

An Analysis of Sport Employee Identification of NCAA Division I Compliance Employees

Morgan G. Melchert¹
Khirey B. Walker³

Benjamin J. Downs²
James E. Johnson²

¹ *National Collegiate Athletic Association*

² *Ball State University*

³ *Elon University*

The current study examined NCAA Division I compliance employees utilizing *Sport Employee Identification* (SEI; Oja et al., 2020). Little academic inquiry has focused on the various ways sport employees, like NCAA compliance employees, identify with their organization. The current study attempted to establish SEI as an applicable construct in sport scholarship and examine potential outcomes of SEI. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine if SEI contributes to organizational behavior outcomes of job satisfaction, lower turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors with NCAA Division I compliance employees. The researchers utilized a demographic form and a 24-item survey including the SEI instrument, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and the relationship between SEI and organizational citizenship behaviors. Data analysis consisted of confirmatory factor analysis, multiple one-way analysis of variance to analyze the connection between demographic variables and SEI, and regression analyses to examine the relationship between SEI and potential organizational behavior outcomes. A total of 217 responses highlighted job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions as outcomes of SEI, while organizational citizenship behaviors lacked enough support as an outcome of SEI. The findings have the potential to assist intercollegiate executives in better managing their compliance personnel and understanding compliance identification processes.

Keywords: compliance, identity, identification, sport, NCAA

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) serves its member institutions by enforcing NCAA legislation created by the members. The NCAA places significant responsibility on each member institution to “comply with all applicable rules and regulations of the Association in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics programs” (NCAA, 2021, p. 3). NCAA compliance employees, while employed by member institutions, primarily assist the NCAA in its enforcement policies by establishing compliant athletic departments. Compliance employees must simultaneously help enforce NCAA legislation and the policies of their institution while managing multiple relationships with other administrators, coaches, and student-athletes (Rhoden, 2009). As implied above, compliance employees represent a unique population of individuals who play a vital role in the student-athlete experience by maintaining order in intercollegiate athletic departments. Thus, providing a positive work experience for compliance employees helps enhance student-athletes’ academic performance, well-being, and athletic performance (Kim et al., 2020).

Minimal research has focused on ways NCAA compliance employees identify with their organization. Scholars have attempted to gain a better understanding of sport employees, like compliance employees, by utilizing team identification scales to assess employees’ identity with their sport organization (Heere & James, 2007; Lock & Heere, 2017; Oja et al., 2015; Swanson & Kent, 2015, 2017). Applying team identification scales with sport employees, however, assumes sport employ-

ees to be fans of their organization (Oja et al., 2020).

Previous research classified athletic department personnel into four subgroups: (a) entry; (b) mid-level tier II; (c) mid-level tier I; (d) executive (Ott & Beaumont, 2020). Ott and Beaumont (2020) defined middle management employees in intercollegiate athletic departments as employees having responsibilities that support and progress the athletic department while having supervisory responsibilities over other administrators or departments. The director of athletics exists as the sole qualifier for an executive position, where any remaining associate (i.e., Mid-Level Tier I, assistant (i.e., Mid-Level Tier II), or rank-and-file (i.e., Entry) athletic administrators assumed mid-level status in descending order of authority within the athletic department (Ott & Beaumont, 2020).

In recognizing the need for a sport employee specific measure, Oja et al. (2020) created a sport-specific construct for mid-level sport employees rooted in social identity theory (SIT) called Sport Employee Identification (SEI). SIT has previously been described as how membership in a group impacts an individual’s identity (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Since Oja et al. (2020) developed the SEI instrument, some research has built upon the foundation of SEI (e.g., Kim et al. (2023); Oja et al. 2023). However, the completion of more studies are needed to better establish the SEI construct. Furthermore, no SEI studies specifically examined the varied identification processes of compliance employees in the sport industry. Therefore, the purpose of this study is

to examine the connection between SEI and organizational behavior outcomes of job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors for NCAA Division I compliance employees.

Review of Literature

Scholarly examinations of compliance employees in intercollegiate athletics are limited with no studies that address compliance employees' identity as a sport employee. Past research focused on compliance employee responsibilities (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017; Kaltenbaugh et al., 2013; Rogers & Ryan, 2007; Weight & Zullo, 2015), ethical decision-making (Kihl, 2006, 2007, 2009; Sagas & Wigley, 2014), as well as rule violations and NCAA sanctions (Dixon et al., 2003; Pflieger et al., 2019; Pierce et al., 2008; Smith, 2015; Walker et al., 2018; Weston, 2011).

Maintaining a strong compliance department remains vital for an athletic department's success and protecting student-athletes and coaches (Wong et al., 2015). Not only must compliance employees understand thousands of NCAA bylaws, but much of their responsibilities are to ensure all student-athletes, coaches, administrators, and other individuals and representatives of athletics interests remain compliant with NCAA regulations (Wong et al., 2015). Compliance employees also face various challenges such as interpreting NCAA rules, working toward institutional goals and objectives (Kihl, 2007), and managing multiple roles. Combined, the various and changing tasks and responsibilities of compliance employees can lead to role stress, which is comprised of role conflict and role ambiguity (Par-

nell et al, 2022).

Previous scholarship conceptualized role conflict as situations where employees are expected to perform two or more contradicting tasks, while role ambiguity is the uncertainty of which responsibilities are part of one's role (Biddle, 1986). Parnell et al. (2022) referenced work from Jackson and Schuler (1985) when they stated, "role conflict and ambiguity can have several negative consequences, including anxiety, lower commitment, effort, and performance" (p. 4). Parnell et al. (2022) identified role perception, unclear job description, and poor organizational communication regarding the position as areas that can lead to role stress and thus threats to successfully creating new positions or establishing new roles within a sport organization.

To maintain the sanctity of intercollegiate competition and minimize uncertainties in current legislation, the NCAA continues developing new rules and regulations for each division while placing greater complexity on the work environment of NCAA compliance employees (Sagas & Wigley, 2014; Smith, 2000; Weight & Zullo, 2015). For example, Pierce et al. (2008) implied role ambiguity when they noted the importance of compliance employees operating a compliant athletic department while "attempting to achieve a competitive advantage" in college athletics (p. 87). Similarly, Bolton and Rosselli (2017) analyzed the stress levels of NCAA Division I compliance professionals and found reason to believe multiple roles caused anxiety.

Specifically, 28% of compliance professionals indicated their stress originat-

ed from pressure from coaches, where 17% indicated their stress originated from pressure from outside influences, and 11% indicated their stress was both internally and externally driven (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017). Kim et al. (2020) previously suggested employees working to support student athletes should take on new roles and responsibilities to promote student athlete success. The complexity of compliance employees' work environment combined with the challenge of maintaining a compliant athletic department and managing multiple roles with coaches, student-athletes, and administrators raises the question of how compliance employees handle role conflict, ambiguity, and stress.

Social Identity Theory

Tajfel (1978) defined Social Identity Theory (SIT) as “that part of individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 63). Membership of certain groups or categories, in some form, affect an individual's view of their self and helps create one's social identity (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Ashforth and Mael (2004) simplified this definition to the “perception of oneness with or belongingness to some human aggregate” (p. 135). As individuals join groups, they tend to discriminate or act stereotypical toward outgroup members, often favoring the ingroup (Hogg & Terry, 2001; Jenkins, 2008; Stets & Burke,

2000), and creating the notion of ‘we’ and ‘them.’ More recently, Hogg (2018) discussed SIT as an analysis of how individuals view themselves related to their group memberships and relationships.

Social categorization, an important aspect of SIT, results from the ongoing identification process (Jenkins, 2008; Oja et al., 2020; Tajfel, 1978). As the identification process continues, employees then classify, categorize, and/or name themselves and others into separate social groups based on characteristics such as age, membership, gender, or cohort (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social categorization further identifies the differences among groups and similarities within groups (Worchel et al., 1998). Oja (2016) stated, “the need for distinction of social groups reiterates the usefulness of social categorization as it allows one to understand how an individual defines their group membership” (p. 21). Given the apparent intrinsic and extrinsic conflict experienced by compliance employees, senior administrators would be wise to consider how those unique employees situate themselves within the athletic department. Specifically, senior administrators should seek to understand if compliance employees experience sport employee identification processes (Oja et al., 2020) differently than other members of the athletic department. Similarly, senior administrators may want to consider how role stress (Parnell et al., 2022) is encouraged and manifests in compliance employees.

Organizational Identification

Organizational identification has previously been defined as the “perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he or she is a member” (Mael & Ashforth, 1992, p. 104). Similarly, Pratt (1998) suggested individuals identify with organizations when they incorporate their beliefs of the organization into part of their identity. Previous SIT literature defined organizational identification as a form of social identification where individuals group themselves in different social categories and describe themselves in terms of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). As individuals group themselves in social categories and develop their identity within an organization, they may be less likely to become alienated or separated from the group (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000).

Van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) argued that organizations provide multiple memberships in different forms such as organizational memberships, departmental memberships, and work-group departmental memberships. They also discovered work-group identification acted stronger than identification with organizations due to its smaller size, as they observed a stronger correlation between work-group identification and job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job involvement, and job motivation versus organizational identification. Van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) suggested future research may benefit organizations

greatly from focusing more on work-group identification versus organizational identification. Conversely, Gaertner et al. (2012) described how competition affects organizational identification as “win-lost, zero-sum competitive relations between groups, in particular, enhance the salience of group boundaries and produce negative feelings toward and stereotypes about the other group” (p. 268). Consideration for intercollegiate compliance officers highlights the need for a better understanding of sport employees. While this unique population is tasked with protecting the athletic department, they also support and contribute to departmental and athletic team success. Oja (2016) discussed various components associated with competition and sport and displayed the various intersections of competition and sport organizations. Further, Oja et al. (2020) and Oja et al. (2023) noted that competition, as it relates to pushing oneself to get better in an organizational culture that supports “continual improvement” can have a positive impact on identification (p. 212).

Sport Employee Identification

Various scholars addressed the importance of recognizing sport management as a distinct discipline separate from general management research (Chalip, 2006; Costa, 2005; Cunningham, 2013; Doherty, 2013; Lis & Tomanek, 2020). Nonetheless, limited research exists regarding sport-specific theory and sport employee identities. Oja (2016) argued previous research failed to “yield an empirical explanation for their (i.e., sport employees)

identification process” (p. 8). Similarly, Oja et al. (2015) argued that middle management employees generally outnumber coaches and administrators. The authors noted that research continually underexamined middle management employees of sport organizations, and in particular, those employees that are simultaneously in positions to support and monitor the sport departments where they work. Subsequently, Oja et al. (2015) and Oja et al. (2020) proposed the SEI model to better understand mid-level sport employees.

SEI development began when Oja et al. (2015) recognized the need for a sport-employee specific instrument and continued when Oja (2016) performed three separate studies aimed at formally creating a SEI instrument while examining the potential antecedents and organizational outcomes outlined by Oja et al. (2015). Oja (2016) continued the work of Oja et al. (2015) and examined job satisfaction, turnover intentions, counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs), and organizational citizenship behavior as potential outcomes of SEI. Oja (2016) discovered mixed results with each potential outcome and SEI’s two dimensions in which neither SEI dimension was found to impact CWBs. Oja’s (2016) mixed results for both SEI dimensions suggest further investigation and validation needed for the SEI instrument.

Oja et al. (2020) made critical strides in the development of SEI by modifying SEI and identifying two key dimensions of SEI, sport affinity, and collective enhancement. Sport affinity explores the similarities between participants and their organi-

zation otherwise known as the “realization of a sport symmetry between themselves and their sport organization” (Oja et al., 2020, p. 278). Collective enhancement explores the overall enhancement of one’s identity due to the “perceived unity” with their sport organization (Oja et al., 2020, p. 278). After Oja et al. (2020) formally created the SEI instrument, Oja and Bass (2020) measured the relationship between individual, organizational, and leadership antecedents and SEI.

In recent years, sport scholarship has embraced and continued to validate SEI. Oja et al. (2019) incorporated SEI into their examination of a proposed psychological capital construct, authentic psychological capital (A-HERO). Within, SEI is proposed as an antecedent variable to A-HERO and was proposed as a positive influence on A-HERO. Kim et al. (2023) carried the SEI-informed work of Oja et al. (2019) by validating the A-HERO construct. Within, the authors found that pride, another antecedent to A-HERO positively influenced SEI and the positive influence of pride was increased with a longer tenure with an organization. The authors also noted that harmonious passion, the desire to do work freely, was also an antecedent to SEI and promoted organizational identification.

Oja et al. (2023) sought to identify how sport employees identify with their organization by employing semi-structured interviews informed in part by SEI. The authors justified their research on grounds that better understanding employee psychology and identity development could promote improved workplace

performance. Overall, the authors identified three themes related to sport employee identity development revolving around personal experiences with sport, the alignment of personal and organizational values, and group/team membership in the organization. Citing sport affinity (Oja et al., 2020), the authors found that alignment of personal and organizational values contributed to the dimension of sport affinity. While no overt support of collective enhancement was identified, the concepts of professionalism identified as part of group/team membership are in line with Oja et al.'s (2020) definition of collective enhancement.

Previous research not only created, tested, and developed a sport-employee-specific instrument, but it developed a valid and reliable instrument for scholars to explore sport employees' identification processes (Oja et al., 2015; Oja, 2016; Oja et al., 2020; Oja & Bass, 2020). Research recently emerged regarding the impact of SEI on middle management sport employees and/or sport employees with potential for conflicted feelings due to the nature of their role, such as compliance personnel (Kim et al., 2023; Oja et al., 2023; Oja et al., 2019).

When developing the SEI instrument, previous studies utilized various middle management intercollegiate employees for participants, but the current study examines the effects of SEI at a micro-level with a specific population of professionals that are likely to experience role ambiguity (i.e., compliance employees). Thus, the purpose of the current study was to extend SEI research by examining the potential outcomes of SEI on compliance

employees relative to job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypotheses

Based upon the work of Oja (2016) and Oja et al. (2020, 2023), SEI should be an appropriate measurement model for NCAA Division I Compliance Employees. The investigators developed three hypotheses based on work of Oja (2016). Specifically, the researchers analyzed work performed by Oja (2016) in testing the potential outcomes of SEI with 2,000 sport employees across various departments of American intercollegiate athletics departments. Oja (2016) examined organizational citizenship behaviors, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and counterproductive workplace behaviors. Due to Oja (2016) discovering partial support for job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors, the researchers predicted SEI to significantly aid in predicting job satisfaction, lower turnover intentions, and organizational citizenship behaviors as outcomes of SEI for NCAA Division I compliance employees.

The link between SEI and job satisfaction relies on organizational identification. Swanson and Kent (2015) identified a positive relationship between organizational identification and job satisfaction. Relatedly, van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) indicated that work-group identification was strongly correlated to job satisfaction. Compliance employees are unique in athletic departments because they are tasked with ensuring athletic department employees and representatives adhere to

NCAA rules (Wong et al., 2015) while also trying to achieve the goals and objectives of the department (Kihl, 2007). Though this balance is stressful for compliance employees (Bolton and Roselli, 2017), the uniqueness of their positions likely promotes work-group identification. As suggested by van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000), this should contribute to positive job satisfaction for compliance employees.

H1: Compliance personnel SEI will positively influence job satisfaction.

While job satisfaction is likely influenced by organizational identity, turnover intentions may similarly be impacted by social identity. Here, being the member of a group affects how individuals view themselves (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As part of developing a social identity, individuals identify similarities within their group and differences from other groups (Worchel et al., 1998). Furthermore, Hogg (2018) suggested individuals will view themselves in relation to their group membership and the relationships they have formed. As compliance employees work in their unique positions (Wong et al., 2015), they likely feel a connection within the compliance office and with their coworkers. This connection and social identity as a member of the compliance office should make them less inclined to seek new employment.

H2: Compliance personnel SEI will positively influence lower turnover intentions.

Organizational citizenship behaviors have been shown to relate to organizational identification and social identity. Pratt (2012) suggested that organizational compliance is a likely outcome of strong identification. Individuals with strong organizational identification and robust relationships within their work groups should engage in citizenship behaviors that benefit the organization and its interests (Cheney, 1983; Dutton et al., 1994). As posited above, compliance employee responsibilities within an athletic department likely promote organizational identification and social identity through the tasks and relationships those workers experience. Therefore, compliance employees should engage in organizational citizenship behaviors.

H3: Compliance personnel SEI will positively influence organizational citizenship behaviors.

Method

Research Design and Data Collection

To develop the research questions and hypotheses, researchers utilized previous research performed by Oja (2016). The present quantitative study used convenience sampling to target NCAA Division I compliance employees via email with a link to complete the questionnaire. Participants included compliance employees currently employed with an NCAA Division I institution (i.e., Division I-FBS Power 5; Division I-FBS Group of Five; Division I-FCS; Division I-NO) and excluded any administrative assistants, part-time employees, graduate assistants, volunteers, and interns. Before the solicita-

tion of participants, researchers received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.

Researchers identified 914 email addresses from online staff directories and participants received the invitation in early January 2022 through email. A link to the online survey software Qualtrics was provided. Data collection remained open for four weeks. After completing data collection, researchers completed an automatic transfer of responses from Qualtrics into STATA software and performed a confirmatory factor analysis to ensure SEI as an appropriate measurement model for NCAA Division I compliance employees' identity. Additionally, researchers analyzed the connection between each demographic variable and SEI through one-way ANOVAs. Finally, simple linear regression analyses were utilized to test H1, H2, and H3.

Instruments

The full instrument in this study included questions from five instruments. The first portion consisted of a demographics form. The second portion of the survey consisted of the two 4-item dimensions of the SEI instrument, collective enhancement and sport affinity (Oja et al., 2020), measured with a 7-point Likert scale where 1 equaled "strongly disagree" and 7 equaled "strongly agree." The third and fourth portions of the survey measured job satisfaction and turnover intentions, and utilized two 3-item, 7-point Likert scales from Cammann et al. (1983). Job satisfaction measured individuals' overall satisfaction with their current po-

sition and turnover intentions addressed participants' intent to leave their position with their current organization. Lastly, the fifth portion of the survey measured the relationship between SEI and organizational citizenship behaviors and utilized a 10-item, 7-point Likert scale from Podsakoff et al. (1990). As discussed by Podsakoff et al. (1990), organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors exhibited by employees that go beyond their assigned duties.

Results

Reliability Assessments

In order to determine model reliability, each factor's construct reliability and Cronbach's alpha was assessed. Reliability assessments revealed Cronbach's alphas for all items were within the acceptable range. The Cronbach's alpha value for each factor was within the range of .76 to .88. The construct reliability for each of the factors exceeded .70, which showcases the internal consistency of the constructs (Hair et al., 2017). Additionally, to assess the converging validity of each factor, an average variance extracted (AVE) was completed and the values were all above .50, which is considered to be appropriate (Hair et al., 2017). The construct's analysis results are represented in Table I. Additionally, a confirmatory factor analysis was utilized to test the goodness of fit for the proposed SEI model. The model chi-square value was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 7.228$, $p = .124$), suggesting good model fit. Additionally, the RMSEA ($RMSEA = .061$) indicated a close model fit. Finally, the CFI ($CFI = .954$), where

values range from zero to one, indicated a satisfactory fit with a value above 0.90 and the SRMR ($SRMS = .042$) indicated a good model fit.

Table 1

Measurement Items of the Construct's Analysis Results

Factor	C.R.	AVE
Job Satisfaction ($\alpha = .88$)	.72	.81
Turnover Intentions ($\alpha = .76$)	.73	.68
Organizational Citizenship Behavior ($\alpha = .80$)	.86	.52
Sport Affinity ($\alpha = .84$)	.90	.69
Collective Enhancement ($\alpha = .88$)	.92	.73

Descriptive Statistics

A total of 217 usable responses were collected from NCAA Division I compliance employees. Of the 217 participants, 107 (n = 107) were female and 110 (n = 110) were male. There were two (n = 2) Asian/Pacific Islander, 23 (n = 23) Black/African American, 8 (n = 8) Hispanic/Latino, one (n = 1) Native American, 181 (n = 181) White/Caucasian, and 2 (n = 2) other. Furthermore, respondent level of college sport as well as years working in compliance were also recorded. Level of college sport and years working in compliance are represented in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 2.

Participants by Level of College Sport

Classification Level	n
FBS Power Five	59
FBS Group of Five	28
FCS	72
No Football Program	57

Table 3.

Participants Number of Years on Staff

Number of Years	n
1-5 Year(s)	148
6-10 Years	35
11-15 Years	13
16-20 Years	8
21-25 Years	8
26-31+ Years	5

In indicating the percentage of the participants' job solely related to athletics compliance, 133 (n = 133) indicated 100-90%, 30 (n = 30) indicated 89-80%, 29 indicated (n = 29) 79-70%, 6 (n = 6) indicated 69-60%, and 19 (n = 19) indicated <55%. The current study also collected the participants' job title and direct line of report. Participants reported a variety of job titles: Compliance Specialist/Officer (n = 20), Assistant Director (n = 43), Director (n = 28), Assistant Athletic Director (n = 31), Associate Athletic Director (n = 62), Executive/Senior Director (n = 29), and Deputy Athletic Director (n = 4). Lastly, direct lines of report were classified into three separate groups: Athletics (n = 184), Outside of Athletics (n = 20), and Combination of Athletics and Outside of Athletics (n = 13).

To better understand the nuances of the descriptive data, a collection of ANOVAs was conducted. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if SEI levels were different for compliance employees based upon gender identification. Participants were classified into two groups: male (n = 110) and female (n = 107). There was a statistically significant difference between males and females [$F(1,215) = 4.88, p = .002$] with females reporting higher levels of SEI.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if SEI levels varied for compliance employees based upon racial identification. Results revealed identifying as a Hispanic compliance employee has a significant impact on SEI. Participants were classified into two groups: Hispanic ($n = 8$) and Non-Hispanic ($n = 209$). There were statistically significant differences between groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA [$F(1,215) = 5.44, p = .020$].

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if SEI levels varied based on years on staff for compliance employees. Participants were classified into six groups: 1-5 years on staff ($n = 148$), 6-10 years on staff ($n = 35$), 11-15 years on staff ($n = 13$), 16-20 years on staff ($n = 8$), 21-25 years on staff ($n = 8$), and 26-31+ years on staff ($n = 5$). There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA [$F(5,211) = 2.65, p = .024$]. A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that SEI was statistically significantly higher in the 11-15 years on staff group compared to the 1-5 years on staff group ($.354 \pm .116, p = .003$). This data suggests beginning a second decade within a compliance office has as statistically significant impact of SEI. This finding appears to support previous SIT and organizational identification literature that indicated that the process is ongoing (Jenkins, 2008; Oja et al., 2020; Tajfel, 1978) and that as the process continues, employees further classify and identify with distinct groups (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Furthermore, as

individuals engage in the social categorization engage in this process, they may be less likely become alienated from the group (van Knippenberg and van Schie, 2000).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if SEI levels were different based upon compliance employees' job title. Participants were classified into seven groups: Associate Director ($n = 62$), Assistant Director ($n = 43$); Assistant Athletic Director ($n = 31$); Executive or Senior Director ($n = 29$); Director ($n = 28$); Compliance Officer ($n = 20$); and Deputy Athletic Director ($n = 4$). There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA [$F(6,210) = 5.20, p < .001$]. A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that SEI was statistically significantly higher in the Executive/Senior Directors group compared to the Compliance Officers group ($.487 \pm .112, p < .001$). Also, SEI was significantly higher in the Executive/Senior Directors group compared to the Assistant Director of Compliance group ($.406 \pm .093, p < .001$).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if SEI levels were different based upon compliance employees' direct line of report. Participants were classified into three groups: Athletics (i.e., Those who reported to a department and/or individual within athletics, such as Senior Associate Athletic Director, Athletic Department, etc.) ($n = 184$), Outside of Athletics (i.e., Those who reported to a department and/or individual outside of athletics, such as President, Chancel-

lor, Human Resources, etc.) (n = 20); and individuals Within and Outside of the Athletic Department (n = 13); there was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA [$F(2,214) = 3.78, p = .024$]. Results indicated a statistically significant difference in the mean SEI between compliance employees who report directly to an individual or department within athletics ($M = 5.157$), compliance employees who report directly to an individual or department outside of athletics ($M = 5.300$), and those report to combination of individuals and departments in and outside of athletics ($M = 5.438$). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that SEI was statistically significantly higher in the “In and Outside of the Athletic Department” group compared to the “Athletic Department” group ($.280 \pm .115, p = .004$).

Hypothesis Testing

The first potential outcome, job satisfaction, was statistically significant and found to be a predicted variable of SEI ($\beta = .187, p < .001$). This finding supports H1. The second potential outcome, turnover intentions, was statistically significant and found to be a predicted variable of SEI ($\beta = -.275, p < .001$). This finding supports H2. Lastly, the third potential outcome, organizational citizenship behaviors, was not statistically significant and found to not be a predicted variable of SEI ($\beta = .073, p = .073$). This finding rejects H3. Results from the regression analyses are located in Table 4.

Table 4.

Linear Regression Analysis Results

	β	p
Job Satisfaction	.187	.001
Turnover Intentions	-.275	.001
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	.073	.073

Discussion

Job Satisfaction and SEI

A statistically significant result for H1 reflects similar findings from past scholars. As compliance employees feel an increased “perception of oneness with or belongingness” (Mael & Ashforth, 1992, p. 104) to their organization, they may feel a heightened sense of satisfaction with their position. This finding supports results from Swanson and Kent (2015), who observed a positive relationship in their study between participants’ organizational identification and job satisfaction. Additionally, Olusegun (2013) noted many factors including relationships, quality of work environment, and contentment of one’s work that all affect job satisfaction and social identity development.

In considering job satisfaction as how content employees are with their job (Azeez et al., 2016), the results suggest as compliance employees feel a higher sense of belongingness and “shared similarity” (Oja & Bass, 2020, p. 428) between themselves and their organization, they are more likely to feel satisfied with their position. Additionally, compliance employees’ relationships formed with coaches and student-athletes considerably impact their job satisfaction (Olusegun, 2013).

Ultimately, as compliance employees form lasting relationships with student-athletes and coaches and observe minimal differences in their wants and needs, their job satisfaction is likely to increase.

Turnover Intentions and SEI

Results from H2 suggest that as compliance employees feel a higher sense of belongingness and symmetry between themselves and their organization, they are less likely to leave, or desire to leave, their organization (Azeez et al., 2016; Olusegun, 2013). The relationship between SEI and turnover intentions may stem from the relationships compliance employees form with coworkers, coaches, and student-athletes. This notion was supported by Hogg (2018) who put forward that social identity is related to how individuals view themselves based on group memberships and relationships. As compliance employees feel more connected with their organization and develop long-lasting relationships, they may be less likely to leave their current organization. This finding is supported by Kim et al. (2020), who noted the influence collegiate sport employees have on student-athletes' overall collegiate experience.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and SEI

An insignificant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and SEI for H3 suggests an increased SEI may not necessarily result in compliance personnel going above and beyond their assigned tasks. This finding is logical when one considers the strict guide-

lines of the NCAA rules manual and how compliance professionals must be diligent to educate and enforce those rules. However, these results are counter to most research that suggests a positive relationship between identity and organizational citizenship (Cheney, 1983; Dutton et al., 1994; Pratt, 2012; van Dick, 2001). For example, Cheney (1983) and Dutton et al. (1994) noted individuals with a stronger organizational identification may lead to stronger citizenship behavior and considering organization interests with making on-the-job decisions. Furthermore, as individuals form stronger relationships with in-group members and the organization, an individual's focus shifts to duties benefiting the entire organization (Dutton et al., 1994). Lastly, Pratt (2012) discussed organizational compliance as an outcome of strong identification.

It is important to note the uniqueness of compliance employees when it comes to an insignificant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and SEI. With the expectation of upholding NCAA standards and university specific policies, maintaining a compliant athletics department and ensuring student-athletes receive the best possible collegiate experience, compliance employees have minimal time to go above and beyond their assigned tasks and responsibilities. Various groups including boosters, parents, friends, coaches, and other administrators are affected by NCAA legislation when violations come to compliance employees. This may suggest role conflict (Biddle, 1986) exists within compliance offices and compliance employees consider orga-

nizational citizenship behaviors as part of their job that is stringently dictated by their dual role as athletic department employee and an extension of the NCAA.

Gender

There were several noteworthy descriptive findings. First, the finding that females reported higher levels of SEI ($M = 5.24$) compared to men ($M = 5.12$) suggests compliance employees' gender is related to SEI. Sweeting et al. (2014) addressed gender role attitudes and noted, historically, men's roles generally include paid work and "breadwinner" status, whereas women generally care for the family and home. This notion from Sweeting et al. (2014), coupled with the general understanding of males dominating managerial positions in the workplace (Cohen & Huffman, 2007) and positions of power in the sport industry (Shaw & Hoerber, 2003), suggests that women, broadly, may have become resigned to mid-level management positions and to compliance positions specifically (Chaffins et al., 1995). The higher levels of SEI for females in the current study may suggest female compliance professionals feel more satisfaction and connection with their organization.

Length of Employment

A statistically significant difference in the SEI levels between individuals with "11-15 years of experience" ($M = 5.490$) and the individuals with "1-5 years of experience" ($M = 5.136$; $p = .003$) reflect similar findings from previous research (i.e., Jenkins, 2008; Oja et al., 2020; Tajfel, 1978; Todd & Kent, 2009). Tajfel (1978)

noted identification as an ongoing process developed over time. As individuals develop their identity and form relationships within their organization, they may be less likely to become alienated or separated from the group resulting in a stronger connection (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Kim et al. (2023) also suggested pride and length of employment tend to increase, enhancing SEI. Additionally, Todd and Kent (2009) noted how athletic departments contribute strongly to an individual's social identity. Todd and Kent (2009) identified that employees of sport organizations may view their employment within a sport organization as culturally admired and prestigious, likely resulting in positive social identity. That positive social identity influences an increase in various organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and levels of job involvement.

The results suggest that compliance employees staying with an organization through 15 years feel more connected and have a stronger sense of identity they feel with their department. Oja (2016) referenced work from Baumeister and Leary (1995) to explain that employee relationships are a strong characteristic of organizational identification as individuals work diligently to uphold their relationships. Thus, as time passes and compliance employees form strong relationships with others, they appear more connected with the organizations. Lastly, the results may also suggest supervisors should work diligently in building that connection with new hires so all employees feel part of the team. A stronger connection between the

organization and employees may result in better teamwork and SEI.

Job Title

A statistically significant difference in the SEI levels between individuals identified as “Executive/Senior Directors” ($M=5.44$) and “Compliance Officers” ($M=4.96$, $p < .01$) and “Executive/Senior Directors” ($M=5.44$) and “Assistant Director of Compliance” ($M=5.04$, $p < .01$) suggests levels of power and authority affects compliance employees’ SEI levels. Results revealed SEI mean differences among those with increased power and authority compared to compliance employees with less power and authority. Regarding organizational identification, Hogg and Terry (2000) defined organizations as “internally structured groups that are located in complex networks of intergroup relations characterized by power, status, and prestige differentials” (p. 121). Jenkins (2008) also discussed the importance of power and authority for sound procedures and order to occur within organizations. Athletic departments often employ similar levels of hierarchy where employees within each office carry different ranges of authority and power.

The results from the current study suggest compliance employees in positions of power reported higher levels of SEI and felt more connected with their organization. As noted previously, the greater the length of employment within an athletic department suggests higher levels of identity development (Kim et al., 2023; Oja et al., 2020). Relatedly, the longer compliance employees remain

with their organization those employees may earn more authority, resulting in those employees feeling more connected with their organization as they have more time to develop their identity and build relationships. This finding falls in line with research from Tajfel (1978) that referenced identification as an ongoing process which develops over time. Therefore, it appears as compliance employees develop relationships with coaches and student-athletes while they build their organizational identity, they feel more connected to the environment.

Direct Line of Report

A statistically significant difference in the SEI levels between compliance employees that report to individuals both “in and outside of the athletic department” and those solely in “the athletic department” ($p = .043$) suggests role conflict and ambiguity may play a role in compliance employees’ direct line of report (Parnell et al., 2022). Specifically, a difference in SEI levels based on direct line of report draws to question whether the various pressures compliance employees face from coaches and other outside influences (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017) heighten their sense of role conflict when working to satisfy different groups.

For instance, compliance employees who report directly to athletics may feel less connected with their organization due to increased conflicts of interest or ethical conflicts that might arise if a compliance worker feels pressured to provide liberal interpretations of NCAA rules to satisfy sport coaches and/or stakehold-

ers focused on winning (Sagas & Wigley, 2014). Conversely, compliance employees reporting to individuals or departments outside of athletics feel more connected with their organizations due to a diminished perception of role conflict brought on by pressures to justify their decisions when their actions may not be viewed as satisfactory by coaches or other interested athletic department stakeholders who may not be directly involved in the operation of the compliance office (Parnell et al., 2022).

This possibility does not assume compliance employees work less to satisfy coaches and other stakeholders when reporting to individuals or groups outside of the athletic department. Considering the uniqueness of their position and their relationships created within athletics, however, having a direct line of report outside of athletics may minimize the role stress felt by compliance employees by creating an environment with clear role perception, job description, and communication which could lessen role conflict and role ambiguity present for compliance employees within the athletic department. In this scenario, diminished role stress may likely lead to greater job satisfaction (Parnell et al., 2022).

The current results raise the question of whether athletic departments should relocate their athletics compliance employees' direct line of report to an individual or department outside of athletics. As noted by Weight and Zullo (2015), some institutions already relocated their compliance offices out of the "athletics department umbrella" (p. 69). Relocating

compliance offices outside of athletics or adjusting direct lines of report opposes results from Bolton and Rosselli (2017) where 62% of participants indicated being part of an athletic department as their favorite part of being an NCAA compliance employee. Based on results from the current study and Bolton and Rosselli (2017), perhaps the best course of action for future athletic departments and directors may be to shift compliance employees' direct line of report to individuals or departments outside of athletics while keeping the physical location of the offices within athletics.

Practical Implications

As compliance employees continue to manage role conflict, role ambiguity, and potential conflicts of interests, SEI allows for sport managers to better understand this unique employee population in college athletics. The present study bears important information for sport practitioners that can positively impact their athletic department. In the compliance context, athletic department executives should foster a departmental culture that embraces the compliance office as a key component of the athletic department while guarding against conflicts of interest (Hogg & Terry, 2001; Jenkins, 2009; Stets & Burke, 2000). Oja et al. (2020) expanded on previous literature regarding the dimensions of SEI, identifying sport affinity and collective enhancement. Embracing the compliance office as a key component of the athletic department would enable the SEI dimension of collective enhancement. In recognizing the

value of compliance the likelihood of role stress (Parnell et al., 2022) brought about through role conflict (Biddle 1986) could be diminished as compliance employees would feel more connected with the organization and part of the collective. Similarly, emphasizing sport affinity may be a complicating factor for compliance employees. While Oja et al. (2020) suggested sport employees embrace sport in the abstract, within compliance, sport and competition can be problematic, raising concerns over ethical behavior (Sagas & Wigley, 2014) and possibly contributing to role stress (Parnell et al., 2022) or perceived stressors from coaches and other athletic department stakeholders (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017).

The role of the compliance office as a critical resource for the athletic department should be articulated to all athletic employees, including coaches. Such action would likely increase job satisfaction while decreasing turnover intentions by signaling that the compliance office is part of the organization and encouraging compliance officers to identify with the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Such support could also lead to greater affinity amongst compliance office employees (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). This step is critical as compliance employees have been identified as working in ambiguous, isolated roles where they must hold coworkers and students to NCAA rules while being in a middle management position.

Limitations

Several limitations exist for the current study. First, the current study in-

cluded full-time NCAA Division I compliance employees with other athletic department-related tasks such as student services. The current study recognized certain Division I institutions assign compliance personnel with other athletic department responsibilities and therefore included such individuals in the current study. Results may be impacted by experiences outside of athletics compliance. For example, approximately 83% of our respondents identified as White/Caucasian in their survey responses, potentially skewing the results of the study. In the future, a more systemic sampling could reduce potential bias and increase representation. Additionally, approximately 24% of surveys were completed and usable. This presents the possibility that only compliance employees who highly identify with their position responded to the survey. Survey responses were also collected online, limiting the extent for researchers to adequately determine who completed each survey and the reliability of such responses. Statistically, structural equation modeling (SEM) was not used within the study. While our intent was to study the relationship between each individual outcome, SEM could be used to determine the relationships between factors. Lastly, with compliance being a highly scrutinized area of intercollegiate athletics (Rhoden, 2009), participants may have been reluctant or hesitant to participate.

Future Research

Considering the results from this study and suggestions from Oja et al. (2020) and Oja and Bass (2020), there remains a

significant amount of future research opportunities involving the SEI instrument. This study identified statistically significant differences in SEI when considering gender, length of employment, job title, and direct line of report. These findings, coupled with the support of the SEI instrument demonstrated in this project provides solid footing for future research into why those differences exist. Relatedly, the lack of a significance in organizational citizenship behaviors and compliance personnel is intriguing. Understanding the complexities of compliance employees' work within the context of organizational citizenship behaviors can assist upper-level administrators in promoting behaviors that do not conflict with compliance tasks.

Future studies should also consider exploring SEI antecedents of NCAA Division I compliance employees or other specific groups of sport employees. While the current study offered valuable insight into the role SEI plays in organizational behavior outcomes and other implications for upper management in better managing their compliance personnel, future research should examine factors leading to SEI for compliance personnel. For example, Oja and Bass (2020) explored the relationship between potential antecedents and SEI with employees of American intercollegiate athletics departments, which should be performed with NCAA compliance personnel and other intercollegiate athletics employees.

Finally, future research should continue building upon NCAA compliance employee research. For example, the NCAA response to the COVID-19 pandemic and

NIL changes drastically affected compliance operations among student-athletes and coaches. Compliance employees must simultaneously adapt with college athletics and work to maintain a compliant athletic department. As the NCAA continually makes changes, future research should qualitatively examine the effects of those changes, such as COVID-19 and NIL, on compliance employee identity and their overall connection with their organization.

The current study revealed job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions as outcomes of SEI for NCAA Division I compliance employees, but found no support for organizational citizenship behaviors. Additionally, this discovery contributes to SEI research by applying the SEI instrument to a specific group of collegiate sport employees further validating the SEI instrument for future sport research. Lastly, the current study contributes to sport research by examining a specific population of collegiate sport employees often working behind the scenes to provide quality experiences for NCAA student-athletes, coaches, and other administrators.

References

- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4278999>
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (2004). Social identity theory and the organization. In M. J. Hatch and M. Schultz (Eds.), *Organizational identity* (pp. 134-160). Oxford University Press.

- Azeez, R. O., Jayeoba, F., & Adeoye, A. O. (2016). Job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment. *BVIMSR's Journal of Management Research*, 8(2), 102-114.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 67-92.
- Bolton, C. B., & Rosselli, A. C. (2017). The assessment of NCAA Division I compliance professionals: A comprehensive look at those administrators, their experiences, and the pressure they face. *Journal of NCAA Compliance*, 1(5), 3-9.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, Jr., G. D., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change* (pp. 71-138). New York: Wiley.
- Chaffins, S., Forbes, M., Fuqua Jr., H. E., & Cangemi, J. P. (1995). The glass ceiling: Are women where they should be?. *Education*, 115(3). 380-386.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Toward a distinctive sport management discipline. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.20.1.1>
- Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs*, 50(4), 342-362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758309390174>
- Cohen, P. N., & Huffman, M. L. (2007). Working for the women? Female managers and the gender wage gap. *American Sociological Review*, 72(5), 681-704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200502>
- Costa, C. A. (2005). The status and future of sport management: A delphi study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(2), 117-142. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.19.2.117>
- Cunningham, G. B. (2013). Theory and theory development in sport management. *Sport Management Review*, 16(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2012.01.006>
- Dixon, M. A., Turner, B. A., Pastore, D. L., & Mahoney, D. F. (2003). Rule violations in intercollegiate athletics: A qualitative investigation utilizing an organizational justice framework. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1(1), 59-90. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025477824078>
- Doherty, A. (2013). Investing in sport management: The value of good theory. *Sport Management Review*, 16(1), 5-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.12.006>
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 239-263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393235>
- Gaertner, S. L., Bachman, B. A., Dovidio, J., & Banker, B. S. (2012). Corporate mergers and stepfamily marriages: Identity, harmony, and commitment.

- In M. A. Hoff & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 265-282). Psychology Press.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Heere, B., & James, J. D. (2007). Stepping outside the lines: Developing a multi-dimensional team identity scale based on social identity theory. *Sport Management Review*, 10(1), 65-91. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(07\)70004-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(07)70004-9)
- Hogg, M. (2018). Social identity theory. In P. J. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 112-138). Stanford University Press.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2001). Social identity and organizational processes. In M. A. Hogg & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 1-12). Psychology Press.
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16-78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(85\)90020-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(85)90020-2)
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social identity*. Routledge.
- Kaltenbaugh, L. P., Parsons, J., & Winters, B. (2013). A preliminary investigation of NCAA Division II compliance officers. *Sport Journal*, 16(1), 1.
- Kihl, L. (2006). What's morality got to do with it? An examination of compliance officers' approaches to rule interpretations. *Journal of College and Character*, 7(3), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1534>
- Kihl, L. (2007). Moral codes, moral tensions and hiding behind the rules: A snapshot of athletic administrators' practical morality. *Sport Management Review*, 10(3), 279-305. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(07\)70015-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(07)70015-3)
- Kihl, L. (2009). Pacific-10 compliance officers' morality and moral reasoning. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2(1), 11-149.
- Kim, M., Oja, B.D., & Anagnostopoulos, C. (2023). An expanded psychological capital (A-HERO) construct for creativity: Building a competitive advantage for sport organisations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 23(3), 722-744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2021.1922480>
- Kim, M., Oja, B. D., Chin, J., & Kim, H. (2020). Developing student-athlete school satisfaction and psychological well-being: The effects of academic psychological capital and engagement. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34(4), 378-390. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2020-0091>
- Lis, A., & Tomanek, M. (2020). Sport management: Thematic mapping of the research field. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 20(2), 1201-1208. <https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2020.s2167>
- Lock, D., & Heere, B. (2017). Identity crisis: A theoretical analysis of 'team identification' research. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 17(4), 413-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1306872>

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(2), 103-123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030130202>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2021). *NCAA 2021-22 Division I Manual*. <https://web3.ncaa.org/lstdbi/reports/getReport/90008>
- Oja, B. (2016). *The contemporary sport employee: An examination of sport employee identification (SEI)* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas]. KU Scholar Works. <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/handle/1808/22011>
- Oja, B. D., Bass, J. R., & Gordon, B. S. (2015). Conceptualizing employee identification with sport organizations: Sport Employee Identification (SEI). *Sport Management Review, 18*(4), 583-595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.02.002>
- Oja, B. D., & Bass, J. R. (2020). Gaining the perception of oneness with a college sport organization: Examining the antecedents of sport employee identification. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 13*, 424-444. http://csri-jiia.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/RA_2020_20.pdf
- Oja, B. D., Bass, J. R., & Gordon, B. S. (2020). Identities in the sport workplace: Development of an instrument to measure sport employee identification. *Journal of Global Sport Management, 5*(3), 262-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2018.1477521>
- Oja, B. D., Gordon, B. S., & Hazzaa, R. N. (2023). Navigating psychological membership in sport organizations: Exploring sport employees' identities. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 35*(2), 202-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2021.2021563>
- Oja, B. D., Kim, M., Perrewé, P.L., & Anagnostopoulos, C. (2019). Conceptualizing A-HERO for sport employees' well-being. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal, 9*(4), 363-380. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-10-2018-0084>
- Olusegun, S. O. (2013). Influence of job satisfaction on turnover intentions of library personnel in selected universities in South West Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice, (e-journal)*, 1-22. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/914/?utm_source=digitalcommons.unl.edu%2Flibphilprac%2F914&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- Ott, M., & Beaumont, J. (2020). Defining and describing mid-level administrators in intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2020*(189), 87-102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20356>
- Parnell, D., Easton, B., Bond, A., & Kelly, S. (2022). Perceptions of role ambiguity for sporting directors in professional football. *Soccer and Society, 23*(4-5), 451-465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14660970.2022.2059856>
- Pfleegor, A. G., Soebbing, B. P., & Seifried, C. (2019). Corruption, rule-breaking, and sanctions: The case of the

- NCAA. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 4(1), 38-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2018.1493355>
- Pierce, D., Kabarakis, A., & Fielding, L. (2008). Compliance officers' guide to navigating NCAA student-athlete reinstatement cases involving amateurism violations. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 1, 87-106.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be? Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in Organizations: Building theory through conversations*. (pp. 171-207). Sage.
- Pratt, M. G. (2012). Social identity dynamics in modern organization: An organizational psychology/organizational behavior perspective. In M. A. Hogg & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 13-30). Psychology Press.
- Rhoden, W. C. (2009, April 11). University compliance officers: Good cop, bad cop. *New York Times*, p. D2.
- Rogers, M., & Ryan, R. (2007). Navigating the bylaw maze in NCAA major-infractions cases. *Seton Hall Law Review*, 37(3), 749-797.
- Sagas, M., & Wigley, B. J. (2014). Gray area ethical leadership in the NCAA: The ethics of doing the wrong things right. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 7(1), 40-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jis.2014-0084>
- Shaw, S., & Hoerber, L. (2003). "A strong man is direct and direct women is a bitch": Gendered discourses and their influence on employment roles in sports organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(4), 347-375.
- Smith, D. R. (2015). It pays to bend the rules: The consequences of NCAA athletic sanctions. *Sociological Perspectives*, 58(1), 97-119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121414556844>
- Smith, R. (2000). A brief history of the national collegiate athletic association's role in regulating intercollegiate athletics. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 11(1), 9-22.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695870>
- Swanson, S., & Kent, A. (2015). Fandom in the workplace: Multi-target identification in professional team sports. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(4), 461-477. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jism.2014-0132>
- Swanson, S., & Kent, A. (2017). Sport identification and employee pride: Key factors in sport employee psychology. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 17(1/2), 32-51. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSMM.2017.083986>
- Sweeting, H., Bhaskar, A., Benzeval, M., Popham, F., & Hunt, K. (2014). Changing gender roles and attitudes and their implication for well-being around the new millennium. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 49(5),

- 791-801. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-013-0730-y>
- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 61-67). Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Nelson-Hall.
- Todd, S., & Kent, A. (2009). A social identity perspective on the job attitudes of employees in sport. *Management Decision*, 47(1), 173-190. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740910929777>
- van Dick, R. (2001). Identification in organizational contexts: Linking theory and research from social and organizational psychology. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(4), 265-283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00068>
- van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900166949>
- Walker, K. B., Seifried, C. S., & Soebbing, B. P. (2018). The National Collegiate Athletic Association as a social-control agent: Addressing misconduct through organizational layering. *Journal of Sport Management*, 32(1), 53-71. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2017-0197>
- Weight, E. A., & Zullo, R. H. (2015). *Administration of intercollegiate athletics*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Weston, M. A. (2011). NCAA sanctions: Assigning blame where it belongs. *Boston College Law Review*, 52(2), 551-583.
- Wong, G. M., Deubert, C. R., & Hayek, J. (2015). NCAA Division I athletic directors: An analysis of the responsibilities, qualifications and characteristics. *Jeffrey S. Moorad Sports Law Journal*, 22(1), 1-73.
- Worchel, S., Morales, J. F., Páez, D., & Deschamps, J. (1998). *Social identity: International perspectives*. SAGE Publications Ltd.