

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects

Graduate School

Summer 2021

Calibration of the Severity of Rule Violations and Punishments in Team Disciplinary Decisions

Grant Boyd Mowrer

Western Kentucky University, grant.mowrer86@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mowrer, Grant Boyd, "Calibration of the Severity of Rule Violations and Punishments in Team Disciplinary Decisions" (2021). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 3512.

<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/3512>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

CALIBRATION OF THE SEVERITY OF RULE VIOLATIONS AND
PUNISHMENTS IN TEAM DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychological Sciences
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

By
Grant Boyd Mowrer

August 2021

CALIBRATION OF THE SEVERITY OF RULE VIOLATIONS AND
PUNISHMENTS IN TEAM DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS

Date recommended June 16, 2021

Elizabeth Shoenfelt Digitally signed by Elizabeth Shoenfelt
Date: 2021.06.16 14:16:10 -05'00'

Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt, Ph.D., Director of Thesis

Reagan Brown Digitally signed by Reagan Brown
Date: 2021.06.16 10:35:03 -05'00'

Reagan D. Brown, Ph.D.

Andrew Mienaltowski Digitally signed by Andrew Mienaltowski
DN: cn=Andrew Mienaltowski, o=Western Kentucky University,
ou=Psychological Sciences, email=drmski@wku.edu, c=US
Date: 2021.06.16 09:46:56 -05'00'

Andrew Mienaltowski, Ph.D.



Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	20
Results.....	23
Discussion.....	32
References.....	39
Appendix A.....	44
Appendix B.....	48
Appendix C.....	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Athlete and Coach Ratings of Rule Violation Severity	24
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations of Athlete and Coach Ratings of Punishment Severity.....	25
Table 3: Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Athlete Severity Ratings of Rule Violations.....	27
Table 4: Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Coach Severity Ratings of Rule Violations.....	29
Table 5: Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Athlete Severity Ratings of Punishments.....	31
Table 6: Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Coach Severity Ratings of Punishments.....	32

CALIBRATION OF THE SEVERITY OF RULE VIOLATIONS AND PUNISHMENTS IN TEAM DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS

Grant Boyd Mowrer

August 2021

52 Pages

Directed by: Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt, Reagan Brown, and Andrew Mienaltowski

Department of Psychological Sciences

Western Kentucky University

In this study I investigated perceptions of the severity of rule violations and punishments to calibrate these events for use in research on sport team disciplinary decisions. Data were collected from 62 athletes and 12 coaches who rated the severity of violations and punishments. Comparisons were made between the athlete and coach ratings for both violations and punishments. The results showed that there is a high degree of agreement between the coaches and athletes in their rating the severity of violations and punishments. Ratings in this study were compared with the results of a previous study conducted almost two decades ago (Specht, 2000). Current ratings of severity for violations and punishments by both athletes and coaches were highly correlated with the ratings from 2000. Most of the meaningful differences for athletes and coaches in the comparison with Specht's results and the current study was a trend downward, meaning that they perceived the violations and punishments to be less severe than they were rated in 2000. Implications for practice and for future research are discussed.

Calibration of the Severity of Rule Violations and Punishments in Team Disciplinary Decisions

The study of discipline in organizations has received considerable attention (Arvey & Ivancevich 1980; Greenberg, 1990). The study of discipline in sports teams has received substantially less attention (e.g., Jordan, Gillentine & Hunt, 2004). The current research addresses the latter. One method for studying disciplinary actions in sport teams is with the use of vignettes/scenarios where research participants are asked to read a vignette and respond to questions posed by the researcher about the scenario in the vignette. To help ensure external validity of this type of study, it is critical that the scenario depicted in the vignette is realistic (i.e., misbehavior and punishment that actually occur in the real world) and that the scenario presents disciplinary situations that correctly operationalize both the misbehavior and the punishment in terms of the severity of these actions. The current study addresses these concerns by calibrating the severity of examples of misconduct (operationalized as the violation of a team rule) and potential disciplinary actions that were identified by intercollegiate coaches and athletes. The results of this study provide a pool of realistic misconduct actions and disciplinary actions with an empirically established level of severity for use in future research.

In 2000, Specht conducted a study entitled “Distributive Justice and Perceptions of Fairness in Team Sports.” Specht used the vignette method referenced above for her study. She collected examples of team rule violations and punishments from intercollegiate athletes and coaches and then had other

coaches and athletes rate the severity of the examples to determine empirically the level of severity represented by each example. Specht then created vignettes representing low, moderate, and severe levels of rule violations and punishments. The length of time that has passed since Specht's study suggest that the calibrations in her study merit reexamination as perceptions of severity of the actions may have changed over time. In this study, rating data collected from intercollegiate coaches and athletes were used to determine the stability over time of the perceptions of severity of misbehavior actions and disciplinary actions and to provide a current pool of calibrated rule violations and punishments.

In this paper, I begin by defining punishment/discipline. Because perceptions of fairness are important in the effectiveness of punishment in organizational settings, I briefly review the key concepts in organizational justice theory. For the purposes of this study, I focus on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and the roles that they play. Next a review of the perceptions of fairness of punishment in organizations is examined focusing on important topics such as punishment severity, individual differences in justice cognition, and observer's perceptions of justice. This will be followed by similar application of justice within sports teams, although there is limited research in this arena. Finally, I present an overview of the current study before presenting the method and results of this study.

Punishment and Discipline in Organizations

Kazdin (2012) defined punishment (or discipline) as "the presentation of an aversive event or removal of a positive event contingent on a response that

decreases the probability or likelihood of the response.” (p. 624). Thereby, the purpose of discipline is, in its simplest form, to foment change, specifically to reduce of end behavior. The implementation of unpleasant consequences in a work environment does not necessarily equate to punishment; punishment must be in response to a specific behavior and to have the desired result of the punishment decreasing the likelihood of that behavior in the future. Furthermore, perceptions of whether an unpleasant outcome is a punishment is dependent the individual being trained by the introduction of consequences.

Some of B.F. Skinner’s early work in behaviorism shifted corrective methods away from punishment toward positive reinforcement to foster the same desired shift in behavior, but more recent studies have highlighted the effectiveness of punishment as a means of achieving a change in behavior (Pinder, 2008). According to Trevino (1992), people have the expectation that individuals who violate rules and norms deserve unpleasant consequences and punishment. These punishments exist so that standards of behavior are enforced within a given context (society, work, school, teams, etc.). Butterfield, Trevino, Wade, and Ball (2005) even went so far as to say that “punishment remains an important aspect of virtually all managers’ jobs” (p. 363).

Punishment is a managerial strategy widely used to influence behavior. Although there have been contradictory findings in organizational studies which have found positive, negative, and non-significant relationships between punishment and job performance or satisfaction, it is still the primary way by which violations are sanctioned because it has been proven to change behavior

(Shoenfelt & Bucur, 2002). Punishment often carries a less than favorable connotation in the literature because it frequently leads to unpleasant outcomes; however, because leaders do utilize punishment in reality, it is therefore necessary to understand how to utilize it for the most constructive outcome possible, focusing on minimizing adverse emotional reactions to the punishment and increasing the perception of appropriate justice (Ball, Trevino & Sims, 1992). And, when discipline is perceived by the violator as fair, unpleasant outcomes tied to the discipline are exceedingly rare. This led Atwater, Waldman, Carey, and Cartier (2001) to conclude that, “when discipline events are seen as fair, rarely do negative attitudes accompany the event, and some positive outcomes can even occur when discipline events are seen as unfair” (p. 264).

Perceptions concerning a disciplinary decision, either by recipients of the discipline or by observers of the discipline, can affect the extent to which punishment can effectively be used to change behavior (Ball, et al.; 1992, 1994). A punished individual's likelihood of changing their behavior in the future following a sanction can, to a large extent, be determined by the perception that they were treated fairly (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974). Accordingly, I next address perceptions of fairness as framed by organizational justice theory.

Organizational Justice Theory. The exchange of and perceptions of fairness between an organization and its employees is not simply a matter of equity, although Adam's (1963) research on equity theory was among the first to address organizational justice. For example, an individual may have the perception that he or she is underpaid for the effort exerted or for the expertise

he or she brings to the role. According to Adams, inequity is perceived when a comparison is made by the person to the referent other and the person perceives that their input/outcome ratio is less desirable than that of the comparison other. This model can be extended, for the purposes of this study, to perceptions of fairness with the context of punishment. Traditionally, punishment has been used by leaders as the presentation of unpleasant consequences for undesired behaviors to reduce or eliminate them. In other words, subordinates obey the rules because they want to avoid the punishment (Ball, et al., 1992).

Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng (2001) conducted a meta-analysis covering 25 years of research in organizational justice. They noted that justice in organizational settings is typically described by examining the “antecedents and consequences of the two types of subjective perceptions: (a) the fairness of outcome distributions or allocations and (b) the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcome distributions or allocations.” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 425). The distinction between these two concepts, better known as distributive and procedural justice, respectively, can be simplified as what one gets and the procedure by which one gets it. Managers view procedural and distributive justice as equally important and distinct, whereas subordinates are primarily focused on distributive justice and the outcomes that result from discipline. Managers think about different things than subordinates do when considering punishment procedures and punishment outcomes (Butterfield et al., 2005), and each of these concepts of justice is impacted by a subordinate’s perception of fairness.

Distributive Justice. An individual judging distributive justice is assessing the fairness of distributions of resources between parties to a social exchange as he or she perceives it. According to this concept, people perceive distributions of outcomes (e.g., pay) to be fair to the extent that said outcomes are proportionate relative to job contributions (Greenberg, 2009). Note that distributive justice is essentially the same construct as Adam's (1863) equity construct. Justice perceptions subsequently impact other attitudes and behaviors related to performance. If individuals believe they are being treated fairly with respect to how organizational rewards and punishments are distributed, they will be more likely to have positive attitudes about their work, the results of their work, their supervisors, and they will be more accepting of decisions that result in unpleasant outcomes.

Procedural Justice. According to Greenberg, (2009) influenced by Leventhal's (1980) critique, the focus on distributive justice was supplemented in the 1980s by attention to procedural justice. The concept of procedural justice was originally introduced into the literature by Thibaut and Walker in 1975 (Colquitt et al., 2001) and has been defined as "the perceived fairness in the decision-making process" (Bies & Shapiro, 1988, p. 676).

Individuals are more likely to be receptive to punishment when the decision making that leads to the punishment seems fair. Bies and Shapiro (1988) focused on what they called "voice" and "mute" procedures in decision-making processes. Voice procedures were ones in which subordinates had the opportunity to give feedback, whereas mute procedures were ones in which

they did not. When subordinates are involved in the decision-making process, they rate procedural justice as significantly higher than when they are not, even when the resulting decision is unfavorable to them. Additionally, they found that when a justification is given by a leader concerning the punishment, the perception of procedural justice by the subordinate is higher than when a justification is not included. The justification provides a clearer understanding of the decision-making process and the resultant punishment that resulted from a violation (Bies & Shapiro, 1988).

Colquitt, Noe, and Jackson (2002) extended the research concerning procedural justice by testing to verify if the same dimensions carried through from the individual to the team environment, as much of the research done prior to this study had only focused on the individual's perception of fairness. They noted that an individual's perception of fairness was often mediated by their social group, and over time lead to similar justice perceptions within the larger group. Justice climate at the organization, or team level, has two different components. Climate level is defined by the overall attitude of the group and climate strength is a measure of the variance between members of the group, or more simply, the strength or weakness of the overall attitude and how much agreement exists within the group.

Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis further underscored the impact procedural justice has not only on perceptions of fairness or constructive outcomes for individuals disciplined, but possibly more importantly for

organizations or teams attempting to foster a high-performance environment.

When procedural justice becomes an important part of culture, everyone wins.

Interactional Justice. Following distributive and procedural justice, a third dimension was introduced by Bies and Moag (1986) in their concept of interactional justice. Here, an individual's perception of fairness considers the way that outcomes and procedures are communicated. According to Greer and Labig (1987), both interactional and distributive justice play an important role in perceptions of fairness. Bies and Moag (1986) further divided interactional justice into informational justice and interpersonal justice. According to informational justice, people may feel they are treated fairly when procedures are adequately explained with sufficient details and explanations, whereas under interpersonal justice, they may feel treated fairly when they are treated with adequate levels of dignity or respect. Colquitt et al. (2001) in their meta-analysis found interpersonal justice and informational justice to be correlated, but not to the extent to which they believed that both should be considered the same construct under interactional justice. When considered by themselves, interpersonal and informational justice explained a significant increment in the variance of perceptions of justice. However, when compared to procedural justice their impact on the variance was small.

Retributive Justice. Skarlicki, Ellard, and Kelln (1998) introduced a fourth justice dimension which is retributive justice. This is the idea that, following perceived unfairness in distributive or procedural justice, observers will act against the leader, organization, coach, etc. that introduced a sanction. This

further highlights the importance of best practices when it comes to punishment. The introduction of sanctions can have long-reaching impact on a team's overall perception of the fairness of their leadership, which can lead to the continuance of unwanted behaviors and attitudes.

Each distinct dimension of perceived justice comprises what is referred to as organizational justice, yet each dimension offers a different answer to the question, "What's fair?" (Greenberg, 2009). Although it is impactful for research to carefully consider each of those perspectives, the pervasive theme is that the concept of fairness is a crucial consideration in any effective discipline strategy for an organization or leader. As Colquitt et al. (2001) determined, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice all distinctly contribute to perceptions of fairness, and overall perceptions of fairness regarding procedural justice can be linked to job-satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior and even job performance.

Perceptions of Fairness of Punishment in Organizations

Punishment Severity. Trevino (1992) indicated severity is a key component to consider when it comes to punishment as a deterrent in organizations and that the more severe the punishment, the more likely that it will prevent the behavior in the future. The punished individual considers the risk/reward of the situation. For the punishment to be effective, it must be severe enough to deter from the potential reward and adequately harsh (Ball, et al., 1992). Ball, et al. (1994) however, found that the severity of punishment was negatively related to subsequent performance. In other words, harsher

punishments were less effective at altering behaviors. Bennett (1998) importantly found that inconsistent punishments resulted in decreased perceptions of fairness and increased anger. Anger is an impactful component that appears to be understudied.

Like Trevino, Bennett (1998) found that the severity of punishment did decrease the likelihood of undesirable behavior in the future, but also noted that increased severity resulted in increased anger. There would appear, therefore, to be a careful balance between the severity of punishment, the incentive for behavior change, and the anger that may proceed from punishment. This anger should be controlled by high levels of procedural justice with consistently applied punishment. For the best outcomes, punishment should be applied consistently to individuals throughout the organization, making sure not to rely on personal biases that would skew the severity of punishment (Ball et al., 1992). Disciplinary action is more effective when the subordinate perceives it as consistent with what others received and as matching the severity of the infraction (Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball 1996).

Liden, Wayne, Sparrowe, Kraimer, Judge, and Franz (1999) examined differences in punishment severity among managers, individuals, and group consensus decisions. They found that managers and group consensus decisions were more severe than individual decisions. Decision maker attributions are also important in determining the severity of punishment decisions. When internal attributions are made for behavior, the responsibility for that behavior is placed upon the violator and therefore the punishment decision is more severe than

when an external attribution is made, meaning that responsibility rests outside of the individual violator in some way leading to a less severe punishment.

According to Boise (1964), the chosen disciplinary action taken by supervisors was dependent on the value of those employees, with one example being that employees whose skills were in short demand were not punished as frequently or as severely. Rosen and Jerdee (1974) found that participants believed that violations that result in more severe consequences (e.g., illegal use of a company car resulting in a major, rather than a minor, car accident) should result in more severe sanctions. They also found the reverse to be true, meaning that violations that result in low organizational harm did not deserve as severe punishment. They perceived this equality of violation consequences to sanctions as being fairly and justly applied.

Liden et al.'s (1999) research also supports Rosen and Jerdee's findings (1974) that managers punish more severely when a violation results in high outcome seriousness than they do when it results in low outcome seriousness. They also found this to be the case not only in managers, but also in group members and individuals. An employee's value to the organization was also found to significantly affect the way in which disciplinary actions were recommended, finding that individuals of low value were punished more harshly than individuals of high value for the same violation. Participants also rated the low value individuals as bearing more responsibility for their actions and the violations themselves were perceived as more severe than for the high value individuals. It is important to note that the results found by both Boise (1964) and

Rosen and Jerdee (1974) provide information on how leaders, coaches, supervisors etc. may be more likely to act, not what best practices are for fostering an environment with positive justice perceptions. This approach to discipline stands in contrast to most of the research cited previously, which suggests that discipline be implemented consistently to promote perceptions of justice and fairness, regardless of performance or value.

Individual Differences in Justice Cognition. Ball et al. (1992) proposed that “subordinate reaction to punishment situations suggests that justice cognitions and affect play an important role in the leader’s effective use of punishment,” (p. 326) meaning that punishment will not have the same level of effectiveness for all subordinates and therefore will depend on the subordinate’s perception of fairness. A subordinate’s perception of bias can have a significant impact on their view that punishment has been procedurally fair (Bies & Shapiro, 1988). The severity of punishment should therefore be consistent with what subordinates have previously been able to see when others have committed similar violations (Ball et al., 1992). This consistency is a key determinant in whether the punishment will be perceived as fair. If the outcomes received are of a similar severity to what can be observed for others, then the punished outcome is perceived as fair (Trevino, 1992). This can be especially important when considered in the context of a team environment where these social comparisons can be easily made (Colquitt et al., 2002). It is also important that punishment be delivered privately and in a timely manner (Ball et al., 1992).

The punishment that occurs does not exist in a time-space bubble. The dynamic that exists between a specific leader and a subordinate can impact the perception of fairness of a punishment; or in other words, subordinates who have a good relationship with their leader will have less of a negative emotional reaction when punishment is used. Punishment can thus be used to reduce unwanted behavior to make it possible to then reward desired behavior when there is less of a negative emotional reaction to the justice outcome. On the other hand, even when procedures are followed consistently and punishment is delivered appropriately, the subordinate may be more likely to have a negative emotional reaction to the justice outcome if there is a prior negative relationship with the leader (Ball et al., 1992). The disciplined party, as well as observers of the punishment, can see the benefits of the discipline; however, if the punishment is perceived as unfair, respect can be lost for the discipliner and the punishment can produce unfavorable organizational attitudes (Niehoff, Paul, & Bunch, 1998).

Observer's Perceptions of Justice. Butterfield et al. (2005) found that managers may not be considering observers' perceptions of fairness in punishment as much as they should be, given that third party observers work through and understand the punishment event for themselves. This finding also suggests that supervisors are not as concerned with other members of the team as they are with the individual being disciplined when carrying out the punishment.

However, Butterfield et al. (1996) also found that supervisors are aware that punishment has effects that go beyond the punished violator to other members of the organization. Supervisors view punishment as an opportunity to promote learning by delivering a message to all subordinates that certain behaviors will not be tolerated. The reactions of subordinates to punishment in the workplace have been shown to be related to justice perceptions. Furthermore, observers' reactions to disciplinary decisions can vary, both positively and negatively, based on perceptions of fairness in the procedure and the outcome of punishment (Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980).

Atwater et al. (2001) also addressed the important idea that discipline can have a significant impact on those who observe it in their teammates. Many observers report being able to learn from observing the discipline of others, even when they find the discipline to be unfair. They can learn how to behave so as not to be punished themselves, an increased awareness of their own actions, and even learn what not to do should they ever be in a management position responsible for behavior change.

Violations that do not result in discipline, even if they result in little to no harm, may give team members the impression that those violations, and possibly others, are tolerated by the organization (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974). This once again highlights the overarching theme in the justice literature that demonstrates that discipline should be applied consistently across all members of the organization.

Justice in Sports Teams

There is a close link between business and another important performance-based domain – sports teams. Excellence in business and high performance in sports are closely related in a variety of different dimensions including leadership, coaching, mental skills, performance routines, motivation, stress, mental toughness, and positive self-talk. There is robust crossover in the link between sports and business, and research in this area is increasing (Fletcher, 2010).

According to Mahony, Hums, Andrew, and Dittmore (2010), the research into organizational justice in the context of sports teams has “evolved” over the last fifteen years. They stated that much of the research that has been done concerns distributive justice in relation to perceptions of fairness, equality, and need. The shift also has been made from organizations to collegiate-level sports, and even to professional athletes concerning procedural and interactional justice and how those dynamics affect outcomes. It is of primary importance that a coaching relationship be built on a firm foundation of trust and mutual respect, on both of which discipline can play an important role (Fletcher, 2010).

Shoenfelt and Bucur (2002) found that it is a subordinate’s justice cognitions in response to punishment that impact how effectively punishment can be used to change behavior. They explain that “punishment can be effective in achieving change in behavior, and that subordinates react more positively to punishment that is perceived to be fair” (p. 2). This is an important consideration when discipline needs to be used on different members of a team. Often team

members have different roles, functions, skill, or performance level. Punishment consistently applied with no special treatment for the star athlete was perceived as fairer to both the punished athlete and to teammates. Making an exception to a team rule to spare a star player was perceived as less likely to deter future misconduct by that athlete or by other teammates in the future, as well as being perceived as less fair to both the punished athlete and to teammates. For punishment to effectively serve as a deterrent, it must be consistently applied across team members.

Shoenfelt and Bucur (2002) also found that severe punishment would act as a greater deterrent to future misconduct than would moderate punishment. The perception of fairness is therefore applied to both the consistency of the punishment and the appropriate severity of punishment given the violation (Trevino, 1992). The effectiveness in deterring future misconduct for moderate violations occurred when moderate or severe punishments were implemented. When a severe rule violation occurred, severe punishments were the most effective at deterring future misconduct (Shoenfelt & Bucor, 2002). The severity of the punishment should match the severity of the violation. In other words, for punishment to effectively work as a deterrent for future misconduct, it needs to be at least as severe as the rule that was violated.

Anshel (1990) recognized both positive and negative leaders within a team construct and the distinct roles that they each play within the team environment. Due to the behavior of negative team leaders, they are likely to be punished, and that can impact the rest of the team given their position of

influence within it. It is also possible for negative leaders to influence the rest of the team to engage in negative behaviors as well. It is therefore critical, if the coach is able, to correct their behaviors, and to even transform the said “negative leader” into a “positive leader” that can help the team. The conversation about the individual’s negative behavior should be done privately, quietly, and quickly. Anselm made the important point that, even though punishment may occur, the punished individual should still have the opportunity to make changes to his or her behavior, with the understanding that further violations will result in further, and possibly more severe, sanctions. By setting behavioral expectations with violation-driven sanctions early with individuals, it allows them to take responsibility for their actions.

In order to increase team cohesion, Anselm (1990) noted that discipline should be consistent across all team members, and that this should include standout or star players. Status should not lead to any difference of treatment regarding behavior expectations or sanctions. This increase in team cohesion is associated with an increase in player satisfaction, but not always with increased team performance, although Fletcher (2010) made the point that high levels of cohesion aid in effective communication which can lead to increases in performance. Connected to this, it is important to note that procedural justice has been found to be positively related to performance (Colquitt et al. 2001)

Colquitt (2004) found that when considering procedural justice within teams, an individual’s own perceptions of justice had a more positive effect when the other team members also had high perceptions of procedural justice. This

underscores the importance of cohesive levels of procedural justice perceptions in a team and its potential concomitant increase in role performance. This dynamic echoes the findings of Colquitt et al. (2002) regarding climate. The recognition and observation of the perceptions of procedural justice fairness was a key finding in Colquitt (2004) in which team members made social comparisons and their own subsequent justice perceptions were modified by the consistency of procedural justice within the team. This interaction between own and others' justice perceptions was linked to role performance, procedural fairness perceptions, and cooperation (Colquitt, 2004).

Coaches cannot simply use sanctions to change behavior in a vacuum consisting of only the violator. They need to be aware that justice perceptions move beyond the sanctioned individual. Colquitt (2004) concluded that, "some differences in treatment may be inevitable within teams, particularly in cases in which differences in function, status, or skill sets dictate differences..." (p. 643). From this he determined that discipline should be carried out consistently regardless of those differences.

Phillips, Douthitt, and Hyland (2001) found that performance can impact justice perceptions. When a team performed well the favorable affect that they experienced was independent of a leader's behavior towards them. On the other hand, when a team performed poorly, they perceived low justice even if the leader was favorable to them. Team members do factor in fairness when considering their overall satisfaction with a leader, but "the degree to which a team member's input is reflected in the team's final decision, the consideration

behavior of the leader in the decision-making and communication process...of the team are each independently related to increased perceptions of fairness” (Phillips, et al., 2001 p. 322).

In summary, the research into justice has evolved and has been refined for close to sixty years now. When individuals engage in a communal activity together, whether that is in an organization, athletic team or even society, there is an understanding that certain personal liberties are given up. In order to play a sport, engage in business or be an upstanding citizen you must adhere to the rules of the game. And being the member engaging in that communal activity consists of having behavioral expectations and following the rules of that team (Fraleigh, 2003). Breaking those rules results in consequences which often take the form of punishment. And the perceptions of severity that punishment entails vary from person to person. This study examined perceptions of the severity of violations and punishments in the context of team disciplinary decisions.

Current Study

The current study reexamines the perceptions of intercollegiate athletes and coaches of the severity of team rule violations and punishments identified and initially calibrated by Specht (2000). These violations and punishments were identified for use in research studying perceptions of fairness in sport team disciplinary settings. Two decades have passed since Specht’s calibration study. Accordingly, it is of interest to examine the stability over time of these ratings and to ensure that the violations and punishments used in research are appropriately

calibrated for the current time. Intercollegiate athletes and coaches were asked to rate the severity of a list of team rule violations and punishments.

Consistent with the objective of this study, no hypotheses were offered. Rather, analyses were conducted to identify the current level of perceived severity of each of the rule violations and punishments. Differences in perceptions between athletes and coaches were explored as were differences between the ratings in Specht's study (i.e., Study 1, 2000) and the current study (i.e., Study 2).

Method

Participants

Data were collected from 62 athletes and 12 coaches at a large, public university in the southeastern United States. The mean age of the athletes was 19.52 years ($SD = 1.25$) and of the coaches was 38.36 years ($SD = 8.72$). All athlete participants were female; for coaches, 58.3% were female and 41.7% were male. Athletes and coaches, respectively, represented the sports of soccer (37.1%, 16.7%), softball (29.0%, 25%), volleyball (14.5%, 25%) and basketball (19.4%, 33.3%). Ethnicity of athletes was 75.8% White, 17.7% Black American, and 4.8% Other. Ethnicity of coaches was 75% White, 14.3% Black American, and 2.5% Hispanic. Athletes had a mean of 2.03 years ($SD = 1.01$) of experience at the intercollegiate level; coaches had a mean of 12.79 years ($SD = 7.73$) experience at the intercollegiate level.

In Specht's (2000) stimulus-rating study she collected data from 28 intercollegiate athletes and eight intercollegiate coaches at two universities and

39 additional undergraduate students from a third university. Only the results for the intercollegiate athletes and coaches were used in the current study. Because Specht reported demographics for all athletes and coaches in aggregate, we cannot determine the demographics for the intercollegiate athletes and coaches in her study.

Instrument

An instrument was developed to collect the ratings data. First, the list of rule violations and punishments from the Specht (2000) study were reviewed by a subset of the coaches from the current study. Six of Specht's rule violations were identified as unlikely to happen. These six rule violations (i.e., skipping study hall, missing practice, disrespectful to dorm supervisor, disrespectful to professor, unsportsmanlike conduct, and charged with a misdemeanor) were removed from the list and were replaced with seven rule violations that were more relevant (i.e., inappropriate use of social media, poor academic performance, late to team event, irresponsible with gear or uniform, drinking rule violation, drug use, and charged with a DUI). Specht's rule violations of "missing the bus" and "late to the bus" were combined into a single violation for the current study.

Specht's (2000) list of punishments were reviewed by the same subset of coaches from the current study. Three of Specht's punishments were identified as not likely to be used (i.e., run laps or stadium stairs, additional conditioning, and no team gear). These punishments were replaced with extra study hall, suspension from team, and loss of scholarship and suspension from team. The

wording of some rule violations and punishments were tweaked for consistency or accuracy. For example, “6 am workout” was replaced with “extra workout.”

The first section of the instrument asked for demographic data (i.e., team, role – athlete or coach, years of experience, gender, ethnicity, and age). The team rule violations and punishments were presented next, formatted in tables with a 5-point rating scale at the top. The scale anchors were 1 = Not at All Severe, 2 = Moderately Severe, 3 = Severe, 4 = Very Severe, and 5 = Extremely Severe. The instrument may be found in Appendix A.

Procedure

Data were collected in a team meeting for each sport. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation. The IRB approval form may be found in Appendix B. Each participant was asked to complete an instrument requesting demographic information and to rate the severity of 17 team rule violations and 10 punishments. Time to complete the ratings took about 15 minutes.

Results

Results for Ratings of Severity of Rule Violations and Punishments by Athletes and Coaches in the Current Study

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the ratings by athletes and coaches of each rule violation and punishment. Independent sample t-tests were conducted to explore potential differences in perceptions between athletes and coaches. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1 contains the mean severity ratings by athletes and coaches for the rule violations. As seen in Table 1, coaches and athletes agreed in their perceptions of the severity of rule violations with one exception. Coaches perceived breaking curfew prior to a game as a more severe violation than did athletes.

Table 2 contains the mean severity ratings by athletes and coaches for the disciplinary actions/punishments. As seen in Table 2, coaches and athletes agreed in their perceptions of the severity of punishments with three exceptions. Athletes perceived being suspended from a game, being suspended from practice, and a verbal reprimand as more severe punishments than did coaches.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Athlete and Coach Ratings of Rule Violation Severity

	Athletes (N = 62)		Coaches (N = 12)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Rule Violation				
Charged with a felony	4.89	.41	5.00	.00
Charged with a DUI	4.81	.44	4.83	.39
Failed a drug test	4.55	.74	4.42	.79
Drug use (other than failing drug test)	4.34	.90	4.50	.80
Skipped team workout	4.02	.93	3.83	.94
Drinking rule violation	3.73	.87	3.25	.97
Disrespectful to coach or trainer	3.24	.94	3.42	1.08
Poor academic performance	3.24	.95	3.75	.97
Late to or missed team bus - unexcused	3.21	1.07	3.25	1.14
Late to team event - unexcused	3.10	1.11	3.25	1.14
Late to team workout – unexcused	3.08	1.09	3.08	1.00
Late to practice - unexcused	2.94	.99	3.08	1.17
Breaking curfew before a game ^a	2.92	.98	3.67	.89
Fighting with teammate	2.61	.99	2.75	1.06
Inappropriate social media use	2.58	.78	2.67	.66
Irresponsible with equipment, gear, or uniform	2.25	1.00	1.92	.80
Used profanity/cussing	1.87	.91	1.83	.84

Note. ^acoach and athlete means significantly different $t(72) = 2.45, p = .017$, Cohen's $d = .77$.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Athlete and Coach Ratings of Punishment Severity

Punishment	Athletes (N = 62)		Coaches (N = 12)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Lost scholarship and suspension	4.76	.47	4.67	.50
Dismissed from team	4.71	.69	4.83	.58
Suspended from team	4.34	.70	4.17	.58
Suspended from game ^a	3.69	.85	3.00	.60
Revoke starting position	3.10	1.04	2.58	.67
Suspended from practice ^b	3.05	.95	2.25	.75
Extra workout(s)	2.39	.80	2.00	.85
Do team laundry or clean locker room	1.95	.82	1.58	.90
Verbal reprimand/warning ^c	1.84	.81	1.33	.65
Extra study hall	1.82	.95	1.58	.67

Note. ^acoach and athlete means significantly different $t(24) = 3.24, p = .004$, Cohen's $d = .74$.

^bcoach and athlete means significantly different $t(72) = 2.75, p = .008$, Cohen's $d = .87$.

^ccoach and athlete means significantly different $t(72) = 2.07, p = .046$, Cohen's $d = .64$.

Comparison of 2000 and Current Study Ratings of Severity of Rule

Violations

One sample t-tests were conducted for each violation that was included in both studies to determine if statistically significant differences existed between the severity ratings of rule violations in Study 1 (Specht, 2000) and severity ratings of rule violations in Study 2 (current study). The mean rating from Specht was used as the test value (see Appendix C for these values). Ratings made by athletes in each study were compared and ratings made by coaches in each study were compared. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively.

Relative to athletes in Study 1, athletes in Study 2 reported higher severity ratings for being charged with a felony, $t(61) = .6.10, p < .01$, lower severity ratings for being disrespectful to coach or trainer, $t(61) = -2.68, p < .01$, lower severity ratings for fighting with a teammate, $t(60) = -6.19, p < .01$ and lower severity ratings for using profanity/cussing, $t(61) = -2.66, p < .01$. Results for athlete severity ratings of rule violations are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3
 Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Athlete Severity
 Ratings of Rule Violations

Outcome	<i>M (SD)</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect Size	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
	2000 ^a	Current			
Charged with a felony	4.57 (.96)	4.89 (.41)	.77	6.10**	61
Failed a drug test	4.46 (1.07)	4.55 (.74)		.94	61
Skipped team workout	3.79 (1.23)	4.02 (.93)		1.91	61
Disrespectful to coach or trainers ^b	3.56 (1.15)	3.24 (.94)	-.34	-2.68**	61
Missed team bus ^c	3.57 (1.35)	3.21 (1.07)	-.34	-2.64**	61
Late to team bus ^c	2.89 (1.31)	3.21 (1.07)	-.30	2.35*	61
Late to team workout- unexcused	3.08 (1.00)	3.04 (1.09)		.29	61
Late to practice- unexcused	2.71 (1.05)	2.94 (1.00)		1.79	61
Breaking curfew before a game	2.86 (1.15)	2.92 (.98)		.48	61
Fighting with teammate	3.39 (1.07)	2.61 (.99)	-.79	-6.19**	60
Used profanity/cussing	2.18 (1.19)	1.87 (.91)	-.34	-2.66**	61

Note. * $p < .05$., ** $p < .01$

^aN = 28 for Study 1 (2000)

^bIn 2000 this item was worded as 'Talking back to coach'

^cIn current study these items were combined into one item "Late to or missed team bus." A comparison was made between each of the old items and the new combined item.

Relative to the coaches in Study 1, coaches in Study 2 reported lower severity ratings for failing a drug test, $t(11) = -2.55, p < .05$, lower severity ratings for a skipped team workout, $t(11) = -2.46, p < .05$, lower severity ratings for breaking curfew before a game, $t(11) = -2.28, p < .05$, lower ratings for being disrespectful to a coach or trainer, $t(11) = -3.08, p < .01$, lower severity ratings for fighting with a teammate, $t(11) = -4.10, p < .01$, and lower severity ratings for using profanity/cussing, $t(11) = -5.38, p < .01$. All results for coach severity ratings of rule violations are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4
Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Coach Severity
Ratings of Rule Violations

Outcome	<i>M (SD)</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect Size	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
	2000 ^a	Current			
Charged with a felony	5.00 (.00)	5.00 (.00)			11
Failed a drug test	5.00 (.00)	4.42 (.79)	-.74	-2.55*	11
Skipped team workout	4.50 (.53)	3.83 (.94)	-.74	-2.46*	11
Breaking curfew before a game	4.25 (.89)	3.67 (.88)	-.66	-2.28*	11
Disrespectful to coach or trainers ^b	4.38 (.74)	3.42 (1.08)	-.89	-3.08**	11
Missed team bus ^c	4.50 (.76)	3.25 (1.14)	-1.10	-3.80**	11
Late to team bus ^c	3.88 (.99)	3.25 (1.14)		-1.92	11
Late to practice- unexcused	3.50 (.53)	3.08 (1.17)		-1.24	11
Late to team workout- unexcused	3.50 (.53)	3.08 (1.00)		-1.45	11
Fighting with teammate	4.00 (1.07)	2.75 (1.05)	-1.18	-4.10**	11
Used profanity/cussing	3.13 (.99)	1.83 (.84)	-1.55	-5.38**	11

Note. * $p < .05$., ** $p < .01$

^aN = 12 for Study 1 (2000)

^bIn 2000 this item was worded as "Talking back to coach"

^cIn the current study these items were combined into one item "Late to or missed team bus." A comparison was made between each of the old items and the new combined item.

Comparison of 2000 and Current Study Ratings of Severity of Punishments

One sample t-tests were conducted for each punishment that was included in both studies to determine if statistically significant differences existed between the severity ratings of punishments in Study 1 (Specht, 2000) and the severity ratings of punishments in Study 2 (current study). The mean ratings from Specht were used as the test values (see Appendix C for these values). Ratings made by athletes in each study were compared and ratings made by coaches in each study were compared. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 5 and Table 6, respectively.

Relative to athletes in Study 1, athletes in Study 2 reported lower severity ratings for being suspended from practice, $t(61) = -2.59, p < .05$, lower severity ratings for additional conditioning, $t(61) = -2.79, p < .01$, higher severity ratings for doing team laundry or cleaning locker room, $t(61) = 3.29, p < .05$, and higher severity ratings for an having to attend an extra study hall, $t(61) = 2.09, p < .05$. All results for athlete severity ratings of punishments are displayed in Table 5.

Relative to coaches in Study 1, coaches in Study 2 reported lower severity ratings for being suspended from a game, $t(11) = -6.49, p < .01$, lower severity ratings for revoking an athlete's starting position, $t(11) = -2.83, p < .05$, and lower severity ratings for being suspended from practice, $t(11) = -2.90, p < .05$. All results for coach severity ratings of punishments are displayed in Table 6.

Table 5

Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Athlete Severity Ratings of Punishments

Outcome	<i>M (SD)</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect Size	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
	2000 ^a	Current			
Suspended from game	3.93 (1.18)	3.69 (.99)		-1.89	61
Suspended from practice	3.36 (1.06)	3.05 (.95)	-.33	-2.59*	61
Revoke starting position	3.10 (1.15)	2.86 (1.04)		1.80	61
Additional conditioning ^b	2.68 (1.19)	2.39 (.80)	-.36	-2.79**	60
Do team laundry or clean locker room	1.61 (.57)	1.95 (.82)	.42	3.29*	61
Verbal reprimand/warning	2.00 (1.25)	1.84 (.81)		-1.56	61
Extra study hall	1.57 (.57)	1.82 (.95)	.27	2.09*	61

Note. * $p < .05.$, ** $p < .01$

^aN = 28 for Study 1 (2000)

^bIn 2015 this item was "Extra workouts"

Table 6

Results of One-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Coach Severity Ratings of Punishments

Outcome	<i>M (SD)</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect Size	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
	2000 ^a	Current			
Suspended from game	4.13 (.35)	3.00 (.60)	-1.87	-6.49**	11
Revoke starting position	3.13 (.64)	2.58 (.67)	-.82	-2.83*	11
Suspended from practice	2.88 (1.25)	2.25 (.75)	-.84	-2.90*	11
Additional conditioning ^b	2.38 (.74)	2.00 (.85)		-1.54	11
Extra study hall	2.00 (.93)	1.58 (.90)		-1.60	11
Do team laundry or clean locker room	1.75 (.89)	1.58 (.67)		-.864	11
Verbal reprimand/warning	1.63 (.92)	1.33 (.65)		-1.58	11

Note. * $p < .05.$, ** $p < .01$

^aN = 12 for Study 1 (2000)

^bIn 2015 this item was "Extra workouts"

Correlations between Study 1 and Study 2 Ratings of Rule Violations and Punishments

Despite the above noted differences between athlete and coach ratings in Study 1 and Study 2, it was of interest to see if the relative severity of the ratings was consistent across the two studies. Pearson correlation coefficients were conducted to make this determination. The correlation between athlete mean ratings of rule violations in Study 1 and Study 2 was $r = .92, p = .000, n = 11$. The correlation between coach mean ratings of rule violations in Study 1 and Study 2 was $r = .85, p = .001, n = 11$. The correlation between athlete mean ratings of punishments in Study 1 and Study 2 was $r = .97, p = .000, n = 7$. The correlation between coach mean ratings of punishments in Study 1 and Study 2 was $r = .99, p = .000, n = 7$. The high magnitude of these correlation coefficients indicates consistency across time in the rank order of the severity of the rule violations and the punishments for both athletes and coaches.

Discussion

In this study, athlete and coach perceptions of the severity of team rule violations and punishments were examined. Almost universal agreement was found between coaches and athletes when rating the severity of rule violations. Only one out of seventeen violations, breaking curfew before a game, was found to be significantly different with the coaches perceiving it to be a more severe violation than did the athletes. Less agreement was found when rating the severity of punishments, but there was still agreement in seven out of ten punishments. The three punishments (i.e., being suspended from a game, being

suspended from practice, and receiving a verbal reprimand) where severity was rated significantly different, the athletes rated the punishments as more severe than did the coaches. This indicates that in some instances athletes may perceive punishments as more severe than even the coaches intend. Therefore, coaches need to consider the purpose of those punishments and use them accordingly, understanding that the resulting level of severity may be different than their intent.

When comparing the athletes' perception of the severity of rule violations in Study 2 (current study) with Study 1 (Specht, 2000) some comparisons were found to be statistically significant. However, upon closer inspection the statistical significance for each rating did not necessarily represent a meaningful difference. For example, in Table 3 for Use profanity/cussing means of 2.18 (Study 1) and 1.87 (Study 2) are statistically significant but represent the same rating of a 2 (moderately severe). The same was true for the other instances where statistical significance was found as well: Fighting with a teammate 3.39 (Study 1) and 2.61 (Study 2) represent a rating of 3 (severe), Charged with a felony 4.57 (Study 1) and 4.89 (Study 2) represent a rating of 5 (extremely severe), Disrespectful to coach or trainers 3.56 (Study 1) and 3.24 (Study 2) represent a rating of 3 (severe), Late to team bus 2.89 (Study 1) and 3.21 (Study 2) represent a rating of 3 (severe), and Missed team bus 3.57 (Study 1) and 3.21 (Study 2) also represents a rating of 3 (severe). Thus, in each case, the differences in athlete perceptions across time of the severity of rule violations are not practically meaningful.

Athlete perceptions of six total violations were found to have statistical significance between the current study and the Specht 2000 study with four of the six trending downwards in severity and two trending upwards. It may be likely for two comparison items that the decision to combine them in Study 2 explains the difference. Two items from Study 1, Late to team bus and Missed team bus, were combined into one item in Study 2, Late to or missed team bus. The mean for the combined item is 3.21 (Study 2), which, as one might expect, falls between the more severe Missed team bus at 3.57 (Study 1) and the less severe Late to team bus at 2.89 (Study 1). When those two items are not considered, four violations were significantly different with three means trending downward, Used profanity/cussing, Fighting with a teammate, and Disrespectful to coach or trainers; and only one item trending upward, Charged with a felony. It may be of interest to future researchers to determine if this downward trend continues and moves beyond statistical significance and towards meaningful differences in perceptions of severity.

In contrast to the athlete perceptions of severity of rule violations from Study 1 and Study 2 where statistical but no meaningful differences were found, six of the seven statistical differences found when looking at coach severity ratings were meaningful differences. The only instance where statistical significance was found but not a meaningful difference, Breaking curfew before a game at 4.25 (Study 1) and 3.67 (Study 2) which both represent the same rating of 4 (very severe). The instances where a meaningful difference were found are as follows as can be found in Table 4: Used profanity/cussing 3.13 (Study 1) and

1.83 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 3 (severe) and 2 (moderately severe), Skipped team workout 4.50 (Study 1) and 3.83 (Study 2) represents different ratings of 5 (extremely severe) and 4 (very severe), Fighting with a teammate 4.00 (Study 1) and 2.75 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 4 (very severe) and 3 (severe), Failed a drug test 5.00 (Study 1) and 4.42 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 5 (extremely severe) and 4 (very severe), Disrespectful to coach or trainers 4.38 (Study 1) and 3.42 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 4 (very severe) and 3 (severe), and Missed team bus 4.50 (Study 1) and 3.25 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 5 (extremely severe) and 3 (severe).

Every instance of significant statistical and meaningful difference trended downwards, meaning that the coaches in the current study rated the violations as less severe than did the coaches in Study 1. Out of the eleven total items only Charged with a felony was rated the same in both studies with a mean of 5.00. Although no significant differences were found in three items, Late to practice-unexcused, Late to team workout-unexcused, and Late to team bus, these also had means which trended downwards from Study 1 to Study 2. This gives us a clear indication that the perception of severity of violations from the coaches' point of view has decreased substantially since the first study. As with the athletes, it may be of interest to future researchers to identify if this trend continues and incorporate other research to help us understand why this may be occurring.

Next comparisons were made between the severity of punishments in Study 1 and Study 2. Statistical significance was found for four out of seven athlete ratings of punishments, with only one punishment, Additional conditioning, showing a meaningful difference at 2.68 (Study 1) representing a rating of 3 (severe) and 2.39 (Study 2) representing a rating of 2 (moderately severe) as found in Table 5. The athletes found Additional conditioning to be a less severe punishment in Study 2 than in they did Study 1. Of the three other punishments which showed statistical significance, two trended up and one trended down. The two which trended up were Extra study hall 1.57 (Study 1) and 1.82 (Study 2) and Do team laundry or clean locker room 1.61 (Study 1) and 1.95 (Study 2). Suspended from practice trended downward at 3.36 (Study 1) and 3.05 (Study 2).

Statistical significance was found in three out of seven punishment items when rated by the coaches, with two showing a meaningful difference. All three punishment items trended down from Study 1 to Study 2 as can be seen in Table 6 and as follows: Suspended from practice 2.88 (Study 1) and 2.25 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 3 (severe) and 2 (moderately severe), Suspended from game 4.13 (Study 1) and 3.00 (Study 2) represent different ratings of 4 (extremely severe) and 3 (severe), while Revoke starting position 3.13 (Study 1) and 2.58 (Study 2) both represent a rating of 3 (severe).

Generally, if perceptions of severity for both violations and punishments changed, they decreased for both athletes and coaches between Study 1 and Study 2. However, strong correlations between ratings in Study 1 and Study 2 for

both athletes and coaches and both rule violations and punishments indicate that the relative perceptions of severity did not change. Nonetheless, scenario research using these team rule violations and punishments should use the recalibrated values when developing vignettes to reflect any absolute changes in perception of severity since the original study (Specht, 2000).

Limitations of Current Study

The current study obtained severity ratings from only female athletes, whereas Specht (Study 1) used both male and female athletes to rate severity although 80 percent of her participants were also female. It is important to note, however, that she found no gender differences in perceptions of fairness of the punishments between male and female athletes in her vignette study. Male and female coaches were used in both studies. A convenience sample was used in both Study 1 and Study 2. It can be difficult for athletes and coaches to find time to participate in research and, as such, those coaches and athletes that were willing to participate comprised samples in both studies. This sampling technique is not ideal and can present biases, but comparisons were able to be made between studies because the same sampling technique was used in both.

Because some violations and punishments were modified from those used by Specht, not all items in the current study had a comparison baseline from 2000. As such, we did not have current severity ratings for all the items used by Specht and likewise do not have 2000 ratings for all items used in the current study. Therefore, we were unable to determine if severity perceptions changed over time on some violations and punishments.

Implications

By recalibrating the violations and punishments in this study, we now have a pool of realistic misconduct actions and disciplinary actions that can be used for future research. The most interesting finding in our study is that generally perceptions of severity have decreased over time for both athletes and coaches. Punishment is often used as a deterrent and the severity of that punishment can impact the effectiveness the punishment has in changing behavior. A decrease in the perception of punishment severity may mean that more severe punishment must be used if it is to have the desired result. For example, a coach seeking a severe punishment in response to a violation in Study 1 could have chosen a suspension from practice. But today that same punishment would only be perceived as moderately severe; thus, the coach would have to increase the severity of the punishment for the desired result. This could be done by suspending the athlete from a game, which was perceived as severe in the current study, but in Study 1 was perceived as extremely severe. This is especially important because we found there are instances where athlete perceptions of severity were higher than those of coaches, leading to incongruence in the eyes of the athletes and the coaches in terms of the severity of the punishment being implemented. It may be of interest for future researchers to explore these types of differences to find the most effective way of using punishment to change behavior.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.
- Anshel, M. H. (1990). *Sport psychology: From theory to practice*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.
- Arvey, R. D., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1980). Punishment in organizations: A review, propositions, and research suggestions. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 123-132.
- Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., Carey, J. A., & Cartier, P. (2001). Recipient and observer reactions to discipline: are managers experiencing wishful thinking? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*(3), 249–270.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (1992). Understanding subordinate reactions to punishment incidents: Perspectives from justice and social affect. *Leadership Quarterly, 3*, 307-333.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 299-322.
- Bennett, R. J. (1998). Taking the sting out of the whip: Reactions to consistent punishment for unethical behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 4*, 248-262.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.),

Research on negotiations in organizations (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *31*, 676-685.
- Boise, W. B. (1965). Supervisors' attitudes toward disciplinary actions. *Personnel Administration*, *28*, 24–27.
- Butterfield, K., Treviño, L., Wade, K., & Ball, G. (2005). Organizational punishment from the manager's perspective: An exploratory study. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *17*(3), 363-382.
- Butterfield, K. D., Trevino, L. K., & Ball, G. A. (1996). Punishment from the manager's perspective: A grounded investigation and inductive model. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(6), 1479–1512.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Does the justice of the one interact with the justice of the many? Reactions to procedural justice in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(4), 633–646.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Noe, R. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2002). Justice in teams: Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, *55*, 83-109.

- Fletcher, D. (2011). Applying sport psychology in business: A narrative commentary and bibliography. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 1(3), 139–149.
- Fraleigh, W. (2003). [Review of the book *Fair Play in Sport: A Moral Norm System*, by S. Loland]. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 30(1), 93–96.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.
- Greenberg, J. (2009). Everybody talks about organizational justice, but nobody does anything about it. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2(2), 181–195.
- Greer, C. R., & Labig, C. E. (1987). Employee reactions to disciplinary action. *Human Relations*, 40, 507-524.
- Jordan, J. S., Gillentine, J. A., & Hunt, B. P. (2004). The influence of fairness: The application of organizational justice in a team sport setting. *International Sports Journal*, 8(1), 139-149.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2012). *Behavior Modification in Applied Settings* (7th ed.). Waveland Press, Inc.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances and theory and research* (167-218). New York: Academic Press.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Judge, T. A., Sparrowe, R. T., Kraimer, M. L., & Franz, T. M. (1999). Management of poor performance: A comparison of

- manager, group member, and group disciplinary decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 835–850.
- Mahony, D. F., Hums, M. A., Andrew, D. P., & Dittmore, S. W. (2010). Organizational justice in sport. *Sport Management Review*, 13(2), 91–105.
- Niehoff, B., Paul, R., & John F. S. Bunch. (1998). The social effects of punishment events: The influence of violator past performance record and severity of the punishment on observers' justice perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(6), 589-602.
- Phillips, J. M., Douthitt, E. A., & Hyland, M. M. (2001). The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 316–325.
- Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior, Second Edition*. Scott Foresman & Co.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974). Factors influencing disciplinary judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 327-331.
- Shoenfelt, E., & Bucur, D. R. (2002, November). *Distributive justice in team disciplinary decisions*. Paper presented at the Conference of The Association for Applied Sport Psychology, Tucson, AZ.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Ellard, J. H., & Kelln, B. R. C. (1998). Third-party perceptions of a layoff: Procedural, derogation, and retributive aspects of justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 119–127.
- Specht, L. L. (2000). *Distributive justice and perception of fairness in team sports*. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Kentucky University.

Trevino, L. K. (1992). The social effects of punishment in organizations: A justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 647-676.

Appendix A
Rating Instrument
Perceptions of Severity of Team Rule Violations and Punishment

Thank you in advance for your participation. The focus of this study is perceptions of the severity of athlete rule violations and disciplinary actions. Your participation is voluntary.

Demographic Information:

As researchers, we are sometimes interested in determining if certain groups respond differently (e.g., males vs. females, older vs. younger, soccer vs. basketball athletes, etc.). To make these comparisons, we need you to complete the demographic information below. Your responses are anonymous (i.e., your name should *not* be recorded on this sheet). No individual responses will be reported; only overall/group responses will be reported.

Please complete the following demographic information.

1. **Which best describes you?** Athlete Coach GA/Trainer
 Other: _____

2. **Athletic team affiliation** (e.g., WKU softball) _____

3. **Gender:** Male Female

4. **Age** (in years) _____

5. _____ **Number of years participating in intercollegiate athletics**
(If you are a coach, please fill in the number of years *coaching* intercollegiate athletics.)

6. **Ethnicity:** African American
 Asian
 Hispanic
 White
 Other: _____

DIRECTIONS
- FOR NEXT 2 PAGES -

Most teams have rules that guide the athlete's behavior outside of competition that team members are expected to follow. On the next two pages, you will find, *listed in alphabetical order*, a number rule violations that athletes may commit followed by a list of punishments or disciplinary actions. Please evaluate each violation and punishment in the context of a NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic team. **For each violation and each punishment, please mark the number that indicates your opinion of the severity of the violation and punishment.** There are no "right" or "wrong" answers; your honest opinion is the correct answer. Thank you!

RULE VIOLATIONS Please mark the rating that indicates your opinion of the severity of each rule violation.	SEVERITY RATING				
	Not Severe	Moderately Severe	Severe	Very Severe	Extremely Severe
Breaking curfew before a game	1	2	3	4	5
Charged with a DUI	1	2	3	4	5
Charged with a felony	1	2	3	4	5
Disrespectful to coach or trainer	1	2	3	4	5
Drinking rule violation	1	2	3	4	5
Drug use (other than failing drug test)	1	2	3	4	5
Failed a drug test	1	2	3	4	5
Fighting with teammate	1	2	3	4	5
Inappropriate social media use (e.g., inappropriate posts on Twitter or Facebook)	1	2	3	4	5
Irresponsible with equipment, gear, uniform (e.g., left equipment at competition site)	1	2	3	4	5
Late to practice - unexcused	1	2	3	4	5
Late to or missed team bus - unexcused	1	2	3	4	5
Late to team event - unexcused	1	2	3	4	5
Late to team workout – unexcused	1	2	3	4	5
Poor academic performance (e.g., poor grades, skipped class , skipped study hall)	1	2	3	4	5
Skipped team workout	1	2	3	4	5
Used profanity/cussing	1	2	3	4	5

PUNISHMENTS

PUNISHMENTS Please mark the rating that indicates your opinion of the severity of each punishment.	SEVERITY RATING				
	Not Severe	Moderately Severe	Severe	Very Severe	Extremely Severe
Extra study hall	1	2	3	4	5
Extra workout(s)	1	2	3	4	5
Dismissed from team	1	2	3	4	5
Do team laundry or clean locker room	1	2	3	4	5
Lost scholarship and suspension	1	2	3	4	5
Revoke starting position	1	2	3	4	5
Suspended from game	1	2	3	4	5
Suspended from practice	1	2	3	4	5
Suspended from team	1	2	3	4	5
Verbal reprimand/warning	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you for your time and effort in helping with this important study!

Appendix B
IRB Approval Form

Informed Consent

Project Title:

Perceptions of Severity of Team Rule Violations and Punishment

Investigator: Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt, Department of Psychological Sciences, 745-4418.

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your agreement to participate in this project.

You must be 18 years old or older to participate in this research study.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

If you decide to participate in the project, please complete the questionnaire and return the completed questionnaire to the researcher. Completing and returning the ratings implies your informed consent to participate in the project. You may keep this consent form.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:** To determine the degree of perceived severity of team rule violations and punishments.
2. **Explanation of Procedures:** In this study, you will be asked to indicate your opinion of the severity of a list of rule violations and punishments by rating each on a 5-point scale.
3. **Discomfort and Risks:** There are no known risks to completing this brief questionnaire.
4. **Benefits:** There are no known direct benefits to completing this brief questionnaire. However, your participation will help us understand the dynamics of discipline in team settings.
5. **Confidentiality:** No names are requested or should be recorded on the survey instrument. No individual responses will be identified and all responses will be kept confidential. Only results averaged across respondents will be reported.
6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:** Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

Your continued cooperation with the following research implies your consent.

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY
THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Paul Mooney, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-2129



Appendix C

Specht Mean Ratings of Rule Violations and Punishments

Means and Standard Deviations For Stimulus Rating Study

Violations	Students (N = 39)		Athletes (N = 28)		Coaches (N = 8)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Late to Practice	2.49	.82	2.71	1.05	3.50	.53
Late to Team Workout	2.72	.97	3.04	1.00	3.50	.53
Use of Profanity	2.85	.78	2.18	1.19	3.13	.99
Breaking Curfew before a game	3.08	.96	2.86	1.15	4.25	.89
Skipping Team Study Hall	3.10	.99	2.71	1.08	3.87	.83
Disrespectful to Dorm Supervisor	3.28	1.19	2.68	1.09	3.50	.53
Late to Team Bus	3.31	1.00	2.89	1.31	3.88	.99
Skipping Team Workout	3.49	.76	3.79	1.23	4.50	.53
Missing Practice	3.54	.76	3.89	1.13	4.50	.76
Disrespectful to Professor	3.77	1.09	2.93	1.02	4.00	.53
Unsportsmanlike Conduct	3.87	.80	3.21	1.10	4.00	.53
Talking Back to Coach	3.90	.91	*3.56	*1.15	4.38	.74
Missing Team Bus	3.97	.96	3.57	1.35	4.50	.76
Fighting With Teammate	4.05	.65	3.39	1.07	4.00	1.07
Charged with a Misdemeanor	4.56	.64	4.32	.98	4.62	.74
Charged with a Felony	4.74	.55	4.57	.96	5.00	.00
Failing a Drug Test	4.77	.74	4.46	1.07	5.00	.00

Note: Scale Values (Violations)

1 = Not Severe, 2 = Moderately Severe, 3 = Severe, 4 = Very Severe, 5 = Extremely Severe

* n = 27

Punishments	Students (N = 39)		Athletes (N = 28)		Coaches (N = 8)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Extra Study Hall	1.67	.81	1.57	.57	2.00	.93
Clean Locker Room	2.08	.90	1.61	.57	1.75	.89
Run Laps or Stadium Stairs	2.10	.82	2.46	.92	2.38	.74
Verbal Reprimand	2.31	1.17	2.00	1.25	1.63	.92
6 am Workout	2.44	1.02	2.36	.99	2.63	.74
Additional Conditioning	2.44	.94	2.68	1.19	2.38	.74
No Team Gear	2.87	1.22	2.68	1.19	2.88	1.13
Suspension from Practice	2.97	1.22	3.36	1.06	2.88	1.25
Revoke Starting Position	3.46	1.00	2.86	1.15	3.13	.64
Suspension from Game	3.72	1.07	3.93	1.18	4.13	.35
Dismissed from the Team	4.77	.48	4.71	.85	5.00	.00

Note: Scale Values (Punishments)

1 = Not Severe, 2 = Moderately Severe, 3 = Severe, 4 = Very Severe, 5 = Extremely Severe