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The organizational justice perspective suggests that procedural and
distributive justice evaluations of a specific punishment event will affect an
individual’s reactions to the punishment. A 3 (decision-making procedure: autocratic,
participative, group) X 3 (punishment severity: low, moderate, high) factorial design
was utilized to develop punishment scenarios in team-sport settings which were
evaluated by 205 participants. Decision-making procedure and punishment severity
both produced significant main effects on evaluations of the fairness of the procedure.
Only punishment severity produced a significant main effect on perceptions of the
fairness and appropriateness of the punishment, as well as on perceptions of the
likelihood of the punishment to deter future violations. Implications for future
research and coaching effectiveness are discussed.
Introduction

Over the past two decades, beginning with a review by Arvey and Ivancevich (1980), discipline and punishment in organizations have received increasing amounts of attention (Arvey, Davis, & Nelson, 1984; Ball & Sims, Jr., 1991; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, Jr., 1992a, 1993b, 1994c; Bennett, 1998; Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball, 1996; Greer & Labig, 1987; Podsakoff & Todor, 1985; Trevino, 1992; Tyler, 1989). In contrast to the conventional wisdom of an unpleasant connotation associated with the use of punishment, researchers have proposed that punishment in organizations may elicit positive or negative reactions depending on justice perceptions regarding the disciplinary process and outcome (e.g., Arvey, Davis, & Nelson, 1984; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, Jr., 1992a, 1993b, 1994c; Bennett, 1998; Trevino, 1992). The justice perspective suggests that evaluations of the procedural and distributive characteristics of a specific punishment event will affect subordinate behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the punishment. Some of these reactions include effects on subsequent performance, perceptions of fairness of the procedure and outcome, and the perceptions of the favorability and appropriateness of the outcome (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1993). While discipline and punishment have been studied in a variety of organizations, this author found no published studies on the effects of disciplinary actions in sports teams. The present study is an attempt to integrate the past research on organizational justice and punishment and
apply it to the setting of team sports. The current research draws upon the organizational justice literature to create a conceptual framework for understanding observers’ attitudinal responses to specific punishment events in team-sport settings. The model guiding this study is presented in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1

**Proposed model of Observers’ Reactions to Punishment Events in Team-Sport Settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Characteristics of the Punishment Event</th>
<th>Attitudinal Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Procedural Characteristics</td>
<td>• Fairness of Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- level of participation in decision-making</td>
<td>• Fairness of Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distributive Characteristics</td>
<td>• Fairness to Violator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- severity of punishment</td>
<td>- Fairness to Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriateness of Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deterrence of Misconduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This literature review first introduces the relevant concepts providing the theoretical underpinning of the above model. Punishment is defined and its use in organizational research is reviewed. Justice evaluations are then reviewed from two main perspectives: distributive justice and procedural justice. Research regarding the attitudinal outcomes listed in Figure 1 is also reviewed. Finally, research on participatory decision-making systems and different decision-making styles is discussed. The present study and hypotheses are then introduced.

**Punishment**

A distinction is sometimes made between the terms “discipline” and “punishment.” Punishment is the presentation of an aversive event following an undesired behavior that is intended to decrease the likelihood that the undesired behavior
will occur again. Discipline is defined as the formal sanctions administered by an organization intended to direct effort toward new, desired behavior (Pinder, 1998). In this study, the terms punishment and discipline are used interchangeably. Although punishment carries a more unpleasant connotation than discipline, both procedures involve the presentation of an aversive event or the removal of a positive event in order to change an undesirable behavior (Ball et al., 1994). The organizational behavior literature has traditionally represented punishment and other aversive control systems to change and modify subordinate behaviors and attitudes, particularly undesirable ones (Arvey, Davis, & Nelson, 1984).

Arvey and Ivancevich (1980) indicated that while research in other applied settings has found punishment to be effective in the reduction or elimination of undesirable behaviors, virtually all past organizational research focused on positive systems for modifying employee behavior. Although other procedures can decrease undesirable behavior, these researchers assert that there is no empirical data to suggest any of these procedures produces an effect as immediate, lasting, and effective as that provided by properly administered punishment.

Trevino (1992) considered the direct influence of punishment events on the subsequent misconduct of observers. Deterrence theory suggests that punishment deters misconduct of observers by heightening their perceived risks. The observation of a punishment event leads the observer to form punishment expectancies, which in turn inhibit the punishable behavior. This theory also suggests that characteristics of the punishment will influence its effectiveness in deterring misconduct. Trevino and Ball (1992) found that only severe punishment of misconduct influenced the punishment
expectancies of observers, while moderate punishments had no effect. Trevino (1997) proposed that potential violators conduct a utility analysis that compares the potential costs and benefits of the expected punishment. If the costs of the expected punishment are viewed as exceeding the potential gain from the punishable behavior, then the misconduct will be deterred.

In a review of the research on organizational punishment, Arvey and Jones (1985) found it impossible to draw conclusions about the relationship between punishment and outcome variables such as subsequent job performance or satisfaction, suggesting that important additional variables may need to be identified to fully understand the dynamics of punishment. The inconclusive results may stem in part from the origination of punishment research in behaviorism and reinforcement theory, which targeted the study of observable behavior rather than cognition. More recent research focusing on attitudinal outcomes of disciplinary events suggests that reactions to punishment may depend upon how subordinates process information regarding the specific disciplinary event (Ball, et al., 1993; 1994). Ball, Trevino, and Sims (1992) propose that the conceptual basis for understanding reactions to punishment incidents may be provided by subordinates' justice evaluations. The concept of organizational justice and its relationship to punishment will be discussed in the following section.

Justice Evaluations

Ball et al. (1992) suggested that subordinates are likely to form fairness perceptions of a punishment event in an organization and that these evaluations will influence their responses to that event depending on justice perceptions of the disciplinary processes and outcomes. Ball et al. (1992) defined justice as subjective
evaluation judgements about the rightness of one’s fate or treatment by others. These evaluations are thought to be accompanied by emotional and behavioral reactions. This justice perspective suggests that negative reactions result from punishment that is perceived to be unjust, rather than punishment per se.

Arvey and Ivancevich (1980) suggested that punishment’s effects may depend upon the fairness of the punishment. They presented such variables as harshness, timing, consistency, and the provision of a rationale as important factors. Although not based upon the justice literature, the variables identified by Arvey and Ivancevich are consistent with those generally considered as criteria for justice evaluations. Thus, it should follow that timely punishment administered consistently among subordinates, accompanied by a clear rationale for the discipline, and that is not overly harsh should be more effective and evaluated more positively than unexplained, haphazardly administered punishment. Furthermore, the recent abundance of research on organizational justice (Arvey, Davis, & Nelson, 1984; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, Jr., 1992a, 1993b, 1994c; Bennett, 1998) has highlighted the importance of this construct in organizations. Justice theory suggests that subordinates evaluate justice from two primary perspectives: distributive justice and procedural justice (Ball et al., 1993).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of an outcome distribution. Theories of distributive justice are based upon years of research focusing on equity in social exchange (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1992). Perceptions of inequity are theorized under distributive justice formulations (i.e., equity theory) to result from social comparison processes where one’s input/outcome ratio is compared to that of a referent
other in a similar situation. Arvey et al. (1984) found consistency to be an important dimension of employee perceptions of the supervisor’s use of discipline. Punishment outcomes that are perceived to be consistently distributed across subordinates are expected to be evaluated as more just than are punishment outcomes that are perceived as more harsh or more lenient than that received by similar others (Trevino, 1992). In other words, when a subordinate perceives that the punishment received is harsher or more lenient than the disciplinary action given to others committing similar infractions, unjust distributive evaluations should result (Ball et al., 1992).

More recent equity formulations ignore outside comparisons with referent others, suggesting instead that people evaluate justice by comparing their outcomes with their beliefs about what is just (Ball et al., 1993). Trevino (1992) argued that people evaluate the fairness of punishment outcomes based upon a comparison between the outcome that is deserved and the outcome that is received in relation to the specific violation. This relationship suggests a “just deserts model” based upon one’s beliefs about the appropriate levels of punishment that fit an infraction. According to Ball et al. (1992), cultural norms exist within society regarding the perceived appropriate levels of punishment for a specific misconduct, which suggests that people expect superiors to invoke “normal remedies” perceived as fitting and consistent with the violation. Furthermore, Ball et al. (1993) suggested that evaluations of appropriateness are likely to be based upon specific contingencies of the misconduct that precipitated the punishment, such as the seriousness of the infraction and whether the misconduct was the first offense. Ball et al. (1994) also proposed that disciplinary actions that are perceived to be distributively fair will be related to positive outcomes. Fair distributions should therefore
result in positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. In addition, fair procedures should also result in positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. The dynamics of this exchange are explained by the construct of procedural justice.

**Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the procedures used in decision making. Fair procedures are instrumental in that they are the "means" by which various "ends" are accomplished. The emphasis on decision-making procedures is different from the concept of distributive justice, which emphasizes fairness evaluations of the content and consequences of those decisions (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Ball et al. (1993) suggested that negative outcomes should be more acceptable if the procedures leading to them are deemed fair. Furthermore, Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) well-known discussion on procedural justice in legal-dispute settings suggested that people’s reactions to third-party allocation and dispute-resolution decisions rely heavily upon the fairness of the decision-making process, independent of the fairness or favorability of the actual decisions reached. This procedural justice effect has since been widely replicated in legal, political, organizational, and interpersonal settings (Tyler, 1989). It is now well established that people are concerned about the justice of allocation and decision-making procedures.

Thibaut and Walker (1975) formulated a psychological model for explaining procedural preferences. This model proposed that the distribution of control between the participants and the third party (i.e., judge) is the key procedural characteristic shaping people’s views about both fairness and appropriateness. They further distinguished two types of control: decision and process control. Decision control refers to the degree of
participants’ influence over the nature of the actual decisions made, while process control is the extent to which participants have the opportunity to express their views and present evidence on their behalf. Research has shown that heightened decision control, independent of process control, significantly influences perceptions of procedural justice in a variety of settings (Ball et al., 1992). Research also suggests that individuals will perceive the procedure as more just to the degree that they are given control over the process used in attaining the outcome (Ball et al., 1993). More specifically, studies have shown that when subordinates are given the opportunity to express opinions, present their evidence, and these opinions were adequately considered, the subordinates had perceptions of greater procedural justice and were more accepting of the decision outcome (Ball et al., 1992). Furthermore, Ball et al. (1993) found that decision control and process control combined to create a single factor representing an individual’s overall perception of control in the punishment decision. Thus, they proposed that procedures allowing individuals more control over the punishment decision will induce perceptions of procedural justice.

In formulating their psychological model for explaining procedural preferences, Thibaut and Walker (1975) sought to discover the formal decision-making processes that individuals perceive as most just. Organizations that operate according to a set of procedures viewed as just will induce commitment and loyalty, which will subsequently contribute to the stability of the institution. Because this fair and just procedure is postulated to maximize legitimacy, endorsement, and stability, the effect produced has been dubbed the “fair process effect” (Cohen, 1985).
In addition to studies on the effects of “control” in dispute-resolution situations, researchers have also examined the effects of a subordinate’s “voice” in reward-allocation situations (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Folger and Greenberg reviewed several process control studies involving reward distribution manipulations. The typical procedure manipulation in these studies involved giving workers a “voice,” or an opportunity to influence the decision maker, and not giving workers this opportunity, referred to as the “mute” condition. In studies of this nature, “voice” workers reacted significantly more favorably toward the perceived fairness of their outcomes than did their “mute” counterparts. This research illustrated the “fair process effect” in situations where the same outcome is produced by two different procedures that differ in perceived fairness. The outcome itself is perceived as more fair (e.g., more acceptable, satisfying, etc.) when associated with the fairer procedure. Thus, studies of reward distribution procedures have demonstrated enhanced outcome-acceptance effects and greater perceived procedural fairness associated with procedures that give people process control in the form of voice (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

Lind and Tyler (1988) proposed a different conception of the psychology of procedural justice, labeled the “group value model.” This model suggests there may be crucial aspects of procedural justice that are not represented by the control model and that may be particularly useful for understanding observers’ perceptions of procedural justice in organizational punishment situations (Trevino, 1992). Justice concerns in the group-value model extend beyond the immediate control or outcome issues involved in a given dispute. This model assumes that people value their membership in social groups, such as teams and organizations, and that they are concerned about their long-term social
relationships with the authorities and fellow members of these groups (Trevino, 1992). In the context of this long-term relationship, group members are concerned with three noncontrol issues: neutral treatment of group members, trust in the leader, and social status in the group. Tyler (1989) proposed that these three issues will have an effect on reactions to experiences independent of the influence of the distribution of control or outcome favorability. This group-value model proposes a broader conception of procedural justice than is offered by the control model. It argues that organizational members are concerned with their long-term social relationships within the group and with its formal authorities and institutions. Members expect the organization to use unbiased decision-making procedures implemented by trustworthy authorities so that all members will benefit fairly over time from their group membership. They further expect the organization to treat them as valued members of the group who deserve treatment with respect, dignity, and politeness, thus building and affirming their self-esteem (Tyler, 1989).

Norms associated with treatment and decision-making are important to the regulation of organizational process and structure. Group members are concerned about punishment procedures and whether they are aligned with fundamental group values and norms, as well as whether or not these procedures are neutrally applied. Also, concerns about the trustworthiness of the leader suggest the importance to group members of the leader’s intention to treat fellow subordinates fairly. Finally, interpersonal relations between group members and the leader communicate information about social status in the group (Tyler, 1989). According to the group-value model, group norms establishing fair treatment are preferred because all members stand to benefit in the long term from
fair treatment and because they allow members to trust their leaders’ intentions and to believe that their own rights would be protected in similar situations. Thus, the group-value model suggests that all group members, including both observers and punishment targets, should be concerned about the leader’s just treatment of any group member (Trevino, 1992). Organizations that operate according to a set of procedures viewed as fair and just will induce trust, commitment, and loyalty from members, which will subsequently contribute to the stability of the institution. Because more authoritarian styles of leadership may inhibit trust in the manager, as well as beliefs about neutral and fair treatment, one alternative is to allow subordinate participation in organizational decision-making processes, as suggested by the literature on participatory decision-making systems (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

Participatory Decision-Making Systems

The trend toward democratization of organizations over the last century “has been stimulated by beliefs about the productive efficiency resulting from workers’ participation in organizational decision making, and by the philosophy that it offers a less oppressive alternative to more authoritarian styles of management” (Folger & Greenberg, 1985, p. 166). Unfortunately, the voluminous research on participatory decision-making (PDM) in organizations has yielded equivocal results of the effects of PDM practices with respect to worker productivity and satisfaction (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). Folger and Greenberg (1985) attempted to explain the positive effects of PDM in terms of the fair process effect and the negative effects of PDM in terms of the “frustration effect.” They argued for a social influence explanation of these positive and negative effects of PDM.
Folger and Greenberg (1985) proposed that because perceptions of justice are inherently ambiguous, subordinates will engage in social comparison in which they compare their voiced opinions about the justice of a decision to those opinions conveyed by the supervisor via his or her decision. The supervisor’s decision is considered a response to the worker’s voiced opinion. A denial of the worker’s voiced request is interpreted as evidence of the supervisor’s true opinion, and workers may believe that the supervisor’s judgement must be a more valid judgement. Based on what they call the “augmentation effect,” Greenberg and Folger argued that expression of an opinion by a supervisor against a voiced request by a subordinate increases the perceived reliability of the supervisor as a source of information because of the supervisor’s assumed expert judgement relative to his/her position in the organizational hierarchy. This greater perceived reliability of the supervisor leads to greater acceptance of the resulting outcomes. The relationship between the procedure implied by the provision of voice and the perception of outcomes produced by that procedure constitutes the social influence explanation of the fair process effect (Cohen, 1985).

Cohen (1985) further stated that this explanation can be used to account for situations in which the fair process effect does not occur, but rather backfires into a “frustration effect.” In some situations, rather than voice producing increased acceptance of unfair outcomes, it can actually decrease the acceptability of these outcomes. Such an effect occurs when either the individual receives information that other members confirm his/her initial opinion that the outcome is unjust, or when the individual receives outcomes in subsequent allocations that are perceived as more just than the outcome originally perceived as unjust by the individual (Cohen, 1985). In both cases, social
influence from either coworkers’ opinions or employer’s decisions validates the subject’s initial perceived injustice.

Greenberg and Folger (1985) considered the “voice” given to subjects in experimental research as a marker for participation in PDM processes. In other words, “voice” is a marker for the various ways in which subordinates may try to influence their superiors’ decisions. Greenberg and Folger suggested that the interplay of the forces of social influence is a significant factor in determining whether PDM practices will increase or decrease morale, satisfaction, and productivity, as well as perceptions of justice. The amount of voice given to subordinates is reflected in the different styles utilized in organizational decision-making.

The humanistic orientation toward leadership prescribes increased participation of group members in organizational decision making on the grounds that such participation enhances feeling of self-worth and self-confidence among members, as well as the personal growth of the members (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989). Folger and Greenberg (1985) attributed many of the positive effects of PDM to the fair-process effect. Cohen (1985) suggested organizations that maximize this fair-process effect operate according to a set of procedures viewed as just, which in turn induces commitment, loyalty, and stability within the institution. Folger & Greenberg (1985) found that organization members who are given a “voice” in decisions reacted more favorably toward the perceived fairness of their outcomes. Furthermore, Ball et al. (1992) showed that when members are given the opportunity to express opinions, present evidence, and when these opinions were adequately considered, members had perceptions of greater procedural justice and were more accepting of the decision. Given the context
of the present study, that is, athletic teams, it follows that coaching effectiveness should be enhanced through the use of PDM by inducing perceptions of the quality of decision outcomes and the acceptance of these decisions.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) provided a taxonomy of decision making styles subsequently utilized in a plethora of studies, including the athletic team research of Chelladurai et al. (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989). The Vroom-Yetton model defined various decision-making styles that differ in the extent to which group members are given participation and influence in the decision outcome. In sports settings, coaching effectiveness is largely dependent upon the quality of the coaches' decisions and the degree of acceptance of these decisions by the athletes (Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989). Even though there has been a trend toward democratization of organizations over the last century, Chelladurai and Arnott (1985) indicated that traditional coaching practices in athletic-team settings are authoritarian and coaches remain reluctant to include athletes in the decision-making process. Furthermore, this autocratic style of coaching has been attributed to a common personality trait (Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989).

Chelladurai and his colleagues addressed the effects of participation in decision-making in sports teams utilizing an adaptation of the Vroom-Yetton model. The decision-making styles in these studies were based upon the degree of influence given to the team members. Chelladurai et al. (1989) gave the following descriptions of five decision styles:

1. Autocratic I (AI). You [the coach] solve the problem yourself, using the information available to you at the time.
2. Autocratic II (AI). You obtain the necessary information from relevant players, then decide yourself. You may or may not tell your players what the problem is in getting the information. The role played by your players is clearly one of providing information to you the coach, rather than generating or evaluating solutions.

3. Consultative I (CI). You consult the players individually and then you make the decision yourself. Your decision may or may not reflect your players’ influence.

4. Consultative II (CII). You consult with your players as a group and you make the decision yourself. Your decision may or may not reflect your players’ influence.

5. Group (G). You share the problem with your players, then together you and your players jointly make the decision without any influence on your part. (p.203)

A sixth decision style based upon the Vroom-Yetton model that was used in the Chelladurai and Arnott (1985) study is the Delegative style (D). The Delegative style of decision making occurs when the decision is delegated to one or more players. The role of the coach in this style is simply to implement the decision once it is made by the player(s). These six decision styles can be viewed as lying on a continuum of player’s influence on the decisions, ranging from total influence (D) to no influence (AI).

Chelladurai and Arnott found the delegative style was totally rejected by athletes and thus was not viable in the context of team sports (1985).
Furthermore, Chelladurai et al. (1989) indicated that both coaches and athletes alike most preferred the Al style, while CII was chosen as the second most preferred style. CI, on the other hand, was the least preferred style. Chelladurai and Arnott (1985) offered a notion of equality to explain the rejection of the delegative style by their participants. Chelladurai et al. (1989) also used this explanation to rationalize the finding that consultation with individuals (CI) was the least preferred style in their study, while consultation with the team as a whole (CII) was the second most preferred. According to Chelladurai and Arnott (1985), this result could be explained by the notion that sharing decision-making power with only a few members from the group is antithetical to the egalitarian concept inherent in a team. Thus, they concluded that delegating or consulting with only a few athletes might be perceived by the rest of the team as preferential treatment. Thus, the two decision-making styles, Delegative (D) and Consultative I (CI) were determined to be untenable to participative decision-making in team sports. The authors concluded that the decision styles which are viable in team sport settings are ordered along a continuum of low (AI), moderate (CII), and high (G) member influence upon the decision outcome.
Present Study

The organizational justice perspective suggests evaluations of the procedural and distributive characteristics of punishment events determine individual behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the punishment. Some of these reactions include perceptions of the fairness of the disciplinary procedure and outcome to both the punished individual and the other organizational members, as well as perceptions of the appropriateness of the outcome given the specific infraction committed.

In this study, the terms punishment and discipline are used interchangeably because both terms refer to the presentation of an aversive event or the removal of a positive event in order to change an undesirable behavior. Although other procedures can decrease undesirable behavior, Arvey and Ivancevich (1980) asserted that none of these procedures are as immediate, enduring, and generally effective as a deterrent to future undesirable behavior as is the proper use of punishment.

Recent research on reactions to punishment suggests that these reactions may depend upon how individuals process information regarding the specific disciplinary event (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1992). Justice theory suggests that subordinates evaluate justice from the distributive and procedural perspectives. In organizational discipline research, distributive justice is the perceived fairness of the punishment distribution, while procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the procedures used in making the punishment decision. Recent distributive justice formulations suggest that people
evaluate the appropriateness and fairness of punishment outcomes based upon a comparison between the outcome that is received and what outcome they believe is deserved given the specific violation. Procedural justice studies on the effects of “control” in dispute-resolution situations and “voice” in reward-allocation situations both have demonstrated greater outcome acceptance and greater perceived procedural fairness associated with procedures that give people influence in the decision-making process. This influence is allowed in organizations through the use of participatory decision-making (PDM) systems.

Given the context of the present study, that is, athletic teams, it follows that coaching effectiveness should be enhanced through the use of PDM by inducing acceptance of decision outcomes, as well as perceptions of the fairness of decision outcomes and procedures. Three decision styles are utilized in the current research to represent differing levels of influence given to team members upon the decision-making process. The styles utilized in this study are the Autocratic, Consultative, and Group, which are taken from Chelladurai et al. (1989) and Vroom and Yetton (1973).

The proposed conceptual model for understanding observers’ attitudinal responses to punishment events was presented in Figure 1. As indicated by this model, the perceived justice of the procedural and distributive characteristics of the punishment events will elicit attitudinal responses regarding the fairness and appropriateness of these characteristics. The perceived characteristics of the punishment events will also determine whether subjects believe that the punishment will act as a deterrent to future infractions by the violator and other team members.
The present study examined the attitudinal outcomes of perceived procedural and distributive justice in sports teams. These variables were operationalized in scenarios of a moderately severe team violation paired with varying degrees of participation (low, moderate, high) by team members in the procedure determining the punishment, and varying degrees of harshness of the punishment outcome (low, moderate, high). Specifically, perceptions of the procedural and outcome fairness and perceptions of outcome appropriateness were investigated. The current research also addressed the perceived fairness of the punishment event to the violator and to other team members, as well as the perceived ability of the punishment to deter future misconduct.

In their review of procedural justice studies, Folger and Greenberg (1985) found when group members are given a “voice” in the decision-making process, they will perceive an outcome as fair because of their perceptions of a just procedure (i.e., the “fair process effect”). Folger and Greenberg (1985) considered the voice given subjects in experimental research as a marker for participation in PDM processes. Furthermore, Ball et al. (1992) demonstrated that subordinates given the opportunity to express opinions, to present evidence, and to have these opinions adequately considered develop perceptions of greater procedural justice and subsequently are more accepting of the decision outcome. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

(H1): Conditions providing increased participation and influence in the decision-making process will result in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both the punished player and the other team members.
(H1a): The Consultative II (C=moderate influence) condition will result in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness than will the Autocratic I (A=low influence) condition.

(H1b): The Group (G=high influence) condition will result in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness than will the Consultative II (C=moderate influence) condition.

(H2): Conditions providing increased participation in the decision-making process will result in significantly higher perceptions of distributive (i.e., outcome) fairness to both the punished player and the other team members.

(H2a): The Consultative II (C) condition will result in significantly higher perceptions of distributive fairness than will the Autocratic I (A) condition.

(H2b): The Group (G) condition will result in significantly higher perceptions of distributive fairness than will the Consultative II (C) condition.

This “fair process effect” has been produced in the past in situations where the same outcome is produced by different procedures that differ in perceived fairness. The outcomes were perceived as more fair when they were associated with just procedures (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Although Chelladurai et al. (1989) indicated that both coaches and athletes alike preferred the Autocratic style of decision-making, the aforementioned hypotheses are formulated in accordance with the abundance of organizational literature which contends that group members who are given influence in
the punishment decision will have perceptions of greater procedural justice and will be more accepting of the decision (Ball et al., 1992).

The group-value model proposed by Lind and Tyler (1988) assumes that people value their membership in social groups such as teams, and that they are concerned with their long-term social relationships with both the group leaders and their fellow group members. In the context of these relationships, members are concerned with fair treatment, that is, the neutral treatment of group members, trust in the leader, and social status in the group. Fair treatment is preferred because all members stand to benefit in the long-term. Tyler (1989) proposed that these issues will have an effect on reactions to punishment experiences independent of the influence of procedural and distributive justice evaluations. Thus, it is predicted that the perceived fairness of the punishment event to both the violator and the team members will be dependent upon the perceived neutrality or appropriateness of the punishment given the severity of the violation.

(H3): The punishment outcome of moderate severity will be perceived as more than will either a more severe or a more lenient punishment outcome.

(H3a): The punishment outcome of moderate severity will be perceived as more fair to the violator than will either a more severe or a more lenient punishment outcome.

(H3b): The punishment outcome of moderate severity will be perceived as more fair to other team members than will either a more severe or a more lenient punishment outcome.
Group members also expect superiors to apply normal remedies that are perceived as appropriate for a given violation (Ball et al., 1992). Given the moderate severity of the violation in this study, it is hypothesized that:

(H4): The punishment outcome of moderate severity will be perceived as more appropriate than will either a more severe or a more lenient punishment outcome.

In addition, Trevino (1992) suggested that punishment outcomes induce punishment expectancies and subsequently deter misconduct only if the punishment is harsh enough to gain the attention of the potential violators. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

(H5): Punishment conditions with increased outcome severity will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future violator misconduct than will punishment conditions with less severe punishments.

(H5a): The high severity of punishment condition will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future violator misconduct than will the moderate punishment severity condition.

(H5b): The moderate severity of punishment condition will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future violator misconduct than will the low punishment severity condition.

(H6): Punishment conditions with increased outcome severity will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future team member misconduct than will punishment conditions with less severe punishments.
(H6a): The high severity of punishment condition will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future team member misconduct than will the moderate punishment severity condition.

(H6b): The moderate severity of punishment condition will be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future team member misconduct than will the low punishment severity condition.

In sum, the punishment outcome of moderate severity should be perceived as more fair and appropriate to both the punished player and the other team members than more severe or lenient punishment outcomes. Conditions with increased outcome severity should be perceived as a stronger deterrent to future misconduct by both the violator and the other team members than the more lenient outcomes.
Method

Participants

Initially, 232 undergraduate students from a southeastern university voluntarily participated in this study. After manipulation checks were implemented to eliminate inattentive participants, 205 participants were utilized for the analyses. Of these 205 participants, 59 (29%) were male and 146 (71%) were female. The mean age of participants was 19.94 years (SD = 4.07), while 186 participants were white, 13 African-American, 3 Asian/Asian American, 2 Hispanic, and 1 reported “other.”

Design

A 3 (decision-making procedures: Autocratic (A), Consultative (C), Group (G)) X 3 (punishment outcomes: low, moderate, and high severity) factorial design was used. The nine procedural justice and punishment conditions were represented in hypothetical team-sport scenarios.

Procedure

Scenario Development. Hypothetical scenarios were developed representing the nine conditions created by the 3 X 3 factorial design. A moderate team infraction, along with low, moderate, and high levels of participation in the outcome decision, and low, moderate, and severe punishment outcomes were used in the scenarios. The nine
scenarios, as well as the other materials used for data collection, may be found in Appendix A.

Participation was operationalized through the use of an abbreviated version of the continuum of decision styles used in the Chelladurai et al. studies (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989). These decision styles are ordered along a continuum of low, moderate, and high member influence upon the final decision made. The decision style used with no team member influence was the Autocratic I (A) style in which the coach makes the decision himself, using the information available at the time. The decision style used with moderate team member influence was the Consultative II (C) style in which the coach consults with all the players as a group and then makes the decision himself. The third decision style utilized in this study, in which the team members have the highest degree of influence, was the participative or Group (G) style. This style of decision making is characterized by the coach and the team members making the decision together, with the role of the coach being only that of another member. These decision styles were utilized in this study to represent a continuum of team member amounts of influence in the decision outcome. The degree of severity of the rule violations and punishments was derived from a stimulus-centered rating study.

Stimulus-Rating Study. The researchers initially generated a list of violations and punishments. This list was reviewed and refined by two intercollegiate NCAA coaches at two different universities, resulting in a list of 17 team infractions and 11 punishments. A questionnaire was developed and distributed to 28 intercollegiate athletes and eight coaches at two universities as well as to 39 undergraduate students at a third university.
The instrument consisted of 17 infractions that were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = not severe to 5 = extremely severe. The instrument also included 11 punishments for violation of team rules that were rated on the same five-point scale. Demographic information was also collected. The results indicated the sample had the following characteristics: group (39 students, 28 athletes, 8 coaches), level of athletic experience (6 Recreational League, 2 Intramurals, 21 High School Varsity, 30 NCAA Intercollegiate), the sport(s) the respondent played, gender (15 males, 60 females), age (19.94 years; SD = 4.07), and ethnicity (17 African American, 54 White, 1 Hispanic, 2 other).

Mean ratings and standard deviations for the infractions and punishments may be found in Appendix B. The results of the stimulus-rating study provided the basis for selecting variables for use in the study. The punishable behavior used in all the scenarios, breaking team curfew before a game, was one of several behaviors rated close to the midrange of the scale. Of these behaviors, breaking curfew appeared to be the most appropriate for the purposes of this study. The low-severity punishment chosen, extra study hall, was clearly rated the least severe by all three subject pools. The moderate punishment chosen, revoking the player’s starting position, was the behavior rated closest to the midrange by the coaches and athletes and near the midrange by the undergraduates. The severe punishment chosen, dismissal from the team, was clearly rated the most severe by all three subject pools.

**Questionnaire Distribution.** The scenario-based questionnaires were distributed to the participants during the last 30 minutes of their class and took approximately 15 minutes to complete. The participants reported demographic information, and were
asked to read and respond to the hypothetical scenarios as if they were members of the
team in the scenario. Each participant received one scenario. For each scenario, the
participant rated his/her perception of the fairness of the punishment procedure and
outcome to both the violator and the other team members. Participants also rated the
appropriateness of the punishment as well as the ability of the punishment to deter future
misconduct of both the violator and of the other team members. Participants were then
asked to return the scenarios to the researcher before they exited the classroom.
Results

**Manipulation Checks**

Participants were asked to identify the rule that was violated, the punishment that was implemented, and the procedure that was used to determine the punishment. Out of the original 232 participants, 205 passed the manipulation checks (i.e., responded correctly to all three items); their data were utilized for the following analyses.

**Descriptives and Correlations**

A correlational analysis was used to investigate bivariate relationships. Means, standard deviations, and inter-item correlations are provided in Table 2.

**Table 1**

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for All Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fairness of Procedure to Player</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fairness of Procedure to Team</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.529*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fairness of Punishment to Player</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.471*</td>
<td>.327*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fairness of Punishment to Team</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.351*</td>
<td>.547*</td>
<td>.492*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Appropriateness of Punishment</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.655*</td>
<td>.501*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deterrent to Player</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Deterrent to Team</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.680*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 205.*

*p < .05. **p < .01.
All four fairness dependent variables and the appropriateness dependent variable were significantly correlated. The two deterrence dependent variables were not significantly related to most of the fairness and appropriateness variables, but were significantly correlated with each other.

**Analyses for Fairness and Appropriateness**

Due to the intercorrelated fairness (4 variables) and appropriateness (1 variable) dependent variables, a 3 (team member participation in decision-making procedure: low=autocratic, moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high) MANOVA was used to determine the effects of the two independent variables. Decision-making procedure had a significant multivariate effect, Wilk’s Lambda $F(10, 205) = 3.87$, $p < .001$. Punishment severity also produced a significant effect, Wilk’s Lambda $F(10, 205) = 9.84$, $p < .001$. No significant interaction effects were found.

**Fairness of Procedure to Player.** Following the significant MANOVA, univariate ANOVAs were conducted to test the hypotheses. The results for the ANOVA on fairness of the procedure to the player are illustrated in Table 3. Decision-making procedure and punishment severity both produced significant main effects on perceptions of fairness of the procedure to the player; no interaction was found.

A Scheffe’s post-hoc test for the significant main effect of decision-making procedure indicated that the autocratic method differed significantly from the consultative ($p < .05$) and group ($p < .01$) methods, while the consultative and group methods were not significantly different from each other. Autocratic decision-making produced the lowest ratings of procedural fairness to the player ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.09$, $N = 69$), while
Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Procedure to Player

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.45**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*P < .01. **P < .001.

the consultative (M = 3.82, SD = 0.99, N = 61) and group (M = 3.96, SD = 0.96, N = 75) conditions elicited higher ratings of procedural fairness to the punished player.

A Scheffe’s post-hoc test for the significant effect of punishment severity indicated that the severe punishment differed significantly (p < .01) from mild and moderate punishments, while mild and moderate punishments did not differ from each other. More specifically, severe punishment (M = 3.23, SD = 1.11, N = 70) elicited lower perceptions of procedural fairness to the punished player than did either moderate (M = 3.85, SD = 0.90, N = 62) or mild (M = 4.11, SD = 0.89, N = 73) punishments.

Fairness of Procedure to Other Team Members. The results for the ANOVA on perceptions of fairness of the procedure to other team members are presented in Table 4. ANOVA revealed that decision-making procedure and punishment severity both produced significant main effects on perceptions of fairness of the procedure to the other team members. No interaction effect was found.
Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Procedure to Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.78*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.62**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*2 < .01. **p < .001.

A Scheffe's test indicated that the autocratic method differed significantly from the consultative and group (p < .01) methods, while the consultative and group procedures were not significantly different from each other. Autocratic (M = 3.19, SD = 1.15, N = 69) decision-making was rated less fair to the other team members than were consultative (M = 3.80, SD = 1.00, N = 61) and group (M = 4.15, SD = 0.94, N = 75) decision-making. A Scheffe's post-hoc test also found that mild (M = 3.94, SD = 1.08, N = 73) and severe (M = 3.40, SD = 1.08, N = 70) punishments significantly differed from each other in eliciting perceptions of procedural fairness to the other team members, while moderate (M = 3.82, SD = 1.09, N = 62) punishments did not significantly differ from either of the other two.

The aforementioned results indicate partial support for Hypothesis 1, which stated that conditions providing increased participation and influence in the decision-making process will elicit higher perceptions of procedural fairness. More specifically,
Hypothesis 1a was supported in that the Consultative condition resulted in higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both punished players and other team members than the Autocratic condition. Hypothesis 1b was not supported as the Group condition did not result in significantly higher perceptions of procedural fairness to both punished players and other team members than the Consultative condition.

**Fairness of Outcome to Player.** A 3 (decision-making procedure: low=autocratic, moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of decision-making procedures and punishment severity on perceptions of fairness of the punishment outcome to the player. As illustrated in Table 5, the type of decision-making procedure did not significantly effect perceptions of fairness of the punishment to the player, while punishment severity had a significant main effect. No significant interaction was found.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.15**</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

**p < .001.
A Scheffe's post-hoc comparison indicated that mild ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.91$, $N = 73$), moderate ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.00$, $N = 62$), and severe ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.00$, $N = 70$) punishments all significantly differed ($p < .01$) from each other on perceptions of fairness of the punishment to the player. Mild punishment was perceived as the most fair to the punished player, while severe punishment was viewed as being the least fair.

**Fairness of Outcome to Other Team Members.** A 3 (decision-making procedure: low=autocratic, moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of decision-making procedures and punishment severity on perceptions of fairness of the punishment outcome to the other team members. As the data in Table 6 indicate, punishment severity produced a significant main effect for perceptions of fairness of the punishment to the team members, while the main effect for decision-making procedure was not significant. Again, no interaction effect was found.

| Table 5 |

<p>| Analysis of Variance for Fairness of Punishment to Team Members |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.57*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

*p < .01.*
A Scheffe’s test indicated that in terms of fairness of the punishment to the team members, severe punishment differed from moderate ($p < .05$) and mild ($p < .01$) punishment, while moderate and mild punishment were not significantly different from each other. More specifically, severe punishment ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.95$, $N = 70$) was viewed as less fair to the other team members than either moderate ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.88$, $N = 63$) or mild ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.10$, $N = 73$) punishment.

These results fail to support Hypothesis 2, which stated that conditions providing increased participation in the decision-making process would result in higher perceptions of distributive (i.e., punishment) fairness. Hypotheses 3, 3a, and 3b are partially supported by the ANOVA results. These hypotheses stated that the punishment outcome of moderate severity would be perceived as more fair to both the player and to the team members than either a severe or a mild punishment outcome, given the moderately severe team infraction. Moderate punishment was perceived to be more fair to the player and other team members than was severe punishment. However, less severe punishment was perceived to be more fair to both the punished player and the other team members than punishment of increased severity.

**Appropriateness of Punishment.** A 3 (decision-making procedure: low=autocratic, moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of decision-making procedures and punishment severity on perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment given the violated team infraction. As illustrated in Table 7, decision-making procedure did not produce a significant main effect for perceptions of appropriateness of
the punishment for the moderately severe violation; punishment severity produced a significant main effect. No significant interaction was found.

A Scheffe's post-hoc comparison indicated that severe punishment differed significantly (p < .001) from both mild and moderately severe punishments, while mild and moderate punishments did not significantly differ from each other. More specifically, severe punishment (M = 2.41, SD = 0.94, N = 70) was perceived as being less appropriate than either moderate (M = 3.39, SD = 0.88, N = 62) or mild (M = 3.30, SD = 0.98, N = 73) punishments. These results indicate partial support for Hypothesis 4, which stated that the punishment outcome of moderate severity would be perceived as more appropriate than either a more severe or a more lenient punishment outcome.

Table 6
Analysis of Variance for Appropriateness of Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.32**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

**p < .001.

Analyses for Deterrence. The deterrence dependent variables were intercorrelated, thus, a 3 (decision-making procedure: low=autocratic,
moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low, moderate, high)

MANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of the two independent variables on
the deterrence dependent variables. No significant interaction effects were found.
Punishment severity had a significant main effect, Wilk's Lambda $F(4, 205) = 25.51, p < .001$. However, decision-making procedure did not produce a significant main effect for

deterrence of future rule violations.

Following the significant MANOVA, two 3 (decision-making procedure:
low=autocratic, moderate=participative, high=group) X 3 (severity of punishment: low,
moderate, high) ANOVAs were conducted to test the effects of decision-making
procedure and punishment severity on perceptions of the likelihood of the punishment to
deter future violations by both the punished player and the other team members. The
results in Tables 8 and 9 indicate that the severity of punishment had significant main
effects for perceptions of deterrence of future violations, while the decision-making
procedure used had no effect. Furthermore, there were no significant interaction effects.

For both of these analyses, Sheffe's post-hoc tests indicated that mild punishment
differed significantly ($p < .001$) from both moderate and severe punishments, while
moderate and severe punishments were not significantly different from each other. More
specifically, in the ANOVA for deterrent to player, mild punishment ($M = 2.71, SD =
0.96, N = 73$) was viewed as significantly less likely to deter future violator misconduct
than either moderate ($M = 4.00, SD = 0.89, N = 62$) or severe ($M = 3.61, SD = 1.33, N =
70$) punishment. Likewise, in the analysis for deterrence of future team member
violations, mild punishment ($M = 2.62, SD = 1.04, N = 73$) was viewed as significantly
Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Deterrent to Player

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.71**</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

**p < .001.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance for Deterrent to Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment Severity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.23**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Procedure X Punishment Severity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error.

**p < .001.

less likely to deter future team member misconduct than either moderate (M = 3.90, SD = 0.90, N = 62) or severe (M = 4.03, SD = 1.18, N = 70) punishment.
These results provide partial support for Hypotheses 5 and 6, which stated that punishment with increased severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future violator misconduct and future team member misconduct, respectively, than would less severe punishment. More specifically, Hypotheses 5a and 6a were not supported as they stated that the severe punishment condition would be perceived as more likely to deter future violator misconduct and future team member misconduct, respectively, than the moderate punishment condition. Hypotheses 5b and 6b were supported in that they hypothesized that moderate punishments would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter future player misconduct and future team member misconduct, respectively, than mild punishment.
Discussion

The organizational justice and punishment literatures suggest that procedural and distributive justice evaluations for a specific punishment event will affect organizational members’ behavioral and attitudinal reactions to punishment. Some of these reactions may include subsequent performance and/or misbehavior, perceptions of fairness of the procedure and outcome to both the punished individual and the other organizational members, and perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment given the specific violation (Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1993). If positive, these reactions will subsequently contribute to the stability of the institution, because organizations that operate according to a set of procedures and distributions viewed as fair and just will induce commitment, trust, and loyalty from its members (Cohen, 1985).

Because more authoritarian styles of leadership may inhibit trust in the leader, as well as beliefs about neutral and fair treatment, one alternative proposed by the justice literature is to allow group member participation in the decision-making process (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Chelladurai and Arnott (1985) indicated that traditional athletic-team coaching practices are authoritarian and that coaches remain reluctant to include athletes in decision-making. However, the organizational justice and discipline literatures imply that coaching effectiveness should be enhanced through the use of participative decision-making by inducing perceptions of higher quality of decision
outcomes and increased acceptance of these decisions. This study contributes significantly to the organizational justice and discipline literatures as well as the sport psychology literature because it empirically addresses the appropriateness of applying the aforementioned concepts in the team-sports setting.

It was first hypothesized that conditions providing increased participation and influence in the decision-making process would induce greater perceptions of procedural fairness. Participation in this study was operationalized on a continuum where coaches allowed low (Autocratic condition), moderate (Consultative condition), and high (Group condition) degrees of team member influence in the decision-making process.

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported in that both the Group and Consultative conditions were rated as significantly more procedurally fair than the Autocratic condition. However, the Group and Consultative conditions did not result in significantly different perceptions of procedural fairness. This finding is consistent with the organizational justice literatures since conditions allowing participative decision-making were viewed as more procedurally fair than the autocratic decision-making condition. One possible explanation for the lack of a significant difference between the Group and Consultative conditions is that subjects may not have distinguished between the two levels of participation in the decision-making processes. Subjects may have viewed these two processes as being equivalent in team-member participation. Many of the subjects who failed the manipulation check and were not included in the analyses failed the manipulation checks because they were unable to distinguish between the Group and Consultative conditions. Future research should place more emphasis on distinguishing between Group and Consultative decision-making conditions.
Next it was hypothesized (H2) that conditions providing increased participation in the decision-making process would result in higher perceptions of distributive (i.e., punishment) fairness. This supposition was not the case, however. The decision-making procedure was found to have no effect on perceptions of fairness of the punishment outcome, although the severity of the punishment produced an effect. Thus, it seems that the procedure used in determining the punishment is not as important in impacting the perceived fairness of the punishment as is the severity of the punishment. This finding departs from the traditional organizational justice and discipline literatures contending that both procedural and distributive characteristics are important factors in inducing perceptions of distributive fairness (Ball et al., 1993). In fact, the past literature suggests that procedural factors may be more important than distributive factors in determining fairness perceptions (Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the punishment outcome of moderate severity would be perceived as more fair than either a severe or a mild punishment outcome, given the moderately severe team infraction utilized in all nine scenarios. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported in that less severe punishments induced greater perceived fairness to both the punished player and the other team members than punishments of increased severity. In this study subjects were less concerned with aligning the punishment to fit the crime than they were with the actual harshness of the punishment. It was also hypothesized (H4) that the punishment outcome of moderate severity would be viewed as more appropriate than either a more severe or a more lenient punishment, given the moderately severe violation committed. Mild and moderate punishment, however, were perceived as being equally more appropriate than severe punishment. Trevino (1992)
proposed that people evaluate the fairness of punishment outcomes based upon their individual belief about the appropriate levels of punishment that fit an infraction. Because severe punishments were viewed as less appropriate than mild and moderate punishments, it follows that these less severe punishments would be viewed as more distributively fair than punishments of greater severity, as discussed above. Thus, given the moderately severe team infraction committed, it seems that severe punishments will be viewed as less appropriate, and thus less fair to punished players and team members alike.

Furthermore, Hypotheses 5 and 6 proposed that conditions providing increased punishment severity would be perceived as significantly more likely to deter both future violator misconduct and future team member misconduct than would less severe punishments. These hypotheses were partially supported in that mild punishment was viewed as significantly less likely to deter future misconduct of violators and team members than were either moderate or severe punishments, while moderate and severe punishments were not significantly different from each other. According to Trevino (1992), deterrence theory suggests that punishment outcomes induce punishment expectancies and subsequently deter misconduct only if the punishment is harsh enough to gain the attention of the potential violators. Given the moderate team infraction in this study, it seems that mild punishments were not harsh enough to create effective punishment expectancies in our participants to induce perceptions of the deterrence of subsequent misconduct. Therefore, these results suggest that punishment severity should be at least as severe as the misbehavior in order to form effective punishment expectancies that will subsequently deter similar future infractions.
Limitations

There were some shortcomings in this study. As discussed earlier, there seemed to be some difficulty with our participants in distinguishing between the two levels of participative decision-making utilized in this study (i.e., Consultative and Group). Failing to distinguish between these conditions was the most common problem for participants who failed the manipulation check. It is not possible to determine from our data whether the problem was in the wording of the scenario or the manipulation check. Group decision-making was meant to portray complete team member influence in the decision-making process, and the Consultative condition was meant to portray partial team member influence in the decision-making process. Thus, the wording of these conditions should be carefully considered in future research of this kind.

A second potential shortcoming in the present study was related to the punishment of ejecting the punished player from the team. This punishment created problems with the deterrence dependent variables. Although moderate and severe punishments were found to induce perceptions of increased deterrence of future misconduct, a few subjects marked that the severe punishment was “very unlikely” to deter the punished player from committing this infraction again. The reasoning behind this response is that the player was not on the team any longer; therefore, he/she could no longer break a team rule. This problem may have resulted in the nonsignificant difference in the severe and moderate punishment conditions in their effect on perceptions of deterrence of future misconduct. This shortcoming should be corrected and investigated in future research.
Future Directions

In a departure from past literature, which suggests that procedural factors are more important than distributive factors in determining perceptions of the fairness of the actual punishment, the results of this study found that the procedure used did not have a significant effect upon perceptions of distributive fairness for the participants. Future research on discipline in sports teams should consider and investigate this finding. A major premise of organizational justice and discipline research is that less authoritarian processes such as participative decision-making should enhance attitudinal perceptions of the outcomes derived from these processes.

Another puzzling finding that should be considered in future research is that mild punishments were perceived as more fair to punished players and team members alike than moderate or severe punishments. Given the moderate offense committed in these scenarios, it was hypothesized that moderate punishments would be perceived as most fair. It is possible that the specific moderate and severe punishments chosen were not the optimal punishments to use given the purposes of this study. Participants may have viewed both the revocation of the player's starting position (i.e., moderate) and kicking the player off the team (i.e., severe) as unfair to both the player and the other team members because of the adverse impact, on the team as a whole, of these specific punishments. Future research should consider this finding and possibly use punishments that would not have such an adverse impact on the rest of the team.

Implications

The results of this study have implications for effective coaching in team sports. As previously discussed, traditional coaching practices are typically authoritarian and
rarely include more democratically oriented processes such as participative decision-making. However, organizational research has consistently found participative decision-making to be a more effective method for making decisions that will strengthen an organization by inducing trust in the leader, perceptions of the quality of decisions, and increased acceptance of these decisions. This research also demonstrated the "fair-process" effect in that conditions providing participative decision-making were viewed as more procedurally fair than the Autocratic condition, which allowed no athletic participation in the decision process. Thus, today’s coaches should consider this alternative to traditional coaching practices for strengthening the interpersonal bonds within the team/organizational structure.

Additionally, this research indicated that mild punishments for moderately severe infractions are not powerful enough to induce effective punishment expectancies that will subsequently deter future misconduct. Thus, coaches should be aware that a simple "slap on the wrist" of a player who breaks a team rule may not adequately create a punishment expectancy that will cause that player to think twice about committing the infraction again. In fact, if team members conduct a mental utility analysis weighing the costs of the mild punishment against the perceived benefits of committing this infraction, they may actually be encouraged by weak punishment to commit the infraction if a future opportunity arises.

Conclusions

The conceptual framework guiding this study was presented in Figure 1. This model suggests that evaluations of the procedural and distributive characteristics of punishment events in team-sport settings will dictate individual attitudinal reactions
regarding the fairness and appropriateness of the punishment, as well as perceptions of its ability to deter similar future misconduct. This conceptual model was partially supported by the results of this study.

Both the procedural and distributive characteristics of the punishment event had a significant effect on perceptions of the fairness of the procedure to both the violator and the other team members. However, only the distributive characteristics of the punishment produced a significant effect on individual perceptions of the fairness of the punishment outcome to both the violator and the other team members. As discussed earlier, this finding departs from an abundance of organizational justice and discipline literatures which contend that both procedural and distributive characteristics are important factors in determining fairness perceptions (Ball et al., 1993). Past literature even suggests that procedural factors may carry more weight than distributive factors in inducing perceptions of distributive fairness (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Regarding individual perceptions of the appropriateness of the punishment outcome for a given infraction, only the distributive characteristics of the punishment produced a significant effect. Procedural characteristics produced no effect on perceptions of punishment outcome appropriateness.

Furthermore, distributive characteristics of the punishment produced a significant effect on perceptions of the ability of the punishment to deter future misconduct, while procedural characteristics of the punishment did not produce a significant effect for deterrence of future rule violations. This finding follows the literature on deterrence theory which suggests that distributive characteristics of the punishment event, that is the severity of the punishment implemented, will determine whether the punishment event
will induce punishment expectancies that will subsequently deter misconduct (Trevino, 1992).

These findings collectively paint a picture of reactions to punishment events that is inconsistent with that provided in the proposed model in Figure 1. The results of this study suggest that procedural and distributive characteristics alike are important in determining perceptions of the procedural fairness of a punishment event. However, in determining perceptions of the appropriateness and fairness of the punishment outcome and perceptions of the ability of the punishment outcome to deter future misconduct, the procedural characteristics of the punishment event are not important, while the distributive characteristics of the punishment are the deciding factor in determining these perceptions. Future research should address whether or not the current findings regarding observers’ attitudinal reactions to punishment events generalizes to punishment events in team-sport and other settings.
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Appendix A
Western Kentucky University

INFORMED CONSENT INFORMATION FORM

I consent to participate in the research investigation: Perceptions of Justice in Team Sports. Jason Tapp from the Psychology Department has explained the general purpose and nature of the research study to me.

I understand the purpose of this research is to investigate perceptions of justice resulting from punishment in team settings and that the research procedures involves a hypothetical, yet realistic scenario to be read with several questions to be answered following the scenario. I further understand there are no potential risks to research participants.

I understand that I am voluntarily participating in this research and that all information is confidential. I understand that my identity will not be revealed. I also understand that I am free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time, and that any questions I have about the project will be answered by the aforementioned researcher or by an authorized representative.

Western Kentucky University and the aforementioned investigator have responsibility for ensuring that participants in research projects conducted under institutional auspices are safeguarded from injury or harm resulting from such participation. If appropriate, the researcher named below may be contacted for remedy or assistance for any possible consequences from such activities. Furthermore, I understand that if I have any questions concerning my rights as a research participant I may contact the Chair of the Committee for the Protection of Human Research Participants, Dr. Elizabeth Lemerise, at (270) 745-4390.

On the basis of the above statements, I agree to participate in this project.

________________________
Participant’s signature

________________________
Jason Tapp (Researcher)
Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt (Faculty Advisor)
264 Tate Page Hall
(270) 745-2695
Team Justice Study

This research is examining justice perceptions of punishment in a sports-team setting. Justice evaluations of punishment are important because they affect team members' behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the punishment. These reactions have implications regarding team cohesiveness and performance, as well as other important aspects of team sports. The researchers are also interested in the differing perceptions of different groups of individuals such as athletes versus non-athletes, males versus females, older versus younger individuals, etc. In order to answer these important research questions, we need the demographic information requested on this part of the questionnaire.

Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this material.

1. Athletic Experience (check all that apply)
   ___Recreation League (e.g., YMCA, church league, etc.)
   ___Intramurals
   ___High School Varsity
   ___NCAA Intercollegiate

2. Gender
   ___Male
   ___Female

3. Age
   ___Years

4. Ethnicity
   ___African American
   ___Asian
   ___Hispanic
   ___White
   ___Other (please specify) _____________________________

DIRECTIONS:

On the following page is a hypothetical, but realistic scenario depicting a situation involving an intercollegiate basketball team. Please read the directions carefully and respond to the questions that follow. It is very important to the success of this research that you pay close attention to the details of the scenario and respond as honestly as possible to each of the questions that follow. When you have completed the questionnaire please return it to me. When everyone has finished you will be free to go.

AGAIN, PLEASE READ THE SCENARIO AND QUESTIONS CAREFULLY. THANK YOU.
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat's punishment would be. The coach and all the team members together made the determination of the punishment given to Pat. The group as a whole decided that Pat would receive extra study hall the following week for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _______________ (fill in the blank)
2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _______________ (fill in the blank)
3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision  coach and team together made decision  coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
   very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1 _______ 2 _______ 3 _______ 4 _______ 5
    very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat's punishment would be. The coach and all the team members made the determination of the punishment given to Pat. The group as a whole decided that Pat's starting position would be revoked and must be re-earned for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _______________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)

   coach made decision  coach and team together made decision  coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?

   1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
   very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?

    1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5
    very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat's punishment would be. The coach and all of the team members made the determination of the punishment given to Pat. The group as a whole decided that Pat would be dismissed from the team for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   - coach made decision
   - coach and team together made decision
   - coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 fair
   - 5 very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 fair
   - 5 very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 fair
   - 5 very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 fair
   - 5 very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   - 1 very unfair
   - 2 unfair
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 fair
   - 5 very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   - 1 very unlikely
   - 2 unlikely
   - 3 neutral
   - 4 likely
   - 5 very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    - 1 very unlikely
    - 2 unlikely
    - 3 neutral
    - 4 likely
    - 5 very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat’s punishment would be. After consulting with the team as a whole, the coach decided what Pat’s punishment should be. The coach decided that Pat would receive extra study hall the following week for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated?______________________________________(fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented?______________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision  coach and team together made decision  coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How __________fair to the punished player was the procedure used__________ in determining the punishment?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

5) How __________fair to the team members was the procedure used_________________ in determining the punishment?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

6) How __________fair to the punished player was the actual punishment________________ in that was implemented?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

7) How __________fair to the other team members was the actual punishment________________ in that was implemented?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how __________appropriate was the punishment?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unfair  unfair  neutral  fair  very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will __________deter the player who________________ committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
   very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will __________deter the other team __________Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5
    very unlikely  unlikely  neutral  likely  very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat’s punishment would be. After consulting with the team as a whole, the coach decided what Pat’s punishment should be. The coach decided that Pat’s starting position would be revoked and must be re-earned for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision coach and team together made decision coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
   very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
    very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach and the team had a meeting the next day to decide what Pat’s punishment would be. After consulting with the team as a whole, the coach decided what Pat’s punishment should be. The coach decided that Pat would be dismissed from the team for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision coach and team together made decision coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach made the decision as to what Pat’s punishment would be. The coach decided that Pat would receive extra study hall the next week for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? _________________________________________ (fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? _________________________________________ (fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision coach and team together made decision coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1 2 3 4 5
    very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach made the decision as to what Pat's punishment would be. The coach decided that Pat's starting position would be revoked and must be re-earned for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)
2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ____________________________ (fill in the blank)
3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision coach and team together made decision coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
   very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5
    very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely
Scenario: Pat is an intercollegiate basketball player at State University. Before the last game, Pat missed the team curfew. Because of this team infraction, the coach made the decision as to what Pat's punishment would be. The coach decided that Pat would be dismissed from the team for missing the team curfew.

Please answer the following questions concerning the above scenario. For the first 2 questions, please fill in the blanks based on the information given in the scenario.

1) In this situation, what rule was violated? ________________________________(fill in the blank)

2) In this situation, what punishment was implemented? ________________________________(fill in the blank)

3) What procedure was used to determine the punishment? (circle one)
   coach made decision coach and team together made decision coach consulted with team before decision

There are two important components in a disciplinary situation. One is the procedure used to determine the punishment, and the other is the actual punishment itself. The justice of a punishment situation can be assessed from two perspectives. The punishment situation can be assessed from the perspective of the punished player or the perspective of the other team members.

4) How fair to the punished player was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

5) How fair to the team members was the procedure used in determining the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

6) How fair to the punished player was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

7) How fair to the other team members was the actual punishment that was implemented?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

8) Given the team infraction committed by Pat, how appropriate was the punishment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unfair unfair neutral fair very fair

Furthermore, punishment is meant to deter future misconduct, that is, punishment will make that behavior less likely to occur in similar future situations.

9) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the player who committed the team infraction from violating this rule in the future?
   1 2 3 4 5
   very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely

10) How likely is it that the punishment implemented in this situation will deter the other team Members from committing this team infraction in the future?
    1 2 3 4 5
    very unlikely unlikely neutral likely very likely
### Table B1

**Means and Standard Deviations for Stimulus-Rating Study (Violations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violations</th>
<th>Students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Athletes&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Coaches&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late to Practice</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late to Team Workout</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Profanity</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking Curfew Before Game</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipping Team Study Hall</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful to Dorm Super</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late to Team Bus</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipping Team Workout</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Practice</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect to Professor</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsportsmanlike Conduct</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking Back to Coach</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Team Bus</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting with Teammate</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged with Misdemeanor</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged with Felony</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing Drug Test</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale values: 1 = not severe, 2 = moderately severe, 3 = severe, 4 = very severe, 5 = extremely severe.

<sup>a</sup>n = 39.  <sup>b</sup>n = 28.  <sup>c</sup>n = 8.
Table B2

Means and Standard Deviations for Stimulus-Rating Study (Punishments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punishments</th>
<th>Students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th>Coaches&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Study Hall</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Locker Room</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Laps or Stadium Stairs</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Reprimand</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 a.m. Workout</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Conditioning</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Team Gear</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from Practice</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revoke Starting Position</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from Game</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from Team</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale values: 1 = not severe, 2 = moderately severe, 3 = severe, 4 = very severe, 5 = extremely severe.

<sup>a</sup>n = 39.  <sup>b</sup>n = 28.  <sup>c</sup>n = 8.