

Organizational Justice as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction: An Examination of University Recreation Department Student Employees

Jeremy S. Jordan

Brian A. Turner

Rhonda R. DuBord

One goal of university recreation departments is the development and implementation of quality programs and services for different patron groups (Kearney & Tingle, 1998; Miller, 1993). Similar to other types of service organizations in the sport industry, the ability to provide quality services is dependent, in part, on the workforce employed by the organization. It is common for university recreation departments to employ a workforce comprised of full-time professional staff and part-time employees (Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2005; Keizer, 1997). One factor that makes these departments unique is that the part-time workforce consists largely of student workers who normally are only employed during their attendance at the institution (Turner, Jordan, & Dubord, 2005). While it is not uncommon for a sport organization to utilize part-time or seasonal workers, university recreation departments are unique in that they rely heavily on a student workforce in the daily operations of facilities and delivery of services. Fur-

thermore, student employees often occupy supervisory positions which require them to lead and direct their peers in the workplace.

A factor that can determine whether employees will be successful in the performance of job responsibilities is the attitudes they have about their work experience (Fisher, 2003; Saari & Judge, 2004; Wilson & Frimpong, 2004). The positive and negative feelings employees have about the work experience comprise their levels of job satisfaction. Addressing the importance of job satisfaction, Kearney and Tingle (1998) stated "Employee satisfaction is also essential to a recreation program. A happy employee is generally a good employee" (p. 45). One way to influence employee attitudes of job satisfaction is to develop an environment of fairness in the workplace (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Lambert, 2003). Organizational justice is the body of research which examines how employees develop perceptions of fairness regarding workplace issues and how these perceptions inter-

act with other attitudes and behaviors (Greenberg, 1990). A sport manager who has a greater understanding of employee attitudes about fairness, and what drives these attitudes, is more likely to create a positive work experience for employees.

Organizational Justice

Over the last 40 years the concept of workplace fairness has received considerable attention in the social sciences (Colquitt, 2001). This inquiry has centered on how employees develop judgments of fairness and the influence these determinations have on work-related attitudes and behaviors. Researchers in prior studies have found that relationships exist between employee attitudes of fairness and outcomes such as organizational commitment (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), turnover (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000), job performance (Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002), and satisfaction (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). An employee's consideration of fairness was initially thought to be influenced by one factor or dimension (Adams, 1965). However, over time other researchers have suggested that organizational justice is best understood by examining multiple dimensions which collectively and individually influence fairness perceptions. These dimensions have been identified as distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Ambrose, 2002; Greenberg, 1990).

Research involving organizational justice was first conducted by Adams

(1965), who focused on distributive justice - the fairness of outcomes received by an employee. Examples of outcomes made available to employees include items such as pay, promotions, bonuses, job assignments and other types of work related rewards. Adams found that an employee was more likely to judge outcomes fair when they matched the perceived effort or contribution put forth by the employee. Furthermore, Adam's work, labeled the theory of inequity, revealed that employees were more concerned with the relative fairness of an outcome rather than the absolute value of the reward. The process of allocating employee rewards based on individual effort or contribution was for a time, considered the equitable way to distribute outcomes to employees (Adams, 1965; Colquitt, 2001). However, researchers have since discovered that certain work situations required the organization to use a different allocation process. For example, Deutsch (1975) and Lerner (1975) suggested that for group work projects or situations where it was difficult to distinguish individual employee contributions, distributing outcomes equally to all employees was perceived as most fair. In addition to this allocation method, termed the equality principle, researchers also discovered that in certain cases it was important for an organization to allocate outcomes based on employee needs (Homans, 1982). For instance, employees who have not received an equal share in the past or demonstrate the greatest need for a particular outcome must at times be offered a larger share. In contrast to

the equity rule, the latter two allocation principles use criteria other than individual performance or contribution as the basis for determining how rewards are distributed. Regardless of the manner in which they are allocated, distributive justice is based on employee judgments of whether organizational rewards are fair or not.

As organizational justice research continued to evolve, it became evident that in addition to the actual rewards, the processes used when making allocation decisions were also significant in terms of employee judgments of fairness (Ambrose, 2002; Cropanzano & Schminke, 2001). This line of inquiry, termed procedural justice, was initiated by Thibaut and Walker (1975) who examined the importance of the amount of decision influence and control (termed "voice") experienced by individuals involved in litigation. These authors found that individuals were more likely to feel they had been treated fairly in the judicial process when they had been given the chance to voice their concerns and have a say in trial strategy. The work of Thibaut and Walker was later expanded and applied to a work setting by Leventhal (1980), who found other factors, in addition to decision and process control that influenced an employee's perception of procedural justice. Leventhal suggested that policies and procedures used to make allocation decisions were more likely to be considered fair when they were: a) based on accurate information; b) applied in a consistent manner; c) considerate of all affected by the decision; d) free from personal biases;

e) based on prevailing ethical standards; and f) safeguarded by a mechanism to remedy incorrect decisions. Application of these six rules, in addition to providing employees a "voice" (i.e., decision influence and/or control) in the decision-making process, increases the likelihood that they will have positive judgments of procedural justice.

In addition to the fairness of outcomes and the procedures used to determine those outcomes, the interactions an employee has with organizational representatives also contributes to overall determinations of fairness. This dimension of organizational justice, termed interactional justice, is based on the treatment received by the employee, as well as the quantity and quality of information provided regarding procedures used to determine the allocation of organizational rewards (Bies & Moag, 1986, Colquitt, 2001; Greenberg, 1990). The fairness of interpersonal contact between the employee and the organization is influenced by whether or not the individual is treated with respect, dignity, and in a polite manner by persons occupying supervisory roles. Interactional justice is also influenced by whether or not employees are provided with explanations regarding decisions made by the organization that have direct relevance to their work experience. Therefore, this dimension of justice is based on how an employee is treated by the organization and whether or not the persons occupying supervisory positions take the time to provide meaningful explanations about how and why a particular decision was made.

In order to fully comprehend the significance of fairness in the workplace, it is important to consider all three dimensions of organizational justice. This is especially the case as researchers have demonstrated that each dimension influences fairness judgments in a unique manner (Ambrose, 2002; Colquitt et al., 2002; Whisenant & Jordan, in press). It is also important to note that positive perceptions for one or more of the three dimensions has been shown to offset negative or lower perceptions in another dimension (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). For example, an employee who is not entirely satisfied with the level of pay received from an organization may still have an overall positive perception of fairness if the employee is treated with respect by supervisory personnel, provided with explanations regarding decisions that impact his/her work experience, and feels the policies used to make these decisions are being made in a fair and consistent manner (Blader & Tyler, 2003). To date there have been few studies in sport management that have measured employee perceptions of organizational justice and the effect these perceptions have on other work-related attitudes and behaviors (Whisenant & Smucker, 2006). There is a need to determine if findings from organizational justice research in other contexts would hold true when studying employees of sport organizations.

Employee Characteristics

Past research on organizational justice has attempted to determine if demographic characteristics such as sex, race, age, tenure of employment, or supervision have an influence on individual perceptions of one or more of the justice dimensions (Anderson & Shiner, 2003; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997; Whisenant & Smucker, 2006). One possible explanation of why these characteristics could affect justice perceptions is that different demographic groups may place more or less emphasis on the various dimensions of justice based on a desired result or outcome (Kulik, Lind, Ambrose, & MacCoun, 1996). For example, Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) found that men and women differed on the perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice. These authors discovered that women placed more emphasis on the policies and procedures (i.e., procedural justice) utilized by an organization when making worker related decisions. Conversely, men tended to focus on individual outcomes (i.e., distributive justice) when determining whether the organization had treated them in a fair manner. This finding was consistent with the work of Tata and Bowes-Sperry, (1996) who had found that men tended to emphasize distributive justice, more than women. However, these authors found no difference on considerations of procedural justice, but did indicate that women focused more on interactional justice when developing perceptions of fair-

ness. Finally, Anderson and Shinen (2003) questioned members of the American Parks and Recreation Society (APRS) on their perceptions of gender equity, within the context of organizational justice, in the recreation and leisure industry (i.e., organizations responsible for the delivery of park, recreation, and leisure services). These authors found that women were more dissatisfied than men on all three dimensions of organizational justice, suggesting a certain degree of perceived gender inequity within the profession. Based on prior research, we would expect the sex of the employee may influence perceptions of organizational justice.

Tenure of employment is another demographic characteristic that has been included in organizational justice research (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). The length of time an individual has been employed at an organization could influence perceptions of justice based on increased opportunities to gather information necessary when making fairness determination (Colquitt, 2001). Employees who have worked for an organization for an extended period of time often have increased opportunities to evaluate organizational rewards (i.e., distributive justice), policies (i.e., procedural justice), and the way the organization treats its workers (i.e., interactional justice). Further, evaluations of distributive and interactional justice tend to occur prior to judgments of procedural justice (Colquitt et al., 2001; Greenberg, 1990). For employees, individual outcomes such as pay or work-related

benefits, as well as initial interactions with supervisory personnel, often represent a first opportunity to make a fairness determination about an organization. Judgments of procedural justice normally occur over time as an employee gains understanding of organizational policies and their effect on the employee's work experience (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2002; Greenberg, 1990).

Supervision is an additional factor that could affect employee perceptions of organizational justice. Turner et al. (2005) found that the type of supervision a student-employee received influenced their attitudes of organizational commitment. These authors found that students supervised by their peers (i.e., student supervisors) demonstrated lower levels of commitment compared with students that had professional staff supervisors. Despite the fact that the influence of supervision has received limited attention in organizational justice research, there is a need to explore whether the findings of Turner et al. would also be present when measuring perceptions of other employee attitudes, including organizational justice.

Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

As stated previously, employee attitudes of organizational justice can influence various work related attitudes and behaviors. Job satisfaction, or the positive and/or negative feelings an individual has about a job, is one attitude that can be influenced by an employee's

judgment of fairness (Greenberg, 1990; Masterson et al., 2000; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993). The relationship between organizational justice and employee job satisfaction has been the focus of a number of studies; however, results of these studies have not always been consistent (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001).

Researchers have demonstrated that one or more of the three dimensions of organizational justice can explain a portion of the variance associated with job satisfaction. For example, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) and Schappe (1998) found that distributive justice was a more powerful predictor of employee satisfaction than procedural justice. In contrast, an earlier study by Moorman (1991) revealed that all three dimensions of organizational justice were independently related to job satisfaction; however, interactional justice was shown to be the strongest predictor. A third explanation, based on findings from past research, identified procedural justice as the strongest predictor of employee job satisfaction (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Colquitt et al., 2001; Harvey & Haines, 2005; Lambert, 2003; Tremblay, Sire, & Balkin, 2000). So while it is evident that a relationship exists between organizational justice and job satisfaction, there is a lack of clarity on the role that each dimension (i.e., distributive, procedural and interactional justice) has in predicting employee job satisfaction. To date, the most comprehensive examination of the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction can be attributed to two

meta-analyses conducted by Colquitt et al. (2001) and Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001). Both studies found that all justice types were significantly related to employee job satisfaction, however Colquitt et al. identified procedural justice as the strongest predictor while Cohen-Charash and Spector suggested that job satisfaction was "similarly and relatively highly related to all justice types" (p. 305). This general lack of clarity on the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction identifies the need for additional research which further explores the connection.

While organizational justice and job satisfaction research has been conducted in a variety of work settings, often utilizing full-time professional employees as participants (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002), there is a limited amount of research on the work-related attitudes of part-time workers in recreational sports (Turner et al., 2005). Specifically, there have been no studies to date which have measured perceptions of organizational justice and the influence these attitudes have on job satisfaction for student employees. It would seem prudent to investigate this relationship due to the high number of students employed by recreation departments and the importance of this group in delivering quality programs, services, and customer relations. Furthermore, increased understanding of how organizational justice interacts with job satisfaction could aid sport managers attempting to create a positive work

environment for student employees. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to measure student employee attitudes of organizational justice and how these attitudes related to overall job satisfaction. The following research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What were student employee attitudes regarding distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and did these attitudes differ based on (a) sex of the employee; (b) tenure of employment; and/or (c) type of supervision?
2. What was the relationship between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and overall job satisfaction?

Method

Participants

Students employed at the recreation department of a mid-sized American university in the southeast served as participants for this study. Student workers representing all aspects of the recreation department (i.e., aquatics, intramurals, fitness, facilities, etc.) were included in the study. However, only students who had received a paycheck (i.e., currently employed) during the semester data was collected were eligible for participation. One week prior to data collection a pre-notification announcement was included in an employee newsletter informing students about the study and how they could obtain and return the survey packet. The questionnaire was made available to student

employees on-site at the recreation department over a three-day period. Student employees were asked to obtain a survey packet from the administrative offices and complete the questionnaire prior, during, or following an assigned work shift. Upon completing the questionnaire students returned the survey packet by depositing it in a collection receptacle located in the administrative office. Of the 250 student workers who were eligible to participate in the study, 203 completed and returned the questionnaire, for a response rate of 81.2%.

Measures

The Organizational Justice Index (OJI) was used to measure the three dimensions of organizational justice. The OJI, developed by Rahim, Magner, and Shapiro (2000), is a self-report questionnaire designed to measure participant attitudes of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice experienced in the work environment. Each item of the OJI is scored on a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree) with items for each dimension summed in order to create a mean score for that particular dimension of organizational justice. The reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha) for the OJI were .83 for procedural, .90 for interactional, and .91 for distributive justice, all above the minimum suggested as acceptable by Nunnally (1978).

Overall job satisfaction was determined for each participant with a single-item measure adapted from previous research projects (Loo, 2001; Wanous &

Hudy, 2001; Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997) that examined attitudes of job satisfaction in a variety of settings. While the debate on the merits of single-item measures continues (Kwon & Ko, 2006; Kwon & Trail, 2005; Nagy, 2002) there is a strong body of work which suggests single-item measures of overall job satisfaction are valid and reliable (Oshagbemi, 1999; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Wanous & Hudy, 2001; Wanous et al., 1997). Furthermore, the benefit of using an overall measure of job satisfaction is that it allows participants to select their own criteria for evaluation, rather than forcing them to consider specific facets (Wanous & Hudy, 2001; Wanous et al., 1997). Finally, single-item measures of overall job satisfaction have been deemed reliable measures of the construct based on reliability estimates determined by using the well-known formula correction for attenuation (see Wanous et al., 1997, for a discussion on single-item reliability). The single-item "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job at the recreation department", was scored on a seven-point Likert scale (1=very dissatisfied to 7=very satisfied).

Results

Demographics

Of the 203 respondents, 96 were male (47.3%) and 107 were female (52.7%) with ages ranging from 17 to 29 years ($M = 19.85$, $SD = 1.72$). In terms of supervision, of those who reported their type of supervision, 97 participants were supervised by a student staff member

(49%), and 101 were directed by a professional staff member (51%). With regard to tenure, just over one-half of the respondents ($n = 102$; 50.5%) were in their first year of employment with the recreational sports department.

Comparisons of Organizational Justice Dimensions

Paired-sample *t*-tests were conducted to determine differences among the three organizational justice variables. On the seven-point Likert scale used, the mean score for interactional justice ($M = 5.90$; $SD = 1.09$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for both distributive justice ($M = 4.61$; $SD = 1.43$), $t(202) = 14.132$, $p < .001$, and procedural justice ($M = 4.73$; $SD = 1.21$), $t(202) = 15.463$, $p < .001$. There was no statistical difference between the mean scores of distributive and procedural justice, $t(202) = 1.378$, $p = .170$.

Group Differences

A MANOVA was used to determine whether there were differences for the three dimensions of organizational justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional) based on sex, tenure, and type of supervision (i.e., peer or professional supervision). While sex did not have a significant main effect on the organizational justice variables, Wilks' Lambda = .961, $F(3, 185) = 2.496$, $p = .061$, both tenure, Wilks' Lambda = .911, $F(3, 185) = 6.013$, $p = .001$, and type of supervision, Wilks' Lambda = .956, $F(3, 185) = 2.827$, $p = .040$, did have significant main effects. For tenure, a follow-up ANOVA showed student employees

Table 1
Mean (and Standard Deviation) Organizational Justice Scores Based on Sex,
Tenure and Type of Supervision

	Distributive Justice	Interactional Justice	Procedural Justice
SEX			
Female (<i>n</i> = 107)	4.71 (1.41)	6.10 (.99)	4.90 (1.21)
Male (<i>n</i> = 96)	4.51 (1.45)	5.71 (1.10)	4.58 (1.13)
TENURE			
1 year or less (<i>n</i> = 102)	4.68 (1.38)	5.87 (.99)	5.01 ^a (.96)
More than 1 year (<i>n</i> = 100)	4.55 (1.47)	5.95 (1.13)	4.47 (1.31)
SUPERVISION			
Peer (Student) (<i>n</i> = 97)	4.38 (1.47)	5.73 (1.11)	4.65 (1.17)
Professional (<i>n</i> = 101)	4.86 ^b (1.32)	6.06 ^b (1.06)	4.82 ^b (1.23)
TOTAL (<i>n</i> =203)	4.61 (1.43)	5.90 ^c (1.09)	4.73 (1.21)

Note. All means are on a 7-point Likert scale.

^aStudents in their 1st year were significantly higher in procedural justice than those who had worked one year or more ($p < .001$). ^bStudents supervised by professional staff were significantly higher in distributive justice ($p = .009$), interactional justice ($p = .018$), and procedural justice ($p = .035$). ^cMean score for interactional justice was significantly higher than distributive justice ($p < .001$) and procedural justice ($p < .001$).

who were in their first year of employment scored significantly higher in procedural justice than those who had been employed over a year at the recreational sports department, $F(1, 187) = 12.948$, $p < .001$. With regards to type of supervision, student employees who were supervised by professional staff members reported significantly higher levels than those supervised by peers on distributive justice, $F(1, 187) = 6.949$, $p = .009$, interactional justice, $F(1, 187) = 5.659$, p

$= .018$, and procedural justice, $F(1, 187) = 4.506$, $p = .035$ (see Table 1 for group mean differences). None of the three two-way interactions had a significant main effect on the organizational justice variables. It is important to note that all group and overall means were above the mid-point on the 7-point Likert scale.

Organizational Justice and Satisfaction

Correlations among the three justice variables and overall job satisfaction are

Table 2
Correlations among Participants' Overall Job Satisfaction and Justice Variables

	Distributive Justice	Interactional Justice	Procedural Justice	Overall Job Satisfaction
Distributive Justice	1.000	.488***	.552***	.532***
Interactional Justice		1.000	.563***	.470***
Procedural Justice			1.000	.369***
Overall Job Satisfaction				1.000

*** $p < .001$.

Table 3
Regression of Participants' Overall Job Satisfaction on Justice Variables

Variables Entered	R^2	ADJ R^2	F	β BETA	t
Distributive Justice				.335	5.645***
Interactional Justice	.341	.331	34.691***	.304	3.898***
Procedural Justice				-.010	-.132

*** $p < .001$.

presented in Table 2. The regression equation with all three organizational justice variables was significant, $F(3, 205) = 34.691$, $p < .001$, explaining 33.1% of the variance in overall job satisfaction (see Table Table 3). Follow-up analyses showed that distributive justice, $t(205) = 5.645$, $p < .001$, and interactional justice, $t(205) = 3.898$, $p < .001$, contributed uniquely to the explained variance in satisfaction; procedural justice did not, $t(205) = -0.132$, $p = .895$.

To determine if there were differential effects of organizational justice on overall job satisfaction based on any of the three dichotomous grouping variables in this study (sex [male/female], type of

supervision [student staff member/professional staff member], tenure [employed one year or less/employed more than one year]), six additional regression analyses were run. First, for sex (controlling for type of supervision and tenure), the regression equation with all three organizational justice variables was significant for both male employees, $F(3, 86) = 27.971$, $p < .001$, and female employees, $F(3, 97) = 12.967$, $p < .001$, with overall job satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 4). For both males, $t(86) = 4.501$, $p < .001$, and females, $t(97) = 3.815$, $p < .001$, distributive justice contributed uniquely to the variance in job satisfac-

Table 4
Regression of Participants' Overall Job Satisfaction
on Justice Variables Based on Sex

Variables Entered	R^2	ADJ R^2	F	β	t
<i>MALES</i>					
Distributive Justice				.447	4.501***
Interactional Justice	.467	.461	27.971***	.332	3.342**
Procedural Justice				.042	.385
<i>FEMALES</i>					
Distributive Justice				.414	3.815***
Interactional Justice	.285	.269	12.967***	.153	1.442
Procedural Justice				.051	.471

Note. The regression equation controlled for type of supervision and tenure.
*** $p < .001$.

Table 5
Regression of Participants' Overall Job Satisfaction on Justice Variables
Based on Type of Supervision

Variables Entered	R^2	ADJ R^2	F	β	t
<i>STUDENT STAFF SUPERVISOR</i>					
Distributive Justice				.399	3.722***
Interactional Justice	.348	.334	16.846***	.267	2.390*
Procedural Justice				.028	.226
<i>PROFESSIONAL STAFF SUPERVISOR</i>					
Distributive Justice				.413	4.327***
Interactional Justice	.389	.378	22.094***	.229	2.481*
Procedural Justice				.102	1.056

Note. The regression equation controlled for sex and tenure.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

tion. However, the amount of variance explained was higher for males (46.1% vs. 26.9%). Furthermore, interactional justice contributed uniquely to the ex-

plained variance in satisfaction for males, $t(86) = 3.342$, $p = .001$, while it did not for females, $t(97) = 1.142$, $p = .153$.

For type of supervision (controlling for sex and tenure), the regression equation with all three organizational justice variables was significantly related to overall job satisfaction for students supervised by another student, $F(3, 90) = 16.846$, $p < .001$, and for those supervised by a professional staff member, $F(3, 93) = 22.094$, $p < .001$ (see Table 5). The amount of variance explained was similar for both groups, with the justice variables explaining 33.4% of the variance for those supervised by a student staff member and 37.8% for those supervised by a professional staff member. Similar to the findings with sex, distributive justice contributed uniquely to the variance in job satisfaction for those supervised by a student staff member, $t(90) = 3.722$, $p < .001$, and for those supervised by professional staff, $t(93) = 4.327$, $p < .001$. Interactional justice also

contributed uniquely for both groups ($t(90) = 2.390$, $p = .019$ for those supervised by a student staff member; $t(93) = 2.481$, $p = .015$ for those supervised by a professional staff member).

Comparable to type of supervision (controlling for sex and type of supervision), the linear combination of organizational justice variables was significantly related to overall job satisfaction for those employed one year or less, $F(3, 96) = 17.888$, $p < .001$, and for those employed more than one year, $F(3, 87) = 30.094$, $p < .001$ (see Table 6). Both distributive and interactional justice contributed uniquely to the variance in job satisfaction for those with one year or less experience with the department ($t(96) = 4.588$, $p < .001$, for distributive justice; $t(96) = 3.559$, $p = .001$, for interactional justice), and those who had worked more than a year ($t(87)$

Table 6
Regression of Participants' Overall Job Satisfaction
on Justice Variables Based on Tenure

Variables Entered	R^2	ADJ R^2	F	β	t
<i>EMPLOYED 1 YEAR OR LESS</i>					
Distributive Justice				.429	4.588***
Interactional Justice	.340	.327	17.888***	.388	3.559**
Procedural Justice				-.183	-1.654
<i>EMPLOYED MORE THAN 1 YEAR</i>					
Distributive Justice				.349	3.304**
Interactional Justice	.487	.481	30.094***	.196	2.101*
Procedural Justice				.295	2.993**

Note. The regression equation controlled for sex and type of supervision.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

= 3.304, $p = .001$, for distributive justice; $t(87) = 2.101$, $p = .039$, for interactional justice). However, the amount of variance explained was higher for students who had worked more than one year (48.1% vs. 32.7%). Furthermore, procedural justice contributed uniquely to the explained variance in satisfaction for those who had been employed more than one year, $t(87) = 2.993$, $p = .004$, while it did not for those employed one year or less, $t(96) = -1.654$, $p = .101$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to measure student employee attitudes of organizational justice and to determine if these attitudes differed based on the (a) sex of the employee; (b) tenure of employment; and/or (c) type of supervision. Additionally, this study examined the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. Following is a discussion of the results and the implications they present for sport managers.

Organizational Justice

Student employees in the present study scored above the mid-point (3.5) on measures for all three dimensions of organizational justice, indicating positive attitudes of fairness. Scores for interactional justice were significantly higher than those for distributive and procedural justice. This result suggests that student workers felt the interactions they had with supervisory personnel, as well as the quality of information they received, was fair. Furthermore, this finding is important for the organization

considering the critical role that supervisors occupy in the work life of their subordinates. The interpersonal treatment that employees receive from supervisors often serves as an indicator of acceptance by their superior (Tyler & Lind, 1992), which can affirm employee status and enhance self-esteem (Tyler & Blader, 2000). Additionally, judgments of interactional justice often occur immediately for an employee and thus serve as the initial gauge of the relative fairness of the workplace (Greenberg, 1990; 2001). These first impressions of fairness, based on interactional justice, could help establish a positive work experience for students who are beginning their employment at a recreation department.

Differences in attitudes of organizational justice based on sex, tenure of employment and type of supervision were examined in this study. While no significant variation was found based on the sex of the student, significant differences were discovered based on length of employment (tenure) and type of supervision. Student employees who had worked at the recreation department for less than one year scored higher on measures of procedural justice than those who had been employed at the department for more than a year. This finding was consistent with the work of Ambrose and Cropanzano (2003) who found that employee attitudes of procedural justice change over time. Procedural justice involves "global" or organization wide evaluations by employees when determining if work policies are fair (Ambrose, 2002; Viswesvaran &

Ones, 2002). Comprehension of organizational policies is something that develops over time, thus, the longer an employee has been with an organization the more likely he/she understands its policies (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003). Therefore, as the duration of employment increases, employees obtain more information on which to base procedural justice judgments. Whether or not this increased understanding results in less positive attitudes of procedural justice depends on the experience of the employee (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003). Differences in attitudes of procedural justice in the present study could be the result of employees having greater comprehension not only of organizational policies, but also the effect these policies have on their work experience. The inverse relationship between tenure of employment and procedural justice in this study suggests that organizational policies utilized at the recreation department, overtime, erodes student attitudes of procedural justice. Even so, mean scores for all respondents indicated that all recreation employees remained more positive than negative as all group means were above the mid-point of the seven-point scale.

A difference in attitudes of organizational justice was also found based on the type of supervision the student worker received. As mentioned previously, university recreation departments employ a large number of students with some assuming supervisory responsibilities within the department (DiMonda & Smith, 1994; Turner et al., 2005). While few studies have examined the

influence of supervisor types in university recreation departments, Turner et al. (2005) did discover that commitment levels of student employees differed based on whether the employee had a professional staff or student supervisor. These authors found that students supervised by professional staff demonstrated a stronger commitment to the department than those who had a peer supervisor. A similar result was evident in this study as students who had professional staff supervisors scored higher on all three dimensions of organizational justice compared with students working under peer supervision. This finding is likely attributed to the difference in training, experience and education between professional staff and student supervisors employed at the recreation department. The organization in this study required that professional staff members have, at a minimum, a college degree, and during their employment must go through several training sessions intended to assist them with managing subordinates and handling job responsibilities. Furthermore, professional staff supervisors normally have more recreation work experience, allowing them to be better prepared to handle the different aspects of the job.

An additional explanation for the difference could be the challenges associated with having students fulfill supervisory positions. Often, student employees have limited work experience in which they fulfilled a managerial role (Turner et al., 2005). Lack of managerial training and experience has been identified as one reason managers (i.e., su-

pervisors) are not successful in accomplishing the responsibilities of their job (Katz, 1974; Mintzberg, 1975; Vroom, 2003). Further research is needed to more fully understand the influence supervisor inexperience can have on subordinate attitudes of organizational justice. However, results of the present study suggest that the manner in which professional staff allocate organizational rewards, apply and explain work policies, and interact with workers, could improve student employee attitudes of fairness.

Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Consistent with previous research (Colquitt et al., 2001; Harvey & Haines, 2005; Lambert, 2003; Tremblay et al., 2000), results of the present study indicated that organizational justice explained a significant portion of the variance in overall job satisfaction. Collectively, the regression equation for the three dimensions explained 33.1% of the variance, which is noteworthy considering that overall job satisfaction is a large construct (Colquitt et al., 2001). Results of this study suggest that sport managers should consider all three dimensions of organizational justice simultaneously when addressing employee job satisfaction rather than focusing on each dimension separately. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) identified the importance of considering all three dimensions, stating "to maintain employees' satisfaction, managers should take care that distributions, pro-

cedures, and interactions will all be fair" (p. 306). While it is important to understand the collective influence of organizational justice, it is also of interest to determine which dimensions explain the most variance associated with job satisfaction. In the present study, follow-up analyses revealed that distributive and interactional justice contributed uniquely to the explained variance in job satisfaction.

The finding that individual justice dimensions uniquely explained portions of the variance associated with job satisfaction is consistent with previous research (Colquitt et al., 2001; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Masterson et al., 2000). In the present study distributive (13.7%) and interactional justice (7.0%) each made unique contributions to job satisfaction. These results are consistent with the work of McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) and Schappe (1998) who found that distributive justice was the strongest predictor of employee job satisfaction. The finding that interactional justice also explained a portion of the variance in job satisfaction is similar to the results of Moorman (1991) and Masterson et al. (2000). However, as previously mentioned, procedural justice has been identified as the best predictor of job satisfaction based on results of past studies (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Colquitt et al., 2001; Harvey & Haines, 2005; Lambert, 2003; Tremblay et al., 2000). For example, a meta-analysis conducted by Colquitt et al. (2001) examined 183 studies that looked at the relationship between organizational justice and a number of employee attitudes

and behaviors, including job satisfaction. Similar to the results of this study, Colquitt et al. found that the multiple dimensions of organizational justice explained a portion of the variance in job satisfaction. However, the finding in this study that procedural justice did not make a unique contribution to the explained variance associated with job satisfaction is inconsistent with the results of the meta-analysis. One explanation for the difference in results between this study and previous work could be due to the type of employees studied.

Previous work on organizational justice and employee job satisfaction has for the most part, been conducted in professional work settings utilizing full-time employees (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002). The population used for this research project was student employees working part-time in a college recreation department. This population may differ from those used in previous research in that one of the primary reasons for working is compensation, rather than career advancement (Ellingson, 1987). In their discussion of part-time seasonal recreation employees, Hoff, Ellis, and Crossley (1988) stated:

A considerable difference, however, may exist between the motive structures of full-time, professional personnel and their seasonal counterparts. Specifically, motivational factors may be present only for professionals who may seek advancement, status, and upward mobility. Expectations for such advancement within an agency could be absent from seasonal workers. (p. 68)

This difference in motives may also be evident in the present study, as many of the students working in college recreation departments seek employment in order to earn money to offset expenses incurred while in school. Additionally, it is likely that a majority of the students working in college recreation departments are pursuing academic degrees in disciplines other than recreational sport and are less concerned with career placement/advancement in the field. For example, at the recreation department in this study, less than 20% of the student workers were majoring in recreation/sport management (anonymous recreational sports director, personal communication, February 16, 2006). Therefore, financial rewards received from working tend to be the primary motivation and thus a main determinant of job satisfaction. This would explain why distributive justice had the lowest mean score ($M = 4.63$; $SD = 1.41$) yet explained the largest portion of variance (13.7%) with job satisfaction among the three dimensions. According to DiMonda and Smith (1994), salary was the second most important determinant of morale (behind only interaction with employer) for student workers. This finding is consistent with the present study in that distributive and interactional justice were the only dimensions of organizational justice that uniquely explained a portion of the variance in job satisfaction. It would appear that when student employees who were part of this study made determinations of job satisfaction, the evaluation pro-

ess was centered on distributive and interactional justice.

While there were no differences in levels of organizational justice based on sex, findings from this study showed there were differential effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction for men and women. Specifically, the organizational justice variables explained almost twice the amount of variance in job satisfaction for male employees as it did for females (46.1% vs. 26.9%). In the present study, organizational fairness played an important role when male employees made a determination of job satisfaction. Past researchers (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997; Tata & Bowes-Sperry, 1996) have identified the relationship between fairness, however the difference in variance explained between males and females in the present study is somewhat unique. Additional research is needed to determine what aspect of the employment experience is contributing to this difference.

Differential effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction were also found for tenure; the amount of variance explained in satisfaction was higher for those who had been employed more than one year (as opposed to those who had worked one year or less). In addition, procedural justice contributed uniquely to this variance for those who were employed more than one year, while it did not for those who had been employed one year or less. This finding is consistent with results from Ambrose and Cropanzano (2003) who found that judgments of procedural justice tend to change as length of tenure increases.

Also, the finding of the present study supports those of Colquitt (2001) and Colquitt et al. (2002) who determined that procedural justice in normally based on a global evaluation of an organization and its application of policies. The relative fairness of organizational policies normally is best understood over time and often contributes to an employee's level of trust in an organization.

With regards to supervision, the effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction were similar whether the student was supervised by a peer or a professional staff member. For both groups, distributive and interactional justice contributed uniquely to the variance in satisfaction, and the amount of variance explained by all three justice variables were similar (33.4% for those supervised by a student, 37.8% by a professional staff member). Therefore, while type of supervision did result in varying perceptions of organizational justice, this difference did not translate into variation in attitudes of job satisfaction. This finding is likely attributed to the fact that regardless of type of supervision, all employees scored above the mid-point on all three measures of organizational justice, indicating relatively positive perceptions of fairness.

Implications

Addressing employee attitudes of organizational justice can have many benefits for a university recreation department. Positive attitudes of organizational justice are likely to lead to increased levels of job satisfaction. When

employees have positive feelings about their work experience, organizations are more likely to experience improved work performance and less employee attrition. The finding that students working for professional staff measured higher on all three dimensions of organizational justice suggests that recreation departments would benefit from increased interaction between students employees and professional staff. This is especially true when organizations are attempting to improve attitudes of job satisfaction. While distributive justice explained the largest portion of variance in job satisfaction, interactional justice also made a unique contribution and presents the most immediate and direct way to influence employee attitudes. Many recreation departments are limited in their ability to modify employee rewards or organizational policies; however, they do have the ability to change the quality of interaction between subordinates and their supervisors. Encouraging supervisors to provide meaningful information to employees, especially explanations regarding perceived injustice, and serving as a source of emotional support in the workplace can improve employee attitudes of fairness, resulting in a more satisfied worker.

Limitations and Future Research

The present study includes limitations which require the reader to interpret the results with caution. First, anytime predictor and criterion variables are measured at the same time there is the possibility for common method bias (Pod-

sakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). To minimize the potential effects of common method bias, the researchers used several procedural remedies recommended by Podsakoff et al., including: a) protecting the anonymity of respondents; b) counterbalancing question order (i.e., separating items related to organizational justice and those related to job satisfaction; c) using established scales (to reduce item ambiguity); and d) using different scale endpoints for the organizational justice and job satisfaction items.

In addition, the generalizability of the results may be limited due to the fact that information was collected at only one university recreation department. While there is no reason to think this recreation department was unique, additional data from other institutions is required in order to confirm the results of this study. Second, the sample chosen for this study represents a possible limitation. Data on the variables of interest was collected from college students working part-time at the recreation department. Therefore, results of this study should not be inferred to part-time employees working at other sport organizations. The use of part-time or seasonal employees is not unique to recreation departments; however, additional research using employees from a variety of sport organizations is needed to determine the reliability of results from this study. Lastly, data collected for this study was self-reported information collected at one point during the year. Reliability and validity of self-reported information is dependent upon whether the

participants understand the questions and their willingness to provide truthful responses (Thomas, Nelson, & Silverman, 2005). Additionally, because participants were questioned at one time it is possible their responses were influenced by recent work experiences (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Future research should examine the affects of organizational justice on job satisfaction, as well as other employee attitudes and behaviors, over a period time to more completely understand the contextual nature of the construct.

References

- Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural justice and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 117-198.
- Ambrose, M.L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 803-812.
- Ambrose, M.L., & Cropanzano, R. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of organizational fairness: An examination of reactions to tenure and promotion decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 266-275.
- Anderson, D.M., & Shinew, K.J. (2003). Gender equity in the context of organizational justice: A closer look at a reoccurring issue in the field. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35(2), 228-247.
- Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Blader, S.L., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 107-126.
- Bower, G.G., Hums, M.A., & Keedy, J.L. (2005). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor students within campus recreation. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 29(1), 59-77.
- Bridges, F.J., & Roquemoire, L.L. (2004). *Management for athletic/sport administration: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Decatur, GA: Educational Services for Management.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of

- organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Colquitt, J.A., Noe, R.A., & Jackson, C.L. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 83-109.
- Cropazano, R. & Schminke, M. (2001). Using social justice to build effective work groups. In M. Turner (Ed.) *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 143-171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- DeConinck, J.B., & Stilwell, C.D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 225-231.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-150.
- DiMonda, S., & Smith, J.L. (1994). Student-employee morale. *NIRSA Journal: Journal of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association*, 19(3), 8-11.
- Ellingson, L.A. (1987). Creating commitment in student employees. *NIRSA Journal*, 11, 20-23.
- Fisher, C.A. (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(6), 753-777.
- Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (1996). *How to design and evaluation research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (2001). Setting the justice agenda: Seven unanswered questions about "What, Why, and How". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 210-219.
- Harvey, S. & Haines III, V. Y (2005). Employer treatment of employees during a community crisis: The role of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 20(1), 53.
- Hoff, A., Ellis, G., & Crossley, J. (1988). Employment motive of summer job seekers in recreation settings: A test of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 6(1), 66-77.
- Homans, G. (1982). Foreward. In J. Greenberg and R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Katz, R.L. (1974). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 52, 90-102.
- Keamey, J.S., & Tingle, J.K. (1998). Evaluation of student employees: Why, who, when, what, and where. *NIRSA Journal*, 22(3), 45-48.

- Keizer, S. (1997). Student employees: Focusing on the internal customer. *NIRSA Journal*, 21(2), 46-49.
- Kulik, C.T., Lind, A.E., Ambrose, M.L., & MacCoun, R.J. (1996). Understanding gender differences in distributive and procedural justice. *Social Justice Research*, 9, 351-369.
- Kwon, H., & Ko, Y. (2006). Validation of Single Item Measure of Scale of Service Quality for Recreational Sport (SSQRS). *International Journal of Sport Management*, 7(1), 110-120.
- Kwon, H., & Trail, G.T. (2005). Feasibility of single-item measures in sport loyalty research. *Sport Management Review*, 8, 69-88.
- Lambert, E. (2003). The impact of organizational justice on correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 155-168.
- Lerner, M. (1975). The justice motive in social behavior: Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 1-19.
- Leventhal, G. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum.
- Loo, R. (2001). A caveat on using single-item versus multiple-item scales. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17, 68-75.
- Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M., & Taylor, S.M. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- McFarlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637.
- Miller, J.T. (1993). Job enrichment and its motivational effect on student employees in a college recreational services setting. *NIRSA Journal: Journal of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association*, 17(2), 20-25.
- Mintzberg, H. (1975). The manager's job: Folklore and fact. *Harvard Business Review*, 53, 49-61.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Nagy, M.S. (2002). Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 77-85.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14, 388-403.

- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method bias in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-903.
- Rahim, M., Magner, N., & Shapiro, D. (2000). Do justice perceptions influence styles of handling conflict with supervisors: What perceptions precisely? *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 11*, 9-31.
- Saari, L.M., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 395-407.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology, 36*, 577-600.
- Schappe, S.P. (1998). Understanding employee job satisfaction: The importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 12*(4), 493-503.
- Sweeney, P.D., & McFarlin, D.B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55*, 23-40.
- Sweeney, P.D., & McFarlin, D.B. (1997). Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*, 83-98.
- Tata, J., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (1996). Emphasis on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice: Differential perceptions of men and women. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 1327-1330.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thomas, J.R., Nelson, J.K., & Silverman, S. J. (2005). *Research methods in physical activity* (5th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Tremblay, M., Sire, B., & Balkin, D.B. (2000). The role of organizational justice in pay and employee benefit satisfaction, and its effects on work attitudes. *Group and Organization Management, 25*(3), 269-290.
- Turner, B.A., Jordan, J.S., & DuBord R.R. (2005). Retaining student workers: The importance of organizational commitment. *Recreational Sports Journal, 29*(2), 117-126.
- Tyler, T.R., & Blader, S.L. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T.R., & Lind, E.A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp.115-191) San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D.S. (2002). Examining the construct of organizational justice: A meta-analytic evaluation of relations with work

- attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38(3), 193-203.
- Vroom, V.H. (2003). Educating managers for decision making and leadership. *Management Decision*, 41 (10), 968-978.
- Wanous, J.P., & Hudy, M.J. (2001). Single-item reliability: A replication and extension. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(4), 361-375.
- Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E., & Hudy, M. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 247-252.
- Wilson, A. & Frimpong, J. (2004). A re-conceptualisation of the satisfaction-service performance thesis. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(6), 471-481.
- Whisenant, W., & Jordan, J.S. (in press). Organizational justice and team performance in interscholastic athletics. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics*.
- Whisenant W., & Smucker, M. (2006). Perceptions of organizational justice among high school coaches of girl's teams. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 7, 206-216.

Dr. Jeremy Jordan teaches at the University of Miami; Dr. Rhonda DeBord is associate director of the department of Wellness and Recreation at the University of Miami while Dr. Brian Turner is on the faculty at The Ohio State University.