INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA 800-521-0600





NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMľ



The Influence of Perceived Procedural Justice on
Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Persons Employed
in the Parks, Recreation or Leisure Services Profession

Beverly M. Evans

A dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Arts degree in Physical Education in the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Safety.

December 2001

UMI Number: 3030572

IMI°

UMI Microform 3030572

Copyright 2002 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company 300 North Zeeb Road P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 The Influence of Perceived Procedural Justice on
Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Persons Employed
in the Parks, Recreation or Leisure Services Profession

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Dr. Peter Cunningham,

Major Professor

Dr. Eric Frauman,

Committee Member

Dr. Jane Williams,

Committee Member

Martha H. Whaley

Dr. Martha Whaley,

Chair, Department of Health, Physical Education,

Recreation, and Safety

Donald Curry,

Dean of the Graduate Egglege

ABSTRACT

The Influence of Perceived Procedural Justice on
Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Persons Employed
in the Parks, Recreation or Leisure Services Profession

The purpose of this study was to first determine levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, specifically loyal boosterism, and perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession based on the demographic and occupational variables of tenure, highest education level attained, degree status, and gender. Second was to determine whether levels of perceived procedural justice influence organizational citizenship behaviors, specifically loyal boosterism, among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

Three hundred eighty three surveys were mailed to systematically selected members belonging to the American Parks and Recreation Society and the National Society for Park Resources branches of the National Recreation and Parks Association residing in the southeast United States. Two hundred fifty six surveys were returned. Participants were asked to respond anonymously to a survey instrument containing modified procedural justice items from Howard

(2001) and loyal boosterism items modified from Moorman, Blakely and Niehoff, (1998).

High levels of loyal boosterism were found for all respondents. After Analysis of Variance there were no significant differences (p>.05) based on demographic or occupational variables for loval boosterism. Significant differences (p<.05) were found for some items based on demographic variables, most notably gender for perceived procedural justice. Pearson r correlation was employed to determine relationships between the three dimensions of procedural justice (policy fairness [r=.303], interpersonal fairness [r=.316], and decision fairness [r=.358]) and loyal boosterism. Significant (p<.01) relationships were found. Through hierarchal regression it was determined that perceived procedural justice did influence the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism of persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank Dr. Peter Cunningham who has guided and encouraged me. It is through his positive approach, patience and understanding that this dissertation has been completed. I would also like to thank Dr. Eric Frauman for his hard work and expertise in statistics, which has truly helped me understand more than the basics. To Dr. Williams whose very presence had a calming effect. I would like to thank Dr. Howard for sharing his procedural justice scale and his expertise in the area of organizational justice.

I would also like to thank HLG who understood and SJH who picked up the slack.

It is also important for me to acknowledge my Mom and Grandmother who I know were watching over my shoulder.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
List	of Tables	vi
List	of Appendices	viii
I.	Introduction	1
	Significance of Study	6
	Research Questions	7
	Delimitations	8
II.	Review of Literature	11
	Organizational Justice	12
	Relative Deprivation	12
	Equity Theory	12
	Distributive Justice	14
	Procedural Justice	16
	Theories of Procedural Fairness	19
	Instrumental Model	19
	Social Exchange Model	20
	Group Value Model	21
	Justice Judgment Theory	21
	Fairness Heuristic Theory	22
	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	23
	Dimensions of Citizenship Behavior	25
	Antecedents to Citizenship Behavior	29
	Employee Characteristics	29
	Role Perceptions	30
	Demographic Variables	31
	Task Characteristics	31
	Organizational Characteristics	32
	Leadership Behaviors	32
	Organizational Success	33
	Justice as a Predictor	35
	Personality and Citizenship Behaviors	38
III.	.Methods	40
	Sample and Data Collection	40
	Measures	41
	Analysis	42
	Subjects	44

III	. Methods	40
	Sample and Data Collection	40
	Measures	41
	Analysis	42
	Subjects	44
IV.	Results	43
	Subjects	44
	Loyal Boosterism	50
	Perceived Procedural Justice	59
	Correlations	75
	Regression Analyses	76
	Results Summary	81
ν.	Discussion	83
Ref	erences	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Number of Respondents According to Gender	Page 45
2. Aff	Number of Respondents Based on NRPA Branch	45
3. Le	Number of Years in the Parks, Recreation or isure Services Profession	46
4. (Te	Number of Years with Current Employer	47
5.	Number of Respondents Who Lead Activities	47
6.	Highest Level of Education Attained	48
7.	Degree Status	49
8.	Primary Job Duties of Respondents	50
9.	Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Tenure	53
10. Ed	Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Highest	55
11. Sta	Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Degree	56
12.	Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Gender	57
Hi	Mean Scores and Significance Levels For yal Boosterism Composite Based on Tenure, ghest Education Level Attained, Degree Status d Gender	58
14.	Procedural Justice Scores Based on Tenure	60
15. Ed	Procedural Justice Scores Based on Highest ucation Level Attained	63
16. St	Procedural Justice Scores Based on Degree	66
17.	Procedural Justice Scores Based on Gender	69

18	Means Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice Dimension of Policy Fairness Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender	72
19	. Means Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice Interpersonal Dimension Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender	73
20	. Means Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice Dimension of Decision Fairness Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender	74
21	. Correlations Between Dimensions for Procedural Justice and Loyal Boosterism	76
22	. Hierarchical Regression R Change Model Summary	78
23	. ANOVA Table for Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results	79
	. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis	80

LIST OF APPENDICES

 Institutional Review Board Approval	Page
 Loyal Boosterism and Procedural Justice	102

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) promote the efficiency and effectiveness necessary for productive organizations (Organ, 1988). All organizations are concerned with the effectiveness with which their operational goals and missions are achieved. Researchers (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998) have suggested that perceived procedural justice or perceptions of fairness influence employee citizenship behaviors. Persons working in a variety of occupational settings have been studied regarding their perceptions of organizational justice and their tendencies to display citizenship behaviors. However, no one has investigated the influence of perceived procedural justice on organizational citizenship behaviors of persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

Organizational Citizenship is defined by Organ (1988) as "individual behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective function of the organization." Citizenship behaviors are

those that go beyond the formal job duties, according to Folger and Cropanzano, (1998). Moorman (1991) and various other researchers have used the term "extra role" or "prosocial" behaviors. Many organizations fail to recognize organizational citizenship behaviors as a path to effective functioning (Schappe 1998). Vast amounts of human and material resources are used to maintain a social work structure. When these resources are used to maintain an inefficient work environment, it leaves fewer resources available to produce goods or deliver services (Organ, 1988). Early organizational researchers (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) concluded that job satisfaction was a predictor of citizenship behaviors. However, Organ reinterpreted the earlier studies that had reported a relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. He found that perceptions of fairness or justice better explained the variance in organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, 1991).

Workplace fairness and justice issues are investigated under a field of study called Organizational Justice.

There are currently two categories of Organizational

Justice-Distributive and Procedural. Distributive

Justice focuses on the distribution of rewards and

resources. Procedural justice relates to organizational

policies and procedures. Distributive justice has been

previously eliminated as an antecedent to organizational

citizenship behaviors (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Gilliland,

1993). Therefore, this study focuses on perceived

procedural justice.

Moorman, (1991) found that perceptions of fairness predict organizational citizenship behaviors while job satisfaction did not significantly influence organizational citizenship behavior. Further evidence (e. g., Moorman, 1991; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998) supports the proposition that procedural justice is highly correlated with citizenship behavior.

Organizational Citizenship behavior has been studied by many researchers (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Moorman, 1991; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Masterson, 1998) in a variety of occupations.

Banking, manufacturing, military hospital employees, university professors, union leaders/members, and salesmen have all been studied. However, no one has determined the

influence of perceived procedural justice on the citizenship behaviors of persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure service profession.

Christoph, McLellan and Stahl (1987) have noted that it is possible that persons employed in public recreation and leisure services work for different rewards or goals than do employees in private sector roles. Previous researchers (e.g., Cunningham & Rollin, 1991; Holdnak, Zoerink, & Adkins, 1995) have suggested that persons entering the recreation and leisure service profession are different from those persons entering other professions or occupations Cunningham and Rollin concluded that students in leisure service differed in specific personality dimensions and vocational role preferences from students majoring in other fields of study. Holdnak, Zoerink, & Atkins' research supported the Cunningham and Rollin findings. According to Organ and Ryan (1995), some occupational settings (health care works) may predispose the employee to exhibit citizenship behaviors. Past research on the dimensions of personality and their relationship to citizenship behaviors has mainly been focused on altruism or compliance/conscientiousness dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ,

1994). Altruism or helping behavior and compliance are part of the five-dimension model of organizational citizenship behavior as developed by Organ (1988).

Courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue/loyal boosterism are the other three dimensions that will be discussed further in Chapter 2. According to Organ (1994), the results of the studies on personality as a predictor of OCB have been inconsistent. Of further note, according to Organ and Ryan (1995), the research on personality and OCB has again been limited to persons in manufacturing, banking, hospital employees and sales.

To summarize, perceived procedural justice has been shown to influence citizenship behaviors. Without employees exhibiting these behaviors organizations may be operating inefficiently and wasting valuable resources. Neither procedural justice nor citizenship behavior has ever been investigated within the parks, recreation and leisure service profession.

This investigation seeks 1.) To determine levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, specifically loyal boosterism, and perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession based on demographic and occupational variables

and 2.) To determine whether perceived procedural justice influences organizational citizenship behaviors among persons employed in the parks, recreation, or leisure services profession.

Significance of Study

First this study is important because to date no one has investigated persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure service organizations and their perceptions of procedural justice, nor has anyone studied their organizational citizenship behaviors. Although Anderson (2000) studied equity and citizenship behaviors, the focus was on issues of gender equity in the parks and recreation profession. This study focuses on the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism behaviors among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession. Second, this study is important because it is essential for supervisors and managers in parks, recreation and leisure service agencies and organizations to understand the nature of citizenship behaviors and how these behaviors contribute to the productivity and effectiveness of their organizations. Third it is important for supervisors and managers to understand employees' perceptions of fairness and the

impact they have on their citizenship behavior. This is especially important in recreation and leisure service where the primary product of the organization is the delivery of service designed to enhance the quality of life of a customer or participant. Recently Masterson, (1998) reported that the way in which an employer treated the employee, as perceived by the employee, impacted the level of service delivered to the customer.

Therefore, understanding justice perceptions within organizations providing parks, recreation or leisure services is essential for the proper management of human resources and for the accomplishment of the mission of the agency.

Research Questions

- Will there be a significant difference in perceptions of procedural justice among selected park, recreation and leisure service employees based upon the variables of tenure, education level, degree status or gender.
- 2. Will there be a significant difference in the organizational citizenship dimension of loyal boosterism among selected park, recreation and leisure service employees based upon the variables of tenure, education level, degree status or gender.

- 3. Will there be a relationship between procedural justice and the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism.
- 4. Will levels of perceived procedural justice influence loyal boosterism behaviors among selected park, recreation and leisure service employees based upon the variables of tenure, education level, degree status or gender.

Delimitations

- This investigation was limited to persons holding professional membership in the National Park and Recreation Association (NRPA) and residing in the Southeastern United States.
- 2. This investigation was further limited to American Park and Recreation Society (APRS) and National Society for Park Resources (NSPR) branch members of the National Park and Recreation Association (NRPA) in the Southeastern United States.

Definitions

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: "Individual behaviors that are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective function of the organization" (Organ, 1998).

Loyal Boosterism: A form of citizenship behavior where an employee actively promotes the organization's product and image and defends the organization against criticism (Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff, 1998).

Perceived Procedural Justice: An individual's appraisal of the fairness with which the organization treats its employees in regard to policies, interactions and decisions (Organ and Ryan, 1995).

National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA): A national organization representing persons with an interest in advancing parks, recreation and environmental conservation efforts that enhance the quality of life for all people (www.nrpa.org).

American Society of Parks and Recreation (APRS): A branch of the NRPA dedicated to strengthening the park and recreation profession by fostering professional growth and

development of parks and recreation personnel
 (www.nrpa.org).

National Society for Park Resources (NSPR): A branch of the NRPA that represents the NRPA members working in natural resources, parks and conservation (www.nrpa.org).

Tenure: For this study tenure refers to time in which someone is employed with the current agency as is consistent with management literature.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Even though fairness issues came to the attention of researchers during World War II, human resource managers have just recently realized the impact of justice issues as they relate to the functioning of the organization (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). All organizations are concerned with the effectiveness with which their goals are achieved. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) promote the efficiency and effectiveness necessary for productive organizations (Organ, 1988). Researchers (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998) have suggested that organizational justice, specifically procedural justice or fairness, as perceived by an employee, influences citizenship behavior. Organizational justice focuses on an individual's or group's perception of fair or unfair treatment in the workplace. This includes, but is not limited to, resource allocation (distributive justice), policies (procedural justice) and the behavioral reaction (citizenship behaviors) to those perceptions of justice (James, 1993).

Toward a better understanding of the justice theories, the organizational literature from both the psychological perspective and management perspective will be reviewed from the development of the justice theories to the current constructs. Second, the literature concerning the nature, forms and underlying theories of organizational citizenship behavior will be reviewed.

Organizational Justice

Organizational researchers and psychologists focus on the conditions of employment that lead employees to believe that they are being treated fairly or unfairly (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The theories of organizational justice did not develop from abstract academic theory, but from the real dynamics in the workplace. Distributive Justice theory evolved from Relative Deprivation Theory and Equity Theory (Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Relative Deprivation

Fairness issues in organizations first came to the attention of researchers Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star and Williams (1949). In a set of studies conducted on soldiers during World War II, researchers used the concept of Relative Deprivation to explain why the more highly educated soldiers were less satisfied with their job status

than their less educated counter-parts. The more highly educated soldiers aspired to higher status; therefore, they were relatively deprived of status and thus less satisfied with current roles (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). According to Cropanzano and Randall (1993), "the deprivation is relative in that it is compared to some reference point and is not an absolute or objective quantity" (p.4). fundamental principle is that employees make social comparisons and judgments of justice based on those comparisons (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). As more recent theories have emerged, they have retained Relative Deprivation's central premise that justice is defined relative to some referent standard, according to Cropanzano and Randall (1993). The work of Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star, and Williams (1949) was followed by Adams' (1965) Equity Theory.

Equity Theory

The underlying aspect of Equity Theory is that "when someone works for an organization they present certain inputs (e.g., ability or job performance). Based on what they put in, people expect to get something out" (p.5).

Adams (1965) presented the idea of social comparisons as a quasi-mathematical formula (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993).

Equity Theory predicted that dissatisfaction would occur from perceived low rewards as well as overpay distributions (Gilliland, 1993). According to Adams (1965), inequitable distributions produce negative emotions that motivate individuals to change their behavior to adjust for the inequities. Dissatisfaction may occur in an overpayment situation due to feelings of guilt (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998). Williams (1999) wrote that the employee is motivated by tension that results from anger to be less productive in underpayment situations. In the overpayment situation the employee will feel quilt and will be motivated to be more productive but will still be unsatisfied (Mowday, 1985). The study of organizational justice has evolved from the study of Relative Deprivation and Equity Theory to the study of Distributive Justice (often still studied under the name of Equity Theory (Williams, 1999) to the study of procedural justice).

Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice is concerned with the allocation of rewards while the study of procedural justice is concerned with the procedures used to determine resource and reward allocation (Greenberg, 1990b). Distributive Justice (DJ) focuses on the perceived outcomes or rewards

that an individual receives from the organization. When these rewards are judged to be unjust, the employee may perform poorly on the job (Greenberg, 1988; Pfeffer & Langton, 1993), engage in withdrawal behaviors (Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1992) cooperate less, reduce work quality, steal (Greenberg 1990) and experience stress (Zohar, 1995).

In 1988, Greenberg studied insurance underwriters who were temporarily assigned to offices of either higher, lower, or equal status co-workers. He hypothesized that the status value of the new office would create increases, decreases, or no change in organizational output. His hypothesis was supported. The size of these performance changes was directly related to the magnitude of the status inconsistencies encountered. Greenberg (1990) measured employee theft rates during a pay reduction period. compared to theft rates before the pay reduction and after pay reduction it was found that theft increased during the reduced pay period. Equity theories and Distributive Justice have been studied for decades. However, Procedural Justice (PJ) is a relatively new concept (Greenberg, 1990c). Although both concepts are separate and distinct, they are both important determinants in fairness perceptions and organizational outcomes (Williams, 1999).

Procedural Justice

Researchers have shown that procedural justice accounts for more variance among a number of dependent measures than do perceptions of distributive justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Gilliland, 1993; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Procedural Justice focuses on the perception of the fairness of the decision making process related to the allocation of rewards (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998). In procedural justice studies, the perceived fairness of the process has been demonstrated to be as important to the employees as the reward outcome (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; and Greenberg, 1986). According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), a wealth of procedural justice studies show that when the decision-making process is perceived to be unfair employees show less commitment, higher turnover intentions, lower performance and fewer helpful citizenship behaviors. Greenberg, (1990c) suggests two components to procedural justice. First is the presence or absence of procedures relating to distribution of rewards. The second component is the explanation of the formal procedures called interactional justice. Folger and Cropanzano (1998)

further defined interactional justice as the quality of interpersonal treatment received by an individual.

Procedural justice can be divided into three dimensions: (a) formal characteristics of procedures (structure), (b) explanation of procedures and decision making (informational), and (c) interpersonal treatment (interactional) (Greenberg, 1990b, 1993). The structural elements of procedural justice include policies, rules and voice. Howard (2001) refers to structural elements of procedural justice as "Policy Fairness" and to rules and voice as "Decision Fairness".

Recently, researchers have found that voice influences perceptions of fairness (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1998; Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995; Greenberg, 1986). Process control or "voice" allows individuals affected by decisions to have input or present information relevant to the decision. Procedural justice is enhanced by process control as the key element factor (Shapiro, 1993).

However, positive effects of voice are limited. Hunton, Hall, and Price (1998) found that fairness perceptions did not increase with increasing voice opportunities.

Expectations of voice are related to the incremental value of voice.

The informational element of procedural justice deals with the explanations for decisions. Greenberg (1993) defined informational justice as the social determinant of procedural justice. Howard (2001) calls this element of procedural justice "Interpersonal Fairness". information regarding reward or allocation decisions that demonstrates respect for other's concerns typifies informational justice. By openly sharing procedural knowledge an organization promotes this class of justice. Bies and Shapiro (1988) demonstrated a difference between structural justice (voice) and informational justice (providing explanations). Brockner, Dewitt, Grover, and Reed (1990) found evidence to support moderators of informational fairness perceptions, including the uncertainty of the decision, the importance of the decision, the severity of the decision and the adequacy of the explanation. Interactional (informational or interpersonal) Justice refers to the set of conditions where an individual finds that he/she has been treated with respect. According to Konovsky (2000),

With respect to interactional justice, Bies (in press) recently identified factors indicating the absence of interactional injustice. These include derogatory judgments, deception, invasion of privacy, inconsiderate or abusive actions,

public criticism and coercion. Bies also provides evidence that violating any of these elements of interactional justice leads to decreased perceptions of fair treatment.

According to Bies and Shapiro (1988), interactional justice can be referred to as the social exchange between two parties. Tyler (1989) found that people were more likely to feel that they had been treated fairly by police and the court system when the authorities showed concern and sympathy for the individual. Politeness, and respect for citizens' rights enhanced perceptions of fair treatment. The constructs of procedural justice have been studied under the following theoretic models.

Theories of Procedural Fairness

Instrumental Model

Instrumental models that proposed that fair procedures lead to favorable outcomes first explained Procedural Justice effects. Individuals have no need for fair procedures independent of the association between fair procedures to fair outcomes (Konovsky, 2000). Thibaut and Walker (1975), as described in Konovsky (2000) and Folger & Cropanzano (1999), studied dispute resolution procedures. They found support for two types of control. People have control over procedures used to settle grievances (process

control) and they have control over determining the outcomes (decision control). Thibaut and Walker (1975) suggested that procedural control is perceived as the best way to insure the best possible outcome. Folger & Cropanzano (1998) in describing the findings of Thibaut and Walker, "participants saw the resolution process as fair and were contented with the results if they were given a sufficient chance to present their cases" (p. xxiii).

Social Exchange Model

According on Konovsky (2000), social exchange theories focus on how relationships are formed and how power is dealt with inside of the relationship. The basis of a social exchange relationship is contributions of one party now with the expectation of an unspecified future obligation. To maintain the social exchange, trust must be the key element. Procedural fairness is one important source of trust (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Managers are key to building trust (Whitener, Brodt, Dorsgaard, & Werner, 1998). When managers treat employees fairly, they are demonstrating respect for the rights of the employee, which leads to the development of trust (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Developing trust furthers positive reciprocation and results in the stabilization of the relationship.

(Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Konovsky and Pugh (1994) suggested, "In addition to stabilization of relationships, procedural justice induced trust also predicts important employee behaviors such as citizenship behavior".

Group Value Model

The group value model (Tyler, 1989) of procedural justice describes the value that people place on group membership for obtaining social status and self esteem.

Neutrality, trust and standing are the three rational concerns that evaluate social status and self-esteem.

According to Konovsky (2000), "Neutrality indicates that an individual is treated without bias. Trust emerges from a decision maker using unbiased procedures. Standing is conveyed when group authorities treat people with politeness, respect for their rights, and dignity".

Treatment of persons that enhance neutrality, trust and standing enhances perceptions of procedural justice and stabilizes the group (Konovsky, 2000).

Justice Judgment Theory

Folger and Cropanzano (1998) listed Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry's (1980) six attributes of fair procedures which indicate the presence of procedural justice. These characteristics of fairness include (a) consistency over

time, (b) bias suppression, (c) accuracy, (d) correctability, (e) representativeness, and (f) based on prevailing ethical standards (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). These six characteristics are essential to increase perceptions of procedural fairness. Gilliland (1993) adapted Leventhal et al.'s model to assess selection fairness in the workplace.

Fairness Heuristic Theory

The Fairness Heuristic Model focuses on how procedural justice and distributive justice relate to determine fairness perceptions (Konovsky, 2000). According to Konovsky, (2000), people are untrusting with authority because of the potential for exploitation. In order for the individual to trust the authority figure, the individual must refer to the fairness of the authority's procedures (van den Bos, Wilke, & Lind, 1998). According to Konovsky (2000), "PJ is not only an antecedent of trust, it can serve as a substitute for trustworthiness". A second component of heuristic theory considers why procedural justice information can affect judgments of distributive justice. The order of information presented is important also. Information concerning procedures will affect perceived outcome fairness when procedural

information is available before outcome information. The third component states that fairness outcomes are more difficult to judge than the fairness of procedures because information is limited concerning the outcomes of others.

To summarize, the theories differ in how they treat the relationship between distributive justice and procedural justice. Second, the theories differ on importance placed on the relationship between objective and subjective fairness perceptions and the relationship between subjective fairness perceptions and their consequences. Third, the concept of trust is central to the group value model, but not in the instrumental model (Konovsky, 2000).

Perceptions of procedural fairness often influence employee work behaviors. Citizenship behavior is often influenced by perceptions of procedural justice. Studies by Konovsky and Organ (1996), Konovsky and Pugh (1994), Moorman (1991), and Niehoff and Moorman (1993) have shown that procedural justice not distributive justice predicts citizenship behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Katz and Kahn (1978) published a comprehensive text

analyzing organizational behaviors. They identified three

areas of behavior with which organizations are concerned. First, organizations must attract and maintain employees in the system. Second, organizations must ensure that employees perform duties to a set minimum requirement. Third, they must evoke "innovative and spontaneous behavior performance beyond role requirements for accomplishments of organizational functions" (p. 337). According to Organ (1988), the last area includes employees acting to cooperate with other employees, to protect or enhance the organizational system, and to promote favorable work environments. Katz and Kahn, (1978) wrote, "Within every work group in a factory, within any division in a government bureau, or within any department of a university are countless acts of cooperation without which the system would break down. We take these everyday acts for granted, and few of them are included in the formal role prescriptions for any job" (p. 339).

Bateman and Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983) labeled the extra role behaviors as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs). These behaviors promote the efficiency and effectiveness necessary for productive organizations (Organ, 1988). Organizational Citizenship is defined by Organ (1988) as "individual behaviors that are

discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective function of the organization." Citizenship behaviors are those that go beyond the formal job duties, according to Folger and Cropanzano, (1998).

Dimensions of Citizenship Behavior

Organ (1988) originally identified 5 forms of
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Altruism,
Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy, and Civic
Virtue. Since Organ first identified these dimensions of
OCBs, many researchers have investigated the forms and have
often used differing terms to describe the same dimension.
Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) have
identified seven common themes from the many different
reported dimensional forms of organizational citizenship
behavior. These include (1) Helping Behavior (2)
Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty/Loyal Boosterism,
(4) Organizational Compliance, (5) Individual Compliance,
(6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self-development.

Helping behaviors, according to Podsakoff et al.

(2000), are conceptually defined as voluntarily behaviors
that help others or prevent the occurrence of work-related
problems. This definition includes Organ's altruism,

peacemaking, and cheerleading. The second part of the definition includes Organ's concept of courtesy where an employee takes steps to prevent problems for co-workers.

Sportsmanship is a form of citizenship where a person is willing to tolerate inconvenience at work without complaining (Organ, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Podsakoff et al. (2000) expanded this definition. They suggested that a person displaying sportsmanship maintains a positive attitude and is willing to "sacrifice their [sic] personal interest for the good of the work group" and endure personal inconveniences without complaint in order to conserve organizational resources (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Loyal boosterism (van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994), refers to protecting the organization and spreading good will (George & Brief, 1992), and supporting and defending the organizational objectives. Evidence is still unclear concerning this dimension of OCB. Moorman and Blakely (1995) found this dimension to be separate from other forms. However, Moorman, Blakely and Niehoff (1998) failed to find this distinction (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

The concept of organizational compliance has been studied under the terms or constructs of general compliance by Smith et al. (1983); organizational obedience by van

Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994); and following organizational rules and procedures by Borman and Motowidlo (1993). Organizational compliance describes a person's acceptance of the organization's rules, policies and procedures. The internalization of the rules compels the individual to adhere strictly to them even though no one monitors compliance. This person is referred to as an especially "good citizen" (Podsakoff et al., 2000). An employee exhibiting this form of OCB uses his/her time effectively for the good of the organization, respects company resources and faithfully adheres to policies and procedures (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

The dimension of organizational citizenship called individual initiative is described as task role activity that goes so far beyond the minimally required or expected levels that it becomes viewed as voluntary. Innovation, enthusiasm, extra responsibilities that go beyond the call of duty characterizes this dimension (Podsakoff et al., 2000). This construct is similar to Organ's (1988) conscientiousness construct. Other researchers have investigated similar constructs under the following terms: the personal industry and individual initiative, van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994), Moorman and Blakely, (1995);

constructive suggestions George and Brief, (1992) and George and Jones (1997); volunteering and enthusiasm, Borman and Motowidlo (1997); taking charge, Morrison and Phelps (1999); and job dedication construct from van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996). Because individual initiative is difficult to distinguish from required inrole tasks, many researchers have not included this dimension in their studies (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Overall commitment to the organization is termed civic virtue. Actively participating in the governance of the organizations and being vigilant for changes in the industry that would threaten the organization characterize civic virtue. van Dyne, Graham, and Diensch (1994) in their investigation termed this dimension organizational participation. George and Brief (1992) also studied civic virtue under the construct of protecting the organizations.

A key dimension of citizenship behavior as identified by George and Brief (1992) is self-development. Improving knowledge, skills and abilities characterizes this dimension. By seeking to develop themselves personally, the employees enhance the organization. According to Podsakoff et al. (2000),

Self-development has not received any empirical confirmation in the citizenship literature. However, it does appear to be a discretionary form of employee behavior that is conceptually distinct from the other citizenship behavior dimensions, and might be expected to improve organizational effectiveness through somewhat different mechanisms than the other forms of citizenship behavior.

Antecedents to Citizenship Behavior

Employee Characteristics

According to Podsakoff et al (2000), employee characteristics are the most frequently studied antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior. Bateman & Organ, (1983) first studied OCB in regard to affective morale. Employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceptions of fairness, and perceptions of leader supportiveness underlie the affective morale employee characteristic (Organ & Ryan, 1995) and appear to be important predictors of citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al, 2000). In addition to morale, Organ and Ryan (1995) suggested that dispositional factors, such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity, determine the way in which an employee interacts with coworkers. Therefore, the

reporting satisfaction, support, and fair treatment. Thus dispositional factors could be classified as indirect contributors instead of direct contributors to organizational citizenship behavior (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Organ & Lingl, 1995).

Researchers have found a significant relationship between conscientiousness, agreeableness and altruism.

Also, a relationship was found between positive affectivity and altruism. However, Organ and Ryan (1995) using a meta analysis found that when the self report data were dropped from the analysis the relationships became non-significant. A positive relationship was found between consciousness and general compliance. Even when the self-report data were dropped, the relationship was still significant (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Role Perceptions

According to Podsakoff et al (2000), role perceptions are significantly related to OCB dimensions. Role ambiguity and role conflict are significantly negatively related to altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship. However, role ambiguity and role conflict are related to satisfaction, and satisfaction is related to organization citizenship behaviors. Therefore, it is likely that

satisfaction mediates the relationship between role ambiguity and role conflict and OCBs.

Demographic Variables

Kidder and McLean Parks (1993) present plausible theories of why gender should be related. They suggest that empathetic concern (a notable female trait) should influence both helping behavior and courtesy. However, Podsakoff et al. (2000) reported that researchers have failed to find a relationship between demographic variables, such as gender or years on the job, and OCBs.

Task Characteristics

Aside from employee characteristics, task characteristics are significantly related and an important determinant to the dimensions of organization citizenship behavior. Task characteristics include: task feedback; task routinization; and intrinsically satisfying tasks.

Task routinization was negatively related to OCBs while task feedback and intrinsically satisfying tasks were positively related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al, 2000).

Organizational Characteristics

Only three organizational characteristics were found to have significant relationships with the organizational citizenship behaviors dimensions. Group cohesiveness was positively related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Perceived organizational support was positively related to altruism. Rewards not under the leader's control were negatively related to altruism, courtesy, and conscientiousness. None of the other organizational characteristics, formalization, organizational inflexibility, advisory/staff support, or spatial distance, showed a consistent relationship to OCB (Podsakoff et al, 2000).

Leadership Behaviors

Leadership behaviors can be further categorized as

Transactional, Transformational, Path-Goal, or Leader
Member exchange. Transactional leaders share a vision and

inspire the group to accept the vision, provide direction,

and expect high standards to achieve a shared group goal.

Consistently, transactional leader behaviors were found to

be positively related to altruism, courtesy,

conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Of the

transformational leadership behaviors of contingent rewards, contingent punishment, non-contingent reward and non-contingent punishment, only contingent reward had a positive relationship to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue while non-contingent punishment behavior had a negative relationship (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Of the three Path-Goal forms of leadership (role clarification, specification of procedures, or supportive leader behavior), role clarification was positively related to altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship. Supportive leader behavior was found to be positively related to all organizational citizenship behaviors. Leader-member exchange was positively related to altruism and overall organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, et al.).

Organizational Success

A key portion of Organ's definition of citizenship behaviors is that over time these behaviors will enhance organizational effectiveness. According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), this tenet was accepted without empirical evidence based solely on the plausibility. Podsakoff et al. (2000) listed 7 reasons why OCBs may influence organization performance.

OCBs may contribute to organizational success by:

(a) enhancing coworker and managerial

productivity; (b) freeing up resources so they

can be used for more productive purposes; (c)

reducing the need to devote scarce resources to

purely maintenance functions; (d) helping to

coordinate activities both within and across work

groups; (e) strengthening the organizations'

ability to attract and retain the best employees;

(f) increasing the stability of the

organization's performance; and (g) enabling the

organization to adapt more effectively to

environmental changes.

Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1994) in a study of 116 insurance agents found that 17% of the variance in organizational performance was due to civic virtue and sportsmanship. Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie (1997) in a study of paper mill work crews found that 26% of the variance in organization performance for quantity was due to helping behavior and sportsmanship. In the same group they found that helping behavior accounted for 17% of variance for product quality. MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne (1996) as cited in Podsakoff et al. (2000) found that helping behavior and civic virtue accounted for 16% of variance in sales performance among pharmaceutical sales teams.

Justice as a Predictor

Organ (1994) suggested that fairness could predict citizenship. The first reason given was based on Adams' (1965) proposition that conditions of unfairness create tension within an individual. As this individual attempts to resolve the tension, Organ (1994) suggests that the individual could raise or lower his or her level of citizenship behaviors as a response to inequity. Furthermore, since organizational citizenship behaviors are discretionary extra role behaviors, the individual would be safer in changing these behaviors than he/she would be by changing behaviors relating to formal role requirements. A second reason to conclude that perceptions of fairness could be related to organizational citizenship behavior, as suggested by Organ (1994), is that an employee may define his/her relationship with the organization as one of social exchange. According to Moorman (1991), because social exchange exists outside formal contracts, employees are free to act in discretionary ways, therefore, the employee will more likely exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors as a form of social exchange. Early empirical evidence supports the relationship between perceptions of fairness and organizational citizenship behaviors (Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; and Moorman, 1991).

Moorman (1991) found significant relationships between interactive justice and altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship. No significant relationships were found between the formal procedures (structural) and any organizational citizenship behavior dimension. contrast to Moorman, in a study by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) formal procedures were found to predict courtesy, sportsmanship and conscientiousness while interactional justice was linked only to sportsmanship. Further support for the ability of procedural justice to predict organizational citizenship behavior was provided by Farh et al. (1990). By using measures of supportive and participative leader behaviors to represent procedural justice, they found a relationship between leader fairness and altruism. Interpersonal and structural dimensions were not specifically measured.

Schappe (1998) reported contrasting results. In a study of the influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organization citizenship behavior he found that when considered together

only organizational commitment could account for variance in organizational citizenship behaviors.

Moorman, Blakely and Niehoff (1998) investigated the mediating relationship of organizational support on procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. Analysis of the data from supervisors and subordinates at a military hospital indicated support for the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organization support and between perceived organizational support and three of the four organizational citizenship behavior dimensions (interpersonal helping, personal industry, and loyal boosterism). When the mediating variable was included, the researchers found a stronger effect of procedural justice on citizenship behaviors. researchers offered an alternative explanation for their findings. They suggested that perceived organization support could affect judgment of procedural justice instead of procedural justice affecting judgments of organizational support. Konovsky and Pugh (1994) found that an employee's trust in his/her supervisor fully mediated the relationship between procedural justice and citizenship.

Personality and Citizenship Behaviors

Thus far the literature regarding distributive justice, procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviors has been reviewed. Previous researchers have reported that procedural justice is a better predictor of citizenship behaviors than distributive justice. According to Organ (1994), the research regarding the relationship of personality on organizational citizenship behavior is inconclusive. However, Organ and Ryan (1995) report that it is possible that persons in some occupations may be predisposed to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. George (1992) also reported the inconsistencies of personality as it relates to the organizational citizenship behavior literature. However, George (1992) added that individuals with high self esteem, competence, internal locus of control, and moral development and low in the need for approval tend to be more likely to exhibit citizenship behaviors. In light of the statements of Organ and Ryan (1995) and George (1992), research on the personality of parks, recreation, and leisure service employees becomes important because Cunningham and Rollin, (1991) reported that students majoring in leisure services are different in personality traits than those entering

other majors. Christoph, McLellan and Stahl (1987) wrote that it may be possible that parks and recreation employees may work for different rewards and goals.

The theories of Organizational Justice differ within the framework of the model being used. The evolution of justice theories from the early relative deprivation theory to the procedural justice theory and its various models continues to inspire researchers to update their models and to expand the research to new groups. Various theories of procedural justice have found support. Empirical support for procedural justice as a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors is available for various dimensions. Many researchers have looked at the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. Most often the researchers have focused on altruism or helping behaviors. However, no one to date has investigated the relationship of perceived procedural justice on citizenship behaviors, specifically loyal boosterism, within the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

In order to determine the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism behaviors among selected parks, recreation or leisure services employees, the following procedure was followed.

Sample and Data Collection

Participants were systematically selected from the American Park and Recreation Society (APRS) and National Society for Park Resources (NSPR) membership branches of the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) from a mailing list provided by the organization's Southeast Regional Director. A random number was generated through the data analysis feature of the Microsoft Excel computer program. That number was used to determine the starting place for selection. After the starting point was determined, every third name was selected for a total of 383 individuals to whom surveys were mailed. The instruments and cover letters were mailed the last week in May 2001. The subjects were asked to respond anonymously to the items. A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope was provided for the return of the survey.

Measures

Procedural justice. Perceived procedural justice was measured with a 21 item, 5 point Likert type scale that asked the respondents to express the extent of their agreement or disagreement (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) with a series of statements (e.g. "managers in this organization treat all people with respect" and "rules in this organization apply the same to everybody who works here") measuring three subscale elements of procedural justice. The subscales and their respective reliabilities were policy fairness (α =.87), interpersonal fairness (α =.88) and decision fairness (α =.86), (Howard, 2001).

Loyal boosterism. Loyal boosterism was measured with a 5-item Likert type scale adapted from Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff (1998) and Moorman & Blakely (1995). Respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement or disagreement (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) with a series of statements (e.g. "do you defend the organization when other employees criticize it"). This scale has a reliability alpha of .84 (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998).

Analysis

All data were entered into a computer and analyzed using the Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Demographical information was reported. Analysis of

Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant

differences based on demographic variables for both

procedural justice and loyal boosterism. Correlations were

used to determine relationships between perceived

procedural justice and loyal boosterism. Hierarchical

Regression was used to determine the influence of

procedural justice on loyal boosterism among those sampled

who are employed in parks, recreation or leisure services.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study was designed to measure the levels of loyal boosterism and perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession. Furthermore, this study was designed to determine the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism behavior among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to detect significant differences (p<.05) in levels of loyal boosterism among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession based on the demographic and occupational variables of tenure, highest education level attained, degree status and gender. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also used to detect significant differences (p<.05) in levels of perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession based upon the length of their employment with their current employer, highest education level attained, degree status and gender. Correlational analysis was used to determine relationships between loyal

boosterism and the three dimensions of perceived procedural justice. Hierarchical regression was employed to determine the nature of the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism behaviors.

In order to determine the influence of perceived procedural justice on the loyal boosterism behaviors of selected parks, recreation or leisure services employees, surveys (N=383) were mailed to members of the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) residing in the Southeast region of the United States during the last week in May, 2001. Data were collected during the month of June. Two hundred fifty six usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 67%.

Subjects

Of the 256 returned surveys, 174 respondents were male (68.0%), 78 (30.5%) female and 4 respondents (1.5%) failed to indicate gender. The majority (63.3%) of respondents reported belonging to the American Park and Recreation Society (APRS) branch of the National Park and Recreation Association (n=162). Eighty one (31.6%) reported belonging to the National Society for Park Resources (NSPR) branch of the National Park and Recreation Association (NRPA).

branch affiliation. Table 1 shows the frequency according to gender. Table 2 shows the frequency according to NRPA branch affiliation.

Table 1

Number of Respondents According to Gender

Gender	n	Percent
Female	78	30.5
Males	174	68.0
Missing responses	4	1.5
Total	256	100.0

Table 2

Number of Respondents According to NRPA Branch Affiliation

Branch affiliation	n	Percent	
APRS	162	63.3	
NSPR	81	31.6	
Missing responses	13	5.1	
Total	256	100.0	

When asked the number of years they had worked in recreation, respondents reported an average tenure of 17.6 years. The largest percentage of respondents (18.8%) reported working in the park, recreation or leisure services profession for 26-30 years. The second and third

most reported years in recreation were 16-20 years (n=47) and 6-10 years (n=46) respectively. Table 3 indicates the number of years respondents had worked in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

Table 3

Number of Years in the Parks, Recreation or Leisure Services Profession

Years	n	Percent
<u><</u> 5	31	12.0
6-10	46	18.0
11-15	26	10.1
16-20	47	18.4
21-25	43	16.8
26-30	48	18.8
>31	15	5.9
Total	256	100.0

The average for those answering "years with current employer" was 11.6. Eighty one respondents indicated that they had been with their current employer for five or less years (31.6%). The second most frequent response was the 6-10 years with current employer group (n=49). Table 4 indicates the number of years respondents had worked for their current employer.

Table 4

Number of Years With Current Employer (Tenure)

Years	n	Percent	
<u><</u> 5	81	31.6	
6-10	49	19.1	
11-15	38	14.8	
16-20	42	16.4	
21-25	25	9.9	
>26	20	7.8	
Missing response	1	. 4	
Total	256	100.0	

When asked if job duties included leading activities for patrons, 155 of 251 reported that they did lead activities (60.5%) while 96 reported that they did not lead activities (37.5%).

Table 5

Number of Respondents Who Lead Activities

	n	Percent
Lead activities	155	60.5
Do not lead activities	96	37.5
Missing response	5	2.0
Total	256	100.0

Eighty six percent of respondents indicated that they had either a 4-year degree (n=143) or a graduate degree (n=77). Complete results for the variable of "highest level of education attained" are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Highest Level of Education Level Attained

Education level	n	Percent
High school	6	2.3
Some college	12	4.7
Associate degree	17	6.6
4 year degree	143	55.9
Graduate degree	77	30.1
Missing response	1	. 4
Total	256	100.0

Of those reporting having a degree, 186 (72.7%) reported that their degree was related to parks, recreation, or leisure services. Table 7 summarizes the respondents' degree status (degree related or unrelated to parks, recreation, or leisure service).

Table 7

Degree Status

Degree status	n	Percent
Degree related to Parks, Recreation and Leisure Services	186	72.7
Unrelated Degree	59	23.0
Missing response	11	4.3
Total	256	100.0

Inconsistencies appear between respondents' answers to "highest level of education attained" and degree status. Only 237 responses should have been able to indicate degree status. As shown in Table 6, 237 respondents reported having an associate degree (17), 4-year degree (143) or graduate degree (77). However, as shown in Table 7, 245 respondents indicated a degree either related or unrelated to parks, recreation or leisure service. This discrepancy may reflect some confusion on the part of the respondents, but more likely is the result of some respondents having a degree of some sort that is not provided for in the previous question. Eighteen respondents reported some college (12) or high school (6) with one missing response. It would appear that 8 of the 19 (12 "some college", 6 "high school" and one missing response) responded to degree status while 11 respondents left the item blank.

When asked to indicate their primary job duties, one hundred sixty one (62.8%) responded that they had administrative duties; forty six (18.0%) stated that their primary duties were programming, and forty seven individuals (18.4%) indicated an equal amount of administrative and programming duties. Results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Primary Job Duties of Respondents

Job duties	n	Percent	
Administrative	161	62.8	
Programming	46	18.0	
Equal amounts of both	47	18.4	
Missing responses	2	.8	
Total	256	100.0	

Loyal Boosterism

A modified version of Moorman's (1998) organizational citizenship behavior scale was used to determine levels of loyal boosterism among persons employed in the parks, recreation, or leisure services profession. Respondents were asked to reply to 5-items in a Likert type scale that measured loyal boosterism by indicating their level of

agreement (strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neutral=3, agree=4, strongly agree =5). Reliability analysis was first performed on the loyal boosterism measure followed by factor analysis to determine if the scale was consistent and unidimensional. An overall Cronbach's alpha of .79 was found with all five items loading on one factor, thereby supporting the unidimensional nature of the measure.

Descriptive analysis found all demographic or occupational groups reporting high levels of loyal boosterism behaviors, although following Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests, no significant differences (p>.05) in loyal boosterism were found among respondents based on the variables of tenure, highest educational level attained, degree status or gender on individual items or the unidimensional scale.

At the individual item level, mean scores and significance levels for loyal boosterism items are presented in Tables 9-12. Table 9 shows loyal boosterism scores based on tenure. Although no significant differences were found for loyal boosterism items based on tenure, respondents belonging to the 16-20 years tenure group reported the highest mean score (4.52) for the item "defends the organization when employees criticize it".

Respondents in the 5 years or less tenure group reported

the highest mean score (4.53) for the item "encourages friends and family to use organization's product". For the loyal boosterism item of "defends the organization when outsiders criticize" respondents in the 16-20 years tenure group reported the highest mean score (4.54). The highest mean score for the loyal boosterism item "shows pride when representing the organization in public" was reported by respondents in the 5 years and less tenure group (mean=4.75) and the 6-10 years tenure group (mean=4.75). For the loyal boosterism item "actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users" respondents in the 5 years and less tenure group reported the highest mean score (4.61).

Table 9

Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Tenure (Years With Current Employer)

Providence Providence Control of the	≤5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	<u>></u> 26	
Loyal boosterism items	(n=81)	(n=49)	(n=32)	(n=42)	(n=25)	(n=20)	p
Defends the organization when employees criticize it	4.30	4,26	4.23	4.52	4.24	4.40	.376
Encourages friends and family to use organization's product	4.53	4.51	4,39	4.50	4.32	4.50	.761
Defends the organization when outsiders criticize	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.54	4.36	4.50	.150
Shown pride when representing the organization in public	4.75	4.75	4.55	4.61	4,68	4.70	,274
Actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users	4.61	4.48	4.31	4.57	4,44	4.60	.121

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

Table 10 shows loyal boosterism scores based on highest education level attained. Although no significant difference (p>.05) was found between groups on any item, those who indicated a high school education level reported the highest mean scores for 3 of the 5 loyal boosterism items "defends the organization when employees criticize it" (mean=4.66), "encourages friends and family to use organization's product" (mean=4.50), and "actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users" (mean=5.0). For the loyal boosterism items of "defends the organization when outsiders criticize" (mean=4.70), and "shows pride when representing the organization in public" (mean=4.88) those belonging to the associate degree group reported the highest mean score. Those with a 4-year degree had the same mean score (4.50) for the item "encourages friends and family to use organization's product" as did the high school education level group.

Table: 10

Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Highest Education Level Attained

	High School	Some College	Associate Degree	4 year Degree	Graduate Degree	
Loyal boosterism items	(n=6)	(n=12)	(n=17)	(n=143)	(n=77)	р
Defends the organization when employees criticize it	4.66	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.25	.295
Encourages friends and family to use organization's product	4.50	4,33	4.64	4.50	4.41	.650
Defends the organization when outsiders criticize	4.66	4,33	4.70	4.42	4.42	.277
Shows pride when representing the organization in public	4.83	4.50	4.88	4.68	4.67	,263
Actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users	5.00	4.33	4.70	4.52	4.48	.098

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

Table 11 shows loyal boosterism scores based on degree status. Although all items were non significant (p>.05) for each of the 5 loyal boosterism items, those without degree related to parks, recreation or leisure service reported higher mean scores than those with a degree related to parks, recreation, or leisure service.

Table 11

Loyal Boosterism Scores Based on Degree Status

	Related degree	Without related degree	
Loyal boosterism items	(n=186)	(n=56)	_ g
Defends the organization when employees criticize it	4.29	4.37	. 444
Encourages friends and family to use organization's product	4.45	4.57	.217
Defends the organization when outsiders criticize	4.41	4.54	.130
Shows pride when representing the organization in public	4.66	4.76	.182
Actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users	4.51	4.57	.442

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

Table 12 shows loyal boosterism scores based on gender. Male respondents scored the highest mean (4.33) score for the item "defends the organization when employees criticize it". Both male and female respondents reported mean scores of 4.48 for the item "encourages friends and family to use organization's product". Females reported higher mean scores for the remaining items. However, no significant difference (p>.05) was found for any item.

Table 12

Loyal Boosterism Sccres Based on Gender

	Male	Female	
Loyal boosterism items	(n=174)	(n=78)	р
Defends the organization when employees criticize it	4.33	4.29	.680
Encourages friends and family to use organization's product	4.48	4.48	.962
Defends the organization when outsiders criticize	4.44	4.46	.866
Shows pride when representing the organization in public	4.67	4.71	.544
Actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users	4.50	4.57	.358

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The composite measure of loyal boosterism as analyzed for tenure, highest education level attained, degree status and gender is represented in Table 13. As previously found at the individual item level no significant differences (p>.05) were found based on any of the variables.

Mean Scores and Significance Levels for Loyal Boosterism Composite
Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and
Gender

Demographic Variable	Mean	p
Tenure		_
<5	22.71	
6-10	22.48	
11-15	21.73	
16-20	22.76	
21-25	22.04	
>26	22.70	
Total	22.46	.223
Highest Education Level Attained		
High School	23.66	
Some College	21.75	
Associate Degree	23.52	
College Graduate	22.44	
Graduate Degree	22.25	
Total	22.45	.110
Degree Status		
With Related Degree	22.33	
Without Related Degree	22.83	
Total	22.45	.136
Gender		
	22.44	
Male	22.53	
Female		
Total	22.47	.768

Perceived Procedural Justice

Respondents were asked to three subscales (policy fairness, interpersonal fairness, decision fairness) of a procedural justice measure developed by Howard (2001) by indicating their level of agreement with 21 Likert-scaled items (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). The overall reliability (i. e. Cronbach's alpha) for the full measure was .95 with a Cronbach alpha of .88 found for the subscale policy fairness, .83 for decision fairness, and .87 for interpersonal fairness. Each of these was deemed acceptable and coincided with Howard's (2001) findings ranging from .84-.91 in pilot testing. Following Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) testing, significant differences (p<.05) were detected among respondents at the individual item level of procedural justice as well within two of the subscale dimensions. As revealed in Table 14, no significant differences (p>.05) were found for any procedural justice item based on tenure.

Table 14

Procedural Justice Scores Based on Tenure (years with current employer)

	<u><</u> 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	226	
Procedural Justice Items	(n=81)	(n=49)	(n=32)	(n=42)	(n=25)	(n=20)	_ _ p
Policy Fairness							
Policies are based on accurate information	3.74	3.79	3.76	3,92	3.80	3,90	.796
Policies serve intended purposes	3,37	3.64	3,64	3,71	3,64	3.75	.990
Rules apply the same to everyone	3.40	3.16	3,55	3.29	3.16	3,63	.451
Formal policies are fair	3.82	3.77	3,63	3.83	3.60	3,75	. 679
Formal policies are applied the same	3.49	3.44	3,55	3.57	3,60	3,55	, 986
Standards for measuring employee performance are clear	3,38	3.28	3,63	3,38	3.28	3.40	.756
Everyone is accountable to the rules	3,54	3,53	3,68	3,66	3.6	3.75	,925
Interpersonal Fairness							
Managers lie to employees ^r	3,79	3,65	3,89	3.69	3.56	3,90	.850
Managers treat all people with respect	3,61	3.59	3,76	3.76	3.56	3.70	.835
Managers show favoritism ^r	3,30	3,20	3,52	3.26	3.28	3.50	.794

Table 14 continued							
Managers deal honestly with employees	3.70	3,56	3,78	3,65	3.60	3.89	.744
Managers treat employees with dignity	3.85	3.77	3.92	3.85	3.72	4.1	.662
Whengver managers criticize they explain what is wrong	3,51	3,59	3.57	3.71	3,56	3.60	.877
Managers never treat employees like second- class citizens	3,49	3.37	3,28	3.54	3,24	3.90	.233
Managers show same consideration to all without prejudice or bias	3.51	3,44	3,63	3,42	3.40	3.60	.929
Decision Fairness							
Oppositunities to provide input for decisions	4.22	3.52	4.30	4.23	4.04	4.10	.777
Decinions are made in a timely fashion	3,34	3.63	3,36	3,42	3.24	3.40	.472
Control over guidelines	3,96	3.93	3.97	3.92	3,88	3.70	.869
I am provided opportunities to appeal or challenge decisions that affect me	3,86	3.89	3.97	4.14	3.80	3.80	.542
Oppostunities to voice my opinion in dispute at work	4.01	4.08	3.94	4.21	3.92	3.85	.301
I am encouraged to provide information that might help resolve a dispute	3,90	4.04	3.89	3.97	3,84	3.85	.886

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)
*Reverse scored

In regards to highest education level attained, significant differences (p<.05) were found between groups for the procedural justice item of "decisions are made in a timely fashion". Those with an associate degree (mean=4.05), those with some college (mean=3.66), those with a graduate degree (mean=3.40), and those with a 4-year degree agreed more strongly than those with a high school education (mean=3.00). Although a significant difference (p<.05) was found, only 6 respondents reported in the high school group. When grouped with those reporting some college and those reporting an associate degree no significant difference was found. Table 15 shows results for procedural justice items based on highest educational level attained.

Table 15

Procedural Justice Scores Based on Highest Education Level Attained

	High School	Some College	Associate Degree	4 year Degree	Graduate Degree	
Procedural Justice Items	(n=6)	(n=12)	(n=17)	(n=143)	(n=77)	р
Policy Fairness						
Policies are based on accurate information	3.66	4,00	4.05	3.79	3.74	.422
Policies serve intended purposes	3.00	3,83	3.70	3.73	3.67	.309
Rules apply the same to everyone	2,83	3,18	3,47	3.40	3,32	.736
Formal policies are fair	3,33	4.00	3,94	3.73	3,76	.392
Formal policies are applied the same	3.00	3.66	3,70	3,53	3.49	.630
Standards for measuring employee performance are clear	3,33	3,58	3,61	3.35	3.36	,817
Everyone is accountable to the rules	3.16	3,58	3,70	3,65	3,53	.714
Interpersonal Fairness						
Managers lie to employees ^r	3,16	3,41	3,29	3.72	3.98	.094
Managers treat all people with respect	3,66	3,66	3,88	3.63	3,66	.863
Managers show favoritism ^r	2.83	3,41	3,29	3,35	3.31	.858

Table 15 continued

Managers deal honestly with employees	3,33	3,58	3.81	3,73	3,63	.728
Managers treat employees with dignity	3,16	4.16	3,94	3.85	3.85	.173
Whenever managers criticize they explain what is wrong	3.50	3.91	3.82	3,53	3,58	, 354
Managers never treat employees like second- class citizens	3.50	3.72	3.70	3.41	3,45	.738
Managers show same consideration to all without prejudice or bias	3,00	3.41	3.58	3,55	3.44	.702
Decision Fairness						
Opportunities to provide input for decisions	3,66	3,08	3,47	4.13	4.33	.071
Decisions are made in a timely fashion	3,00	3,66	4,05	3,34	3.40	.014*
Control over guidelines	3,33	4.00	4.05	3,91	3.96	.437
I am provided opportunities to appeal or challenge decisions that affect me	3,66	3.83	4.23	3.81	4.09	.101
Opportunities to voice my opinion in dispute at work	3,50	3.83	4.17	4.00	4.12	.111
I am encouraged to provide information that might help resolve a dispute	3,50	3.90	4,17	3,93	3.92	.509

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

Reverse scored

^{*}p<.05

For the variable of degree status, significant differences (p<.05) were found between those reporting having a degree related to parks, recreation, or leisure service and those who do not on the procedural justice item of "managers lie to get employees to do what they want". Those possessing a degree related to parks, recreation or leisure service (mean=3.86) disagreed more strongly than those without a related degree (mean=3.42). Table 16 shows procedural justice results based on degree status.

Table 16

Procedural Justice Scores Based on Degree Status

	Related degree	Without related	
Procedural Justice Item	(n=186)	(n=56)	p
Policy Fairness			
Policies are based on accurate information	3.81	3.74	.506
Policies serve intended purposes	3.73	3.63	.388
Rules apply the same to everyone	3.38	3.32	.751
Formal policies are fair	3.80	3.62	.114
Formal policies are applied the same	3.58	3.37	.155
Standards for measuring employee performance are clear	3.38	3.38	.960
Everyone is accountable to the rules	3.60	3.72	.385
Interpersonal Fairness			
Managers lie to employees	3.86	3.42	.013*
Managers treat all people with respect	3.67	3.66	.896
Managers show favoritism ^f	3.37	3.18	.272
Managers deal honestly with employees	3.71	3.68	.834
Managers treat employees with dignity	3.87	3.81	.599
Whenever managers criticize they explain what is wrong	3.55	3.59	.766
Managers never treat employees like second-class citizens	3.44	3.55	.428
Managers show same consideration to all without prejudice or bias	3.49	3.59	.517

Table 16 continued

Decision Fairness			
Opportunities to provide input for decisions	4.22	4.20	.845
Decisions are made in a timely fashion	3.39	3.47	.534
Control over guidelines	3.93	3.91	.868
I am provided opportunities to appeal or challenge decisions that affect me	3.94	3.86	.528
Opportunities to voice my opinion in dispute at work	4.04	4.01	.750
I am encouraged to provide information that might help resolve a dispute	3.93	3.96	.797

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

Reverse scored

^{*}p<.05

For 20 of the 21 procedural justice items, males reported higher mean scores the only exception being for the item "managers explain what is wrong when they criticize". In regard to this item, males reported a lower mean score (3.59) than females (3.61). Significant differences (p<.05) were found for 10 of the 21 procedural justice items as shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Procedural Justice Scores Based on Gender

	Male	Female	
Procedural Justice Items	(n=174)	(n=78)	p
Policy Fairness			
Policies are based on accurate			
information	3.80	3.78	.818
Policies serve intended purposes	3.80	3.48	.006*
Rules apply the same to everyone	3.48	3.07	.007*
Formal policies are fair	3.82	3.60	.031*
Formal policies are applied the same	3.60	3.30	.025*
Standards for measuring employee			
performance are clear	3.47	3.20	.064
Everyone is accountable to the rules	3.72	3.29	.001+
Interpersonal Fairness			
Managers lie to employees ^r	3.81	3.65	.336
Managers treat all people with respect	3.74	3.46	.014*
Managers show favoritism ^r	3.39	3.17	.175
Managers deal honestly with employees	3.71	3.47	.014*
Managers treat employees with dignity	3.88	3.75	.242
Whenever managers criticize they explain			
what is wrong	3.56	3.61	.662
Managers never treat employees like second-class citizens	3.45	3.42	.882
Managers show same consideration to all			
without prejudice or bias	3.58	3.28	.034*
Decision Fairness			
Opportunities to provide input for			
decisions	4.28	4.02	.014*

Table 17 continued

Decisions are made in a timely fashion	3.42	3.37	.658
Control over guidelines	3.98	3.75	.039*
I am provided opportunities to appeal or challenge decisions that affect me	3.94	3.87	.519
Opportunity to voice my opinion in dispute at work	4.05	3.96	.290
I am encouraged to provide information that might help resolve a dispute	3.97	3.81	.165

⁽¹⁼strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree) Reverse scored

^{*}p<.05

Tables 18-20 show mean scores and significance levels (p<.05) for the three dimensions of procedural justice (policy fairness, interpersonal fairness, decision fairness) procedural justice given the variables of tenure, highest education level attained, degree status and gender following ANOVA testing. For the subscale policy fairness the only significant difference (p<.05) was found based on gender scores (p=.007). Males agreed more (mean=25.64) than did females (mean=23.75) with policy fairness overall (Table 18).

Mean Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice Dimension of Policy Fairness Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender

Demographic Variable	Mean	p
Tenure		
<5	25.11	
6-10	24.48	
11-15	25.44	
16-20	25.26	
21-25	24.26	
>26	25.05	.952
Total		
Highest Education Level Attained		
High School	22.33	
Some College	25.45	
Associate Degree	26.23	
College Graduate	25.14	
Graduate Degree	24.80	
Total	25.06	.576
Degree Status		
With Related Degree	25.23	
Without Related Degree	24.66	
Total	25.10	.452
Gender		
Male	25.64	
Female	23.75	
Total	25.04	.007*

^{*}p<.05

In regard to the interpersonal dimension of procedural justice, no significant differences were found among respondents based on tenure, highest education level attained or gender.

Mean Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice
Interpersonal Dimension Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education
Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender

Demographic Variable	Mean	p
Tenure		
<5	28.80	
6-10	28.44	
11-15	29.39	
16-20	29.02	
21-25	27.92	
>26	30.47	
Total	28.90	.729
Highest Education Level Attained		
High School	26.16	
Some College	30.09	
Associate Degree	29.62	
College Graduate	28.84	
Graduate Degree	28.98	
Total	28.92	.710
Degree Status		
With Related Degree	29.04	
Without Related Degree	28.58	
Total	28.93	.585
Gender		
Mala	20.20	
Male	29.29	
Female	27.94	005
Total	28.87	.085

For the dimension of decision fairness the only significant difference (p<.05) was found among the variable "group of highest education level attained". Those with a high school education level only agreed less regarding decision fairness (mean=20.66) than the other groups (Table 20).

Mean Scores and Significance Levels for Procedural Justice Dimension of Decision Fairness Composite Based on Tenure, Highest Education Level Attained, Degree Status and Gender

Demographic Variable	Mean	p
Tenure		
<5	23.30	
6-10	24.00	
11-15	23.34	
16-20	23.92	
21-25	22.72	
>26	22.70	
Total	23.44	.562
Highest Education Level Attained		
High School	20.66	
Some College	23.72	
Associate Degree	25.17	
College Graduate	23.14	
Graduate Degree	23.84	
Total	23.46	.046*
Degree Status		
With Related Degree	23.48	
Without Related Degree	23.44	
Total	23.47	.935
Gender		
Male	23.67	
Female	22.85	
Total	23.42	.096

Correlations

As a first step to determine if perceived procedural justice influences the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism, correlation procedures were utilized to detect relationships. If a relationship were found hierarchical regression would be employed to determine the predictability of loyal boosterism behaviors from perceived procedural justice. The results of the correlations show the three dimensions of procedural justice, (policy fairness, interpersonal fairness and decision fairness), were highly correlated to each other as expected since they are components of the overall procedural justice scale. All three dimensions of perceived procedural justice, policy fairness (r=.303), interpersonal fairness (r=.316) and decision fairness (r=.358) were significantly (p<.05) positively correlated to loyal boosterism. Decision fairness was the most highly correlated (r=.358) with loyal boosterism. Table 21 shows correlations between the dimensions of procedural justice and loyal boosterism.

Table 21

<u>Correlations Between Dimensions for Procedural Justice and Loyal</u>
Boosterism

Dimension	ion Policy Fairness			Loyal Boosterism
Policy Fairness				
Interpersonal Fairness	.809*			
Decision Fairness	.729*	.689*		
Loyal Boosterism	.303*	.316*	.358*	

^{*}p<.01

Regression Analyses

Since a significant correlation (p<.05) was found between the three dimensions of procedural justice and loyal boosterism, hierarchical regression analysis was employed to determine if perceived procedural justice would predict loyal boosterism behaviors. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test for the unique variance accounted for by the three dimensions of procedural justice and the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism because the hierarchical regression analysis procedure allows for the partitioning of the total variance accounted for in a dependent variable by a set of predictors (Schappe, 1998).

The variables of tenure, education level, degree status and gender were entered into the regression equation as a block as consistent with Schappe (1998) to be used as controls. There was no significant relationship (p>.05) between the control variables and loyal boosterism (Adjusted R^2 =.000, df=225, p>.05). This indicates that these variables do not contribute significantly to the prediction of loyal boosterism. This supports Podsakoff et al.'s (2000) report that no relationship exists between the demographic variable of years on the job (tenure) or gender to organizational citizenship behaviors. In the second equation block, the three dimensions of procedural justice; policy fairness, interpersonal fairness, and decision fairness were added to the first block entered. After the second block of variables were entered, perceived procedural justice became a significant predictor (Adjusted $R^2 = .191$, df = 222, p<.001) of loyal boosterism behaviors among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession as shown in Table 22 .

Table 22
Hierarchical Regression R Change Model Summary

Model	R	R²	Adjusted R ²	SEE	R ² Change	dfl	df2	Sig F Change
1 Control Variables	.130	.017	.000	2.22	.017	4	225	.424
2 Procedural Justice Dimensions	.465	.216	.191	2.00	.199	3	222	.000

Even though all three dimensions of procedural justice as a block of variables showed significance (p<.001) as seen in both Table 22 and Table 23 overall, it is actually decision fairness (p<.001) that most strongly predicts the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism as seen in Table 24. Neither the demographic variables, nor the procedural justice dimensions of interpersonal fairness (.088) or policy fairness (.338) showed significance (p>.05) individually within the second regression block. Table 23 shows the ANOVA table for both hierarchical regressions models. Model 1 (control variables model) shows no significant relationship (p>.05) of tenure, highest education level attained, degree status or gender to loyal boosterism. Model 2 (predictor variables model)

shows a positive significant (p<.001) relationship of procedural justice dimensions to loyal boosterism.

Table 23

ANOVA Table for Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results

		Sums of	d£	Mean	F	þ
Mode	5T	squares	Square			
1	Regression	19.243	4	4.811	.972	.424
	Residual	1113.731	225	4.950		
	Total	1132.974	229			
2	Regression	244.666	7	34.952	8.735	.000
	Residual	888.308	222	4.001		
	Total	1132.974	229			

^{*(}p<.001)

Table 24 is a summary of the hierarchical regression results. In model 1 (tenure, highest education level attained, degree status, gender) no significant predictor variable was found. In model 2 the only significant relationship was decision fairness (p<.001). However, interpersonal fairness (\square =.178) does contribute positively to the equation but policy fairness (\square =-.107) contributes negatively to the regression equation This accounts for the results listed in the ANOVA summary (Table 23) that shows model 2 as a significant predictor block.

Table 24

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results

Variable	В	SE B	β	t	Ď	r²
Model 1				19.66		
Tenure	004928	.018	019	281	.779	
Education Level	201000	.203	070	990	.323	
Related Degree Status	.465000	.370	.088	1.256	.210	
Gender	.015180	.324	.003	.047	.963	.017
Model 2				11.20		
Tenure	-0013080	.016	012	194	.846	
Highest Education Level Attained	202000	.184	070	-1.098	.273	
Related Degree Status	.506000	.334	.096	1.516	.131	
Gender	.186000	.296	.038	.630	.529	
Policy Fairness	.046740	.049	107	960	.338	
Interpersonal Fairness	.070030	.041	.178	1.714	.088	
Decision Fairness	.249000	.057	.391	4.377	.000*	.216

^{*}p<.001

To ensure that no assumptions were violated, scatter plots were produced to determine normality,

homoscedasticity and linearity. No assumptions were found to have been violated. To access multicollinearity a twostep process was employed. All variables with a condition index (the collinearity of combinations of variables in th data set) above 30 were identified. Second, the identified variables above the threshold were then inspected to determine if any had variance proportions above the .90 level. A collinearity problem is indicated when two or more coefficients have a proportion of variance .90 or above. No coefficients were found with a proportion of variance above .90.

Results Summary

This study was designed to measure the levels of loyal boosterism and perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession. Furthermore, this study was designed to determine the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism behavior among persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

Descriptive analysis determined high levels of loyal boosterism behaviors reported by persons employed in the parks, recreation or leisure services profession.

Significant differences were not found (p>.05) for loyal boosterism behavior among respondents based on demographic variables of tenure, highest education level attained, degree status, and gender. Significant differences (p<.05) were detected among respondents based on demographic

variables for some procedural justice items and dimensions. The perceived procedural justice dimension of policy fairness correlated positively and significantly with loyal boosterism. The perceived procedural justice dimension of interpersonal fairness correlated positively and significantly with loyal boosterism. The perceived procedural justice dimension of decision fairness correlated positively and significantly with loyal boosterism. Procedural justice, specifically the decision fairness dimension, was a significant predictor of the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to 1.) Determine levels of loyal boosterism and perceived procedural justice among persons employed in the parks, recreation, or leisure services profession, and 2.) Determine the influence of perceived procedural justice on loyal boosterism among persons employed in the parks, recreation, and leisure services profession. Results of this study support the possibility that parks, recreation or leisure professionals exhibit high levels of loyal boosterism activities regardless of any demographic or occupational variables. In regards to procedural justice, parks, recreation or leisure service professionals seem to perceive fairness differently based on some demographic and occupational variables. Women employed in the parks, recreation and leisure service profession seem to perceive less fair treatment, specifically in policy fairness, in the organization than men. It would appear from the results of this study that parks, recreation and leisure services agencies and organizations provide little opportunity for the employee to have input and "voice" as reflected in the decision fairness data. However, it would appear that

within parks, recreation and leisure services agencies and organizations levels of perceived interpersonal fairness are high. Levels of perceived policy fairness seem to be higher than decision fairness but lower than interpersonal fairness based on the results of this study.

Support was also found for a positive relationship between the organizational citizenship behavior of loval boosterism and each of the three dimensions of procedural justice (policy fairness, interpersonal fairness, decision fairness). This finding supports the work of Moorman (1991) and Organ (1988). It also appears from the results of the present study that decision fairness is the dimension that best predicts the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism among persons employed in the parks, recreation, or leisure services profession. This is consistent with the work of Organ and Ryan (1995). the results of this study, it would appear that persons employed in the parks, recreation, or leisure services profession value having input or "voice" within the organization and this in turn influences their citizenship behaviors even though policy fairness and interpersonal fairness both have influence on loyal boosterism. Therefore, perceived procedural justice can likely predict

the organizational citizenship behavior of loyal boosterism. This is also consistent with Organ's (1988) view that the decision to engage in citizenship behaviors, specifically loyal boosterism, is a function of the employee's perception of fairness. Furthermore, perceptions of fair treatment allow for a redefinition of the exchange between the organization and the employee from one of economic exchange to one of social exchange.

According to Moorman (1991), this is consistent with the Equity Theory where the employee my increase or decrease loyal boosterism activities as a reasonable adjustment to perceptions of equity.

Limitations

- Only a small number of parks, recreation or leisure service professionals were surveyed.
- 2. The sample came from various organizations and organizational structures within parks, recreation, and leisure service. Previous research dealt with single companies or industries.
- 3. The participants were asked to self-report on their loyal boosterism activities. Researchers are undecided as to the value of self-report data for organizational citizenship behavior scales.

Implications for Recreation

It is essential for directors, supervisors, site managers and human resource managers in parks, recreation and leisure services agencies to understand the nature of citizenship behaviors and how these behaviors contribute to the productivity and effectiveness of their organizations. The strongest implication of this study may be that by better understanding the employee's perception of fair treatment organizations, through policies, interpersonal interactions and decision processes, can positively influence employee citizenship behaviors. Directors, supervisors and managers can use this information to further the mission of the organization. This is especially important so that parks, recreation and leisure service organizations can operate efficiently to deliver services to a customer or participant. Often the mission of the organization is to enhance the quality of life for the community in which the organization is based through its products and services. Recently (Masterson, 1998), reported that the way in which an employer treats the employee as perceived by the employee impacts the level of service delivered to the customer. Therefore, understanding that justice perceptions within the parks,

recreation or leisure services profession influence employee organizational citizenship behaviors which in turn impacts the delivery of the service to the patron or participant is important to the success of the organization.

Directions for Future Research

Loyal boosterism is one of the least investigated dimensions of citizenship behavior. It would be of value to further explore loyal boosterism along with the remaining organizational citizenship behaviors among persons employed in the parks recreation and leisure services profession. Also, given that males and females working in parks, recreation or leisure services organizations seem to differ on perceptions of procedural justice in the current study further investigation based on gender is warranted. Additionally, future researchers should consider research designs that employ data collection methods other than self-report for the organizational citizenship behavior measures.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In

L. Berkowitz (Ed), Advances In Experimental Social

Psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Anderson, D. M. (2000). How do male and female public parks and recreation professionals' perceptions of equity affect their workplace attitudes? UMI Proquest Digital Dissertations, AAT9971013.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". The Academy of Management Journal, 26, 587-595.

Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: their influence on procedural fairness judgements. Academy of Management Journal, 32(3), 676-685.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations: 71-98. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. Human Performance, 10, 99-109.

Brockner, J., DeWitt, R. L., Grover, S., & Reed, T. (1990). When it is especially important to explain why: Factors affecting the relationship between managers' explanations of a layoff and survivors' reactions to the layoff. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26, 389-407.

Christoph, R. T., McLellan, R. W. & Stahl, M. J.

(1987). Comparison of decision-making behavior between prospective recreation and management personnel. <u>Journal</u> of Park and Recreation Administration, 5(2), 41-46.

Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. (1989). Referent cognition and task decision autonomy beyond equity theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 14(2), 293-300.

Cropanzano, R., & Randall, M. L. (1993). Injustice and work behavior: a historical review. In Russell Cropanzano (Ed.), <u>Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management</u>. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cunningham P. H. & Rollin, S. (1991). Dimensions of personality and vocational role preferences: a further examination of the status of women entering the leisure services profession. <u>Journal of Parks and Recreation</u>

Administration, 9(2), 17-24.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990).

Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. <u>Journal of</u>

Management, 16, 705-721.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational justice and human resource management. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 115-130.

George, J. M. (1992) The role of personality in organizational life: issues and evidence. Journal of Management, 18(2), 185-114.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organization spontaneity relationship. <u>Psychological</u>
Bulletin, 112, 310-329

George, J. M., & Jones, B. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. <u>Human Performance</u>, 10, 153-147.

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: an organizational justice perspective.

Academy of Management Review, 18(4), 694-735.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. <u>Journal of Applied</u> Psychology, 71(2), 340-343.

Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity and workplace status: a field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73(4), 606-614.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: the hidden cost of pay cuts.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(5), 561-568.

Greenberg, J. (1990b). Organizational Justice: yesterday, today and tomorrow. <u>Journal of Management</u>, 16(2), 399-433.

Greenberg, J. (1990c). Looking fair vs. being fair: managing impressions of organizational justice. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 111-157.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the Workplace: Approaching

Fairness in Human Resource Management. Hillsdale NJ:
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Holdnak II, A. Zoerink, D. A., & Adkins, K. D. (1995)

Personality styles of majors in recreation, parks and

leisure studies. The 1995 Leisure Research Symposium.

Howard, L. W. (2001). The scale of organizational justice (SOJ): A multi-level, comprehensive measure of perceived fairness in organizations. Paper presented at the national meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington, D. C., August.

Hunton, J. E., Hall, T. W., & Price, K. H. (1998).

The value of voice in participative decision making.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 788-798.

James, K. (1993). The social context of organizational justice: cultural, intergroup, and structural effects on justice behaviors and perceptions.

In R. Cropanzano, (Ed.), <u>Justice in the Workplace:</u>

Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management.

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kidder, D. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The good soldier: Who is (s)he? In D. P. Moore (Ed.), Academy of Management Best Papers Proceeding, 363-376.

Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on businesses organizations.

Journal of Management, 26(3), 489-529.

Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. <u>Journal of Applied</u> Psychology, 76(5), 698-707.

Konovsky, M., & Folger, R. (1991). The effects of procedures, social accounts, and benefits level on victims' layoff reactions. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 630-650.

Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17, 253-266.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. Academy of Management

Journal, 37, 656-669.

Korsgaard, A. M., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of

instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. <u>Journal of Management</u>, 59, 952-959.

Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980).

Beyond fairness: a theory of allocation preferences. In

G. Mikula (Ed.), <u>Justice and Social Interaction</u>. New York:

Springer-Verlag.

Masterson, S. (1998). A trickle down model of organizational justice: Relating employee and customer perceptions of and reactions to organizational fairness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(10), 3883.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1998). Does having a say matter only if you get your way? <u>Basic and Applied</u>
Psychology, 18, 289-303.

Moorman, R. (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. (1995).

Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. <u>Journal</u> of Organizational Behavior, 16, 127-142.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 41(3), 351-358.

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. Academy Management Journal, 37, 1543-1567.

Mowday, R. T (1985). Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. M. Steers and L. W. Porter (Eds.), Motivation and Work Behavior. New York: McGraw Hill.

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. P. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and citizenship behaviors. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 527-556.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.

Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. <u>Journal of Management</u>, 20, 465-478.

Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. The Journal of Social Psychology, 135(3), 339-350.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personal Psychology, 48(4), 775-802.

Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. (1992). Salary dispersion, location in the salary distribution, and turnover among college administrators. <u>Industrial and Labor Relations Review</u>, 45(4), 753-763.

Pfeffer, J., & Langton, N. (1993). The effect of wage dispersion on satisfaction, productivity, and working collaboratively: evidence from college and university faculty. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38(3), 382-407.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B.

(1997). Organizational citizenship behaviors and the quantity and quality of work group performance. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 82, 262-270.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994).

Organizational citizenship hehaviors and sales unit effectiveness. Journal of Marketing Research, 3(1), 351-363.

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), 513-553.

Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 72(4).

Shapiro, D. (1993). Reconciling Theoretical differences among procedural justice researchers by reevaluating what it means to have one's views "considered": Implications for third-party managers. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fariness in Human Resource Management. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. The Journal of Psychology, 132(3), 277-290.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983).

Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and

antecedents. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 68(4), 653-663.

Stouffer, S. A., Suchman, E. A., DeVinney, L. C., Star, S. A., & Williams, R. M., Jr. (1949). The American soldier: adjustment during army life. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice:
A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates.

Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: a test of the group-value model. <u>Journal of</u>
Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 830-838.

van den Bos, K., Wilke, H., & Lind, E. A. (1998).

When do we need procedural fairness? The role of trust in authority. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 1449-1458.

van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 37(4), 765-803.

van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996).

Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate

facets of contextual performance. <u>Journal of Applied</u>
Psychology, 81, 525-531.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Dorsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: an exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. Academy of Management Review, 23(3), 513-531.

Williams, S. (1999). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on performance. The Journal of Psychology, 133(2), 183-193.

[www.nrpa.org]

Zohar, D. (1995). The justice perspective of job stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16, 487-495.

APPENDICIES

- APPENDIX A Internal Review Board Approval Letter

Department of Management and Marketing



P.O. Box 75 Middle Tennessee State University Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37132 Phone: (615) 898-2736 FAX: (615) 898-5308

TO: Beverly M. Evans

FROM: Jill Austin (Luc)

SUBJECT: "Influence of Perceived Procedural Justice on Citizenship Behaviors of

Selected Parks, Recreation, and Leisure Service Employees" (Protocol #:

01-215)

DATE: May 23, 2001

The project for a survey of 500 members of the National Park and Recreation Association has been reviewed and approved. This approval is for one year only and must be reviewed by the committee on an annual basis if the project continues beyond the next twelve months. Any changes in the protocol (materials, design, etc.) requires resubmission of your project for committee approval.

Good luck on the successful completion of your project.

c: Dr. Peter Cunningham



College of Business

A Tennessee Board of Regents Institution

MTSU is an equal opportunity, non-racially identifiable, educational institution that does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities

Thank	you for your participation. Please respond to the following questions as honestly as possible.				•	
	- Jones Jones beneather come readhors on the committee describer up to committee					
1.	To which NRPA branch do you belong? APRSNPRS					
2.	How many years have you worked in recreation?					
3.	How many years with current employer?					
4.	Does your job involve duties that include leading activities for your patrons? YesNo					
5. H	Education Level igh school Some college Associate Degree 4 Year degree Graduate	Degre	æ			
6.	If you have a degree is it related to the Parks, Recreation, or Leisure Service? YesNo					
7.	My current position requires primarily-administrative duties programming duties equal	amou	ınt o	f eac	h_	
8.	Please indicate your gender. Male Female					
Reme	e indicate your level of agreement by circling the response that most closely matches your opinion. The mber your participation is completely voluntary and your answers are completely anonymous. The may stop at any time.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
ι.	. I go out of my way to help coworkers with work-related problems	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	I voluntarily help new employees settle into the job	SD	D	N	A	SA
3	. I frequently adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employee's requests for time-off	SD	D	N	A	SA
4	. I go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group	SD	D	N	Α	SA
5	I show genuine concern toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations	SD	D	N	A	SA
6	i. For issues that may have serious consequences, I express opinions honestly even when others may disagree	SD	D	N	Α	SA
7	7. I often motivate others to express their ideas and opinions	SD	D	N	A	SA
8	3. I encourage others to try new and more effective ways of doing their job	SD	D	N	A	SA
ç	9. I encourage hesitant or quite co-workers to voice their opinions when they otherwise might not speak-up	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	10. I frequently communicate to co-workers suggestions on how the group can improve	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	11. I rarely miss work even when I have a legitimate reason for doing so	SD	D	N	A	SA
:	12. I perform my duties with unusually few errors	SD	D	N	A	SA
	13. I perform job duties with extra special care	SD	D	N	A	SA
	14. I always meet or beat deadlines for completing work	SD	D	N	A	SA

15.	I defend the organization when other employees criticize it	SD	D	N	A	SA
16.	I encourage friends and family to utilize the organization's product	SD	D	N	A	SA
17.	I defend the organization when outsiders criticize it	SD	D	N	A	SA
18.	I show pride when I represent the organization in public	SD	D	N	Α	SA
19.	I actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users	SD	D	N	Α	SA
20.	I Consider attending professional development opportunities a fringe benefit of my employment	SD	D	N	Α	SA
	Over					
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agrec	Strongly Agree
21.	I feel that the present attention being given to professional training by my agency is adequate	SD	D	N	A	SA
22.	I equate the amount of professional development funds invested in me to be an indication of my worth either to the organization or my supervisor	SD	D	N	A	SA
23.	I consider the amount of professional development and training provided to the employees a measure of the quality of my Parks and Recreation Dept.	SD	D	N	A	SA
In your	organization					
24.	Managers in this organization treat all people with respect	SD	D	N	A	SA
25.	Managers in this organization deal honestly with employees	SD	D	N	A	SA
26.	The performance appraisal system at my organization is fair	SD	D	N	A	SA
27	I have opportunities to provide input for decisions that affect me at work	SD	D	N	A	SA
28	Policies in this organization serve their intended purposes	SD	D	N	A	SA
29	. Managers here will lie to employees to get them to do what the managers want	SD	D	N	A	SA
30	. Decisions that affect me at work are made in a timely fashion	SD	D	N	A	SA
31	. Rules in this organization apply the same to everybody who works here	SD	D	N	A	SA
32	Managers in this organization show favoritism to certain employees	SD	D	N	A	SA
33	I have some control over guidelines used to make decisions that affect me at work	SD	D	N	A	SA
34	Formal policies in this organization are fair to everyone	SD	D	N	A	SA

35. 1	Policies in this organization are based on accurate information	SD	D	N	A	SA
36. 3	Managers in this organization treat employees with dignity	SD	D	N	A	SA
37.	I am provided opportunities to appeal or challenge decisions that affect me	SD	D	N	A	SA
38.	Formal policies are applied here the same from one time to the next	SD	D	N	A	SA
39.	Standards for measuring employee performance are clear	SD	D	N	A	SA
40.	Whenever managers here criticize an employee's work, they explain what is wrong	SD	D	N	A	SA
41.	I get the chance to voice my opinion in a dispute that involves me at work	SD	D	N	A	SA
42.	Everyone is held accountable to the rules here	SD	D	N	A	SA
43.	Managers here never treat employees like second-class citizens	SD	D	N	A	SA
44.	If I have information that might help resolve a dispute, I am encouraged to provide it	SD	D	N	A	SA
45.	Managers here show the same consideration to all employees without prejudice or bias	SD	D	N	A	SA
46.	Managers use training dollars as rewards for good employees	SD	D	N	A	SA
47.	Managers and/or supervisors actively promote professional affiliation and involvement of the employees	SD	D	N	A	SA
48.	Training and professional development is a high priority	SD	D	N	A	SA

Thank You!