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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction in a sport environment. Three dimensions of organizational justice were assessed with regards to their relationship with five facets of job satisfaction and the job in general. The subjects for the study were high school coaches (N=203). The findings indicated a linear relationship (p<.05) between the fairness perceptions of each of the three organizational justice dimensions and most facets of job satisfaction and job in general. The study adds to the literature knowledge about relationships between job satisfaction and organizational justice in sport organizations.

Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction: Perceptions Among Coaches of Girls’ Teams

Participation in interscholastic athletics grew in the 2002-03 school year to 6.8 million kids across the United States (Kanaby, 2003) and as reported by the NFHS News, surpassed the 7.1M mark during the 2005-06 school year (Participation increases for 17th consecutive year, 2006). The data compiled by the NFHS News indicated that girls accounted for approximately 41% of the high school student athletes that participated in interscholastic athletics. The dramatic rise from 8% prior to 1972 was a testament to the success of Title IX in promoting participation opportunities for girls. Looking deeper into the organizational structure of interscholastic athletics, however, parity has not been achieved for women as coaches nor as administrators (Whisenant, W., Vincent, J., Pedersen, P., & Zapalac, R., in press).

With the number of girls seeking to play interscholastic athletics on the rise, the number of coaches and administrators needed to coordinate their activities escalated. Despite the increasing opportunities for women to assume these new coaching and administrative roles, in most cases, men often filled the positions (Chesebro, 1985; Heishman, Bunker, & Tutwiler, 1990). Research suggested that during the first fifteen years after the passage of Title IX (1972 to 1987), women coaching girls’ teams declined from 98% to less than 50% (Hart, Hasbrook, & Mathes, 1986; Heishman et al., 1990). In Texas, which accounted for 14% of all student athletes in the nation, women held less than 2% of the athletic director positions and fewer than 50% of the head coach positions for girls’ basketball (42%) and girls’ softball (46%). It was only volleyball that the number of women serving as the head coach exceeded the number of men (84%) (Whisenant, Vincent, Pedersen, & Zapalac, in press).

Scholars have provided a range of causes for the inequity between men and women coaches of girls’ teams. Homologous reproduction, which suggests that the group in power replicates in its own image, advocated by Stangl and Kane (1991) and Lovett and Lowry (1994) would support the suggestion that hegemonic masculinity continues to thrive within interscholastic athletics. Changing priorities with respect to family, a desire to continue their education, and a reluctance to sacrifice personal time have been noted as three primary reasons for burnout among those women who have entered the coaching profession (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Others have suggested that women leave the profession because they are disappointed with their own performance as coaches; their personal life and coaching career created a sense of role conflict; they felt there was a lack of opportunity to achieve their own professional goals; or they experienced a sense of tokenism (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Hart et al., 1986; Knoppers, 1987).

The previous studies suggest many instances that indicate job satisfaction remains an overriding variable that impacts a woman’s desire to continue in a career within interscholastic athletics. No work has been initiated to assess if men who coach girls’ teams also experience the same levels of job satisfaction as the women who coach girls’ teams. A need also exists for the introduction of organizational justice research into sport organizations to explore its effects on organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). This study has introduced three dimensions of organizational justice – procedural justice, distributive justice, and interpersonal justice – to the organizational setting of interscholastic athletics. Of particular interest is the determination of how the three justice dimensions impact five facets of job satisfaction – the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, and co-workers – and the job in general.

Organizational Justice

The basis for the study of organizational justice research is Adams’ (1965) equity theory. Equity theory essentially focuses the perceptions individuals establish when they make judgments about their level of inputs compared to resulting outcomes. In effect, organizational members continually examine the relationship between their contributions (inputs) to the organization and the distributions (outcomes) made by the organization. Those transactions result in the group members forming various perceptions regarding the climate of fairness which exists within the organization. Those fairness perceptions then emerge to shape the level of organizational justice or fairness thought to exist within the organization (Greenberg, 1987, 1990; Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001; Greenberg, Mark, & Lehman, 1985).

Four dimensions of justice guide the current research trend in organizational justice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001). Those dimensions include distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and anticipatory injustice. As noted previously, justice research initially focused on the fairness of the distribution of outcomes (Adams, 1965). The fairness of these outcomes provides the foundation for the dimension of distributive justice. Organizational members often feel a greater sense of fairness in the distribution of outcomes when they sense that the process used...
to arrive at outcomes was fair. Maintaining consistency, ensuring the process is free from bias, and allowing members to provide some type of input during the decision process have a positive impact on how group members perceive the fairness of the process. Exploring the processes used to arrive at the decisions or outcomes within the organization form the basis for fairness perceptions associated with procedural justice (Moorman, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Interpersonal justice, the third dimension of organizational justice, places an emphasis on how organizational members are treated by the decision makers or the organization during the decision process (Bies & Moag, 1986; Moorman, 1991). Favorable perceptions of fairness form when people impacted by the decisions to be made are treated with dignity and respect during the decision process. If individuals impacted by an outcome expect an unfair outcome or have some previous referent experience which would lead them to anticipate an unfair outcome, a bias may unduly influence the perception of fairness in a negative manner when in actuality, an injustice may not have occurred (Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001). This preconceived bias or assumption frames the fourth dimension of organizational justice. It has been suggested anticipatory injustice assists in forming a sense of inequity or injustice through anticipation.

Organizational justice and its dimensions have repeatedly been directly linked to performance, commitment, and citizenship behavior (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et. al., 2001; Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002; Fields, Pang, & Chiu, 2000; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Lam, Schaubroeck, & Aryee, 2002; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). While each of these dimensions have intensely been studied in business organizations, limited research has been conducted in sport environments, despite the proposed expansion of justice research by Greenberg, Mark, and Lehman (1985). They wrote:

Sports may be special in many ways related to justice. Alternatively, sports may represent a miniature social system from which conclusions about justice in society can be drawn. In either case, the future study of justice in sports will increase our understanding of behavior in sports as well as our understanding of justice in general (p. 30).

Outside the field of leisure services (Anderson & Shinew, 2003) little work framed in organizational justice has involved sport settings. Hums and Chelladurai (1994a, 1994b) initiated justice studies in sport management by investigating resource allocations in intercollegiate athletics. Their work was then followed by Mahony and Pastore (1998) and again by Mahony, Hums, and Riemer (2002). These initial applications of justice into sport management were, however, limited to only one dimension, distributive justice. The studies focused on the equitable distribution of tangible outcomes without consideration for the perceptions of fairness held by organizational members. Jordan, Gillettine, and Hunt (2004), Whisenant (2005), and Whisenant and Jordan (2006) recognized the need to expand beyond the narrow focus of one dimension and applied the multiple dimensions of organizational justice to teams and other organizations associated with sport to assess organizational behaviors in teams and individual behaviors by athletes associated with commitment. Vigorous research grounded in organizational justice requires that multiple justice dimensions be taken into consideration due to the interactions found to exist among distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and anticipatory injustice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001).

Job Satisfaction

With various facets of job satisfaction being used to define job satisfaction, no consensus exists (Gruneberg, 1979) among researchers in this area. As such, this study defined job satisfaction as the opinions or emotional responses to a particular job utilizing five facets as referent points. The five facets were pay satisfaction, satisfaction with promotional opportunities, satisfaction with people associated with the job or co-workers, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with the work itself (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). This definition provides a clear, simple explanation, which corresponds to one of the most used measures of job satisfaction, the Job Descriptive Index (Balzer, Kihm, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra, 1997).

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weik (1970) divided job satisfaction theories into two distinct categories: process theories and content theories. Process theories take into account the process by which variables such as expectations, needs and values, and reference groups interact with the job to produce job satisfaction. Content theories are based on various factors which influence job satisfaction. Content based theories essentially investigate what satisfies an individual (Chelladurai, 1999). According to Balzer et al. (1997), five facets, which are used in this study, have consistently emerged from early satisfaction research.

The work facet is comprised of the task contents of the job, growth opportunities, variety, and the level of responsibility associated with the work. The work itself provides the opportunity for considerable self reflection, possibly enhancing motivation and having a positive impact on satisfaction. The pay facet includes attitudes toward pay and perceived differences between expected and actual pay. This aspect of the pay satisfaction facet is an extension of Adams (1965) equity theory with perceptions of inputs and outcomes compared to others. The financial status of the employee and the amount of pay from previous employment may also impact pay satisfaction. Supervision is another facet that reveals satisfaction with a worker’s supervisor. This facet includes consideration of the employee, competence of the supervisor, feedback, and listening. The promotion facet reflects an employee’s satisfaction with promotional policies and the administration of those policies. Frequency, desirability, and importance of promotions have been shown to impact satisfaction with this facet (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Co-worker or people satisfaction facet reveals satisfaction with a worker’s fellow employees and can be influenced by work related interactions. Finally, overall satisfaction is an indication of the individual’s complete evaluation of their job. This facet incorporates any omissions not covered by the previously mentioned facets and reflects the long term evaluation of the job (Balzer et al., 1997).

Unjust and unfair practices by organizations often lead to a lack of cooperation and effort among employees, resulting in alienated and dissatisfied workers (Chelladurai, 1999). An important factor in the success of organizations revolves around the concept of justice and fairness. The relevance of justice as being a strong organizational occurrence is not only the influence on perceptions of fairness, but also the influence on employee attitudes and
behaviors. Recent initial research suggests that organizational justice influences employee attitudes and job satisfaction in sport organizations (Jordan, Fink & Pastore, 2004). Thus far, however, no research has been conducted to explore the relationships between organizational justice and job satisfaction in interscholastic athletics.

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between three dimensions of organizational justice – procedural justice, distributive justice, and interpersonal justice - and five facets of job satisfaction – pay, people, promotion, supervision, and work – as well as overall job satisfaction. Secondary comparisons were also made based upon the sex of the coaches.

Method

Subjects

The subjects of this study were men and women who coach girls’ high school athletics. The schools used to draw the coaches were stratified to ensure each of the state’s competitive divisions would be equally represented during the initial mailing of the survey. The names of the head coaches (N=1200) and their schools’ mailing addresses were drawn from the Texas Sports Guide for High School and Colleges, (Coynor & Lo Presto, 2002). Head coaches of all competitive girls’ sports were included in the initial mailing. The sports included basketball, cross-country, golf, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, track, and volleyball. Since the sex of the coaches was not listed in the directory, no effort was made to gain an equal representation of men and women.

Justice Dimensions

The instrument used to collect the data associated with the three justice dimensions was the most recent measurement instrument published in the justice literature (Colquitt, 2001). The subjects were directed to use their athletic department as their referent organization when responding to the statements. Since coaches often serve as teachers or in other capacities within the school, without directing them to use their athletic department, they may have used other school organizational structures as their point of reference. The coaches were asked to respond with their level of agreement with the 15 justice statements. A six-point Likert scale was used to record their responses: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Somewhat Disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree. Perceptions associated with procedural justice were derived from the first set of statements. The second set of statements was used to assess distributive justice, and the third set of statements provided data for interpersonal justice. The mean scores for each set of statements were then used to assess perceptions held by the coaches regarding each of the three justice dimensions. While the measure instrument developed by Colquitt was found to have a reliability ranging from .90 to .93 (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005), the reliability coefficients for this study produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .91 for the justice measures.

Job Satisfaction

To measure job satisfaction, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI – Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) is the most frequently used measure of job satisfaction (e.g., DeMeuse, 1985; Zedeck, 1987). The JDI measures satisfaction perceptions for five job facets: pay, promotions, supervision, co-workers, and the work itself. The JDI has been shown to be a highly valid and reliable measure of the construct (e.g., Gillet & Schwab, 1975). The JDI consists of 72 items: 9 items each for the facets of promotion and pay; and 18 items each for work, supervision, and co-workers. Each item contains a simple word or phrase (no more than 5 words) to which the respondent answers in one of three ways – “yes” if the word or phrase describes that part of their work; “no” if it does not describe their work; or “?” if they are not sure. The scoring is three points for a “yes” response, zero for points for a “no” response, and one for a “?” response. For those facets that only contained 9 items as compared to 18, the score was doubled to allow each facet to have the same possible range of scores. All of the facets were then summated separately which allows for comparison amongst the facets. The JDI provided a measure of facet satisfaction and allowed for an understanding of five discreet parts of the job (Balzer et al., 1997), but did not provide a measure of an employee’s global satisfaction with their job.

The Job in General (JIG) scale was utilized, which was designed to be used with the JDI (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989), to measure each employee’s overall satisfaction with their job. With the JIG, the respondent was asked questions about their overall feelings about the job. There were eighteen total items on the JIG, which were phrased and scored in the same fashion as the JDI. Each response was scored based upon their selection. The range of scores for both instruments is 0 to 54. Mean scores ≥22 indicated dissatisfaction, 23 to 31 indicated neutral satisfaction, and ≥32 indicated satisfaction. Reliability assessments using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients typically exceed .80 for both scales (e.g., Parks, Russell, Wood, Robertson, & Shewokis, 1995; Smucker, Whisenant, & Pedersen, 2003). For this study, the coefficients were as follows: pay (.72); promotion (.85); supervision (.87); people / co-workers (.72); work itself (.68); and overall (.82).

Data Analyses

Pearson correlations were used to determine the relationship between each of the justice dimensions and each of the job satisfaction variables. Descriptive statistics were also obtained to provide general demographic information about the coaches. An alpha level of .05 was used for all analyses.

Results

The response rate for the 1200 mailings was 16.9% (N=203). Despite having made no effort to stratify the sample in an effort to obtain an equal amount of responses from both men and women, 51% of the respondents were men (n=105) and 49% were women (n=98). Looking beyond the sex of the coaches, the portrait which best represented those who coached girls’ high school sports would include the following attributes: earned more than $40,000 (66%); held a bachelor’s degree (69%); were between the ages of 36 and 45 (39%); and were white/Caucasian (85%). While 72% of the coaches indicated they had been employed at their school district for ten years or less, 21% had been employed at the same district for more than fifteen years. Men dominated the head coaching positions for basketball (68%), golf (92%), soccer (60%), and swimming / diving (80%). Women dominated the head coaching positions for the remaining sports of softball (58%), tennis (54%),
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track (69%), and volleyball (92%). When asked to identify what they considered to be their primary sport, the majority of all coaches identified basketball (30%) and volleyball (23%). The majority of the women identified volleyball (44%) and basketball (19%). The majority of the men identified basketball (40%) and golf (11%) as their primary sport. In spite of serving as the head coach of a girls’ team, 12% of the men identified football as their primary sport. When asked to identify their immediate supervisor, 52% indicated it was the athletic director, 15% said a campus coordinator, and the remaining 33% considered their principal to be their immediate supervisor. Men dominated each of the supervisory positions: athletic director (94%); campus coordinator (58%); and principal (73%). In 57% of the instances, the athletic director also served as the head football coach.

The descriptive statistics for the nine variables tested are listed in Table 1. An assessment of the justice dimensions indicated the coaches’ perceived level of fairness to be greater within their athletic departments in all three dimensions. For three of the five job satisfaction facets - the work itself, supervision, and co-workers – the coaches indicated they were satisfied. The coaches indicated they were neutral in their satisfaction towards promotional opportunities and dissatisfied with their pay, while overall, however, when considering the job in general, the coaches were satisfied.

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Justice Dimensions and Satisfaction Variables |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Variable                        | All Coaches M  | All Coaches SD | Men M  | SD | Women M  | SD |
| **Justice Dimensions**          |                |                |        |    |           |    |
| Procedural Justice             | 3.87           | 1.42           | 3.97   | 1.47 | 3.76      | 1.36 |
| Distributive Justice           | 3.91           | 1.59           | 3.95   | 1.64 | 3.86      | 1.54 |
| Interpersonal Justice          | 4.53           | 1.43           | 4.68   | 1.44 | 4.36      | 1.41 |
| **Job Satisfaction**           |                |                |        |    |           |    |
| Work Itself                    | 50.23          | 8.49           | 49.82  | 9.18 | 50.77     | 7.71 |
| Supervision                    | 37.41          | 19.18          | 39.12  | 18.79 | 35.60     | 19.53 |
| Co-Workers                     | 47.67          | 11.04          | 48.75  | 9.51 | 46.51     | 12.42 |
| Pay                            | 21.09          | 15.86          | 20.57  | 15.94 | 21.64     | 15.84 |
| Promotion                      | 26.26          | 19.02          | 26.37  | 19.58 | 26.15     | 18.52 |
| Job In General                 | 44.72          | 11.61          | 44.36  | 11.56 | 45.11     | 11.71 |

N=203; Men=105; Women=98

In response to the primary research objective, the findings from the Pearson correlations for all of the coaches are noted in Table 2. Linear relationships of significance (p<.01) were present among the three justice dimensions and two of the satisfaction facets (supervision and promotion) and the job in general. Significant (p<.05) relationships also existed between procedural justice and both the work itself and pay; and between distributive justice and the work itself.

The secondary findings (see Table 3) indicated that in four instances the relationships between the justice dimensions and satisfaction facets were significant (p<.05) for the women but not significant for the men. Those instances were procedural justice and the work itself; interpersonal justice and the work itself; distributive justice and co-workers; and interpersonal justice and the job in general. Linear relationships were significant (p<.01) for both the men and the women between the three justice dimensions and two satisfaction facets, supervision and promotion. The same was true for the job in general and two of the justice dimensions, procedural justice and distributive justice.

**Table 2. Pearson Correlations of Justice Dimensions and Satisfaction Facets for All Coaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Interpersonal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p<0.01; * p<0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Interpersonal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Women            |                    |                      |                       |
| Work Itself      | .209*              | .159                 | .207*                 |
| Supervision      | .585**             | .495**               | .570**                |
| Co-Workers       | .195               | .221*                | .094                  |
| Pay              | .148               | .099                 | .117                  |
| Promotion        | .368**             | .342**               | .318**                |
| Job In General   | .402**             | .418**               | .350**                |

Note: ** p<0.01; * p<0.05.

**Discussion**

As have many of the studies focusing on the climate of fairness within organizations, this study attempted to associate perceptions of fairness held by organization members to their perceived level of job satisfaction. This study was aligned with previous studies that focused on the climate of fairness within organizations. The present research study examined organization members in terms of their perceptions of fairness. The research study also determined the extent to which the three justice dimensions were related to five key facets of job satisfaction. A strong linear relationship did exist between the three justice dimensions and two of the five
satisfaction facets as well as the subjects’ level of satisfaction with their job in general.

**Organizational Justice**

Overall, the coaches indicated the climate of fairness within their athletic departments was above the mid-point. The level of fairness regarding the outcomes and processes used to arrive at those outcomes were perceived to be high, as indicated by the responses associated with both procedural justice and distributive justice. The results, in many ways, may have been attributable to the overall organizational environment in which sport was framed. Leadership in sport, like the military, can be characterized as often being autocratic and directive by nature. In most interscholastic athletic organizations the chain of command was distinctive, cascading down from athletic director to head coach to assistant coach to student athlete. Since most coaches probably spent a large portion of their lives as players and then as assistant coaches, the long-term exposure to the autocratic decision making environment which permeates sports may have served as their referent point when considering the fairness of the decisions made within their current school’s athletic department. The coaches’ perception of interpersonal justice was the highest rated justice dimension. The high levels of interpersonal justice suggested the coaches felt those making the decisions within their athletic departments were treating them with dignity and respect.

**Job Satisfaction**

The satisfaction perceptions of the coaches were similar to other sport related satisfaction studies. While the coaches were satisfied with the work itself, their co-workers, supervision, and the job in general, they were dissatisfied with their pay and neutral regarding promotional opportunities. Their uncertainty or neutrality with the promotional opportunities potentially available to them may be attributed to the nature of the athletic director’s role in the majority of their schools. Since 57% of their athletic directors were also the head football coach, being the coach of a girls’ team may assure them they are excluded from consideration for an athletic director position in most schools.

**Organizational Justice & Job Satisfaction**

Generally the findings were mixed when compared with previous research which has explored the relationship between organizational justice and organizational outcomes associated with job satisfaction and selected satisfaction facets. Consistent with Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor’s (2000) findings, procedural justice was found to have a stronger association with job satisfaction than interpersonal justice. Other findings differed with research cited in Colquitt et al. (2001) that indicated distributive justice was a stronger predictor of satisfaction with pay and supervisor satisfaction than would be procedural justice.

A linear relationship, which was significant \( p < .05 \), existed between procedural justice and the satisfaction facets of the work itself, supervision, pay, promotion, and the job in general. Among the five facets, all but satisfaction with co-workers indicated a significant linear relationship \( p < .05 \) existed with procedural justice. The strongest relationship existed with supervision satisfaction. It was clear that the coaches placed a great deal of importance on the supervisor’s ability to conduct the business of the athletic department in a manner that assured consistency and was free from bias. Of all the relationships explored, the variability among satisfaction responses, 28% was attributable to the respondents’ perceived level of procedural justice. The coaches also placed a strong emphasis on the fairness of procedures associated with promotional opportunities. The only facet not impacted by procedural justice was the coaches’ satisfaction with their co-workers. This lack of concern may be due to the organizational structure within interscholastic athletic departments. By design, the various sports were often managed in silos with each sport’s head coach reporting directly to the Athletic Director. In that type of structure, coaches from other sports have little influence on sports that they did not have any direct coaching duties. As a result, fairness concerns may not influence satisfaction perceptions.

Distributive justice and three facets - the work itself, supervision, and promotion – and the job in general had significant \( p < .05 \) linear relationships. The relationship between distributive justice and supervision satisfaction had the strongest relationship among the satisfaction facets and the justice dimension, which focused on the fairness of the decision outcomes. Distributive justice accounted for 23% of the variability among satisfaction responses to the coaches’ supervisor. The coaches want the decisions made by the athletic department supervisors to fairly reflect their efforts and contributions to the athletic program and the sport they coached. Performance should drive the decisions made by the athletic department administrators. Those same factors should also drive the decisions associated with promotional considerations. For the promotional facet of satisfaction, the fairness of the decisional outcomes was most important, with 11.4% of the variability being attributed to distributive justice. When considering the job in general, again distributive justice was slightly stronger than procedural justice. The coaches as a group appeared to feel that their level of overall job satisfaction was influenced significantly by organizational decisions based upon their individual performance.

The relationships between interpersonal justice and the facets of supervision and promotion, as well as the job in general were also significantly correlated \( p < .01 \). The extent to which the coaches’ supervisors treated them with dignity and respect weighed heavily on how the coaches perceived their own levels of satisfaction, with not only their supervisor but promotional opportunities and their job in general. Interpersonal justice accounted for 24% of the variability associate with supervision satisfaction.

In summary as a group, perhaps since these coaches serve as the head coach of girls’ teams, they may place a great deal of emphasis on all three dimensions of organizational fairness when judging their job satisfaction. Since they are not coaching boys’ sports they entrust their supervisor to render fair decisions based upon sound processes which are followed to ensure equity among both girls’ teams and boys’ teams. In addition, they value behaviors by their athletic directors which demonstrate a level of respect for the coaches who coach girls’ teams.

For the women, a linear relationship \( p < .001 \) existed between each of the three justice dimensions and three of the satisfaction facets - supervision, promotion, and the job in general. Relationships were also found between the work itself and both procedural justice and interpersonal justice as well as co-workers
and distributive justice ($R^2$) were between each of the justice dimensions and satisfaction with the women’s supervisor. Linear relationships ($p<.05$) also existed among the men between each of the three justice dimensions and two facets – supervision and promotion. The job in general satisfaction was associated with both procedural justice and distributive justice ($p<.05$). The strongest relationships ($R^2$) for the men were also between each of the justice dimensions and supervisor satisfaction.

Regarding the work itself, while no significant relationship existed among the men, the women may have placed a greater value on the relationships and procedures used to make decisions affecting their teams. Again, since these coaches were not coaching boys’ sports, they may have recognized and placed a greater value and appreciation on outcomes that were favorable to their sports than perhaps their peers coaching boys’ sports. While the men indicated no relationship between fairness and their satisfaction with their co-workers, the women placed a great deal of emphasis on the fairness of the decision outcomes and their satisfaction with their co-workers. Since the women worked in a male dominated environment, they probably valued performance based outcomes and hoped that performance would drive the decisions made within the athletic department. When competing in a good ‘ole boy business such as high school sports, and given that they were not part of the male dominated infrastructure, they may have had past experiences whereby the process was flawed, favoring boys’ sports. If so, then their faith in the process may have been void leading them to place greater value on the fairness of the final decision.

The implications for athletic administrators at the high school level are two-fold. First, understanding that there is a relationship between organizational justice and the satisfaction of coaches is a significant step in providing better strategies for instituting fairness throughout the organization. Second, by addressing and providing these strategies administrators can create a better organizational climate which may lead to a greater avoidance of coaching burnout and turnover.

While the current study has established a viable baseline for exploring the relationships between three dimensions of organizational justice and five facets of job satisfaction in sport settings, continued research is needed within sport. Justice and satisfaction and their interactions with numerous other organizational variables including retention, commitment, and performance are also needed. As Greenberg, Mark, and Lehman (1985) noted nearly two decades ago, “sports may represent a miniature social system from which conclusions about justice in society can be drawn” (p.30).

Dr. Warren Whisenant teaches at the University of Miami and Dr. Michael Smucker is on the faculty at the University of Tampa.
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