

# Florida State University Libraries

---

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

---

2003

## An Examination of the Relationship Between Regional Sport Commissions and Organizational Structure

Cheri L. Bradish



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
REGIONAL SPORT COMMISSIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

By

CHERI L. BRADISH

A Dissertation submitted to the  
Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded  
Fall Semester, 2003

Copyright © 2003  
Cheri L. Bradish  
All Rights Reserved

The members of the committee approved the dissertation of Cheri L. Bradish defended on June 19, 2003.

Charles Imwold  
Professor Directing Dissertation

Joe Cronin  
Outside Committee Member

Annie Clement  
Committee Member

Cecile Reynaud  
Committee Member

Approved:

Charles Imwold, Chair  
Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses her appreciation to the following individuals for their cooperation and assistance in completing this dissertation in particular; and more importantly, for their ongoing support and encouragement of my professional pursuits in general. First, genuine gratitude is expressed to Dr. Charles Imwold, my doctoral committee chair, for his extreme patience and guidance during my doctoral study – it will always be appreciated. Sincere appreciation is also extended to the other members of my committee: Dr. Joe Cronin, Dr. Annie Clement, and Dr. Cecile Reynaud, who each provided invaluable assistance and mentorship during the development of the dissertation. A thank you is also extended to all Sports Commissions participants, the National Association of Sports Commissions administration, and Mr. Larry Pendleton of the Florida Sports Foundation, for his input in this research project.

Last, but definitely not least, recognition must be made to my parents, Tom and Helen Bradish, who, as they often remind me, without them and their resources, this project and experience would of never been possible. While words can not properly express the impact that my parents have had on me in the pursuit of my graduate education, I thank my father for constantly encouraging me to keep ‘moving ahead,’ and my mother for actually getting me there; including those many memorable road trips between Glanworth, Ontario and Tallahassee. I thank you both from the bottom of my heart for all you have done to support the completion of this important project, and all the other significant milestones in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	vi
Abstract .....	xii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Review of the Literature .....	2
Historical Significance .....	3
Contemporary Perspectives .....	4
Sports Commissions .....	7
Theoretical Frameworks .....	10
Organizational Theory .....	10
Organizational Structure .....	13
Dimensions of Organizational Structure .....	15
Organizational Design .....	17
Classification .....	18
Emerging Organizational Structures .....	19
Related Sport Management Research .....	21
Statement of the Problem .....	28
Research Questions .....	28
Definition of Terms .....	29
Assumptions .....	30
Limitations .....	31
Significance of Study .....	31
2. METHODOLOGY .....	33
Subjects .....	33
Instrumentation .....	34
Validation of the Pilot Study .....	36
Centralization, Complexity, Formalization, Organizational Characteristics .....	37
Validity .....	38
Research Design .....	41
Reliability .....	46

Analysis of Data.....	46
Data Management .....	46
Statistical Analyses .....	48
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	49
Results .....	51
Research Question One – Centralization .....	51
Research Question Two – Complexity.....	56
Research Question Three – Formalization.....	69
Research Question Four – Organizational Characteristics.....	90
Discussion .....	95
Centralization .....	111
Complexity .....	112
Formalization .....	112
Organizational Characteristics .....	113
Conclusions.....	115
4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS .....	116
Summary .....	116
Conclusions.....	118
Recommendations.....	119
APPENDICES.....	121
A. Active Sports Commissions Membership List .....	121
B. Metropolitan Population Estimates .....	127
C. Sports Commissions Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS).....	130
D. Information/Consent Cover Form .....	137
E. SCOSS Data Management .....	139
F. Human Subjects Information .....	150
REFERENCES .....	152
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	164

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Dimensions of Centralization.....	42
2.	Dimensions of Complexity .....	43
3.	Dimensions of Formalization.....	44
4.	Components of Organizational Characteristics.....	45
5.	Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Centralization for the Study .....	53
6.	Analysis of Variance Results for Centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants.....	54
7.	Analysis by Question of the Level of Centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q1) .....	57
8.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q2) .....	58

9.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q3) .....	59
10.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q4) .....	60
11.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q5) .....	61
12.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q6) .....	62
13.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q7) .....	63
14.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q8) .....	64
15.	Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q9) .....	65
16.	Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Complexity for the Study .....	67



17.	Analysis of Variance Results for Complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants.....	68
18.	Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Population Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q10) .....	70
19.	Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q11) .....	71
20.	Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q12) .....	72
21.	Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q13) .....	73
22.	Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q14).....	74
23.	Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Formalization for the Study.....	76
24.	Analysis of Variance Results for Formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants .....	77

25.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q15) .....	79
26.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q16) .....	80
27.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q17) .....	81
28.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q18) .....	82
29.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q19) .....	83
30.	Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q20) .....	84
31.	Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Centralization for the Study .....	86
32.	Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Complexity for the Study .....	87

33.	Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Formalization for the Study .....	88
34.	Analysis of Variance Results for Overall SCOSS Dimensions of Organizational Structure Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants .....	89
35.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants .....	91
36.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q21-22, 38) .....	96
37.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q35-36).....	97
38.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q23-26, 34).....	98
39.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q27-33).....	99
40.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q37, internally performed) .....	100

41.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q37, externally performed).....	101
42.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q37) .....	102
43.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Q39-40).....	109
44.	Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants (Events Hosted).....	110

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to examine the differences in the organizational structure of Sports Commissions in the United States of America. This study also examined Sports Commissions according to general organizational characteristics. Further, this study attempted to classify Sports Commissions according to organizational structure. In addition, comparisons and contrasts regarding organizational structure were drawn between organizations that represent large and small geographic regions.

The theoretical frameworks for this study were based within contemporary and traditional organizational theories. The literature was grounded in reference to similar studies and findings relative to management and legal interpretations of community supported sport in general, and within sport management frameworks in particular. While the significance of this study is revealed in the findings pertaining to the structure of Sport Commissions, greater implications relative to sport organizations and community sport development are also discussed.

The subjects for this study were regional Sports Commissions of the United States of America considered 'active' members of the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC) collective. The survey instrument contained three sections which addressed the areas of centralization, formalization, and complexity, in addition to a fourth section, which examined descriptive organizational characteristics.

The components of centralization measured included information dissemination, information output, and control of information. The components of formalization included written job descriptions, written rules and procedures, and supervision of personnel. Complexity was measured using size of structure, and education and experience of employees. Organizational characteristics were assessed according to Commission type, financial components, and activities performed. Survey methods included both telephone and

mail surveys. Of the 74 total Sports Commissions surveyed, 57 participated; producing a final overall return rate of return was 77.03%.

Three types of analyses were conducted on the data. One, a descriptive evaluation of each component of the Sports Commissions profiles identified was conducted. Two, a SCOSS reliability correlation analysis within and between SCOSS components was analyzed. Finally, a comparison between the organizational characteristics and dimensions of organizational structure of Sports Commissions. Responses were also coded into two major groupings: those that represent larger markets, specifically greater than 1 million inhabitants; and those which represent smaller markets, specifically smaller than 700,000 inhabitants.

There was no significant difference found in the degrees of centralization, complexity, and formalization for the organizations studied, which signals important considerations regarding the overall status of the organizational structure of Sports Commissions. Finally, important findings and implications related to the organizational characteristics studied was also revealed.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Let me root, root, root for the home team; If they don't win it's a shame.

For it's one! two! three! strikes you're out, At the old ball game!

(Gorn & Goldstein, 1993, p. 187)

As synthesized by one of the most famous of all anthems, there has been a long and loyal relationship between sport and the communities that are represented by them. With the modernization of sport and society this dynamic has flourished within home communities, and has been reinterpreted to include returns with regard to both political and economic implications. Throughout most regions of the United States of America, modifications of community sport partnerships have been formally recognized and supported by individual citizens and their representative political associations.

In fact, since the beginning of the twentieth century, community administrators have identified sport as a means to achieve economic progress and advanced social development. They have systematically capitalized on the commercial interests of sport by creating a variety of sport related organizations and services within urbanized communities (Wilson, 1994). One hundred years of related developments later, there is the clear emergence of a sophisticated sport event industry (Schneider, 2002) and at its core of success and development, the regional Sports Commission. In conjunction with the management of these organizations, various types of sport properties including major sporting events, sport franchises, and facility developments have become integrated within a community's social, economic, and political infrastructures.

Created by, and within, specific communities, regional Sports Commissions exist within almost every metropolitan community throughout the United States of America (National

Association of Sports Commissions, 1995). They serve as a representative sport event and management infrastructure, of both advocacy and expertise, to attract and enhance sport properties for the purpose of, among other goals, to contribute to a community's greater social and economic development. However, little scholarly or industry research has examined the successes or the structures of the regional Sport Commission. Related research has been limited to but a few related academic studies and presentations (Brown & Zuefle, 1996; Covell, 2002; Lachowetz, 2001) all of which have only casually introduced the concept and profile of the Sports Commission. The most comprehensive profile of these organizations to date is offered by Pennell (1990) in his descriptive analysis of Sports Commissions.

At best, Sports Commissions have been discussed by related trade and sport industry media, with profiles of specific community sport accomplishments or when noted in the context of the national governing association, the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC). Thus, given the recognized importance of sport related events and properties to a local community, it is clear that too little is known about representative regional Sports Commissions, which have become powerful constituents within the sport industry. Further, enhanced research regarding the structure and nature of Sport Commissions is also important to the greater study and practice of sport management.

This chapter reviews the historical and contemporary significance of sport and community development, and discusses the phenomena of the organization of the Sport Commission. Further, it introduces the theoretical framework of organizational structure as related to this study, and presents sport management academic literature related to sport organizations. Finally, it concludes with an overview of the problem and purpose of the study.

## **Review of Literature**

The entity of Sports Commission is one of the greatest examples of the evolving state of sport as defined and influenced by a region's political, economic and social goals. To understand the management and the structure of the Sport Commission, it is important to interpret the historical and contemporary relationships between sport and community



development, which has been well-documented (Ellul, Pardee & Wilkinson, 1993). As Danielson (1997) noted, in his commentary of commercialized sport:

The development of team sports in the United States and Canada is closely connected with basic urban trends; viable major leagues first emerged in the booming industrial cities of the late nineteenth century; and professional sports spread to cities across the continent as urban growth put more and more places into the big leagues (p. 19).

As such, Danielson (1997) articulates the environment that supported the development of the regional Sports Commission. Further, it is important to note that the development of sport is significant for what it has contributed to its respective neighborhood, town, or city. Undeniably, such sport structures have provided a most effective arena to create and articulate a bond between citizens and a community (Gorn & Goldstein, 1993); and as such, have been recognized as a longstanding means of both social and political partnership (Danielson, 1997).

### **Historical Significance**

Ellul, Pardee & Wilkinson (1993) were among many scholars who have discussed the historical significance of sport and community development. They commented that “sport has been conditioned by the organizations of the great cities; apart from city life its very invention is inconceivable” (1993, p. 382). The combinations of these findings have well established that sport was first organized, and then commercialized, in America during the middle to late 1800’s (Adelman, 1990; Ingham & Loy, 1993). During this time, the development of sport was the result of many factors including the industrialization and urbanization of metropolitan communities (Sage, 1998; Schimmel, Ingham & Howell, 1993). Capitalizing on the growth of cities and the increasing number of citizens with substantial amounts of discretionary leisure time and money (Sage, 1998) a multitude of sport related goods and services were created to sustain the needs and wants of an ever growing consumer population of sport spectators and participants (Dunning et al., 1993; Jarvie & Maguire, 1995). The phenomena of the sport industry was created, which continues to permeate our culture (Wiggins, 1995). Recent estimates in fact indicate that sport is the eleventh largest industry segment in America annually contributing approximately \$400 billion (U.S.) to the American economy (Meek, 1997).

Important to this research, is that much of the sustained growth and success of the sport industry is attributed to the historical roots of urban development; wherein emotional bonds were first created between citizens and their new communities through sport and their representative and increasingly structured sport organizations (Bale, 1989). Turn of the century consumer sport participation entitled individuals to fulfill their urban sensation for camaraderie and community identity. Further, this dynamic created greater sociological benefits to a city, as it articulated a “collective community pride and ownership not previously realized among divergent groups of people” (Wiggins, 1995, p. 334).

By the 1900’s, sport had become one of the major sources of recreation (Adelman, 1990) as Americans experienced incredible interest and opportunity to participate in athletics. At the same time, as sport grew in popularity, the involvement between representative governments and sport was also increasing (Coakley, 1998; Wiggins, 1995). The explosive growth and popularity of commercialized sport resulted in the subsequent identification of home teams and host communities created further longstanding attachment between sport and place (Danielson, 1997; Rowe & McGuirk, 1999). Actions of the local governments toward sport organizations were favorable through legislation, court rulings, and even through established policies and regulations (Sage, 1998). Further, the perception that sport should be controlled and regulated by an outside entity that represented the interests of all citizens and as a collective means of organizing community pride for economic prosperity was advanced (Coakley, 1998; Eitzen & Sage, 1997). This effectively signaled the acceptance of organized public sport and hence, was the precursor to the regional Sport Commission (Sage, 1998).

### **Contemporary Perspectives**

With a growing public acceptance of community based sport infrastructures and the recognition of a commercialized sport industry, public investment initiatives were put in place to actively engage in the business of sport as a perceived means to achieve social, economic, and civic opportunities (Graham, Goldblatt & Delpy, 1995). In line with what was referred to as an ‘entrepreneurial phase’ of government (Heap, 1996) the local Sports Commission was created as a means of incorporating sport and economic strategy. Since the 1980’s, the popular regional

Sports Commission has emerged as a powerful and sophisticated advocate for specific communities (Pelissero, Henschen & Sidlow, 1993) with a mandate to create, attract, and develop sport properties as a means to greater economic development and resources (National Association of Sports Commissions, 1995). There are a number of residual effects of the success and attention garnered by a Sports Commission, such as the enhanced external perception and prestige for the community on a larger scale. Further, the internal and intangible benefits of a Sports Commission must also be recognized in the overall benefits of such organization to a region. A detail of each of these benefits will further point to the importance of the regional Sport Commission to local communities, and as an integral constituent in the contemporary sport industry.

**Economic development.** At the very minimum, significant public capital resources are allocated for the acquisition of sport properties for the perceived greater economic benefits of supporting such ventures. Further, other constituents within the community, such as financial partners and realtors often also become vested partners and influential decision-makers in such projects that also perceive the benefits of such capital investments (Howard & Crompton, 1995). In fact, regarding various forms of public subsidies (tax, stadium developments) it has been estimated that the “size of the annual subsidy provided by cities and states to sport franchises (sic) to be approximately \$500 million” (Crompton, 1995, p. 35). Communities attempt to quantify the actual impacts of this support, primarily thorough ‘economic impact’ studies, which, although debated and discussed by economists and Sports Commissions alike, is an assessment of the overall economic effects of hosted events (Baade & Sanderson, 1997; Crompton, 1995; Howard & Crompton, 1995; Kaufmann, 2002). Defined as “the net change in an economy resulting from a sport event” (Lee, 2001, n.p.) this includes visitors’ spending, public spending, employment opportunities, and tax revenue, this type of measure remains criticized by all constituents involved for its accuracy and meaning (Kaufmann, 2002).

Finally, it is also perceived that one-time event hosting in fact contributes a great deal to a community’s economy, serving as a means to entice what is referred to as ‘sport tourism’ defined as using sport for tourist pursuits (Kurtzman, 2001). For example, it is estimated that the 1999 Superbowl created a residual effect of \$260 million for the city of Atlanta (Kurtzman,

2001, p. 26). This increased community visibility also undeniably creates media coverage (Howard & Crompton, 1995) which has a residual effect of generating greater tourism and hospitably benefits.

**External perception.** For many ambitious communities, one of the primary motives of sport involvement, as actively solicited by regional political bodies, is to acquire permanent and temporary sport properties of significant stature which will enhance a community's prestige, and contribute to it's recognition as a 'major league city' (Ingham & Loy, 1993; Schimmel et al., 1993). Specifically, communities lobby to host major league professional sport franchises, acquire the rights to host a major sporting events, or, for resources and means to fund multi-purpose athletic facilities. Sport properties are also pursued by public representatives, and endorsed by the citizens as a means to validate themselves as a major metropolitan region and 'first-class' city (Eitzen & Sage, 1997). All which further demonstrates how sport is used as an image builder for a community (Howard & Crompton, 1995).

Eitzen and Sage (1997) also suggest that professional sport organizations take into consideration regional identifications in their sport management and marketing strategies. In response to this, it has been said, "small-city franchises and second franchises in a city seem to experience competitive difficulties both on the field and in the ledger" (Schimmel et al., 1993, p. 221). Ritchie (1989) studied the level of awareness raised through a successful sport event relative to the 1988 Winter Olympics. He concluded that the visibility for the host city of Calgary increased approximately forty percent in global recognition, signaling the value of high exposure for hosting communities.

**Community pride.** Perhaps one the greatest mobilizing forces contributing to the rise of public support of sport and the Sport Commission, was penned by Lipsky (1981) who noted that "sport is the magic elixir that feeds personal identity while it nourishes the bonds of communal solidarity" (p.5). This medium, referred to as the 'psychic income' and intrinsic impact of sport, speaks to the greater benefits of the successful support of sport and the means of community pride in the accomplishment (Howard & Crompton, 1995). This effectively suggests that sport

serves as a catalyst for enhancing a city identity's spirit and civic pride (Coakley, 1998; Danielson, 1997; Rowe & McGuirk, 1999). In short, these factors combined with such residual factors as community increases in employment, participant sport offerings and grassroots sport development (Bale, 1989; Trojan Sport & Event Marketing, 2003) all point to the benefits of a Sport Commission.

The combination of these interrelated contributors signal sport prioritized for economic development in many communities, and effectively create local sport experts and event managers who continually solicit and maintain a portfolio of sport related properties. It is the recognized community support and smooth functioning of these events (Catherwood & Van Kirk, 1992) that further creates a reputation for these communities as recognized sport leaders and 'supporters'. For example, the NCAA recently acknowledged that established community support and appreciation of sport was of paramount importance in selecting hosts cities (Catherwood & Van Kirk, 1992). The same is true for internationally recognized events, such as the Olympic Games, wherein communities wishing to establish themselves as potential hosts must make efforts to be recognized as structured sport organizations and experts in sport event management.

Yet, while the historical and political forces of community sport have been discussed, the 'mobilization agent' of the structure of the Sports Commissions has largely been ignored. By systematically examining the organizational structure of Sports Commissions, which have become the primary link between communities and economic development through sport, one can better understand the way these organizations are structured, and how they have come to be so prevalent and influential in today's societies. First, however, an analysis of Sports Commissions will permit a greater understanding of how communities have directly prospered from their inception.

## **Sports Commissions**

Public investment in sport is regarded as one of the most significant developments within the sport industry over the past two decades (Graham et al., 1995). Arguably, the one best response to organized and supported community sport has been the regional Sport Commission. Since 1980, more than one hundred communities throughout the United States have created the

representative municipal, regional, and even state based Sports Commission (also referred to as sport authority, council, corporation, federation, or, foundation) (Graham et al., 1995; National Association of Sports Commissions, 1995). The objective of these entities is to attract, stimulate, and promote sporting events and facilities, which at the same time, provide a significant economic impact and increased quality of life to their community (Palm Beach County Sports Commission, 1996).

In the past few years, the majority of the major sporting events, such as the NFL Super Bowl, the NCAA Men's Basketball Final Four Tournament, or, the Olympic Games, were hosted in conjunction with the resources of a regional Sports Commission. The success of these organizations, as effective sport and event managers, and, vehicles of economic development, is attributed to a number of factors, similar to the historical and contemporary perspectives related to sport and community development. Emanating from such organizations as Chambers of Commerce, many of these are associated with local convention and visitors bureaus; others are independent, non profit, and a third category is those government agencies tasked to specialize in sport ventures. Along with this cluster, most Sports Commissions have a functional board structure, which account for key and desired representatives for the commission in the community. An inventory of sports facilities and sports organizations within the community becomes the sports properties which the commission positions as properties in its' ability to attract and retain sport events (National Association of Sports Commissions, 1995).

Further, in response to the growth and development of a collective of community based sport promotion entities, the National Association of Sports Commissions was legally established in 1992. This group represents communities engaged in soliciting sporting events, and works with local Sports Commissions, along with other athletic organizations, such as the United States

Olympic Committee, and the Amateur Athletic Union (National Association of Sports Commissions, 1995).

Some examples of specific Sports Commissions best illustrate their community significance. The Indianapolis Sports Corporation became the first community based organization in the United States in 1979 to "identify, bid for, and host sporting events systematically" (Macnow, 1989, p. 48) and successfully 'pioneered' a community-based

organization with interest in sport. At the beginning of the 1970's (Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, 1991) the city initiated a strategic plan, which was hinged to, among other items, to developing its economy and improve its image through investment in amateur sports. The results for Indianapolis in this plan were astounding. Within fifteen years and with a \$124 million investment, the city "had attracted eighteen national governing bodies, had contributed \$213 million to the state and \$683 million in personal income to the Indianapolis residents, and had created over 2,700 fulltime jobs" (Marietta & Sheahan, p. 21, 1995). Success of this magnitude has been attributed to cooperation among the parties, and the integration of a sport and event marketing firm that educated regions on the sports marketplace, and access to it. Further, other communities, motivated by the success of Indianapolis, quickly entered the sport event management business to capitalize on the opportunities and gains related to community supported sport.

Sport Commissions representing various size regions have demonstrated great impacts on their communities. For example, the New York City Sports Commission is attempting, in addition to attracting amateur events, to host the summer 2012 Olympics as a means of significantly contributing to the economy and tourism (Kaplan, 2002). On the other hand, but equally important, the Greater Raleigh Convention and Visitors Bureau highlighted in the 2000-2001 Annual Report that their sports marketing arm had "assisted in booking 29 sports events accounting for 40,132 room nights and an economic impact of \$10.4 million" (Greater Raleigh Convention and Visitors Bureau, 2001).

In short, the regional Sports Commission is important to specific communities and as a constituent of the greater sport event industry. Further, an understanding of the Sport Commissions is best accomplished through an analysis of its organizational design and structure. As the Sports Commission has become a significant organization for many communities, little is known about its operation about organizational structure. In fact, the NASC, in their role as a facilitator and educator of Sports Commission development, notes that that the structure of these entities will vary. They further caution that "a commission may alter its organizational structure in order to accomplish the goals of its mission. However, it is imperative to ensure that all of the 'players' are involved in determining the appropriate time for change" (National Association of Sports Commissions, 1995, p. 3).

Therefore, it would reason that a thorough analysis of their organizational structure would permit a better understanding of the processes and procedures incorporated by Sports Commissions. This in turn, could be used to identify those structural variables which contribute to the overall organizational effectiveness of the organization. Such a review would not only provide a broader knowledge of Sports Commissions, but it would benefit the greater theory and practice of sport management.

### **Theoretical Frameworks**

There is an abundant amount of research which has examined the elements or configurations concerning organizational structure (Mintzberg, 1979). Yet, as Slack notes, within the field of sport management, there is a great need to develop a more comprehensive body of knowledge on the structure and operations of the many and various sport organizations that constitute the sport industry” (Slack, 1996, p. 10). Thus, within the context of this research about organizational structure, it is important to be well grounded in the diverse field of organizations and organizational theory. Therefore, this theoretical framework is divided into the following categories: organizations and theory, organizational design, organizational structure, dimensions of organizational structure, and finally, a synthesis of related sport management research.

### **Organizational Theory**

Peter Drucker (1988) proclaimed that, while historically, management theory has examined organization design and goals, an increased understanding of what makes organizations ‘tick’ is needed. First, however, it is important to understand organizations. Organizations are essentially the confines and constructs of specific enterprises that are comprised of a variety of characteristics, much like the human being. Organizational theory is a broad based philosophy concerned with the structure and design of organizations (Hanline, 1993). Conceptually, organizational theory was first established on the premise that if work



could be studied properly and if principles could be drawn about how best to perform this work, then these principles could be incorporated to improve formal organizations (Mintzberg, 1979). Within this philosophy, the Classical School, the Behavioral School, and the Systems School exist as the three primary schools of thought in the evolution of organization theory, and continue to influence the body of literature today.

The Systems School of organizational theory is the most recently introduced theory concerning organizations and their management. Essentially, this approach mathematically examines how organizations behave, and incorporates principles found in earlier theories (Fombrun, 1984). Similar in context, the Behavior School examines behavior (i.e. manner and characteristics) by which individuals and small groups operate within an organization. Thus, researchers from both schools are primarily concerned with personnel issues such as job satisfaction, leadership style, communication, team building, and motivation. Therefore, both the Systems School and the Behavioral School concentrate on interrelationships within an organization, as opposed to examining the organization as a constructed unit.

Termed the Classical School, a foundation of organization and organization structure theory was initiated in the 1900's by a social scientist, Max Weber. By 1910, Weber had depicted and outlined the features of the bureaucracy as the ideal form of the organization (Nohria, 1995). Weber (1946) also detailed the structure of tasks within an organization as central to a rationalized society (Ranson, Hinings & Greenwood, 1980). These have served as an organizing framework for most modern organizations and could enable them to become more rational and efficient. The features of this bureaucracy include, a clear differentiation of tasks and responsibilities among individuals, coordination through a hierarchy of decision rights and standard rules and procedures, vertical separation of planning and execution and, technical criteria for recruitment and promotion (Nohria, 1995).

Essentially, the Classical School became concerned with identifying rational techniques to determine the components of structure within an organization (Hanline, 1993). The Classical School of thought attempts to determine if and how a coordinated set of relationships exist within an organization, assuming that the organization could better ascertain and attain the goals for which it was established, and thus identify and improve these relationships. Following on Weber's work, the research of Taylor (1911), and Fayol in 1916 (1949) expanded on the

principles of effective administration and introduced the concept of ‘scientific management’. This perception of the workplace positioned a systematic and ordered approach to work, and effectively suggested that workers should be incorporated into this system; as opposed to a more democratic approach to workers, and leading them to maximize their efficiency and competencies.

Studies that are more recent have also indicated that there is no one best way to organize; the appropriate organizational form depends upon the human and business situation facing the organization (Lorsch, 1987, p. 2). While this new approach has given rise to a new body of literature and interest, termed contingency theory many managers still revert to the early models of management and organizations when faced with an organizational design question. This is particularly in the case when little information is known about the organization type or industry of which it is a part. Further, organizations exist to enable people, or groups of people, to effectively coordinate their efforts to set and accomplish tasks (Nohria, 1995). As such, organizations can also be understood as systems of governance (Fombrun, 1984) of voluntary associations which work towards the achievement of common ends, (in which power and consensus are institutionalized through processes of differentiation and integration)

This understanding of organizations has been advanced by the theoretical body of literature referred to as ‘organizational theory.’ Interestingly, this study is considered “the main subject taught under the heading management in many of our business schools” (Drucker, 1982, p. 193). As such, the interest in this analyses was, as it is today, based on the premise that performance depends on sound organization, which is a determinant of the structural characteristics (Drucker, 1988).

Organizations have been described and analyzed in many ways. In particular, a number of metaphors have been used to understand organizations, most prevalent being the analogies between organizations and machines, between organizations and organisms, and most recently, organizations and cultures (Smircich, 1995). While organizations differ in the way they are assembled and in their elements, they do have four basic characteristics (Bowditch & Buono, 2000) which include:

1. Social entities. One of the major characteristics which identifies an organization is that it is comprised of people, or groups of people, who work together to perform related tasks of the association.
2. Goal directed. Organizations exist for a purpose or mission, which is the overall guiding principle and desired outcome for the enterprise. Although varying goals may differ internally, they are fundamentally always working toward the greater end goal of the organization.
3. Identifiable boundaries. Distinct elements or internal characteristics characterize every organization. External elements are those features that link the organization to other systems or organizations. Yet, although each organization is exposed to and affected by various external elements, each organization is able to control the extent of influence of these elements due to its boundaries, this dictate the openness and degree of influence of others.
4. Structured systems. Individuals within the organization are divided into distinct units according to task and division, which will best ensure effectiveness in attaining the mission or goal of the organization. This creates a structure for the organization and is accompanied by a number of guiding principles to facilitate the work processes of the divisions.

Therefore, one can see that organizations have similar internal characteristics, structure being one which can be controlled and manipulated by the internal infrastructure, and thus, requiring further review.

## **Organizational Structure**

Organizational structure has been defined and introduced in many ways (Pennings, 1976). Some define organizational structure as “the ways in which an organization divides its tasks and then coordinates them” (Bowditch & Buono, 2000, pg. 258). Drucker (1974) explains organizational structure as determining what structure is needed, and then how it should be built. Others add that this includes balancing job-related functions with integration. Structure means the patterns of job definition, authority, and communication relationships represented in the

organization charts and position descriptions (Lorsch, 1987). Power (1988) defines organization structure as the specific manner in which authority is distributed to managers. Finally, Ranson et al. (1980) define the concept of structure as to “imply a configuration of activities that is characteristically enduring and persistent; the dominant feature of organizational structure is its patterned regularity” (p. 1) and indicates the importance of recognizing that these structures evolve and change over time.

In short, the structure of an organization is the pattern of organizational roles, relationships, and procedures that enable such coordinated action by its members. Organization structure serves the following functions:

1. It enables members of the organization to undertake a variety of activities according to division of labor. This includes the extent of horizontal and vertical specialization (i.e. the breadth of the jobs in terms of the extent to which the activities are combined, and the grouping of activities according to the output nature of the organization).
2. It enables the members of the organization to coordinate their independent activities through integrating mechanisms.
3. It defines the boundaries of the organization and its tasks, and interfaces with other constituents.

Other components of structure include:

- i. The distribution of decision-making, and means of how information is distributed.
- ii. The informal structure, aside from standard roles and relationships.
- iii. The political structure. Given that many organizational members will have varying political interests and agendas, there will be internal political agendas, which must be assessed by the manager.
- iv. The legitimate basis of authority. Oftentimes, rank and authority do not entirely comprise or control the power of the organization, and other factors, such as a member’s expertise, charisma, and social status will influence authority within an organization.

In theory, there are a number of issues regarding organization structure, yet in practice, only a few designs are observed. These designs have become the standard forms of structure.

Organizational structure is understood as the mechanism by which an organization divides and distributes tasks throughout the personnel of the organization, the reporting relationships, and the coordinating and controlling mechanisms used within the organization. “As such, shaping an effective organization structure is one of the central functions of the manager” (Nohria, 1995). Nevertheless, one of the essential principles of organizational structure is the division of labor, which refers to the ways in which the roles of the organization are divided among the members. Division of labor is best understood when discussing dimensions of organizational structure. This explains how jobs and job responsibilities are divided into various components and how they are integrated into the overall structure of the organization.

Another means of understanding organizational structure is by the extent a structure is rigid and routine or flexible and non-routine (Bowditch & Buono, 2000). Rigid structures are referred to as mechanistic, while flexible organizations are considered organic. Furthermore, mechanistic organizational structures often resemble Weber’s identification of a bureaucracy, where clear job descriptions exist, heightened upper management is involved, and standardized decision making reward systems are accepted. On the other hand, organic organizational structures may be referred to as adhocracies, and are designed with flexibility to cope with rapidly changing environments (Mintzberg, 1979). However, what is most important of all these combined findings is that research is consistent in its assessment that further research is needed to describe the similarities and differentiated dimensions of organizations (Pennings, 1976, p. 702).

### **Dimensions of Organizational Structure**

The abundance of research concerned with organizational structure has focused primarily on what is considered the three basic dimensions, or characteristics of organizations. These include centralization, formalization, and complexity (Bowditch & Buono, 2000; Dalton et al., 1980). Referred to most often as structuring dimensions, these were introduced in 1977 (Downey, Hellriegel & Slocum) as a specific means of identifying the interrelationships and characteristics of organizations. An analysis of the elements of these dimensions identifies

crucial components and interrelationships within organizations (Dalton et al., 1980) and provides an excellent foundation for comparison between organizations. These dimensions are also referred to as the anatomy of an organization (Cummings & Berger, 1976).

**Centralization.** Centralization involves the level and involvement of authority to make decisions in the organization (Bowditch & Buono, 2000; Kikulis, Slack, Hinings & Zimmerman, 1989; Pugh, Hickson & Hinings, 1968). Mintzberg (1979) suggested that centralization also refers to the power to make decisions and the extent to which this power is concentrated in the organization. A centralized organization, therefore, is one in which authority is concentrated with very few positions made by the upper levels of management, providing tighter coordination, and control.

A decentralized structure, on the other hand, transfers authority and control for the decision making from management throughout the organization to many more members of the organization. This structural dimension usually occurs with the presence of a more professionally trained staff (Hage, 1980). When incorporated properly within organizational structure, decentralization can be advantageous to an organization because it allows senior managers more time to concentrate on broader policy issues, enhances employee moral and motivation, and, often increases organizational communication and response time (Miller & Monge, 1986).

**Complexity.** Complexity, also referred to as specialization, is concerned with the number of components or the extent to which an organization is differentiated (Slack, 1997; Walton, 1981) or the degree to which organizational tasks, units and roles are broken down and allocated (Amis & Slack, 1996; Kikulis et al., 1989) according to different functions, titles, or divisions within organizations. Essentially, it is a measure of the reflection of the degree of internal variation of an organization's roles and activities. Horizontal differentiation refers to how organizations differentiate in terms of administrative and technical roles and in terms of professional and volunteer roles. Vertical differentiation, understood as the depth of authority

structure, is a means of coordinating horizontal complexity, and can be represented by the number of levels in an organizational chart.

**Formalization.** Formalization, also referred to as standardization (Amis & Slack, 1996) refers to the means to which expectations and behavior regarding job responsibilities are described and coordinated for an organization. This is demonstrated in written form (via rules, regulations, job descriptions, policies, and procedures) or is legitimized by reoccurring events (termed standardization) in the organization (Hage & Aiken, 1970). The more specific these specifications regarding roles and tasks, the more formalized the organization and its structure. Formalization is best understood within the components of job codification (how many rules a person is asked to follow) and rules observation (how closely individuals must follow these rules). In general, if organizations are highly formalized, employees have little discretion over how and when they do their work (Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980).

Formalization therefore, is best prescribed for an organization when there is a need for consistent expectations, to maintain and monitor employee behavior, and in particular, when employees are less professionalized. Conversely, excessive formalization should be discouraged for some organizations, as it has been linked to goal displacement, decreasing adherence to rules, and the minimization of creative behavior due to prescribed written procedure. However, tempered within the overall type of organization, formalization is a vital component of organizational structure, and as such, interrelated within the centralization and complexity as a structural dimension of organizations (Walton, 1981).

## **Organizational Design**

Organization theory involves the ways in which managers influence employees to work toward the goal of the organization. One of these ways is through personal contact and rapport, the second is through rational decision-making regarding resource allocation, and the third, is through decision made about the definition of jobs, their arrangement on organization charts, the

measurement and reward schemes, selection criteria for personnel (Lorsch, 1987). This third mechanism is referred to as organization design.

Specifically, the design of an organization refers to structure, rewards, and measurement practices intended to direct members' behavior toward the organization's goals, as well as the criteria used to select persons for the organization (Lorsch, 1987). The basic idea of organization design focuses on the management side of organization theory, and by constructing and changing an organization's structure to achieve its goals (Bowditch & Buono, 2000).

## **Classification**

While much has been written about organizational structure, it became clear that a mere description of each organization, by dimension, was limiting in its scope. Therefore, Mintzberg (1980) introduced organizational design as a systematic means of classifying structures. Further, these configurations attempt to speak to the greater inherent needs of each structure, as essential determinants of organizational success. Although no two organizations are alike, organizational design essentially is concerned with examining similar characteristics as a means of classification and comparison (Slack, 1997). By identifying commonly occurring features in sport organizations, therefore, it is possible to classify them into configurations or designs.

Standard means of identifying these design types includes typologies, which are grounded in a number of assumptions, and taxonomies, which are derived from multivariate analyses of empirical data on organizations and used to understand organizational phenomena. Typically, organizations or aspects of their structure are described relative to a number of variables (Miller & Friesen, 1984; Slack, 1997).

Although other options have been offered, some researchers have offered a three tiered design form approach that states that organizations begin as functional forms based upon simple division of labor. With greater growth, they become a divisional form based on grouping of functions and divisions, until, generally a hybrid, the matrix form emerges, which is both functional and divisional, creating a dual hierarchy able to meet multiple demands.



## Emerging Organizational Structures

Mintzberg's design parameters are the most frequently cited source of organizational design typology (1979; 1981). Within this framework, there exist five main types of organizational configurations, as defined by parts of the organization and method of coordination. The parts of the organization to which Mintzberg refers to are: the operating core (employees responsible for basic work), the strategic apex (the senior managers), the middle line (managers between the operating core and strategic apex), the techno-structure (analysts responsible for designing the standard work systems), and the support staff (who provide alternative sources of support to the organization not already mentioned). In following, Mintzberg also identifies five means of coordination (Slack, 1997). These five established design types are characterized by one part and one means of coordination, and will be defined.

**Simple structure.** The simple structure is characterized most often by its simplicity. Typically, it has little or no techno-structure, few support staff, and a loose division of labor (Mintzberg, 1980). The organization has low levels of formalization and decision-making, and yet is highly centralized and informal at the same time. It is above all, organic in nature and dynamic. This structure type is often evident in small organizations that have not yet bureaucratized. At the same time, the simple structure is most preferred by entrepreneurial firms who prefer flexibility.

**Machine bureaucracy.** This structure is characterized by high levels of specialization and standardization, formalized operating procedures, the functional grouping of operational tasks, a clear delineation between line and staff relationships, and, centralized decision-making. This type of design depends most often on the standardization of work processes for coordination, and is most often identified with regulating systems, the techno-structure prevails as the most crucial component of the structure. The Machine Bureaucracy is typically associated with environments that are both simple and stable, generally is a matured organization, and as

such, has come to depend on a large support staff. Finally, the Machine Bureaucracy is often associated with external control.

**Professional bureaucracy.** The Professional Bureaucracy design type is characterized by the standardization of skills (Mintzberg, 1981) in which behaviors are regulated or standardized by a coordinating mechanism, which allows for decentralization. Here, the organization hires highly trained specialists and permits them considerable autonomy in their work, in their relationships with other colleagues, while delegating them collective control of the administrative functioning of the organization. In this type, operating units are typically very large yet decentralized in both vertical and horizontal dimensions. Finally, this type works in conjunction with an environment that is both complex in regulations and stable. It is also considered democratic for its professional employees, offering them considerable autonomy to coordinate along natural work function (Mintzberg, 1981).

**Divisionalized form.** The Divisionalized Form is one which exists because its product lines are diversified (Mintzberg, 1981) and operates most often in a diversified market. In fact, given its name, the divisions that constitute the whole structure may exhibit a variety of designs. The essential component is the middle line wherein managers are given control over the strategic and operating decisions of their respective divisions. A corporate support system provides support and exercises some degree of control over divisions. Therefore, this structure works is a synthesis of two types of power models, and works best with machine bureaucracies that are implemented at the divisional level.

**Adhocracy.** Mintzberg's Adhocracy Model (1980; 1981) has been defined as a highly flexible and responsive form of organization, that is highly organic in structure (Slack, 1997). Most often, the organizations that exhibit this design are almost entirely comprised of interactive professionals and work teams, which often blur the line between levels of hierarchy. This structure is most applicable when intense levels of innovation are required within the organization, and as such may be a permanent or temporary design according to situation and extent of collaboration. This design type is considered both complex and non-standardized; and

as such is characterized by low levels of formalization and standardization, lack of hierarchy, and high levels of differentiation (at the horizontal level).

Therefore, it is important to note that these five design types enable the researcher to compare and contrast sport organizations on a number of dimensions (Slack, 1997). As Drucker remarked (1982) in *The Practice of Management*, “we are speedily closing the gap by creating a unified discipline of organization that is both practical and theoretically sound” (p. 194). Further, scholars who study organizations of all types have long considered a means of classification as one of the basic requirements of the field (Slack, 1997).

### **Related Sport Management Research**

Clearly, there is an abundance of evidence that supports Sport Commissions as vital organizations as catalysts for social development and advocates for publicly supported sport. Sports Commissions also emerge as influential constituents within the sport industry, and as models of success for the overarching study of sport management. Although a review of specific sport management literature reflective of sport management specific resources reveals a paucity of research directly related to Sports Commissions, a synthesis of related sport management research from a myriad of multidisciplinary perspectives does provide a supporting framework relative to the research question. For, as commented by Slack, much of sport management research has failed to match in theory the advances made in practice (1996). Specific to this research, Slack (1997) queried that “in terms of the type of organizations that sport management scholars have studied, our conception of the industry is a very narrow one” (p. 98). As such, there is considerable support within sport management for greater comprehensive research to enhance the discipline and understanding of all types and structures of organizations within the sport industry. This supports the need to examine varied and significant sport organizations, such as Sport Commissions.

This section will review the nexus of research reflective of sport management journals and other resources relative to the relationship between Sport Commissions and organizational structure as well as review other relative community sport literature. Here, the term ‘sport management literature’ and ‘literature reflective of sport management journals or resources’ will

be used to describe research and findings couched by and within sport management housed faculty, scholars, and practitioners, and, which has been published or presented within sport management specific frameworks. While other sport literature will be presented (specifically relative to law and general management and economics) this research has been introduced within disciplines outside the frameworks of specific sport management outlets, but has offered important implications relative to community supported sport in general, and to the study of Sports Commissions in particular.

Concerning the greater social impact of these structures to sport management, a review of related literature couched within frameworks of policy analysis (Chalip, 1996) and sport development (Boshoff, 1997; Pitter, 1996) proves relevant. Chalip (1996) suggests the importance of a critical analysis in analyzing state sport policies, which is also endorsed by Frisby and Crawford (1994) as a means of empowering citizens at a local level. He further suggests that “policymakers are willing to work with stakeholders” (p. 321). Boshoff (1997) examined sport as a crucial function and form with society, and as an agent for community development, and acknowledged its ability to mobilize its citizens. Similarly, Covell (2002) discussed how sport properties are perceived as mechanisms to enhance community image. Finally, Pitter (1996) in his comprehensive review of the Alberta Sport Council (a state supported sport agency) “identified key individuals, organizational factors, and the unique political and economic characteristics” (p. 31) of the agency which factored in its development. His research was based on the work of Harvey (1988) and Gruneau (1983) which also suggested the need for greater research pertaining to the relationship between state and sport.

However, the greatest volume of research relative to the study of the entity of the Sports Commission is couched within sport management resources related to sport event management. These profile the multipurpose and coordinated roles of state supported sport as marketing mechanisms, event and facility managers, host communities, tourism agents, advocates, and is loosely coupled under and sport tourism. Turco and Lim (1998) noted that while many studies have examined the economic impacts of professional sport teams, stadium development, and financial operations (n.p.) fewer studies have attempted to balance the economic and social costs and benefits of community supported sport. In their study, they examine the relationship between a professional sport franchise and the host community, and in fact conclude that

there is a positive financial return to the host community in their support of sport, and conclude that a “sport franchise can make substantial net economic and social contributions to a community’s tourism industry” (p. 5).

Rosentraub and Swindell (2002) examined how sports teams lobby cities for public funding, and how this process is similarly practiced to support and host major sporting events. As such, they suggest a framework to ensure that the balance of power of these negotiations remains with the community state, to avoid what they term the ‘winner’s curse’ defined as happening “when the returns on the public’s investment for these economic development opportunities fail to exceed the costs of the package that won” (p. 20). Their suggestions are to assist communities become aware of the types of information they need to properly enter ‘the bidding game’ (p. 21).

Green, Costa & Fitzgerald (2003) studied how host cities can capitalize on the marketing tools of sporting events and incorporate this into their greater city marketing strategies. Mules (1998) examines the bidding wars and taxpayer subsidies between communities and major sporting events, and discusses how these events do not appear to generate sufficient tax revenue to justify the expenditure of taxpayers’ funds (p. 25). Instead, he suggests that the tourism stakeholder within the community needs to take a greater responsibility in assisting with such tasks. In his study of Olympic sponsorship, Brown (2000) also points to the important role of tourism agents in community event management as facilitators of marketing and sponsorship acquisition.

Most important to this study and to research regarding the public support of sport, are the findings by Chalip and Leyns (2002) who studied how local communities and stakeholders can maximize their opportunities through sporting events. In their research, they note that the increased use and support of sport events as a policy linked to social and economic development been unparalleled in the sport and events industry. Further, their review of literature pointed to the work of Mules and Faulker (1996) who noted that ‘estimated economic impact typically exceeded the amount of public subsidy’ (p. 131). Thus, while recognizing that many communities have been criticized for their inequitable support of publicly support sport, they highlight the importance of leveraging such opportunities as a crucial component of community sport event management.

Chalip and Leyns (2002) also comment that the communication to event visitors must be strategically enhanced, though basic marketing strategies, for current and future economic impacts. As such, they support a more 'managed' approach to event management, and concur with Sack and Johnson (1996) that "sport managers learn to work more closely with local government and with local businesses in order to function effectively in the context of development policy" (p. 154). They conclude that both the short and long term benefits for event leveraging "are largely unrealized and that some degree of inertia would need to be overcome to realize those potentials" (p.132). Further, they note that "sport can render benefits that exceed the value of the subsidy and services" (p. 154) that are consistent with their purpose. What is interesting here, in these important, yet seemingly contradictory findings, is that the study of Sports Commissions spans many interrelated disciplines, and is at the nexus of research pertaining to sport management.

Secondary support for community sport collectives in the literature also has emerged within a marketing perspective, where the support for regional sport properties has been identified as an added value marketing and endorsement tool (Van Hoecke, Van Hoecke, de Knop & Taks, 2000) acknowledging that "the role of affection is also important regarding local" (n.p.) sport properties due to feelings of patriotism, which in turn are translated to greater media attention and the consumerism of civic pride. Similarly, from a sponsorship perspective, Cousens and Slack (1996) further demonstrated that national corporations are able to enhance their market position through local market sponsorships.

These and similar studies can be synthesized for a direct application to Sports Commissions by the work of Frederick (2003), Holmes (2000) and Lachowetz (2001). Holmes (2000) introduced a framework for understanding how corporations can enhance their brand and market value through well-managed and strategic 'community partnerships.' While this may take the form of corporate philanthropy (Frederick, 2003) it may also commit resources through strategic partnerships for the betterment of local communities, while also broadly supporting community based sport programming.

Lachowetz (2001) introduced the most applicable study relative to Sports Commissions in his conceptual review of 'regional sport alliances.' While not in theory subscribing to the same mission of the Sports Commission, he suggests that sport organizations (including

spectator sport franchises) that are similar in objectives and type (i.e. women's professional softball, Major League Soccer, and minor league baseball, or, an alliance of a NFL, MLB, WNBA, and a NCAA Division 1 program) and within a same regional area, would be best served to form strategic alliances to increase their share in the discretionary expended entertainment market. Effectively, he suggests that sport properties should pool their collective marketing and promotion skills to create and maximize their end objectives. While this type of alliance differs from the Sports Commission concept, it does support regionally supported and promoted sport, and it suggests an additional function of a Sports Commission, as a greater regional marketing entity. These findings are comparable to research regarding place marketing, which is defined as marketing a community and its unique capacities and its ability to manage, accommodate and execute a specific sporting event (Kotler et al., 1993; Rowe & McGuirk, 1999). While this collective research reveals many interpretations for the study of Sports Commission, an in-depth analysis of organization studies specific to sport management is also important.

**Sport organizations.** It is also important to examine sport management literature that has addressed the study of sport organizations. In particular, Slack (1992; 1997) has been a significant contributor to the study of sport organizations within sport management specific literature. His findings have introduced a body of literature previously lacking in sport management. As such, he is also a strong advocate of the need for greater, more diverse research related to sport organizations, to develop alternative understandings of such entities, to improve the discipline, as well as to develop “better managers” (1993, p. 189) in sport.

Kikulis et al., (1989) introduced a structural ‘taxonomy’ as a means of classifying sport organizations by identified design types, according to their dimensions of organizational structure. Effectively, this clustering of organizations builds on Mintzberg’s (1979) design parameters of emerging organizational structures. As part of this work, Kikulis, Slack and Hinings (1992) suggested specific design ‘archetypes’ as a means to understanding the relationship between organizational values and change in Canadian National Sport Organizations. Here, they discuss the greater design archetypes of The Kitchen Table (volunteer

leadership), the Boardroom, and the Executive Office as alternative views of structural design and as a greater overall means of understanding the designs of organizations.

Thibault, Slack and Hinings (1993) further introduced a framework for the analysis of strategy in nonprofit sport organizations. Recognizing the difference between these types of organizations and commercial ones, the researchers offer various classifications of structures for organizations. These are on a gradient from simple (innovating and exploring type organizations) to complex (for enhancing and refinement types) depending on the strategy of the entity.

In accordance with assessing comparative organizations, Amis and Slack (1996) analyzed the relationship between organization size and structure, and noted that size effects the type of structure of an organization. Further, they noted that the relationship of the essential constituents in this dynamic is also important. In this study, what is also important is that the researchers noted that the most commonly identified measure of size was the number of personnel available to the organization (in addition to physical size, volume of input/output, availability of discretionary resources). As supported in this study, they defined personnel as total number of members in the organization as the organization in question was primarily service based, much like Sports Commissions. They also comment that “the members represent the most important part of the organization, and hence provide the most important measure of organization size” (p. 80). While their conclusions acknowledge this important relationship, they point to the need for greater related research.

Most recently, Cunningham and Rivera (2001) examined structural designs within American intercollegiate athletic departments, using the dimensions of centralization, complexity (also referred to as specialization) and formalization to classify departments according to their organizational structure. In their findings, they encouraged the development of an Enabling Structure as the best means to meeting end department objectives relative athletic achievements.

**Sport and the law.** Legal perspectives related to sport have also analyzed issues related to the business of sport and event management. These findings have interest to the study of regional Sports Commissions. Related areas of research include sports facilities development and public financing, sport property relocation, considerations for major sporting events.



Public expenditures in support of sporting events has received considerable attention by sport lawyers, and as evidenced in sport law scholarship, in particular relative to stadium financing. Both Bhasin (2000) and Forsythe (2000) examined trends relative to publicly supported sports stadiums throughout the United States of America and offered considerations for local governments. Similar in line with this research is that of Cardwell (2000) who examined sports facilities and their contributions to urban redevelopment. This is also supported by Goodman (2002) who evaluates the public subsidization of stadium financing and proposes an equitable solution to stadium financing; and, Fort (2000) who expands this interpretation to include both public and private considerations. Sport property relocation was studied by Sepulveda (2001) who analyzed the relocation of sports properties within metropolitan areas, considered the appropriateness and implications of such movements as means of community redevelopment. In line with this study, Rosentraub (2000) also offers considerations for links between sport facility relocations and redevelopment.

Considerations for major sporting events were offered by Schwartz (2002) who examined the legal challenges in hosting major sporting events, specifically, the Olympic Games. Delpy and Costello (1995) suggested legal counsel for major sporting events, and for sport event managers. Of particular interest, Wall (2002) discussed considerations regarding the bidding and negotiations of major sport events.

**Sport economics.** Finally, despite an abundance of support within the sport management literature regarding Sports Commissions and the incorporation of sport for community development, it is important to examine literature couched within economic frameworks with relevance to sport and event management. An examination of this literature reveals considerable agreement that the economic activity and development value of sport and sport subsidies by local governments does not “provide a solid argument for subsidizing stadiums” (Fort, 2003, p. 331) or other related sport properties.

Many sport economists argue that any measured or claimed value of publicly supported sport is in fact a redistribution of impacts already measured and realized within host regions. In fact, it has been noted that “critics could paper a trail (sic) with reports and studies showing that, far from being catalysts for nearby development sport properties actually are black holes where

tax dollars go to die” (Ward, 2002, p. 38). This debate is supported with greater vigor by some economists who have adopted this position as a platform for greater amplification, with interesting implications. For example, in Toronto, Ontario, Canada a sport economist lead movement has banded together under the umbrella ‘Breads not Circuses’ as a cautious advocate of the magnitude benefits of sports and community support (Palmer, 2002).

In short, an analysis of specific sport management literature and broader legal and economics interpretations related to the study of community sport development reveals a variety of multi-disciplinary implications and considerations regarding the study of Sports Commissions and organizational structure. As such, the combination of this literature signals the need for more related research, such as the study proposed in this paper.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this research was to examine, and compare the differences between, the dimensions of organizational structure and organizational characteristics of regional Sports Commissions in the United States of America. Specifically, the dimensions of centralization, formalization, complexity were used to describe and measure organizational structure (Blackburn, 1982). Applied to the entity of the Sports Commission, these organizational dimensions provide considerable insights into organizational structure. Further, this analysis compared organizations that represent large and small geographic regions served.

### **Research Questions**

The research questions relative to this study were:

1. Was there a difference in organizational centralization between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

2. Was there a difference in organizational complexity between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

3. Was there a difference in organizational formalization between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

4. Was there a difference in organizational characteristics between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

### **Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were defined:

**Centralization.** Centralization refers to the concentration of decision-making authority within an organization and is a measure of which power may be concentrated within an organization.

**Complexity.** Complexity speaks to the extent of an organization's differentiation, and is determined by number of titles, functions, or divisions, and is a reflection of specialization with an organization according to, among other measures, horizontal, and vertical differentiation.

**Formalization.** Formalization is a measure to assess the degree to which behaviors are prescribed by and for an organization, and is measured by the standardization within an organization according to employee discretion over work functions.

**Geographic region served.** According to recent population estimates, and metropolitan areas identified by regional Sports Commissions, larger and smaller geographic regions were utilized as a means of comparison, and was determined by the researcher post hoc.

**National association of sports commissions.** The National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC) is the governing collective of Sports Commissions in the United States of America, with the purpose of increasing professionalism and participation in the Sports Commission industry. As such, this is the sole governing body and resource of these sport organizations, and membership represents all related sport organizations who are involved full or part time in the industry of sport and event management, or, also sport event rights holders.

**Organizational structure.** Representing the framework of the organization, including means of interpreting lines of authority, division of labor, and work responsibilities and providing an means of understanding how work is divided and managed within an organization. An interpretation of organizational structure is an important component about understanding the greater functioning and operations of the organization. Commonly accepted measures of organizational structure include the three dimensions of centralization, complexity, and formalization.

**Sports commissions.** Representative of regional communities, the mission of these entities, is to attract, stimulate, and promote sporting events and facilities. For the purposes of this study, a Sports Commission member was deemed an ‘active’ member of the National Association of Sports Commissions, meaning a full-time commitment to sport and event management.

### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions were the basis for this study:

1. The Sports Commissions studied possessed norms and goals of a true business management environment (i.e. will maximize their ability to achieve financial success, as per their mission).
2. The survey instrument was accurately and truthfully answered by the identified Executive Director or designate.

## **Limitations**

The following limitations were applied to this study:

1. The findings of this research are specific to Sports Commissions which are ‘active’ members of the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC) and as such, may not be applicable to other member categories of the NASC, or other entities engaged in like community sports pursuits.

2. That data collected relevant to the descriptive characteristics of the Sports Commissions is specific to the 2002-2003 year. It is recognized that greater Sports Commission capital project or fundraising campaigns and similar ventures may positively or negatively affect the mission of some Sports Commissions. Therefore, some of the data collected may not be a true measure of the average profile of the Sports Commissions.

## **Significance of Study**

The combined types and impacts of community supported sport clearly indicate that regional Sports Commissions are critical constituents within the sport event management. It would be reasoned that an analysis of the determinants of a well managed, successful Sports Commission would reveal important implications for the greater study and practice of sport management. Yet, despite the collective impacts of these organizations, the author revealed that there is a paucity of academic research related to an analysis of the organizational structure and organizational characteristics of regional Sports Commissions.

This study provides important findings and implications to the business of community supported sport and sport event management, as articulated by the regional Sports Commission. Sports Commissions will be able to compare policies, procedures, and other inherent dimensions of organizational structure to other similar organizations to identify possible areas for improvement or adjustment to enhance their overall operation. Further, the results of this study are a meaningful comparison to the larger examination of sports organizations concerned with enhancing successful performances and impacts through an analysis of organizational structure.

Concerning the descriptive organizational characteristics revealed concerning Sports Commissions, these findings provide valuable baseline data to the related industry, especially given that the last most comprehensive study was conducted in 1990. This information highlights the changes and developments concerning these critical constituents within the domain of sport event management. As a means of comparison, the differences between organizations that represent large and small geographic regions served was also examined. This provides additional insight regarding the functioning of Sports Commissions, especially concerning similar organizations that represent similar constituents. This means of analysis provides a valuable means of comparison for organization within each category.

Further, an examination of Sports Commissions translates on a greater scale as a comparative means of examining other sport organizations, especially those involved in the business of hosting and supporting sport properties. This research is also important for sport governing bodies similar to the National Association of Sports Commissions. Finally, the findings of this research are important to the evolving greater study and practice of sport management, which continually is developing a body of literature committed to a greater understanding of varying types of sports organizations; and, which is also continually concerned with assessing the benefits of publicly supported sport.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

Sport management literature clearly indicates the need for a greater understanding and research of a variety of sport organizations and their structure (Kikulis et al., 1989; Slack, 1997). As such, Sports Commissions have been defined as organizations that are mandated to attract, stimulate, and promote sport and sport related events, sport properties, and sport facilities for their given constituents. It has also been demonstrated that these Commissions provide a significant economic impact and an increased quality of life to their communities. Further, it has been demonstrated that these organizations support a large proportion of the major sporting events hosted each year. Yet, as significant as the Sports Commissions have become to the sport industry, very little research outlining their organizational structure and their organizational characteristics exists. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine and compare the organizational characteristics and dimensions of organizational structure of regional Sports Commissions in the United States of America, which serve both large and small geographic regions.

#### Subjects

The subjects will consist of all 86 regional Sports Commissions that are 'active' members of the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC). This represents a purposive sample (Babbie, 1995, p. 287) of the greater population of all types of NASC Sports Commissions, which will enhance the generalizability of this cross sectional design. A listing of 'active' members was provided by *The Street & Smith's Sports Business Journal* and cross-referenced with NASC documents. The *Street & Smith's Sports Business Journal* is considered a valid

source as acknowledged as a principal leader in the sport business industry and comprehensive assessment of NASC 'active' membership (Cawley, 1999). A listing of the 'active' Sports Commission Membership is outlined in Appendix A.

The NASC is recognized as the sole governing body of regional Sports Commissions and the foremost networking association of the sport event industry (National Association of Sports Commissions, 1999). The term 'Sports Commission' will be used to refer to all like entities, who are also referred to as Foundations, Councils, Alliances, Authorities, Partnerships, and include all those who are named and operate in conjunction with their Convention & Visitors Bureau. Within the NASC, 'active' membership is one of three categories designated for those Sports Commissions whose primary objective is the business of sport and event management. Specifically, this category of membership is defined by the National Association of Sports Commissions (1999) as:

An organization in a given city, community, metropolitan area or urban unit that is organized (*sic*) which solicits and services sports events, sports organizations, and sports facilities and other types of sports-related activities in that community, or, (*sic*) that is larger than an urban unit and local in a region, state, nation, commonwealth, territory (p. 7).

### **Instrumentation**

The survey instrument used for this study was the Sport Commission Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS) (see Appendix C). Robbins (1987) designed the initial three components of this instrument to evaluate dimensions of organizational structure within a framework appropriate for administrative organizations. These components of this instrument have since been used by other researchers to analyze the structural dimensions of sport organization cohorts (Erdmann, 1995; McDougal, 1991). McDougal (1991) examined the correlation between organizational structure of division I-A football departments and their respective national rankings. Erdmann (1995) also used a modified version of the SCOSS to evaluate athletic booster foundations. For this instance, the questionnaire was customized to ensure greater response validity by enhancing the clarity of questions and creating a more



systematic form of objectivity (Erdmann, 1995). Thus, a compilation of previous research demonstrated that the organizational structure components of the SCOSS instrument were grounded in established organization theory and research (Erdmann, 1995; McDougal, 1991; Robbins, 1989) ensuring content validity according to the nature of its construction.

The fourth component of the SCOSS was designed to assess general descriptive organizational characteristics of each Sports Commission studied. The inclusion of this component was vital, as there has previously been minimal research regarding Sports Commissions to contribute a greater understanding of these types of organizations. The questions relative to organizational characteristics were based on the membership instrument developed and endorsed by the National Association of Sports Commissions (1994) and more recently endorsed by sport management specific scholars (Amis & Slack, 1996; Slack, 1997). The positioning of the section relative to organizational characteristics at the end of the SCOSS is consistent with both sport management and market research survey design (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2000). Previous utilization of the SCOSS indicated an encouraging response rate exceeding 80% (McDougal, 1991).

This study used the Sports Commission Organization Structure Survey to examine the dimensions of organizational structure and organizational characteristics of regional Sports Commissions. Comparable to the previous versions of the SCOSS, this study implemented the same four components which included: i) centralization, ii) complexity, iii) formalization and iv) organizational characteristics. However, the aforementioned 32-item survey was modified and expanded to include 40 items. Specific modifications were made to the organizational characteristics. Previously, this section was composed of questions that represented classifications of responses rather than measurement of the level of a particular characteristic. This nominal approach involved only crude levels of measurement rather than sensitive estimation of the quantity of a trait. For example, the previous version inquired as to the organization's 'estimated annual budget' with stratified responses such as '\$50-100,000'. The revised version incorporated an open-ended question in order to record more sensitive data. Therefore, the intent as well as the integrity of the question was maintained, but also enhanced. Furthermore, the time to complete the survey was comparable to the original version and required approximately 15 minutes.

## **Validation of the Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted at the 1996 National Association of Sports Commissions Annual General Meeting with the purpose of validating the Sport Commission Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS). The SCOSS consisted of four sections composed of 41 questions. The first three sections incorporated measures of centralization (9 items), complexity (5 items), and formalization (6 items). These sections were based on previous measurements developed within organizational theory literature (Robbins, 1987) and adopted to sport management disciplines (Erdmann, 1995; McDougal, 1991). A Likert response scale was used to evaluate the dimensions of organizational structure. A fourth section included general descriptive data and general characteristics of sport organization types. This section contained 21 items and was adopted from previous research conducted by Pennell (1990) and the National Association of Sports Commissions Application for Membership (1995).

The SCOSS was randomly distributed to Sport Commission Executive Directors. Subjects were asked to complete and evaluate the survey as to the content validity and format, and to return the survey to the principal research investigator within the three-day duration of the meeting. This forum was chosen as the most convenient and accurate testing environment as it was a national representation of acknowledged Sports Commission authorities. In total, twelve executive or comparable directors voluntarily completed and returned the SCOSS. This represented a cross-section of diverse Sport Commissions by geographic dispersion and size of regions served. For example, four directors indicated no membership base, while seven noted memberships between 41 and 50 individuals. In addition to completion of the SCOSS, members offered constructive verbal and written input regarding the development of the survey instrument. Overall, responses pertaining to the survey were positive. Constructive comments pertaining to the instrument's content validity of questions in the centralization, complexity and formalization sections were reviewed and considered. Organizational characteristics, including those that could be obtained via telephone, including geographic region served, were eliminated from the instrument, given the length of the survey was identified as a significant concern. Interestingly, Erdmann (1995) also previously cited the length of the SCOSS as a limitation.

As a result of the pilot study, a modified survey instrument was produced that enhanced the validity and practical administering of the SCOSS instrument. The final version of the SCOSS consisted of 40 questions encompassing three sections representing dimensions of organization structure (i.e., centralization, complexity, and formalization) and a fourth section addressing organizational characteristics.

## **Centralization**

Centralization refers to the concentration of decision-making authority within an organization. There were nine items (questions #1-9) in this section that examined two components of centralization. The first component within centralization examined the degree of influence that the Executive Director (ED) or designate had with regards to the decision-making process (questions #1-3). Second, the extent to which the staff has in regards to the execution of their positions within the organization was evaluated (questions #4-9). Scoring for this section was a numerical value for each answer. Therefore, a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, and e=5. The sum of the item scores is reflective of the degree of centralization. The total possible points for this section was 45. Robbins (1987) stated that 36 points or higher represents a high amount of centralization, 19 to 35 points a moderate representation of centralization, and 18 points or less indicative of a decentralized organization.

## **Complexity**

Complexity addressed to the extent to which organizations are differentiated, and is determined by number of titles, functions, or divisions. This section contained five items (questions #10-14) that measured four major components of complexity. These included horizontal differentiation (questions #10-11), education/experience of staff (questions #12-13), and vertical differentiation (question #14). As with the sub-scale of centralization, the alpha choices were assigned numerical numbers to score the section, ranging from 5 to 25 points. Scores under 10 points reflected units with relatively low levels of complexity, while 11 to 19

representing moderate levels of complexity, and 20 or higher signaling a relatively high degree of complexity.

### **Formalization**

Formalization is a measure to assess the degree to which behaviors are prescribed by and for an organization. This section contained six items (questions #15-20) that measured three components of formalization. The components included the degree to which job descriptions and regulations are specified in writing (questions #15-17), the degree of supervision (question #19), and, the degree to which regulations exist and are enforced (questions #18 and 20). As with the two previous sub-scales, this dimension was also scored with the alpha-numerical assignment. The total possible points for this section ranged from 6 to 36 points. A score of 12 or less represents low amounts of formalization, while 13 to 23 indicates moderate levels, and 24 or greater signaling high levels of formalization within an organization.

### **Organizational Characteristics**

This section contained 21 questions (questions #21-41) that addressed organizational characteristics of regional Sports Commissions. The major areas included type of Commission (question #21), organization operation (question #22), staff number (questions #23-26), budget accountability (questions #27-33), budget (question #36), areas of activity (questions #37-38), and perceptions of organization success (questions #39-40).

### **Validity**

Validity is defined as the degree to which the test measures what it is supposed to measure (Thomas & Nelson, 1996). Furthermore, validity refers to the soundness of the interpretation of a test, and is regarded as the most important consideration in measurement (Thomas & Nelson, 1996). Both the American Psychological Association (APA) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) concur that the four main types of validity

when referring to criterion-referenced measurement are logical, criterion, construct, and content validity (Thomas & Nelson, 1996). Logical validity, also referred to as face validity is a condition that is asserted when the measure clearly involves the performance being measured. In other words, it is valid by definition. Criterion validity, also referred to as concurrent validity is the degree to which scores on a test are related to some recognized standard, or criteria, and exists in two main forms: concurrent validity and predictive validity. Construct validity refers to the degree to which a test measures a hypothetical construct, usually established by relating the test results to some behavior. Finally, content validity is achieved if a measure adequately samples the content of interest to be studied, or, as defined by Babbie (1995) the degree to which a measure covers the range of meanings within the concept. This type of validity is most prevalent in educational settings, and is best demonstrated by tests that adequately sample what was covered in a course. Of the four basic types of validity, content validity emerged as the most conducive measure of validity with respect to the Sports Commission Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS). Content validity requires both item validity, which is concerned with whether the test items represent measurement in the intended content area, and, sampling validity, which examines how the test samples the total content area.

Content validity is assessed by expert judgment, demonstrated through individual and collective experience in the subject matter and a specialization suggesting one's 'validity of the content' of a given subject area. Typically, individual experts are asked to review the process used in developing a test, and in the test itself, to determine how well the constructs of the instrument reflects the nature of the subject area (tables of specifications in the content area to follow). Specifically, this judgment is based on whether all facets of the subject area are included, and adequately proportioned. Hence, there is no formula to compute this validity, and no manner in which to express it qualitatively.

When conducting research, the researcher assumes a responsibility for the subject area, and essentially becomes an expert in his or her study area through an exhaustive review of related theoretical and contemporary literature. Thus, the researcher is also able to determine the content validity concerning his or her study. With respect this study, the principal investigator demonstrated content validity through a comprehensive review of related organizational structure literature, and also with acknowledgement of the application (Erdmann, 1995; McDougal, 1991)

and creation (Robbins, 1987) of the survey instrument, in which the sections of centralization, complexity and formalization were developed. The expert judgment concerning the component of organizational characteristics was developed in conjunction with the National Association of Sports Commissions (1995), and with reference to other similar sport organization studies (Amis & Slack, 1996).

Tables 1 to 4 present the major components involved in the survey instrument, including centralization, complexity, formalization and organizational characteristics to be studied. Included in the tables are the questions addressing those components used within the SCOSS. This reveals the scope of study of the survey instrument, and permits the reader to better understand the relationship between the specific question asked on the survey instrument and how it was related to the content area studied. An examination of the tables also assists in determining item and sampling validity. It is clear that the items of the survey represented measurement as revealed by the dimensions, including centralization, complexity and formalization, of organizational structure, which fulfills item validity. Further, sample validity was also achieved through the sectioned instrumentation measures, which sampled the entire content area and was examined in a thorough review of literature.

Centralization addresses the degree of influence the Executive Director (ED) has over essential parts of the decision-making process, as well as the amount of discretion staff has over critical elements of their job (Table 1). The components of complexity studied included horizontal differentiation, education/experience of staff, and, vertical differentiation (Table 2). Both of these dimensions of organization structure were based on the research findings of Hall (1991), Mintzberg (1979) and Robbins (1987). Further, these definitions of centralization and complexity were incorporated into this section of the survey instrument to best measure their dimensions as critical components of organization structure.

Similar to centralization and complexity, the dimension of formalization was incorporated in the survey instrument through definitions by Fredrickson (1986) and Mintzberg (1979) and as previously identified for instrumentation by Robbins (1987). For this dimension, the degree to which job descriptions were specified, the degree of supervision, and the degree to which organization policies is available in writing were addressed in the survey instrument.

Thus, it was supported that content validity, as a measure of validity, was accounted for this study of Sports Commissions and their organizational structure. It should be noted that another type of measurement validity, logical validity (also referred to as face validity) was also addressed. Used to describe the extent of the measure testing the content purported to be measured, this type of validity, in part, can be used as an initial screening process in survey determinants (Babbie, 1995). Therefore, regarding the study of Sports Commissions, the face validity demonstrated strength in the survey given the review of literature and content validity utilized. Thus, the face validity of this survey appeared strong. The strength of the instrument came from the theoretical background and expert support upon which it was developed. Further, previous applications of the survey by McDougal (1991) and Erdmann (1995) also contributed to the construct validity of the SCOSS instrument.

### **Research Design**

This study incorporated a cross sectional survey design. The subjects were placed in categories (large versus small) according to the geographic region served, as identified by the Sports Commission Executive Director or designate. The following objectives were achieved during the initial telephone contact with each 'active' regional Sports Commission.

1. Identification and contact with the Executive Director (or designate) of the regional Sports Commission to explain the purpose of the study. If this contact was not made after the second attempt, the researcher asked to be referred to a designate with decision-making responsibilities.
2. General descriptive data was obtained from the regional Sports Commission, including information regarding geographic region served.
3. Exact mailing address for Executive Director or designate at the Sports Commission was confirmed.
4. Discussion with contact indicated that a cover letter (see Appendix D – Information/Consent Form) outlining the purpose of the study and that the attached Sports Commission Organization Structure Survey would be forwarded to his/her attention. In the

Table 1  
*Dimensions of Centralization*

Survey Question(s)	Definition of Centralization
#1 Amount of involvement by the ED gathering information.	Degree of influence the ED has over key parts of the decision making process.
#2 Amount of participation by the ED interpreting/outputting information.	
#3 Amount of control by the ED executing decisions.	
#4-9 Amount of discretion staff has with: Budget Evaluation Hire and Fire Develop personnel rewards Develop programs or projects Determine work exceptions	Amount of discretion staff has over critical elements of his/her job.



Table 2  
*Dimensions of Complexity*

---

Survey Question(s)	Definition of Complexity
#10 Number of job titles	Horizontal differentiation
#11 Number of staff	
#12 Graduate degree	Education/experience of staff
#13 Sport experience	
#14 Staff levels	Vertical differentiation

---

Table 3  
*Dimensions of Formalization*

Survey Question(s)	Definition of Formalization
#15 Job descriptions	Job descriptions/contracts available
#16 Job contracts	
#17 Written policies and procedures	Written policies/procedures
#18 Individual performance reviews	Degree of supervision
#19 Board of Directors	
#20 Board of Directors influence	

Table 4  
*Components of Organizational Characteristics*

Survey Question(s)	Definition of Organizational Characteristics
#21 Type of Commission	Reference to different Sport Commissions
#22 Organization operation	Profit versus not-for-profit operations
#23-36 Full, part, intern, volunteers	Staff number within the organization
#27-33 Percentage of budget obtained by: Corporate partnership Individual partnership Events revenue Lodging/bed tax Government assistance Grants Other means	Budget accountability
#34-35 Board of Directors	Board of Directors (BOD) composition
#36 Estimated annual budget	Sports Commission budget
#37/38 Commission activities	Areas of activity within the Commission
#39 Level of success	Perceptions of Organization Success

instances where a designate was the contact, they were be asked to notify the Executive Director of this study.

Following the telephone data collection, each Executive Director or designate was sent a cover letter and survey with a self-addressed, stamped, return envelope. The cover letter was personalized for each organization. A follow-up telephone call was made three weeks following the initial mail-out and a second survey was sent to those who did not respond.

### **Reliability**

To ensure reliability, the Cronbach alpha coefficient test was utilized. This test is a generalized reliability coefficient that is more versatile than other methods (Thomas & Nelson, 1996, p. 227). One of the strengths of this test is that it is able to be used with items that have varying point values, such as those particular to the SCOSS instrument. This test incurs a calculation of variation of parts of the test. If components are parts of the test, the results will be the same as the Flanagan split-halves method, and when the parts are trials or tests, the results will be the same as interclass correlation. Coefficient alpha is considered the most commonly used method of estimating reliability in standardized tests. It should be noted that previous reliability tests of the SCOSS (Erdmann, 1995) indicated a significantly positive correlation coefficient of  $r=0.96$ .

### **Analysis of Data**

#### **Data Management**

Completed Sports Commission Organization Structure Surveys were converted to a numerical format to be analyzed statistically. Data entry was conducted by the principal investigator and involved defining the variables, data coding as well as checking and cleaning the database for all closed-ended data. Data was be entered into a spreadsheet of the Statistical

Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5. Open-ended data (question #40) was also be

entered into the spreadsheet program by subject response (Babbie, p. 371) and a descriptive analysis interpretation was conducted by the researcher post hoc. The following steps were followed with regard to data management:

1. **Definition of the variables.** Each variable was identified and provided a name. The variable name was subsequently used to identify variables in the database and for data analysis. Appendix E presents the names chosen for each variable from the SCOSS used for data management. Each variable was given an abbreviated name, self-explanatory for each variable measured. For example, 'cent1' pertains to question #1 for centralization 'How much direct involvement does the Executive Director or designate have in gathering the information he/she will use to make decisions?' This abbreviated format allowed the data analysis output to be more clearly read and understood.

2. **Data coding.** Data was coded with respect to level of measurement, formatting, and conditional outcomes. Level of measurement included nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio type data. Consistency in coding was maintained for all dichotomous measures. For example, the formatting of Likert scale responses 'Never', 'Almost never', 'Sometimes', 'Almost always' and 'Always' responses were consistently coded as '1, 2, 3, 4 and 5', respectively.

3. **Data entry quality control.** All subject files were re-examined to verify the reported information. Furthermore, a 'range of permissible values' was assigned for all nominal and ordinal data. The purpose of defining variable ranges was to guide data editing, whereby values outside the defined range was checked for accuracy. Finally, frequency distributions and histograms were incorporated on all discrete and continuous variables, respectively, in order to identify 'outlier' or erroneous data. The purpose of the data cleaning process was to validate all information prior to the final statistical analyses.

## Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses of the data was evaluated using SPSS, version 11.5. Statistical procedures were used to evaluate the data collected. The statistical analyses was separated into three sections, including: i) descriptive evaluation of Sports Commission profiles, ii) SCOSS reliability correlation analysis within and between SCOSS components and iii) comparison of organizational characteristics and dimensions of organizational structure of Sports Commissions according to those that serve larger versus smaller geographic regions.

**Descriptive evaluation of Sports Commission profiles.** Distribution analysis of valid frequency and cumulative percent was used to summarize centralization, complexity, and formalization responses for Sports Commissions that serve large versus small geographic regions. Descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation and range was used to describe Sports Commission organizational characteristics.

**Correlation analysis within and between SCOSS components.** Assuming a non-parametric distribution of categorical (nominal and ordinal), a Spearman rho correlation analysis was used to evaluate associations within and between sport commission responses for centralization, complexity and formalization. Level of statistical significance was set at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

**Demographic and organization structure differences of smaller versus larger sport commissions.** In keeping with the main objective of this study, organizational characteristic differences were evaluated between Sports Commissions that represent smaller versus larger geographic regions, according to recent population estimates was evaluated using an unpaired analysis of variance (ANOVA) approach. Level of statistical significance was set at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter contains two major sections. The first presents the results and significant findings of this study regarding the dimensions of organization structure relative to regional Sports Commissions. Similarly, the second section will present the results and significant findings concerning the organizational characteristics of the regional Sports Commissions surveyed.

The purpose of this study was to examine, and compare the differences between, the dimensions of organizational structure of regional Sports Commissions in the United States of America. Specifically, the organizational dimensions of centralization, complexity and formalization were used to describe and measure organizational structure between regional Sports Commissions with represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants (also referred to as large markets) and those regional Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants (also referred to as small markets). This study also examined the organizational characteristics of regional Sports Commissions and compared the results between Sports Commissions, which represented large versus small market communities. The population consisted of all 'active' members of the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC) (Appendix A). A phone survey was conducted to introduce the study, and to obtain the name of the Executive Director (or designate) and the current mailing address of each Sports Commission. Other information pertaining to organizational characteristics was also obtained, including related to events hosted (number of events, estimated economic impact, and number of major events hosted), as was information related to the geographic region (city, county, region, state) served, all specific to the 2002-2003 year. Information provided related to geographic region served was cross-referenced with the U.S



Census Bureau's *Metropolitan Area Population Estimates* (2002), to determine the population size of the metropolitan community for each regional Sports Commission surveyed. In line with the Census Bureau's categorization of Metropolitan Area Population Estimates, Sports Commissions identified as 'large' markets for the purpose of this study were those representing populations over 1,000,000 (n=27). Those regional Sports Commissions identified as 'small' markets were those under 1,000,000 and, for the purpose of this study were communities under 700,000 inhabitants (n=30) (see Appendix B).

At the time of proposal of this study, 97 regional Sports Commissions had been identified as 'active' members of NASC, meaning sport organizations with a full-time commitment to sport and event management on behalf of regional communities. However, at the time of initial contact with these organizations, it was acknowledged that this number of 'active' members of NASC had changed. Specifically, nineteen previously identified 'active' regional Sports Commissions had dissolved (typically due to financial considerations, change in community support), changed status, or, altered their name according to a new or revised geographic territory. During the same timeframe, eight new 'active' regional Sports Commissions had been incorporated and were identified, thus changing the subject population to 86. Of the 86 'active' regional Sports Commissions identified, seventy-four were contacted and indicated an interest to participate in the study survey. Attempts made to contact the remaining twelve 'active' Sport Commissions proved futile, as no contact or response of interest was ever made. All organizations which were initially contacted volunteered information pertaining to their geographic territory and related to hosted events.

The Executive Director or Chief Executive Officer (or designate) of each of the 74 identified 'active' regional Sports Commissions were sent the Sport Commission Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS) to complete, which consisted of 40 questions and four major components (see Appendix C). The first sections included measures to assess the three dimensions of organizational structure: centralization, complexity, and formalization. The fourth section was designed to assess general organizational characteristics of the sports commissions surveyed. Data were obtained using three mail-outs, each approximately three weeks after the previous mail-out, to those organizations which had not yet responded. Of the 74 total Sports

Commissions surveyed, 57 returned the instrument, thus acknowledging their participation in the study. Therefore, the final overall return rate of return was 77.03% (57 out of 74).

Three types of analyses were conducted on the data. One, a descriptive evaluation of each component of the Sports Commissions profiles identified was conducted. Two, a SCOSS reliability correlation analysis within and between SCOSS components was analyzed. Finally, a comparison between the organizational characteristics and dimensions of organizational structure of Sports Commissions, according to those which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those which represent small populations less than 1 million. Responses were then also coded into two major groupings: those that represent larger markets, specifically greater than 1 million inhabitants; and those which represent smaller markets, specifically smaller than 700,000 inhabitants.

## **Results**

This section presents the results of the four main research questions of the SCOSS survey instrument, with regard to the dimensions of organizational structure (centralization, complexity and formalization) and general findings related to the organizational characteristics of the regional Sports Commissions studied. Each of the questions was analyzed individually, and with regard to findings for ‘small’ versus ‘large’ region served. Finally, two other statistical analyses were conducted to determine the correlation and statistical significance for the component of organizational structure for the study. The Spearman rho correlation was used to evaluate the relationship between the variables of the three dimensions of organizational structure for the study (Tables 27-29). The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences for the overall SCOSS dimensions of organizational structures was also conducted (Table 30).

### **Research Question One – Centralization**

Research question one, as identified in the introduction of this study, asked whether ‘there is a difference in level of organizational centralization between Sports Commissions which

represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants.

**Findings.** Question one was analyzed according to the levels of centralization, as identified by the participants, through the dimensions of centralization measured. The two main components of centralization measured were: a) the degree of influence the Executive Director(ED)/Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (or designate) has over key parts of the decision making process and b) the amount of discretion the staff has over critical elements of his/her job. In addition to a descriptive evaluation (including mean, standard deviation and range) of the dimension of centralization for both ‘large’ and ‘small’ Sport Commissions, statistical analyses was conducted to determine correlation and statistical significance for the study.

The Spearman rho correlation was used to evaluate the associations within the dimensions of centralization (Table 1). There was a positive correlation ( $r = .615$ ) between the Executive Director (ED) Information-Input and ED Decision-Making; a positive correlation ( $r = .528$ ) between ED Decision Control and ED Decision Making, and ( $r = .373$ ) ED Information Input; a positive correlation ( $r = .669$ ) between Staff Department Evaluation and Staff Budget Decisions; a negative correlation ( $r = -.291$ ) between Staff Hire/Fire Personnel, and, ED Decision control, yet, a positive correlation ( $r = .412$ ) between Staff Hire/Fire Personnel and Staff Budget Decisions, and, ( $r = .346$ ) Staff Department Evaluation; a positive correlation ( $r = .463$ ) between Staff Develop Rewards and Staff Budget Decisions, and, ( $r = .507$ ) Staff Department Evaluation, and, ( $r = .505$ ) Staff Hire/Fire Personnel; a positive correlation ( $r = .400$ ) between Staff Develop Program and Staff Budget Decisions, and, ( $r = .390$ ) Staff Department Evaluation; finally, a negative correlation ( $r = -.274$ ) was between Staff Work Exceptions and ED Decision Making, yet, a positive correlation ( $r = .434$ ) between Staff Work Exceptions and Staff Budget Decisions, and, ( $r = .532$ ) Staff Dept. Evaluation, and, ( $r = .357$ ) Staff Develop Awards, and, ( $r = .587$ ) Staff Develop Programs.

Finally, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences between the dimensions of centralization was utilized. No significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in the level of centralization present in the organizational structure of Sports Commissions

Table 5

*Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Centralization for the Study*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ED Decision Making									
ED Information Input	.615**								
ED Decision Control	.528**	.373**							
Staff Budget Decisions	-.177	-.149	-.176						
Staff Dept. Evaluation	-.223	-.196	-.151	.669**					
Staff Hire/Fire Personnel	-.120	.030	-.291*	.412**	.346*				
Staff Develop Rewards	.138	.150	-.198	.463**	.507**	.505**			
Staff Develop Programs	-.223	-.126	-.097	.400**	.390**	.099	.100		
Staff Work Exceptions	-.274*	-.079	-.088	.434**	.532**	.189	.357**	.587**	

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 6

*Analysis of Variance Results for Centralization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

	Mean	SD	ANOVA (p-value)
Large Markets Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	27.58	4.0	.504
Small Markets Under 700,000 (n =30)	26.71	5.1	

\*p<.05. \*\*p<.01.

representative of large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small market populations less than 700,000 inhabitants (Table 2).

Tables 3 through 11 represent the nine individual questions used to measure the level of centralization present in the organizational structure of the 'active' Sports Commissions. From question one (Table 3), analysis found that 50% of the 'large' market Sports Commissions has 'some' direct ED/CEO involvement in decision-making, whereas 39.3% of the 'small' market Sports Commissions has 39.3% of the same response. However, 17.9% of the 'small' market Sports Commissions also indicated that their ED/CEO is directly involved in 'all' decision-making of the organization, versus 8.3% of the 'large' market Commissions. Further, 7.1% of the 'small' market Commissions also indicated that their ED/CEO demonstrates 'almost no' involvement with regards to gathering information relative to making decisions. Finally, it is important to note that while the median response for 'large' market Commissions was 3.5 ('some'), for 'small' market Commissions, the median response was 4.0 ('almost all').

In question two (Table 4), with regard to the interpretation and distribution of information output, a combination of 79.2% of the 'large' market Commissions indicate that their ED/CEO 'almost always' or 'always' participates; whereas 82.2% of 'small' market Commissions indicate the same combined score. Here, the end mean response for 'large' market Commissions was 3.92 ('sometimes'), whereas it was 4.18 ('almost always') for 'small' market Commissions. Regarding the direct control of the execution of decisions in question three (Table 5), 75% of 'large' market Commissions indicated the ED/CEO 'almost always' controls the execution of decisions; whereas the distribution for 'small' market Commissions included 28.6% who indicated 'sometimes', 42.9% who noted 'almost always', and, 25% who responded 'always'.

Question four through nine investigates the discretion of the staff over organizational responsibilities. In question four (Table 6), the Sport Commissions were asked to indicate the frequency of the staff involvement with regards to discretion over unit budget(s). While 50% of the 'large' market Commissions indicated that the staff 'always' (4.2%) or 'almost always' (45.8%) has discretion over their unit budget(s); 32.2% of the 'small' market Commissions indicated that the staff has 'almost always' (14.3%) or 'always' (17.9%) discretion over establishing their unit budget(s). Interestingly, 32.2% of the 'small' market Commissions also

indicated that their staff ‘almost never’ (14.3%) or ‘never’ (17.9%) has discretion over their unit budget(s).

Similarly, in question five (Table 7), the Sports Commissions were asked to identify how the staff determines how the unit will be evaluated. For the ‘large’ market Commissions, 41.7% indicated the staff ‘never’ (4.2%) or ‘almost never’ (37.5%) has discretion over how the department will be evaluated; and 42.8% of the ‘small’ market Commissions ‘never’ (21.4%) and ‘almost never’ (21.4%). Question six (Table 8) examines how the staff hires and fires personnel. For the ‘small’ market Commissions, 71.4% indicated that the staff is ‘never’ accountable for such responsibilities; whereas ‘large’ market Commissions indicated that their staff ‘never’ is responsible for the same 41.7% of the time. As such, the median response to this question for ‘large’ markets was 2.0 indicating ‘almost never’, whereas the same response was 1.0 for ‘small’ markets, indicating ‘never’ for the same responsibility. Question seven (Table 9) examines the extent the staff develops personnel rewards. Responses for this question were very similar for both ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Sport Commissions. ‘Large’ markets indicated that 45.8% of the staff ‘never’ were involved in the development of personnel rewards; whereas ‘small’ market Commissions indicated 42.9% for the same response.

For question eight (Table 10), Commissions were asked to identify the involvement of the staff in developing programs or projects. Similar responses for both groups indicated that the staff is involved in program and projects ‘sometimes’ for 66.7% ‘large’ markets and 53.6% for ‘small’ markets. Finally, question nine (Table 11), the final dimension identified for centralization, measured the extent that the staff determines how work exceptions are to be handled. ‘Large’ market Commissions responded that 66.7% of the staff ‘sometimes’ was involved in work exceptions. In contrast, while 50% of ‘small’ market Commissions were also ‘sometimes’ involved in these decisions, while 25% were ‘almost always’ involved.

## **Research Question Two – Complexity**

Research question two asked whether ‘there is a difference in level of organizational complexity between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater

Table 7

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 1: How much direct involvement does the Executive Director/CEO have in gathering the information he/she will use to make decisions?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Markets Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.58	3.5	3.0	.65
Small Markets Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.64	4.0	3.0	.87

  

Responses	ED Decision-Making	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	None		
B (2)	Almost none		7.1%
C (3)	Some	50.0%	39.3%
D (4)	Almost All	41.7%	35.7%
E (5)	All	8.3%	17.9%



Table 8

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 2: How often does the Executive Director/CEO participate in the interpretation and distribution of information input?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.92	4.0	4.0	.58
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	4.18	4.0	4.0	.82

  

Responses	ED Information Input	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never		
B (2)	Almost Never		3.6%
C (3)	Sometimes	20.8%	14.3%
D (4)	Almost Always	66.7%	42.9%
E (5)	Always	12.5%	39.3%

Table 9

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 3: How often does the Executive Director/CEO directly control execution of decisions?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.87	4.0	4.0	.46
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.89	4.0	4.0	.83

  

Responses	ED Decision Control	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1) Never			
B (2) Almost Never			3.6%
C (3) Sometimes		16.7%	28.6%
D (4) Almost Always		75.0%	42.9%
E (5) Always		4.2%	25.0%

Table 10

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 4: How often does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) have discretion over establishing their unit budget?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.42	3.5	4.0	.78
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.33

  

Responses	Staff Budget Discretion	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never		17.9%
B (2)	Almost Never	12.5%	14.3%
C (3)	Sometimes	37.5%	35.7%
D (4)	Almost Always	45.8%	14.3%
E (5)	Always	4.2%	17.9%

Table 11

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 5: To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) determine how their department will be evaluated?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	2.96	3.0	2.0	1.12
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	2.67	3.0	4.0	1.18

Responses	Staff Department Evaluation	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never	4.2%	21.4%
B (2)	Almost Never	37.5%	21.4%
C (3)	Sometimes	29.2%	21.4%
D (4)	Almost Always	16.7%	32.1%
E (5)	Always	12.5%	

Table 12

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 6: To what extent does other staff (excluding the ED/CEO) hire and fire personnel?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	1.96	2.0	1.0	1.11
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	1.63	1.0	1.0	1.24

  

Responses	Staff Hire/Fire Personnel	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never	41.7%	71.4%
B (2)	Almost Never	29.2%	7.1%
C (3)	Sometimes	16.7%	7.1%
D (4)	Almost Always	4.2%	3.6%
E (5)	Always	4.2%	7.1%

Table 13

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 7: To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) develop personnel rewards (such as salary increases, promotions, etc.)?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	1.91	2.0	1.0	1.04
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	1.96	2.0	1.0	1.11

  

Responses	Staff Develop Rewards	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never	45.8%	42.9%
B (2)	Almost Never	20.8%	21.4%
C (3)	Sometimes	20.8%	21.4%
D (4)	Almost Always	8.3%	3.6%
E (5)	Always		3.6%

Table 14

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 8: To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) develop a new program or project?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.21	3.0	3.0	.83
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.22	3.0	3.0	.80

  

Responses	Staff Develop Programs	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never	4.2%	3.6%
B (2)	Almost Never	4.2%	7.1%
C (3)	Sometimes	66.7%	53.6%
D (4)	Almost Always	16.7%	28.6%
E (5)	Always	8.3%	3.6%

Table 15

*Analysis by question of the level of centralization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 9: To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) determine how work expectations are handled?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.08	3.0	3.0	.78
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.04	3.0	3.0	.98

  

Responses	Staff Work Expectations	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Never		10.7%
B (2)	Almost Never	16.7%	7.1%
C (3)	Sometimes	66.7%	50.0%
D (4)	Almost Always	8.3%	25.0%
E (5)	Always	8.3%	3.6%



than 1 million inhabitants and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants.'

**Findings.** Questions 10 through 14 were analyzed according to the levels of centralization, as identified by the participants, through the dimensions of complexity measured. The three main components of complexity measured were: a) size/horizontal differentiation b) education/experience of the staff and c) staff levels/vertical differentiation. In addition to a descriptive evaluation (including mean, standard deviation and range) of the dimension of complexity for both 'large' and 'small' Sport Commissions, statistical analyses was conducted to determine correlation and statistical significance for the study.

The Spearman rho correlation was used to evaluate the associations within the dimensions of complexity (Table 12). There was a positive correlation ( $r = .797$ ) between Full-Time Employees and Job Titles; negative correlations ( $r = -.290$ ) between Staff Related Experience and Job Titles, and, ( $r = -.292$ ) Full-Time Employees; a positive correlation ( $r = .650$ ) between Staff Levels and Job Titles, and, ( $r = .572$ ) Full-Time Employees.

Finally, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences between the dimensions of complexity was utilized. No significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in the level of complexity present in the organizational structure of Sports Commissions representative of large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small market populations less than 700,000 inhabitants (Table 13).

Tables 14 through 18 represent the five individual questions used to measure the level of complexity present in the organizational structure of the 'active' Sports Commissions. For question 10 (Table 14) 'large' market regional Sports Commissions indicated that 41.7% have 3-5 job titles in their organization, similar to 'small' market Commissions, who indicate 39.3% within the same category. However, 'small' market Commissions also indicated that 32.1% also have between '1-2' job titles in their organization.

For question 11 (Table 15), 85.7% of the 'small' market Sport Commissions indicated between '1-4' (64.3%) or '5-8' (21.4%) number of full-time employees in the sport organization. On the other hand, the dispersion of employees varied between the 'large' market Sport

Table 16

*Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Complexity for the Study*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Job Titles					
Full-Time Employees	.797**				
Staff Graduate Education	-.113	.001			
Staff Related Experience	-.290*	-.292*	.212		
Staff Levels	.650**	.572**	-.031	-.136	

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 17

*Analysis of Variance Results for Complexity between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

	Mean	SD	ANOVA (p-value)
Large Markets Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	12.17	2.9	.079
Small Markets Under 700,000 (n =30)	10.71	2.9	

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

Commissions, where 50% indicated between '1-4' employees, 20.8% '5-8', and 12.5% for both '9-12' and '13-16.'

Question 12 (Table 16) examined the proportion of staff that has a graduate degree. While 37.5% of the 'large' market Sport Commissions indicated that 'some' hold advanced degrees, only 14.3% of 'small' market Sports Commissions indicated the same. On the other hand, 42.9% of 'small' market Sports Commissions indicated that 'none' of the staff held graduate degrees, whereas only 16.7% of 'large' market Commissions responded to the same level.

Question 13 (Table 17) measured the proportion of previous Sports Commission or related sport management experience of the staff. 'Large' market Sports Commissions indicated that their staff had 87.5% sport experience, including 'some' (45.8%), 'almost all' (29.2%), and 'all' (12.5%). In contrast, only 67% of the 'small' market Sports Commissions indicated sport experience for the same variables, including 'some' (35.7%), 'almost all' (17.9%), and 'all' (14.3%). It is also important to note the other piece of this equation, that 32.1% of the 'small' market Sports Commissions indicated that their staff has 'almost none' (25%) or 'none' (7.1%) related sport experiences.

The final measure for the dimension of complexity, question 14 (Table 18) assesses the number of staff levels within the sport organization. While 42.9% of 'small' market Sport Commissions indicate '1-2' staff levels in their organizations, and 46.4% noting '3-4' staff levels; 62.5% of 'large' Sports Commissions indicated '3-4' staff levels.

### **Research Question Three – Formalization**

Research question three asked whether 'there is a difference in level of organizational formalization between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants.'

Table 18

*Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 10: How many different job titles are there in your organization?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	2.54	2.0	2.0	1.32
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	2.14	2.0	2.0	1.15

Responses	Job Titles	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	1-2	20.8%	32.1%
B (2)	3-5	41.7%	39.3%
C (3)	6-8	12.5%	17.9%
D (4)	9-11	12.5%	3.6%
E (5)	>11	12.5%	7.1%

Table 19

*Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 11: How many full-time employees are there in your organization?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.25
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	1.71	1.0	1.0	1.27

  

Responses	Full-time Employees	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	1-4	50.0%	64.3%
B (2)	5-8	20.8%	21.4%
C (3)	9-12	12.5%	3.6%
D (4)	13-16	12.5%	
E (5)	> 16	4.2%	10.7%

Table 20

*Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 12.           What proportion of your staff has a master's or PhD degree?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	2.46	2.0	2.0	1.06
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	2.11	2.0	1.0	1.31

  

Responses	Staff Graduate Education	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	None	16.7%	42.9%
B (2)	Almost None	37.5%	28.6%
C (3)	Some	37.5%	14.3%
D (4)	Almost All		3.6%
E (5)	All	8.3%	10.7%

Table 21

*Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 13: What proportion of your staff has had previous sports commission or related sport management experience?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.38	3.0	3.0	.97
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.07	3.0	3.0	1.15

  

Responses	Staff Related Experience	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	None	4.2%	7.1%
B (2)	Almost None	8.3%	25.0%
C (3)	Some	45.8%	35.7%
D (4)	Almost All	29.2%	17.9%
E (5)	All	12.5%	14.3%



Table 22

*Analysis by question of the level of complexity between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 14: How many staff levels exist within your organization?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	1.79	2.0	2.0	.59
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	1.68	2.0	2.0	.67

Responses	Staff Levels	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	1-2	29.2%	42.9%
B (2)	3-4	62.5%	46.4%
C (3)	5-6	8.3%	10.7%
D (4)	6-7		
E (5)	>7		

**Findings.** Questions 15 through 20 were analyzed according to the levels of formalization, as identified by the participants, through the dimensions of formalization measured. The three main components of formalization measured were: a) job descriptions/contracts available b) written policies/procedures and c) degree of supervision. In addition to a descriptive evaluation (including mean, standard deviation and range) of the dimension of formalization for both ‘large’ and ‘small’ Sport Commissions, statistical analyses was conducted to determine correlation and statistical significance for the study. The Spearman rho correlation was used and revealed no correlations within the dimensions of formalization for the study (Table 19).

Finally, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences between the dimensions of formalization was utilized. No significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in the level of formalization present in the organizational structure of Sports Commissions representative of large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small market populations less than 700,000 inhabitants (Table 20).

Question 15 (Table 21) measured the amount of written job descriptions available within the sports organizations. For this question, a similar response was given for both ‘large’ market and ‘small’ market Sports Commissions. ‘Large’ markets indicated 87.5% of written job descriptions, and ‘smaller’ market Commissions indicated 82.1%. Question 16 (Table 22) was similar to question fifteen, and assessed the written job contracts available for the organization. Here, 29.2% of ‘large’ Commissions indicated that contracts were available for the Executive Director and 35.7% of ‘small Commissions. Of interest, while the median response of the ‘large’ market Commissions was 4.0 (signaling ‘high’ levels of formalization), that of the ‘small’ market Commissions was 1.0 (representing equally ‘low’ levels).

Question 16 (Table 23) examined the percentage of written policies and procedures for the organization. While 50% of the ‘large’ market Commissions and 53.6% of the ‘small’ market Commissions indicated that ‘81-100’ percent of their policies were written; surprisingly, another 29.2% of ‘large’ market Commissions indicated they had only ‘1-20’ percent of written policies. As such, also related to this question, was the mean response for the ‘large’ market

Table 23

*Correlation Matrix Within the Variables of Formalization for the Study*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Job Descriptions					
Written Job Contracts	.116				
Written Policies/Procedures	-.137	.185			
Performance Reviews	-.095	-.071	-.082		
Board of Directors	.142	.054	.125	-.066	
BOD Resource Input	.210	.147	.235	-.086	.173

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 24

*Analysis of Variance Results for Formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

	Mean	SD	ANOVA (p-value)
Large Markets Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	16.71	5.0	.760
Small Markets Under 700,000 (n =30)	16.29	4.9	

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

Commissions which was 3.36 ('moderate' levels of formalization), whereas the mean response for 'small' market Commissions was 4.00 (representing 'high' levels of formalization).

Following from above, question 18 (Table 24) examines how often individual job performances are reviewed. Here, there were similar responses for both 'large' and 'small' Commissions, with 66.7% and 67.9%, respectfully, for such reviews 'once per year.' Question 19 (Table 25) revealed that a large majority of 'large' (100%) and 'small' (89.3%) Commissions have a Board of Directors. With those Commissions that did indicate a Board of Directors (question 20) responses for both 'large' and 'small' market organizations were split according to the influence of the Board on the finances of the Commission (Table 26). For example, 41.7% of the 'large' Commissions indicated less than half of the financial procedures determined by their Board, and yet, another 37.5% of the same group indicated same Board influence greater than fifty percent. Similarly, with 'small' Commissions, 32.1% of the organizations indicated Board involvement less than fifty percent, while 35.7% of the same group indicated greater than fifty percent influence over financial procedural decisions.

**Findings Summary for the Dimensions of Organizational Structure.** As a final analysis for the first three sections of the survey instrument, the Spearman rho correlation was used to evaluate the relationship between the variables of the three dimensions of organizational structure for the study (Tables 27-29). Regarding the correlation between the variables of organizational structure for the dimension of centralization (Table 27): for ED Decision Making, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.510$ ) between COM1 (Job Titles), and, ( $r = -.419$ ) COM2 (Full Time Employees), and, ( $r = -.347$ ) COM5 (Staff Levels), and a positive correlation ( $r = .301$ ) with COM4 (Staff Work Experience). For ED Information Input, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.319$ ) between COM1 (Job Titles), and, ( $r = -.275$ ) COM2 (Full Time Employees), and, a positive correlation ( $r = .304$ ) with COM4 (Staff Work Experience). For ED Decision Control, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.451$ ) with COM1 (Job Titles), and, ( $r = -.396$ ) COM2 (Full Time Employees), and ( $r = -.274$ ) COM5 (Staff Levels). For Staff Budget Decisions, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.368$ ) with FORM2 (Written Job Contracts), and, ( $r = -.312$ ) FORM3 (Written Policies and Procedures), and, ( $r = -.274$ ) FORM6 (BOD Resource Input). For Staff Hire/Fire Personnel, there was a positive correlation ( $r = .273$ )

Table 25

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 15: Written job descriptions are available for (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	5.09	5.0	6.0	1.38
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	4.96	5.0	6.0	1.56

Responses	Job Descriptions	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Executive Director/CEO	8.3%	7.1%
B (2)	Department Directors/Coordinators		7.1%
C (3)	Assistant Directors	41.7%	
D (4)	Department/Admin Assistants		
E (5)	All the above	45.8%	35.7%
F (6)	More than one	41.7%	46.4%

Table 26

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions  
Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports  
Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 16: Written job contracts are available for (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.24	4.0	1.0	2.02
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	2.78	1.0	1.0	2.13

  

Responses	Written Job Contracts	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Executive Director	29.2%	35.7%
B (2)	Assistant Director		
C (3)	Administrative Assistants		
D (4)	Other	16.7%	10.7%
E (5)	All the above	16.7%	7.1%
F (6)	More than one	8.3%	10.7%

Table 27

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 17: What percentage of all operating policies and procedures are available in writing for your organization:

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.36	5.0	5.0	1.89
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	4.00	5.0	5.0	1.47

  

Responses	Written Policies and Procedures	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	1-20	29.2%	14.3%
B (2)	21-40	8.3%	
C (3)	41-60	4.2%	10.7%
D (4)	61-80		14.3%
E (5)	81-100	50.0%	53.6%



Table 28

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 18: Where written job descriptions exist, how many times per year are individual performances reviewed to ensure compliance with standards set in the job description?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	2.39	2.0	2.0	.94
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	2.36	2.0	2.0	.95

  

Responses	Performance Reviews	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	Not reviewed	4.2%	7.1%
B (2)	Once per year	66.7%	67.9%
C (3)	Twice per year	16.7%	14.3%
D (4)	Three times per year	8.3%	3.6%
E (5)	More than three times per year		7.1%

Table 29

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 19: Does your organization have a Board of Directors? (IF NO, GO TO QUESTION #21)

---

Responses	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
A. Yes	100%	89.3%
B. No		

---

Table 30

*Analysis by question of the level of formalization between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 20: What proportion of the procedures concerning the allotment of money does your Board of Directors determine?

	Mean Response	Median Response	Mode Response	Standard Deviation
Large Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	3.17	3.0	5.0	1.49
Small Under 700,000 (n =30)	3.21	3.0	5.0	1.44

  

Responses	BOD Resource Input	Large Sports Commissions	Small Sports Commissions
A (1)	None	12.5%	10.7%
B (2)	Approximately 25%	29.2%	21.4%
C (3)	Approximately 50%	20.8%	17.9%
D (4)	Approximately 75%	4.2%	10.7%
E (5)	All of the above	33.3%	25.0%

with COM2 (Full Time Employees). For Staff Develop Programs, there was a positive correlation ( $r = .294$ ) with COM1 (Job Titles), and, ( $r = .267$ ) COM5 (Staff Levels). Finally, there was a positive correlation ( $r = .282$ ) between Staff Work Exceptions and COM1 (Job Titles).

Regarding the correlation between the variables of organizational structure for the dimension of complexity (Table 28): for Job Titles, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.510$ ) with CEN1 (ED Decision Making), ( $r = -.319$ ) CEN2 (ED Information Input), ( $r = -.451$ ) CEN3 (ED Decision Control), and, a positive correlation ( $r = .294$ ) with CEN8 (Staff Develop Programs), ( $r = .282$ ) CEN9 (Staff Work Exceptions), and, ( $r = .427$ ) FOR3 (Written Policies and Procedures). For the variable of FT Employ, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.419$ ) with CEN1 (ED Decision Making), with ( $r = -.275$ ) CEN2 (ED Information Input) , and ( $r = -.396$ ) CEN3 (ED Decision Control), and, a positive correlation ( $r = .273$ ) with CEN6 (Staff Hire/Fire Personnel), and with ( $r = .337$ ) FOR3 (Written Policies and Procedures). For Staff Wk Experience, there was a significant correlation ( $r = .301$ ) with CEN1 (ED Decision Making), and, with ( $r = .305$ ) CEN2 (ED Information Input). Finally, for Staff Levels, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.347$ ) with CEN1 (ED Decision Making) , and ( $r = -.274$ ) CEN2 (ED Information Input), and a positive correlation ( $r = .267$ ) with CEN8 (Staff Develop Program), and, with ( $r = .298$ ) FOR3 (Written Policies and Procedures).

Regarding the correlation between the variables of organizational structure for the dimension of formalization (Table 29): a negative correlation ( $r = -.368$ ) was found with CEN4 (Staff Budget Decisions). For Written Policies and Procedures, a positive correlation ( $r = .427$ ) was found with COM1 (Job Titles), and ( $r = .337$ ) COM2 (FT Employ), and, COM5 (Staff Levels); and a negative correlation ( $r = -.312$ ) was found with CEN4 (Staff Budget Decisions). Finally, a negative correlation ( $r = -.274$ ) was found between BOD Resource Input and CEN4 (Staff Budget Decisions).

Finally, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences for the overall SCOSS dimensions of organizational structure was utilized (Table 30). No significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in overall SCOSS dimensions of organizational structure of Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small market populations less than 700,000 inhabitants.

Table 31

*Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Centralization for the Study*

Variables	Com1	Com2	Com3	Com4	Com5	Form1	Form2	Form3	Form4	Form5	Form6
ED Decision Making	-.510**	-.419**	.134	.301*	-.347**	.185	.112	-.085	.195	.086	.249
ED Information Input	-.319*	-.275*	.064	.305*	-.245	.235	-.071	.029	.165	-.015	.201
ED Decision Control	-.451**	-.396**	.127	.166	-.274*	.078	.226	-.149	.090	.016	.244
Staff Budget Decisions	.227	.250	.091	-.086	.222	.071	-.368*	-.312*	.139	-.055	-.274*
Staff Dept. Evaluation	.131	.167	.104	-.087	.249	-.100	-.154	-.222	.183	-.210	-.103
Staff Hire/Fire Personnel	.174	.273*	-.093	-.068	.018	-.112	.257	-.139	.067	-.115	-.249
Staff Develop Rewards	.012	.048	.105	-.023	-.125	.007	-.175	-.187	.080	-.139	-.118
Staff Develop Programs	.294*	.251	.145	-.171	.267*	.217	-.067	.118	.083	-.052	-.074
Staff Work Exceptions	.282*	.116	.037	-.258	.230	.034	-.116	-.017	.028	-.026	-.196

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 32

*Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Complexity for the Study*

Variables	Cen1	Cen2	Cen3	Cen4	Cen5	Cen6	Cen7	Cen8	Cen9	For1	For2	For3	For4	For5	For6
Job Titles	-.510**	-.319*	-.451**	.227	.131	.174	.012	.294*	.282*	-.090	-.101	.427**	-.127	.180	-.240
FT Employ	-.419**	-.275*	-.396**	.250	.167	.273*	.048	.251	.116	-.102	-.152	.337*	.000	.172	-.220
Staff Grad Ed	.134	.064	.127	.091	.104	-.093	.105	.145	.037	.096	-.104	-.019	-.046	-.165	.157
Staff Wk Exp	.301*	.305*	.166	-.086	-.087	-.068	-.023	-.171	-.258	-.036	.217	-.087	.155	-.018	.118
Staff Levels	-.347**	-.245	-.274*	.222	.249	.018	-.125	.267*	.230	-.042	-.250	.298*	.014	.261	.007

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 33

*Correlation Matrix Between the Variables of Organizational Structure for the Dimension of Formalization for the Study*

Variables	Cen1	Cen2	Cen3	Cen4	Cen5	Cen6	Cen7	Cen8	Cen9	Com1	Com2	Com3	Com4	Com5
Job Descriptions	.185	.235	.078	.071	-.100	-.112	.007	.217	.034	-.090	-.102	.096	-.036	-.042
Written Job Contracts	.112	-.071	.226	-.368*	-.154	-.257	-.175	-.067	-.116	-.101	-.152	-.104	.217	-.250
Written P&P	-.085	.029	-.149	-.312*	-.222	-.139	-.187	.118	-.017	.427**	.337*	-.019	-.087	.298*
Performance Reviews	.195	.165	.090	.139	.183	.067	.080	.083	.028	-.127	.000	-.046	.155	.014
Board of Directors	.086	-.015	.016	-.055	-.210	-.115	-.139	-.052	-.026	.180	.172	-.165	-.018	.261
BOD Resource Input	.249	.201	.244	-.274*	-.103	-.249	-.118	-.074	-.196	-.240	-.220	.157	.118	.007

\*Significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

Table 34

*Analysis of Variance Results for Overall SCOSS Dimensions of Organizational Structure Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

	Mean	SD	ANOVA (p-value)
Large Markets Over 1,000,000 (n = 27)	56.46	8	.216
Small Markets Under 700,000 (n =30)	53.71	7.8	

\*p<.05. \*\*p<.01.



#### **Research Question Four – Organizational Characteristics**

Research question four asked whether ‘there is a difference in general organizational characteristics between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants.’

**Findings.** A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences within the dimensions of organizational characteristics was utilized. A significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found between the ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Sport Commissions for the following general organizational characteristics: volunteers, board members, meetings per year, annual economic impact, major events hosted, and, metropolitan population served (Table 31). Further, no significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found between the ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Sport Commissions for the ‘activity’ organizational characteristics measured.

For this section, questions 21 through 40 (Tables 32 through 40), in addition to five miscellaneous organizational characteristic questions asked of the Executive Director (or designate) in the initial telephone call were analyzed. For each question, the status of all participating organizations as a whole was examined. In additions, comparisons and contrasts between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants. The five main components of organizational structure measured were: a) general organizational characteristics, b) personnel compliment, c) budget sources, d) Commission activities, and, e) event hosting characteristics.

Regarding ‘type’ of Sport Commission (question 21), while 70.8% of ‘large’ market Commissions were self-identified as ‘independent’ Sport Commissions; the majority of ‘small’ market Commissions indicated they were associated with ‘Convention and Visitors Bureaus’ (42.9%), and only 35.7% identified as ‘independent’ Sport Commissions (Table 32). On the other hand, responses were consistent regarding question 22, concerning the organization operation. One hundred percent of the ‘large’ market Commissions surveyed were ‘not-for-profit’, as were 89.3% of ‘small’ market Commissions (Table 32). In fact, only one organization



Table 35

*Analysis of Variance Results for Individual General Organizational Characteristics between Sports Commissions which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Organizational Characteristic	Mean		SD		ANOVA (p-value)
	Large Market	Small Market	Large Market	Small Market	
Comm Type	1.75	2.25	1.33	1.11	.145
Comm Op	2.0	2.0	0.00	0.28	1.00
Full Time Emp	6.3	5.11	5.36	6.94	.392
Part Time Emp	3.93	2.1	10.08	1.72	.575
Interns	2.43	1.94	1.45	1.04	.241
Volunteers	1434.54	258.23	1823.73	565.72	.019*
Bud Corp Part	41.6	133.26	27.65	26.68	.371
Bud Ind Part	5.58	10.64	5.59	20.25	.411
Bud Events	22.66	13.65	17.63	14.60	.131
Bud Lod Tax	44.95	61.15	38.6	32.48	.219
Bud Govern	36.66	28.00	29.37	36.85	.511
Bud Grant	7.85	9.30	6.73	14.12	.806
Bud Other	9.55	14.20	6.68	27.54	.610
Board Mem	35.16	20.91	22.10	11.32	.007**
Meet Year	6.41	9.36	3.69	3.65	.007**
Ann Bud	828652.2	592144.6	815981.5	766675.0	.301
Amateur Sprt	1.88	1.83	0.448	.448	.887
Success Meas	4.20	3.71	0.77	1.21	.093
Success Factors	2.8	3.0	1.82	1.87	.720
Ann Econ Impac	4.52	3.73	0.99	1.40	.029*
Avg Events	2.38	2.67	1.21	1.33	.419
Major Ev Hosted	3.46	2.69	1.02	0.83	.005**
Metro Pop	1916200	317129	992820	196913	.000**
Year Incorpor	1990	1991	8.51	11.66	.673

\*p<.05. \*\*p<.01.

(a 'small' market Commission) identified themselves as a 'for profit' organization. With regard to amateur sport mandates, the responses from each group was similar. Seventy nine percent of 'large' market Commissions and 78.6% of 'small' market Commissions indicated they did not operate according to a limitation of amateur sport activities only (Table 32).

The second section of general organization characteristics (Table 33) investigated four variables: two were collected through the survey instrument (questions 35-36), and two through variables collected from the initial telephone contact. The descriptive statistics analyzed for each question included both the mean score and standard deviation. Regarding number of meetings per year, the 'large' market Commissions indicated that they meet approximately every two months (6.42), whereas the 'small' market organizations meet approximately nine times per year (9.36). Understandable disparities were found with regard to organization budgets, with the mean score of 'large' Commissions being approximately \$828,652 and that of the 'small' organizations being approximately \$200,000 less at \$592,145. Important to note is that the standard deviation for both the 'large' and 'small' Commissions was approximately \$800,000.

As collected from the Executive Director (or designate) in the initial telephone contact, the mean score for the year of incorporation of the Sports Commission was similar for each group; 1990 for 'large' markets, and 1991 for 'small.' Most interesting, and the basis for determining the classification of 'large' versus 'small' Commissions was the metropolitan population served for each Sports Commission. Here, the mean score for the 'large' Commission was 1,916,200 whereas that for the 'small' was 317,129. Further, the standard deviation for the 'large' metropolitan organizations was approximately one million inhabitants (992,821) whereas the same score for the 'small' regions was 196,913.

The compliment of the traditionally in-office personnel (questions 23-25) was consistent with both organization groups (Table 34). Regarding 'full-time' employees, 'large' Commissions noted a mean score of 6.63, and 'small' Commissions indicated 5.11. Part-time employees for 'large' organizations was a reported 3.93, and 2.1 for 'small' market Commissions. Finally, for interns, 'large' market Sport Commissions noted a mean score of 2.43 interns for their organization, whereas 'small' markets noted 1.94.

Outside personnel support identified revealed a greater disparity between the organization types. While the average number of 'volunteers' (question 26) for the 'large' market Sport

Commissions was 1,434, the average ‘volunteer’ pool for ‘small’ market Commissions was considerably less at 258. As such, the related standard deviation for the ‘large’ organizations was 1,824 and that for the ‘small’ market Commissions was 566. Finally, concerning the Board of Directors compliment (question 34) we see understandably greater proportion of directors for the ‘larger’ Sport Commission. Specifically, the average size of the ‘large’ market Commissions was thirty-five board directors, whereas that for the ‘small’ organizations was twenty members (Table 34).

With regard to the resource inputs of the Sport Commission budgets (questions 27-33) similar, yet telling findings are revealed. For both the ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Commissions, the following variables were identified as the top three contributors to Commission budgets, in rank order: ‘lodging/bed tax’, ‘corporate partnerships’, and, ‘government assistance’. For all Commissions, ‘lodging/bed tax’ represented over one half of the budget resources. Relative to ‘small’ Commissions, this accounted for almost seventy percent of budget resources (68.53%). ‘Corporate partnerships’ accounted for approximately one third of all Sports Commissions budgets (37.01%) but over forty percent (41.61%) to the ‘large’ market Sports Commissions. The third top contributor identified, ‘government assistance’ also was recognized for procuring approximately one third (32.15%) to the budget of all Sports Commissions. This was represented as a slightly greater contributor to ‘large’ market Sports Commissions (36.67%). Of the other variables identified as contributors, it is important to recognize that the ‘large’ market Sport Commissions also noted that over twenty percent (22.67%) of their budget was accounted for by ‘events revenue’ (Table 35).

In question 37, respondents were asked to identify from a list provided which activities their Sport Commission performs, and how the activities were managed (not managed, internally, externally via contract, external pro-bono, or, other). However, analyzes revealed an overwhelming indication of ‘internal performed’ activities for each variable. Thus, this question was also depicted according to this specific response (Table 36). There was also a minimal collective indication from all Commissions of ‘external’ responsibility for functions performed (whether contract or pro-bono), and as such, the two responses were collapsed to represent both external categories (Table 37). (For the cumulative responses to each variable, according to responsibility of the management function, see Table 38).

From the ‘internally performed’ activities, eleven functions were identified for all Commissions as occurring for over fifty percent of the organizations. These included, in order: ‘soliciting events for bidding’ (80.7%), ‘writing bids’ (77.2%), ‘presentation of bids’ (77.2%), ‘assembly of bid teams’ (73.7%), ‘obtaining special funding for bids’ (73.7%), ‘assembly of local organizing committees (LOC)’ (68.4%), ‘recruitment of volunteers’ (63.2%), ‘marketing’ (61.4%), ‘LOC management’ (57.9%), ‘economic development’ (56.1%), and, ‘sport event development’ (52.6%). This rank order is similar for both the ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Commissions, as is the number of activities that the organizations are primarily responsible for over fifty percent of the organizations. The one exception is that over fifty percent (54.2%) of ‘large’ markets did note ‘event management’ within their internal responsibilities as well. It is also important to note here that while ‘solicit events for bidding’ was ranked as the most common internal function of both ‘large’ (87.5%) and ‘small’ (78.6%) of Commissions. Tied with this for each group was ‘writing bids’ (87.5%) for ‘large’ markets (87.5%) and ‘obtaining special funding for bids’ (78.6%) for ‘small’ markets. In fact, the least identified ‘internally performed’ activities for all Commissions included: ‘sport facility management’ (7.0%), ‘physical fitness and health’ (8.85%) and, ‘community recreation’ (10.5%). Conversely, about only twenty percent of the activities identified by all Commissions were ‘externally performed.’ Further, only one activity was identified by either of the Commissions at over twenty percent of management being ‘externally performed.’ This being ‘sport facility management’ which was identified by the ‘small’ market Commissions at almost thirty percent (28.5%).

With regards to the perception of their organization (questions 39-40) Sports Commissions were asked to identify the success of their Commission (where 1 is not successful to 5 being very successful) (Table 39). Not surprisingly, the overall score for all Commissions was that 73.7% ranked themselves on a 4 or 5 level of success. However, an overwhelmingly number of ‘large’ market Commissions (87.5%) identified themselves as ‘very successful’ or ‘moderately successful’; whereas two thirds (67.9%) of ‘small’ market Commissions identified themselves within the same range. Even more interesting, almost twenty percent (17.8%) of the ‘small’ market Commissions noted they were within the ‘not successful’ categories (‘1’-‘2’).

Building from above, respondents were also asked to indicate what factor(s) their Commission used to measure success (question 40). As identified in the methodology,

qualitative responses were coded by the researcher post-hoc for analysis. From this, five major success factors were identified. From all the Commissions, 'economic impact' was identified by almost one third (28.1%) as the most important measure of organization 'success' (slightly higher for 'large' markets at 33.3%). Second most important for all was events/events hosted at approximately sixteen percent (15.8%); however second for 'small' market Commissions was 'room nights' at 17.9%. Yet, a close third for all Commissions was 'room nights' at fourteen percent (Table 39).

Of final interest to the organizational characteristics of the Sports Commissions studied was the information related to event hosting (Table 40), as collected from the Commission Executive Directors (ED) (or designate) in the initial contact. With regard to average number of events hosted for all Commissions, over fifty percent indicate they host between one and ten events annually. Only five percent (5.3%) indicate they host more than fifty events per year. Again, over fifty percent of all organizations indicated that their corresponding estimated annual economic impact of these events is greater than five million dollars per year. Finally, there was considerable disparity regarding the number of 'major' events hosted. For the 'large' market Commissions, over forty percent (41.7%) identified they hosted '5-7' major events over the 'past two years' whereas the same percentage (42.9%) of 'small' markets noted they hosted '3-4' major sporting events during the same time period.

## **Discussion**

This section will present the discussion of the results of the study's survey findings. The major areas of focus will include: a) comparisons of the dimensions of organizational structure between 'large' and 'small' market Commissions and b) an analyses of the differences in organizational characteristics between 'large' and 'small' market Commissions.

Table 36

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

General Characteristics/ Responses	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Markets (n=27)	Small Markets (n=30)
Type of Commission (Q21)			
Independent	50.9%	70.8%	35.7%
Chamber of Commerce	8.8%	4.2%	14.3%
CVB	31.6%	12.5%	42.9%
Government Entity	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
Other	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
Organization Operation (Q22)			
For profit	1.8%		3.6%
Not-for-profit	94.7%	100%	89.3%
Other	1.8%		3.6%
Amateur Activities (Q38)			
Yes	17.5%	16.7%	17.9%
No	77.2%	79.2%	78.6%
Unsure	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%



Table 37

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Markets (n=27)	Small Markets (n=30)
Meetings Per Year (Q35)	7.69 mean 3.94 sd	6.42 3.69	9.36 3.65
Annual Budget (Q36)	663,514 mean 763,708.77 sd	828,652.17 815,981.54	592,144.58 766,675.02
Year of Incorporation	1991 mean 9.99 sd	1990 8.52	1991 11.66
Metro Population	1,137,011.7 mean 1,199,315.28 sd	1,916,200.4 992,820.46	317,128.86 196,913.23

Table 38

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Personnel Compliment	All Organizations (n=57)		Large Sports Commissions (n=27)		Small Sports Commissions (n=30)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Full-Time Employees (Q23)	5.71	6.05	6.63	5.36	5.11	6.94
Part-Time Employees (Q24)	3.04	7.51	3.93	10.03	2.1	1.73
Interns (Q25)	2.24	1.40	2.43	1.46	1.94	1.04
Volunteers (Q26)	684.35	1273.24	1434.55	1823.74	258.24	565.73
Board of Directors (Q34)	27.16	18.61	35.17	22.11	20.92	11.33

Table 39

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Percentage of Budget	All Organizations (n=57)		Large Sports Commissions (n=27)		Small Sports Commissions (n=30)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Lodging/Bed Tax (Q30)	57.02	35.29	44.96	38.61	68.53	21.81
Corporate Partnerships (Q27)	37.01	26.46	41.61	27.66	33.27	26.68
Government Assistance (Q31)	32.15	32.02	36.67	29.38	28.00	36.85
Events Revenue (Q29)	17.92	16.26	22.67	17.64	13.66	14.61
Other (Q33)	15.54	25.94	9.55	6.69	14.20	27.54
Grants (Q32)	11.00	14.73	7.86	6.74	9.30	14.13
Individual Partnerships (Q28)	8.31	15.29	5.58	5.60	10.64	20.26

Table 40

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 37: Based on the activities of your Sports Commission, indicate from the list below the primary responsibility of the functions performed (internally performed).

General Characteristics	All Commissions (n=57)	'Large' Commissions (n=27)	'Small' Commissions (n=30)
1. Solicit Events for Bidding	80.7%	87.5%	78.6%
2. Writing bids	77.2%	87.5%	71.4%
3. Presentation of bid	77.2%	83.3%	75.0%
4. Assembly of bid team	73.7%	83.3%	67.9%
5. Obtaining special funding for bids	73.7%	75.0%	78.6%
6. Assembly of LOC)	68.4%	75.0%	67.9%
7. Recruitment of volunteers	63.2%	58.3%	71.4%
8. Marketing	61.4%	70.8%	60.7%
9. LOC management	57.9%	66.7%	53.6%
10. Economic development	56.1%	58.3%	57.1%
11. Sport event development	52.6%	58.3%	50.0%
12. Event management	49.1%	54.2%	46.4%
13. Selling of event sponsorships	49.1%	62.5%	46.4%
14. Fundraising for LOC	43.9%	50.0%	42.9%
15. LOC board commitments	43.9%	37.5%	46.4%
16. LOC marketing	40.4%	37.5%	46.4%
17. Sports information	36.8%	45.8%	32.1%
18. Grassroots sport development	35.1%	33.3%	39.3%
19. Entertainment	29.8%	29.2%	28.6%
20. Community sport education	24.6%	25.0%	28.6%
21. Ticket sales	21.1%	33.3%	14.3%
22. Sport prop./franchise management	19.3%	20.8%	21.4%
23. Sport prop./franchise partnerships	19.3%	20.8%	17.9%
24. Olympic/elite training/support	15.8%	16.7%	14.3%
25. Community recreation	10.5%	20.8%	3.6%
26. Physical fitness and health	8.8%	12.5%	3.6%
27. Sport facility management	7.0%	8.3%	7.1%

Table 41

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 37: Based on the activities of your Sports Commission, indicate from the list below the primary responsibility of the functions performed (externally performed).

General Characteristics	All Commissions (n=57)	'Large' Commissions (n=27)	'Small' Commissions (n=30)
1. Sport facility management	21.0%	16.7%	28.5%
2. LOC marketing	14.1%	12.5%	10.7%
3. Ticket sales	12.3%	8.3%	14.3%
4. Community recreation	12.3%	8.3%	17.8%
5. Event management	10.6%	8.4%	7.1%
6. Community sport education	10.6%	8.3%	14.3%
7. Selling of event sponsorships	10.5%	8.4%	7.2%
8. Fundraising for LOC	8.8%	8.4%	7.1%
9. Recruitment of volunteers	8.8%	8.4%	7.1%
10. Sports information	7.1%	12.5%	3.6%
11. LOC board commitments	5.3%	12.5%	3.6%
12. Sport event development	5.3%	4.2%	3.6%
13. Marketing	5.3%	4.2%	
14. Physical fitness and health	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
15. Olympic/elite training/support	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
16. Presentation of bid	3.6%	4.2%	3.6%
17. Sport prop./fran. attract/relocation	3.6%		7.2%
18. Obtaining special funding for bids	3.5%		7.1%
19. Sport prop./franchise partnerships	3.5%	8.3%	
20. Grassroots sport development	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
21. Entertainment	3.5%	8.3%	
22. Solicit Events for Bidding	1.8%		3.6%
23. Writing bids	1.8%		3.6%
24. Assembly of LOC	1.8%		3.6%
25. LOC management	1.8%	4.2%	3.6%
26. Economic development	1.8%		3.6%

Table 42

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Question 37: Based on the activities of your Sports Commission, indicate from the list below the primary responsibility of the functions performed: 1) not an activity of responsibility of our Sports Commission, 2) internally performed, 3) externally performed (contracted), 4) externally performed (pro-bono), or, 5) other.

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Solicit Events for Bidding</b>			
Not performed	1.8%		
Internal performed	80.7%	87.5%	78.6%
External performed (contract)	1.8%		3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other			
More than one of above	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
<b>Assembly of bid team</b>			
Not performed	1.8%		
Internal performed	73.7%	83.3%	67.9%
External performed (contract)			
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	1.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
<b>Writing bids</b>			
Not performed	3.5%		3.6%
Internal performed	77.2%	87.5%	71.4%
External performed (contract)	1.8%		3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other			
More than one of above	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%

Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Presentation of bid</b>			
Not performed	1.8%		
Internal performed	77.2%	83.3%	75.0%
External performed (contract)	1.8%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other			
More than one of above	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
<b>Obtaining special funding for bids</b>			
Not performed	3.5%	4.2%	
Internal performed	73.7%	75.0%	78.6%
External performed (contract)			
External performed (pro-bono)	3.5%		7.1%
Other	1.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
<b>Assembly of local organizing committees (LOC)</b>			
Not performed	3.5%	4.2%	
Internal performed	68.4%	75.0%	67.9%
External performed (contract)			
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other			
More than one of above	7.0%	4.2%	10.7%
<b>LOC management</b>			
Not performed	5.3%	4.2%	3.6%
Internal performed	57.9%	66.7%	53.6%
External performed (contract)	1.8%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)			3.6%
Other			
More than one of above	10.5%	8.3%	14.3%

Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Fundraising for LOC</b>			
Not performed	12.3%	12.5%	10.7%
Internal performed	43.9%	50.0%	42.9%
External performed (contract)	7.0%	4.2%	7.1%
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%	4.2%	
Other			
More than one of above	8.8%	8.3%	10.7%
<b>LOC marketing</b>			
Not performed	8.8%	8.3%	7.1%
Internal performed	40.4%	37.5%	46.4%
External performed (contract)	5.3%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	8.8%	8.3%	10.7%
Other	1.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above	10.5%	12.5%	10.7%
<b>LOC board commitments</b>			
Not performed	14.0%	8.3%	10.7%
Internal performed	43.9%	37.5%	46.4%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%	8.3%	3.6%
Other	8.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above		12.5%	7.1%
<b>Recruitment of volunteers</b>			
Not performed	5.3%	8.3%	
Internal performed	63.2%	58.3%	71.4%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
Other			
More than one of above	8.8%	8.3%	10.7%



Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Event management</b>			
Not performed	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
Internal performed	49.1%	54.2%	46.4%
External performed (contract)	5.3%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
Other	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
More than one of above	15.8%	16.7%	17.9%
<b>Sport event development</b>			
Not performed	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
Internal performed	52.6%	58.3%	50.0%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other	1.8%		3.6%
More than one of above	10.5%	12.5%	10.7%
<b>Selling of event sponsorships</b>			
Not performed	5.3%	4.2%	3.6%
Internal performed	49.1%	62.5%	46.4%
External performed (contract)	7.0%	4.2%	3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
Other	1.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above	14.0%	12.5%	17.9%
<b>Marketing</b>			
Not performed	3.5%	8.3%	
Internal performed	61.4%	70.8%	60.7%
External performed (contract)	5.3%	4.2%	
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	1.8%		3.6%
More than one of above	10.5%	8.3%	14.3%

Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Ticket sales</b>			
Not performed	24.6%	25.0%	21.4%
Internal performed	21.1%	33.3%	14.3%
External performed (contract)	12.3%	8.3%	14.3%
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other			
More than one of above	14.0%	12.5%	17.9%
<b>Sport facility management</b>			
Not performed	38.6%	50.0%	28.6%
Internal performed	7.0%	8.3%	7.1%
External performed (contract)	17.5%	16.7%	21.4%
External performed (pro-bono)	3.5%		7.1%
Other	1.8%		
More than one of above	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
<b>Sports information</b>			
Not performed	19.3%	16.7%	21.4%
Internal performed	36.8%	45.8%	32.1%
External performed (contract)	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%	4.2%	
Other	1.8%		
More than one of above	8.8%	8.3%	10.7%
<b>Sport property/franchise attraction/relocation</b>			
Not performed	35.1%	41.7%	28.6%
Internal performed	19.3%	20.8%	21.4%
External performed (contract)	1.8%		3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other	5.3%	4.2%	3.6%
More than one of above	3.5%	8.3%	

Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Sport property/franchise partnerships</b>			
Not performed	40.4%	41.7%	39.3%
Internal performed	19.3%	20.8%	17.9%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	8.3%	
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	1.8%	4.2%	
More than one of above			
<b>Physical fitness and health</b>			
Not performed	45.6%	45.8%	50.0%
Internal performed	8.8%	12.5%	3.6%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	8.3%	
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other	7.0%	8.3%	3.6%
More than one of above			
<b>Community recreation</b>			
Not performed	35.1%	33.3%	35.7%
Internal performed	10.5%	20.8%	3.6%
External performed (contract)	7.0%	8.3%	7.1%
External performed (pro-bono)	5.3%		10.7%
Other	8.8%	12.5%	3.6%
More than one of above	1.8%		3.6%
<b>Community sport education</b>			
Not performed	26.3%	33.3%	17.9%
Internal performed	24.6%	25.0%	28.6%
External performed (contract)	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)	5.3%		10.7%
Other	5.3%	8.3%	
More than one of above	1.8%	4.2%	

Table 42 – continued

General Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
<b>Grassroots sport development</b>			
Not performed	17.5%	25.0%	10.7%
Internal performed	35.1%	33.3%	39.3%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	7.0%	8.3%	3.6%
More than one of above	10.5%	4.2%	17.9%
<b>Economic development</b>			
Not performed	8.8%	8.3%	7.1%
Internal performed	56.1%	58.3%	57.1%
External performed (contract)	1.8%		3.6%
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	1.8%		3.6%
More than one of above	7.0%	12.5%	3.6%
<b>Olympic/elite training/support</b>			
Not performed	33.3%	37.5%	32.1%
Internal performed	15.8%	16.7%	14.3%
External performed (contract)	3.5%		8.3%
External performed (pro-bono)	1.8%		3.6%
Other	8.8%	8.3%	7.1%
More than one of above	3.5%	4.2%	3.6%
<b>Entertainment</b>			
Not performed	24.6%	29.2%	25.0%
Internal performed	29.8%	29.2%	28.6%
External performed (contract)	3.5%	8.3%	
External performed (pro-bono)			
Other	5.3%	4.2%	3.6%
More than one of above	7.0%	4.2%	10.7%

Table 43

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Perceptions of Success	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
How would you characterize the success of your Sports Commission (Q39):			
1	3.5%		7.1%
2	7.0%	4.2%	10.7%
3	14.0%	8.3%	14.3%
4	42.1%	50.0%	39.3%
5	31.6%	37.5%	28.6%
What factor(s) does your Sports Commission use to measure success (Q40):			
Economic impact	28.1%	33.3%	28.6%
Room nights	14.0%	8.3%	17.9%
Partnerships	5.3%	8.3%	3.6%
Event hosting	15.8%	16.7%	14.3%
All of the above	10.5%	8.3%	14.3%
Other	8.8%	8.3%	10.7%

Table 44

*Analysis by Questions of Organizational Characteristics Between Sports Commissions Which Represent Large Metropolitan Populations Greater Than 1 Million and Those Sports Commissions Which Represent Small Populations Less than 700,000 Inhabitants*

Event Hosting Characteristics	All Organizations (n=57)	Large Sports Commissions (n=27)	Small Sports Commissions (n=30)
Average number of events hosted annually:			
0-5	26.3%	29.2%	25.0%
6-10	26.3%	29.2%	21.4%
11-20	19.3%	20.8%	17.9%
21-50	19.3%	16.7%	25.0%
51+	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
Estimated annual economic impact of these events:			
\$250,001-500,000	7.0%		10.7%
\$500,001-1,000,000	7.0%	8.7%	7.1%
1,000,001-2,000,000	12.3%	8.7%	17.9%
2,000,001-5,000,000	12.3%	4.3%	17.9%
5,000,001+	52.6%	78.3%	39.3%
Major sporting events hosted in the past two years:			
None	5.3%	4.2%	7.1%
1-2	22.8%	12.5%	28.5%
3-4	35.1%	29.2%	42.9%
5-7	24.6%	41.7%	14.3%
8+	7.0%	12.5%	92.9%

## Centralization

Results of analysis of the research study revealed similarity in the degree of centralization between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations less 700,000 inhabitants. Further, as first suggested by Robbins (1987), and endorsed for sport organizations by McDougall (1991) and Erdmann (1995), the sum of the item scores for centralization from the SCOSS instrument in this study are the determinants for the degree of centralization for the organizations studied. As noted, a score of 18 points or less indicates a decentralized organization, 19 to 35 represents moderate levels of centralization, and 36 points or higher signals high levels of centralization.

As such, the means of the 'large' and 'small' regional Sports Commissions surveyed represent moderate levels of centralization. This score is in line with the findings of variables measured for centralization which were similar for both markets: moderate levels of ED decision-making, ED information outputs, staff department evaluations, staff hire/fire personnel, staff development of rewards. Where the 'large' markets display noticeably greater levels of centralization included: ED decision control, and, staff discretion over unit budget(s). On the other hand, the variables where the 'small' markets displayed noticeably greater levels of centralization included: staff developing programs, and, staff determining how work exceptions are to be handled.

From the analyses of the correlations found, positive correlations were found between the variables of the functions of the Executive Director (ED) studied, and similarly, between the responsibilities of the staff identified. On the other hand, a negative correlation was found between the staff functions regarding personnel decisions and ED decision control. Finally, a negative correlation was found between staff work exceptions and ED decision making. These findings were expected, representing the areas of responsibility between the ED and the staff of the organizations studied.

## **Complexity**

Results of analysis of the research study revealed similarity in the degree of complexity between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations less than 700,000 inhabitants. Further, as first suggested by Robbins (1987), and endorsed for sport organizations by McDougall (1991) and Erdmann (1995), the sum of the item scores for complexity from the SCOSS instrument in this study are the determinants for the degree of complexity for the organizations studied. As noted, a score of 10 points or less indicates an organization with low levels of complexity, 11 to 19 represents moderate levels of complexity, and 20 points or higher signals high levels of complexity.

According to this formula, the means of the 'large' and 'small' regional Sports Commissions surveyed reveal moderate levels of complexity. However, it is important to note that the mean score for the 'small' market Sports Commissions (10.71) borders the score for low levels of complexity. Again, these findings are not surprising given that the 'large' market Sports Commissions studied revealed higher levels of complexity for the variables of the study. For example, the 'large' market Commissions had, overall, more: employees, job titles, staff graduate education, previous related sport experience, and, staff levels.

## **Formalization**

Results of analysis of the research study revealed similarity in the degree of formalization between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations less than 700,000 inhabitants. From the work of Robbins (1987), McDougall (1991), and Erdmann (1995), the sum of the item scores for formalization from the SCOSS instrument in this study are the determinants for the degree of formalization for the organizations studied. A score of 12 points or less indicates an organization with low levels of formalization, 13 to 23 represents moderate levels of formalization, and 24 points or higher signals high levels of formalization.



According to this formula, the means of the ‘large’ and ‘small’ regional Sports Commissions surveyed reveal moderate (to low) levels of formalization. Like the previous two dimension scores from the variables studied for organizational structure, these results are in line with the organizational findings for the study. For formalization, areas of similarity between the ‘large’ and ‘small’ market Sports Commissions included: written job descriptions, written job contracts, written policies and procedures, annual performance reviews, presence of a Board of Directors (BOD), and, BOD resource input. While there clearly were differences in the organizational characteristics between the ‘large’ and ‘small’ Commissions studied, it became apparent that the organizational dimensions studied, both individually and collectively, demonstrated a similar profile for both group. Further, the structure of the organizations resembled many of the characteristics of a smaller organization, and thus, moderate ranges of the organizational dimensions studied, representing well structured, but more informal, organizations were expected to emerge.

### **Organizational Characteristics**

Perhaps the most interesting findings from the SCOSS survey research was revealed in the findings regarding general organizational characteristics between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations than 700,000 inhabitants. Rich in interpretation, this data revealed that, although similar in structure, there were important differences between ‘large’ and ‘small’ Sports Commissions studied, with regard to organizational characteristics.

From the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for differences within the dimensions of organizational characteristics that, the findings underpinned the greatest significant findings between the two groups, including number of: volunteers, board members, meetings per year, annual economic impact, major events hosted, and, metropolitan population served. This framework and understanding provided the basis of interpretation for the balance of the organizational characteristics findings. For example, while the majority of ‘large’ market Commissions were independent in function type, the ‘small’ Commission varied in type and operation. This provides an interesting perspective and consideration regarding the subsequent

organizational structure findings. For, it is likely that those more dependent Commissions would be more accountable to other units, such as the Convention and Visitors Bureau or related Chamber of Commerce, and as such, have more ‘moderate’ levels of organizational structure according to these relationships.

Also of interest was the findings regarding the sources of budgets for each group. While similar in inputs, the actual percentage of contribution from various variables identified proved interesting. For example, ‘small’ market Sports Commissions were heavily identified as dependent upon lodging/bed tax for funding, followed by one third of their budget being supported by corporate partnerships. On the other hand, ‘large’ market Sports Commissions noted only a 45% dependency on lodging/bed taxes, but an equally important reliance upon corporate partnerships. Again, these findings are symptomatic of the size of the Sports Commissions market. ‘Large’ market Commissions can, and do, rely more heavily on the support of the major corporations which are housed in their metropolitan cities, whereas ‘small’ market Commissions, many of whom are located small communities, rely heavily on lodging/bed taxes. This later finding also demonstrated the strong relationship between ‘small’ Commissions and other similar governing bodies in their respective communities.

Interesting findings are also revealed regarding the types of activities performed by the Sports Commissions, specifically those that are performed internally and externally. Internally, an overwhelmingly majority of the tasks performed by the ‘large’ Sports Commissions involve bid solicitation; while these same responsibilities occur, but on a lesser scale. It should also be noted that the majority of tasks performed were internal. On the other hand, those tasks that were performed externally (either pro-bono or contracted) primarily reveal that for those indicated, only a minority of administrative and community activities are outsourced.

With regards to perceptions of success, it is interesting to note that there was a perceived distribution of success according to the participants, especially with regard to the ‘small’ market Commissions. This is important and surprising, given the prominent place and regard many of these organizations hold in their communities. For the factors used in evaluating this success, economic impact was the most prominent indicator. This is not surprising given relationship with the importance of room tax for the budget input.

## Conclusions

There was no significant difference found between the level of centralization present in the organizational between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations than 700,000 inhabitants. The mean score for the level of centralization for the 'large' market Sports Commissions was 27.58 and 26.71 for the 'small' market Commissions. This revealed a moderate level of centralization for these Commissions.

There was no significant difference found between the level of complexity present in the organizational between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations than 700,000 inhabitants. The mean score for the level of complexity for the 'large' market Sports Commissions was 12.17 and 10.71 for the 'small' market Commissions. This also revealed a moderate level of complexity for these Commissions.

There was also no significant difference found between the level of formalization present in the organizational between Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent small populations than 700,000 inhabitants. The mean score for the level of formalization for the 'large' market Sports Commissions was 16.71 and 16.29 for the 'small' market Commissions. This too revealed a moderate level of formalization for these Commissions.

Finally, the 'large' and 'small' regional Sports Commissions surveyed displayed varying differences with regard to organizational characteristics. These findings revealed important insights and considerations with regard to the functioning of the 'large' and 'small' organizations studied, and provided important means of further investigation.

## **Chapter IV**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Summary**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine, and compare the differences between, the dimensions of organizational structure of regional Sports Commissions in the United States of America. Specifically, the organizational dimensions of centralization, complexity and formalization were used to describe and measure organizational structure between regional Sports Commissions with represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million inhabitants (also referred to as large markets) and those regional Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants (also referred to as small markets). In addition, the differences between general organizational characteristics were examined between 'large' and 'small' market Sport Commissions.

The two main components of centralization measured were: a) the degree of influence the Executive Director(ED)/Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (or designate) has over key parts of the decision making process, and b) the amount of discretion the staff has over critical elements of his/her job. The three main components of complexity measured were: a) size/horizontal differentiation, b) education/experience of the staff, and c) staff levels/vertical differentiation. The three main components of formalization measured were: a) job descriptions/contracts available, b) written policies/procedures, and c) degree of supervision. Finally, the five main components of organizational structure measured were: a) general organizational characteristics, b) personnel compliment, c) budget sources, d) Commission activities, and e) event hosting characteristics.

The data regarding general organizational characteristics included Sport Commission event hosting characteristics, geographic metropolitan area served, and personal contact

information were obtained (via telephone) from the population of 'active' members of the National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC). All surveyed, fifty seven of seventy four 'large' market and 'small' market Sports Commissions participated in the survey research, producing an overall response rate of return of 77.03%. The Sport Commission Organization Structure Survey (SCOSS) was the base instrument for the study. This instrument contained four major components including measures to assess the three dimensions of organizational structure: centralization, complexity, and formalization. The fourth section was designed to assess general organizational characteristics of the sports commissions surveyed. The sections related to measures of organizational structure were developed by Robbins (1987) and adopted and tested by McDougal (1991) and Erdmann (1995) for direct application to sport organizations. The section regarding organizational characteristics was developed by the researcher based on information provided by the NASC.

An analysis of the data for the three dimensions of organizational structure, which involved centralization, complexity, and, formalization, included a) descriptive evaluations of Sports Commissions profiles, b) SCOSS reliability correlation analysis within and between SCOSS components, and c) the comparison of organizational characteristics and dimensions of organizational structure of Sports Commissions, according to those that serve 'larger' versus 'smaller' metropolitan communities.

An examination of general organizational characteristics for the participants revealed Sports Commissions that varied considerably in their organizational characteristics, as revealed by an analysis of mean scores and standard deviation.

The research questions relative to this study were:

1. Was there a difference in organizational centralization between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

2. Was there a difference in organizational complexity between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

3. Was there a difference in organizational formalization between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

4. Was there a difference in organizational characteristics between regional Sport Commissions that serve larger geographic regions, versus those that serve smaller geographic regions, according to population estimates?

In summary, the participating Sport Commissions displayed moderate levels of centralization, complexity, formalization signaling important considerations regarding the overall status of the organizational structure of Sports Commissions. The Sport Commissions studied also revealed interesting findings regarding general organizational characteristics.

### **Conclusions**

The following conclusions were made from the examination of the organizational structure of Sports Commissions which represent large metropolitan populations greater than 1 million and those Sports Commissions which represent smaller populations less than 700,000 inhabitants, during the 2002-2003 year, and, from the analysis of general organizational characteristics within these Commissions:

1. The overall organizational structure of the Sports Commissions studied displayed similar levels for both 'large' and 'small' organizations – despite greater differences found with regard to organizational characteristics – and indicates that these sport organizations are similar in organization and structure.

2. In addition, the overwhelmingly majority of Sport Commissions also indicated moderate levels of formalization and operation as 'not-for-profit' organizations - lacking many of the attributes of a highly formal organizational. As such, while Sport Commissions are not necessarily reflective of a true corporate environment, they did display evidence of regulated businesses with regard to levels of centralization, complexity, and formalization as evidenced by governing policies and procedures.

3. There were great and varied differences found relative to organization characteristics between the 'large' and 'small' market Sport Commissions related to budget size, number of board members, events hosted, and metropolitan areas served.

4. The results of the study concerning human and capital resources; including volunteers, corporate and individual partners, board of directors members, and, budget inputs, demonstrates the interest and indication of strong support of sport, as a means for both social and economic development, within both 'large' and 'small' market communities.

5. The diverse organizational activities performed reveal important implications for the current and future management of Sport Commissions. Specifically, many of the important resource dependent activities (marketing, fundraising, and, management) seem to be out-sourced or minimized by the organizations, yet, these functions could very well be enhanced to contribute to the overall success of the organization, and even better coordinated within the communities served.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the results of this study, and review of related research, the following recommendations were made for further study:

1. Compare the dimensions of organizational structure studied for Sports Commissions according to annual budget and type of commission (independent versus other government affiliation).

2. Replicate this study for all levels of National Association of Sports Commissions (NASC) membership (including inactive and other).

3. Replicate the SCOSS instrument to other similar organizations, especially those that are as actively engaged in the event hosting industry.

4. Replicate the SCOSS instrument, in particular related to the dimensions of organizational structure, to other sport organizations, especially those that are new and emergent, to identify basic operating principles and characteristics in practice within the sport industry.

5. Examine further the bid and management (including marketing and fundraising) activities identified within the 'large' and 'small' Sport Commissions to determine the

effectiveness of the outcomes of these responsibilities, related to the overall 'success' of the sport organizations.

6. Investigate the community perception of the effectiveness of these organizations and the perception of the 'legacy' of the events hosted between 'large' and 'small' market Sport Commissions.

7. Compare and study the overwhelming volunteer support identified and corresponding culture, as components of the overall organization management of the Sport Commission, between 'large' and 'small' market Sport Commissions.

8. Relate to other sport studies couched within frameworks and comparisons of large versus small markets.



**APPENDIX A**  
**ACTIVE SPORTS COMMISSIONS MEMBERSHIP LIST**

## APPENDIX A

### ACTIVE SPORTS COMMISSIONS MEMBERSHIP LIST

Alabama Sports Foundation  
110-100 Grandview Place  
Birmingham, Alabama 35243

Ames Area Sports Commission  
110-1601 Golden Aspen Drive  
Ames, Iowa 50010

Atlanta Sports Council  
P.O. Box 1740  
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Bakersfield Sports Council  
515 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, California 93301

Baton Rouge Area Sports Foundation  
P.O. Box 4149  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821

Bloomington Convention & Visitors Bureau  
450-1550 East 79th Street  
Bloomington, Minnesota 55425

Brazos Valley Sports Foundation  
310 University Dive East  
College Station, Texas 77840

Central Florida Sports Commission  
126 East Lucerne Circle  
Orlanda, Florida 32801

Charleston Metro Sports Council  
81 Mary Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29403

***Charlotte Regional Sports Commission***  
1590-Two Wachovia Center  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28282

Chicago Southland CVB/Sports Council  
2304 173rd Street  
Lansing, Illinois 60438

Chippewa Valley Convention & Visitors  
Bureau  
3635 Gateway Drive  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Colorado Springs Sports Corporation  
200-219 West Colorado Boulevard  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

Detroit Metro Sports Commission  
1125-211 West Fort Street  
Detroit, Michigan 48226

District of Columbia Sports &  
Entertainment Commission  
2400 East Capitol Street SE, RFK  
Washington, DC 20003

Gainesville Sports Organizing Committee,  
Inc.  
100-300 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Greater Augusta Sports Council  
P.O. Box 1331  
Augusta, Georgia 30903-1331

Greater Chattanooga Sports & Events  
Committee  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Greater Cincinnati Sports Corporation  
300 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Greater Cleveland Sports Commission  
1515-50 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44107

Greater Columbus Sports Commission  
90 North High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Greater Columbus Sports & Events Council  
P.O. Box 1519  
Columbus, Georgia 31902

Greater Denton Convention & Visitors  
Bureau  
P.O. Drawer P  
Denton, Texas 76202

Greater Des Moines Sports Authority  
201-405 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Greater Ft. Lauderdale Sports Development  
Office  
303-1850 Eller Drive  
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316

Greater Kansas City Sports Commission &  
Foundation  
1308 Pennsylvania  
Kansas City, Missouri 64105

Greater Lafayette Convention & Visitors  
Bureau  
301 Frontage Road  
Lafayette, Indiana 47905

Greater Lansing CVB  
200-1223 Turner Street  
Lansing, Michigan 48906

Greater Louisville Sports Commission  
1802-Waterfront Plaza  
325 West Main Street  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Greater New Orleans Sports Foundation  
918-1400 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

***Greater Springfield Area Sports  
Commission***  
200-901 St. Louis Street  
Springfield, Missouri 65806

Greater Wichita Area Sports Commission  
100-100 South Main  
Wichita, Kansas 67202

Greensboro Sports Commission  
317 South Greene Street  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27401

Gwinnett Convention & Visitors Bureau  
110-1505 Lakes Parkway  
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043

Jacksonville Sports & Entertainment Board  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor-220 East Bay Street  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Joplin Sports Authority  
222 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Joplin, Missouri 64802-1384

Kankakee County Sports Commission  
1270 Larry Power Road  
Bourbonnais, Illinois 60914

Knoxville Sports Corporation  
390-900 East Hill Avenue  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37915

Lawrence Sports Corporation  
101-743 Vermont  
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Lee County Sports Authority  
100-2180 West First Street  
Fort Myers, Florida 33901

Lexington Area Sports Authority  
301 East Vine Street  
Lexington, Kentucky 40507

Lincoln Sports Commission  
P.O. Box 83737  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Long Island CVB/Sports Commission  
203-330 Motor Parkway  
Hauppauge, New York 11788

Los Angeles Sports Council  
250-350 South Bixel Street  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Lubbock Sports Authority  
200-1301 Broadway  
Lubbock, Texas 79401

Mashantucket Pequot Athletic Commission  
P.O. Box 3378  
145 Route 2  
Mashantucket, Connecticut 06339

Massachusetts Sports Commission  
200-One FleetCenter Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Maui Sports & Entertainment Council  
200 South High Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Memphis and Shelby County Sports  
Authority  
47 Union Avenue  
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

Metro Denver Sports Commission  
600-1550 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Mobile Area Sports Commission  
1621 Virginia Street

Mobile, Alabama 36604  
Monroe County Sports Development  
Commission  
8100-50 West Main Street  
Rochester, New York 14614

Nashville Sports Council  
100-211 Commerce Street  
Nashville, Tennessee 37201

Nassau County Sports Commission  
1380 Northern Boulevard  
Manhasset, New York 11030

New York City Sports Commission  
2 Washington Street  
New York, New York 10004

North Carolina Amateur Sports  
P.O. Box 12727  
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina  
27709

Palm Beach County Sports Commission  
1410-1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Pensacola Sports Association  
101 West Main Street  
Pensacola, Florida 32501

Philadelphia Sports Congress  
2020-1515 Market Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Portland Oregon Sports Authority  
1888 SW Madison  
Portland, Oregon 97205

Rhode Island Sports Council  
30 Exchange Terrace, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Richmond Sports Backers  
300-100 Avenue of Champions

Richmond, Virginia 23230  
Rochester Amateur Sports Commission  
30 Civic Center Drive SE  
Rochester, Minnesota 55904

Spokane Regional Sports Commission  
501-801 West Riverside  
Spokane, Washington 99201

Rockford Area Convention & Visitors  
Bureau  
211 North Main Street  
Rockford, Illinois 61101

Sports Promotion-City of Battle Creek,  
Michigan  
77 East Michigan Avenue  
Battle Creek, Michigan 49017

Sacramento Sports Commission  
700 University Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95825

St. Cloud Area CVB/Sports Commission  
1-525 Highway 10 South  
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56304

San Antonio Sports Foundation  
Box 830386  
San Antonio, Texas 78283

St. Louis Sports Commission  
1100-One Metropolitan Square  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

San Diego International Sports Council  
2919 Camino Del Rio South  
San Diego, California 92108

St. Petersburg Clearwater Area CVB  
108-14450 46<sup>th</sup> Street North  
Clearwater, Florida 33762

San Jose Sports Authority  
975-99 Almaden Boulevard  
San Jose, California 95113

Stockton Sports Commission, Sports  
Commissions Director  
46 West Fremont Street  
Stockton, California 95202

Seattle Sports Commission  
800-701 Pike Street  
Seattle, Washington 98101

Tallahassee Sports Council  
106 East Jefferson Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Shreveport Regional Sports Authority  
629 Spring Street  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101

Tampa Bay Sports Commission  
4040 North Himes Avenue  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Siouxland Sports Congress  
801 Fourth Street  
P.O. Box 3183  
Sioux City, Iowa 51101

Tri-Valley CVB/Sports Commission  
260 Main Street  
Pleasanton, California 94566

South Bend Regional Sports Commission  
310-401 East Colfax  
P.O. Box 1677  
South Bend, Indiana 46634-1677

Tulsa Sports Commission  
Williams Center, Tower II  
Two West Second Street  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

Vermont State Sports Council/CVB  
100-60 Main Street  
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Wenatchee Valley Sports Council  
116 North Wenatchee Avenue  
Wenatchee, Washington 98801

Winston-Salem Convention & Visitors  
Bureau (DNC)  
200 Brookstown Avenue  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27102

Wisconsin Sports Development Corporation  
P.O. Box 7788  
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

**APPENDIX B**  
**METROPOLITAN POPULATION ESTIMATES**

## APPENDIX B

### METROPOLITAN AREA POPULATION ESTIMATES

#### Large Sport Commissions (n=27)

1. Massachusetts Sports Commission (MA)	5,667,225
2. Detroit Metro Sports Commission (MI)	5,469,312
3. Philadelphia Sports Congress (PA)	4,949,867
4. Atlanta Sports Council (GA)	3,857,097
5. Greater Cleveland Sports Commission (OH)	2,910,616
6. Wisconsin Sports Development Corporation (WI)	2,872,109
7. San Diego International Sports Council (CA)	2,820,844
8. Long Island CVB/Sports Commission (NY)	2,688,904
9. Seattle Sports Commission (WA)	2,334,934
10. Portland Oregon Sports Authority (OR)	2,180,996
11. Metro Denver Sports Commission (CO)	1,978,991
12. Greater Cincinnati Sports Corporation (OH)	1,960,995
13. Greater Kansas City Sports Commission and Foundation (MO)	1,755,899
14. San Jose Sports Authority (CA)	1,647,419
15. Sacramento Sports Commission (CA)	1,585,429
16. San Antonio Sports Commission (TX)	1,564,949
17. Central Florida Sports Commission (FL)	1,535,004
18. Greater Columbus Sports Commission (OH)	1,489,487
19. Charlotte Regional Sports Commission (NC)	1,471,217
20. Greensboro Sports Commission (NC)	1,179,384
21. Nashville Sports Council (TN)	1,171,755
22. Rhode Island Sports Council (RI)	1,125,639
23. North Carolina Amateur Sports (NC)	1,105,535
24. Monroe County Sports Development Corporation (NY)	1,079,073
25. Jacksonville Sports and Entertainment Board (FL)	1,056,332
26. Palm Beach County Sports Commission (FL)	1,049,420
27. Greater Louisville Sports Commission (KY)	1,005,849



## METROPOLITAN AREA POPULATION ESTIMATES

### Small Sport Commissions (n=30)

28. Knoxville Sports Corporation (TN)	672,087
29. Bakersfield Sports Council (CA)	642,495
30. Baton Rouge Area Sports Foundation (LA)	578,946
31. Stockton Sports Commission (CA)	563,183
32. Charleston Metro Sports Council (SC)	552,803
33. Mobile Area Sports Commission (AL)	535,472
34. Greater Augusta Sports Council (GA)	460,826
35. Lexington Area Sports Authority (KY)	455,617
36. Greater Chattanooga Sports and Events Committee (TN)	452,034
37. Greater Lansing Convention and Visitors Bureau (MI)	450,789
38. Greater Des Moines Sports Authority (IA)	443,496
39. Pensacola Sports Association (FL)	403,384
40. Lee County Sports Authority (FL)	400,542
41. Tallahassee Sports Council (FL)	260,003
42. Lincoln Sports Commission (NE)	237,657
43. St. Petersburg/Clearwater Area CVB (FL)	234,647
44. Tri-Valley CVB/Sports Commission (CA)	218,849
45. Gainesville Sports Organizing Committee, Inc. (FL)	198,484
46. Vermont State Sports Council (VT)	165,917
47. Greater Ft. Lauderdale Sports Development Office (FL)	154,021
48. Chippewa Valley CVB (WI)	144,463
49. Greater Springfield Area Sports Commission (MO)	142,669
50. Rochester Amateur Sports Commission (MN)	119,077
51. Chicago Southland CVB/Sports Council (IL)	107,720
52. Sioux City (IA)	100,000
53. Lawrence Sports Corporation (KS)	98,343
54. Greater Denton Sports Commission (TX)	79,208
55. St. Cloud Area CVB (MN)	58,099
56. Ames Area Sports Commission (IA)	48,777
57. Mashantucket Pequot Athletic Commission (CT)	9,999

**APPENDIX C**

**SPORTS COMMISSIONS ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE SURVEY (SCOSS)**

## APPENDIX C

### SPORTS COMMISSIONS ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE SURVEY (SCOSS)

Please take a few moments to complete this survey as it applies to your organization. Approximations and/or brief responses may be appropriate and are encouraged for some questions, whenever necessary.

#### Dimension 1: Centralization

1. How much direct involvement does the Executive Director/CEO have in gathering the information he/she will use to make decisions?  

<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost all
<input type="checkbox"/> Almost none	<input type="checkbox"/> All
<input type="checkbox"/> Some	
  
2. How often does the Executive Director/CEO participate in the interpretation and distribution of information input?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Never	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost always
<input type="checkbox"/> Almost never	<input type="checkbox"/> Always
<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes	
  
3. How often does the Executive Director/CEO directly control execution of decisions?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Never	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost always
<input type="checkbox"/> Almost never	<input type="checkbox"/> Always
<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes	
  
4. How often does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) have discretion over establishing their unit budget?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Never	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost always
<input type="checkbox"/> Almost never	<input type="checkbox"/> Always
<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes	
  
5. To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) determine how their department will be evaluated?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Never	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost always
<input type="checkbox"/> Almost never	<input type="checkbox"/> Always
<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes	

6. To what extent does other staff (excluding the ED/CEO) hire and fire personnel?
- Never  Almost always  
 Almost never  Always  
 Sometimes
7. To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) develop personnel rewards (such as salary increases, promotions, etc.)?
- Never  Almost always  
 Almost never  Always  
 Sometimes
8. To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) develop a new program or project?
- Never  Almost always  
 Almost never  Always  
 Sometimes
9. To what extent does the staff (excluding the ED/CEO) determine how work expectations are handled?
- Never  Almost always  
 Almost never  Always  
 Sometimes

### **Dimension 2: Complexity**

10. How many different job titles are there in your organization?
- 1-2  9-11  
 3-5  >11  
 6-8
11. How many full-time employees are there in your organization?
- 1-4  13-16  
 5-8  >16  
 9-12
12. What proportion of your staff has a master's or PhD degree?
- Never  Almost always  
 Almost never  Always  
 Sometimes

13. What proportion of your staff has had previous sports commission or related sport management experience?

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Never        | <input type="checkbox"/> Almost always |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Almost never | <input type="checkbox"/> Always        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes    |  |

14. How many staff levels exist within your organization?

- |                              |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6-7 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> >7  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 |                              |

### Dimension 3: Formalization

15. Written job descriptions are available for (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Director/CEO            | <input type="checkbox"/> Department/Admin Assistants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Department Directors/Coordinators | <input type="checkbox"/> All the above               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Directors               |  |

16. Written job contracts are available for (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Director        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director        | <input type="checkbox"/> All the above |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Assistants |  |

17. What percentage of all operating policies and procedures are available in writing for your organization:

- |                                |                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-20  | <input type="checkbox"/> 61-80  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21-40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 81-100 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41-60 |                                 |

18. Where written job descriptions exist, how many times per year are individual performances reviewed to ensure compliance with standards set in the job description?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed   | <input type="checkbox"/> Three times per year           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Once per year  | <input type="checkbox"/> More than three times per year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twice per year |   |

19. Does your organization have a Board of Directors? (IF NO, GO TO QUESTION #21)

Yes

No

20. What proportion of the procedures concerning the allotment of money does your Board of Directors determine?

- None
- Approximately 25%
- Approximately 50%
- Approximately 75%
- All of above

**Component 4: Organizational Characteristics**

21. Type of Commission:

- Independent Sports Commission
- Chamber of Commerce or Committee
- Convention & Visitors Bureau or Dept.
- Government Entity or Dept.
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (specify)

22. Organization Operation:

- For profit
- Not-for-profit
- Other

23. How many full-time employees do you have in your organization? \_\_\_\_\_

24. How many part-time employees do you have in your organization? \_\_\_\_\_

25. How many interns do you have in your organization? \_\_\_\_\_

26. How many volunteers do you have in your organization? \_\_\_\_\_

27. What percentage of your budget is obtained by corporate partnerships? \_\_\_\_\_

28. What percentage of your budget is obtained by individual partnerships? \_\_\_\_\_

29. What percentage of your budget is obtained by events revenue? \_\_\_\_\_

30. What percentage of your budget is obtained by lodging/bed tax? \_\_\_\_\_

31. What percentage of your budget is obtained by government assistance? \_\_\_\_\_

32. What percentage of your budget is obtained by grants? \_\_\_\_\_

33. What percentage of your budget is obtained by other means? \_\_\_\_\_

34. How many Board of Directors (BOD) do you have? \_\_\_\_\_

35. How many meetings per year do you have? \_\_\_\_\_

36. What is your estimated annual budget? \_\_\_\_\_

37. Based on the activities of your Sports Commission, indicate from the list below the primary responsibility of the functions performed: 1) not an activity of responsibility of our Sports Commission, 2) internally performed, 3) externally performed (contracted), 4) externally performed (pro-bono), or, 5) other.

- Solicitation of events for bidding
- Assembly of bid team
- Writing bids
- Presentation of bid
- Obtaining special funding for bids
- Assembly of local organizing committees (LOC)
- LOC management
- Fundraising for LOC
- LOC marketing
- LOC board commitments
- Recruitment of volunteers
- Event management
- Sport event development
- Selling of event sponsorships
- Marketing
- Ticket sales
- Sport facility management
- Sports information
- Sport property/franchise attraction/relocation
- Sport property/franchise partnerships
- Physical fitness and health
- Community recreation
- Community sport education
- Grassroots sport development
- Economic development
- Olympic/elite training/support
- Entertainment
- All of the above
- Other

38. Do you limit your mandate to amateur sporting activities?

Yes

No

Don't know

39. How would you characterize the success of your Sports Commission, on a scale of 1 (not successful) to 5 (very successful)?

1 (not successful)

2

3

4

5 (very successful)

40. What factor(s) does your Sports Commission use to measure success? \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING  
THE SPORT COMMISSION ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE SURVEY!**



**APPENDIX D**  
**INFORMATION/CONSENT COVER FORM**

## APPENDIX D

### INFORMATION/CONSENT COVER FORM

**Principal Investigator:** Cheri L. Bradish, Florida State University

**Title of Study:** An Examination of the Relationship between Regional Sports Commissions and Organizational Structure

Dear [Name]:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Charles Imwold in the Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education, College of Education at Florida State University. I am conducting a nation-wide research study to examine the relationship between regional Sports Commissions and organizational structure. This study will also examine regional Sports Commissions according to general organizational characteristics, such as organization operation, budget inputs, and, activities performed.

I am requesting your participation in my research project, which will involve the completion of the attached questionnaire, which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time, there will be no penalty. The results of this research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please contact me at (905) 688-5550 ext. 4119 (e-mail: [cbradish@brocku.ca](mailto:cbradish@brocku.ca)); or, Dr. Charles Imwold at (850) 644-0918 (email: [cimwold@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:cimwold@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)).

Return of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cheri L. Bradish, Ph.D. (Candidate)

**APPENDIX E**  
**SCOSS DATA MANAGEMENT**

**APPENDIX E**  
**SCOSS DATA MANAGEMENT**

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ID	ordinal		= 1 . . .
SERIAL	nominal (syntax)	[Name] Sports Commission	= 1 . . .
CENT1	ordinal	None	= 1
		Almost none	= 2
		Some	= 3
		Almost all	= 4
		All	= 5
CENT2	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT3	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT4	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT5	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT6	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
CENT7	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT8	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
CENT9	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
COMPLEX1	ordinal	1-2	= 1
		3-5	= 2
		6-8	= 3
		9-11	= 4
		>11	= 5
COMPLEX2	ordinal	1-4	= 1
		5-8	= 2
		9-12	= 3
		13-16	= 4
		>16	= 5
COMPLEX3	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5
COMPLEX4	ordinal	Never	= 1
		Almost never	= 2
		Sometimes	= 3
		Almost always	= 4
		Always	= 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
COMPLEX5	ordinal	1-2	= 1
		3-4	= 2
		5-6	= 3
		6-7	= 4
		>7	= 5
FORMAL1	nominal	Executive Directors/CEO	= 1
		Department Directors/Coordinators	= 2
		Assistant Directors	= 3
		Department/Admin Assistants	= 4
		All the above	= 5
FORMAL2	nominal	Executive Director	= 1
		Assistant Director	= 2
		Administrative Assistants	= 3
		Other	= 4
		All the above	= 5
FORMAL3	ordinal	1-20	= 1
		21-40	= 2
		41-60	= 3
		61-80	= 4
		81-100	= 5
FORMAL4	ordinal	Not reviewed	= 1
		Once per year	= 2
		Twice per year	= 3
		Three times per year	= 4
		More than three times per year	= 5
FORMAL5	nominal	Yes	= 1
		No	= 2
FORMAL6	ordinal	None	= 1
		Approximately 25%	= 2
		Approximately 50%	= 3
		Approximately 75%	= 4
		All the above	= 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ORGCR1	nominal	Independent Sports Commission Chamber of Commerce or Committee Assistant Directors Department/Admin Assistants All the above	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ORGCR1.1	nominal (syntax)	“Other Specify”	= 1 . . .
ORGCR2	nominal	For Profit Not-for-profit Other	= 1 = 2 = 3
FLLTIME	interval	Number of full-time employees	#
PRTTIME	interval	Number of part-time employees	#
INTERNS	interval	Number of interns	#
VOLUNTEE	interval	Number of volunteers	#
BUDCP	ratio	% Budget – corporate partnership	/100
BUDIP	ratio	% Budget – individual partnership	/100
BUDEVE	ratio	% Budget – event revenue	/100
BUDLODG	ratio	% Budget – lodging/bed tax	/100
BUDGOV	ratio	% Budget – government assistance	/100
BUDGRANT	ratio	% Budget – grants	/100
BUDOTHER	ratio	% Budget – other means	/100
BODMEM	interval	Number of Board of Directors	#
MEETYR	interval	Number of meetings per year	#
ANNBUD	interval	Estimated annual budget	#
ACTSOL	nominal	<b>Solicitation of events for bidding</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTASS	nominal	<b>Assembly of bid team</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTWRITB	nominal	<b>Writing bids</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTPRES	nominal	<b>Presentation of bid</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTOBT	nominal	<b>Obtaining special funding for bids</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTASSLO	nominal	<b>Assembly of local organizing committees</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5



Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTLOC	nominal	<b>LOC management</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTFUND	nominal	<b>Fundraising for LOC</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTLOCM	nominal	<b>LOC marketing</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTLOCB	nominal	<b>LOC board commitments</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTRECV	nominal	<b>Recruitment of volunteers</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTEVENT	nominal	<b>Event management</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTSPOE	nominal	<b>Sport event development</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTSELL	nominal	<b>Selling of event sponsorship</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTMAR	nominal	<b>Marketing</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTTICK	nominal	<b>Ticket sales</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTSFAC	nominal	<b>Sport facility management</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTSI	nominal	<b>Sports information</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTSPOPR	nominal	<b>Sport property/franchise attraction/relocation</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTSPPAR	nominal	<b>Sport property/franchise partnerships</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5
ACTPE	nominal	<b>Physical fitness and health</b>	
		Not performed	= 1
		Internally performed	= 2
		Externally performed (contracted)	= 3
		Externally performed (pro-bono)	= 4
		Other	= 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTCR	nominal	<b>Community recreation</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTCSE	nominal	<b>Community sport education</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTGSD	nominal	<b>Grassroots sport development</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTED	nominal	<b>Economic development</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ACTOLY	nominal	<b>Olympic/elite training/support</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5

Variable	Level of Measurement	Format	Coded Values
ACTENT		<b>Entertainment</b> Not performed Internally performed Externally performed (contracted) Externally performed (pro-bono) Other	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
ORGCR18	nominal	Yes No Don't know	= 1 = 2 = 3
SUCCESS	ordinal	1 (not successful) 2 3 4 5 (very successful)	= 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5
MEASSUC	nominal (syntax)	"Measure Success"	= 1 ...

**APPENDIX F**  
**HUMAN SUBJECTS INFORMATION**

## **APPENDIX F**

### **HUMAN SUBJECTS INFORMATION**

The University's Human Subjects Committee has reviewed and approved the research proposal and data collection for this research study

## REFERENCES

- Adelman, M. L. (1990). *Sporting time: New York City and the rise of modern athletics, 1820-70*. CITY, ST: University of Illinois Press.
- Amis, J. & Slack, T. (1996). The size-structure relationship in voluntary sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 76-86.
- Baade, R.A. & Sanderson, A.R. (1997). Cities under siege: How the changing financial structure of professional sports is putting cities at risk and what to do about it. *Advances in the Economics of Sport, 2*, 77-114.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bale, J. (1989). *Sports geography*. New York, NY: E.& F.N. Spon.
- Bhasin, A. K. (2000). Tax-exempt bond financing of sports stadiums: Is the price right? *Sports and Entertainment Law Journal, 7*(2), 1-21.
- Blackburn, R. (1982). Dimensions of structure: A review and reappraisal. *Academy of Management Review, 7*, 59-66.
- Boshoff, G.B.E. (1997). "Barefoot" sports administrators: Laying the foundation for sports development in South Africa. *Journal of Sport Management, 11*, 69-79.
- Bowditch, J.L. & Buono, A.F. (2000). *A primer on organizational behavior*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.



- Brown, G. (2000). Emerging issues in Olympic sponsorship: Implications for host cities. *Sport Management Review*, 3, 71-92.
- Brown, M.T. & Zuefle, D.M. (1996, May). *An evaluation of the NASC's recommendations for computation of economic impact*. Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual North American Society for Sport Management Conference, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada.
- Cardwell, D. E. (2000, Spring). Sports facilities & urban redevelopment. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 10(2), 417-424.
- Catherwood, D.W. & Van Kirk, R.L. (1992). *The complete guide to special event management*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cawley, R. (1999, August 16-22). Special report: Sports Commissions. *Street & Smith's SportsBusiness Journal*, 23-33.
- Chalip, L. (1996). Critical policy analysis: The illustrative case of New Zealand sport policy development. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 310-324.
- Chalip, L. & Leyns, A. (2002). Local business leveraging of a sport event: Managing an event for economic benefit. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 132-158.
- Clegg, S. & Dunkerley, D. (1980). *Organization, class, and control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Coakley, J.J. (1998). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (1996). Using sport sponsorship to penetrate local markets: The case of the fast food industry. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 169-187.
- Covell, D. (2002, May). *Minor league baseball, civic image, and public support of stadium construction: The Lowell Spinners and the city of Lowell, Massachusetts*. Paper presented

- at the Seventeenth Annual North American Society for Sport Management Conference, Canmore, Alberta, Canada.
- Cummings, L.L. & Berger, C.J. (1976, Autumn). Organization structure: How does it influence attitudes and performance. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5, 34-49
- Cunningham, G.B. & Rivera, C.A. (2001). Structural designs within American intercollegiate athletic departments. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(4), 369-390.
- Crompton, J.L. (1995). Economic analysis of sports facilities and events. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 14-35.
- Dalton, D.R., Todor, W.D., Spendolini, M.J., Fielding, G.J. & Porter, L.W. (1980). Organizational structure and performance: A critical review. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 49-64.
- Danielson, M.N. (1997). *Home team*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Delpy, L. A. (1995, Fall). Lawyering on the front lines: On-site legal counsel for major sporting events. *Marquette Sport Law Review*, 6(1), 29-63.
- Downey, K., Hellriegel, D. & Slocum, J. (1977). *Readings in organizational behavior: Contingency views*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Drucker, P.F. (1974, January-February). New templates for today's organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 45-52.
- Drucker, P.F. (1982). *The practice of management*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Drucker, P.F. (1988, January-February). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 3-11.
- Dunning, E.G., Maguire, J.A., & Pearton, R.E. (Eds.). (1993). *The sports process: A comparative and developmental approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

- Eitzen, D. S. & Sage, G. H. (1997). *Sociology of North American sport* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Ellul, J., Pardee, D. & Wilkinson, J. (1993). *The meaning of the city*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Erdmann, J. W. (1995). *An examination of the NCAA division I-A university athletic boosters/foundations pertaining to their organizational structure and policies concerning institutional control*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Fayol, H. (1925). *Industrial and general administration*. Paris: Dunod. (Original work published 1916).
- Fombrun, C.J. (1984). Structures of organizational governance. *Human Relations*, 37, 207-223.
- Forsythe, K. C. (2000, Spring). The stadium game Pittsburgh style: Observations on the latest rounds of publicly financed sports stadia in Steeltown, U.S.A.; And comparisons with 28 other major league teams. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 10(2), 237-310.
- Fort, R. (2003). *Sports economics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fort, R. (2000, Spring). Stadiums and public and private interests. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 10(2), 311-334.
- Frederick, A. (2003, January). Pro sports teams are a growing community resource. *Board & Administrator*, 19(5), 6.
- Fredrickson, J. (1986). The strategic decision process and organizational structure. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(2), 291.
- Frisby, W. & Crawford, S. (1994, June). *Participatory action research: Its potential application to sport management*. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual North American Society for Sport Management Conference.
- Gibson, H.J. (1998). Sport tourism: A critical analysis of research. *Sport Management Review*,

1, 45-76.

- Goodman, A. (2002). Public financing stadiums. *Sports Lawyers Journal*, 9(1), 2-25.
- Gorn, E. & Goldstein, W. (1993). *A brief history of American sports*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Graham, S., Goldblatt, J.J. & Delpy, L. (1995). *The ultimate guide to sport event management and marketing*. Chicago, IL: Irwin Professional Publishing.
- Greater Raleigh Convention and Visitors Bureau. (2001). *Another year of entertaining greater Raleigh visitors* (14<sup>th</sup> ed.). Raleigh, NC: Author.
- Green, B.C., Costa, C. & Fitzgerald, M. (2003, December/January). Marketing the host city: Analyzing exposure generated by a sport event. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 335-353.
- Gruneau, R. (1983). *Class, sports, and social development*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hage, J. (1980). *Theories of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1970). *Social change in complex organizations*. New York: Random House.
- Hall, R. (1991). *Organizations, structures, processes, and outcomes* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hanline, M. (1993). *Models of organization: The application of organization theory*. York, PA: Matrix Publishing Company.
- Harris County-Houston Sports Authority. (2001, December 17). *Luck ready to tackle sports authority challenges*. Houston, TX: Author

- Harvey, J. (1988). Sport policy and the welfare state: An outline of the Canadian case. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 315-329.
- Heap, P. (1996). Cities often dream up stadiums before thinking payment. *The Bond Buyer*, 2.
- Holmes, M. (2000, February). Community sponsorships: Look for the added value. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 67-73.
- Howard, D.R. & Crompton, J.L. (1995). *Financing sport*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Illinois Parks & Recreation. (1995, September-October). *The Illinois Sports Strategy in Illinois Parks & Recreation*. Illinois: Author.
- Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. (1991). *Beyond the games: Executive summaries*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Ingham, A. G. & Loy, J. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Sport in social development: Traditions, transitions, and transformations*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Jarvie, G. & Maguire, J. (1995). *Sport and leisure in social thought*. London: Routledge.
- Kaplan, D. (2002, January 21-27). Its chief back, N.Y. agency targets Games. *Street & Smith's SportsBusiness Journal*, p. 9.
- Kaufmann, M. (2002, June 10-16). Commissions wonder if sports are still worth it. *Street & Smith's SportsBusiness Journal*, pp. 15, 24.
- Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T. & Hinings, B. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sport organizations. *International Review for Sociology of Sport*, 27, 343-366.
- Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, B., & Zimmerman, A. (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 129-150.

- Kotler, P., Haider, D.H., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing places*. New York, NY: Macmillan, Inc.
- Kurtzman, J. (2001). Economic impact: Sport tourism and the city. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 6 (3), 11-33.
- Lachowetz, T. (2001). Regional sports alliance: A conceptual approach. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 10(1), 25-34.
- Lee, S. (2001, Spring). A review of economic impact study on sport events. *The Sport Journal*, 4(2). Retrieved March 27, 2002, from <http://thesportjournal.org/>
- Lipsky, R. (1981). *How we play the game: Why sports dominate American life*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Lorsch, J.W. (1987, January, 30). *Note on organization design*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Macnow, G. (1989, November). Cities get into the game. *Nation's Business*, 48-54.
- Marietta, E. & Sheahan, T. (1995, September/October). The Illinois sports strategy. *Illinois Parks & Recreation*, pp. 21.
- McDougal, M. K. (1991). *The relationship between organizational structure of division 1-A football teams and national ranking*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Meek, A. (1997). An estimate of the size and supported economic activity of the sport industry in the United States. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 6(4), 15-21.
- Michener, J. A. (1976). *Sports in America*. New York, NY: Fawcett Crest.

- Miller, D. & Friesen, P. (1984). *Organizations: A quantum view*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Miller, K.I. & Monge, P.R. (1986). Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 727-753.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of related research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1980, March). Structure in 5's: A synthesis of the research of organization design. *Management Science*, 26(3), 322-341.
- Mintzberg, H. (1981, January-February). Organization design: Fashion or fit? *Harvard Business Review*, 103-116.
- Mules, T. (1998). Taxpayer subsidies for major sporting events. *Sport Management Review*, 1, 25-43.
- Mules, T. & Faulkner, B (1996). An economic perspective on special events. *Tourism Economics*, 2, 314-329.
- National Association of Sports Commissions. (1995). *Sports commission 101*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.
- National Association of Sports Commissions. (1999). *By-laws*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.
- Nohria, N. (1995, June 30). *Note on organizational structure*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Palm Beach County Sports Commission. (1996). *Palm Beach County sports commission: 1996 annual report*. Palm Beach, FL: Author.
- Palmer, J. P. (2002, March). Bread and circuses. *C. D. Howe Institute Commentary*, 161, 1-18.

- Pelissero, J., Henschen, B., & Sidlow, E. (1993). Community development or business promotion? A look at sports-led economic development. In D. Fasenfest (Ed.), *Community economic development: Policy development in the US and the UK* (pp. 157-172). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Pennell, B.L. (1990). *A descriptive analysis of sports commissions in the United States of America*. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of North Carolina.
- Pennings, J. (1976). Measures of organizational structure: A methodological note. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 686-704.
- Pitter, R. (1996). The state and sport development in Alberta: A struggle for public status. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 31-50.
- Power, D.J. (1988). Anticipating organization structures. In J. Hage (Ed.), *Futures of organizations: Innovating to adapt strategy & human resources to rapid technology changes* (pp. 67-79). Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.
- Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J. & Hinings, C.R. (1968). The context of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 91-114.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980, March). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 1-17.
- Ritchie, B.J.R. (1989, June). *Mega sporting events and their role in the development and promotion of international tourism destinations*. Keynote address presented at the Fourth Annual North American Society for Sport Management Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Robbins, S. P. (1987). *Organizational theory: Structure, design, and applications* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosentraub, M. S. (2000, Spring). Sports facilities, redevelopment, and the centrality of downtown areas. *Marquette Sports Law Journal*, 2(10), 219-235.



- Rosentraub, M. S. & Swindell, D. (2002). Negotiating games: Cities, sports, and the winner's curse. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*, 18-35.
- Rowe, D. & McGuirk, P. (1999). Drunk for three weeks. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 34*(2), 125-141.
- Sack, A.L. & Johnson, A.T. (1996). Politics, economic development, and the Volvo International Tennis Tournament. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 1-14.
- Sage, G.H. (1998). *Power and ideology in American sport: A critical perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Schimmel, K.S., Ingham, A.G. & Howell, J.W. (1993). Professional team sports and the American city: Urban politics and franchise relocations. In A.G. Ingham, & J.W. Loy (Eds.), *Sport in social development: Traditions, transitions, and transformations* (pp. 211-241). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Schneider, T. (2002, April). The growth industry. *SportsTravel, 4*.
- Schwartz, S. (2002). The fight for an Olympic bid. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport, 12*(2), 133-148.
- Sepulveda, P. (2001, November). The use of the eminent domain power in the relocation of sports stadiums to urban areas: Is the public purpose requirement satisfied? *Seton Hall Journal of Sport Law, 11*, 137-156.
- Slack, T. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management, 6*, 114-132.
- Slack, T. (1993). Morgan and the metaphors: Implications for sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management, 7*, 189-193.
- Slack, T. (1996). From the locker room to the board room: Changing the domain of sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 97-105.

- Slack, T. (1997). *Understanding sport organizations*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Smircich, L. & Calas, M. B. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical perspectives on organization and management theory: History of management thought*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Dartmouth Pub. Co.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- 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, J. R. & Nelson, J. K. (1996). *Research methods in physical activity* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Trojan Sports & Event Marketing (n.d.). *Using grassroots sponsorship to build your brand*. Retrieved April 7, 2002 from <http://trojansports.com/grassRoots.htm>
- Turco, D.M. & Lim, C. (1998). Green and gold: Tourism relations between the Green Bay Packers and the host community. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 2 (3). Retrieved March 27, 2002, from <http://ww.ausport.au/fulltext/1998/cjasm/>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2002, September). *Metropolitan area population estimates*. Retrieved April 8, 2003, from <http://eire.census.gov/popest/data/metro.php>
- Van Hoecke, J., Van Hoecke, W., De Knop, P. & Taks, M. (2000). The contribution of “local heroes” in the athlete endorsement mix: A case study approach. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 2 (3). Retrieved January 27, 2002, from <http://ww.ausport.au/fulltext/2000/cjasm/>
- Wall, A. M. (2002, Spring). The game behind the game. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 12(2), 555-562.
- Walton, E.J. (1981). The comparison of measures of organizational structure. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 155-160.

Ward, J. (2002, April). If you build it, will they come? *The American City & County*, 117(6), 38-45.

Weber, M. (1946). *Essays in sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wiggins, D.K. (Ed.). (1995). *Sport in America: From wicked amusement to national obsession*.  
Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

Wilson, J. (1994). *Playing by the rules: Sport, society, and the state*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.



## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

Cheri Bradish was born March 27, 1969 and was raised in Glanworth, Ontario, Canada. She graduated from Lord Dorchester Secondary School in Dorchester, Ontario in 1988. She graduated from the University of Guelph in 1993 where she was a member of the varsity volleyball team. In 1994, she received a Masters of Science in Athletic Administration from Florida State University. She has held sport management related positions with the NBA Vancouver Grizzlies, Nike Canada, and the Florida Sports Foundation, in addition to various positions in the Florida State University Athletic Department. She began teaching at Brock University in the Department of Sport Management in 1997 where she continues today. She received her Ph.D. from Florida State University in 2003.