

Differential Association and Role-Set Configuration: The Impact of Significant Others Upon the Perception of Ethical Climate in a Sports Organization

David Cruise Malloy and James Agarwal
University of Regina

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence that significant others have upon the perception of ethical climate in a Canadian provincial non-profit sport federation. The study was theoretically based upon the concepts of differential association and role-set configuration as well as the ethical climate dimensions developed in a non-profit context by Agarwal and Malloy (1999). The results demonstrate some support for the earlier empirical and theoretical findings that suggest that members of non-profit organizations may not be influenced by internal strategies of control and conformity. While this study was based upon a single provincial sport federation, the authors cautiously draw attention to the implications that the results may have for other non-profit organizations.

The concern for the ethical sport organization is an implicit assumption (Schein, 1990) or a metavalue (Hodgkinson, 1996) among administrators and participants (Malloy & Zakus, 1995). However, perhaps because of its subtlety, organizational ethics has not received the attention that it deserves or necessitates, and as a consequence, ethical transgressions are poorly understood and seem to continue unabated (Donnelly, 2000; Malloy, Ross, & Zakus, 2000). We contend that much more attention be given to the conduct of members and the various factors that influence behavior in order to understand and enhance the ethical nature of the organization and the perception of sport by the public. This paper is an attempt to contribute to this aim by examining the influence of the significant other upon ethical climate.

Ethical climate is a construct that reflects the memberships' shared perceptions of what is acceptable and unacceptable ethical behavior in their organization (Victor & Cullen, 1988). In other words, it is what the members (e.g., players, coaches, administrators, and volunteers) perceive the organization's ethical

David Cruise Malloy is with the Faculty of Physical Activity Studies and James Agarwal is with the Faculty of Administration at the University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada, S4S 0A2.

orientation to be as opposed to formal statements sanctioned by the organization. Having said this, it is acknowledged that there exists a dominant climate and sub-climates within large organizations (Sinclair, 1993). The focus of this particular study is with the overarching climate of a sports federation as opposed to its sub-climates. The research that has examined this realm of organizational life has revealed that numerous factors influence our perception of what is ethically right or wrong, good or bad. For example, studies have demonstrated that a variety of individual, organizational, and external moderators affect the way in which we "see" the organization as being an ethical or unethical institution (e.g., Fritzsche, 2000; Morris & MacDonald, 1995; Sims & Keon, 1997; Upchurch & Ruhland, 1995).

Of the many variables that may impact upon the perception of ethical climate, the influence of the significant other may be of particular interest to administrators who wish to gain a better understanding of the potential role of interpersonal contact (e.g., leadership and group dynamics) in the organization's ethical atmosphere. For example, Ferrell, Zey-Ferrell, and Krugman (1983) state that "the definitions of significant others in the focal person's intraorganizational and interorganizational environments determine his/her definition of what is ethical and how he/she will act relative to this definition" (p. 20). Further, Ferrell and Gresham (1985) suggest that "Individuals do not learn values attitudes, and norms from society or organizations but from others who are members of disparate social groups, each bearing distinct norms, values, and attitudes [i.e., significant others]" (p. 90).

Despite the inclusion of the significant other as a variable in research on for-profit organizations (e.g., Adams, Harris, & Carely, 1998; Jones & Kavanagh, 1996), it has yet to be incorporated into an empirical investigation in the non-profit sector or the realm of sport administration. As the research argues that significant differences exist between the two sectors in terms of mission, governance, and decision making, it is important to examine other factors that may influence ethical climate in order to further our understanding of the realm of non-profit sport. For example, Thibault, Slack, and Hinings (1993) stated that

in essence, the context in which nonprofit groups operate is different from the context of profit-oriented organizations. Thus, nonprofit organizations do not necessarily "strategize" in the same manner as organizations whose goals are primarily profit oriented. . . . When nonprofit administrators develop strategies, their purposes are generally very different than those of profit-oriented organizations. (p. 26)

In this paper, we investigated the extent to which the significant other (i.e., superiors, co-workers, volunteers, and athletes) affects the perception of ethical climate in a non-profit Canadian sport federation.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this project is based upon two behavioral theories concerning the influence of significant others and the ethical climate construct

developed by Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988). In the following section this framework is discussed.

Differential Association and Role-Set Configuration: The Influence of Significant Others

The theory of social modeling (Bandura, 1977) explains ethical or unethical behavior as a function of behavioral modeling, imitating, and role-playing. Learning (ethical or unethical) occurs through one's observation of other individuals and the corresponding reinforcement one receives for that behavior.

Bandura's work is consistent with the earlier research investigating the theories of differential association (Sutherland & Cressey, 1970) and role-set configuration (Merton, 1957). Differential association describes ethical or unethical behavior as a function of the frequency of interaction with one's significant others and the ratio of ethical to unethical behaviors that are observed. Should the individual have more ethical than unethical contact with peers, then according to this theory, the individual will probably be ethical.

Merton's (1957) perspective is somewhat similar; however, he included the variables of power and distance to the social modeling framework. He posits that the role-set (i.e., the characteristics of referent others in terms of their location in the hierarchy, power, attitudes, and behaviors) will influence the behavior of the focal person within the organization. For example, if a coach has significant authority or power over an athlete, and the relative organizational distance between them is small, then it can be predicted that the coach's behavior will have significant influence upon the athlete. In other words, the closer the proximity, the greater the pressure to conform to similar behavior.

Ferrell and Gresham (1985) incorporated both differential association and role-set configuration into their theoretical framework of ethical decision making in marketing. They stated that

in our model, it is expected that association with others who are perceived to be participating in unethical behavior, combined with the opportunity to be involved in such behavior oneself, are major predictors of unethical behavior [i.e., differential association] . . . [further] one would anticipate that top management, as referent others with greater authority, would have more influence than peer group's on the focal person's ethical/unethical behavior [i.e., role set configuration]. (pp. 90-92)

Empirical findings have generally supported both differential association and role-set configuration (e.g., Adams et al., 1998; Baumhart, 1961; Brenner and Molander, 1977; Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982). Early research by Ferrell, Zey-Ferrell, and Krugman (1983) found that referent others were one of two factors that significantly influenced ethical behavior among advertising managers. Jones and Kavanagh (1996) also found that peer influence significantly affects workplace ethical/unethical behavior. They concluded that "behavior on the part of the manager and that of the peer group can be managed to curb unethical behavior on the part of employees, as indicated by the positive influence of ethical managers and

peers" (p. 521). Adams et al. (1998), in a survey tracking critical ethical dilemmas faced by business school graduates, found that "in the internal role set, therefore, not only did the majority of incidents involve the focal person's supervisor, but the respondents perceived the greatest pressure to act unethically themselves when their supervisors were involved" (p. 1332). Ford and Richardson (1994), in a review of the empirical literature in ethical decision making, concluded that "the direct influence of the person's peers increases as the intensity and frequency of contact with that person's peers increases" (p. 212). In summarizing the findings of role set research, they stated that "an individual's ethical beliefs and decision making behavior will increasingly become congruent with top management's belief as defined through their words and actions as rewards provided for compliance congruency are increased" (p. 216). Fritzsche (1997) concludes that

both peers and top management appear to influence significantly the ethical behavior of managers, with top management wielding the greatest influence. Ethical behavior can be encouraged and unethical behavior can be discouraged by the actions of top management and of peers. Unfortunately, the converse is also probably true. (p. 66)

In light of the theoretical and empirical findings in for-profit non-sport contexts, it would seem evident that significant others play a tremendous role in establishing the locus of analysis of ethical or unethical behavior. Cognitive moral development theory presents evidence that indicates that as most individuals fall into the conventional category, there will be opportunity for peer influence in the organizational context. From a different conceptual perspective of moral behavior, similar findings emerge from social modeling theory (Bandura, 1977), differential association, and role-set configuration. Perceptions of what is "right" and "wrong" are a function of observation of, reinforcement by, and interaction with significant others in the organization. It would appear then that the role of organizational peers ought to have a significant impact upon behavior and perceptions of what is ethical.

Ethical Climate

Researchers and practitioners alike have paid considerable attention to the notion of organizational climate in for-profit organizations as a means to enhance productivity and satisfaction among members (Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989; Bartels, Harrick, Martell, & Strickland, 1998; Cohen, 1995; Jones & Hildebeital, 1995; Marcoulides & Heck, 1993; Schwepker, Ferrell, & Ingram, 1997; Sinclair, 1993; Trevino, 1990). Climate has been considered to be the informal interpreter and judge of an individual's organizational behavior. Specifically, it has been suggested by many in the field that the ethical climate in organizations influences the moral conduct of the membership (Cohen, 1995; Schneider, 1975; Victor & Cullen, 1987, 1988).

Climate is generally defined as a psychological construct that is based upon the aggregation of individual perceptions of what is ethical conduct in the organization. As such, ethical climate is defined generally by the group and in turn

identifies for the group and for individuals what is ethical or unethical behavior and how ethical issues are managed. An understanding of the factors that influence the perception of ethical behavior in an organization, therefore, would be extremely important for the leadership of any group of people in order to foster ethical conduct that is organizationally and/or socially preferred.

Victor and Cullen Research (For-Profit)

Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988) developed a framework for measuring the perception of ethical climate by combining the theoretical constructs of *cognitive moral development*, *ethical theory*, and *locus of analysis*. They draw from the findings of Kohlberg's research (Higgins, Power, & Kohlberg, 1984; Kohlberg, 1984) that indicate that the individual's cognitive ability to reason through moral dilemmas is developmental. The opportunity for moral development takes place within a "moral atmosphere" or "higher stage environment" that is created by the collective or the "just community."

Ethical theory, in Victor and Cullen's (1987, 1988) construct, consists of three dimensions that parallel the pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional orientations of Kohlberg's (1969) model. They include the teleological or ends-oriented perspectives of egoism (hedonism) and benevolence (utilitarianism) as well as the deontological or means-oriented perspective of principled ethical grounding. Egoism refers to behavior that is fundamentally self-interested in seeking pleasure and avoiding pain for the individual actor. The focus of benevolence or utilitarianism is toward the greatest pleasure and least pain for the collective or for the greater number (e.g., the immediate work group, the firm, the community, and the society-at-large). In contrast to these two teleological-based orientations is the deontological view that places the greatest emphasis upon duty founded upon principles, laws, rules, policies, and procedures (e.g., the firm's code of ethics, the laws of society, or divine commandments).

Locus of analysis consisting of individual, local, and cosmopolitan sources functions to "shape the behaviors and attitudes of role incumbents" (Victor & Cullen, 1988, p. 106). The individual locus of analysis is idiographically based and may reflect a hedonistic or an existentialistic (i.e., authentic or genuine) ethical orientation. The local referent is the immediate work group or the firm in general as well as the individual's community of significant others. Norms, values, and behaviors derived from this immediate work or social community are internalized or at least generally operationalized by the individual actor. The cosmopolitan (i.e., global or universal) locus of analysis extends beyond the group and the firm. At this level, behavior is shaped by normative systems that have the potential to operate within the organization but are generated and maintained externally (e.g., professional codes of ethics as opposed to firm-specific behavioral norms). The juxtaposition of ethical theory and locus of analysis results in a 3x3 matrix consisting of nine theoretically based ethical climates (Figure 1).

While the nine cells of Victor and Cullen's (1988) matrix are generic in their theoretical application, the research that has been conducted, with few exceptions, has focused upon the for-profit sector. The empirical results, as indicated in *italics*

LOCUS OF ANALYSIS				
		Individual	Local	Cosmopolitan
ETHICAL CRITERIA	Egoism	SELF-INTEREST ¹	COMPANY PROFIT	EFFICIENCY
		<i>Instrumental²</i>	<i>Instrumental</i>	
	Benevolence	FRIENDSHIP	TEAM INTEREST	SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
		<i>Caring</i>	<i>Caring</i>	
	Principle	PERSONAL MORALITY	COMPANY RULES AND PROCEDURES	LAW & PROFESSIONAL CODES
		<i>Independence</i>	<i>Rules</i>	<i>Law and code</i>

¹Victor and Cullen's (1987, 1988) conceptual dimensions based upon a priori juxtaposition of ethical theory and locus of analysis are found in upper case letters.

²Victor and Cullen's (1988) empirical dimensions are found in italics.

Figure 1 — Victor and Cullen's (1987, 1988) Ethical Work Climate Matrix (For-Profit).

in Figure 1, demonstrate that generally only five climate types in for-profit settings emerge. The climate and their corresponding Cronbach Alpha scores are as follows: instrumental (0.71), caring (0.80), independence (0.60), rules (0.79), and law & code (0.79). This point raises the following questions: Is the non-profit context the same? Further, is the non-profit sport organization the same?

The non-profit sector, by virtue of its metavalue or implicit assumption to not actively seek profit, presumably has a somewhat different orientation in terms of ethical climate than its for-profit counterparts (Brower & Shrader, 2000; Carver, 1990; Hansmann, 1987; Jeavons, 1994; Jinkins & Jinkins, 1998). For example, responsibility and commitment of the non-profit employee/volunteer and organization may lean more toward the commonweal as opposed to the explicit commitment of the for-profit organization to the shareholder (cf. Friedman, 1970).

In a recent study by Brower and Shrader (2000), it was found that non-profit organizations differ significantly in ethical climate from their for-profit counterparts. These researchers found that non-profit organizations tended to reflect ethical climates that were more benevolent and principled whereas for-profit organizations reflected a climate of egoism. In a study of non-profit organizations, Deshpande (1996) found that managers who perceived themselves in caring climates (e.g., "Our major concern is what is best for everyone in the organization," p. 319) associated success with ethical behavior. Further, managers who perceived themselves to work in instrumental climates (e.g., "In this organization, people protect their own interests above all else," p. 319) believed the need for an inverse relationship between success and ethical behavior.

LOCUS OF ANALYSIS				
ETHICAL CRITERIA		Individual	Local	Cosmopolitan
	Egoism	<i>Machiavellianism</i>		
	Benevolence	<i>Individual caring</i>		<i>Social caring</i>
	Principle	<i>Independence</i>		<i>Law and code</i>

Figure 2 — Agarwal and Malloy’s (1999) Ethical Work Climate Matrix (Non-Profit).

Agarwal and Malloy’s Research (Non-Profit)

Agarwal and Malloy (1999) investigated the nature of ethical climates in a non-profit sport organization. Using Victor and Cullen’s (1987, 1988) framework and instrument for measuring the perceptions of ethical climate, Agarwal and Malloy conducted a common factor analysis with oblique rotation (in contrast to principal components analysis with varimax rotation used in past research based on the theoretical assumption of correlation among factors). Figure 2 is a reproduction of the five extracted dimensions within Victor and Cullen’s framework of ethical criteria and locus of analysis. In this matrix, a Machiavellian climate is perceived as being a competitive and careerist environment where the strongest survive. Machiavellianism is used as a term that commonly depicts self-centred/hedonistic behavior on the part of an individual. We remind the reader that while this is a common understanding of the term, Machiavelli’s Prince was ruthless but only for the wellbeing of civic virtue (Jenkins & Jenkins, 1998; Machiavelli, 1532/1973). Individual caring climate is perceived by members as being personally concerned for the well being of the individual. The climate described as independence allows for individual freedom and responsibility in the organizational setting. Social caring refers to an organization where members perceive the organization to be concerned with the welfare of the commonwealth and not just its own survival. Finally, law and code refers to a structured organizational climate that is driven by formal policy and procedure

While a number of findings in the Agarwal and Malloy (1999) study were noteworthy, the focus of this paper is directed to the polarization of the individual and cosmopolitan loci of analysis. In Figure 2, there is an absence of perception of ethical climate relating to the organization itself (i.e., the local locus of analysis). This suggests that individuals in the not-for-profit sector may perceive ethical climate as more supportive toward personal growth and wellbeing and toward social responsibility than to the organization in which they work. It would also appear that norms, values, and behaviors derived from the formal culture do not influence the perception of ethical climate to a significant degree. This finding is in sharp contrast to the for-profit sector where organizational imperative is strongly advocated and inculcated (Hodgkinson, 1996; Ouchi, 1980; Victor & Cullen, 1987, 1988; Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983). The finding by Agarwal and Malloy (1999) that the local locus of analysis was not significant in a non-profit organization appears

to cast some doubt on the universal organizational applicability of differential association and role set configuration. That is, the non-profit sport organization may differ from traditional administrative assumptions.

The investigation of the impact of organizational variables such as climate and culture is a relatively new research focus in the field of sport administration (e.g., Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Scott, 1999; Slack, 1997; Snyder, 1990; Wallace & Weese, 1995; Weese, 1995). However, none of the research, with the exception of Agarwal and Malloy (1999) and Malloy and Taylor (1999), has been directed toward the ethical aspect of organizational climate. Further, the relevance of differential association and role-set configuration theories has gone equally unnoticed in our field. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to investigate the ethical climate of a non-profit sport organization and the extent to which "significant others" impact upon members' perception.

Hypotheses

As we have discussed, theorists and researchers alike conclude that the nature and frequency of interaction with superiors and co-workers will influence the ethical behavior and/or the perception of ethical behavior by the individual. Differential association and role-set configuration predict ethical behavior to be a function of frequency of interaction and organizational distance, respectively (e.g., Ferrell & Gresham, 1985; Fritzsche, 1991). Social modeling theory predicts behavior to be a function of the focal person's observation of the behavior of significant others (Bandura, 1977). Traditionally, superiors and co-workers represent a powerful source of normative pressure to conform to local/organizational standards of conduct in for-profit contexts. However, the non-profit context may be unique with respect to the influence of superiors and co-workers upon the perception of ethical work climate. As the local locus of analysis was found not to be influential in terms of the perception of ethical dimensions of work climate in a non-profit context (Agarwal & Malloy, 1999), it may be hypothesized that internal significant others are expected not to influence the perception of ethical climate. The following six hypotheses developed for this study reflect this expectation.

They have been grouped into two categories based upon the linkage with the two behavioral theories discussed earlier. The first set of hypotheses is based upon the frequency of interaction with superiors, peers, volunteers, and athletes (i.e., differential association). The second set of hypotheses is based upon the perceived influence of the behavior of superiors and peers (i.e., role-set configuration).

Dilemma Interaction Factors (Based on Differential Association Theory)

These hypotheses are concerned with the frequency of interaction with four different cohorts within the sport organizational community. Hypotheses H1A, H1B, and H1C are null based upon the notion that they are internal organizational cohorts (i.e., superiors, peers, and athletes) and therefore should not influence

member perception according to Agarwal and Malloy (1999). Hypothesis H1D is not a null hypothesis because volunteers are considered "external" to the organization in terms of professional and contractual obligation and duty. This is not to suggest that the volunteer is not integral to the functioning of most non-profit organizations. Rather, as they are generally not involved in the day-to-day functioning of the organization to the same extent as paid staff, they can be perceived as having a greater psychological, physical, and philosophical distance from the organization (Malloy & Agarwal, in press; Niepoth, 1983). This distance is in fact what many organizations count on to ensure that the "big picture" (i.e., the cosmopolitan view) is maintained as opposed to the conceivably more narrow and potentially self-interested perspective of paid staff. Chelladurai (1999) states that "because they [volunteers] are free from considerations of financial benefits to themselves, they can be objective and critical in their evaluation of organizational processes. Such unbridled and constructive feedback helps keep the organization on the right track" (p. 18).

While there may be nonprofit organizations that differ dramatically from this conception (i.e., those that have no paid staff at all), these would be the exception rather than the rule. Therefore, it is argued here that the volunteer represents a more cosmopolitan perspective and may therefore have a greater impact upon ethical perceptions of the member than internal cohorts, such as superiors and co-workers (cf. Fritzsche, 1991). The following are the four hypotheses concerning differential association:

Hypothesis 1a: That there *will not* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of dilemmas dealing with superiors (H1a).

Hypothesis 1b: That there *will not* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of dilemmas dealing with peers (H1b).

Hypothesis 1c: That there *will not* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of dilemmas dealing with athletes (H1c).

Hypothesis 1d: That there *will* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of dilemmas dealing with volunteers (H1d).

Behavioral Influence Factors (Based on Role-Set Configuration Theory)

These two hypotheses are based upon the notion that the characteristics of referent others in terms of their location in the hierarchy, power, attitudes, and behaviors will influence the behavior of the focal person within the organization. In each case, the null hypothesis is presented based upon the assumption that local referents will not influence behavior (Agarwal & Malloy, 1999). The hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 2a: That there *will not* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon behavior influenced by superiors (H2a).

Hypothesis 2b: That there *will not* be a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon behavior influenced by peers (H2b).

Methodology

Sample

The subjects for the study were members of a Canadian provincial sport federation established in 1974. The Federation is an umbrella organization that consists of 70 sport specific sub-units with 400 members that receive philosophical and policy guidance, funding, and administrative support from an administrative central office. The Federation is a not-for-profit organization that is charged with the delivery of sport at both the recreational and elite levels of competition. It is important to note that the Canadian sport scene has undergone dramatic change in the past 30 years as the federal government has taken an active role in the promotion and delivery of sport and recreation programming (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). As a consequence of this initiative, a substantial cadre of professional sport administrators has developed not only at the federal level but also at the provincial and municipal levels of government (Thibault & Harvey, 1997). The rationale for the growth of this emergent profession was the expectation that "better results in the high performance sport area [was] . . . at least partially dependent on the existence of a rational, professionally organised and controlled management system" (Hinings & Slack, 1987, p. 141). Therefore, in Canada (and other countries such as Australia) there exists a distinct force of non-profit administrators, funded directly and/or peripherally (i.e., through licensed lottery sales) by government whose function it is to deliver sport and recreational programming to elite athletes and recreation participants.

The subjects were sent a self-addressed and stamped envelope, the survey instrument, and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study. Subjects were informed, in writing, that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The study received approval from the Research Ethic Board of the authors' university. The return rate was 37% or 148 usable questionnaires. This level of response is not uncommon based upon the ethical nature of the items (cf. Soutar, McNeil, & Moster, 1994; Vitell, Nwachukwu, & Barnes, 1993). The sample consisted of executive and technical directors, board of directors, and coaches. The mean age of the respondents was 42 years. The respondents were 67% male and 33% female and had an average of about 12 years of experience.

Instrument

The instrument used in this study consisted of two sections. The first section included the Ethical Climate Questionnaire (ECQ) developed by Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988). This survey instrument consists of 36 items anchored on a six-point Likert scale (completely false to completely true). Each item asked a question

pertaining to one of the nine theoretical cells identified in Figure 1. For example, item number 14 states, "Decision makers are expected to comply with the law and professional standards over and above other considerations." This particular item reflects an ethical climate that above in the "Local" and "Principle" cell of Figure 1. Items were, in some cases, modified slightly to reflect the context of sport organizations as opposed to the generic format of the ECQ.

The second section consists of independent variables based upon Soutar, McNeil, and Molster's (1994) study investigating the impact of various work factors upon ethical decision-making. Respondents were to indicate, on a five-point Likert scale (Never-1, Occasionally-2, Occasionally to Quite Often-3, Quite Often to Frequently-4, and Frequently-5), to what extent their perception of ethical climate was influenced by the interaction with and behavior of superiors, peers, athletes, and volunteers. These items were not part of the ECQ.

Analysis and Results

The five dimensions extracted by Agarwal and Malloy (1999) in the not-for-profit context were used for this study. The common factor model (oblique rotation) extracted five dimensions with eigenvalues greater than unity. These were: individual caring (6.68), machiavellianism (3.06), independence (2.20), social caring (1.42), and law and code (1.16). Cronbach alphas for these constructs were individual caring 0.67, machiavellianism 0.86, independence 0.78, social caring 0.79, and law and code 0.79, thus indicating acceptable reliability. Table 1 contains the factor loadings. Also, as hypothesized based on theoretical considerations (see Victor

Table 1 Common Factor Analysis (Using Oblimin Rotation)

Pattern matrix	Factor loadings				
	1	2	3	4	5
FACTOR 1: Individual caring					
35. It is expected that each individual is cared for when making decisions here. [BI]	58	-9	-11	5	8
21. Our major consideration is what is best for everyone in the organization. [BI]	46	-19	13	10	24
32. What is best for each individual is a primary concern in this organization. [BI]	46	8	6	4	-1
16. In this organization, our major concern is always what is best for the other person. [BI]	39	-10	17	14	4
FACTOR 2: Machiavellianism					
33. Decision makers in this organization are very concerned about what is best for themselves. [EI]	-2	85	20	-16	-2
10. In this organization, decision makers protect their own interests above other considerations. [EI]	-18	56	-1	-20	-3

Pattern matrix

Factor loadings

	1	2	3	4	5
1. In this organization, decision makers are mostly out for themselves. [EI]	-27	56	9	-19	5
6. There is no room for one's own personal morals or ethics in this organization. [EI]	12	42	-26	-2	-7
FACTOR 3: Independence					
22. In this organization, decision makers are guided by their own personal ethics. [PI]	2	5	81	3	8
3. In this organization, decision makers are expected to follow their own personal and moral beliefs. [PI]	0	9	78	5	-6
FACTOR 4: Social caring					
30. Decision makers in this organization are actively concerned about the athletes' and the publics' interests. [BC]	-4	-5	10	82	-1
34. The effects of decisions on the athlete and the public are a primary concern in this organization. [BC]	15	-4	-9	68	-4
26. It is expected that you will always do what is right for the athlete and public. [BC]	15	5	6	59	5
28. Decision makers in this organization have a strong sense of responsibility to the outside community. [BC]	-9	-13	-5	59	14
FACTOR 5: Law and code					
13. The first consideration is whether a decision violates any law. [PC]	-9	8	-14	18	73
14. Decision makers are expected to comply with the law and professional standards over and above other considerations. [PC]	25	-11	10	-15	69
20. In this organization, decision makers are expected to strictly follow legal or professional standards. [PC]	18	-10	7	-7	63
24. In this organization, the law or ethical code is the major consideration. [PC]	-7	8	8	13	59

Ego-Individual - [EI]; Benevolent-Individual - [BI]; Principle-Individual - [PI]; Ego-Local - [EL]; Benevolent-Local - [BL]; Principle-Local - [PL]; Ego-Cosmopolitan - [EC]; Benevolent-Cosmopolitan - [BC]; Principle-Cosmopolitan - [PC].

and Cullen, 1987, 1988), all of the factors were significantly correlated ($p < .05$) except for independence. Using LISREL, the measurement model with co-variances among constructs (i.e., the five extracted dimensions) was tested using maximum likelihood estimation. The results were: chi square with 67 degrees of freedom = 83.50 ($p = 0.08$); GFI = 0.92; AGFI = 0.88; and RMSR = 0.06, indicating a good model fit.

To test each of the hypotheses, the five climate dimensions, namely, individual caring, machiavellianism, independence, social caring, and law and code,

served as the multivariate dependent variable. A series of MANOVAs was conducted with dilemma interaction and behavioral influence (categorized as never, occasionally, and frequently) serving as the independent variable. The initial five-point Likert scale (Never-1, Occasionally-2, Occasionally to Quite Often-3, Quite Often to Frequently-4, and Frequently-5) was collapsed to three categories (Never-1, Occasionally-2, and Frequently-3) by merging 2 and 3 under “Occasionally” and merging 4 and 5 under “Frequently.” This was done to ensure sufficient cell sizes in each group for the purpose of running MANOVA. Multivariate and univariate ANOVA results are reported for each hypothesis. These results are discussed next.

Four hypotheses were presented for the Dilemma Interaction Factors of which three were supported. H1a was not supported (see Table 2). There was a significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of

Table 2 Dilemma Interaction Factor Result of MANOVA by Dilemma Dealing With Superiors (*n* = 73)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	<i>F</i> Value (2,70)	<i>P</i> Value
Individual caring (F1)			0.63	0.533
Never (<i>n</i> = 36)	3.42	0.62		
Occasionally (<i>n</i> = 27)	3.30	0.60		
Frequently (<i>n</i> = 10)	3.18	1.01		
Machiavellianism (F2)			3.55	0.034*
Never (<i>n</i> = 36)	1.67	0.80		
Occasionally (<i>n</i> = 27)	1.87	0.92		
Frequently (<i>n</i> = 10)	2.58	1.48		
Independence (F3)			3.07	0.053
Never (<i>n</i> = 36)	3.63	0.90		
Occasionally (<i>n</i> = 27)	3.07	1.05		
Frequently (<i>n</i> = 10)	3.05	0.93		
Social caring (F4)			0.60	0.550
Never (<i>n</i> = 36)	3.90	0.63		
Occasionally (<i>n</i> = 27)	3.99	0.72		
Frequently (<i>n</i> = 10)	3.73	0.56		
Law and code (F5)			0.89	0.415
Never (<i>n</i> = 36)	3.61	0.78		
Occasionally (<i>n</i> = 27)	3.86	0.73		
Frequently (<i>n</i> = 10)	3.80	0.73		

Dilemma Dealing with Superiors Effect: Wilk’s Lambda = 0.75; *F* = 2.01, *p* ≤ 0.037;
Univariate Results

dilemmas dealing with superiors ($F = 2.01, p < .037$). Individuals who have a higher frequency of dilemmas in dealing with their superiors perceived relatively strong Machiavellianism climate.

The remaining three hypotheses (H1b, H1c, and H1d) were supported (see Tables 3, 4, & 5). There was no significant difference in the perception of ethical climate based upon frequency of dilemmas dealing with peers (H1b; $F = 1.60, p < .11$). The only dimension with significant difference was social caring ($F = 3.40, p < .039$). Individuals who tended to have a higher frequency of dilemmas in dealing with their peers perceived relatively lower social caring. Hypothesis H1c was supported as no significant differences occurred with regard to the interaction with athletes ($F = 0.38, p < .96$). Finally, H1d was also supported as significant difference was found as a result of the interaction with volunteers ($F = 2.05, p < .032$).

Table 3 Dilemma Interaction Factor Result of MANOVA by Dilemma Dealing With Peers ($n = 75$)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	F Value (2,72)	P Value
Individual caring (F1)			2.11	0.129
Never ($n = 32$)	3.52	0.63		
Occasionally ($n = 38$)	3.27	0.66		
Frequently ($n = 5$)	2.95	1.23		
Machiavellianism (F2)			2.04	0.138
Never ($n = 32$)	1.73	0.87		
Occasionally ($n = 38$)	1.82	0.95		
Frequently ($n = 5$)	2.70	1.95		
Independence (F3)			2.13	0.126
Never ($n = 32$)	3.55	0.82		
Occasionally ($n = 38$)	3.34	1.08		
Frequently ($n = 5$)	2.60	0.96		
Social Caring (F4)			3.40	0.039*
Never ($n = 32$)	3.98	0.51		
Occasionally ($n = 38$)	4.00	0.71		
Frequently ($n = 5$)	3.20	0.99		
Law and Code (F5)			2.34	0.103
Never ($n = 32$)	3.82	0.64		
Occasionally ($n = 38$)	3.74	0.79		
Frequently ($n = 5$)	3.05	0.99		

Dilemma Dealing with Peers Effect: Wilk's Lambda = 0.80; $F = 1.60, p \leq 0.114$;
Univariate Results

Table 4 Dilemma Interaction Factor Result of MANOVA by Dilemma Dealing with Athletes ($n = 75$)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	F Value (2,72)	P Value
Individual caring (F1)			0.50	0.607
Never ($n = 30$)	3.30	0.70		
Occasionally ($n = 39$)	3.46	0.65		
Frequently ($n = 6$)	3.46	0.40		
Machiavellianism (F2)			0.11	0.894
Never ($n = 30$)	1.80	0.91		
Occasionally ($n = 39$)	1.74	0.82		
Frequently ($n = 6$)	1.63	0.91		
Independence (F3)			0.65	0.525
Never ($n = 30$)	3.52	0.92		
Occasionally ($n = 39$)	3.23	1.19		
Frequently ($n = 6$)	3.50	0.89		
Social caring (F4)			0.28	0.76
Never ($n = 30$)	3.88	0.59		
Occasionally ($n = 39$)	3.97	0.58		
Frequently ($n = 6$)	3.83	0.74		
Law and Code (F5)			0.17	0.84
Never ($n = 30$)	3.73	0.69		
Occasionally ($n = 39$)	3.81	0.78		
Frequently ($n = 6$)	3.88	0.69		

Dilemma Dealing with Athletes Effect: Wilk's Lambda = 0.96; $F = 0.38$, $p \leq 0.96$;
Univariate Results

Dimensions yielding significant differences were social caring ($F = 7.57$, $p < .001$) and law and code ($F = 4.66$, $p < .012$).

For the second set of hypotheses categorized as Behavior Influences, one hypothesis was supported (H2a) and one was not supported (H2b; see Tables 6 and 7). The null hypothesis that superiors' behavior would not significantly influence the perception of ethical climate was not rejected ($F = 1.74$, $p < .077$). One dimension, Machiavellianism, was found to be significant ($F = 4.54$, $p < .014$). As influence was believed to increase, the perception of Machiavellianism increased. In contrast, the null hypothesis predicting no significant influence based upon peers' behavior was rejected ($F = 2.04$, $p < .035$). The climate dimension independence was found to be significant ($F = 7.14$, $p < .002$). The less that peer behavior was thought to influence the individual the greater the perception of independence as a climate dimension.

Table 5 Dilemma Interaction Factor Result of MANOVA by Dilemma Dealing with Volunteers ($n = 77$)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	F Value (2,74)	P Value
Individual caring (F1)			1.79	0.174
Never ($n = 15$)	3.30	0.77		
Occasionally ($n = 54$)	3.43	0.59		
Frequently ($n = 8$)	2.97	0.81		
Machiavellianism (F2)			0.20	0.823
Never ($n = 15$)	1.90	0.81		
Occasionally ($n = 54$)	1.78	0.90		
Frequently ($n = 8$)	1.94	0.85		
Independence (F3)			0.80	0.455
Never ($n = 15$)	3.60	0.91		
Occasionally ($n = 54$)	3.34	1.02		
Frequently ($n = 8$)	3.06	1.02		
Social caring (F4)			7.57	0.001*
Never ($n = 15$)	3.65	0.52		
Occasionally ($n = 54$)	4.07	0.57		
Frequently ($n = 8$)	3.31	0.80		
Law and code (F5)			4.66	0.012*
Never ($n = 15$)	3.58	0.66		
Occasionally ($n = 54$)	3.88	0.68		
Frequently ($n = 8$)	3.06	1.14		

Dilemma Dealing with Volunteers Effect: Wilk's Lambda = 0.76; $F = 2.05$, $p \leq 0.032$;
Univariate Results

Discussion

The findings both refuted and supported the a priori claim that internal members (i.e., superiors, co-workers, athletes) would not influence ethical perceptions. It was predicted that the frequency of interaction with superiors would not influence ethical perceptions because the locus of analysis for non-profit members is individual- or cosmopolitan-based. This, however, was not found to be the case. The frequency of interaction with the leadership influenced the perception of climate in a negative manner, as the only climate dimension identified was oriented toward being self-serving and careerist (i.e., Machiavellian). This may be a function of the members' perception that increased interaction leads to controlling and manipulative behavior. If members identify their locus of analysis as being personal or cosmopolitan, then leaders who gear their behavior in terms of local-based interaction may be perceived as using an inappropriate style of leadership for the

Table 6 Lack of Behavior Influence Factor Result of MANOVA by Behavior Influenced by Superiors ($n = 70$)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	<i>F</i> Value (2,67)	<i>P</i> Value
Individual caring (F1)			1.85	0.165
Never ($n = 21$)	3.62	0.56		
Occasionally ($n = 37$)	3.33	0.70		
Frequently ($n = 12$)	3.17	0.93		
Machiavellianism (F2)			4.54	0.014*
Never ($n = 21$)	1.62	0.70		
Occasionally ($n = 37$)	1.68	0.89		
Frequently ($n = 12$)	2.54	1.32		
Independence (F3)			2.28	0.11
Never ($n = 21$)	3.69	1.10		
Occasionally ($n = 37$)	3.11	0.99		
Frequently ($n = 12$)	3.42	0.90		
Social caring (F4)			0.55	0.577
Never ($n = 21$)	3.94	0.50		
Occasionally ($n = 37$)	3.98	0.76		
Frequently ($n = 12$)	3.75	0.55		
Law and code (F5)			0.29	0.749
Never ($n = 21$)	3.67	0.76		
Occasionally ($n = 37$)	3.77	0.83		
Frequently ($n = 12$)	3.58	0.74		

Lack of Behavior Influenced by Superiors Effect: Wilk's Lambda = 0.77; $F = 1.74$, $p \leq 0.077$; Univariate Results

non-profit context. For example, if the climate of a non-profit organization is one dominated by a "caring" orientation (e.g., Agarwal & Malloy, 1999), then a style of leadership that may be appropriate in a for-profit environment may not only be noticed but also perceived negatively by the non-profit membership. While it may be argued by some that Machiavellian behavior need not always be perceived as negative, egocentricity, and unscrupulous power-seeking is generally thought to be the antithesis of positive organizational perception and behavior. Hodgkinson (1991) describes this type of leader as "genial, smooth, suave, highly manipulative, spiritually empty, unauthentic to the core" (p. 119). This finding is also consistent with the perception of Machiavellianism and the use of autocratic styles of decision-making. These perceptions may also be formed if superiors attempt to overtly influence behavior through the use of local/organizational norms (i.e., those who are not supported by the individual-cosmopolitan oriented membership). If

Table 7 Lack of Behavior Influence Factor Result of MANOVA by Behavior Influenced by Peers ($n = 69$)

Ethical climate dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation	<i>F</i> Value (2,66)	<i>P</i> Value
Individual caring (F1)			0.26	0.773
Never ($n = 14$)	3.27	0.47		
Occasionally ($n = 41$)	3.40	0.64		
Frequently ($n = 14$)	3.30	0.79		
Machiavellianism (F2)			0.62	0.541
Never ($n = 14$)	1.80	0.96		
Occasionally ($n = 41$)	1.88	1.00		
Frequently ($n = 14$)	1.54	0.99		
Independence (F3)			7.14	0.002*
Never ($n = 14$)	3.50	1.00		
Occasionally ($n = 41$)	3.61	0.80		
Frequently ($n = 14$)	2.54	1.18		
Social caring (F4)			0.05	0.954
Never ($n = 14$)	3.91	0.41		
Occasionally ($n = 41$)	3.94	0.70		
Frequently ($n = 14$)	3.88	0.84		
Law and Code (F5)			1.85	0.165
Never ($n = 14$)	3.36	0.71		
Occasionally ($n = 41$)	3.78	0.69		
Frequently ($n = 14$)	3.79	0.89		

Lack of Behavior Influenced by Peers Effect: Wilk's Lambda = 0.74; $F = 2.04$, $p \leq 0.035$; Univariate Results

this style and content of leadership is seen as imposed upon the membership, there may be a negative reaction and perception of this organizational behavior (i.e., Machiavellianism). These results suggest that leadership in non-profit contexts should re-evaluate traditional management strategies that may be based upon the implicit theoretical assumptions of the for-profit realm and move toward behavior that is more consistent with what could be a unique paradigm of the non-profit organization.

The second hypothesis was supported (H1b). The findings with regard to the influence of peers were consistent with Agarwal and Malloy (1999). In this non-profit context, as hypothesized, it appears that organizational co-workers are not influenced by the frequency of interaction with one another (H1b). Rather, they are self-driven or appeal to more global sources of normative behavior. If the leadership believes that it can instill a locally/organizationally driven standard of

ethical behavior through the use of traditional means (e.g., codes, peer pressure, tenure, and organizational history/myths) in a non-profit context, it may not succeed. An approach that is consistent with individual empowerment and grounded in global norms may prove to be a more effective means to develop a unified sense of organizational purpose.

The third hypothesis was also supported (H1c). That athletes did not influence climate may initially seem curious and disconcerting as the athlete participating in sport is the *raison d'être* of the sport administrator. However, it may be that as a result of the athlete's rather exclusive focus upon performance, the concern (vocal or otherwise) for, or the involvement in, the governance of his or her sport is negligible (Malloy & Taylor, 1999). It may also be that the administrative cadre does not consider the opinion of the athlete as worthy of influence as the relative knowledge base is questioned (i.e., in the context of delivering sport, they are not significant others). This rationale is often considered as implicit in the often overly paternalistic culture of elite sport (Le Clair, 1992; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1995; Malloy, Ross, & Zakus, 2000; Ravissa & Daruty, 1988; Thomas, 1986). Therefore, the athlete unfortunately does not appear to be an influencing factor in the perception of ethical climate in this sport federation.

The final hypothesis in the first category, which focused upon the influence of volunteers upon ethical perceptions, was supported (H1d). This finding is consistent with the non-profit model of ethical perceptions by Agarwal and Malloy (1999) that demonstrated that members' perceptions are influenced by cosmopolitan norms. Volunteers are external to the organization, insofar as they are unpaid, and typically are not under the same obligation and/or organizational control as internal members. This study has demonstrated that they are able to influence the ethical perceptions of organizational members to a greater extent than do organizational co-workers.

The second set of behavior-based hypotheses revealed some interesting findings that contrast with those based upon the frequency of interaction. It was found that the behavior (H2a) of the leader did not affect the perception of ethical climate (as opposed to the frequency of interaction). This result, as well as the perception of Machiavellianism due to the interaction with superiors, does not bode well for the leader's potential to occupy positions that motivate or raise the level of morality (Burns, 1978) of employees and volunteers beyond the bounds of legitimate authority (i.e., Weber, 1947). It suggests that perhaps another leadership paradigm that will appeal to cosmopolitan referents should be explored, though much more empirical verification is needed before such a conclusion can be made.

Practical Implications: Member-Superior

The results would suggest that the member, when confronted with an ethical dilemma, would not pay attention to the behavior of the superior yet would feel compelled or manipulated as a result of the "forced" interaction with him or her as a function of the role-set power differential. That is, the member would perhaps have little option with regard to interacting with the superior and thus experience significant pressure to adhere to the wishes of the perceived Machiavellian leader.

The final hypothesis (H2b) was rejected and thus peer behavior was found in general (i.e., based upon MANOVA results) to influence the perception of ethical climate. This finding demonstrated that an inverse relationship exists between peer behavior and the independent climate. Specifically, it was found (i.e., based upon ANOVA results) that the less the member perceived peers' behavior as influencing, the more the member perceived independence as an ethical climate. Therefore, only by virtue of its seldom occurrence was peer behavior noticed and thus contributed to a climate of independence. In other words, because the member seems to be rarely influenced by the behavior of the peer, it contributes to the sense of workplace autonomy rather than workplace conformity. This finding seems also to be consistent with Agarwal and Malloy (1999) insofar as role modeling based upon internal cohorts seems not to occur.

Practical Implication: Member-Peer

The results suggest that when confronted with an ethical dilemma, the member would not be influenced by the interaction with his or her peers, as there is no formal or structural rationale for this to occur—unlike situations involving superiors. Presumably as peers hold no formal power over the member, they can be ignored in a manner that a superior cannot. Additionally, the member has a stronger perception of autonomy when the influence of peer behavior is relatively infrequent. Seemingly, the opposite is true. That is, the more peer behavior influences the member, the less the member is able to operate independently.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact that significant others have upon the perception of ethical climate in a non-profit sport organization. As hypothesized, volunteers, as the external cohort, played a significant role in shaping the members' perception of ethical climate. It appears that volunteers, who would perhaps normally not be perceived as powerful stakeholders, seem to hold a considerable amount of influence in the perception of ethical climate. As a consequence, the leadership may be more cognizant of the recruitment practices of the organization to ensure that prospective volunteers will foster a climate that is consistent with institutional missions, commitments, and values.

With regard to the influence of peers, the results generally supported the predicted outcomes that this cohort would hold little sway in the perception of climate. The findings demonstrated that climate was influenced not by the overt behavior of peers but by their seldom-noticed behavior. This limited influence created a climate of self-determination among members rather than a sense of organizational conformity or socialization.

The findings regarding the influence of superiors were mixed. The behavior of the leader was not a factor in developing perception; however, the members' interaction with the superior led to perceptions of Machiavellianism.

The implications for this sport federation are considerable if the leadership is to understand the mechanism of ethical perceptions and the possibility of

enhancing current perceptions. The more traditional and local-based means and assumption to develop and maintain organizational values, norms, beliefs, and behavior may be ineffective in a non-profit context. Rather, the leadership may seek external referents for normative changes and/or maintenance. An example of cosmopolitan influence upon a non-profit organization can be found in the Commonwealth Games Association of Canada (CGAC). This organization, in developing, strengthening, and to some extent legitimizing its internal (i.e., local) document for ethics and values, considered the Commonwealth Games Federation's (i.e., the international body) mission and values as a cosmopolitan source. The resulting document is a reflection of CGAC's history and values as well as a connection with the Commonwealth in general. An additional important implication from this research is the role of the volunteer.

Limitations of the Study and Further Research

This study is limited by the fact that only one non-profit organization is being studied. Further, the purpose of this organization is to deliver elite and recreational sport programming. As such, there may be some fundamental differences between the perceptions of non-profit sport organizations and the perceptions of non-profit hospitals or environmental organizations. Therefore, generalizations to other non-profit organizations must be cautious. Despite this caveat, there has yet to be any research to empirically demonstrate that differences or similarities do occur between non-profit organizations.

Further research in this area is warranted in order to better understand the ethical nature of sport organizations. Future research should not only incorporate different types of non-profit organizations, it should also incorporate larger samples. Research that could be pursued includes studies that look at other moderating variables that may influence the perception of ethical climate (e.g., decision and leadership style, size of organization, organizational culture). In addition, investigations are needed to uncover comparative data between for-profit and non-profit sport contexts using multiple organizations.

References

- Adams, J.S., Harris, C., & Carley, S.S. (1998). Challenges in teaching business ethics: Using role set analysis of early career dilemmas. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **17**, 1325-1335.
- Agarwal, J., & Malloy, D.C. (1999). Ethical work climate dimensions in a not-for-profit organization: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **20**, 1-14.
- Badaracco, J.L., & Ellsworth, R.D. (1989). *Leadership and the quest for integrity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bandura, W. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bartels, L.K., Harrick, E., Martell, K., & Strickland, D. (1998). The relationship between climate and ethical problems within human resource management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **17**, 799-804.
- Baumhart, R.C. (1961). How ethical are businessmen? *Harvard Business Review*, **39**(July-August), 6-19.

- Brenner, S.N., & Molander, E.A. (1977). Is the ethics of business changing? *Harvard Business Review*, **19**(October), 48-54.
- Brower, H.H., & Shrader, C.B. (2000). Moral reasoning and ethical climate: Not-for-profit vs. for-profit boards of directors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **26**, 147-167.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carver, J. (1990). *Boards that make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Enterprises.
- Chelladuari, P. (1999). *Human resource management in sport and recreation*. Windsor, Canada: Human Kinetics.
- Cohen, D.V. (1995). Creating ethical work climates: A socioeconomic perspective. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, **24**, 317-343.
- Deshpande, S.P. (1996). Ethical climate and the link between success and ethical behavior: An empirical investigation of a non-profit organization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **15**, 315-320.
- Doherty, A.J., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). Managing cultural diversity in sport organizations: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, **13**, 280-297.
- Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K.E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, **10**, 292-309.
- Donnelly, P. (2000). *Taking sport seriously*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishers.
- Ferrell, O.C., & Gresham, L.G. (1985). A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision-making in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, **49**(3), 87-96.
- Ferrell, O.C., Zey-Ferrell, M., & Krugman, D. (1983). A comparison of predictors of ethical and unethical behavior among corporate and agency advertising managers. *Journal of Macromarketing*, **Spring**, 19-27.
- Ford, R.C., & Richardson, W.D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **13**, 207-224.
- Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase profits. *New York Times*, pp. 32-33, 122-126.
- Fritzsche, D.J. (1991). A model of decision-making incorporating values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **10**, 841-852.
- Fritzsche, D.J. (1997). *Business ethics: A global and managerial perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fritzsche, D.J. (2000). Ethical climates and ethical dimensions of decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **24**, 125-140.
- Hansmann, H. (1987). Economic theories of non-profit organization. In W.W. Powell (Ed.), *The non-profit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 27-42). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Higgins, A., Power, C., & Kohlberg, L. (1984). The relationship of moral atmosphere to judgements of responsibility. In W. Kutines and J. Gerwitz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral judgement* (pp. 74-106). New York: Wiley.
- Hinings, R., & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of quadrennial plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack and R. Hinings (Eds.), *The organization and administration of sport* (pp. 127-152). London: Heinemann.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Syracuse, NY: SUNY Press.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1996). *Administrative philosophy*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Jeavons, T.H. (1994). Ethics in non-profit management: Creating a culture of integrity. In R.D. Herman (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of non-profit leadership and management* (pp. 184-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Jenkins, M., & Jenkins, D.B. (1998). *The character of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Jones, G.E., & Kavanagh, M.J. (1996). An experimental examination of the effects of individual and situational factors on unethical behavioral intentions in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **15**, 511-523.
- Jones, S.K., & Hildebeitel, K.M. (1995). Organizational influence in a model of the moral decision process of accountants. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **14**, 417-431.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Le Clair, J. (1992). *Winners and losers: Sport and physical activity in the 90s*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishers.
- Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S.K., & Beller, J.M. (1995). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play*. New York: Mosby.
- Machiavelli, N. (1973). *The prince* (G. Bull, Trans.). Hammondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books. (original work published 1532)
- Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). *The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system*. Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Malloy, D.C., & Agarwal, J. (in press). Ethical climate in nonprofit organizations: Propositions and implications. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*.
- Malloy, D.C., Ross, S., & Zakus, D.H. (2000). *Sport ethics: Concepts and cases in sport and recreation*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishers.
- Malloy, D.C., & Taylor, M. (1999). A qualitative inquiry of athletes' perception of the ethical climate in sport. *International Sports Journal*, **3**(2), 112-131.
- Malloy, D.C., & Zakus, D.H. (1995). Ethical decision making in sport administration: A theoretical inquiry into Substance and form. *Journal of Sport Management*, **9**, 36-58.
- Marcoulides, G.A., & Heck, R.H. (1993). Organizational culture and performance: Proposing and testing a model. *Organizational Science*, **4**, 209-225.
- Merton, R.K. (1957). The role-set. *British Journal of Sociology*, **8**, 106-120.
- Morris, S.A., & McDonald, R.A. (1995). The role of moral intensity in moral judgements: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **14**, 715-726.
- Niepoth, E.W. (1983). *Leisure leadership: Working with people in recreation and park settings*. Englewood Cliffs, CA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ouchi, W. (1980). Market, bureaucracies, and clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **25**, 129-141.
- Ravissa, K., & Daruty, K. (1988). Paternalism and sovereignty in athletics: Limits and justification of the coach's exercise of authority over the adult athlete. In P. Galasso (Ed.), *Philosophy of sport and physical activity* (pp. 216-231). Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Schein, E. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, **45**, 109-119.
- Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climate: An essay. *Personnel Psychology*, **28**, 447-479.
- Schweppker, C.H., Jr., Ferrell, O.C., & Ingram, T.N. (1997). The influence of ethical climate and ethical conflict on role stress in the sales force. *Academy of Marketing Journal*, **25**, 99-108.
- Scott, D.K. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, **13**, 298-316.

- Sims, R.L., & Keon, T.L. (1997). Ethical work climate as a factor in the development of person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **16**, 1095-1105.
- Sinclair, A. (1993). Approaches to organizational culture and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **12**, 63-73.
- Slack, T. (1997). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organization theory*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Snyder, C. (1990). The effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, **4**, 59-70.
- Soutar, G., McNeil, M.M., & Moster, M. (1994). The impact of work environment on ethical decision making: Some Australian evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **13**, 327-341.
- Sutherland, E., & Cressey, D.R. (1970). *Principles of criminology*. Chicago: J.B. Lippincott.
- Thibault, L., & Harvey, J. (1997). Fostering interorganizational linkages in a Canadian sport delivery system. *Journal of Sport Management*, **11**, 45-68.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in nonprofit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, **7**, 25-43.
- Thomas, C.E. (1986). Criteria for athlete autonomy in a paternalistic sport model. In S. Ross and L. Charette (Eds.), *Persons, minds, and bodies* (pp. 191-202). Toronto, Canada: University Press of Canada.
- Trevino, L.G. (1990). A cultural perspective on changing and developing organizational ethics. *Research on Organizational Change and Development*, **4**, 195-230.
- Upchurch, R.S., & Ruhland, S.K. (1995). An analysis of ethical work climate and leadership relationship in lodging operations. *Journal of Travel Research*, **Fall**, 36-42.
- Victor, B., & Cullen, J.B. (1987). A theory and measure of ethical climate in organization. *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy*, **9**, 51-71.
- Victor, B., & Cullen, J.B. (1988). The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **33**, 101-125.
- Vitell, S.J., Nwachukwu, S.L., & Barnes, J.H. (1993). The effects of culture on ethical decision making: An application of Hofstede's typology. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **12**, 753-760.
- Wallace, M., & Weese, W.J. (1995). Leadership, organizational culture, and job satisfaction in Canadian YMCA organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, **9**, 182-193.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Weese, W.J. (1995). Leadership and organizational culture: An investigation of Big Ten and mid-American conference camous recreation administrators. *Journal of Sport Management*, **9**, 119-134.
- Wilkins, A.L., & Ouchi, W.G. (1983). Efficient cultures: Exploring the relationship between culture and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **28**, 468-481.
- Zey-Ferrell, M., & Ferrell, O.C. (1982). Role-set configuration and opportunity as predictors of unethical behavior in organizations. *Human Relations*, **35**, 587-604.

Copyright of Journal of Sport Management is the property of Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.