

## ***Journal of Issues in*** ***Intercollegiate Athletics***

### **Organizational Effectiveness of Athletic Departments and Coaches' Extra-Role Behaviors**

---

**Claudio M. Rocha**

*Ohio State University*

**Brian A. Turner, Ph.D.**

*Ohio State University*

---

*The objective of the current study was to explore and describe the relationship between coaches' extra-role behaviors (precisely organizational commitment – OC and organizational citizenship behavior – OCB) and the organizational effectiveness (OE) of athletic departments. OC was measured through 12 items that represent its three dimensions: affective, normative, and continuance commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). OCB was measured using five items that represent its three dimensions: sportsmanship, civic virtue, and helping behaviors (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Following the current tendency in the literature (Cunningham, 2002; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Smart & Wolfe, 2000), OE of athletic departments was investigated in four dimensions: athletic achievement, student-athletes education, social performance, and financial performance. Coaches (N = 241) from NCAA Division I universities responded to the questionnaire. The results indicated coaches' commitment and citizenship behaviors were not good predictors of effectiveness of athletic departments. Coaches' extra-role behaviors either explained small changes in effectiveness or did not explain effectiveness*

**O**rganizational effectiveness (OE) is recognized as the ultimate management-studies variable. OE measures are concerned with understanding the unique capabilities organizations develop to guarantee a successful performance (Jamrog & Overholt, 2004; McCann, 2004). If the organization has a sound strategy, and the intangible assets (e.g., human resources) are aligned with this strategy, then the assets are likely to create value for the organization (Kaplan & Norton, 2004) and, consequently this organization will be considered “effective.” In this way, human resources play a key role in the process of effectiveness assessment.

However, in highly competitive environments, just performing well or being aligned with the organization's strategies is not enough to assure effectiveness. Actually, in this kind of environment, organizations become more dependent on individuals who are willing to go beyond their formal tasks (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Organ, 1988). Organizational commitment (OC) and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are two constructs that illustrate what "to go beyond formal tasks" means (McGee & Ford, 1987; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Some authors present OC and OCB as extra-role behaviors (e.g., Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006), making a distinction between these and the in-role behaviors.

The literature consistently presents links between OC, OCB and OE. The link between OC and some indicators of effectiveness (such as turnover and absenteeism) has been shown in theoretical and empirical studies (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Similarly, OCB has been presented as "discretionary actions that promote organizational effectiveness" (Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004, p.455).

OE of intercollegiate athletics, which are embedded in a highly competitive environment (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005), can be fairly dependent on OC and OCB of athletic departments' workers (i.e., athletic directors, assistant athletic directors, coaches, staff, and athletes). While some authors have investigated OC and OCB of bureaucratic workers, such as assistant athletic directors (e.g., Kent & Chelladurai, 2001), others have opted for coaches (e.g., Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Turner & Chelladurai).

Coaches are seen as the managers of the athletic team (Chelladurai, 2005). For some authors, "coaches constitute a strategic and important human resource of the athletic department" (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005, p.194). "While there are administrative, coaching, and support personnel contributing to organizational effectiveness of collegiate athletic departments, coaches are the most important contributors to overall effectiveness" (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995, p.195). Thus, the objective of this study was to explore and describe the relationship between coaches' extra-role behaviors (precisely OC and OCB) and the effectiveness of athletic departments.

### *Organizational Commitment*

OC is defined as "the degree to which an employee feels a sense of loyalty to the organization" (Rayton, 2006, p.140). Abbott, White, and Charles (2005) and colleagues viewed OC as "a psychological link between the employee and the organization that makes it less likely the employee will voluntarily leave the organization" (p. 532). Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-approach definition is the most used in the literature. For these authors, commitment is a multi-dimensional psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and has significance for his/her decision to continue membership in the organization. Meyer and Allen's three dimensions are: *affective commitment* (emotional attachment to the organization; they *want* to continue), *continuance commitment* (based on consciousness about the costs related to leaving the organization, they *need* to continue), and *normative commitment* (a feeling of obligation; they *ought* to continue).

In general, the literature assumes that OC is a very desirable behavior in many different kinds of industries (e.g. Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000; Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt, & Roman, 2005; Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004; Dixon, Cunningham, Sagas, Turner, & Kent, 2005; Harrison & Hubbard, 1998). Hence, some studies treat *OC as a consequence* of other factors. For

example, OC has been studied as a consequence of leadership behaviors (Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Perryer & Jordan, 2005; Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, & Lawler, 2005), job satisfaction, challenge or stress (Dixon et al., 2005; Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Lee & Gao, 2005; Rayton, 2006; Rifai, 2005), demographics characteristics (Cetin, 2006; Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999), justice (Clay-Warner et al., 2005; Loi, Hang-yue, & Foley, 2006; Rifai, 2005), supervisor support (Dixon et al., 2005), pay satisfaction, social support, and autonomy (Rayton, 2006), need satisfaction factors (Khan & Mishra, 2004), employee stock ownership (Culpepper, Gamble, & Blubaugh, 2004), collegiate membership (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003), and personal values and perceived organizational values (Abbott et al., 2005). Nonetheless, some studies treat *OC as a cause* of other important factors, such as turnover (Abbott et al., 2005; Bentein, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg, & Stinglhamber, 2005; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999), absenteeism (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999), job performance (Lee & Gao, 2005; Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, & Wright, 2005; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005), citizenship behaviors (Rifai, 2005; Sinclair et al., 2005), acceptance of change (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999), and training motivation (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004).

The literature has also reported *OC as a mediator* between two other variables. For example, Chen (2004) examined OC as a mediator between transformational leadership behaviors and job performance. Bishop et al. (2000) also investigated OC as a mediator between perceived team/organizational support and outcome variables, such as intention to quit, job performance, and citizenship behaviors.

Mathieu and Zajac's (1990) meta-analysis distinguished between two forms of commitment: attitudinal and calculative. Nowadays commitment is well recognized as a multidimensional construct whose antecedents and consequences vary across different dimensions (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnysky, 2002). In this way, Meyer and et al.'s meta-analysis extended Mathieu and Zajac's research and compared the strength of true correlations between variables identified in Meyer and Allen's (1991) study (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative commitment).

Additionally, some scholars claim workplace commitment can take different forms, such as commitment to organizations, occupations, unions, teams, leaders, and goals (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Among these, the two most studied in the literature are commitment to an organization and commitment to an occupation. Occupational commitment indicates how devoted the person is to his/her occupation (Cetin, 2006; Meyer & Herscovitch). Some relationships have been found between occupational commitment and (a) demographics variables (Cetin; Cunningham & Sagas, 2004), (b) organizational justice (Whisenant, 2005), (c) intercollegiate athletic membership (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003), and (d) turnover intentions (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). Nevertheless, in recent studies with athletic coaches, although positive relationships have been found between OC and performance, no relationship was found between occupational commitment and job performance (e.g., Turner & Chelladurai).

### *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p.4). Basically,

there are two different approaches to classify OCB: according to the target of the OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and according to the type of behavior (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). The former presents OCB in two broad categories: behaviors that benefit other individuals in the company (OCBI), and behaviors that benefit the organization as whole (OCBO). The latter presents OCB in three main categories: sportsmanship (a willingness to stand less than ideal circumstances without complaints), civic virtue (a willingness to take part in and to be concerned about one's organization life), and helping behaviors (such as altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading).

OCB is a very desirable behavior in almost all kinds of organizations (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Feather & Rauter, 2004; Gautam, Van Dick, Wagner, Upadhyay, & Davis, 2005; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Like OC, OCB has been studied *as a consequence* of other factors, such as job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ; Rifai, 2005; Tepper et al., 2004; Todd & Kent, 2006), organizational commitment (Rifai; Sinclair et al., 2005), perceived leadership (Kent & Chelladurai), psychological ownership (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004), and customer orientation (Donavan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004).

Other studies have sought to investigate OCB *as a cause* of other constructs, such as organizational effectiveness (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Walz & Niehoff, 2000), productivity (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994), and profitability and consumer satisfaction (Koys, 2001). Additionally, some conceptual papers have been presented as attempts to propose new ways to investigate the construct (e.g. Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004; Organ, 1997; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Finally, some scholars proposed to investigate OCB as a cause of negative factors, such as overload, job stress and family conflicts (e.g., Bolino & Turnley, 2005).

Although negative aspects of OCB are not consistently highlighted in the great part of the management literature, these features have been increasingly investigated (Bowler, 2006). Bolino (1999) suggested OCB might be linked to making a better impression on one's superiors and, consequently, to serve one's own interests, rather than the organization's interests. If these impression-management motives are present, it is likely OCB impact on organizational effectiveness will be diminished (Bolino).

In sport management literature, OCB has been investigated in its relationships with different styles of leadership. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) investigated assistant directors of universities' athletic departments and did not find a relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. However, they did find positive correlations between the quality of leader-member exchange and OCB (namely altruism and generalized compliance). According to these authors, "a subordinate reciprocates the rewards from the supervisor by engaging in extra role behaviors" (Kent & Chelladurai, p.153). The relationship between transformational leadership and OCB has been theoretically assumed in the literature by some scholars (Bass, 1985; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Yukl, 1989). In addition, empirical investigations have shown that transformational behaviors of leaders explain unique variance of OCB (Podsakoff et al., 1996).

Chang and Chelladurai (2003) investigated the relationship between OC and OCB in part-time and full-time workers of fitness clubs and recreation centers in South Korea. They found affective commitment and OCB were positively correlated in both groups. However, continuance commitment and OCB were negatively correlated only among full-time workers.

They concluded that part-time workers in sport organizations seem to show lower levels of extra-role behaviors when compared with their full-time peers (Chang & Chelladurai).

### *Organizational Effectiveness*

Because of the difficulty to reach a sound model to measure OE, sport management scholars (e.g., Chelladurai, 1987; Frisby, 1986; Koski, 1995) have proposed an organization should be evaluated in different dimensions at the same time. For instance, an organization can be evaluated regarding its ability to acquire resources (the system resources model), its productivity (the goals attainment model), and its smooth functioning (the internal process model). Frisby (1986), for example, integrated the goals attainment model and the systems resource model to investigate whether the most successful Canadian National Sport Governing Bodies at acquiring scarce financial resources, are also more successful at achieving goals of performance excellence. The results revealed one of the goals model indicators (the effectiveness ranking) was positively and significantly correlated with one of the system model indicators (the total operating budget). This suggests the ability to acquire scarce financial resources is related to the ability of those organizations to achieve its goal of performance excellence. Chelladurai, Szyszlo, and Haggerty (1987) and colleagues also used a multidimensional approach to identify the relative importance attached by the managers of Canadian national sport organizations to different dimensions of effectiveness. Their results showed Canadian managers did not perceive input-monetary resources as an important dimension of effectiveness for their organizations. According to the authors, it should have happened because large part of Canadian sport governing bodies' revenue comes from the government (Chelladurai et al., 1987). Shilbury and Moore (2006) found similar results: Some selected constituent groups (board members, paid administrative staff, subcommittee members, coaches, athletes, officials, state representatives, sponsors, and government agencies) did not perceive resource acquisition as a critical determinant of OE of Australian national sport organizations (Shilbury & Moore).

Another group of authors have been investigating OE of athletic departments in universities and colleges (Baxter, Margavio, & Lambert, 1996; Cunningham, 2002; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Smart & Wolfe, 2000; Wolfe, Hoeber, & Babiak, 2002). Cunningham examined the relationship between OE and specific characteristics of NCAA Division I Athletic Departments. Measuring OE through athletic achievement (points earned in the Sears Director's Cup), student-athletes graduation rates, and social performance (the extent to which athletic departments are compliant with gender equity), Cunningham found athletic departments presented different levels of effectiveness in different dimensions. For example, the group of athletic departments that showed the highest degree of athletic achievement also presented only a moderate social performance. On the other hand, athletic departments that showed a high social performance presented only moderate graduation rates. This apparent competition among different dimensions of OE in athletic departments supports the relevance of multidimensional measures for assessing OE.

For Baxter et al. (1996), those dimensions are competing enough to propose the existence of two kinds of athletic departments: one oriented primarily toward winning and profit, and another oriented toward education and amateur athletic competition. Wolfe and colleagues found support for Baxter et al.'s hypothesis. Putler and Wolfe (1999) reported how the four significant outcomes, which determined intercollegiate athletics program success (athletic achievement,



graduation rates, ethics, and financial performance), were likely to compete with each other. Specifically, athletic achievement and ethics, on the one hand, and graduation rates and financial performance, on the other, arose as competing priorities inside athletic departments (Putler & Wolfe). Likewise, Wolfe et al. (2002) asserted that performance on the field is given greater priority in intercollegiate athletics and may be perceived as a competing value with education and ethics. Thus, the option for multidimensional measures to assess effectiveness seems to be the most indicated in the case of intercollegiate athletic departments.

### *Intercollegiate Athletics*

Cunningham and Ashley (2001) observed that by segmenting member colleges into three divisions, the NCAA created distinct and clear contrasts among these divisions. Other authors also pointed out that athletic departments of Divisions I, II, and III are different in many aspects (DeSchraver & Jensen, 2002; Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2003; Geist & Pastore, 2002; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). Turner and Chelladurai stated colleges from different divisions emphasize athletics differently and, consequently, use different strategies to recruit student-athletes. Division I colleges generally show a drive for national prominence and acknowledge the importance of athletics to the entertainment value for the community (Fink et al., 2003). To Cunningham and Ashley the most prominent distinction between Division I and other division's colleges is in revenue generation, inasmuch as many Division I colleges have profitable football and men's basketball programs. DeSchraver and Jensen supported the same idea, affirming that Division II football programs generate very little, if any, revenue from sources such as media fees, advertisement, and sponsorship.

Different levels of emphasis in athletics seem to have influence on other aspects of athletic departments' life. Schulman and Bowen (2001) described how Division IA public and private universities, Division IAA Ivy League universities, and Division III universities differed (and resembled) each other. Considering academic issues, Schulman and Bowen found an average SAT scores of 917 for high profile athletes (basketball and football), in 1989, in Division I public universities, which tend to focus on athletic performance more openly than other institutions. In the same year, for the same kind of athletes, the average SAT scores for Ivy League and Division III universities was 1212 and 1126, respectively. Moreover, the gap in average SAT scores between students at large and athletes was much more evident in Division I universities than it was in Ivy League or Division III schools (Schulman & Bowen). Academic aspects seem to start in disadvantage since the early beginning of student-athletes live in institutions that emphasize athletic performance.

Nevertheless, not only academic aspects seem to be affected by athletic emphasis. Investigating ethical aspects, Baxter et al. (1996) showed that successful Division I schools were more likely than others to violate the NCAA rules. Regarding social performance, Fink et al. (2003) found that diversity management strategies contributed much more to the variance in organizational effectiveness in Division III than they did in Division I. The emphasis Division I schools put in athletics could be understood as a consequence of their stated missions, which emphasize the entertainment value of athletics for the community (Siegel, 2003). Such entertainment value is not found on Division II or III colleges' missions, which tend to highlight the importance of opportunity for those students participating in athletics (Fink et al.; Siegel).

Given those differences among divisions, coaches from different divisions are likely to face different pressures to perform well and, consequently, engage in different levels of extra-role behaviors to deal with these pressures. We chose to investigate Division I coaches and athletic departments for two different and complementary motives. First, being one of the objectives of this paper to extend the notion of athletic departments effectiveness beyond its individual aspects, Division I schools seem to be very interesting settings, inasmuch as they face greater pressures, when compare to the other two divisions, to balance their intense athletic and financial drive with educational and social concerns. Second, coaches of Division I institutions are more likely to suffer the consequences of multiple (and sometimes competing) aspects of organizational effectiveness. In this sense, the objective of the current study was to explore and describe the relationship between NCAA Division I coaches' extra-role behaviors (precisely OC and OCB) and the effectiveness of their athletic departments.

Previous studies of the relationship between extra-role behaviors and multidimensional organizational effectiveness of athletic departments were not found. Some sport management scholars have investigated the multidimensionality of organizational effectiveness in athletic departments (e.g., Baxter et al., 1996; Cunningham, 2002; Putler & Wolfe, 1999). Outside sport settings, management scholars have found positive relationships between extra-role behaviors and effectiveness (e.g., Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). However, the extent to which extra-role behaviors can (or cannot) influence different dimensions of sport organizations' effectiveness was not investigated so far.

## Method

A pre-notification via e-mail announcing the web-based survey was sent one week before the questionnaires (Kent & Turner, 2002). Along with the questionnaire, a cover letter informed respondents how they were selected to participate in this study (selectivity statement) and the deadline to return the questionnaire (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). Additionally, a guarantee of confidentiality was stated (Singer, Mathiowetz, & Couper, 1993). Due to the necessity to link respondents to their institutions, these were not anonymous. Nevertheless, trying to keep the identity of participants as confidential as possible, they were identified by e-mail addresses only. Additionally, whenever a respondent was associated to an institution, the e-mail was immediately deleted from the spreadsheet. According to Singer et al. (1993), once confidentiality is guaranteed, people tend to be less concerned about the anonymity of responses. Follow-up messages were sent to non-respondents 2 and 4 weeks after the initial e-mailing.

### *Respondents*

The target population was athletic head coaches from NCAA Division I. At the time of this research, there were 5,078 head coaches working with Division I teams. Schools that provided scholarships for student-athletes were only included because graduation rates for student-athletes in these institutions could be found. Coaches ( $N = 800$ ) were randomly selected to respond the questionnaire. Coaches ( $n = 241$ ; 30.1%) responded to the questionnaire. Male respondents ( $n = 181$ ) comprised 75.1% of the total sample, while Caucasian respondents ( $n = 208$ ) represented 86.3% of the total sample (3.3% identified themselves as African-Americans,

2.1% as Latinos, 2.1% as Native-Americans, 1.2% as Asian-Americans, and 1.7% as “Others”). The age of the respondents ranged from 25 to 77 years ( $M = 44.9$ ,  $SD = 10.1$ ). The tenure of the respondents ranged from 1 to 45 years ( $M = 10.8$ ,  $SD = 9.1$ ).

## Measures

For commitment and citizenship behaviors' items, respondents were asked to report opinions based on a six-point Likert scale, indicating the level of agreement ranging from one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree). Similar to Turner and Chelladurai (2005), the highest loading items from Meyer et al.'s (1993) scales were used for affective commitment – AC (three items), normative commitment – NC (three items), and continuance commitment – CC (six items). The reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) of .87 for AC, .72 for NC, and .74 for CC are slightly larger than those reported in previous studies with the same population (e.g., Turner & Chelladurai) and comparable to those reported in other studies (Meyer et al., 2002).

Five items from Mackenzie et al.'s (1993) instrument were used to measure coaches' OCB. Items were reworded to make sense for coaches. Because the initial reliability was only .60 for OCB, one item (“I tend to point out what is wrong inside the athletic department.”) was eliminated. It resulted in a slight increase of the reliability to .63. Although it is at most moderate, it is comparable to previous studies' reliabilities measures of OCB (e.g., Rifai, 2005). Moreover, because increasing the number of items will increase the Cronbach's alpha even with the same degree of inter-correlation, scales with a small number of items could have a less stringent requirement when their reliability is being assessed (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, and Sorensen (2006) recognized reliability of measures that involve personality traits are very difficult to be obtained. Thus, they suggested moderate measures of reliability (from .60 to .70) should be acceptable. OCB (or the good soldier syndrome) is noteworthy, in certain instances, a personality trait (Organ, 1988). Therefore, even with a moderate reliability for this scale, was kept in the analyses.

Following the current tendency in the literature (Cunningham, 2002; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Smart & Wolfe, 2000), four outcomes of athletic departments success were investigated: athletic achievement, student-athletes education, social performance, and financial performance. *Athletic achievement* was evaluated by computing the points earned in the 2006-2007 Sports Academy Director's Cup (formerly Sears' Cup). The National Association of Directors of Collegiate Athletics (NACDA) awards the Sports Academy Director's Cup annually to the most successful athletic department in each NCAA division. Each athletic department sums points according to (1) the teams' finish position in the final polls, or (2) the teams' place in the national tournament held at the end of each season (NACDA, 2007). Men's, as well women's sports count for this award. This award has been used in the literature as an indicator of colleges' athletic achievement (Cunningham; Cunningham & Ashley, 2001; Scott, 1999). For the 2006-2007 edition, points earned in Directors Cup ranged from zero (some colleges did not receive any points) to 1,429 ( $M = 278.59$ ,  $SD = 353.66$ ).

*Student-athletes education* has been operationally defined as graduation rates. For this study, each university's graduation rates were gathered from the 2007 NCAA Division I Federal Graduation Rate Data (NCAA, 2007). Smart and Wolfe (2000) and Cunningham (2002) used the same procedure and elected graduation rates as a measure of academic performance of athletic



departments. The graduation rates for schools presented in our sample ranged from 38% to 98% ( $M = 79.49$ ,  $SD = 10.88$ ).

*Social performance* has been operationally defined as gender equity participation rates in athletic programs. The use of gender equity as a measure of social performance is coherent with previous literature (Cunningham, 2002; Hums & Chelladurai, 1994; Mahony & Pastore, 1998; Zimbalist, 1999). The number of female and male participants in each athletic department was retrieved from the US Department of Education website (USDE, 2007). To create a representative index for gender equity, the total number of participants in women's teams and women in Coed teams was divided by the total number of participants in men's teams and men in Coed team. This procedure produced a ratio of female to male athletes, which was used as a gender equity measure for each university. For example, if a university has 90 female athletes and 120 male athletes, the gender equity for this university is .75 (90/120). For our sample, this ratio ranged from .32 to 1.69 ( $M = .89$ ,  $SD = .21$ ).

*Financial performance* has received little attention in past studies. Smart and Wolfe (2000), for example, used attendance figures as a measure of financial performance. However, they noticed: "The extent to which attendance is related to financial performance remains an empirical question" (Smart & Wolfe, p. 148-149). For this study, we used total revenues reported by universities to the US Department of Education (USDE, 2007). Due to limitations reported in previous studies (e.g., Smart & Wolfe), total revenues were selected as the measure of financial performance. Revenues can, actually, represent an athletic department's ability to acquire financial resources to the institution. For our sample of universities, total revenues ranged from \$ 2,784,412 to 104,704,852 ( $M = 26,848,550$ ,  $SD = 23,108,770$ ).

## Analyses

Four multiple regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the unique and cumulative effects of the four independent variables (AC, NC, CC, and OCB) on four dependent variables (athletic achievement, student-athletes education, social performance, and financial performance). Coaches' extra-role behaviors, our independent variables, were entered simultaneously in all regression analyses.

## Results

The means and standard deviations for all variables are provided in Table 1. T-tests for independent groups were calculated to verify the influence of gender (men/women) on the independent variables. Because of the discrepancy in the number of men and women, and in the number of Caucasian and not-Caucasian respondents, Levene's Test for Equality of Variance was used to assure the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated (Field, 2005). Levene's test comparing men and women, and Caucasian and non-Caucasian, coaches on each independent variable was not significant. For the independent samples *t*-test, no significant differences were found between men and women, or Caucasian and non-Caucasian coaches on any independent variables. Therefore, the sample was considered as a whole group.

Table 1 - Means (standard deviations) for all variables by gender and ethnicity

Variables	Women (n = 60)	Men (n = 181)	Non- Caucasian (n = 25)	Caucasian (n = 208)	Total (n = 241)
Independent					
AC	4.30 (1.20)	4.46 (1.09)	4.63 (.89)	4.41 (1.14)	4.44 (1.12)
NC	4.18 (1.00)	4.33 (.97)	4.33 (.64)	4.30 (1.01)	4.31 (.99)
CC	3.38 (.71)	3.46 (.91)	3.26 (.46)	3.45 (.90)	3.44 (.88)
OCB	4.80 (.66)	4.73 (.72)	4.61 (.68)	4.76 (.72)	4.76 (.71)
Dependent					
Athletic					278.59 (353.66)
Academic					79.49 (10.88)
Social					.89 (.21)
Financial					26,848,550 (23,108,770)

*Note.* AC = affective commitment; NC = normative commitment; CC = continuance commitment; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; Athletic = athletic performance (points earned in the 2006-2007 Directors' Cup); Academic = academic performance (graduation rates); Social = social performance (ratio of female athletes to male athletes); and Financial = financial performance (total revenues [in U.S. dollars]). AC, NC, CC, and OCB are on a 1-6 scale. Eight respondents did not report ethnicity.

Correlations among all variables are provided in Table 2. As expected, different extra-role behaviors were correlated with each other. AC, NC, and OCB were positive and significantly correlated. The exception was CC, the kind of commitment arising from a consciousness about the costs related to leaving the organization (employees perceive they need to go on). CC was negatively correlated with the other dimensions of commitment and positively correlated to OCB, but none of those correlations were significant. Regarding the outcome variables, only athletic achievement and financial performance were significantly correlated with each other. Based on previous studies (Baxter et al., 1996; Cunningham, 2002; Putler & Wolfe, 1999), it was not surprising.

Table 2 - *Correlations among all variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. AC	1							
2. NC	.777**	1						
3. CC	- 0.065	- .022	1					
4. OCB	.534**	.500**	.024	1				
5. Athletic	.190**	.163	- .083	.043	1			
6. Academic	.121	.116	- .002	.137	- .004	1		
7. Social	.157	- .037	.035	.039	- .032	-.020	1	
8. Financial	.157	.161	- .008	.051	.844**	.043	- .011	1

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

Before running the regression analyses, an examination of histograms and plots of residuals were made. Regression analysis basic assumptions were met. The residuals were independent, had a mean of zero, were normally distributed, had constant variance, and were not correlated with our independent variables. Multicollinearity was also examined. Even with a moderate correlation between AC and NC ( $r = .777$ ), tolerance (ranging from .365 to .990) and variance inflation factor (ranging from 1.010 to 2.742) did not point multicollinearity of the independent variables as a concern.

The results of the four regression analyses are presented in Table 3. The regression equation for athletic achievement was significant,  $F(4, 237) = 2.667$ ,  $p = .03$ , explaining 2.9% of the variance. Similarly, the regression equation for social performance was also significant,  $F(4, 237) = 3.403$ ,  $p = .01$ , explaining 4.2% of the variance. None of the independent variables contributed uniquely to the explained variance. The regression equations for academic performance ( $F(4, 237) = 1.244$ ,  $p = .293$ ) and financial performance ( $F(4, 237) = 1.719$ ,  $p = .147$ ) were not statistically significant.

## Discussion

The negative correlations between athletic achievement and academic performance ( $r = -.004$ ) and social performance ( $r = -.032$ ), and the positive and significant correlation between athletic achievement and financial performance ( $r = .844$ ) give support to previous findings in the literature (Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe et al., 2002). As Wolfe et al. reported, “there are competing conceptions of legitimate conduct in intercollegiate athletics: one oriented toward winning and profit, the other toward education and compliance with NCAA rules” (p. 149). According to Putler and Wolfe different college stakeholders have perceived winning (athletic achievement) and accomplishment of rules (in this case gender equity) as competing values. However, athletic achievement seems to be highly dependent on revenue generation or vice-versa (Goff, 2000). As noted by Goff (2000), the denial that “big-time” college athletics is a revenue generator goes counter to basic economic principles.

Table 3 - *Regression of organizational effectiveness to coaches' commitment and citizenship behaviors*

Variables entered	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	$F$	$\beta$	$t$
Athletic achievement	.047	.029	2.667*		
AC				.183	1.667
NC				.061	.572
CC				-.068	-1.018
OCB				-.083	-1.045
Academic performance	.022	.004	1.244		
AC				.042	.374
NC				.034	.318
CC				-.001	-.017
OCB				.098	1.215
Social performance	.059	.042	3.403*		
AC				-.379	-3.474
NC				.184	1.729
CC				.011	.166
OCB				.149	1.883
Financial performance	.031	.013	1.719		
AC				.102	.922
NC				.110	1.026
CC				.003	.039
OCB				-.058	-.725

\*  $p < .05$ 

The results also showed non-significant correlations between academic performance and social performance ( $r = -.020$ ) and financial performance ( $r = .043$ ), as well as between social and financial performance ( $r = -.011$ ). Those results are in congruence with Wolfe et al.'s (2002) findings, which showed a lack of correlation between either academic performance or ethics (social performance) and other indicators of organizational effectiveness in athletic departments. To Wolfe et al. inside athletic departments, academic performance and social performance of athletic departments tend to be "independent determinants," which do not influence perceptions of success in other areas. On the other hand, athletic achievement and financial health can be called "relational determinants," having influence on each other and on other effectiveness factors (Wolfe et al.). These findings support the idea that organizational effectiveness should be investigated through a multidimensional approach (Chelladurai, 1987; Cunningham, 2002; Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000). Performance on the field can account for part of the story.

However, the overall organizational effectiveness of athletic departments cannot be understood without other measures, such as financial health, social concerns and academic performance of student-athletes.

Regarding the regression analyses, coaches' extra-role behaviors were significantly related to athletic achievement and social performance, but they were not related to either academic or financial performance. However, even for athletic achievement and social performance, the variance explained by the independent variables was quite small. The variance explained in athletic success was about 3%. Turner and Chelladurai (2005) reported that organizational commitment explained about 5% of the variance in athletic success of coaches. In the particular case of athletic departments, the more successful coaches are, the better the athletic achievement of their departments. In this sense, coaches' extra-role behaviors seem to have some importance for athletic achievement. To Turner and Chelladurai, even small increases in athletic achievement should be considered critical in the context of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics, where the competition is fiercely intense.

Similarly, coaches' extra-role behaviors explained a small, but significant amount (4.2%) of social performance in athletic departments. Cunningham (2002) found that the strategic profiles of managers have influenced gender equity inside athletic departments. In this study, the more conservative and predictable a manager was, the higher the gender equity in the athletic department (Cunningham). Beyond conservativeness of managers, in the results commitment and citizenship behaviors of coaches could also help athletic departments to attain social performance. Organ and Moorman (1993), for example, asserted notions of justice account for such extra-role behaviors, which in turn have an important role in the overall organizational effectiveness. In this sense, one possible explanation for the result is the more fair an athletic department is perceived by its workers, the more these workers would be willing to engage in extra-role behaviors, which in turn would contribute for the overall organizational effectiveness (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

Coaches' extra role behavior did not affect academic nor financial performance. Overall, either coach's extra-role behaviors explained quite small changes in effectiveness or not at all. In this sense, the results found here seem to bring new information to the sport management literature. Previous studies have consistently reported good relationships between sport workers' extra-role behaviors and other organizational variables, such as turnover intentions (Pack, 2005; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005), perceptions of self-efficacy (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004), job characteristics (Dixon et al., 2005), and job regime (Chang & Chelladurai, 2003). Consistent with Dixon et al., committed workers "have the potential to make an immediate impact on organizational effectiveness" (p. 179). However, this potential was not actually tested. In the results, commitment and citizenship behaviors appear to have less impact on the ultimate organizational effectiveness of sport organizations than past studies have conceptually conjectured.

According to Bowler (2006), only few researchers (Bolino, 1999; Bolino & Turnley, 2003) have questioned the assumption that extra-role behaviors promote organizational effectiveness. Bolino recognized employees who engage in extra-role behaviors are not necessarily acting selflessly on behalf of their firms. Rather, employees who engage in extra-role behaviors can be acting in their own interest, engaging in such behaviors to cause a good impression on their managers. If that is the case, commitment and citizenship behaviors can lose their potential to influence the organizational effectiveness as a whole. Bolino raised suspicions



some “good soldiers” could be, instead, good actors. In this sense, they would not be really willing to go above and beyond their formal tasks. Thus, even when coaches affirm they are expending extra efforts for the athletic departments, they are not really going beyond their formal tasks. Therefore, no effects on organizational effectiveness could be verified.

A second possible explanation for the results comes from the nature of the coaching profession. If considered that the great majority of college coaches do not receive high salaries (with the exception of football and basketball coaches), have to work in “different” shifts and on different days (most coaches work during weekends for practices and games), attend functions that are not required, but that help the athletic department image, and have multiple functions (coach, teacher, advisor), they are already engaged in what other types of workers could considered extra-role behaviors. Dixon and Bruening (2007) described college-coaching demands as a “multifaceted, high-paced work setting full of practices, recruiting, off-season workouts, administrative responsibilities, and teaching duties has created an environment in which only those willing to work 12 hour days, 6 days a week, for 50 weeks a year can thrive” (p. 384). In this sense, college coaching is so full of “formal” extra-role behaviors that commitment and citizenship behaviors are widespread all around. Thus, extra-role behaviors of coaches may not be good predictors of organizational effectiveness.

## Conclusions

To understand coaches as key actors inside athletic departments is intuitive and well reported in the literature (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995; Smart & Wolfe, 2000; Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). Therefore, coaches’ behaviors that can affect the overall effectiveness of athletic departments should be investigated in more detail. This study indicated coaches’ commitment and citizenship behaviors were not good predictors of effectiveness of athletic departments (measured through four dimensions). Coaches’ extra-role behaviors either explained small changes in effectiveness or did not explain it at all.

Limitations of this investigation are as follows. First, only four dimensions of organization effectiveness was considered. Putler and Wolfe (1999) suggested the absence of violations (what they called ethics) as an additional and important dimension of organizational effectiveness of athletic departments. Cunningham (2002) recommended scholarship allocation, recruiting budgets and operating budgets, beyond participation, as interesting dimensions of social performance of organizational effectiveness. Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) considered student-athlete satisfaction as the most important dimension of overall effectiveness of athletic departments. Future studies may shed light on organizational effectiveness of athletic departments by adding one or more of the above-mentioned dimensions.

Another limitation was the absence of a more complex model to understand the role of extra-role on organizational effectiveness. Extra-role behaviors have been proposed as mediators between organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Todd & Kent, 2006), justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993), and supervisor/organizational support (Dixon et al., 2005; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). The relationship between coaches’ extra-role behaviors and organizational effectiveness may be better understood through mediational models

with some of these variables. The assumption other constructs could affect coaches' commitment and citizenship behaviors is also an interesting avenue for future studies.

A third limitation could be associated to the type of sample used. The study was concerned with Division I coaches only. As mentioned elsewhere, given the differences among divisions (Baxter et al., 1996; Fink et al., 2003), coaches from different divisions are likely to face different pressures to perform and, consequently, engage in different levels of extra-role behaviors to deal with these pressures. In this sense, the results could be generalized to Division I institutions. Future studies exploring the relationship between coaches' extra-role behaviors and organizational effectiveness in other divisions could help to advance the literature in athletics.

Another potential limitation of this study was the level of analysis. Only the individual coach extra-role behaviors were considered. Had an aggregate measure of coaches' behaviors been considered, stronger relationships may have been found between those behaviors and organizational effectiveness. Due to the small number of responses per athletic department, this aggregate measure was not performed.

The current study reported coaches' commitment and citizenship behaviors were not good predictors of organizational outcomes, namely athletic achievement, academic performance, gender equity, and financial health. Even where regression equations were significant, the amount of variance explained was quite small: coaches' extra role behaviors could explain 2.9% and 4.2% of the variance in athletic achievement and gender equity, respectively. Naturally, as noted by Turner and Chelladurai (2005), in highly competitive environments, even small contributions are always relevant.

Assuming that commitment and citizenship behavior can actually have positive effects on effectiveness, as previous studies have revealed (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Lee & Gao, 2005; Walz & Niehoff, 2000), the lack of significant correlations between extra-role behaviors and effectiveness in this study could be explained by either the fact that good soldiers are in fact good actors (Bolino, 1999; Bowler, 2006), or by the nature of college coaching, whose formal required demands could be easily considered as extra-role behaviors in other types of professional activities.

## References

- Abbott, G. N., White, F. A., & Charles, M. A. (2005). Linking values and organizational commitment: a correlational and experimental investigation in two organizations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 531-551.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). Introduction to research in Education (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Baxter, V., Margavio, A. V., & Lambert, C. (1996). Competition, legitimation, and the regulation of intercollegiate athletics. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13, 51-64.

- Bentein, K., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal Of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 468-482.
- Bishop, J. W., Scott, D. K., & Burroughs, S. M. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management, 26*(6), 1113-1132.
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review, 24*(1), 82-98.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*(3), 60-71.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 740-748.
- Bowler, M. (2006). Organizational goals versus the dominant coalison: A critical view of the value of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, May*(1), 258-273.
- Cetin, M. O. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational and organizational commitment of academics. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 8*(1), 78-88.
- Chang, K., & Chelladurai, P. (2003). Comparison of part-time workers and full-time workers: Commitment and citizenship behaviors in Korean sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 17*, 394-416.
- Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and multiple perspectives of organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management, 1*, 37-47.
- Chelladurai, P. (2005). *Managing organizations for sport and physic activity: a systems perspective* (2nd. ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Chelladurai, P., & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management, 17*, 63-74.
- Chelladurai, P., Szyszlo, M., & Haggerty, T. R. (1987). Systems-based dimensions of effectiveness: The case of National Sport Organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences, 12*, 111-119.
- Chen, L. Y. (2004). Examining the effect of organizational culture and leadership behaviors on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance at small and middle-sized firms of Taiwan. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*, 432-438.
- Clay-Warner, J., Hegtveldt, K. A., & Roman, P. (2005). Procedural justice, distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on organizational commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 89-102.
- Culpepper, R. A., Gamble, J. E., & Blubaugh, M. G. (2004). Employee stock ownership plans and three-component commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 155-170.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2002). Examining the relationship among Miles and Snow's strategic types and measures of organizational effectiveness in NCAA Division I Athletic Departments. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 37*(2), 159-175.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Ashley, F. B. (2001). Isomorphic tendencies in NCAA athletic departments: The use of competing theories and advancement of theory. *Sport Management Review, 4*(1), 47-63.

- Cunningham, G. B., & Dixon, M. A. (2003). New perspectives concerning performance appraisals of intercollegiate coaches. *Quest*, 55, 177-192.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Mahoney, K. (2004). Self-efficacy of part-time employees in university athletics: The influence of organizational commitment, valence of training, and training motivation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 59-73.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2004). Group diversity, occupational commitment, and occupational turnover intentions among NCAA Division IA Football coaching staffs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 236-254.
- DeSchrive, T. D., & Jensen, P. E. (2002). Determinants of spectator attendance at NCAA Division II Football contests. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 311-330.
- Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 377-406.
- Dixon, M. A., Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., Turner, B. A., & Kent, A. (2005). Challenge is key: An investigation of affective organizational commitment in undergraduate interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80(3), 172-180.
- Donavan, D. T., Brown, T. J., & Mowen, J. C. (2004). Internal benefits of service-worker customer orientation: Job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 128-146.
- Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 67-80.
- Ehrhart, M. G., & Naumann, S. E. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 960-974.
- Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81-94.
- Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS : (and sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll)* (2nd ed.). London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Fink, J. S., Pastore, D., & Riemer, H. A. (2003). Managing employee diversity: Perceived practices and organizational outcomes in NCAA Division III athletic departments. *Sport Management Review*, 6, 147-168.
- Frisby, W. (1986). Measuring the organizational effectiveness of National Sport Governing Bodies. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 11(2), 94-99.
- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N., & Davis, A. J. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8, 305-314.
- Geist, A. L., & Pastore, D. (2002). Leadership - NCAA Division II athletics directors. *Athletics Administration*, 1, 10-13.
- Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 85-104.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Harrison, J. K., & Hubbard, R. (1998). Antecedents to organizational commitment among Mexican employees of a U.S. firm in Mexico. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(5), 609-623.

- Hums, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1994). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: Development of an instrument. *Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 190-199.
- Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment: can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3), 307-333.
- Jamrog, J. J., & Overholt, M. H. (2004). Measuring HR and Organizational Effectiveness. *Employment Relations Today*, 31(2), 33-45.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2004). Measuring the strategic readiness of intangible assets. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(2), 52-63.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior : A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 135-159.
- Kent, A., & Turner, B. A. (2002). Increasing response rates among coaches: The role of prenotification methods. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 230-238.
- Khan, S. M., & Mishra, P. C. (2004). Search for predictors of multidimensional organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Research*, 4(2), 120-126.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Koski, P. (1995). Organizational Effectiveness of Finnish Sports Clubs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 85-95.
- Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 101-115.
- Lee, K. S., & Gao, T. (2005). Studying organizational commitment with the OCQ in the Korean retail context: Its dimensionality and relationships with satisfaction and work outcomes. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 15(4), 375-399.
- Loi, R., Hang-yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of a perceived role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 101-120.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70-80.
- MacLean, J. C., & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Dimensions of coaching performance: development of a scale. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 194-207.
- Mahony, D. F., & Pastore, D. (1998). Distributive justice: An examination of participation opportunities, revenues, and expenses at NCAA institutions - 1973-1993. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 22, 127-152.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.



- McCann, J. (2004). Organizational Effectiveness: Changing concepts for changing environments. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(1), 42-50.
- McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 72, 638-641.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: extensions and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 209-225.
- NACDA. (2007). *Sports Academy Director's Cup Report*. Retrieved January 2, 2008, from <http://nacda.cstv.com/directorscup/nacda-directorscup-current-scoring.html>
- NCAA. (2007). *NCAA Division I Federal Graduation Rate Data*. Retrieved March 1, 2008, from [http://www2.ncaa.org/portal/academics\\_and\\_athletes/education\\_and\\_research/academic\\_reform/grad\\_rate/2007/d1\\_school\\_grad\\_rate\\_data.html](http://www2.ncaa.org/portal/academics_and_athletes/education_and_research/academic_reform/grad_rate/2007/d1_school_grad_rate_data.html)
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Organ, D. W., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Fairness and organizational citizenship behavior: What are the connections? *Social Justice Research*, 6(1), 5-18.
- Pack, S. (2005). *Antecedents and consequences of perceived organizational support for NCAA athletic administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Papadimitriou, D., & Taylor, P. (2000). Organisational effectiveness of Hellenic national sports organisations. A multiple constituency approach. *Sport Management Review*, 3, 23 - 46.

- Perryer, C., & Jordan, C. (2005). The influence of leader behaviors on organizational commitment: A study in the Australian public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28, 379-396.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Porter, S. R., & Whitcomb, M. E. (2003). The impact of contact type on web survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67, 579-588.
- Putler, D. S., & Wolfe, R. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 301-325.
- Rayton, B. A. (2006). Examining the interconnection of job satisfaction and organizational commitment: an application of the bivariate probit model. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(1), 139-154.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, S., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
- Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 20, 127-156.
- Rifai, H. A. (2005). A test of the relationships among perceptions of justice, job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 7(2), 131-154.
- Schulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, D. K. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 298-316.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.
- Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, S. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 689-695.
- Shilbury, D., & Moore, K. A. (2006). A study of organizational effectiveness for National Olympic Sporting Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1), 5-38.
- Siegel, C. (2003). *Athletics and Education*. Chapter 5. Retrieved October 12, 2008, from [http://www.science.smith.edu/exer\\_sci/ESS200/Ed/Athletic.htm](http://www.science.smith.edu/exer_sci/ESS200/Ed/Athletic.htm)

- Sinclair, R. R., Tucker, J. S., Cullen, J. C., & Wright, C. (2005). Performance differences among four organizational commitment profiles. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1280-1287.
- Singer, E., Mathiowetz, N., & Couper, M. P. (1993). The impact of privacy and confidentiality concerns on survey participation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 465-482.
- Smart, D. L., & Wolfe, R. A. (2000). Examining sustainable competitive advantage in intercollegiate athletics: A resource-based view. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 133-153.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the Relationships Between Coworkers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Fellow Employees' Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 455-465.
- Todd, S. Y., & Kent, A. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of task characteristics on organizational citizenship behavior. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(2), 253-268.
- Turner, B. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2005). Organizational an occupational commitment, intention to leave, and perceived performance of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 193-211.
- USDE. (2007). *Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool Website*. Retrieved February, 18, 2008, from <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/main.asp>
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 439-459.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J. J. (2005). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and U.S. financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 235-253.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 24(3), 301-319.
- Whisenant, W. (2005). Organizational justice and commitment in interscholastic sports. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(3), 343-357.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behavior. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Wolfe, R., Hoerber, L., & Babiak, K. (2002). Perceptions of the effectiveness of sport organizations: The case of intercollegiate athletics. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2, 135-156.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Yearly Review of Management*, 15, 251-289.
- Zimbalist, A. S. (1999). *Unpaid professionals : commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.