



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES:

A CONSTITUENCY APPROACH

by

Susan E. Vail

A Thesis presented to the School of
Graduate Studies of the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Ottawa, Ontario, 1985

© Susan E. Vail. Ottawa, Canada. 1986.

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-30957-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Present State of Organizational Effectiveness Research	1
National Sport Governing Bodies: A Description	2
National Sport Governing Bodies as Organizations	4
National Sport Governing Bodies and Effectiveness	5
Defining Organizational Effectiveness	6

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Approaches to Measuring Organizational Effectiveness	10
The Goal Approach	11
System Resource Approach	14
Integrated Goal-System Resource Approach	17
Constituency Approach	20
Summary	29
Rationale for the Study	31
Purpose of the Study	35
Research Hypotheses	36
Operational Definitions and Guidelines	36
Limitations of the Study	40

CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

General Design	41
Sample	41
Identification of Variables	42

Instrumentation	43
▲ Validity Testing	43
Reliability Testing	44
Subscale Analysis	48
Procedures	48
Statistical Analyses	50
 CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	
General Description of the Data	51
Hypothesis One: Five Group Analysis	53
Hypothesis Two: Two Group Analysis	56
Anova with Repeated Measures	60
 CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	
Differences Among the Five Constituent Groups	66
Differences Between the Internal and External	
Constituent Groups	69
Variable Grouping: A Life Cycle Interpretation	71
 CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
 REFERENCES	80

APPENDICES

A	Guidelines for Assessing Organizational Effectiveness	85
B	National Sport Governing Body Sample	91
C	Criteria for Selection of Sport Administration Expert Panel	93
D	Expert Review Instrument (Part 1)	95
E	Expert Review Instrument (Part 2)	100
F	Test-Retest Reliability Questionnaire	105
G	Survey Questionnaire	112
H	Effectiveness Variables and Corresponding Questionnaire Statements	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Definitions of Selected Variables and Supporting References	32
2 Validity Testing: Summary of Results of Expert Review	45
3 Results of Reliability Test-Retest	47
4 Item-Total Correlations for Thirty-Six Item Questionnaire	49
5 Means and Standard Deviations of the Five Groups by Variable	52
6 Means and Standard Deviations of Internal and External Groups	54
7 Bartlett's Chi-Square Test of Equality of Variance	55
8 Coefficients of Skewness for the Six Variables	57
9 Analysis of Variance Tests for Each Variable among the Five Groups	58
10 Analysis of Differences of Means Between Internal and External Groups	59
11 Post Hoc Analysis of Finance and Growth Variables with Newman-Keuls	61
12 Means and Standard Deviations of the Six Variables by Group	62
13 Post Hoc Analysis of the Within Group Variance	63
14 Quinn and Cameron's Integrated Life-Cycle Model	73

ABSTRACT

This study utilized a constituency approach to develop measures of specific variables of organizational effectiveness of National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGBs). Five constituent groups were identified for inclusion in the sample: Executive Directors, Presidents, National Coaches, Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor Representatives. The former three groups represented the internal constituency of the thirty-three NSGBs in the sample. The latter two groups represented the external constituency.

The subjects responded to a questionnaire of thirty-six criterion statements which represented six effectiveness variables in the administrative domain of National Sport Governing Bodies. The respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item using a five-point Likert scale.

The results showed that the variables of adaptability, communication, finance, growth, human resources and organizational planning were all important indicators of organizational effectiveness. The finance and growth variables were ranked as significantly more important to the internal constituent groups than to the external constituencies.

Based on these results, the implications of the similarities and differences in the perceived importance of the effectiveness variables among the five groups and between the two groups (internal and external) were discussed. Further, speculations were made about the relationship between organizational life cycles and effectiveness criteria.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This effort is dedicated to my parents. Without their moral and financial support, this challenge would have been impossible to meet.

I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of my committee, including my thesis advisor, Dr. H. Hansen of the School of Human Kinetics, Dr. I. Dow and Dr. H. Jakes of the Faculty of Education, with special thanks to Professor Robert R. O'Reilly, Ph.D., for his time, guidance and constant encouragement.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Interest in organizational effectiveness is not a recent phenomenon. At the theoretical level, Goodman and Pennings (1977) have argued that effectiveness is the central theme in all organizational analyses and that it is difficult to conceive of a theory of organization that does not include the effectiveness construct.

In spite of the variety of books and articles written on this topic over the past two decades, there is little agreement on how to define or assess organizational effectiveness. Research has failed to produce either a universal definition or a common theoretical position. Many people, over the years, have chosen a wide variety of ways to conceptualize and measure this variable (Price, 1972; Steers, 1975; Campbell, 1977; Cameron, 1980). Others, such as Bluedorn (1980), have become discouraged by the literature on effectiveness and argued that the construct should be entirely eliminated.

Despite its uncertain conceptual state, Cameron and Whetten (1983) have explained why organizational effectiveness is not likely to disappear from organizational research, for reasons that are both theoretical and empirical in nature. Theoretically, the construct of organizational effectiveness is embedded at the centre of all organizational models. Regardless of the approach or perspective, most models are based on the notion that differences exist between effective and ineffective organizations. Empirically, organizational

effectiveness is most often used as the dependent variable in organizational research. The need to demonstrate that one organization is better in some way than another makes organizational effectiveness a key issue for researchers.

This study has employed a constituency approach in the measurement of specific variables of organizational effectiveness for a sample of National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGBs). The author's interest in this area of study stemmed from her seven years of experience as a sport consultant with the federal government. This work involved day-to-day interaction with both paid staff and volunteer administrators of many different NSGBs to discuss technical programming and administrative issues.

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES: A DESCRIPTION

National Sport Governing Bodies form the core of the delivery system for sport in Canada (Neill, 1983). There are approximately 80 such organizations. Each organization represents a single sport and is responsible for the development and control of that sport. Within the jurisdiction of any one NSGB fall such major undertakings as training and competitive programs for Canada's best athletes, the organization of national and international events, programs to encourage all Canadians to become more physically active and the certification of coaches and officials at all levels.

NSGBs are voluntary not-for-profit associations administered on a day-to-day basis by professional staff in such positions as Executive

Directors and Technical Directors. The paid staff, usually via the Executive Director, report to a volunteer Board of Directors. Generally the volunteer President is the head of the Association. The Board may only meet twice each year to discuss major policy issues; however, often the executive committee of the Board will work more closely with the paid staff. The responsibilities of the Executive Director are very similar to those of any chief executive officer and include human resource management, financial management, organizational planning and operations.

The present study has identified three major activity areas or domains within each NSGB: high performance, participation and administration. The term domain has been utilized by a number of researchers (Meyer, 1975; Cameron, 1980) but was first defined by Thompson (1967) as being distinguished by the constituencies served, the technologies employed and the output or services produced. Specifically this study has focused on the administrative domain which services all major constituent groups both internal and external to the organization. Within this domain the development of human resources, financial systems and organizational planning procedures would result in sound administrative practices, facilitating the attainment of organizational goals.

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES AS ORGANIZATIONS

In his text, Scott (1981) emphasized that dependent upon the perspective taken in organizational analysis, different definitions of an organization are appropriate. Scott (1981) analyzed organizations from three perspectives: rational, natural and open. Organizations falling within the rational system are "collectivities oriented to the pursuit of relatively specific goals" and "exhibit a relatively high degree of formalization" (Scott, 1981:20). Natural systems organizations are collectivities "whose participants are little affected by the formal structure of official goals but who share a common interest in the survival of the system and who engage in collective activities, informally structured, to secure this end" (Scott 1981:22). Open systems organizations are "a coalition of shifting interest groups that develop goals by negotiation, the structure of the coalition, its activities, and its outcomes are strongly influenced by environmental factors" (Scott, 1981:22-23).

NSGBs have been defined as open systems in this study. Past sport-related research, although limited, has shown that NSGB goals and activities are strongly influenced by internal and external constituent groups (Szyszlo, 1984) and by the environment (Neill, 1983).

Although many different ways of classifying organizations have been-presented, limited-attempts have been made to classify NSGBs (Neill, 1983). Given that the constituency approach has been utilized in this study, Blau and Scott's (1962) typology, which was based on

the single criterion of "who benefits", could be deemed the most appropriate classification scheme in which to place NSGBs. In this typology, four categories of participants are distinguished in relation to any formal organization: (1) member; (2) owners or managers; (3) clients or the public-in-contact and (4) public-at-large or the members of society in which the organization operates (Scott 1981:41). NSGBs are primarily concerned with servicing their members, and given this, would be classified as mutual benefit associations.

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES AND EFFECTIVENESS

In attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of an organization, a number of different theoretical perspectives have been created. Many have followed some version of the goal model that treats organizations as instruments for the attainment of particular goals (Etzioni, 1960; Mahoney and Weitzel, 1969). Others have favoured the system resource approach (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967). A number of researchers have supported an integrated goal-system resource approach (Strasser et al, 1981; Hoy and Miskel, 1982) and much more attention has been paid in recent years to multiple constituency or stakeholders' models (Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Mendelow, 1983).

Although some writers have continued to debate the superiority of one model of effectiveness over all others (Price, 1972; Steers, 1975), these debates have not proven fruitful. It seems that the

thoughts of each may have been based on different conceptualizations of what an organization is and, subsequently, different definitions of organizational effectiveness. The most recent researchers are moving away from attempts to identify the definitive model and toward the need to develop guidelines for the assessment of organizational effectiveness using a variety of approaches (Reimann, 1982; Hoy and Miskel, 1983; Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983). In particular, Cameron and Whetten (1983) have presented a multiple models perspective which prescribes a framework for organizational effectiveness research.

The organizational effectiveness of NSGBs has yet to be thoroughly researched. Those researchers who have attempted to measure effectiveness have used various definitions and approaches, making the comparison of results very difficult. This study has addressed NSGB effectiveness in the administrative domain within clearly identified research guidelines, in this way, facilitating future attempts to compare or replicate research.

DEFINING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Some theorists have approached the definition of organizational effectiveness from a "goals" perspective, others from a "systems" perspective. Outputs and goal accomplishment have been widely used as criteria of effectiveness (Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum, 1957;

Etzioni, 1964; Price, 1972; Campbell 1977; Jobson and Schneck, 1982). Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum viewed an organization's effectiveness as "the extent to which certain resources and means fulfill its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain on its members" (1957:535). Etzioni's definition is widely cited: "An organizational goal is a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize..." (1964:6). Perrow (1961) made a distinction between "official" and "operative" goals which has been utilized and accepted by many researchers today (Price, 1972; Scott, 1977). Official goals are usually those documented and publicly espoused by the organization. Operative goals mirror the actual tasks and activities performed by the organization (Hoy and Miskel, 1983). After a review of the related literature, Jobson and Schneck provided their definition of organizational effectiveness: "In summary, the goal model defines organizational effectiveness as the degree to which an organization actually attains or achieves its objectives" (1982:28).

Other researchers have viewed organizations as open systems possessing such characteristics as permeable boundaries, inputs, subsystems, output and feedback mechanisms (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967; Friedlander and Pickle, 1968; Mott, 1972; Cameron, 1981). Each has placed varying emphasis on the different aspects of the systems approach in his definition. Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) defined

organizational effectiveness as the ability of an organization to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources. Organizational inputs and acquisition of resources replace goals as the primary criteria of effectiveness. Friedlander and Pickle (1968) attempted to define the criteria of organizational effectiveness to reflect the interdependencies between the total organizational system and its environment. Mott's (1972) definition reflected the concern of Friedlander and Pickle and emphasized the importance of measuring both the internal and external effectiveness of an organization. He defined organizational effectiveness as "the ability of an organization to mobilize its centers of power for action, production and adaptation" (1972:17).

Cameron (1981) suggested that organizational effectiveness should not be defined in terms of mutually exclusive sets of criteria which adhere to one set of theories or another. He proposed that organizational effectiveness be viewed as a construct versus a definition and operationalized through the analysis of a number of different conceptual domains or major program areas within an organization. Further, the effectiveness of one domain would not necessarily relate to the effectiveness of another domain.

Quinn and Rohrbaugh also based their research on "the fact that effectiveness is not a concept but a construct" (1983:363). According to Cameron and Whetten, constructs are "abstractions that exist in the heads of people, but they have no objective reality" (1983:7).

Cameron and Whetten (1983) differentiated between concepts and constructs by stating that concepts can be defined and specified by observing objective events, while constructs are inferences at a higher level of abstraction and as such their meanings are subject to individual preference and interpretation. Therefore, organizational effectiveness, like other such constructs of leadership, intelligence or motivation, may be defined within the confines of one model or approach if the limitations to generalize the result of the research are recognized and clearly stated. Steers (1975) stressed the importance of clearly identifying domains, criteria within domains and the relationship of all criteria in the process of construct validation.

Some of the more recent studies and literature reviews on organizational effectiveness have reinforced Cameron's approach in attempting to define a broader perspective for organizational effectiveness that encompasses rather than conflicts with existing perspectives (Connolly et al, 1980; Cameron and Whetten, 1981; Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Hoy and Miskel, 1983; Gaertner and Ramnarayan, 1983). Cameron's multiple models approach may have promise for resolving some of the theoretical and empirical confusion surrounding the construct of organizational effectiveness.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

APPROACHES TO MEASURING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

For many years administrators, evaluators and theorists have been debating the most appropriate model to use for evaluating organizational effectiveness. Initially most of this debate was focused on the goal-centered approach (Etzioni, 1960, 1964; Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum, 1957; Price, 1972). In the last twenty years, more attention has been given to system-based models as evaluation tools (Yuchman and Seashore, 1967; Steers, 1977; Cameron, 1980). Although various researchers have presented advantages or disadvantages for the use of one approach over the other, neither approach has undergone thorough empirical examination.

Some research has attempted to combine aspects of both models (Campbell, 1977; Strasser et al, 1981; Cameron, 1981). Many writers agree that the selection of a particular approach for the evaluation of organizational effectiveness depends upon the information that decision-makers require at a given point in time. This emphasizes the need to vary the approach dependent upon the situation (Cunningham, 1976) and the perspective of the constituent (Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Mendelow, 1983).

In the following section four approaches to the measurement of organizational effectiveness will be presented, referencing both theoretical and empirical research studies. Sport-related research studies have been included in this literature review.

THE GOAL APPROACH

Several researchers have dealt extensively with the goal approach to the assessment of organizational effectiveness over the past years (Etzioni, 1964; Mahoney and Weitzel, 1969; Price, 1972; Child, 1975; Cunningham, 1977). According to Scott (1977), the major assumption in all goal-oriented approaches is that there exists a concise operational set of goals or objectives within an organization. A second major assumption assumes that people within the organization will agree with and be motivated by the organizational goals.

Etzioni defined a goal as "an image of a future state" (1975: 335). In his approach, the stated goals and objectives of an organization were compared with the actual realization of those goals and objectives.

Mahoney and Weitzel (1969) observed two different classes of organizations based on their goal-oriented approach to the study of organizational effectiveness criteria: general business and research and development. These researchers identified ultimate, intermediate and immediate criteria in the achievement of the final goal. It was found that the important variables for business organizations were productivity, support, utilization, planning, reliability, cooperation and development (1969:362). Research and development model variables were reliability, cooperation and development (1969:362). These findings reinforced the position of Price (1972) and Strasser et al (1981) with respect to the situationality of the application of goal criteria.

Price (1972) identified support for the goal-oriented approach from his review and analysis of fifty research studies. He derived a list of propositions related to organizational effectiveness and concluded that goal-identification, while difficult, was not impossible "if the focus of research is on the organizational goals that the major decision-makers actually pursue and if data are collected about the major decision-makers' intentions and activities" (Price, 1972:6).

There have been a number of variations of the goal-centered approach presented in the literature. They include: the managerial process approach, the management by objectives approach, the organization development approach and cost benefit analysis approach.

The managerial process approach evaluates an organization's effectiveness by its ability to effectively perform certain managerial functions: decision-making, planning and budgeting (Cunningham, 1977). This approach assumes a clear statement of objectives and allows the productivity of the organization to be measured, based on managerial processes.

Management by objectives exemplifies the pure form of the goal-centered model of effectiveness. Unique objectives are identified by each organization and effectiveness is measured in quantifiable terms, based on the degree to which the organization has succeeded or failed to meet the objectives (Campbell, 1977).

The organizational development model views effectiveness in terms of the organization's problem-solving and renewal capabilities (Cunningham, 1977). This model fosters a developmental approach by integrating organizational goals with individual needs for growth.

The essential task of management in this approach was to determine and clarify organizational goals such that the people in the organization could set their own goals within a positive working environment. Child (1975) combined aspects of the managerial process approach and the organization development approach, stressing through his propositions the importance of securing an effective match between a company's internal organizational objectives and the needs of the constituencies that work within the organization.

Cost-benefit analysis is most often used to measure the relative effectiveness of alternative courses of action toward some goal rather than the effectiveness of the whole organization (Campbell, 1977). In his discussion of the various goal-based models, Cunningham (1977) concluded by stating that the ultimate choice of approach was dependent upon the information needed by the decision-makers and type of organizational problem.

The difficulties in determining and measuring an organization's goals have been summarized in a paper by Steers (1975). He recognizes the existence of multiple and often conflicting goals and proposes an "operative goals approach". He cites Etzioni regarding a definition of the operative goals approach: "the capacity of an organization to use its resources successfully toward specific ends" (1975:555). This approach is not based on static official goals. Instead, it identifies the actual behavioural intentions of an organization and allows for the differential weighting of identified evaluation criteria, to reflect the different valences attached to each goal. Steers (1975) recommended that, in future, researchers should consider the weighting

of effectiveness criteria as well as a more flexible contingency approach to the measurement of effectiveness. He proposed that "goal would allow the needed flexibility for criteria changes over time (1975:356). Furthermore, in his 1976 paper, Steers again emphasized that effectiveness cannot be universally defined or measured in terms of a static set of variables. This position has been supported by such researchers as Campbell (1977) and Cameron (1978). Two implications were presented as a result of his analysis. Steers concluded that the concept of organizational effectiveness was best understood in terms of a continuous process rather than an end state and that the recognition of contingencies in the analysis of organizational effectiveness was a central theme (1976:62).

SYSTEM RESOURCE APPROACH

The systems theory perspective focuses on the effective operation of the organization as a whole through an appraisal of four systemic processes and their interrelationships: inputs, transformations (subsystems), outputs and feedback (Evan, 1976:195). Pennings and Goodman describe the systems approach as one in which "organizations are seen as open systems having exchange relationships with their environment and with subsystems that render a contribution to the whole and to each other, show some degree of interdependence and display some structural arrangement that tunes them in to each other and to the environment" (1977:148). Among the researchers that have reinforced this approach are: Yuchtman and Seashore (1967); Friedlander and Pickle (1968); Schein (1972); Katz and Kahn (1978).

Generally, systems theorists assume organizational effectiveness to be a multi-dimensional construct. The organization is seen to be comprised of interdependent subsystems which work together to receive input from the environment and provide output which meet environmental needs (Strasser et al, 1981). Criteria for the measurement of effectiveness must then reflect the major systems components of an organization. The system resource model was introduced by Yuchtman and Seashore (1967). These researchers defined an organization's effectiveness in terms of the bargaining position that was attained between competing organizations and measured by their respective abilities to exploit the environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources.

Friedlander and Pickle (1968) explored the concept of total organizational effectiveness by studying the relationship between internal and external system effectiveness. Their results indicated that organizations found it difficult, although necessary, to meet the major needs of both the employees and the larger society. Schein (1977) viewed an organization's effectiveness in light of its ability to survive, adapt and grow, regardless of the particular function it fulfills. He emphasized the need to use multiple criteria in the measurement of organizational effectiveness.

One study which related the system resource approach to sport administration was conducted by Neill (1983). Her research developed a descriptive/analytical model for National Sport Governing Bodies based on systems theory to aid in the understanding of NSGBs as organizations and their relationship with the environment. After a review of

the documented policies and procedures of fifteen NSGBs, Neill outlined a series of recommendations for NSGBs to assist them in improving their organizational functions and interactions with the environment. Among her recommendations, Neill emphasized that: "NSGBs should attempt to identify and to describe uncertainties which exist within their task environment and identify the impact which these uncertainties have on their goal attainment" (1983:113). Neill supported the use of "boundary spanners", individuals who act as links between the organization and the environment, to ensure that information from the NSGB environment was brought into the organization to assist in decision-making and goal attainment.

Additionally, it was recommended that NSGBs attempt to find financial resources other than the federal government to "reduce their dependence on the federal government" (1983:114). It was also recommended that NSGBs undertake needs assessments as part of program planning and evaluate programs to ensure feedback from the environment. In her recommendations for future research, Neill (1983) supported the need to develop evaluation instruments to empirically study the relationships between NSGBs and their environment. This study has developed an evaluation instrument and solicited feedback from key external constituent groups.

Supporters of the systems approach de-emphasize the goal based definition of effectiveness and emphasize the importance of all systems processes. Although all researchers agree that the construct is multi-dimensional and multiple assessment criteria must be used, little agreement seems to exist as to which systems processes should

be consistently employed in the measurement of effectiveness. Nor does there seem to be any clear indication as to the best measurement techniques given the uniqueness of organizations and their environments.

INTEGRATED GOAL-SYSTEM RESOURCE APPROACH

Several theorists have attempted to integrate the goal and system resource models and although each have different approaches, all agree that the use of goals as a dimension of organizational effectiveness cannot be avoided (Mott, 1972; Steers, 1976; Campbell, 1977; Strasser et al, 1981; Hoy and Miskel, 1982; Jobson and Schneck, 1982). It is assumed, therefore, that the use of operationalized organizational goals are essential to the measurement of organizational effectiveness and should be used as one measure of effectiveness in conjunction with the systems processes.

Mott described effective organizations as "those that produce more and higher quality outputs and adapt more effectively to environmental and internal problems than do other, similar organizations" (1972:17). His criteria for the measurement of effectiveness addressed not only the productivity of the organization but its adaptability and flexibility.

In the description of his goal optimization model, Steers (1976) emphasized that his model focused on the process of becoming effective, given the particular operative goals of an organization, rather than specifying criteria of effectiveness. As a result of his re-

search, he concluded that "the concept of organizational effectiveness is best understood in terms of a continuous process rather than an end state" and that "managers have a continuing responsibility to recognize environmental changes..." (1976:62).

Campbell (1977) identified thirty different criteria of effectiveness. Although he felt that the goal approach might have been the one to pursue at that time, he pointed out that ultimately the research of goal and systems analysts should tend to converge. The goal-oriented analyst seeking to explain the organization's success or lack thereof in meeting its goals would soon have to investigate the systems variables, and vice versa.

Strasser et al (1981) acknowledged that in some systems research, the use of goal criteria should not be avoided, but used as one in a series of equally important criteria. Strasser viewed the goal and systems approaches as a continuum, bounded at one end by a pure goal model and on the other by a pure systems model. These researchers rationalized their continuum and its boundaries by recognizing that different categories of models exist for assessing organizational effectiveness; that positions along the continuum differ according to differences in criteria and that the application and continuum end points were affected by the pre-determined sets of patterns associated with those two defining dimensions.

Hoy and Miskel stated that within the integrated approach "goals become more diverse and dynamic; they are not static, ultimate states, but are subject to change over time" (1982:324). These authors reinforced the need to utilize goals as a measure of effectiveness but not

to the exclusion of criteria related to an organization's ability to adapt and its optimization of other processes such as decision-making and communication.

Jobson and Schneck (1982) in their research, defined effectiveness under the goal view of organizations, in that, it is the degree to which the organization attains its end states or outcomes. They recognized, however, that because each type of organization has "a relatively unique set of goals, functional specializations, organizational characteristics and environmental conditions, it also will have a relatively unique set of effectiveness criteria" (1982:28). These authors also noted that the acquisition of resources is based on the goals that the organization is trying to achieve, thus linking major aspects of both the goal and systems approaches in their research.

Frisby (1983) outlined four purposes for her research on NSGBs. One of them was most relevant for this study and addressed a number of structural variables to determine the extent to which indices of goal and systems models of organizational effectiveness were interrelated in amateur sport organizations. The author collected data from twenty-nine executive directors of Olympic Sports using a questionnaire. As secondary resources, she reviewed administrative and technical profiles of these sports. She found that both goal and systems models were complementary tools in the measurement of organizational effectiveness and that the acquisition of financial resources by the sport association was positively associated with the attainment of organizational objectives. It was also found that National Sport Governing

Bodies with well documented job descriptions and formalized staff evaluation systems were more likely to have had increased government financial support over a twelve year period (Frisby, 1983:240). Specifically, Frisby (1983) indicated that the following structural variables were most strongly associated with effectiveness measures: job description formalization, personnel centralization, the clerical ratio, paid staff professionalism and paid staff turnover rate. Generally speaking, the study showed that the more National Sport Governing Bodies possess features of bureaucratic structures, the more effective they are at acquiring financial resources and achieving goals of performance excellence.

It seems apparent that the integrated goal-system resource approach is coming closer to the conceptualization of organizational effectiveness as a construct versus one model, definition or set of criteria. However, questions relating to the change in criteria over time, the source of criteria and the perceived effectiveness of organizations based on internal and external constituencies do not appear to have been thoroughly addressed within the ambit of this integrated approach.

CONSTITUENCY APPROACH

The constituency view of effectiveness is one of the most recent approaches to be addressed by researchers. This approach further elaborates on the integrated goal-system resource model, emphasizing the need to acknowledge viewpoints of various constituent groups. One will receive different answers to the question "How well is the

organization doing?" depending upon to whom the question is directed. The constituency approach asks a number of questions: "What constituencies exist in a particular setting? What effectiveness assessments does each now reach? What are the consequences of these assessments?" (Connolly et al, 1980:216). The underlying assumption of all constituency based research is that organizational effectiveness criteria will differ depending upon whose viewpoint is taken into consideration (Steers, 1976; Goodman and Pennings, 1977; Cameron, 1978; Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Reimann, 1982; Mendelow, 1983; Gaertner and Ramnarayan, 1983).

As a conclusion from his analysis, Steers (1976) emphasized not only the importance of measuring the processes of an organization, but underscored the central role that constituencies have in any discussion of effectiveness. Pennings and Goodman have referred to the internal constituencies of an organization and the importance of the "dominant coalition" in their writing. They suggested that the "dominant coalition comprises a direct and indirect representation or cross-section of horizontal constituencies (that is, subunits) and vertical constituencies (such as employers, management, owners or stockholders) with different and possibly competing expectations" (1977: 152). This approach allows input by various groups and individuals within the organization into the identification of effectiveness criteria. Cameron (1978) provided further elaboration of Pennings and Goodman's approach and pointed out that some researchers rely heavily on major decision-makers, while others suggest that administrators or managers should be utilized. Reimann conducted a longitudinal study

on a number of manufacturing companies and demonstrated that the dominant coalition of top organizational decision-makers were able and willing to make "reasonably objective and accurate judgments about the potential effectiveness of their organization" (1982:332).

Other authors have indicated that numerous influential constituencies outside the boundaries of an organization are important in defining its effectiveness. Gaertner and Ramnarayan (1983) proposed a paradigm that was based on an approach which viewed the effectiveness of an organization as its ability to account successfully for its output and operations to its various internal and external constituencies. It was argued that "effectiveness in organizations is not a thing, or a goal, or a characteristic of organizational outputs or behaviours, but rather a state of relations within and among relevant constituencies of the organization" (Gaertner and Ramnarayan 1983:97).

Jobson and Schneck (1982) employed the viewpoints of both internal and external constituencies in their research on the effectiveness of Royal Canadian Mounted Police units in Alberta. They found that "multiple criteria of effectiveness, derived from multiple goals of both internal and external constituents, create very complex interrelationships among the criteria - relationships that may result in numerous tradeoffs, potential conflict and inconsistencies" (Jobson and Schneck, 1982:43). These researchers concluded that, in practice, to eliminate conflicting demands of constituencies, sequential attention to goals and tradeoffs may assist the organization in meeting the needs of its major constituent groups. Dubin (1976) also referenced the tradeoffs that are often required between the internal and exter-

nal constituent groups of an organization in its pursuit of effectiveness. He proposed a strategy for managers in business organizations to assist them in making decisions about whose effectiveness goals to address. In his proposed strategy, Dubin emphasized that depending upon whether one was an internal or an external constituent, the means of measuring effectiveness could be quite different and, in many cases, the views of both groups would have to be taken into account simultaneously (1976:12).

Mendelow (1983) defined effectiveness as the extent to which organizations are able to meet societal demands. Given this position, the author stated that in order to be effective, an organization must first determine who its stakeholders are and then determine the outputs desired by those stakeholders. This researcher felt that explicit formulation of stakeholder effectiveness criteria was crucial for three reasons: to aid in exposing underlying assumptions of different constituent groups; to enable prioritization of outputs for the achievement of effectiveness and to determine the effects which changes in stakeholder outputs over time will have on existing or future strategies of the organization (Mendelow, 1983:71). Mendelow (1983) also stressed the importance of recognizing those stakeholders such as government agencies who occupy regulatory positions relative to the organization but outside the organization.

Research on organizational effectiveness and sport-related organizations has been very limited. The sport-related research that has been completed recognized the importance of identifying constitu-

ent groups. Chelladurai et al (1981) used a sample of university students and identified eleven sets of effectiveness criteria for inter-collegiate athletic programs. The authors noted that if the sample constituent group had been decision-makers, different sets of effectiveness criteria may have been identified. Hansen (1983) theorized that if agreement or concordance existed on the priorities of a sport organization among identified key constituent groups holding similar goals, then both the organization and the environment would benefit.

Szyszlo (1984) obtained information from the volunteer and professional administrators of both Olympic and Non-Olympic NSGBs to determine if their perceptions of what constituted effectiveness were congruent. A six dimensional NSGB effectiveness scale was developed to identify the relative emphasis placed on the dimensions of NSGB effectiveness. The scale consists of the following dimensions: input-human resources, input-monetary resources, throughput-mass, throughput-elite, output-mass and output-elite (Szyszlo, 1984).

Based on the analysis of his data, Szyszlo found that the volunteer and professional administrators of both Olympic and Non-Olympic NSGBs were congruent in their perceptions of what constitutes effectiveness. The effectiveness model envisioned by the NSGB administrators was seen to be multidimensional with input-human resources, throughput-mass, throughput-elite and output-elite as the four most important effectiveness dimensions.

Szyszlo (1984) also found that accessing multiple sources of monetary input was not considered by administrators to be a factor important to the effectiveness of a NSGB. Administrators did agree

that effectiveness was related to meeting organizational goals as they addressed both mass participation and elite sport activities; however, they did not consider the output-mass dimension as one of the most important measures of effectiveness (Szyszlo 1984:68). The author concluded his paper by emphasizing that the "model of effectiveness envisaged by the NSGB administrators is "complex" and "clearly multi-dimensional" (Szyszlo 1984:69). Szyszlo's (1984) recommendations have been addressed in the present study: the need to investigate the effectiveness perceptions of external constituencies, particularly Fitness and Amateur Sport and the need to recognize the situationality of effectiveness criteria in developing organizations.

Researchers of the constituency approach have realized that a high level of effectiveness from one point of view may be interpreted as low effectiveness from the perspective of another constituency (Connolly et al, 1980; Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Cameron and Whetten, 1983). Connolly et al employed a multiple-constituency approach in their research and stated that "no surprise is engendered by the discovery that stockholders, senior managers, employee unions and customers espouse divergent views of what the organization's goals should be" (1980:216). Kanter and Brinkerhoff (1981) fully supported the multiple constituency approach, but argued that to simply acknowledge that there are many viewpoints is not enough. They concluded that the search for objective standards to measure the effectiveness of organizations was no longer a tenable approach: "Multiple constituencies and multiple environments require multiple measures" (1981:344).

In their most recent text, Cameron and Whetten (1983) have suggested that research guidelines be used to assist in clarifying the parameters of future organizational effectiveness research. These authors do not advocate the use of one approach over another, but emphasize that whereas each approach "is valuable in its own right because it includes distinctions absent in the others, none has enough explanatory power to supercede other approaches" (1983:7-8). The assumptions, strengths and weaknesses of any approach must be clearly defined for the purposes of evaluating the approach utilized and identifying the parameters of the research to facilitate the comparison of different approaches. "Multiple perspectives (models) are required to understand organizational effectiveness, but the result of these multiple perspectives must be recorded in relationship to one another" (Cameron and Whetten, 1983:20). In other words, it is the position of these researchers that different models, be they goal based or systems based may be useful in effectiveness studies as long as the perspective is clearly defined, providing a framework for comparative research.

Several other researchers have directly or indirectly provided support for the multiple models perspective. Hoy and Miskel (1982) supported the use of the integrated goal and system resource model and expanded this approach by taking into account the additional dimensions of time, organizational level, multiple constituencies and multiple criteria. They proposed that a modified version of Parsons' model could be employed to help in the selection of specific organizational effectiveness indicators. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) utilized

an expert panel to study Campbell's (1977) list of thirty indices of organizational effectiveness. The purpose of the first stage of the judgement task was to reduce the list of effectiveness criteria to contain only singular constructs pertaining to performance evaluations of organizational units. The second stage of the study asked experts to make judgements about the similarity between every possible pairing of the seventeen criteria not eliminated in the first stage. This resulted in the presentation of a framework comprised of four models: human relations, internal process, rational goal and open system. Each model has its own set of organizational effectiveness criteria and a particular set of values attached to those criteria. The authors concluded that their multiple models concept provided an overall framework to guide subsequent efforts at organizational assessment.

Goodman et al (1983) discussed the multiple models perspective from a different vantage point. They stated that there should be a general moratorium on "overall" studies of organizational effectiveness and that in-depth micro-studies of organizational outcomes are needed to correct the deficiencies and lack of theoretical convergence in the study of organizational effectiveness. One of the underlying premises for this position is that there is at present "no singular, parsimonious model or theory of organizational effectiveness" (1983: 164) and that, in future, "it is not likely that there will be convergence of a single theory of OE" (1983:165). These writers treated the multiple models perspective as an assumption for their micro-studies approach to organizational effectiveness.

In the presentation of their case for the adoption of the multiple models perspective, Cameron and Whetten (1983) did not present a model, definition or a set of criteria to describe this approach. To do this would have been incongruous with their position and beliefs. They emphasized in their writing that future researchers must spend more time developing standardized guidelines for assessing effectiveness rather than trying to develop unilateral theories of effectiveness. Cameron and Whetten (1983) presented a series of seven guidelines which provide a framework for assessing organizational effectiveness.

The major research questions representing the seven decision guidelines are stated below and detailed descriptions can be found in Appendix A.

Guideline 1: From whose perspective is the effectiveness being judged?

Guideline 2: On what domain of activity is the judgement focused?

Guideline 3: What level of analysis is being used?

Guideline 4: What is the purpose for judging effectiveness?

Guideline 5: What time frame is being employed?

Guideline 6: What type of data are being used for judgements of effectiveness?

Guideline 7: What is the referent against which effectiveness is judged?

These guidelines incorporate the four dimensions suggested by Hoy and Miskel (1982) and further define the parameters for future organi-

zational effectiveness research by addressing domain, purpose, type of data and referent. The implementation of these guiding questions allows researchers to measure organizational effectiveness at a given point in time for stated internal and external constituencies of organizations. It also ensures a clear understanding of the comparability of results.

The aforementioned researchers clearly supported the approach that assessments of organizational effectiveness must be based on the perspectives of key constituent groups such that an organization may be "rated highly effective on various dimensions by its senior management, moderately effective by its customers, and quite ineffective by a government regulatory agency" (Connolly et al, 1980:212). Jobson and Schneck (1982) stated that because effectiveness criteria reflect the self-interest of various groups "a multiplicity of internal and external criteria are needed for a more comprehensive evaluation of organizations" (1982:26). Cameron and Whetten (1983) reinforced these concerns and emphasized the importance of defined research guidelines in future empirical studies on organizational effectiveness.

SUMMARY

In reviewing the most recent literature, it would appear that many researchers have now rejected the notion that any one definition, set of criteria or model can be utilized to describe organizational effectiveness in a universal fashion. Most researchers seem to agree

that organizational effectiveness has both multiple dimensions and criteria, and, its definition is specific both to the type of organization and the individuals comprising the key constituencies internal and external to that organization.

To this point in time; however, the differences in approach have made it difficult if not impossible to replicate completed empirical studies. In addition, although some of the completed research has been helpful in the identification and description of a variety of models, multiple models guidelines for the application of effectiveness criteria have not been utilized.

Hoy and Miskel reiterated the need to employ "a more comprehensive theoretical formulation for guiding future research efforts" (1982:327). These authors cited studies that have attempted to use a variety of approaches in the assessment of effectiveness but recognized, as did Cameron and Whetten (1983), that few if any studies have identified and addressed the guidelines considered critical to ensuring that the research was evaluable and comparable.

Cameron and Whetten (1983) stressed the necessity of employing a multiple models perspective in any future research. These researchers emphasized that multiple conceptualizations of organizations (versus a universal model), unbounded construct space (versus a single definition) and an absence of consensual criteria (versus one set of criteria) are central to future organizational effectiveness research.

In organizational effectiveness studies, different attempts to map the terrain have mostly been recorded with no consideration given to how they relate to one another. Isolated assessments have been the norm, and theoretical treatises

have generally attempted to replace rather than to add to one another...Multiple perspectives (models) are required to understand organizational effectiveness, but the result of these multiple perspectives must be recorded in relationship to one another. In this manner, a cumulative literature mapping this construct space can be developed. (Cameron and Whetten 1983:20)

This study has utilized Cameron and Whetten's research guidelines to assess the effectiveness of a sample of NSGBs in the administrative domain. Six variables have been identified and defined based on a review of the literature (see Table 1). The constituency approach has been employed, focusing this research on the similarities and differences in perceived effectiveness by key stakeholders.

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Empirical studies to date have not systematically utilized Cameron and Whetten's (1983) decision guidelines to identify organizational effectiveness criteria for NSGBs. Specifically, the guidelines highlight the importance of clearly identifying information relating to the developmental stage of the organization and the type (internal versus external) of constituent groups to be studied.

Szyszlo (1984) recommended that future research be longitudinally based to assess possible changes in effectiveness criteria over time; however, he did not investigate the relationship between the developmental stage of the organization and relevant effectiveness indicators in his study. Frisby (1983) also referenced the need to consider the developmental stages of organizations in effectiveness research.

TABLE 1

DEFINITIONS OF SELECTED VARIABLES AND SUPPORTING REFERENCES

Variable	Operational Definition	References
Adaptability	the ability of an organization to change its standard operating procedures in response to environmental changes	Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum (1957); Bennis (1962); Price (1968; Mott (1972); Campbell (1977); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983)
Communication	the ability of an organization to communicate information in a complete, efficient and accurate manner to all constituent groups	Schein (1970); Campbell (1977); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983)
Finance	the ability of an organization to acquire and manage multiple funding sources	Frisby (1983); Szyszlo (1984)
Growth	the ability of the organization to increase its human and physical resources	Katz & Kahn (1966); Child (1974, 1975); Campbell (1977); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983)
Human Resources	the ability of the organization to attract, maintain and improve administrators (paid and volunteer)	Campbell (1977); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983); Frisby (1983)
Organizational Planning	the ability of an organization to plan, implement and monitor all ongoing and future activities	Georgopoulos & Mann (1957); Campbell (1977); Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983)

Through the use of the Cameron and Whetten's (1983) guidelines, the present research has controlled for developmental stage. Further implications about effectiveness and its relationship with the organization's life cycle have been presented in the discussion section of this paper.

Many researchers have recommended that organizational effectiveness research investigate the environment and the differences in perception of internal and external constituent groups (Steers, 1976; Goodman and Pennings, 1977; Cameron, 1978; Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Reimann, 1982; Mendelow, 1983; Gaertner and Ramnarayan, 1983; Neill, 1983; Szyszlo, 1984). However, little of this research has been empirically based, and those researchers such as Cameron (1978) and Szyszlo (1984) who have done applied studies, focus only on internal constituent groups. The present study has addressed the differences in perceived effectiveness between internal and external constituencies of NSGBs.

In addition to those problems identified in the literature regarding the measurement of organizational effectiveness, this research has provided sport administrators with further information in evaluating their own organizations. In the past there has not been a great deal of concern on the part of either NSGB administrators or the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch of the federal government about sport organizations justifying their programs and showing evidence that government contribution funds are being utilized effectively. The majority of NSGBs receive over half of their annual budgets from Fitness and Amateur Sport, specifically Sport Canada. Due to severe fiscal

constraints and cutbacks by the federal government in recent years, funding is no longer allocated as due process, or based on historical precedent. More recently, the importance of addressing the administrative as well as the technical needs of national sport organizations has been recognized by Sport Canada in a Cabinet document "Fitness and Amateur Sport in the 80's: A Challenge to the Nation" where it was stated:

A number of assumptions have been derived from observations of the current state of affairs related to the administrative elements in the business of national level amateur sport. These assumptions lead to the conclusion that if the federal government is committed to the development of excellence in sport, it must be committed to aiding and encouraging competent, effective administration (1981:9).

The pressure being brought to bear on Sport Canada is being passed along to its national sport clients. At the present time, the majority of NSGBs are dependent on Sport Canada funds to maintain their administrative structures. Clear statements of organizational mandates and evidence of planning and evaluation measures are required prior to any consideration being given to the requests for funding (Sport Canada Contributions Program, 1984-85). National sport administrators are attempting to respond to the demands for increased accountability not only from the federal government but also from corporate sponsors by undertaking such activities as strategic planning, organizational assessment and program evaluations. The present research has provided sport administrators with a number of specific indicators of effectiveness that may be useful in their respective organizational assessments.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study utilized a constituency approach and identified criteria which influenced the organizational effectiveness of NSGBs. Key stakeholders from within the organization and external constituent groups with major financial control were surveyed and the differences in perceived effectiveness have been identified and compared.

The specific purposes of this research were:

- (1) to identify organizational effectiveness variables relevant to the administrative domain of National Sport Governing Bodies;
- (2) to empirically test these variables using a sample of NSGBs;
- (3) to identify the perceived differences in organizational effectiveness among the five constituent groups;
- (4) to identify the perceived differences in organizational effectiveness between the internal and external constituent groupings.

Answers to the following research questions were addressed:

- What are the indicators of organizational effectiveness for NSGBs within the administrative domain?
- What similarities and differences exist in the perceived organizational effectiveness within the administrative domain of NSGBs among identified constituency groups?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Based on the literature review of organizational effectiveness and the author's experience in the sport administration field, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. There will be no significant differences among the five constituent groups for the six organizational effectiveness variables in the administrative domain.
2. There will be no significant differences between internal and external constituent groups for the six organizational effectiveness variables in the administrative domain.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS AND GUIDELINES

For the purposes of this study, the following operational definitions and guidelines were defined.

1. Organizational Definitions

1.1 Organizational Effectiveness

For the purposes of this study, organizational effectiveness was defined as the ability of the NSGB to acquire and utilize human, physical and financial resources to accomplish its objectives and accommodate the needs of its major constituents.

1.2 Executive Director

An Executive Director within a NSGB may be identified by a variety of titles such as director general, general manager or chief executive officer. Regardless of the title, this

individual is responsible for all the day-to-day administrative activities of the NSGB. The Executive Director is generally responsible for the supervision of activities of all other NSGB employees and reports to the President.

1.3 President

The President has the ultimate decision-making authority within the NSGB and is responsible for the effective use of all human and financial resources. The President is a volunteer and is generally in office for a minimum two year term.

1.4. National Coach

The National Coach is employed by the NSGB to oversee the training and competitive needs of all national team athletes. The National Coach is responsible for ensuring that the athletes' needs are addressed by the President and other executive and staff members. There are both men's and women's national team coaches within some NSGBs.

1.5 Sport Canada Consultant

Those Sport Canada (federal government) staff that consult on a regular basis with those NSGBs in the sample for this study were identified. Consultants, through the course of their daily work with NSGB volunteers and staff have considerable influence on the management of NSGB resources.

1.6 Corporate Sponsor

Corporate Sponsors are those non-governmental corporations or agencies that have made significant financial contribu-

tions to NSGBs based on assurances of sound administrative and financial practices by the NSGB. Representatives of those major corporations who have been involved with one or more NSGBs for a minimum period of two years and whose annual contributions exceeded \$100,000 per year were included in this study.

2. Guidelines

2.1 Constituencies

The viewpoints of three internal and two external constituencies relevant to NSGBs were researched in this study. Constituencies were selected based on their knowledge of, participation in and influence on the management of the NSGB.

2.2 Domain

NSGBs have three major areas of activity or domains. The high performance domain includes those activities and programs specific to the production of elite athletes. The participation domain includes those activities and programs designed to increase the number of participants in the sport. The administrative domain includes those activities which are undertaken to acquire and develop the human and physical resources necessary to ensure organizational health through sound administrative practices and financial security.

The administrative domain as defined is the supporting structure for all programs that the NSGB undertakes in conjunction with its organizational objectives. The organizational effectiveness of a number of NSGBs within the administrative domain has been assessed in this study.

2.3 Level of Analysis

This study focused on the organizational level of analysis for a sample of National Sport Governing Bodies.

2.4 Purpose

- To identify organizational effectiveness variables relevant to the administrative domain of NSGBs.
- To empirically test these variables using a sample of NSGBs.
- To identify the perceived differences in organizational effectiveness among the five constituent groups.
- To identify the perceived differences in organizational effectiveness between the internal and external constituent groups.

2.5 Time Frame

The research was completed within the 1984-85 fiscal year.

2.6 Type of Data

Perceptual data was utilized in this study.

2.7 Referent

NSGB effectiveness was evaluated using a static set of characteristics. The sample population was asked to judge the importance of a series of criterion statements in describing NSGB operations.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of this study have been outlined, for the most part, by the research guidelines. It should be emphasized, however, that the researcher has investigated criteria of organizational effectiveness within one domain of the sample of NSGBs. To obtain an overall measure of effectiveness, the high performance and participation domains must also be evaluated.

Further, although the researcher has attempted to control for the developmental stage of the sample of NSGBs, there may be factors associated with the level of development of organizations within the sample population that limit the interpretation of the results of this study.

2

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

GENERAL DESIGN

This study employed survey methodology for the collection of perceptual data on organizational effectiveness within the administrative domain from five NSGB constituent groups. Survey methodology was used for this research because it was deemed to be the most expedient way of collecting perceptual data from a relatively large group of people living in different regions of Canada. Time and cost factors inhibited the use of an interview format. In addition, the use of the mailed questionnaire was not an imposition on the potential respondents if they did not wish to complete the instrument (Alreck and Settle, 1985).

SAMPLE

The sample consisted of National Sport Governing Bodies recognized by Sport Canada who have maintained a national office at the National Sport and Recreation Centre for a minimum of eight years. Thirty-three NSGBs met this criterion. See Appendix B for a listing of NSGBs included in the study.

Five constituent groups were identified for inclusion in the survey sample. They represented individuals inside and outside the NSGB that had a major impact on whether or not the NSGB was able to function effectively within its administrative domain. The internal constituencies were identified as: the executive directors (N=31) employed by the NSGB, the volunteer presidents (N=33) of the NSGB and the national coaches (N=47). External constituencies were identified as those Sport Canada consultants (N=14) associated with the sample of NSGBs and representatives from corporate sponsors (N=15) who had provided financial assistance to NSGBs within the sample.

IDENTIFICATION OF VARIABLES

A review of the literature on organizational effectiveness was conducted and organizational effectiveness variables that had been used in empirical research and were appropriate for non-profit organizations were identified earlier. Based on the literature, both sport and non-sport related, and the experience of the researcher in her seven-year tenure with Fitness and Amateur Sport, six variables of organizational effectiveness for NSGBs in the administrative domain were selected. The selected variables were: adaptability, communication, finance, growth, human resources and organizational planning (refer to Table 1).

INSTRUMENTATION

A questionnaire was developed for the collection of perceptual data from the identified internal and external constituent groups. The instrument was tested for validity and reliability prior to its distribution to the sample.

Validity Testing

A panel of ten sport administration experts was identified to assist in the two phases of validity testing. Judges or experts are often used in validity testing (Smith, 1975). The consensus of the experts, be it high or low on a given variable, demonstrates the predictive ability of the instrument. A list of the criteria used in the selection of experts can be found in Appendix C. An expert review criterion rating scale was designed and personally distributed to the ten experts with a detailed explanation of the purposes of the study and the validity testing. The purpose of phase one was to establish the validity of the 38 items as indicators of the six organizational effectiveness variables previously identified. After receiving responses from all experts, follow-up interviews were conducted by the researcher to discuss the rationale for each response and to identify any additions, deletions or modifications to the criterion statement list. A copy of the expert review criterion rating scale (Part 1) has been included in Appendix D along with a summary of the responses for each item. All items with a total point score of less than fifteen

out of a possible thirty points were modified based on feedback from the experts. Seven additional items were added based on the consensus of two or more experts.

The purpose of the second phase of the validity testing was to ensure that each item or statement related primarily to one of the six identified variables, thereby confirming the proposed categorization of the researcher. A second expert review instrument was designed and mailed to the experts (see Appendix E). Experts were asked to match each of the thirty-eight criterion items with one of the six identified variables of organizational effectiveness. The operational definitions for the six variables were provided.

Eight of the ten experts were able to participate in phase two. If at least fifty percent of the experts agreed on the matching of a statement to a variable, the item was deemed acceptable. If less than fifty percent of the experts agreed on any match, the item was rejected or revised based on further discussion with the experts. Twenty-four of the thirty-six acceptable items received a minimum eighty-eight percent agreement rating by the panel. Two items were rejected, seven were modified and the remainder were retained. Table 2 provides a summary of the results of the validity testing.

Reliability Testing

Based on the results of the validity testing, a questionnaire was drafted for use in the test-retest reliability testing process. The

45
TABLE 2

VALIDITY TESTING: SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF EXPERT REVIEW

Variable	Item	Agreement Among Experts(%)	Retain	Revise	Reject	Comments
Adaptability	1	88	x			
	7	100	x			
	13	88	x			
	19	88	x			
Communication	3	75	x			
	9	100	x			
	15	100	x			
	21	100	x			
	26	100	x			
	31	100	x			
	34	88	x			
	36	88	x			
Finance	6	100	x			
	12	38		x		• word misleading revised & simplified
	18	63	x			
	24	63		x		• clarified wording
	29	88	x			
	33	63		x		• clarified wording
Growth	2	75	x			
	8	50		x		
	14	38		x		
	20	n/a			x	• duplicate question
	25	63		x		
	30	63		x		
Human Resources	4	88	x			
	10	88	x			
	16	100	x			
	22	100	x			
	27	75	x			
	32	100	x			
	35	88	x			
	37	88	x			
	38	63	x			
Organizational Planning	5	88	x			
	11	88	x			
	17	88	x			
	23	100	x			
	28	13			x	• deemed not relevant for NSGBs

instrument consisted of thirty-six criterion statements that had been identified and deemed acceptable by the expert panel. Each respondent was asked to indicate their response to each of the statements by checking off a box on a five-point Likert scale. Response alternatives ranged from "not at all important" to "essential" on a one-to-five point scale. The Likert scale has been used by Mott (1972) and Jobson and Schneck (1982) in their organizational effectiveness research. The scale is most appropriately used when measuring intensity of feeling and is highly reliable when it comes to an ordering of people with regard to a particular attitude (Miller, 1977:89).

A cover letter, instructions and the questionnaire (see Appendix F) were mailed to forty-seven professional staff members of national sport organizations housed in the National Sport and Recreation Centre in Ottawa. These individuals were selected based on their knowledge of NSCB operations and their accessibility to the researcher. The reliability subjects were not part of the final survey sample. Three weeks later, the questionnaire was again mailed to the forty-seven individuals for retest purposes.

Complete test-retest data was received from twenty-nine respondents and Pearson correlations were computed for each of the six variables. Cronbach (1970) suggested that anything greater than .50 is acceptable for group scores in a research setting. All six variable scores were statistically significant at the .05 level. A summary of the correlation results is shown in Table 3. Based on the results of the correlational analysis, no changes were made to the survey questionnaire.

TABLE 3
RESULTS OF RELIABILITY TEST-RETEST

Variable	Test/Retest Pearson Correlation Coefficient (N=29)
Adaptability	.47*
Communication	.74
Finance	.83
Growth	.85
Human Resources	.77
Organizational Planning	.70

* Due to the low coefficient, results for the adaptability variable should be interpreted with caution.

Subscale Analysis

A post-hoc subscale analysis was conducted on the 36 item questionnaire. The analysis involved both item-total correlations and computations of internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha). Item-total correlations are correlations of each criterion statement with the sums of the other statements specific to that variable scale, and with each of the sums of statements describing the other five variable scales.

The results of the item-total correlations showed that each of the six scales was internally consistent (see Table 4). In two scales, finance and growth, one item had a low correlation with other items in the scale, depressing the values of alpha. In the finance scale, if item 12 was omitted, the alpha value would increase from .68 to .74. Similarly in the growth scale, if item 14 was omitted, the alpha value would increase from .60 to .68. In future work with this instrument, items 12 and 14 could be discarded.

The total scale was found to be internally consistent reflected by the total alpha scale score of .84, indicating that all indicators are measuring the organizational effectiveness of the administrative domain for the sample of NSGBs.

Procedures

The questionnaire along with a cover letter, instruction sheet and a stamped self-addressed envelope was mailed to each of the 140

49
TABLE 4

ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATIONS FOR THE THIRTY-SIX ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale	Items	Item-Scale	Scale Alpha
Adaptability	1	.57	
	7	.63	
	13	.49	
	19	.64	
			.78
Communications	3	.31	
	9	.39	
	15	.33	
	20	.40	
	25	.42	
	29	.56	
	32	.48	
	34	.29	
			.71
Finance	6	.56	
	12	.06	
	18	.50	
	23	.39	
	27	.49	
	31	.47	
			.68
Growth	2	.43	
	8	.45	
	14	.09	
	24	.37	
	28	.52	
			.60
Human Resources	4	.42	
	10	.42	
	16	.56	
	21	.51	
	26	.50	
	30	.46	
	33	.42	
	35	.52	
	36	.58	
			.80
Organizational Planning	5	.43	
	11	.55	
	17	.68	
	22	.62	
			.77
Total scale alpha			.84

*value of alpha if item is deleted.

subjects. The questionnaire package has been included in Appendix G. Duplicate follow-up packages were mailed to all subjects two weeks following the initial mailing.

Statistical Analysis

To test the first research hypothesis, analysis of variance was chosen to determine differences among the five constituent groups (Executive Directors, Presidents, National Coaches, Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor Representatives) for each of the six organizational effectiveness variables. ANOVA was selected for use in this study based on three assumptions: (1) that the variables were measured at the interval level using the Likert scale; (2) that the variance between the groups was approximately equal; (3) that the underlying populations were normal. Newman-Keuls tests were used to determine significant differences.

To test the second research hypothesis, t-tests were used to investigate the nature of the differences between internal (Executive Directors, Presidents and National Coaches) and external (Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor Representatives) constituent groups for each of the six organizational effectiveness variables.

As a post hoc procedure it was decided to investigate the differences within groups. Analysis of variance with repeated measures was performed on each of the six variables for the five constituent groups. Newman-Keuls tests were used to determine significant differences.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

A total of 140 questionnaires was distributed to the five identified groups. One hundred and five questionnaires were completed and returned, constituting a seventy-five percent response rate. The respective percentage returns for each grouping were: Executive Directors eighty-seven percent, Presidents seventy-nine percent, National Coaches sixty-eight percent, Corporate Sponsor Representatives forty percent and Sport Canada Consultants one hundred percent. The first three groupings together comprised the internal constituent group; the latter two groupings comprised the external constituency.

The results of the five-group analysis have been reported first, followed by the results of the two group analysis. Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations for the five group analysis and Table 6 outlines the descriptive statistics for the two group analysis. The post hoc analysis of the within group variance has been summarized in Table 13.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA

In an examination of Table 5, it is evident that, with one exception, the variables of organizational planning, finance and communication were ranked as the top three for all five groups. Sport Canada

TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FIVE GROUPS BY VARIABLE

Variable	Presidents n=26 (S.D.)	Executive Directors n=27 (S.D.)	National Coaches n=32 (S.D.)	Corporate Sponsors n=6 (S.D.)	Sport Canada n=14 (S.D.)
Adaptability	3.5 (0.8)	3.6 (0.7)	3.6 (0.7)	3.4 (0.8)	3.5 (0.8)
Communication	3.9 (0.6)	3.8 (0.5)	3.9 (0.4)	3.8 (0.5)	3.6 (0.5)
Finance	4.0 (0.5)	4.0 (0.5)	3.9 (0.6)	3.5 (0.4)	3.4 (0.6)
Growth	3.2 (0.6)	3.2 (0.5)	3.3 (0.8)	2.8 (0.7)	2.7 (0.4)
Human Resources	3.7 (0.7)	3.4 (0.6)	3.5 (0.6)	3.5 (0.4)	3.5 (0.6)
Organizational Planning	4.0 (0.7)	3.7 (0.6)	3.8 (0.6)	4.3 (0.4)	3.8 (0.8)

Consultants were the exception, replacing the finance variable with adaptability and human resources, both with means of 3.5.

Organizational planning was rated as the top criterion by Presidents (tied with finance), Corporate Sponsor Representatives and Sport Canada Consultants. Finance was rated highest by Executive Directors, Presidents (tied with planning) and National Coaches (tied with communication).

The growth variable received the lowest rating across all groups. Adaptability and human resources, with the exception of the Sport Canada group, occupied the mid-range ratings.

In an examination of Table 6, the finance variable received the highest mean score from the internal constituent group while organizational planning was rated as the top criterion by the external group. Both gave the communication variable the second highest mean score. The growth variable received the lowest rating from both constituent groups.

HYPOTHESIS ONE: FIVE GROUP ANALYSIS

Data were tested for equality of variance using Bartlett's χ^2 calculations. As presented in Table 7, no significant differences in variance were found among the five groups on five of the six variables confirming the appropriate use of ANOVA. A significant difference was

TABLE 6

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL GROUPS

Variable	Internal n=85 (S.D.)	External n=20 (S.D.)
Adaptability	3.6 (0.7)	3.5 (0.8)
Communication	3.9 (0.5)	3.7 (0.5)
Finance	4.0 (0.5)	3.4 (0.6)
Growth	3.2 (0.7)	2.7 (0.5)
Human Resources	3.5 (0.6)	3.4 (0.5)
Organizational Planning	3.8 (0.7)	4.0 (0.7)

TABLE 7
BARTLETT'S CHI-SQUARE TEST OF EQUALITY OF VARIANCE

Variable	χ^2	p
Adaptability	1.44	n.s.
Communication	1.58	n.s.
Finance	2.62	n.s.
Growth	11.51	<.02
Human Resources	1.85	n.s.
Organizational Planning	2.98	n.s.

found for the growth variable; however, ANOVA is considered sufficiently robust for minor variations (Blalock, 1964). The coefficients of skewness for each variable have been presented in Table 8, confirming the normality of the underlying populations.

The first research hypothesis predicted that there would be no significant differences among the five constituent groups for the six organizational effectiveness variables in the administrative domain. The null hypothesis was not rejected for four of the six variables (Table 9). Differences in the means among the five constituent groups were not significant for the following variables: adaptability, communication, human resources and organizational planning.

The null hypothesis was rejected for the growth and finance variables. Significant differences ($p < .05$) were found among the five constituent groups: Executive Directors, Presidents, National Coaches, Corporate Sponsor Representatives and Sport Canada Consultants. Post-hoc analyses using Neuman-Keuls were performed and have been displayed in Table 10.

HYPOTHESIS TWO: TWO GROUP ANALYSIS

The second research hypothesis predicted that there would be no significant differences between the internal and external constituent groups for selected organizational effectiveness variables in the administrative domain. The null hypothesis was not rejected for four of

TABLE 8
COEFFICIENTS OF SKEWNESS FOR THE SIX VARIABLES

	Presidents	Executive Directors	National Coaches	Corporate Sponsors	Sport Canada
Adaptability	.25	-.01	-.03	.82	.00
Communication	-.11	-.5	.31	.13	.13
Finance	.24	-.14	-.65	-.44	.08
Growth	-.03	-.03	-.24	.25	-.11
Human Resources	-.02	-.21	-.01	-.53	-.54
Organizational Planning	-.21	-.11	-.45	.7	-.18

Note: The above coefficients indicate that none of the distributions deviate from normality. Values that lie between +1 and -1 do not deviate from normality.

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS FOR EACH VARIABLE
AMONG THE FIVE GROUPS

	df	MS	F	p
Adaptability				
Between Groups	4	0.16		
Within Groups	100	0.54	0.3	n.s.
Communication				
Between Groups	4	0.44		
Within Groups	100	0.25	1.8	n.s.
Finance				
Between Groups	4	1.24		
Within Groups	100	0.30	4.2	$p < .001$
Growth				
Between Groups	4	1.04		
Within Groups	100	0.39	2.6	.05
Human Resources				
Between Groups	4	0.30		
Within Groups	100	0.37	0.8	n.s.
Organizational Planning				
Between Groups	4	0.54		
Within Groups	100	0.44	1.2	n.s.

TABLE 10

POST HOC ANALYSIS OF FINANCE AND GROWTH VARIABLES WITH NEUMAN-KEULS

		Obtained Difference Required Difference for Significance	
Finance			
Means in Rank Order			
Group	Mean		
Presidents	4.0		
Executive Directors	4.0		
National Coaches	3.9		
Corporate Sponsors	3.5		
Sport Canada Consultants	3.4		
Significant Differences			
Group	vs	Group	
Sport Canada Consultants	Presidents	.62	.57
Sport Canada Consultants	Executive Directors	.61	.54
Sport Canada Consultants	National Coaches	.54	.49
Growth			
Means in Rank Order			
Group	Mean		
National Coaches	3.3		
Executive Directors	3.2		
Presidents	3.2		
Corporate Sponsors	2.8		
Sport Canada Consultants	2.7		
Significant Differences			
Group	vs	Group	
Sport Canada Consultants	National Coaches	2.94	2.57
Sport Canada Consultants	Executive Directors	2.39	2.24
Sport Canada Consultants	Presidents	2.38	1.85

Note: In the post hoc analysis of the growth variable, the Corporate Sponsors group did not appear to give significant differences, possibly due to the small sample size (N=6).

the six variables (Table 11). Differences in the means between the internal and external groupings were not significant for the following variables: adaptability, communication, human resources and organizational planning.

The null hypothesis was rejected for the growth and finance variables. Significant differences ($p < .01$) were found between the internal (Executive Directors, Presidents, National Coaches) and external (Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor, Representatives) groupings. In both cases, the means of the internal group were higher than the means of the external group, as shown in Table 11.

ANOVA WITH REPEATED MEASURES

Significant differences were found between the mean scores of the six variables for each of the five constituent groups (Table 12). The means in rank order for each variable as well as the results of the Newman-Keuls analysis have been presented in Table 13.

TABLE 11
ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES OF MEANS BETWEEN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL GROUPS

Variable	Groups		t	p
	Internal $\bar{X}$	External $\bar{X}$		
Adaptability	3.6	3.5	.8	n.s.
Communication	3.9	3.7	1.9	n.s.
Finance	4.0	3.4	4.1	.01
Growth	3.2	2.7	3.2	.01
Human Resources	3.5	3.4	.2	n.s.
Organizational Planning	3.8	4.0	.7	n.s.

d.f. 103

TABLE 12
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX VARIABLES BY GROUP

Group	Adaptability (S.D.)	Communica- tion (S.D.)	Finance (S.D.)	Growth (S.D.)	Human Resources (S.D.)	Organi- zational Planning (S.D.)
Presidents	3.5 (0.8)	3.9 (0.6)	4.0 (0.5)	-3.2 (0.6)	3.7 (0.7)	4.0 (0.7)
Executive Directors	3.6 (0.7)	3.8 (0.5)	4.0 (0.5)	3.2 (0.5)	3.4 (0.6)	3.7 (0.6)
National Coaches	3.6 (0.7)	3.9 (0.4)	3.9 (0.6)	3.3 (0.8)	3.5 (0.6)	3.8 (0.6)
Corporate Sponsors	3.4 (0.8)	3.8 (0.5)	3.5 (0.4)	2.8 (0.7)	3.5 (0.4)	4.3 (0.4)
Sport Canada	3.5 (0.8)	3.6 (0.5)	3.4 (0.6)	2.7 (0.4)	3.5 (0.6)	3.8 (0.6)

TABLE 13

POST HOC ANALYSIS OF THE WITHIN GROUP VARIANCE

		Obtained Difference Required Difference for Significance	
PRESIDENTS			
Variables in Rank Order	Mean		
Organizational Planning	4.0		
Finance	4.0		
Communication	3.9		
Human Resources	3.7		
Adaptability	3.5		
Growth	3.2		
Significant Differences			
Variable	vs	Variable	
Growth		Organizational Planning	.86 .37
Adaptability		Organizational Planning	.53 .35
Growth		Finance	.80 .35
Human Resources		Organizational Planning	.36 .33
Adaptability		Finance	.48 .33
Growth		Communication	.75 .33
Human Resources		Finance	.3 .3
Adaptability		Communication	.43 .3
Growth		Human Resources	.5 .3
Human Resources		Communication	.25 .25
Growth		Adaptability	.33 .25
EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS			
Variables in Rank Order	Mean		
Finance	4.0		
Communication	3.8		
Organizational Planning	3.7		
Adaptability	3.6		
Human Resources	3.4		
Growth	3.2		
Significant Differences			
Variable	vs	Variable	
Human Resources		Finance	.58 .4
Growth		Finance	.79 .4
Growth		Communication	.61 .4
Growth		Organizational Planning	.57 .4
Growth		Adaptability	.44 .4

TABLE 13 continued

			Obtained Difference	Difference Required for Significance
NATIONAL COACHES				
Variables in Rank Order		Mean		
Communication		3.9		
Finance		3.9		
Organizational Planning		3.8		
Adaptability		3.6		
Human Resources		3.5		
Growth		3.3		
Significant Differences				
Variable	vs	Variable		
Human Resources		Communication	.48	.38
Growth		Communication	.66	.38
Human Resources		Finance	.43	.38
Growth		Finance	.61	.38
Growth		Organizational Planning	.53	.38
CORPORATE SPONSORS				
Variables in Rank Order		Mean		
Organizational Planning		4.3		
Communication		3.8		
Finance		3.5		
Human Resources		3.5		
Adaptability		3.4		
Growth		2.8		
Significant Differences				
Variable	vs	Variable		
Growth		Organizational Planning	1.47	1.05
Growth		Communication	1.08	1.05

TABLE 13 continued

		Obtained Difference	Required Difference for Significance
SPORT CANADA CONSULTANTS			
Variables in Rank Order	Mean		
Organizational Planning	3.8		
Communication	3.6		
Adaptability	3.5		
Human Resources	3.5		
Finance	3.4		
Growth	2.7		
Significant Differences			
Variable	vs	Variable	
Growth		Organizational Planning	1.14 .53
Growth		Communication	.86 .53
Growth		Adaptability	.79 .53
Growth		Human Resources	.76 .53
Growth		Finance	.66 .53

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE FIVE CONSTITUENT GROUPS

In the sport-related research of both Frisby (1983) and Szyszlo (1984), finance was investigated as an indicator of organizational effectiveness. Frisby found that there was a positive relationship between increased bureaucratization of the NSGB and increased government financial support. She stated "it appears that the more bureaucratic the NSGB, the more effective it will be with respect to goal attainment and financial resource acquisition" (Frisby 1983:242). Szyszlo (1984), on the other hand, found that NSGB administrators did not consider the acquisition of multiple funding sources to be one of the most important factors in the effectiveness of the NSGB. He attributed this to a low motivation to look for alternative funding given the availability of substantial funding from Fitness and Amateur Sport (1984:67).

Szyszlo's (1984) finding was contrary to the results of the present study and Frisby's (1983) research. Although there could be many explanations for this difference, it may be important to note that Szyszlo's input-monetary resource dimension was represented by only three items in his effectiveness questionnaire, none of which measured government funding support (1984:42). This dimension also had the

lowest internal consistency score of the six dimensional models, which may have had some effect on his results.

In this study, the finance variable was more important to Executive Directors, Presidents and National Coaches than it was to Sport Canada Consultants. The greatest differences in the perceived importance of this variable were between Presidents and Executive Directors ($\bar{x}=4.0$) and Sport Canada Consultants. It would appear that Presidents and Executive Directors consider the ability of the NSGB to acquire and manage funds, from a number of sources including government, to be essential to the effectiveness of the NSGB. As both the President and the Executive Director are responsible for the financial management of the sport governing body, their concern regarding financial stability should not be surprising. One possible explanation for the difference between Szyszlo's research and this study may be the recently raised awareness of NSGB administrators with respect to the importance of their autonomy. In the not so distant past, most NSGBs were content to accept and spend available government funds on a year-to-year basis. Now, as evidenced by this study, NSGBs may be placing greater pressure on themselves to plan and control their finances and to identify additional funding sources. In addition, potential funding agencies are demanding that NSGBs be more accountable for their financial expenditures. Presidents and Executive Directors are now very much involved in developing marketing strategies and financial management systems.

The group of Sport Canada Consultants felt less strongly than Presidents, Executive Directors and National Coaches about the importance of the NSGBs' ability to acquire and manage financial resources. Reasons for this position may be many, but it is conceivable that Sport Canada Staff could be indicating that increased dollars do not necessarily indicate increased effectiveness. From another perspective, it may be the desire of Sport Canada staff to continue their financial control of NSGBs such that they maintain their key stakeholder position of the development of amateur sport in Canada.

Although statistically significant differences were identified among the five groups for the growth variable, it should be noted that it was ranked lowest in importance as an indicator of organizational effectiveness by all five groups. As a result of the rapid growth within most NSGBs over the past ten years, this variable may have been viewed by all constituencies as less important at the particular time this study was undertaken. Greater emphasis was placed on organizational planning, communication and the internal consolidation of activities.

The Sport Canada Consultants' ranking of growth was significantly lower than the other groups. It could be speculated that from their multi-sport perspective, the consultants were more aware of situations where uncontrolled growth had been in fact a detriment to the effectiveness of some sport organizations.

Although no significant differences between the five groups were evidenced for the variables of adaptability, communication, human

resources and organizational planning, all groups deemed these variables to be important in the assessment of organizational effectiveness. The evidence supports the selection of these variables as indicators of organizational effectiveness in the administrative domain. The congruency of opinion may indicate that all the constituent group members agree and recognize the need for the NSGB to communicate with all its constituent groups, attract, maintain and develop its administrators (paid and volunteer) and to plan and evaluate its programs and activities. Further discussion of the relative importance of each variable to each constituent group has been addressed later in this chapter.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CONSTITUENT GROUPS

Few researchers, who have done empirical research in the area of organizational effectiveness, have included data on external constituent groups. However, many researchers have made repeated reference to the need for research that identifies and addresses the perceptions of significant groups of people outside of the organization (Jobson and Schneck, 1982; Gaertner and Ramnarayan 1983; Mendelow 1983; Cameron and Whetten, 1983). Szyszlo (1984), whose sport study dealt with internal NSGB constituent groups, recommended that future sport-related research should attempt to assess the impact of external constituent groups on the organizational effectiveness of national sport organizations.

This present study found that statistically significant differences existed in the importance of various criteria of organizational effectiveness between the internal and external constituent groups on the variables of growth and finance. It appears that the internal constituent group, comprised of Presidents, Executive Directors and National Coaches, felt more strongly about the importance of finance and growth as indicators of organizational effectiveness than did the external group comprised of Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor Representatives. Further, the data seemed to imply that overall, the internal group has a different attitude than the external constituent group about appropriate criteria for assessing their organizations.

Scott et al (1978) proposed that different constituencies actively prefer different kinds of effectiveness measures. These researchers suggested that managers might prefer structural measures of organizational effectiveness because they have control over these factors; while the membership may prefer measures of activity because they can control their own performance and clients or customers prefer outcome measures because they want results. Kanter (1979) looked specifically at non-profit organizations and recognized that managers and funders tend to require different kinds of information.

In this study, significant differences were found in the way in which internal and external constituent groups rated the growth and

finance variables as indicators of effectiveness. In light of the research of Scott (1978) and Kanter (1979), it could be speculated that the internal constituents, all of whom are in management positions, attached greater importance to finance and growth variables because of their ability to directly control these management functions. The external constituents, who represented major funding agencies, were much less concerned with the NSGB's ability to acquire financial resources and grow—possibly being more interested in information directly related to the production of elite athletes and the political and promotional factors inherent in that outcome.

Jobson and Schneck (1982) found that if different effectiveness criteria (or, presumably different weightings of the same effectiveness criteria) were considered important by both internal and external constituent groups, the organization must be aware of the potential conflict, tradeoffs and inconsistencies that may occur. "For example, one criterion may be met at some expense to another because both cannot be completely satisfied simultaneously" (Jobson and Schneck, 1982:43). Based on the different variable rankings identified in this research between internal and external constituencies, NSGB administrators should be prepared to deal with the tradeoffs that may be required to maintain the effective operation of their organizations.

VARIABLE GROUPING: A LIFE CYCLE INTERPRETATION

The variables of organizational planning, finance and communication were ranked in the top three by four of the five constituent

groups (see Table 13). The Sport Canada Consultant group replaced finance with adaptability as its third most important variable. Growth was ranked lowest by all groups and for the most part human resources and adaptability were ranked in the fourth or fifth positions by all.

It would appear that the six variables fall into three groups and it is possible, based on organizational life cycle theory, that the rankings of the variables are a reflection of the NSGB's developmental stage at this point in time. Kimberly and Miles (1980) stated in the introductory chapter to their book entitled, The Organizational Life Cycle, that much of the organizational theory and research today is "static, ahistorical, and arid and that reduction of the paradigms used by researchers may be helped along by thinking about organizations in life cycle terms" (1980:1).

Quinn and Cameron (1983) elaborated on the relationship between stage of development in organizational life cycles and organizational effectiveness. They proposed that an organization goes through four development stages: (1) entrepreneurial, (2) collectivity, (3) formalization and control, and (4) elaboration of structure (1983:43). Each stage is typified by certain effectiveness criteria (see Table 14). Cameron and Whetten (1981) examined the changes that occurred in ratings of effectiveness by organizational members as their organizations developed through the various life cycle stages identified by Quinn and Cameron (1983). The researchers used eighteen simulated or-

TABLE 14

QUINN AND CAMERON'S INTEGRATED LIFE CYCLE MODEL

Stage	Effectiveness Criteria
1. Entrepreneurial	. marshalling of resources . lots of ideas . entrepreneurial activities . little planning and coordination . formation of a "niche" . "prime mover" has power
2. Collectivity	. informal communication and structure . sense of collectivity . long hours spent . sense of mission . innovation continues . high commitment
3. Formalization and control	. formalization of rules . stable structure . emphasis on efficiency and maintenance . conservatism . institutionalized procedures
4. Elaboration of structure	. elaboration of structure . decentralization . domain expansion . adaptation . renewal

* Quinn and Cameron (1983:36)

ganizations to trace the changes that occurred in perceptions of effectiveness over time. The results of the study indicated that the appropriateness of any particular model of organizational effectiveness (or any set of criteria) may depend on the environment, the constituency under investigation and the life cycle stage (Cameron and Whetten, 1981:541). Further, the researchers suggest that different models of organizational effectiveness may be more appropriate at one life cycle stage than at another.

It could be speculated, after examining the data from this study, that the group of NSGBs under investigation are in the formalization and control phase of their development. This stage is described by such criteria as: formalization of rules, institutionalized procedures and creating a stable structure. These criteria for the most part correspond with the variables ranked highest by all constituent groups in this study. The top three variables (organizational planning, finance and communication), based on their operational definitions, reflect an emphasis on consolidation and formalization of the organization.

In Quinn and Cameron's (1983) model, the fourth stage of development is based on the ability of the organization to be flexible and "ready" to realize its growth potential and acquire resources. This stage four description seems to encompass those effectiveness variables that were ranked lower by all groups in the present study. It could again be speculated that because the NSGBs are focusing their

energy at this point in time on planning and communication systems that they are not yet ready to address the effectiveness variables of adaptability, human resources and growth.

The implications of applying the life cycle approach to assessing the effectiveness of NSGBs are far reaching. In spite of the significant differences between the constituent groups, there appears to be great homogeneity in the variable ranking within each group. The differences in perception would seem to be a matter of degree or weighting, rather than differences based on alternative or conflicting sets of variables.

In an attempt to control for developmental stage, the NSGB sample for this study was limited to those organizations who had an office in the National Sport and Recreation Centre for at least eight years. Tremendous growth has occurred in the sport over the last ten years--literally moving sport administration from the kitchen table to the boardroom. To describe that period of time in terms of the life-cycle model, the descriptions of the entrepreneurial and collectivity stages would very much apply.

Today, NSGB efforts to formalize and control are very evident, not only in this research but also in the numerous references to 'the business of sport' and an acceptance of this philosophy by sport managers as well as funding agencies. This is a critical stage in the life cycle of NSGBs. The degree to which they are deemed effective by their key constituencies will have major implications for the future development of amateur sport in Canada.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has concluded that the variables of adaptability, communication, finance, growth, human resources and organizational planning are all important indicators of organizational effectiveness within the administrative domain of the defined NSGB sample. Further, the finance and growth variables are ranked as significantly more important to the internal constituent groups of Executive Directors, Presidents and National Coaches than to Sport Canada Consultants and Corporate Sponsor Representatives.

It has been suggested that the internal constituencies may have different expectations than the external groups about their effectiveness as organizations. This implies that in order to be effective and reach their organizational goals, the internal constituencies of NSGBs must understand how they are being perceived and evaluated by their external counterparts.

Several problems related to research in the area of organizational effectiveness were presented in the introduction and review of literature sections of this study. According to Cameron and Whetten (1983), one of the biggest problems in the area has been the difficulty in replicating, evaluating and comparing completed research. By utilizing the decision guidelines outlined by Cameron and Whetten

(1983), this research provides clear research parameters, including operational definitions of the six effectiveness variables studied. This facilitates the replication of this research in future. Neill (1983), in her recommendations, identified the need to develop evaluation tools to assist in determining the effectiveness of NSGBs. As part of this research, an instrument to measure effectiveness in the administrative domain of NSGBs was designed, and may be useful for further effectiveness research in the administrative area.

Another major problem in the study of effectiveness, has been the limited amount of empirical research that has identified the needs of both internal and external constituent groups in their perceptions of what constitutes an effective organization (Jobsen and Schneck, 1983; Szyszlo, 1984). This research addresses this concern and confirms that differences exist in the way internal and external stakeholders view NSGBs. More than one set of effectiveness criteria may need to be considered by the NSGB in trying to satisfy its external client groups. Further, based on the research of Quinn and Cameron (1983), the ranking of the effectiveness variables by the five constituent groups in this study may lend support to the assumption that effectiveness criteria may change depending upon the life cycle stage of the NSGB.

The following recommendations have been formulated based on the results of this study.

1. Organizational planning, communication and finance have been ranked as important indicators of organizational effectiveness in this study. It is recommended that, in future, NSGB administrators include these variables in their organizational assessment activities.
2. Communication was ranked highly by members of both the internal and external constituent groups. It is recommended that NSGB administrators identify their internal and external constituencies and implement appropriate communication strategies with each group in order to maximize organizational effectiveness.
3. Further empirical research is needed to identify the differences in perceived organizational effectiveness of NSGBs by both internal and external constituent groups. Specifically, the key stakeholder group of corporate sponsors needs further investigation.
4. Future sport-related research in the area of organizational effectiveness must clearly identify the parameters of the research to facilitate the comparison and replication of studies. Specifically, studies similar to the present one should be undertaken to further define effectiveness variables in the administrative domain.

5. More emphasis should be placed in future research, on the identification of domains of organizational effectiveness within NSGBs. Specifically, the high performance, participation and administrative domains need to be researched individually and the results analyzed collectively to provide a comprehensive description of the overall effectiveness of a NSGB.
6. More research in organizational life cycles should be undertaken with NSGBs to identify clearly both developmental levels and effectiveness criteria, in this way assisting organizations in the transition from one stage to the next.

REFERENCES

- Alreck, P. and Settle, R. The Survey Research Handbook. Illinois : Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1985.
- Blalock, H.M. Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research. Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1964.
- Bluedorn, A.C. "Cutting the Gordian Knot: A Critique of the Effectiveness Tradition in Organizational Research", Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 64 No 4: 477-496, 1980.
- Cameron, K. "Critical Questions in Assessing Organizational Effectiveness", Organizational Dynamics, Vol 9: 66-80, 1980.
- Cameron, K.C. "Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 24: 25-47, 1981.
- Cameron, K. "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 23: 604-629, 1978.
- Cameron, Kim S. Organizational Effectiveness: Its Measurement and Prediction in Higher Education. Ann Arbor : University Microfilms International, 1981.
- Cameron, K.S. and Whetten, D.A. (eds.) Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models. New York : Academic Press, 1983.
- Cameron, K. and Whetten, D. "Perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness Over Organizational Life Cycles", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 26: 525-544, 1981.
- Campbell, John. "On the Nature of Organizational Effectiveness" in Goodman, P.S. and Pennings, J.M. (eds.) New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco : Jossey-Boss, 1977.
- Chelladurai, P., Hagerty, T., Campbell, L. and Wall, S. "A Factor Analytic Study of Effectiveness Criteria in Intercollegiate Athletics", Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, Vol. 6: 81-86, 1981.
- Child, J. "Managerial and Organizational Factors Associated with Company Performance: Part II: A Contingency Analysis", The Journal of Management Studies, 12-17, February 1975.
- Connolly, T., Conlon, E.J. and Deutsch, S.J. "Organizational Effectiveness: A Multi-Constituency Approach", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 5: 211-217, 1980.

Cronbach, L.J. Essential of Psychological Testing. New York : Harper and Row, 1970.

Cunningham, J.B. "Approaches to the Evaluation of Organizational Effectiveness", Academy of Management Review, July: 463-474, 1977.

Dubin, R. "Organizational Effectiveness: Some Dilemmas of Perspective", Organization and Administrative Sciences, Vol. 7: 7-13, 1976.

Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs : Prentice Hall, 1964.

Evan, W. Organization Theory, Structure, Systems and Environment. Toronto: Wiley, 1976.

Friedlander, F. and Pickle, H. "Components of Effectiveness in Small Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol.13:289-304, 1968.

Frisby, W. "Bureaucratization of National Sport Governing Bodies and Their Effectiveness", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, 1983.

Gaertner, G.H. and Ramnarayan, S. "Organizational Effectiveness: An Alternative Perspective", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 8:97-107, 1983.

Georgopoulos, B.S. and Tannenbaum, A.S. "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness", American Sociological Review, Vol. 22: 534-540, 1957.

Goodman, P.S., Atkin, R.S. and Schoorman, F.D. "On the Demise of Organizational Effectiveness Studies" in K. Cameron and D. Whetten (eds.) Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models. New York : Academic Press, 1983.

Goodman, P.S. and Pennings, J.M. (eds.) New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco : Jossey-Boss, 1977.

Government of Canada, "Fitness and Amateur Sport in the 80's: A Challenge to the Nation", Cabinet paper, 1981.

Government of Canada, Sport Canada: Contributions Program Funding Guidelines, 1984-85.

Hansen, H.C. "Ordeal of Concordance: A Theoretical Prescriptive Model to Ensure System Effectiveness", Proceedings of the FISU Universiade '83 Conference, Edmonton, 1983.

Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice (Second Edition) New York : Random House, 1982.

Jobson, J.D. and Schneck, R. "Constituent View of Organizational Effectiveness: Evidence from Policy Organization", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 14, No. 1: 25-46, 1982.

Kanter, R.M. "The Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness: Issues and Dilemmas in Service and Non-profit Organizations. Working Paper No. 9, Progr. Non-Profit Organ., Yale University. 1979.

Kanter, R.M. and Brinkerhoff, D. "Organizational Performance: Recent Developments in Measurement", Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 7:321-349, 1981.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York : Wiley, 1978.

Kimberly, J.R. and Miles, R.H. The Organizational Life Cycle. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Inc., 1980.

Mahoney, R.A. and Weitzel, W. "Managerial Models of Organizational Effectiveness", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 14: 357-365, 1969.

Mendelow, A.L. "Setting Corporate Goals and Measuring Organizational Effectiveness, A Practical Approach", Long Range Planning, Vol. 16, No. 1:70-76, 1983.

Meyer, M.W. "Organizational Domains", American Sociological Review 40: 599-615, 1975.

Miller, D.C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, New York : David McKay Company Inc., 1977.

Mott, P.E. The Characteristics of Effective Organizations. New York : Harper and Row, 1972.

Neill, S. "A Descriptive/Analytical Model for National Sport Governing Bodies", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1983.

Perrow, Charles. "Goals in Complex Organizations", American Sociological Review, Vol. 26:856, 1961.

Price, James, L. "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness", The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 13:13-15, 1972.

Quinn, R.E. and Cameron, K. "Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence", Management Science, Vol. 29, No. 1:33-51, 1983.

Quinn, R.B. And Rohrbaugh, J. "A Competing Values Approach to Organizational Effectiveness", Public Productivity Review, June: 122-140, 1981.

Quinn, R.E. and Rohrbaugh, J. "A Special Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis", Management Science, Vol. 29, No. 3:363-377, 1983.

Reimann, B.C. "Organizational Competence as a Predictor of Long Run Survival and Growth", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 25 No. 2: 323-334, 1982.

Schein, E.H. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Scott, W.R. "Effectiveness of Organizational Effectiveness Studies", in P.S. Goodman and J.M. Pennings (eds.) New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco : Jossey-Boss, 1977.

Scott, W.R. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Scott, W.R., Floor, A.B., Ewy, W., Forrest, W.H. "Organizational Effectiveness: Studying the Quality of Surgical Care in Hospitals" in Environments and Organizations, M.W. Meyer, ed. San Francisco : Jossey Bass, 1978.

Smith, H.W. Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Sport Canada, "Operational Corporate Priorities 1984-85", internal document.

Steers, R.M. Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioural Approach. Santa Monica : Goodyear Publishing Company, 1977.

Steers, R.M. "Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 20: 546-558, 1975.

Steers, R.M. "When is an Organization Effective?", Organizational Dynamics, Autumn: 50-63, 1976.

Strasser, S., Eveland, J.D., Cummins, G., Deniston, O. and Romani, J.
"Conceptualizing the Goal and Systems Models of Organizational
Effectiveness-Implications for Comparative Evaluation Research",
Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 18: 321-340, 1981.

Szyszlowski, Mark "A Model of Effectiveness for National Sport Governing
Bodies: Perceptions of the Administrators", Unpublished masters
thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1984.

Thompson, J.D. Organizations in Action. New York : McGraw-Hill,
1967.

Yuchtman, E. and Seashore, S.E. "A System Resource Approach to
Organizational Effectiveness", Administrative Science Quarterly,
Vol. 32:377-395, 1967.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

From: Cameron, K. and Whetten, D. (eds.) Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models. New York : Academic Press, 1983, pp. 270-273.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Seven major decision guides are presented in what follows (see Cameron [1980], Goodman & Pennings [1980], and Steers, [1975], for an elaboration).

They are framed in the form of questions that should be answered in every assessment of organizational effectiveness, in every formulation of a definition of organizational effectiveness, and in every project designed to improve organizational effectiveness. The purpose is to provide an itinerary for mapping the construct space of effectiveness and for helping to make studies of effectiveness comparable. If widely used, these guides can help develop a cumulative literature in organizational effectiveness by providing a general framework against which research can be compared. The seven decision guides are highly interrelated, so that making appropriate choices about one will depend on the choices made about others. No one choice is inherently right for any of the decision guides, but some choices are more appropriate than others when answers to each of the seven questions are considered in concert.

Guide 1: From Whose Perspective Is Effectiveness Being Judged?

Effectiveness must be defined and assessed from someone's viewpoint, and it is important that the viewpoint be made explicit. Chapter 1 in this volume suggests that one reason there are no best criteria for effectiveness is because there is no best constituency to define effectiveness. The criteria used by different constituencies to define effectiveness often differ markedly, and spirited debates about which constituency's criteria are most valuable continue in the literature. Some have advocated using a dominant coalition as the source of criteria (Cameron, 1978), others have argued for top managers (Scott, 1977), external resource providers (Miles, 1980), organizational members (Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980), and so on. No agreed-upon decision rule is available to identify one constituency's criteria as being more important than another constituency's criteria because it partly depends on the other decision guides (to be discussed) and partly on the personal biases of the evaluator. Nevertheless, organizations never satisfy all their constituencies, and what appears to be high effectiveness from one point of view may be interpreted as being mediocre or low effectiveness from another point of view. The specific point of view being accepted, therefore, must be made explicit.

Guide 2: On What Domain of Activity Is the Judgment Focused?

Organizational domains are circumscribed by the constituencies served, the technologies employed, and the services or outputs produced (Meyer, 1975). Domains arise from the activities or primary tasks that are emphasized in the organization; from the competencies of the organization, and from the demands placed upon the organization by external forces (Cameron, 1981; Miles, 1980).

A variety of domains can be identified for almost all organizations, but no organization is maximally effective in all its domains. In a study of the domains in which colleges and universities are effective, for example, no institution was highly effective in more than two of the four major domains identified (Cameron, 1981). Quinn and Cameron (1982) found, in fact, that achieving effectiveness in one domain in a public service agency mitigated against achieving effectiveness in another domain. In another study of production organizations, Cameron and Whetten (1981) observed that the major domains of activity changed over organizational life cycles, and that to have assessed effectiveness in the wrong domain would have been misleading. When analyzing organizational effectiveness, therefore, it is important that the domain(s) being assessed are clearly specified. Not being clear about the differences in the effectiveness of organizational domains may lead to confusing or contradictory research results, as well as to inaccurate judgments of effectiveness.

Guide 3: What Level of Analysis Is Being Used?

Judgments of effectiveness can be made at the individual level of analysis (e.g., Is the human dignity of the individual being preserved?), at the subunit level (e.g., Is the work group cohesive?), at the organization level (e.g., Does the organization acquire needed resources?), at the population or industry level (e.g., Does the primary function of this population of organizations have legitimacy?), or at the societal level (e.g., What is the effect of the organization on society?). Although effectiveness on each of these different levels of analysis may be compatible, often it is not, and effectiveness on one level may mitigate against effectiveness on another level. Freeman (1980) argued that selecting the appropriate level of analysis is critical because data on effectiveness at one level are often nonsensical when viewed from another level. Without attention being paid to which level of analysis is most appropriate, meaningful effectiveness judgments cannot even be made. The appropriateness of the level depends on the constituency being used, the domain being focused on, the purpose of the evaluation, and so on. The choice, in other words, must be made in the context of other decision guides.

Guide 4: What Is the Purpose for Judging Effectiveness?

The purpose(s) for judging effectiveness almost always affects the judgment itself. For example, Brewer (Chapter 9) discussed some of the purposes for evaluating effectiveness that were enumerated by Floden and Weiner (1978). He pointed out that changing the purposes of the evaluation creates different consequences both for the evaluator and for the unit being evaluated. Different

data will be made available, different sources will be appropriate, different amounts of cooperation or resistance will be encountered, and different types of assessment strategies will be required all as a result of differences in purpose (also see Argyris, 1970). (Consider the differences that would arise, for example, when evaluating effectiveness to determine which department to eliminate in a university versus evaluating effectiveness as a part of building an organizational theory.) The purposes of the evaluation also help determine appropriate constituencies, domains, levels of analysis, and so on, hence they must be clearly identified. Sometimes the evaluator can determine his or her own purposes, but frequently the purposes for judging effectiveness are prescribed a priori by the client, the participants in the evaluation, or the external environment. Whatever the case, a clear conception of purpose is important in judging effectiveness.

Guide 5: What Time Frame Is Being Employed?

Selecting an appropriate time frame is important because long-term effectiveness may be incompatible with short-term effectiveness. For example, in a study of the U.S. tobacco industry, Miles and Cameron (1982) found that one company was the least effective of the six tobacco firms when short-term criteria were applied, but it jumped to second most effective when long-term criteria were applied. Another firm was the most effective firm in the short term, but it dropped to fifth in the long term. Some organizations, moreover, may sacrifice short-term effectiveness in order to obtain long-term effectiveness, or vice versa, so that not being clear about what time frame is being employed would severely handicap an assessment. Also, as was noted earlier, effects and outcomes sometimes cannot be detected if the wrong time frame is selected because they may occur incrementally over a long period of time, or they may occur suddenly in the short term. Judgments of effectiveness are always made with some time frame in mind, so it is important that the time frame be made explicit.

Guide 6: What Type of Data Are Being Used for Judgments of Effectiveness?

This is a choice between using information collected by the organization itself and stored in official documents, or relying on perceptions obtained from members of various constituencies. The choice is between objective data (organizational records) or subjective, perceptual data (interviews or questionnaire responses). Objective data have the advantage of being quantifiable, potentially less biased than individual perceptions, and representative of the official organizational position. However, objective data frequently are gathered only on

"official" effectiveness criteria or on criteria that are used only for public image purposes. The official focus may make the data rather narrow in scope. In addition, official data often relate to criteria of organizational effectiveness that do not have readily apparent connections to the organization's primary task (Cameron, 1978).

The advantage of subjective or perceptual data is that a broader set of criteria of effectiveness can be assessed from a wider variety of perspectives. In addition, operative criteria or theories-in-use (Argyris & Schon, 1978) can more easily be tapped. The disadvantages, however, are that bias, dishonesty, or lack of information on the part of the respondents may hinder the reliability and validity of the data. The selection of data by which to judge effectiveness is important because an organization may be judged effective on the basis of subjective perceptions while objective data may indicate that the organization is ineffective. Or, contrarily, objective data may indicate organizational effectiveness while constituencies may rate the organization as being ineffective (Hall & Clark, 1980).

Guide 7: What Is the Referent against Which Effectiveness Is Judged?

There are a variety of referents or standards against which organizational effectiveness can be judged. For example, one alternative is to compare the performance of two different organizations against the same set of indicators (comparative judgment). The question is "Are we more effective than our competitor?" A second alternative is to select a standard or an ideal performance level (e.g., Likert's [1967] "System 4" characteristics), and then compare the organization's performance against the standard (normative judgment). Here the question is "How are we doing relative to a theoretical ideal?" A third alternative is to compare organizational performance on the indicators against the stated goals of the organization (goal-centered judgment). "Did we reach our stated goals?" A fourth alternative is to compare an organization's performance on the indicators against its own past performance on the same indicators (improvement judgment). "Have we improved over the past year?" A fifth alternative is to evaluate an organization on the basis of the static characteristics it possesses, independent of its performance on certain indicators (trait judgment). In this approach, desirable organizational characteristics are identified, and the judgment reflects the extent to which the organization possesses those characteristics. Because judgments of effectiveness can differ markedly depending on which referent is used (e.g., an organization may be effective in accomplishing its stated goals but be ineffective relative to the competition), it is important to be clear about the referent that serves as the basis for those judgments.

The advantage of these seven decision guides is that they help to circumscribe the construct boundaries of effectiveness as well as to identify explicitly the indicators of effectiveness that are being considered. Using these guides makes it clear that the definition of effectiveness being used in an evaluation is just one of several possibilities. But it also provides a basis for comparing one definition (based on a certain set of choices about the decision guides) with other definitions. The construct space of effectiveness can then begin to be mapped.

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY SAMPLE

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY SAMPLE

National Sport Governing Body	Years of Residency in National Sport and Recreation Centre	Financial Contribution from Fitness and Amateur Sport: 1983-84*
Canadian Amateur Basketball Association	14	883,435
Canadian Amateur Boxing Association	13	327,450
Canadian Amateur Rowing Association	13	653,930
Canadian Amateur Diving Association	12	397,469
Canadian Amateur Speed Skating	8	575,389
Canadian Amateur Swimming Association	8	1,107,287
Canadian Amateur Synchronized Swimming Association	12	374,534
Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association	13	444,108
Canadian Badminton Association	9	449,608
Canadian Canoe Association	13	691,922
Canadian Cycling Association	14	596,101
Canadian Equestrian Association	11	452,659
Canadian Federation of Amateur Baseball	13	243,612
Canadian Fencing Association	11	341,582
Canadian Field Hockey Association	14	296,980
Canadian Figure Skating Association	14	704,221
Canadian Gymnastics Federation	13	755,130
Canadian Ladies Curling Association	8	71,597
Canadian Ski Association (Alpine)	12	1,161,871
Canadian Ski Association (Cross Country)	8	694,896
Canadian Soccer Association	14	753,315
Canadian Table Tennis Association	13	313,774
Canadian Track and Field Association	13	1,459,475
Canadian Volleyball Association	12	341,143
Canadian Water Polo Association	12	341,143
Canadian Water Ski Association	13	182,860
Canadian Weightlifting Federation	9	242,642
Canadian Women's Field Hockey Association	14	421,227
Canadian Yachting Association	14	616,376
Curl Canada	8	93,715
Federation of Canadian Archers	9	186,685
Judo Canada	8	374,840
Shooting Federation of Canada	13	448,641

*Source: Fitness and Amateur Sport Annual Report, 1983-84, p.28-30.

APPENDIX C

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SPORT ADMINISTRATION EXPERT PANEL

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SPORT ADMINISTRATION EXPERT PANEL

1. Categories

NSGB paid staff.....	2
NSGB volunteer leaders.....	2
Sport Canada staff.....	3
National Coach.....	1
University professors.....	<u>2</u>
Total	10

2. Criteria for Expert Selection.

2.1 NSGB paid staff and volunteers

- minimum of 3 years of involvement with a national sport organization in Canada
- are holding or have held a leadership position (paid or volunteer) within the national sport organization
- working knowledge of one or more NSGBs

2.2 Sport Canada Staff

- minimum of 3 years of involvement with Fitness and Amateur Sport

2.3 National Coaches

- are holding or have held a national coach position with a NSGB for at least 3 years

2.4 University Professors

- minimum of three years of involvement with a Canadian university in the field of physical education and sport administration
- involvement as a researcher for or in a volunteer leadership capacity with at least one national sport organization

APPENDIX D

• EXPERT REVIEW INSTRUMENT (PART 1)

• SUMMARY OF RESULTS

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES

EXPERT REVIEW

INSTRUCTIONS:

THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIAL INDICATORS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIES (NSGBS). FOR OUR PURPOSES EFFECTIVENESS HAS BEEN DEFINED AS THE ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE AND UTILIZE HUMAN AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES TO FURTHER ITS GOALS.

BASED ON YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE WITH NSGBS:

1. RATE EACH CRITERION AS TO ITS IMPORTANCE WHEN ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN NSGB.
2. ADD ADDITIONAL CRITERIA THAT YOU FEEL ARE IMPORTANT.

MANY THANKS!

EXPERT REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

FROM YOUR EXPERIENCE, HOW IMPORTANT ARE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA IN ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A NSGB? PLEASE INDICATE YOUR RESPONSES USING THE FOLLOWING NUMERICAL SCALE:

VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
3	2	1	0

- | | | |
|-------|--|------|
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ANTICIPATE AND RESPOND TO CHANGES IN POLICY | (1) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS MEMBERSHIP | (2) |
| _____ | GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS | (3) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT AND MAINTAIN QUALIFIED PROFESSIONAL STAFF | (4) |
| _____ | QUALITY OF DOCUMENTED MANDATE AND GOAL STATEMENTS OF THE NSGB | (5) |
| _____ | ABILITY TO ACQUIRE MULTIPLE-FUNDING SOURCES | (6) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACCEPT AND ADJUST TO NEW TECHNIQUES AND IDEAS | (7) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO EXPAND ITS PROGRAMS AND SERVICES | (8) |
| _____ | GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND SPORT CANADA | (9) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT AND MAINTAIN QUALITY VOLUNTEER LEADERS | (10) |
| _____ | QUALITY OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL(S) FOR ALL NSGB ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS | (11) |
| _____ | ABILITY TO ACQUIRE SPORT CANADA FUNDS | (12) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO COPE WITH EMERGENCIES | (13) |
| _____ | ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF | (14) |
| _____ | GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND OTHER NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS | (15) |
| _____ | PROVISION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS BY THE NSGB | (16) |

_____	ABILITY TO ACQUIRE CORPORATE FUNDS	(17)
_____	ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS SUPPLY OF VOLUNTEER LEADERS	(18)
_____	GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL OFFICE AND PROVINCIAL COUNTERPARTS	(19)
_____	PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT OF NSGB STAFF	(20)
_____	ABILITY TO ACQUIRE FUNDS FROM MEMBERSHIP	(21)
_____	GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION	(22)
_____	ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, ENCOURAGE WORKPLANNING AND ASSESS PERFORMANCE OF STAFF	(23)
_____	QUALITY OF SHORT AND LONG TERM PLANS AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES	(24)
_____	QUALITY OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	(25)
_____	GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS ATHLETES	(26)
_____	ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO CLEARLY DELINEATE LINES OF AUTHORITY	(27)
_____	QUALITY OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR ALL NSGB ACTIVITIES	(28)
_____	QUALITY OF A LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN	(29)
_____	GOOD COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS CORPORATE SPONSORS	(30)
_____	ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBERS OF QUALIFIED COACHES AND OFFICIALS	(31)

ADDITIONS/COMMENTS:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (PART 1)

Variable	Item #	Experts Totals (30)	Comments
Adaptability	1	26	
	7	21	
	13	22	
Communication	3	24	
	9	19	
	15	14	modified
	19	24	
	22	14	modified
	26	22	
	30	20	
Finance	6	22	
	12	20	
	17	21	
	21	16	modified
	25	25	
	29	22	
Growth	2	17	
	8	19	
	14	12	* modified
	18	12	modified
	31	24	
Human Resources	4	26	
	10	23	
	16	21	
	20	16	eliminated inappropriate for sample
	23	29	
	27	22	
Organizational Planning	5	19	
	11	17	
	24	28	
	28	25	

APPENDIX E

EXPERT REVIEW INSTRUMENT (PART 2)

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIESEXPERT REVIEW: PART 2

Your comments and recommendations were tremendously helpful to me and I am in the final stages of verifying my survey instrument. As part of this process, I am requesting your assistance just one more time!!

Three (3) pages are attached. The first page operationally defines ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS for the purposes of this research. In addition, the six (6) indices of effectiveness to be investigated in this study are defined. Listed on the two pages following are those statements that many of you considered "important" or "very important" when describing the effectiveness of a NSGB. Some statements have been rewritten in an effort to clarify the meaning of each and some new statements have been added, based on feedback from the expert interviews.

Your assistance is requested for the following

1. Read each of the 38 statements and for each one check (✓) the column within which the statement best fits. PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE COLUMN FOR EACH STATEMENT.
2. If the wording of statements is still unclear or you feel that any of the statements are not relevant in the assessment of organizational effectiveness for NSGBs, please note your comments as appropriate in the questionnaire.

PLEASE SEND THIS BACK TO ME AT SPORT CANADA BY AUGUST 31, 1984.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK WITH ME, CALL ME AT HOME (827-1391) OR LEAVE A MESSAGE WITH NORMA (996-4510 EXT 222) AND I WILL GET BACK TO YOU!

MANY, MANY, MANY THANKS!

Sue Vail

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODIESOPERATIONAL DEFINITIONSORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The Ability of the NSGB to Acquire and Utilize Human and Physical Resources to Further its Objectives.

ADAPTABILITY

The Ability of the NSGB to Change its Standard Operating Procedures in Response to Environmental Changes.

COMMUNICATION

The Ability of the NSGB to Communicate Information in a Complete, Efficient and Accurate Manner to all Constituent Groups.

FINANCE

The Ability of an Organization to Acquire and Manage Financial Resources.

GROWTH

The Ability of the NSGB to Increase its Human and Physical Resources.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The Ability of the NSGB to Attract, Maintain and Improve Administrators (Paid and Volunteer)

ORGANIZATIONAL PLANNING

The Ability of the NSGB to Plan, Implement and Evaluate Ongoing and Future Activities.

NWE:

NSGB EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIREEXPERT REVIEW PART 2

	ADAPTABILITY	COMMUNICATION	FINANCE	GROWTH	HUMAN RESOURCES	ORGANIZATIONAL PLANNING	OTHER (Specify)
1. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ANTICIPATE AND RESPOND TO EXTERNALLY-IMPOSED CHANGES IN POLICY.							
2. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS MEMBERSHIP.							
3. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
4. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT PAID STAFF.							
5. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO AGREE UPON ITS STATED OBJECTIVES AND TO PLAN PROGRAMS.							
6. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
7. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACCEPT AND ADJUST TO NEW TECHNIQUES AND IDEAS.							
8. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO EXPAND ITS PROGRAMS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
9. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND SPORT CANADA.							
10. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
11. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO DEVELOP POLICY STATEMENTS AND PROCEDURE GUIDELINES FOR ITS PROGRAMS.							
12. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO MEET THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OF SPORT CANADA FOR FUNDS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
13. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO COPE WITH CRISES.							
14. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM NEEDS.							
15. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND OTHER NATIONAL SPORT AND MULTI SPORT ORGANIZATIONS.							
16. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PAID STAFF.							
17. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO IMPLEMENT ITS PROGRAMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH AGREED UPON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.							
18. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE CORPORATE FUNDS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
19. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO REACT TO CHANGES IN THE SPORT ENVIRONMENT OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION.							

	ADAPTABILITY	COMMUNICATION	FINANCE	GROWTH	HUMAN RESOURCES	ORGANIZATIONAL PLANNING	OTHER (Specify)
20. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE CORPORATE FUNDS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
21. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND THE PROVINCIAL AND CLUB LEVELS..							
22. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RETAIN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
23. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE ITS PROGRAMS.							
24. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE FUNDS FROM THE MEMBERSHIP.							
25. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF COACHES IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.							
26. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION.							
27. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.							
28. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO CLEARLY STATE THE LINES OF AUTHORITY FOR BOTH PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
29. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO UTILIZE A FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.							
30. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF OFFICIALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.							
31. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS ATHLETES.							
32. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
33. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROJECT ITS FINANCIAL PICTURE IN THE LONG TERM.							
34. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS COACHES.							
35. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEER LEADERS.							
36. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS CORPORATE SPONSORS.							
37. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.							
38. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEERS.							

APPENDIX F

TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

September 21, 1984

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

This study is about National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGBs) and their effectiveness as non-profit voluntary organizations. Because of your involvement with and working knowledge of NSGB operations, I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this doctoral research.

I am in the process of testing the reliability of the enclosed questionnaire through a test-retest format. This means that I would like you to complete this two-page questionnaire now and again in about three weeks time. It is not necessary to sign your name and all responses will remain confidential. Please return the questionnaire using the envelope enclosed before September 28, 1984.

This is a very important step in my study and I thank you for your time and interest in sport research.

Sincerely,

Sue Vail

IT IS NECESSARY TO CODE EACH QUESTIONNAIRE
BECAUSE OF THE TEST-RETEST FORMAT FOR THIS
PHASE OF MY RESEARCH. PLEASE BE ASSURED
THAT YOUR RESPONSES WILL NOT BE SEEN BY
ANYONE OTHER THAN MYSELF AND ALL QUESTION-
NAIRES WILL BE DESTROYED AFTER THE RETEST
DATA HAS BEEN RECORDED.

MANY THANKS!

SUE

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY
EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

LISTED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS THAT MAY DESCRIBE YOUR NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY (NSGB).

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS DESIGNED TO ASSESS ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AS IT IS DEFINED BELOW.

THE ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE AND UTILIZE HUMAN, PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES TO BOTH MEET AND FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.

BASED ON THIS DEFINITION AND YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE, HOW IMPORTANT IS EACH ONE OF THESE STATEMENTS IN THE OPERATION OF YOUR SPORT ORGANIZATION?

PLEASE RECORD YOUR OPINIONS BY CHECKING (✓) EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

NSGB EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

CODE:

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
1. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ANTICIPATE AND RESPOND TO EXTERNALLY-IMPOSED CHANGES IN POLICY					
2. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS MEMBERSHIP.					
3. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
4. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT PAID STAFF.					
5. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO AGREE UPON ITS STATED OBJECTIVES AND TO PLAN PROGRAMS.					
6. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
7. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACCEPT AND ADJUST TO NEW TECHNIQUES AND IDEAS.					
8. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS PROGRAMS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES					
9. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND SPORT CANADA.					
10. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
11. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO DEVELOP POLICY STATEMENTS AND PROCEDURE GUIDELINES FOR ITS PROGRAMS.					
12. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE FUNDS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
13. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO COPE WITH CRISES.					
14. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF.					
15. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND OTHER NATIONAL SPORT AND MULTI SPORT ORGANIZATIONS.					
16. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PAID STAFF.					
17. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO IMPLEMENT ITS PROGRAMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH AGREED UPON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.					
18. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE CORPORATE FUNDS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
19. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO REACT TO CHANGES IN THE SPORT ENVIRONMENT OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION.					

Code:

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
20. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND THE PROVINCIAL AND CLUB LEVELS.					
21. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RETAIN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
22. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE ITS PROGRAMS.					
23. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RAISE FUNDS FROM WITHIN ITS MEMBERSHIP.					
24. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF COACHES.					
25. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION.					
26. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.					
27. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO UTILIZE A FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
28. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF OFFICIALS.					
29. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS ATHLETES.					
30. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
31. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO DEVELOP A LONG TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY.					
32. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS COACHES.					
33. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
34. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS CORPORATE SPONSORS.					
35. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.					
36. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEERS.					

FANY THANKS!

September 28, 1984

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY
EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

Thank you for your assistance with the first phase of my reliability testing. I am now into the retest phase and requesting your help this one last time.

The same two-page questionnaire is enclosed. Please reread the instructions and complete the questionnaire. As before, all responses will remain strictly confidential. A self-addressed envelope has been enclosed and it would be much appreciated if you could return your completed questionnaire to me before Wednesday, October 10, 1984.

Thanks again for your time!

Sincerely,

Sue Vail

APPENDIX G

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

October 19, 1984

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY
EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

This study is about National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGBs) and their effectiveness as non-profit voluntary organizations. Because of your involvement with and working knowledge of NSGB operations, we would greatly appreciate your assistance in this research.

To help us in assessing NSGB effectiveness, we would like you to indicate your opinions by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Your responses are completely confidential and will remain anonymous - do not sign your name. Please use the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed and mail your questionnaire to us before November 9, 1984.

The value of our study will depend upon the frankness and care with which you answer these questions. There are no right or wrong answers - your responses should be based on your personal experience.

If you would like information about the results of this research please don't hesitate to contact us.

Thank you for your time and interest in sport research.

NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY
EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

LISTED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS THAT
COULD BE USED AS CRITERIA TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NSGBS.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY, ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IS
DEFINED AS:

THE ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE AND
UTILIZE HUMAN, PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL
RESOURCES TO ACCOMPLISH ITS OBJECTIVES.

BASED ON THIS DEFINITION AND YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH SPORT ORGANI-
ZATIONS, HOW IMPORTANT IS EACH ONE OF THESE STATEMENTS AS A
CRITERION TO ASSESS THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF A
NATIONAL SPORT GOVERNING BODY?

PLEASE RECORD YOUR OPINIONS BY CHECKING (✓) EACH OF THE FOLLOWING
STATEMENTS.

NSGB PROCESS QUESTIONNAIRE

CCE:

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
1. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ANTICIPATE AND RESPOND TO EXTERNALLY-IMPOSED CHANGES IN POLICY					
2. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS MEMBERSHIP.					
3. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
4. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT PAID STAFF.					
5. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO AGREE UPON ITS STATED OBJECTIVES AND TO PLAN PROGRAMS.					
6. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
7. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACCEPT AND ADJUST TO NEW TECHNIQUES AND IDEAS.					
8. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS PROGRAMS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES					
9. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND SPORT CANADA.					
10. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECRUIT VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
11. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO DEVELOP POLICY STATEMENTS AND PROCEDURE GUIDELINES FOR ITS PROGRAMS.					
12. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE FUNDS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
13. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO COPE WITH CRISES.					
14. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE ITS NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF.					
15. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND OTHER NATIONAL SPORT AND MULTI SPORT ORGANIZATIONS.					
16. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PAID STAFF.					
17. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO IMPLEMENT ITS PROGRAMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH AGREED UPON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.					
18. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO ACQUIRE CORPORATE FUNDS TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
19. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO REACT TO CHANGES IN THE SPORT ENVIRONMENT OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION.					

Code:

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ESSENTIAL
20. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND THE PROVINCIAL AND CLUB LEVELS.					
21. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RETAIN PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
22. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE ITS PROGRAMS.					
23. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RAISE FUNDS FROM WITHIN ITS MEMBERSHIP.					
24. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF COACHES.					
25. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION.					
26. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.					
27. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO UTILIZE A FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO FURTHER ITS OBJECTIVES.					
28. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF OFFICIALS.					
29. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS ATHLETES.					
30. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
31. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO DEVELOP A LONG TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY.					
32. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS COACHES.					
33. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEER LEADERS.					
34. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE NSGB AND ITS CORPORATE SPONSORS.					
35. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF PAID STAFF.					
36. ABILITY OF THE NSGB TO PROVIDE JOB DESCRIPTIONS, OUTLINE WORK-PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF VOLUNTEERS.					

MAY THANKS!

APPENDIX H

EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES AND CORRESPONDING QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS

NSGB EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIREVARIABLESTATEMENTS

ADAPTABILITY

1. Ability of the NSGB to anticipate and respond to externally-imposed changes in policy.
7. Ability of the NSGB to accept and adjust to new techniques and ideas.
13. Ability of the NSGB to cope with crises.
19. Ability of the NSGB to react to changes in the sport environment outside the organization.

COMMUNICATION

3. Communication between paid staff and volunteer leaders.
9. Communication between the NSGB and Sport Canada.
15. Communication between the NSGB and other national sport and multi-sport organizations.
20. Communication between the national level and the provincial and club levels.
25. Communication between the NSGB and its International Federation.
29. Communication between the NSGB and its athletes.
32. Communication between the NSGB and its coaches.
34. Communication between the NSGB and its corporate sponsors.

FINANCE

6. Ability of the NSGB to acquire multiple funding sources to further its objectives.
12. Ability of the NSGB to acquire funds from the federal government to further its objectives.
18. Ability of the NSGB to acquire corporate funds to further its objectives.
23. Ability of the NSGB to raise funds from within its membership.
27. Ability of the NSGB to utilize a financial management system to further its objectives.
31. Ability of the NSGB to develop a long term financial strategy.

GROWTH

2. Ability of the NSGB to increase its membership.
8. Ability of the NSGB to increase its programs to further its objectives.
14. Ability of the NSGB to increase its National office staff.
24. Ability of the NSGB to increase the number of coaches.
28. Ability of the NSGB to increase the number of officials.

HUMAN RESOURCES

- 4. Ability of the NSGB to recruit paid staff.
- 10. Ability of the NSGB to recruit volunteer leaders.
- 16. Ability of the NSGB to provide professional development opportunities for paid staff.
- 21. Ability of the NSGB to retain paid staff and volunteer leaders.
- 26. Ability of the NSGB to provide job descriptions, outline workplanning procedures and assess the performance of paid staff.
- 30. Ability of the NSGB to provide professional development opportunities for volunteer leaders.
- 33. Ability of the NSGB to recognize and reward the performance of volunteer leaders.
- 35. Ability of the NSGB to recognize and reward the performance of paid staff.
- 36. Ability of the NSGB to provide job descriptions, outline workplanning procedures and assess the performance of volunteers.

ORGANIZATIONAL
PLANNING

- 5. Ability of the NSGB to agree upon its stated objectives and to plan programs.
- 11. Ability of the NSGB to develop policy statements and procedure guidelines for its programs.
- 17. Ability of the NSGB to implement its programs in accordance with agreed upon policies and procedures.
- 22. Ability of the NSGB to monitor and evaluate its programs.