinson
& Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989; Wayne et al., 2002). This study concurs with that research and thus suggests that athletic administrators as well as their athletic departments obtain favorable outcomes based on administrators’ perceptions of favorable treatment. In other words, athletic administrators who are treated well are more likely to be affectively committed to their athletic department, satisfied with their job, and ultimately, less likely to leave (e.g., Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades et al., 2001). The results of this study are consistent with Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) conceptualization of POS for athletic administrators. Moreover, the traditional concepts of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) have been shown to hold credence within an intercollegiate athletics context.

The impetus of this study concerning POS was a departure from the traditional sport management literature regarding organizational commitment, satisfaction, and retention. As such, it was found that POS measured the degree of commitment an athletic department demonstrates toward its athletic administrators as opposed to the commitment athletic administrators demonstrate toward their athletic department. This study concurred with prior research in that POS was antecedent to such attitudinal behaviors as affective commitment (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Settoon et al., 1996; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991) and job satisfaction (e.g., Aquino & Griffeth, 1999; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

This study is an indication of the impact of athletic administrators’ POS within NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic departments. As previously mentioned in Chapter 1, Slack (1996) stated that sport management researchers have not kept apace with advances in management theory. However, this study adds to the sport management
literature by linking POS with outcomes such as affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention for athletic administrators. As such, this is an addition to the sport management research regarding how administrators, as opposed to coaches, are satisfied with their jobs, committed to their athletic department, and how their athletic departments are committed to them.

Despite the fact that administrative support was found to be a determining factor in the retention of athletic administrators in Pastore et al.’s (1996) study, the present study is one of the first to elucidate POS and its outcomes for athletic administrators. To this end, the current study developed and tested a comprehensive model of POS that was grounded in the social exchange ideology of employee-organization relationships for NCAA Division athletic administrators. From an athletic department’s perspective, the maximization of employees’ perceptions of support is critical to the reciprocation of positive treatment of athletic administrators.

Practical Implications

This study has several practical implications within intercollegiate athletic departments. The results of this study in combination with the results of other similar studies (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Moorman et al. 1998; Wayne et al., 1997) indicate that many organizational factors affect employee attitudes and behaviors by increasing the POS for those employees. For instance, athletic department and supervisor characteristics such as justice and supervisor support play an active role in demonstrating to employees that they are valued by the organization (Moorman et al., 1998). The implications for these organizational, and in this case athletic department, behaviors provides an added incentive for directors of athletics and the department as a whole to be
more aware of certain human resource practices. As demonstrated through this study, within a sport management context (i.e., NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics) it is beneficial for research on commitment to extend from the commitment of coaches and administrators to the organization to the athletic department’s commitment toward its employees.

In view of the growth of intercollegiate athletic administration as a viable profession, it is quite evident that in a highly competitive job market athletic departments must demonstrate the significance of employees so as to garner certain outcomes such as employee commitment, satisfaction, and retention. With this in mind, much of these outcomes can be attributed to athletic administrators’ perceptions of support. Hence, it has been shown to be beneficial for NCAA Division I athletic departments as well as directors of athletics to establish a mechanism of support for athletic administrators. A need exists for assessing the role of POS in the relationship between human resource practices and employee outcomes for athletic administrators.

It is also advantageous for directors of athletics to be cognizant of the role of POS in terms of developing competitive human resource strategies for retaining top female and male athletic administrators. Strategies on the part of the athletic department such as demonstrating supervisor support may signal to employees that the department values and cares about their well-being and contributions. This may, in turn, result in various favorable outcomes (e.g., affective commitment, job satisfaction, reduced turnover) for both the athletic department and athletic administrators.

For athletic administrators, POS is a critical link between the actions and behaviors of the athletic department and their own actions and behaviors. POS provides a
greater understanding of athletic administrators’ voluntary turnover intentions, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. The degree of POS an athletic administrator perceives will ultimately impact their decision to remain with the department or take a comparable job with another athletic department. This is particularly relevant because of the lack of female athletic directors at the NCAA Division I level. With this in mind, perhaps a lack of supportive human resource practices, such as supervisor support and growth opportunities have been vehicles for low POS and eventual dissatisfaction with the job, lack of commitment, intent to quit, or even a lack of entry into the profession. The onus here is on directors of athletics and university policy makers as they must further develop competitive human resource practices to retain valuable athletic administrators.

Although this study does not recommend particular modifications to procedures for NCAA Division I athletic departments, there is substantial worth in accessing administrators’ POS. Despite the apparent gender gaps in the highest athletic administrative ranks, there is still a lack of literature concerning athletic administrators’ propensity to seek similar positions with other institutions. These horizontal position changes from one institution to another as opposed to vertical position changes within the same institution may also be related to POS. From a practical standpoint, the reciprocation of support is ultimately indicated through outcomes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Therefore for the realization of these outcomes the appropriate levels of support must be realized.
Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study provide fertile ground for several lines of subsequent inquiry. While this study attempted to answer several hypotheses related to POS and athletic administrators, more studies are needed to further examine this topic. In particular, this study tested the applicability of OST within an intercollegiate athletics context. However, OST entails several constructs applicable to intercollegiate athletics beyond POS.

The first recommendation for future research concerns the antecedents of POS for athletic administrators. As discussed in Chapter 2, there are several antecedents of POS that may ultimately have differing impacts on the subsequent consequences of POS. While the current study only looked at six particular antecedents of POS (participation in decision making, supervisor support, growth opportunities, and distributive, procedural and interactional justice), other possible antecedents are job characteristics, perceived politics, normative commitment, trust, careerist orientation, and source credibility. Also, other possible outcomes of POS might provide for more depth in understanding exchange relationships for athletic administrators. Additional outcomes of POS are organizational citizenship behavior, performance, self-efficacy, felt obligation, job induced tension, and positive mood. By examining these additional outcomes of POS, this might shed light on the most important outcomes of POS for athletic administrators.

Next, it is also recommended that future studies test the positioning of the variables in this study. For example, POS might be more aptly served as a mediator between supervisory support and turnover intention. Also, without a true measure of turnover it is advised that future studies include a measure of actual turnover behaviors.
More research must also be performed in regard to the temporal nature of POS. As Shore and Shore (1995) suggested, the history of treatment an employee receives from an organization may have more of an impact on voluntary turnover decisions than the implementation of a particularly favorable human resource practice. Hence, since this study was cross-sectional in nature athletic administrators’ POS might change based on their particular supervisor or various regulatory or policy changes within their institutional environment.

Additionally, based on the results of hypothesis 1c regarding the relationship between growth opportunities and POS, it is advised that further research delve into this phenomenon. The question of why growth opportunities do not signal support for the athletic administrators in this study must be investigated further. Also, the strong correlation between POS and supervisor support must be tested in future studies to ascertain whether the source of support for athletic administrators is their athletic department or their director of athletics. The aforementioned studies can be aided by an instrument that is specifically designed to measure the antecedents and consequences of athletic administrators’ POS.

Finally, in terms of the research setting for this study, future studies should investigate similar antecedents and consequences of POS for athletic administrators at NCAA Division II and III institutions as well as within public and private sport organizations. Also, the population (administrators) should be altered in future studies to encompass the antecedents and consequences of POS for directors of athletics, head coaches, assistant coaches, and student athletes. Regarding the quantitative nature of this study, it is also advised that qualitative research concerning the antecedents and
consequences of athletic administrators’ POS is conducted. In depth interviews might reveal or uncover more antecedents and consequences of POS not possible within a quantitative framework.
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APPENDIX A

Pilot Study Cover Letter
Dear Athletics Administrator:

We are conducting a study on intercollegiate athletic administrators’ perceptions of organizational support. Specifically, we are interested in the retention, commitment, and satisfaction of athletic administrators. There is a need to refocus research on commitment in sport management from the commitment of an employee to his or her institution to the commitment the institution demonstrates toward its employees. As an athletic administrator, we are inviting you to participate. The study’s success and accurate depiction of athletic administrators’ perceptions of support is highly dependent upon your timely completion and return of this survey. We hope you choose to participate.

You as an individual, and the institution as a whole, may be assured of complete confidentiality. Individual responses will not be identified or reported. The survey will be collected and coded without any distinguishing information. Any published or reported results of this study will not be linked to the name of any individual or institution and thus any discussion will be based upon group data. It is anticipated the questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

There are no known risks involved in completing the survey and if you decide to participate, you may feel free to withdraw at any time. Please feel free to contact either of the researchers at any time. If you wish to receive a copy of the results please let the researchers know. Thank you in advance for your participation in this study. Please return your completed survey by TUESDAY, MAY 10TH, 2005. You will find a label attached to your survey, please use it to return this survey via campus mail.

Sincerely,

Simon M. Pack, M.A.
School of PAES
Sport Management
The Ohio State University
376 Cunz Hall
1841 Millikin Drive
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 688-9491
pack.63@osu.edu

Donna L. Pastore, Ph.D.
School of PAES
Sport Management
The Ohio State University
215 Pomerene Hall
1760 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-0954
pastore.3@osu.edu
APPENDIX B

Final Study Cover Letter
May 16, 2005

Dear Athletic Administrator:

We invite you to participate in a research project entitled, “The Perceived Organizational Support of NCAA Athletic Administrators.”

Athletic administrators have not generally been the focus of studies on retention, commitment, and satisfaction. Therefore, a lack of research and theory exists in regard to their perceptions of how their institutions and supervisors are committed to them. Thus, there is a need to refocus research on commitment in sport management from the commitment of an employee to his or her institution to the commitment the institution demonstrates toward its employees. This study’s success and accurate depiction of athletic administrators’ perception of support is highly dependent upon your timely completion and return of this survey. We hope you choose to participate.

You as an individual, and the institution as a whole, may be assured of complete confidentiality. Individual responses will not be identified or reported. The survey will be collected and coded without any distinguishing information. Any published or reported results of this study will not be linked to the name of any individual or institution and thus any discussion will be based upon group data.

There are no known risks involved in completing the survey and if you decide to participate, you may feel free to withdraw at any time. Also, please feel free to contact either of the researchers at any time. If you wish to receive a copy of the results please let the researchers know. Thank you in advance for your participation in this study. Please return your completed survey by Tuesday, May 24th, 2005.

Sincerely,

Simon M. Pack    Brian A. Turner    Donna L. Pastore
Doctoral Candidate    Assistant Professor    Professor & Director
Sport Management    Sport Management    School of PAES
Ohio State University    Ohio State University    Ohio State University
1841 Millikin Road    1841 Millikin Road    1760 Neil Avenue
376 Cunz Hall    267A Cunz Hall    215 Pomerene Hall
Columbus, OH 43210    Columbus, OH 43210    Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 688-9491    (614) 247-8374    (614) 292-6787
pack.63@osu.edu    turner.409@osu.edu    pastore.3@osu.edu
APPENDIX C

Athletic Administrator Questionnaire
Athletic Administrator Questionnaire

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope to:

Simon M. Pack
The Ohio State University
Department of Sport Management
376 Cunz Hall
1841 Millikin Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone: 614-688-9491
Fax: 614-688-3432
Email: pack.63@osu.edu
**PART I:** On the following pages you will find statements describing different aspects of your present job. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the right hand side of each statement (1=Strongly Disagree; 7=Strongly Agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF AGREEMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circle your response)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The athletic department’s decision-making procedures are carried out in the same way each time they are used.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) It would be very hard for me to leave the athletic department right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my time at this university working for the athletic department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The athletic department has procedures that allow employees to express their concerns before a decision is made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The athletic department is willing to provide financial resources when they are necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The athletic department fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Important activities in my unit are regularly cut because of lack of funds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I would not leave the athletic department right now because I have a sense of obligation to it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I am really looking for an athletic department to spend my entire career with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) In this athletic department, I have a high degree of influence in decisions affecting me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I aspire to be a director of athletics at a Division I institution in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I am confident that I will be able to work for this athletic department as long as I wish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to the athletic department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I feel an obligation to remain employed with the athletic department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Even if it were to my advantage, I would not leave the athletic department right now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) The rewards I receive meet my expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I frequently think about leaving the athletic department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I am satisfied with the rewards I receive from the athletic department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) My present job is relevant to growth and development in my career.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the athletic department right now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) I’ll be able to keep my present job as long as I wish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) The athletic department deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) All in all, I am satisfied with my current job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) I feel as if the athletic department’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) If I had not already put so much of myself into the athletic department, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) My immediate supervisor is willing to extend him/herself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) I feel I have too few options to consider leaving my present job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) I would feel guilty if I left the athletic department right now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29) The athletic department has a great deal of personal meaning to me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30) The athletic department cares about my general satisfaction at work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31) Even if I did the best job possible, the athletic department would fail to notice.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32) The athletic department values my contribution to its well-being.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33) In this athletic department, my views have a real influence in decisions.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34) The athletic department responds to the needs of its employees.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35) My immediate supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36) I believe that my immediate supervisor’s actions show that s/he respects me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37) I feel that my present job will lead to future attainment of my career goals.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38) Formal procedures exist at the athletic department that prevents personal biases of supervisors from influencing work decisions.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39) The athletic department is willing to provide financial resources when they are necessary.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40) Right now, staying with the athletic department is a matter of necessity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41) In this athletic department, I have a high degree of influence in decisions.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42) In this athletic department, I often participate in decisions regarding my job.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43) The budget my unit receives from the athletic department is adequate / appropriate.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44) One of the few negative consequences of leaving the athletic department would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

45) My immediate supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

46) I will likely leave the athletic department for another athletic administrative position within the next 2 years.

47) If a good friend of mine told me that he/she was interested in working in a job like mine I would strongly recommend it.

48) I feel that my immediate supervisor attempts to be honest with me.

49) My immediate supervisor treats me in a kind manner.

50) The most productive employees within this athletic department receive the greatest rewards.

51) I feel “emotionally attached” to the athletic department.

52) I do not expect to change athletic departments often during my career.

53) There are many career opportunities I expect to explore after I leave this athletic department.

54) The athletic department takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

55) Knowing what I know now, if I had to decide all over again whether to take my job, I would.

56) I feel like “part of the family” with the athletic department.

57) I expect to work for a variety of different athletic departments often during my career.
| 58) In this athletic department, I can participate in setting new policies. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 59) The rewards I receive with this athletic department match my work effort. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 60) The athletic department shows very little concern for me. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 61) I feel that I have a great deal of job security with the athletic department. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 62) The athletic department adequately funds my unit. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 63) In general, my job measures up to the sort of job I wanted when I took it. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 64) I feel I am able to trust my immediate supervisor. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 65) The athletic department really cares about my well-being. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 66) I owe a great deal to the athletic department. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 67) The athletic department would ignore any complaints from me. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 68) I took this job as a stepping stone to get a better job with another athletic department. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 69) The athletic department provides my unit with necessary monetary resources. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 70) There are ways for employees to challenge decisions they feel are unfair. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 71) The feedback I received in my last performance appraisal was an accurate assessment of my performance. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 72) I can trust what my immediate supervisor says. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 73) My immediate supervisor is a good judge of how I am doing my job. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 74) The athletic department treats its employees fairly. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
PART II: Please respond to the following questions by printing in the space provided or by circling the appropriate response.

75) Please provide the exact title of your current position in the space provided below:
Title: ____________________________________________________________

76) Total number of years in present position: ________ YEARS

77) Age: ________ YEARS OLD

78) Total number of years as an athletic administrator: ________ YEARS

79) Number of years working for your current institution: ________ YEARS

80) Gender (please circle one): A. FEMALE B. MALE

81) Ethnicity/Race (please circle one):
   A. AFRICAN-AMERICAN/BLACK   D. HISPANIC
   B. ASIAN-AMERICAN            E. NATIVE AMERICAN
   C. CAUCASIAN/WHITE           F. OTHER: _____________

82) Number of Athletic Administrators at your institution (NOT including you):
   Assistant ADs ______  Associate ADs ______  Senior Associate ADs ______

83) NCAA Division affiliation (please circle one): A. I-A  B. I-AA  C. I-AAA

84) Please provide the exact title of your current, immediate SUPERVISOR below:
Title: ____________________________________________________________

85) Were you hired by your current, immediate supervisor (circle one): YES / NO

86) Gender of your immediate supervisor (please circle one): A. FEMALE B. MALE

87) Ethnicity/Race of your immediate supervisor (please circle one):
   A. AFRICAN-AMERICAN/BLACK   D. HISPANIC
   B. ASIAN-AMERICAN            E. NATIVE AMERICAN
   C. CAUCASIAN/WHITE           F. OTHER: _____________

88) Please indicate the title of your last position & number of years in that position:
Title: ____________________________________________ YEARS: ______

89) Was this last position in item #88 held at your current institution? YES / NO
Comments on your experiences as an intercollegiate athletic administrator will be appreciated, either here or in a separate envelope.

Thank you for your help.

*Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:*

Simon M. Pack  
The Ohio State University  
Department of Sport Management  
376 Cunz Hall  
1841 Millikin Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43210
APPENDIX D

E-mail Prenotification for Final Sample
May 17th, 2005

Dear Athletic Administrator,

This note is intended to introduce myself and a research project in which you have been selected to participate. My name is Simon Pack and I am a doctoral candidate in Sport Management at The Ohio State University. Along with my advisor, Dr. Brian Turner, from The Ohio State University, I am conducting some important research that pertains to the work and career attitudes of intercollegiate athletic administrators.

You will soon be receiving a brief (10 minute) questionnaire and a pre-stamped return envelope by mail. By means of this brief introduction I am requesting that you kindly participate in this research project. Please note that participation in this study is voluntary. Your participation would, however, be greatly appreciated and is crucial to the success of this research endeavor.

I thank you in advance for your time and assistance in this important project. You can expect the questionnaire and a more detailed description of the study to arrive within a week. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (614) 688-9491.

Best Regards,

Simon Pack
Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University

Dr. Brian Turner
Assistant Professor
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX E

*T*-tests Between Late and Early Respondents
### T-tests Between Late and Early Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Early M</th>
<th>Early SD</th>
<th>Late M</th>
<th>Late SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1.** All items are on a 7-point scale (1 = “strongly disagree” and 7 = “strongly agree”)

**Note 2.** (SS – supervisor support; PJ – procedural justice; IJ – interactional justice; DJ – distributive justice; GO – growth opportunities; PDM – participation in decision making; POS – perceived organizational support; AC – affective commitment; JS – job satisfaction; TI – turnover intention)