



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

**FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES
ET POSTDOCTORALES**



**FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND
POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES**

Christopher Houston

AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

M.A. (Human Kinetics)

GRADE / DEGREE

School of Human Kinetics

FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

**An Analysis of the Canadian Federal Policy on Sport Participation
and its Impact on National Sport Organizations**

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Dr. Jean Harvey

DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

Dr. Milena Parent

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

EXAMINATEURS (EXAMINATRICES) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS EXAMINERS

Dr. Benoit Séguin

Dr. Christine Dallaire

Gary W. Slater

Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN FEDERAL POLICY ON SPORT
PARTICIPATION AND ITS IMPACT ON NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

By

Christopher James Houston

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Human
Kinetics

School of Human Kinetics
Faculty of Health Sciences
University of Ottawa
August 27, 2008



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-48462-3

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-48462-3

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest thanks to my wonderful, patient wife, Leanne. Without her constant encouragement and support, none of this would ever have been possible.

ABSTRACT

The formal inclusion of participation in the new Canadian sport policy in 2002 marks a significant change in the Canadian sporting landscape, a change examined in this Masters thesis through a qualitative research methodology in the form of a questionnaire, interviews, and document analysis. The first section of the thesis seeks to gain a better understanding of what factors led the federal government to add participation to the new Canadian Sport Policy, and what the agendas were of the key stakeholders in the formation of the policy. Findings support Kingdon's Multiple Streams Theory but highlight the importance a single individual can have in driving the policy agenda. The second section examines the participation pillar's effect on NSOs related to new initiatives implemented and organizational structure and values linked to organizational archetypes. Six structure- and value-based barriers to change were found, throwing doubt on the ability of NSOs to deliver participation initiatives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
ABSTRACT	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VIII
CHAPTER 1	I
INTRODUCTION	I
<i>Context of the Research</i>	3
<i>Research Questions</i>	9
<i>Definition of Terms</i>	10
Policy	11
Sport Participation	12
<i>Overview of the study and its benefits</i>	13
REFERENCES	15
CHAPTER 2	18
THE RISE OF PARTICIPATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ORIGINS OF THE PARTICIPATION PILLAR OF THE CANADIAN SPORT POLICY	18
<i>Brief Review of Literature</i>	19
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	23
METHODS	26
<i>Data Analysis</i>	29
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	30
<i>Problem Stream</i>	31

<i>Indicators.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Focusing Event / Crisis.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Feedback from Existing Programs</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Policy Stream.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Political Stream.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Agenda Setting.....</i>	<i>39</i>
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	43
REFERENCES	46
CHAPTER 3.....	51
SPORT PARTICIPATION: A NEW AGENDA FOR NSOS	51
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	52
<i>Archetypes in the Sport Management Literature.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Dimensions of Organizational Structure</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Organizational Values.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Archetypes in the Management Literature.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Organizational Change</i>	<i>61</i>
METHODS	64
<i>Data Collection</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>Data Analysis.....</i>	<i>67</i>
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	67
<i>New NSO Initiatives Resulting from the Participation Pillar.....</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>Organizational Structure.....</i>	<i>69</i>
Specialization.....	69
Formalization.....	70
Centralization.....	71
<i>Organizational Values.....</i>	<i>72</i>
Domain.....	72
Principals of organization.....	74

Criteria of effectiveness	75
Orientation	76
<i>Organizational Change</i>	77
<i>Recent Policy Document</i>	80
CONCLUSION.....	82
REFERENCES	85
CHAPTER 4	89
CONCLUSION	89
<i>Methods Critique</i>	90
<i>Kingdon's Multiple Streams</i>	91
<i>Agenda</i>	92
<i>Organizational Structure and Values and Change</i>	93
<i>Contributions to the Field and Future Research</i>	96
REFERENCES	101
APPENDIX A	103
QUESTIONNAIRE	103
APPENDIX B	105
CONSENT FORM	105
APPENDIX C	107
QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION LETTER	107
POLICY INFORMATION LETTER	109
NSO INFORMATION LETTER	111
APPENDIX D	113
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL ON CANADIAN SPORT POLICY DEVELOPMENT	113
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL ON ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: *Representations of NSOs* 65

Table 3-2: *NSO Participation Programs* 67

Table 3-3: *Organizational Structure and Values – Barriers and Facilitators to Change.*
..... 77

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEO	Chief Executive Officer
COA	Canadian Olympic Association
COC	Canadian Olympic Committee
COO	Chief Operating Officer
CSP	Canadian Sport Policy
FT/P	Federal / Provincial-Territorial
NHL	National Hockey League
NSO	National Sport Organization
NSRC	National Sport and Recreation Centre
PSO	Provincial Sport Organization
QPP	Quadrennial Planning Process.
SFAF	Sport Funding Accountability Framework
SSP	Sport Support Program

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

On April 6th, 2002 in Iqualuit Nunavut, after years of planning and deliberation, the Secretary of State (amateur sport) and the Provincial/Territorial Ministers responsible for Sport, Fitness and Recreation endorsed a new Canadian Sport Policy (CSP). The policy is a long term (2002-2012) vision for the development of amateur sport in Canada. According to the government of Canada the new policy is unique to the Canadian sporting landscape as it seeks to integrate the interests and concerns of a much wider sporting community than has previously been addressed (Canadian Heritage, 2002). This community includes the collaboration and cooperation of all 14 provincial/territorial and federal governments for the first time ever in Canadian sport. The desire for this policy reform was allegedly driven by a new common goal in Canadian sport to make the system more effective and inclusive in order to open sport to all segments of Canadian society (Canadian Heritage, 2002). As a result, the new policy is built upon a foundation of four separate yet highly interconnected pillars: enhanced participation, enhanced excellence, enhanced capacity, and enhanced interaction (Canadian Heritage, 2002).

The sport delivery system in Canada is comprised of many different stakeholders. Here stakeholder is defined as “all individuals or groups that have or claim ownership, rights, or interests in a corporation and its activities, past, present, or future” (Clarkson, 1995, p. 106). These stakeholders include the federal, provincial, and municipal governments in Canada, as well as National Sport Organizations (NSOs), Provincial Sport Organizations (PSOs), and many other interest and advocacy groups concerned with Canadian sport.

Since the 1970s, the Canadian sport system has been elite sport-focused with the bulk of funding and initiatives from the federal government and NSOs aimed at the production of gold medal-winning athletes (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). This goal was accelerated in the early 1980s with the introduction of the “Best Ever” winter and summer programs that provided \$25 and \$37.2 million respectively in federal funding to support Canadian Olympic teams (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). Increased federal involvement in sport led to the government pressuring NSOs to change to a more bureaucratic or professional organizational configuration to better achieve their high performance goals (Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1992; Slack & Hinings, 1987, 1992). The pressure to change organizational models is of significance as it produced an ideal type that the government preferred; yet many NSOs are still struggling to achieve that organizational structure, or find one appropriate for their own needs (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004; Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1995a). Federal policies, such as the enhanced excellence pillar in the Canadian Sport Policy, the “Own the Podium” campaign for the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver and Whistler, British Columbia, and the Road to Excellence Business Plan for the Summer Games, indicate that the achievement of high performance goals is still at the forefront of Canadian sport.

With such a narrow focus on elite achievement taken by the federal government, the promotion of sport participation has historically been the responsibility of provincial governments, PSOs, and municipalities (Health Canada, 1987; Canadian Heritage, 2002; Macintosh et. al., 1987). Thibault and Harvey (1997) stated that local governments play an important role in sport participation by providing the majority of the facilities, programs, and services required for sport in the general population. After the new CSP

was released, the federal government pledged \$45 million over five years to Sport Canada to help support participation initiatives (Canadian Heritage, 2004). The federal government now gives funds to NSOs through the Sport Participation Development funding block (Sport Canada, 2004), but the majority have few participation programs due to their elite focus. This new commitment to participation marks a significant change in the Canadian sporting landscape. With this new direction, however, arise a number of questions which have yet to be answered such as how and why did participation appear on stakeholder agendas? How will this pillar be delivered? Will NSOs be altered structurally or functionally as a result of the pillar, or will they just distribute money down to PSOs and local clubs? These problems are addressed in the following thesis.

The subsequent sections will set the stage for this thesis by providing an outline of the history of participation policy in the Canadian sport system to help situate the context in which the new Canadian Sport Policy was produced. This will be followed by an introduction of the research questions asked in the project. A quick review of essential terms and definitions regarding policy and participation has also been included. The final section of this chapter will then state the purpose and overview of the study followed by a summary of the potential benefits of the research.

Context of the Research

This section provides a brief overview of the history of sport policy in Canada. It will outline the major policy circumstances that have worked to shape sport in Canada from the early 1960s onwards.

In 1961, Bill C-131, An Act to Encourage Fitness and Amateur Sport was passed by the Canadian parliament. The act signified the first time formal legislation was

enacted by the federal government in sport. It consisted mainly of a federal-provincial cost sharing accord designed to promote mass physical fitness and sporting programs. This act, however, failed to gain support, due to its vague terms and lack of precise goals for sport. It ultimately proved to have very few lasting impacts (Macintosh et al., 1987). In 1968, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau used sport as a way to promote national unity in his election campaign. Once elected, his government produced the Report of the Task Force on Sport for Canadians. This report split sport into two separate divisions, Recreation Canada and Sport Canada, both within the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch of the government. The divisional split occurred at the same time as the federal government focused its policies more towards the promotion of high performance and elite sporting achievements which persists to this day. The task force results signified an important change in the dynamics of sports policy and operation in Canada. The government took on a much more active role in sport by creating the National Sport and Recreation Center (NSRC) in Ottawa in an effort to centralize NSOs and help facilitate change from an 'inefficient' volunteer model toward a more professionalized approach (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). The NSRC and the federal government helped provide office and support services, technical and program directors, as well as national team coaches that the NSOs were previously unable to afford. This new dynamic in Canadian sport failed, however, to immediately produce the results in elite sporting successes that the federal government had hoped for as a return on its investment (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990).

The task force report also produced a considerable backlash in regards to its focus on elite sport performance from the National Advisory Committee on Fitness and

Amateur Sport. The Advisory Committee believed that the task force report wholly ignored the area of mass sport and fitness participation programs. As a result, the Minister of Health and Welfare, John Munro, commissioned a study to further investigate the issue. The result of this inquiry led to the formation of Sport Participation Canada. This organization was set up outside the umbrella of the federal government, as it was believed that removing it from political influences would create a more receptive attitude by Canadians towards the value of exercise (Macintosh et. al., 1987). Thus, in 1971, the National Advisory Council formed an independent commission that created the 'Participation' program for the promotion of health and exercise. A survey conducted in 1980 revealed that 87% of Canadians knew of Participation, and 85% believed it to be an effective program. The success of the program was undoubtedly influenced by the many economic and social changes occurring in Canada at the time, as well as from the fitness boom that arose in the late 1970s and early 80s (Macintosh et al., 1987). Although the focus of Participation was placed more on health and exercise than sport participation, it was the most successful program at the time in promoting an active lifestyle for Canadians. It served the purpose of increasing the base of people exposed to physical activity, which in turn increased the pool of people who participated in sport by living an active lifestyle.

The federal government, while focusing on achieving results in elite competitions, left the promotion of sport participation in the hands of the provincial and municipal governments via the 1987 National Recreation Statement. Under this agreement, provincial governments were responsible for providing recreation services in conjunction with municipal governments. The federal government was to provide funding to national

recreation organizations and services (Canadian Heritage, 2002). Very little research (cf. Broom, 1979; Broom & Baka, 1979) is available on what was done by the provincial governments in terms of promoting participation during this time.

From the early 1970s onwards, sport policy in Canada has been focused almost entirely on elite sporting achievements (see Kidd, 1995; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). In 1971, upon being awarded the 1976 Olympic Summer Games in Montreal, the Canadian Olympic Association (COA)—now the Canadian Olympic Committee (COC)—put in place a plan and funding program known as “Game Plan ‘76.” This elite sport strategy was unique to Canadian sport policy as it was to garner the unified financial support of the federal and all of the provincial governments, as well as the COA and the majority of the important multi-sport organizations (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). Game Plan ‘76 failed, however, to be put into action as only two provinces, Ontario and Quebec, made the promised payments of financial support. In December 1975, the provinces met and agreed to sever their involvement in Game Plan ‘76. The results of the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games were not very positive for Canada, as it became the first host nation of an Olympic Summer Games not to win a gold medal. Game Plan ‘76 was significant to Canadian sport policy as it marked the first program specifically aimed at winning medals and supporting elite athletes, paving the way for other elite-focused policies.

The “Best Ever ‘88” program followed, setting aside sums of \$25 million for winter and \$38 million for Olympic Summer Games support for athletes. According to Macintosh and Whitson (1990, p.23), the Best Ever ‘88 program was used “by Olympic sport organizations to bolster their capacities to produce medal-winners at Olympic Games.” During this time, large-scale organizational changes also occurred in NSOs. In

order to secure funding from the federal government, NSOs were encouraged to move away from volunteer-based structures and toward a more professional-based model to better ensure athlete support and medal success (Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1995a, 1995b; Slack, & Hinings, 1992; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1993). The push for programs containing goals measured in medal totals continues today with the “Own the Podium 2010” (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2006a) program aimed at placing Canada as the highest total medal winning country at the Vancouver 2010 Olympic Games, and the “Road to Excellence Business Plan” (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2006b) for summer sports.

As can be seen from the focus on elite sport, sport participation has not officially been the responsibility of Sport Canada for a number of years. Prior to 1992, Sport Canada and Physical Fitness were both situated in Health Canada’s portfolio under the directorate of physical activity and sport. During this time, Physical Fitness gave small sums of money to NSOs for participation initiatives; however, the bulk of their funding came from Sport Canada (Thibault, & Harvey, 1997). In 1993, Kim Campbell, the then Prime Minister of Canada, moved Sport Canada into the new Department of Canadian Heritage in order to help support national pride and identity through the achievement of international sporting success. A strict division of labour between Sport Canada and Physical Fitness occurred as a result. The arrival of the 1990s also saw increased federal budget constraints in many policy areas, and, as a result, contributions to NSOs were decreased by as much as 25% (Canadian Heritage, 1998). These cuts left many NSOs with little or no room for grassroots, participation-based initiatives or programs, and little incentive to pursue them (Thibault, & Harvey, 1997)

The catalyst for change in the sport system came when struggling Canadian National Hockey League (NHL) franchises began approaching the Liberal federal government asking for tax breaks that were being afforded to other large companies in Canada and to other teams in the United States. During the 1996-97 season, the six NHL franchises located in Canada paid a total of \$21.8 million in property taxes, while the 20 other American teams paid only \$2.2 million combined. This, coupled with the fact that the Canadian dollar was trading at a lowly 65 cents against the US dollar, made it arguably difficult for Canadian teams to remain financially competitive with American teams based in larger markets (Whitson, Harvey, & Lavoie, 2000).

This problem with Canada's national winter game led to the creation of the House of Commons Sub-Committee on Sport, chaired by Toronto area MP Dennis Mills, comprising nine Members of Parliament (MPs), although another 40 of them got sporadically involved with its works. The sub-committee produced a report entitled *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business*, which would ultimately come to be known as the "Mills Report." It outlined 69 recommendations needed to update spending on all sport in Canada, including the "sport pact", a controversial initiative proposing governmental support for Canadian NHL franchises. Nevertheless, the report marked the first time since sport joined Canadian Heritage that it was linked to a participation initiative in a major policy publication. More precisely, the third mandate of the Sub-Committee on Sport was to analyze "The potential scope of, and rationale for federal involvement – or increased federal involvement – in the promotion of (and participation in) amateur sports in Canada" (1998, p2). The proposed recommendations for sport participation included school sport, university sport, women in sport, and sport for the disabled and aboriginal

peoples. The most ambitious of the participation recommendations, however, was for an annual tax credit of \$64.3 million for parents with children participating in sport. Yet, there were many people, such as Jack Aubrey, journalist for the Ottawa Citizen newspaper, who believed that the participation recommendations in the Mills Report were never about increasing children's involvement in sport. Instead, Aubrey stated that the tax credit for sports families was only used to balance the Mills committee's strong backing of the NHL teams (Aubrey, 1999).

Most of the recommendations presented in the Mills report were nevertheless turned down by the Liberal government. The most significant commitment made by the federal government was an agreement to host a Sports Summit. In 2001, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) Dennis Coderre succeeded in bringing the federal and provincial/territorial governments, major amateur sport organizations, coaches, athletes, and the media together to discuss the state of Canadian sport. The idea behind the Summit, according to then Canadian Heritage Minister, the Honourable Sheila Copps, was for "participants to chart a course for sport into the next century and outline the role that sport can play as a catalyst for social change" (Aubrey, 1999, p.C3). The outcome from the Sports Summit ultimately led to the creation of the new Canadian Sport Policy in 2002, and produced the participation pillar under investigation in this study.

Research Questions

As stated earlier, the formal inclusion of participation in the sport policy in Canada is a relatively new addition to Sport Canada (as of 2002), and, as such, very little work has been done regarding its specific impact upon the field. The current change in policy direction towards a dual mandate for elite and participatory sport programs has

been interpreted by Green and Houlihan (2004, p.394) as a “significant moment in Canadian amateur sport policy” one that is “evidence of a major policy change”. This potentially unique moment must therefore be documented and analyzed in order to capture and better understand it. As such the primary research problem in this thesis concerns the examination, in two parts, of the dynamics between the pillar of enhanced participation and its impact on the Canadian sport system, specifically NSOs. This research study is set up in a two-paper thesis format. The first section of the thesis focuses on how participation came to be a part of the federal agenda for sport which resulted in its inclusion into the 2002 Canadian Sports Policy, specifically:

1. What factors led the federal government to add participation to the new Canadian Sport Policy?
2. What were the agendas of the key stakeholders in the formation of the Canadian Sport Policy?

The second section examines the organizational impact on and changes in NSOs that have occurred as a result of participation being included in the 2002 Canadian Sports Policy, specifically: What is the impact of the participation pillar on NSOs in terms of (a) new initiatives produced as a result of the pillar; and (b) the organization’s structure and operational values?

Definition of Terms

Sport participation is an area of study that can be difficult to define because of the many different definitions of what sport is, and exactly what it means to participate in sport. For this study, it is important to achieve a sound understanding of these concepts, how they differ, and why. Also, a central focus for both papers in this study is sport

policy. In the first paper, the new Canadian Sport Policy is examined to determine how participation came to be a responsibility of Sport Canada. The second paper uses literature regarding organizational strategy (also often known as policy) to assess the effect of the participation pillar upon Canadian NSOs. As such, it is important that we identify what a policy is and how it can be analyzed.

Policy

Policy has been most broadly defined as a “deliberate choice of action or inaction” (Smith, 1979 p. 13). As noted earlier, it is not just governments who produce and use policies; NSOs, physical education bodies, and individual clubs all have sport related policies which they are trying to advance (Houlihan, 1991). These policies may come in the form of, for example, mission statements, annual reports, or sport-specific rules and regulations. The purpose of these documents is to produce a plan of action to guide an organization toward its goals. These policies and their impacts will be examined in greater depth in paper two of this study.

An increasingly utilized type of policy is known as public policy. Public policy has been defined in a very open manner by Dye (1975, p.1) as “whatever governments choose to do or not to do.” This definition is important as it notes that public policy involves decisions made by governments that will ultimately affect the greater population. A more recent and specific definition of public policy has been put forth by Pal (2006, p.2) as “a course of action or inaction chosen by public authorities to address a given problem or interrelated set of problems.” This explanation provides a more in-depth perspective of public policy. It demonstrates that it is not just a single entity known as ‘government’ that produces policies but the actions of many different public

institutions, with their own specific agendas. It also indicates the complexity of public policy issues as policy often does not involve providing a solution for a single problem. Many different interconnected problems often surface together and create a need for a new policy to be developed and enacted. The main policy of interest in this project is the Canadian Sport Policy, which was enacted into legislation through Bill C-12: An Act to Promote Physical Activity and Sport.

Sport Participation

In order to understand sport participation, it is first necessary to define sport. In the *Socio-economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada* paper, Bloom et al. (2005, p.1) defined sport as: “An activity that requires a degree of physical exertion and skill, which typically involves competition with others and a set of rules, or as a physical activity undertaken to improve personal sporting performance.” This definition excludes activities in which motorized vehicles play a part in determining the competitive outcome. This paper provides the most up-to-date definition of sport available from Sport Canada. The second part of the definition involves defining what it means to participate in sport. According to Bloom et al., there are three different types of sport participation:

1. Active participants – those who engage in sport to compete with others under a set of formal rules, or to improve their personal best in a sporting event.
2. Volunteers – individuals who donate their time and expertise to sport activities, such as a coach or official.
3. Attendees – individuals who view live sporting events.

This study examines the impacts of the policy on the active and volunteer portions. Also, the definition of the enhanced participation goal in the Canadian Sport

Policy (2002, p.16) is to have a “significantly higher proportion of Canadians from all segments of society ... involved in quality sport activities at all levels and in all forms of participation.” This definition is centered on individuals actively participating in all levels and forms of sport in order to benefit individuals, as well as Canada’s sport development system. It is important to also discriminate between being physically active and being active in sport. The definition of physically active encompasses activities such as walking, yoga, or gardening, whereas being active in sport implies participating in activities that fit under the definition of sport. This study examines sport participation as a single element on the sport continuum, excluding the extremes of professional sport at one end, and physical fitness at the other (Canadian Heritage, 1998).

Overview of the study and its benefits

The preceding paragraphs provide a backdrop which demonstrates that an important policy shift has taken place with the creation of the new Canadian Sport Policy. The shift attempts to create a much more balanced sport system between elite- and participation-based initiatives. As such, the main objectives of this study are to examine how sport participation became an issue in the Canadian sporting agenda leading up to its inclusion in the new CSP, how it is being implemented, and to examine some of the initial effects upon NSOs. Due to the relative youth of the CSP, this project is exploratory and descriptive in nature.

In order to better understand how and why the participation pillar was added to the CSP, it is important to understand the policy process that led to its inception. Thus, paper number one uses Kingdon’s (2003) multiple streams method of policy development to gain a better understanding of the agendas of key stakeholders involved in the creation

of the policy. It also looks at various, social, political, and cultural factors that prompted the creation of the participation pillar. The second paper examines the impact of the pillar thus far on Canadian NSOs' organizational structure and operational values. It relies upon Kikulis, Slack and Hinings' (1995a, b) research regarding organizational change in NSOs from 1992-1996 to provide the theoretical framework for the study. Following the two papers is a discussion chapter that details and explains the links between the findings of the two papers. It also provides ideas and suggestions for future research directions.

References

- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18(2), 158-198.
- Aubrey, J. (1999, April 20). Bad sign for Canadian clubs: Mills report rejection suggests tax breaks unlikely to come. *The Ottawa Citizen*, p. C3.
- Bloom, M., Grant, M., Watt, D. (2005). *Strengthening Canada: The Socio-Economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada*. Ottawa: The Conference Board of Canada.
- Broom, E.F. (1979) History of Government involvement in amateur sport in Canada. In *Proceedings: 4th Canadian Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education*, University of British Columbia, Vancouver B.C. June 24th to 26th 1979.
- Broom, E.F., Baka, R.S.P. (1979) *Canadian Government and Sport*: Ottawa, ON: CAPHER.
- Canadian Heritage. (1998). *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2002). *The Canadian Sports Policy*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2004). *Investing in Sports Participation 2004 - 2008*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage, (2004). *Sport Canada Contribution Guidelines 2005-2007*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Clarkson, M.B., (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 92-117.

Canadian Olympic Committee (2006), Funding Programs: Own the Podium 2010 (n.d.)

Retrieved November 23, 2006, from

http://www.olympic.ca/EN/organization/news/2005/0121_background.shtml.

Canadian Olympic Committee (2006), Olympic News: Road to Excellence Business plan

Retrieved November 23, 2006, from

http://www.olympic.ca/EN/organization/news/2006/0608_backgrounder.shtml

Green, M. & Houlihan, B. (2005). *Elite Sport Development: Policy Learning and Political Priorities*. London: Routledge.

Health Canada (1987) *National Recreation Statement*. Ottawa.

Houlihan, B. (1991) *The Government and Politics of Sport*. London: Routledge.

Kidd, B. (1995). Confronting Inequality in Sport and Physical Activity, *Avante* 1(1), 3-19.

Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes:
A framework for understanding change in national sports organizations.

International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 27, 343-370.

Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995a). Toward an understanding of the role of
agency and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport
organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 273-299.

Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R. (1995b). Sector specific patterns of change in
organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(1), 67- 100.

Macintosh, D. Bedeck, T. & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). *Sport and Politics in Canada:
Federal Government Involvement Since 1961*. Kingston ON: McGill-Queen's
University Press.

Macintosh, D. & Whitson, D. (1990). *The Game Planners: Transforming Canada's Sport*

System. Kingston ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pal, L.A. (2006). *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public issues management in turbulent times*.

(3rd Ed.). Toronto: Nelson.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in National Sport Organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*: 6, 114-132.

Thibault, L., Slack, T., Hinings, B., (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in non-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*: 7, 25-43.

Thibault, L., Harvey, J., (1997). Fostering interorganizational linkages in the Canadian sport delivery system. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*: 19(3), 249-265.

Whitson, D., Harvey, J., & Lavoie, M. (2000). The Mills report, the Manley subsidy proposal and the business of major-league sport, *Canadian Public Administration*, 43(2), 127-156.

CHAPTER 2

Paper 1

The Rise of Participation: An Analysis of the Origins of the Participation Pillar of the Canadian Sport Policy

April 6th 2002, the Honourable Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) Dennis Coderre signed a document that marked the end of a long, thorough policy consultation process in the sporting community of Canada that reached across the country. Over 1,000 individuals representing all major stakeholder groups came together in six different regional conferences, as well as in many special discussion groups, throughout the consultation process (Canadian Heritage, 2002). The result was a joint federal-provincial/territorial document built around the four main pillars of enhanced excellence, enhanced participation, enhanced capacity, and enhanced interaction. It is, however, the addition of the participation pillar that signifies a major change in policy direction for Canadian sport. To this point, participation in sport had always been the sole responsibility of provincial governments (Health Canada, 1987). This new pillar gave the federal government a larger responsibility in the development of participation through national sport organizations (NSOs), as well as through targeting under-represented populations in sport (Canadian Heritage, 2002).

Due to the relative youth of the policy (2002), there has been no research done to explore the impact of this new sporting outlook, that has been called a “significant moment in Canadian amateur sport policy” one that is “evidence of a major policy change” (Houlihan & Green, 2004, p.394). This paper contributes to the literature on

Canadian sport policy by filling some of the gaps surrounding the policy process that led to the new Canadian Sport policy (CSP). It specifically seeks to gain a better understanding of what factors led the federal government to add participation to the new Canadian Sport Policy, and what the agendas were of the key stakeholders in the formation of the Canadian Sport Policy.

The paper is structured as follows: first is a brief review of relevant sport policy research focusing upon recent developments in the Canadian sport system. Second is a summary of Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams model, the theoretical framework of the study. Next is the methodology. This is followed by the results and discussion, and finally by a conclusion with suggestions for future research.

Brief Review of Literature

Sport policy research in Canada and worldwide is an emerging area of study that has experienced greater interest and exploration in the last decade (cf. Green, 2005; Harvey, 1999; Houlihan, 2005; Sam, 2003; Sam & Jackson, 2004), yet it does not contain a long history of published research, although mention is to be made to the seminal book by Macintosh and Whitson (1990). Sport policy in Canada is a policy field that is not easily circumscribed or delimited due to the interplay between the many stakeholders involved in sport (Thibault & Harvey, 1997). It often overlaps with many other government policy areas such as education, health, foreign policy, and social services (Houlihan & White, 2002). In Canada, substantial federal policy papers and initiatives such as the Quadrennial Planning Project (QPP) (Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1995a, 1995b; Slack & Hinings, 1987; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1993), *Sport: The Way Ahead* (Amis & Burton, 1996), and the Mills Report (Rail, 2000, Whitson et al, 2000) have

produced valuable insights in sport policy research. The study of sport policy, however, is not limited to major federal documents, as demonstrated by Beamish's (1990) work with athletes and sport organizations, and Harvey's (1988) work on policy and the welfare state.

In the field of Canadian sport policy, the majority of existing research has been produced in the last 20 years. Rail's (2000) paper on the Mills report is of particular interest to this study, as the Mills Report is one of the earliest documents in the past two decades to put forth recommendations regarding participation from the federal government. Rail argued that the four central arguments of the Mills Report—(1) professional sport has a positive effect on the economy; (2) professional sport encourages the involvement of youth in amateur sport; (3) sport, as practiced by sport heroes, conveys positive values; and (4) sport is healthy—are highly problematic and effectively convey the views of only the corporate and sporting elite. The Mills Report's second argument deals with increasing sport participation specifically in youth populations. Rail pointed out that the imitation effect of media is less of a factor in sport participation than other variables such as social class, gender, and age. The imitation effect of professional sport cannot be counted on to raise sport participation levels, but is rather more likely to encourage the consumption of more sporting events (Rail, 2000). Rail also argued that a proposed non-refundable tax credit is more likely to help upper- and middle-class families as they are the ones with the available financial resources to pay the registration fees. The tax credit does not help the disadvantaged classes who cannot afford to participate in sport programs (Rail, 2000).

Harvey (1988; 2008) also addressed the right of all citizens to have access to sport in an analysis of Canadian sport policy and the welfare state. He suggested that adequate access to sport and leisure opportunities are closely related to one's rights to health and work; and, as such, add weight to sport policy agendas. This was not, however, reflected in sport policy as mass participation programs were faced with spending freezes and cuts in the mid 1980s, which had a negative effect on equal opportunity programs. Yet, at the same time, Canada continued to increase its funding for elite sport programs (Harvey, 2008; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990).

Similar to the criticism of elite funding, the inclusion of enhanced participation in the Canadian Sport Policy has also met with doubts from scholars regarding its potential underlying effects. Green (2005) questioned whether the shifts toward a more inclusive approach to sport policy will result in concrete outcomes that aim to benefit those concerned with high performance sport. Green noted that, in the federal paper *Towards a Canadian sport policy: Report on the national summit on sport*, an important principle is to "ensure cooperation with the provinces" (Canadian Heritage, 2001, p.12), which he believed to be a difficult task. The provinces and municipalities have become the providers of mass sport participation initiatives (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). However, many differences exist in provincial sport and recreation policies, and the divergence between the more prosperous and less prosperous provinces has created a large gap that is difficult to fill (Green, 2005). A more integrative Canadian sport system is also not necessarily something all the provinces desire. Many provinces have expressed high performance ambitions of their own, like Quebec through the 1970s to the 1990s, which

used elite sport to help further its own “nationalist” programs (Harvey, 1999). Macintosh also argued that:

In the rush to get on the high-performance bandwagon provincial governments abandoned their previously strongly held position as champions of mass sport...and commenced to compete with the federal government for their attention and glamour associated with international events. (Macintosh, 1991, p.271)

These arguments, combined with the fact that the Canadian sport delivery system has been entrenched in a philosophy of excellence for the past 30 years, have created an incredibly strong ideology that remains resistant to change (Green, 2004). This resistance to change is evident within individual NSOs. In interviews conducted with senior officials at Swimming/Natation Canada (SNC), Green and Houlihan found that, even though sport policy values may be changing toward more inclusive systems, the SNC “has been able to insulate itself from the full impact of federal policy change” (2005, p. 109). This has allowed SNC to maintain its focus on elite level programming.

Mass participation in sport has been the responsibility of provincial or municipal governments in Canada for some time (Beran & Semotiuk, 1991; National Recreation Statement, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). Provincial government units responsible for sport all have varying and often jealously guarded relationships with the federal government that have led to a high degree of variation between policy and financial arrangements (Houlihan, 1991). Also, responsibility for sport at this level does not fall to only one jurisdiction in the provincial government; it is often shared with departments such as Parks and Recreation, Health, or Education (Houlihan, 1991). Sport programs are often developed and administered by PSOs independently of NSOs and other federal influences.

With the new pillar of enhanced participation, the federal government has set aside large sums of money towards increasing sport participation; however, the problem remains that they have no direct delivery method for these funds. This point is demonstrated in Green's (2004, p.385) research, where one Sport Canada official stated that "we're not sure yet how [we will deal with] the participation angle that is now appearing to be part of our mandate and that never had before been there."

Conceptual Framework

In order to effectively analyse major stakeholder agendas in the policy process, as well as to identify some of the indicators for change, it is important to examine sport and public policy research tools. The conceptual framework used in this project is Kingdon's (2003) Multiple Streams theory of the public policy process, and as such, it is necessary to review its concepts and prior research.

Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams framework is based on the garbage can model of decision making developed by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972). Cohen et al. proposed a scenario where organizations in decision making situations are like organized anarchies in situations with a great deal of ambiguity. Decisions are viewed as a garbage can where many different problems and solutions are placed as they are created by those involved in the process. This mélange of ideas and solutions fits well for Kingdon as he stressed the ambiguity, complexity, and degree of randomness involved within the policy making process. The framework is also centered on the idea of agendas, which are viewed as the list of subjects or problems to which stakeholders are paying serious attention at a given time (Kingdon, 2003). Out of all the sets of problems which warrant attention, stakeholders limit their interests to a few, thus narrowing the agenda setting process. As

such, this framework will help to explore how the participation pillar gained favour in the agenda setting process and ultimately led to its inclusion in the Canadian Sport Policy.

Kingdon's (2003) framework is based on three distinct yet interacting streams that work to determine how problems gain prominence in policy agendas. They are the problem stream, policy stream, and political stream. He devised these streams to try and determine why certain agendas become prominent and others become neglected in the policy process.

First, the problem stream tries to answer the question of why policy makers pay attention to some problems and not others (Zahariadis, 1999). The role of this stream is to identify the conditions under which an issue is determined as a problem. Kingdon (2003) identified three specific ways to identify conditions. The first is to use indicators to examine the existence or magnitude of a condition. The second is to watch for dramatic focusing events or crises that may call attention to a problem. The third is to receive feedback from existing policies or programs that may bring problems to the surface. Problem recognition is essential to agenda setting, as an important problem is likely to be pushed higher up on a specific agenda than a problem of a lesser magnitude (Kingdon, 2003). This stream is assumed to exist as participation arrived prominently on Sport Canada's agenda and ultimately became a pillar of the new Canadian Sport Policy. However, there is a need to determine the indicators that were used by Sport Canada to ascertain the extent of the problem. Possible indicators include the decreasing rates of participation in sport and the dramatic increase in obesity and heart disease in the Canadian population (Bloom et al., 2005).

Second is the policy stream, illustrated as being a primeval soup. In this soup, many ideas, sponsored by specific policy stakeholders, float around and bump into each other to form different combinations and re-combinations. These policy stakeholders or policy communities are composed of different bureaucrats, staff members, academics, and researchers who share a common concern in a specific policy area. From this very chaotic setting in the primeval soup, order is eventually developed, as some ideas are identified as useful and others are discarded. The ideas that reach the top of the agenda must fill certain criteria such as technical feasibility, anticipation of future constraints, and congruency with the dominant values of the community (Kingdon, 2003).

Determining which stakeholders within the policy community put forth the participation pillar is the first step in examining this stream. The policy stream was also characterized by the need for reform in the Canadian sport system. The existing policy dating back to 1961 was over 40 years old and could no longer support the current needs of Canadian sport (Health Canada, 2002).

Third, the political stream exists independent of the other two streams. This stream is characterized by three elements: changes perceived in the national mood, the election of new public officials, and various interest groups pushing their demands upon the government. Developments in this stream are powerful agenda setters (Zahariadis, 1999). For instance, a change in government means a whole influx of new agendas. Of the three elements contained in the political stream, it is the combination of national mood and government turnover that can have the most powerful effect upon agendas (Kingdon, 2003). The next step in Kingdon's model is to determine the national mood regarding sport in Canada and Canadians' feelings regarding sport participation. Also, the

influence of coalitions or interest groups lobbying on behalf of sport participation was assessed to determine the impact upon stakeholder agendas.

Typically, the three streams run separately from one another. As Kingdon (2003, p.201) states “problems are recognized and defined according to processes that are different from the ways policies are developed or political events unfold.” However, under the right circumstances, the streams can join together in an important event known as coupling. During this time, the streams work together to push forward issues on the agenda for the purpose of change. When all three streams are coupled together, chances for an issue to increase its priority level are at its peak. These moments have been labelled as ‘Policy Windows’ (Kingdon, 2003) or ‘Launch Windows’ (Houlihan 2005). Kingdon (2003, p.165) defined these windows as a “fleeting opportunity for advocates of proposals to push their pet solutions, or to push attention towards special problems”. Policy windows, when opened, remain open for only a very short period of time. For this reason, policy makers must be sufficiently skilled at recognizing the conditions present when a window opens and must work quickly to push their agendas through before it closes.

Methods

The purpose of this paper is to examine how enhanced sport participation became a pillar of the Canadian Sport Policy. As no other research has been done regarding this pillar of the new sport policy, this study is exploratory and descriptive in nature. In order to carry out the objectives of this study, a qualitative research methodology has been used. A qualitative research design was employed to understand the main factors that led to change and the agendas of the key stakeholders involved.

Data Collection

Data collected came from documents and semi-structured interviews. There are a number of ways in which archival material is able to provide a positive contribution to research, and lends itself particularly well to policy and organizational studies. First, there are very few ethical concerns involved in a document analysis. The use of government documents is ideal for a document analysis because they present few problems regarding privacy, anonymity, or confidentiality as they are in the public domain. The government, however, does not always allow complete access to all documents, as some are classified and others contain sections which have been blacked out. No documents that appeared in this study were censored, as all documents used were released for public consumption. Finally, as all data in the documents were prepared prior to the research and independent of the researcher, it ensured that the information is free of researcher-based biases or influence inherent in the collection process (Abbott et al., 2004).

The major documents covered in this study include the minutes of the meetings leading up to and including the *Mills Report: Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business* (Canadian Heritage, 1998), *Sport Participation in Canada: 1998 Report* (Canadian Heritage, 1999), reports from the regional (Atlantic, Territories, Prairies, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec) conferences, the Aboriginal Sport Circle, Athletes CAN, Equity and Inclusion, NSO, Officials, and Media Roundtables (Canadian Heritage, 2001-04), *Towards a Canadian Sport Policy: Report on the National Summit on Sport* (Canadian Heritage, 2001), *The Federal-Provincial/Territorial Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002-2005* (Canadian Heritage, 2002), the new *Canadian Sport*

Policy (Canadian Heritage, 2002), and some of the current federal participation initiatives. The study begins with the Mills Report as it is believed it to be the first major document from Sport Canada to mention the inclusion of participation since it moved into the portfolio of Canadian Heritage in 1993. The Mills Report's third mandate was to explore "The potential scope of, and rationale for federal involvement – or increased federal involvement – in the promotion of (and participation in) amateur sports in Canada" (Canadian Heritage, 1998, p. 2). The documents were transformed into electronic format, if needed, for subsequent data analysis.

The second data collection method was to conduct semi-structured interviews with major stakeholders in the policy process. Stakeholders were identified and selected based on previous policy stakeholder literature, as well as from candidates who featured prominently in the archival material. Accessing more than one data source created richer, stronger data with increased validity (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). In order to represent the agendas present at the implementation of the new policy, seven interviews were conducted with key stakeholders. The participants were selected to represent all major stakeholder groups present during the policy process. The interviewees consisted of a senior policy advisor to former Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) Dennis Coderre, a participation policy analyst at Sport Canada, two provincial participation policy leaders, a chief executive officer of an NSO, a representative of a sports advocacy group, and an Olympic athlete. All participations were involved in the consultation process rolled out by Sport Canada. Only the Olympics athlete was not involved in the policy process. The senior policy advisor and policy analyst at Sport Canada were directly involved in the writing process of the CSP. It was required that all stakeholders interviewed were in their

positions prior to 2002 when the CSP was created. The interviews focused on identifying the specific agendas of the major policy stakeholders and determining how they influenced the process of adding participation to the Canadian Sport Policy. All interviews lasted between 35 minutes and 1 hour. All participants gave their informed consent to the interviews prior to their commencement (see appendices A, B, C, and D for copies of the questionnaire, information letter, consent form, and interview guide, respectively). Data collected through interviews were transcribed verbatim from the recording device. They were then converted to an electronic Word file, for analysis.

Data Analysis

The document analysis provided the study with insight into some of the indicators and conditions that created the need for participation to return to Sport Canada. The analysis was also conducted to probe for stakeholder agendas and problem indicators. Document analysis is a technique that involves a detailed study of documents in order to understand their substantive content, or reveal a deeper meaning through their style or context (Abbot et al., 2004; Holsti, 1969; Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The document analysis also helped provide a better understanding of the different agendas of the various stakeholders who were present during the creation of the new Canadian Sport Policy. The findings of the document analysis were used to determine who the major stakeholders were in the process, and as such, who should be selected for interviews.

Once selected, the different agendas of the policymakers present during the creation of the new CSP were highlighted in the data. These agendas were examined to determine how they fit into Kingdon's (2003) Multiple Streams model. ATLAS.ti 5.0, a qualitative data analysis program, was used to code all data. For the document analysis,

the codes helped sort data into the problem, policy, and political streams that are used in Kingdon's framework, as well as one for individual/group agendas. For the interview data, coding was classified by identifying individuals' specific agendas, and how they fit into the three streams of the multiple streams framework.

Results and Discussion

During the formation of the Canadian Sport Policy, The Honourable Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) Denis Coderre was asked, during a CBC radio interview, why after years of under-funding at Sport Canada was there an appetite to spend money on it now. He responded by saying,

The most important thing is that we realized sport was an investment, not an expense, so after all the cuts of the last few years we decided it was time to increase funding. Obviously, some of it was because of what happened at the Sydney Olympics.

Stating further that,

Health Canada research has shown that 92 percent of kids who participate in organized sport will never become delinquent; 80 percent of girls who participate in sport will never have an unwanted pregnancy. People participating in sports will have a higher self-esteem and be healthier and happier. So this is a social issue and a health issue. (CBC, 2002)

These statements provide valuable insight into some of the indicators (decreased delinquency rate, increased physical and mental health) Sport Canada used to determine that there was indeed a problem in the Canadian sport system, and that it was time for change. The following section further examines Kingdon's (2003) three streams to gain an understanding of the circumstances present in the sporting and public communities during the creation of the Canadian Sport Policy. The stakeholders' participation agendas were then explored to examine their impacts on the developing policy framework. An

examination of the influence a single person of power can have over the entire policy process, and how that directly relates to Kingdon's model will be discussed.

Problem Stream

Several things happened in the 1990s and early 2000s. In the 1990s, there came evidence from data collected through Statistics Canada through the general social survey that sport and participation in physical activity was decreasing in Canada. Then came the 2000 Olympic Games where we did... well rather poorly. (Sport Canada Policy Officer)

This quote distinguishes a number of different indicators such as decreased participation rates, and poor Olympic results being present prior to 2002, suggesting that a legitimate sport participation crisis existed in Canada at the time. It also provides a focusing event of poor Olympic Games results that caused people to take a closer look at the problem. According to Kingdon (2003), indicators and focusing events combine with feedback from existing policies to form the problem stream in his multiple streams model of policy development. All three of these conditions are found to be present to a certain extent in the formation of the participation pillar of the CSP.

Indicators

The Mills report has been identified as the starting point for this study. The report's main focus was on the economic impact of sport on a national and regional basis, and was conceived in part as a response to the financial troubles of Canadian National Hockey League Franchises. The third mandate of the report acknowledged a potential federal involvement in sport participation, which many indicated was included in the paper in an attempt to help balance out the report's strong backing of professional sport teams (Aubrey, 1999; Rail, 2000). This is further evidenced by the fact that, of the 69 recommendation made in the Mills Report, only seven could be said to directly target

sport participation (Canadian Heritage, 1998). This illustrates that participation was not high on stakeholders' agendas at the beginning of the policy process. It was during the extensive consultation period prior to the formation of the CSP when key indicators surfaced that it quickly became an important topic. Decision makers often have a long list of problems or indicators facing them and have to pay attention to some while ignoring others (Kingdon, 2003). The many indicators surrounding sport participation eventually forced stakeholders to take notice.

I think that it was a general consensus from the very beginning of the consultation among most stakeholders that our current sport participation model was incredibly ineffective. A quick look around at how kids spend their free time sitting on their butts staring at televisions tells you right away we have a problem here. We have or are nearing an obesity epidemic in Canada. Sport and physical activity had to be made more accessible for all. (NSO representative)

Each and every stakeholder interviewed stated that increased rates of obesity, and dramatically decreasing participation levels in sport were prime indicators of the health of our participation programs prior to 2002. This point also emerged from all of the round table discussion forms that were conducted in the lead up to the CSP. Sport Canada however, relied almost entirely upon information collected from Statistics Canada at this time to assess participation. According to one participation policy analyst at Sport Canada, "The General Social Survey was the main tool used to monitor participation". Kingdon (2003) stated that an indicator is not simply a straightforward recognition of facts but must be considered in terms of the methodology with which they were gathered and interpreted. This would need to be carefully considered when using NSO membership rates as an indicator for they only include the paying members of NSOs, which, in many cases, is not an accurate indication of how many people are participating in the sport. For many NSOs, their paying members are their fourteen provincial and

territorial associates. In some cases, the members are the local, affiliated clubs. Besides the elaborate consultation process, it seemed that Sport Canada did very little of its own research to confirm any information they were given indicating that sport participation was on the decline.

Another key indicator that arose in the interview process and in all but one of the minutes of the regional consultations was that the current participation system was far too narrow, and competition focused at an early age.

We now have 6 year old kids playing summer hockey in Canada who are labelled as right defensemen... I think that Sport Canada was much too centered on athlete development, it was not concerned with the sports participation of the general population. (Senior Policy Advisor)

The participation system, as it stood, was designed to produce athletes who were interested only in competitive sport. It was not, however, concerned with attracting participants from new demographics or marginalized groups, nor was it focused upon creating lifelong participants in sport. This resulted in children quitting sport early, which in turn created a deficit at higher levels.

The indicators stated above (increasing rates of childhood obesity, elite focused system, barriers towards participation for marginalized groups) caused stakeholders to pay attention to the problem; however, they do not explain the entire situation. Policy problems are often not explicitly defined by indicators and often need a focusing event, powerful symbol, or the personal experience of policy makers in order to gain space on a stakeholder's agenda.

Focusing Event / Crisis

"I can't recall one particular event or crisis that was able to drive it that at the end of the day was responsible for participation being a part of the CSP" (Provincial Policy

Analyst). There appears to be no single focusing event in the policy process responsible for bringing participation into the new CSP. There were, however, a number of minor events that ran just below the surface of the process that had significant effects on the addition of the participation pillar.

As mentioned earlier by Mr. Coderre and others, the closest situation to a focusing event would be the poor performance of Canadian athletes at the Olympic Summer Games in Sydney. As is the case every four years, “there is a lot of hand ringing and gnashing of teeth when our Summer Olympic team does poorly, and there is a lot of rejoicing when our Winter Olympic teams do well” (Sport Canada Policy Officer). This reaction is also documented by Heritage Canada (2001) which states that positive results at Olympic Winter Games generate pride and admiration, but poor results are met with doubts over the effectiveness of the sport system. The negative publicity generated by the poor results in Sydney created a heightened public interest towards the state of Canadian sport. This resulted in a public that was open and supportive of change to the sport system. The lack of medals provided a distinct indicator to sport stakeholders that substantial problems existed in the Canadian sporting system.

A further event or crisis was found in the relationship that existed between Sport Canada and Health Canada. At the time, Sport Canada was solely responsible for the promotion of sport and Health Canada the promotion of physical activity.

Health Canada and Sport Canada, those two agencies don't even talk to each other! There is and was very little money put into programs for physical activity. Health Canada did have a program for physical activity, but they didn't exactly know what to do with it. Sport Canada and Health, well they had meetings but they never came up with anything in terms of a coherent approach towards improving participation in physical activity and sport. The best example that I can give you of that is, if you look at the modification of the law that used to be called The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act. We modified that to physical activity and

sport and if you look into that all the principals and pillars of the sports policy are mentioned there in the law. In physical activity, there is almost nothing because Health Canada didn't want a policy on physical activity, they didn't want anything. They just said 'we'll handle it, we'll handle it another way'. There was definitely a war going on for the turf of physical activity staying with health. (Senior Policy Advisor)

This tenuous relationship caused Sport Canada to try and extend and secure influence into sport participation because they were receiving little help on physical activity from Health Canada.

It may not have been any of these indicators that had the largest impact upon participation becoming one of the four pillars of the CSP. The largest influence was the influx of money spent on sport in Canada. Federal budget cuts in the early 1990s led to a situation where "Sport Canada was only able to support programs in excellence, not even leading to excellence" (Sport Canada Policy Officer). In the words of one senior policy advisor,

The federal government wanted to put more money into sport, but not competitive sport. They wanted more people to participate in sport, they wanted the underprivileged, and new populations to have access to sport. So that is why it became an issue, such that money to excellence was not necessarily the answer.

Feedback from Existing Programs

Garnering feedback from existing policies and programs had very little impact on the outcome of the policy. The nature of the consultation process being as inclusive as it was, much of the feedback Sport Canada received came from the regional forums, as well as conferences with all of the major stakeholder groups rather than detailed analyses of existing programs.

Policy Stream

The jurisdiction of sport participation in Canada according to the Canadian Constitution lies in the hands of the provinces and territories. Sport itself is not specifically mentioned but can be taken in the context of recreation. The 1987 National Recreation statement, however, states that the federal government has a role to play in sports development through its spending power. “Even though we don’t have jurisdiction from a legal point of view, we have a role to use our spending power to further sport” (Sport Canada Policy Officer). This use of spending power gives the federal government the ability to develop participation programs as an extension of their responsibilities to sport.

The inclusion of participation to the policy came with very little push or pressure from outside lobby groups or organizations. It was a combined provincial/territorial/federal insistence. An organization like the Sport Matters Group, which was in its infancy at the time, produced a paper called *Sport the Way We Want It* that expressed their views regarding the importance of including sport participation in the CSP. It tackled the ethical dimension of sport participation, decreeing that it must be of the highest quality and integrity. They insisted that “many parents may be turned off of registering their kids in a sports program, where the sport program is not age adapted, or if there is too much early competition” (Advocacy Group Representative).

At the time the policy was initiated, it is important to note that there was a stable majority government that was into its second term in office. “Post Mills, we started to see the deficit budgeting was done, you know [Paul] Martin had done that as finance minister, and so [Jean] Chrétien is that much more confident, and decides to expand the

cabinet which in turn provides an opportunity for Mr. Dennis Coderre” (Advocacy Group Representative). Coderre seized the opportunity and began to engage stakeholders in discussions over what could be changed. Coderre immediately recognized this as an opportunity to place his own stamp on the portfolio, “I would say that he [Coderre] had interest in the policy that had a political drive to it” (Advocacy Group Representative). He was aided by the fact that the core stakeholders in sport were “encouraging a political involvement” (Advocacy Group Representative), and were ready for change. This is reflected in the opinion of a Sport Canada Policy Officer who believed that “Sport Canada was in a place where it would respond to a new Secretary of State for Amateur Sports’ interest in doing certain things, mostly because there hadn’t been one assigned previously and then a very persuasive one comes along.” As mentioned earlier with the agenda of the consultation processes largely set by the federal government, it is important to note that according to one sport advocacy group member, “the sport community took that on and accepted that. I don’t really recall people questioning whether the rollout really resembled the consultation.”

There also may not have been a need for an outside driver for the inclusion of participation, as the nature of the consultation process distinctly lent itself to it. Situating the policy in a Federal/Provincial-Territorial (F/TP) way and taking it to many different geographic communities ensured that they got feedback from participation stakeholders. “Sport is fundamentally a community-based experience, driven by volunteers for the purpose of participation” (Advocacy Group Representative). A single or decisive driver for participation was not necessary because they would have heard about its importance at every stop in the road. There also was no real formal sport coalition at the time –

Canadian sport still does not have a representative coalition of organizations or federations. As such, there was no obvious leader to drive and put forth collective opinions.

Political Stream

A key area of the political stream is the mood of the general public during the policy process. When Coderre initially took office, the Canadian public “appeared very indifferent toward the state of sport in Canada” (Advocacy Group Representative). The entire process got a large boost thanks to Canada’s poor showing at the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. The results caused sympathy in the Canadian general public to the needs of athletes and the larger sporting system. A senior Sport Canada Official stated that “everyone recognized that our athletes are under funded when compared to other nations. People were asking questions such as ‘how come Australian athletes are so much better, why do they have this and that?’”(Sport Canada Policy Officer). He later added, “So I think that the mood of the public at the time was generally supportive, but people wanted to make sure that both participation and excellence were addressed, not just one.” This indicates that the public clearly realized the necessity for change in the sport system. With sport participation on the decline, it was clear this was a problem that could not be fixed simply by increasing elite funding as was the practice in the past.

As mentioned before, the strong support of the majority of the sporting community during the consultation process helped push the agenda forward. However, there were still internal debates among major shareholders in sport as to what their role in participation should be.

Everyone was looking at the implications, what am I going to lose? What am I going to gain? I suppose that may have been a little disappointing, there were

many people looking at what their organizations would benefit from, as opposed to what will benefit the participant. In a way, I think that helped to shape the policy into the very inclusive, participant-focused final document that we have. (Senior Policy Advisor)

Agenda Setting

Determining the various agendas that were brought to the table in the building of the CSP strengthens the understanding of how and why participation became one of the pillars of the new sport policy. All stakeholders interviewed in the project indicated that participation was clearly present at various levels on their agendas at the beginning of the policy process. As participation is a major component of sport, it is logical that it appears on all stakeholders' agendas. The difference, however, exists in how high a priority they are given on each stakeholder's agenda. Sport Canada was the driver behind the development, and consultation process of the policy, which pushed the organization's agenda to the forefront. A high level Sport Canada employee explained that their involvement in participation came from "a need for better interaction among the different levels of government and partners" (Sport Canada Policy Officer). The intention then was to provide a more connected system where all levels of government and sport are interacting together. The only way this could be possible was to add participation to federal policy:

It was a highly strategic move by Sport Canada. By adopting a role in sport participation, it created conditions for this to be a federal/provincial/ territorial policy agreed to by all governments. Really, with the absence of participation, there is no way the provinces and territories would be in there. (Advocacy Group Representative)

Sport Canada was almost forced to position participation as a highly significant priority on their agenda as a result of the various other goals they wanted to see achieved. In order to get all the stakeholders of sport to the table, adding a participation component to the

federal policy was a necessary step. A senior policy advisor explained that the “participation element was designed to give impetus to and to put pressure on the provinces to do something” (Senior Policy Advisor). This was seconded by a provincial policy analyst, adding that “Sport Canada was fully aware that in some provinces nothing was happening... using federal money as a lever to make sure that the provincial or territorial jurisdiction would do something” (Provincial Policy Analyst). This would indicate that participation was also on the federal agenda as a way of leveraging the provinces into taking a greater interest and responsibility in sport. The intent was not only to bring the provinces together under a single sport policy, but also for the federal government to be able to place some pressure on the provinces to deliver on participation initiatives. This is a strategy that Sport Canada has used in the past via funding allocation to influence and control NSOs organizational structures and methods (Kikulis et al., 1992 1995a, 1995b; Slack & Hining, 1987, 1992; Thibault et al., 1993).

Sport Canada took considerable care to make the policy process as inclusive and open as possible. Sport Canada organized round tables, regional conferences and the National Sport Summit held in Ottawa on April 27th and 28th 2002 to engage all important stakeholders in the discussions. It was suggested, however, that the policy process may not have been as entirely encompassing as it appeared. “The agenda and the outcome were led by the government, we talked a lot about the policy of engagement so that you would really feel like it was co-designed and co-delivered, and it wasn’t that” (Athlete Representative). These findings indicate that Sport Canada made it appear as though it was a holistic process; however, in actuality, their prefabricated agenda was followed throughout the process.

These findings are not fully in line with Kingdon's (2003) notion of agenda setting where problems rise and fall on stakeholders' lists of priorities throughout the policy process. The indicators, focusing events, and feedback established participation as an area of concern for stakeholders; however, this did not result in its elevation on their agendas. It was only when participation was viewed as a solution by Sport Canada and the federal government, towards making the sporting systems more connected and inclusive that it began to rise on their agenda. Participation's importance on Sport Canada's agenda did not arise from low levels of involvement in sport, or the obesity crisis. Participation gained its prominence when Sport Canada identified it as the only way to get all provinces and territories involved in the CSP. Kingdon (2003) stresses that problem recognition is critical to agenda setting; yet in this case, it was only when a problem was viewed as a solution that it began to rise on stakeholders agendas.

The development of the new CSP was a culmination of many different agendas working both together and against one and other. There was, however, a major driving force behind the policy that came in the form of Dennis Coderre's personal agenda. "He was an extreme go-getter kind of guy, and he wanted to do something of note during his stay as Secretary of State, and so he was a main driver behind the impetus to build a Canadian Sport policy" (Sport Canada Policy Officer). His desire to leave a mark on the sport system is evident. "The Secretary of State at the time had his own ambitions and the sport portfolio provided a useful way for him to step out and engage in a very public way as well as engage in the file" (Advocacy Group Representative). Coderre was fortunate to arrive at a time when there had been no previously assigned Secretary of State; so when he arrived, "Sport Canada was in a place where it would respond to a new amateur sports

minister's interest in doing certain things" (Advocacy Group Representative). Coderre seized the opportunity and pushed forth his agenda to bring about a new inclusive federal/provincial Canadian Sport Policy.

The large influence that a single individual can have on the creation of a policy is not fully addressed in Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams model. Kingdon examined the differences between visible participants, regarded as prominent figures who receive a lot of press, and hidden participants that include academics, researchers, and bureaucrats. Coderre's position as secretary of state places him in the visible category. Kingdon argued that visible individuals can hold significant sway over the agenda setting process and draw attention to significant issues. Coderre, however, extended his influence well past the agenda setting stage to the creation of the CSP, advocating for funds, leading discussions, and working to involve the entire Canadian sporting community in the policy process. This extended influence of a single individual is therefore an additional factor to be considered when using Kingdon's Multiple Streams model of the policy process; it is thus a contribution of this paper to the literature.

It is important to note that Kingdon stressed that "A complex combination of factors is generally responsible for the movement of a given item into agenda prominence. For a number of reasons a combination of sources is virtually always responsible" (1995, p.76). Some of the findings put forth in this paper may not seem to be congruent with Kingdon's Multiple Streams model. However one of the strengths of the Multiple Streams model is that it is able to accommodate many different factors involved in the agenda setting process. Some of the differences highlighted in this paper may arise from the fact that the Multiple Streams model as developed in light of the American

political system, which is pluralist. In the Canadian system the executive power is stronger especially with majority governments. It doesn't contain the many checks and balances of the American system and as such the Westminster parliament system gives a lot more decision power to cabinet ministers. The system induced differences pointed out in this paper could likely be included in a revised edition of Kingdon's model that would work well for Commonwealth countries and for a more state centralised system such as France.

Conclusions and Future Directions

This paper explored the policy process which saw sport participation added as one of the four main pillars of the Canadian Sport Policy. Kingdon's (2003) Multiple Streams policy model provided an excellent tool for an in-depth examination of the major problem, policy, and political themes that shaped its inception, as well as provided insight into the agenda's of the major stakeholders involved in the progression of the policy. These findings offer us a better understanding of what transpired during the implementation a major sport policy document. It also highlighted the influence that a single person motivated to leave a mark can do in developing a policy, as Coderre was clearly the driving force of the policy right from its implementation. Kingdon's framework was, however, unable to clearly identify why participation became a focal point on stakeholders agendas in the policy process. In Kingdon's framework, only identified problems arise on stakeholder agendas. In this case, however, it was only when Sport Canada identified participation as a solution to making the sport system more inclusive that it gained prominence. Participation was always on stakeholder agendas; however, it was only when Sport Canada began to see it as a way to exert more control

over the provinces and territories that its profile was elevated. Ultimately however, this study identified two main reasons for the addition of participation to the CSP: 1) it was a unique blend of newly available federal funds; and 2) the federal government identified it as an opportunity to extend its influence over the sport system.

The study also highlighted Sport Canada's unique agenda during that time. Sport Canada decision makers wanted to get more involved in the promotion of physical activity, which was out of their jurisdictional control. By including the provincial governments in the CSP, they gained an inclusive sport system, as well as the ability to leverage funding for participation among the provinces. With all provinces signed onto the policy and working towards similar participation goals, it could become very easy to ensure that provinces are following certain standards.

Much research still needs to be done in terms of the Canadian Sport Policy and its effects on the Canadian sport system. This study only concerned itself with the participation pillar; but there are still excellence, capacity, and interaction that have not been examined. Future research within the participation pillar needs to be done regarding the bilateral agreements signed between Sport Canada and their various provincial counterparts. Examining what is being done in each province using their new levels of funding and how it is being done is essential for understanding the effect of the pillar. The policy process of the agreements and the differences between them would also provide useful insight into what is happening in relation to the pillar. Also, as more information becomes available over time, the next step would be to analyze exactly what types of participation programs have been initiated and how successful they are. Whether

the extra funding being added to the system is actually resulting in an increased number of participants in sport needs to be determined.

References

- Abbott, S., Shaw, S., Elston, J. (2004). Comparative Analysis of Health Policy Implementation. The Use of Documentary Analysis. *Policy Studies*, 25(4), 259-266.
- Amis, J., Burton, T.L. (1996) Beyond Reason: formulating Sport Policy in Canada. *Avante*, 2(2), 17-36.
- Beamish, R., (1990).The persistence of inequality: An analysis of participation patterns among Canada's high performance athletes. *International Review of Sociology of Sport*: 25, 143-153.
- Beran, J. A., Semotiuk, D. (1991). Sport for all: Fact or fantasy in the United States and Canada. In J. Standeven, K. Hardman, & D. Fisher. (Eds.) *Sport for All: Into the 90's*, p. 108-116. Aachen: Mayer and Mayer.
- Bloom, M., Grant, M., Watt, D. (2005). *Strengthening Canada: The Socio-Economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada*. Ottawa: The Conference Board of Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (1998). *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage, (2000). *Sport Participation in Canada: 1998 Report*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada for Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage, (2001). *Towards a Canadian sport policy: Report on the national summit on sports*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.

- Canadian Heritage, (2001). *The Federal-Provincial/Territorial Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002-2005*, Ottawa: Sport Canada
- Canadian Heritage. (2002). *The Canadian Sports Policy*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003) *A British Columbian Perspective on Sport – Report on the British Columbian Perspective on Sport*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *A Collaborative Tradition – Atlantic Canada in Canadian Sport: Report on the Atlantic Regional Conference*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *A Northern Perspective on Sport - Report on the Territorial Regional Conference*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *A Prairies Perspective on Sport – Report on the Prairies Regional Conference*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *A Quebec Perspective on Sport – Report on the Quebec Regional Conference*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *It's About Working Together – Report on the Ontario Regional Conference*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Report on the Aboriginal Roundtable*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Report on the Athletes Roundtable*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Report on the Media Roundtable*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Report on the NSO/MSO Roundtable*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Report on the Officials Roundtable*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage (2003). *Sport for All: Report on the Roundtable on Equity and Inclusion in Amateur Sport*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.

- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2003). *Q & A; An interview with Minister of Sport Denis Coderre*. Retrieved 02/15/06 from www.cbc.ca/sports/indepth/coderre2.html
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., Olsen, J.P., (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, 1-25.
- Green, M (2004). Power, policy, and political priorities: Elite sport development in Canada and the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21, 376-396.
- Green, M. (2005). Integrating macro- and meso-level approaches: A comparative analysis of elite sport development in Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5(2), 143-166.
- Green, M. & Houlihan, B. (2005). *Elite Sport Development: Policy Learning and Political Priorities*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, J. (1988). Sport policy and the welfare state: An outline of the Canadian case. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 315-329.
- Harvey, J. (1999). Sport and Quebec nationalism: Ethnic of civil identity? In. J. Sugden, & A. Bairner (Eds.), *Sport in Divided Societies* (p. 31-50) Aachen: Mayer and Mayer.
- Harvey, J. (2008). Sport, Politics and Policy. In. J. Crossman (Ed.) *Canadian Sport Sociology* (p. 221-236) Toronto: Nelson.
- Health Canada. (1987). *The National Recreation Statement*. Ottawa.
- Holsti, R. (1969) *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Don Mills ON: Addison-Wesley.
- Houlihan, B. (1991) *The Government and Politics of Sport*. London: Routledge.

- Houlihan, B., & White, A., (2002). *The politics of sport development: development of sport or development through sport*. London: Routledge.
- Green, M. & Houlihan, B. (2004). Advocacy coalitions and elite sport policy change in Canada and the United Kingdom. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(4): 387-403.
- Houlihan, B. (2005) Public sector sport policy: Developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 40(2), 163-185.
- Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995a). Toward an understanding of the role of agency and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 273-299.
- Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R. (1995b). Sector specific patterns of change in organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(1), 67- 100.
- Kingdon, J.W., (2003) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. (2nd ed.) New York: Longman.
- Macintosh, D. & Whitson, D. (1990). *The Game Planners: Transforming Canada's Sport System*. Kingston ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Macintosh, D. (1991). Sport and the State: The case of Canada. In F. Landry, M. Landry, & M. Yerles (Eds.), *Sport the third millennium: Proceedings of the international symposium*, (p. 269-275). Québec City, Canada: Les Presses de l'University de Laval.
- Miles & Huberman, (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

- Rail, G. (2000) Contextualizing the Mills Report: Professional Sport, Corporate Welfare and the Canadian State. *Avante*, 6(1), 1-18.
- Ritchie, Lewis (2003).
- Sam, M.P. (2003) What's the Big Idea? Reading the Rhetoric of a National Sport Policy Process. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20(3), 189-213.
- Sam, M.P., Jackson, S.J. (2004) Sport Policy Development in New Zealand. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(2) 205-222.
- Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 12, 185-193.
- Sport Matters Group, (2003) *Sport the way we want it*.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., Hinings, B., (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in non-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*: 7, 25-43.
- Thibault, L., Harvey, J., (1997). Fostering interorganizational linkages in the Canadian sport delivery system. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*: 19(3), 249-265.
- Whitson, D., Harvey, J., & Lavoie, M. (2000). The Mills report, the Manley subsidy proposal and the business of major-league sport, *Canadian Public Administration*, 43(2), 127-156.
- Yin, R.K., (2003). *Case Study Research, Design and Methods* (5th Ed.) London: Sage Publications.
- Zahariadis, N. (1999). Ambiguity, time and multiple streams. In P.A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (p.73-93) Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

CHAPTER 3

Sport participation: A new agenda for NSOs

The establishment of a new Canadian Sport Policy (CSP) in 2002 signified the beginning of a new direction for Canadian Sport. The policy is built upon the four pillars of: enhanced participation, enhanced excellence, enhanced capacity, and enhanced interaction. These four pillars are thought to form a solid platform for sport in Canada to address the sports continuum from entry to excellence (Canadian Heritage, 2002). It is, however, the pillar of enhanced participation that represents the largest change to the Canadian sport system. That pillar allows for the federal government to have a broader role in the development of sport participation, which until then was primarily the responsibility of provinces, territories, and municipalities (Health Canada, 1987).

The changes initiated through the CSP reflect a continuing trend of the federal government extending its grasp on Canadian Sport through the conditional funding of National Sport Organizations (NSOs) (Amis & Burton, 1996; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Rail, 2000), its primary delivery method for sport. The Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP) is a prime example of this kind of activity. In this case, the federal government used the implementation of a four-year, long-term planning module to pressure NSOs to conform to specific organizational standards that were believed to be ideal (Kikulis, Slack & Hinings 1992, 1995a, 1995b; Slack & Hinings, 1987, 1992; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings 1993). The introduction of the CSP in 2002 and the inclusion of the participation pillar represent a significant change to Canadian sport and NSOs, which has not been experienced since the introduction of the QPP. As such, it is an

important time to examine the ramifications of this change in NSOs, specifically the types of structural and functional impacts that the participation pillar has produced in NSOs.

This chapter specifically examines the organizational changes in NSOs that have occurred as a result of participation being included in the 2002 Canadian Sports Policy, specifically in terms of new initiatives produced as a result of the pillar, and to the organization's structure and operational values. Findings will help provide sport managers and researchers with a better understanding of the role that the participation pillar is playing in Canadian sport, specifically how it is impacting NSOs.

This paper will begin with the theoretical framework which covers the relevant literature pertaining to organizational design and change, as well as the framework used for organizational analysis. This will be followed by the methods used in the study. Results and discussion are then presented. Finally, the conclusion and avenues for future research are offered.

Theoretical Framework

While this study focuses on how NSOs are reacting toward the pillar of enhanced participation and the influx of federal funding for new participation initiatives, it is too early to measure any of the direct effects NSOs' participation programs have had in increasing grassroots sporting involvement. Nevertheless, the impact the new pillar is having upon NSOs, in terms of changes to their structure and operations, can be studied through an organizational analysis.

The existing research specific to Canadian NSOs and organizational change was produced mainly by Slack and colleagues (Kikulis et al., 1992, 1995a, 1995b; Slack &

Hinings, 1987, 1992; Thibault et al., 1993) who studied the federal government's introduction of the QPP and its impact on NSOs. The QPP resulted in a significant change in the organizational structure of Canadian NSOs. One of the central aims of the QPP was to shift NSOs from being volunteer-controlled organizations with a simple structure to a more professional and bureaucratic model containing full time employees in decision making positions (Macintosh, Bedeck, & Franks, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Hinings, 1987, 1992). The work produced by Slack and colleagues during the implementation of the QPP regarding organizational changes in NSOs is closely related to this study, and will provide the basis for much of the research in this paper. Specifically relevant are the concept of archetypes, which represent the different types of organizational designs present in NSOs. Key archetypes within both the sport management and management literatures are briefly discussed.

Archetypes in the Sport Management Literature

An archetype is a set of beliefs and values that aide an organization in determining their goals and direction in combination with structures and processes that serve to implement and strengthen those ideas (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988). In simpler terms, an archetype is an arrangement of structures and systems that reflect a single interpretive design (Greenwood & Hinings, 1993). The variety of organizational designs present is a result of the choices made by organizational members regarding appropriate structural outlines and the tolerance of the current environment to support the different schemes. These archetypes are not static and organizations can move, although not easily, from one to the other when needed or required. Also, it is important to note that there is no 'optimal' or 'ideal' archetype for NSOs, as any one may be correct for a particular

organization (Kikulis et al., 1992). Archetypes when viewed as methodological tools assist in observation and prediction but their true value is that they allow organizations to be described in terms that are comparable (Kikulis et al., 1995b). Hinings and Greenwood (1988) utilized archetypes to better understand organizational change. Archetypes establish sector-specific designs, which can then be used to compare the degree and patterns of change that occur in organizations over time. Archetypes are classified based upon information regarding organizational values and organizational structure.

In 1990, Macintosh and Whitson identified two different archetypes in Canadian NSOs: the “traditional,” which opposes professional staff autonomy, and the “corporate volunteer,” which supports professional management and governance. Kikulis, Slack, and Hinings (1992) expanded upon this work to produce three distinct archetypes to classify the structure of Canadian NSOs after the changes brought about by the QPP. They named the three archetypes they produced the kitchen table, the boardroom, and the executive office.

The kitchen table archetype was the most common design in NSOs until the early 1970s (Kikulis et al., 1995b) and was named after the dedicated volunteers who ran the organization in their spare time often from the kitchen tables of their homes. Control of these organizations was completely in the hands of volunteers. Individual roles were awarded primarily on the basis of loyalty and commitment rather than education and expertise, with little role specialization. A very low level of importance was given to formal planning in this design. Policies, procedures and financial decisions were all handled by an elected board that represented various geographic locations across the country which met only once or twice a year. The majority of the funding for the

organization came from private funding ventures and membership. The organizations were run very informally with the focus on the enjoyment and satisfaction of its members (Kikulis et al., 1992).

The boardroom archetype was developed in the early 1970s after the increase in federal funding provided at the time. The funding also came with expectations and pressure for NSOs to increase the scope and domain of their activities. This design still relied on volunteer participation to run the organization; however, there was a significant shift in its commitments. A new focus on elite level athletic performances was favoured, and board positions were elected “because of their business acumen as opposed to their regional focus or experiences in sport” (Kikulis et al., 1995b, p.78). With pressure to become more businesslike, NSOs began instituting more formal policies and procedures. Increased exposure to competitive opportunities and training camps for athletes, as well as coaching development programs, became common place. Professional staff members were also introduced to support and implement the decisions made by the volunteer-controlled hierarchy, and execute the day-to-day operations of the organization. This was the dominant organizational model found in Canadian NSOs in the 1970s and 1980s until the introduction of the QPP in 1984 (Kikulis et al., 1995b).

The third and most recent archetype, the executive office design, arose as a direct result of the QPP and the government’s desire to focus NSOs on preparing athletes for major international competitions. The measurement of success in this archetype was not in terms of how many people were competing in a sport, or how much enjoyment they have in participating in it, but rather by the number of medals won (Kikulis et al., 1995a). The acceptance of volunteers was based less upon their commitment and desire to help

than on their respective technical and administrative abilities. The most noticeable difference between the boardroom and executive office design is the shift of complete control from volunteers to professionals. The volunteer board's role was reduced to endorsing the policies and procedures produced by the organization's full time technical and administrative staff (Kikulis et al., 1995b).

The archetypes created by Kikulis et al. (1992) for Canadian NSOs were created based on information regarding two defining sets of characteristics, organizational structure and values. In determining the organizational structure of Canadian NSOs, Kikulis et al. (1992) collected qualitative data for three key components: specialization, formalization and centralization. These measures were taken from a set of five different levels of organization produced by the Aston Group, in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Pugh & Hickson, 1997). The three measures of structure have been used extensively in organizational design research (e.g., Greenwood & Hinings, 1993; Pugh, Hickson, & Hinings, 1969; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968) and regarding amateur sport organizations (e.g., Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004; Cousens, 1997; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Slack & Hinings, 1992; Stevens, 2006). These studies have established the three measures theoretically and empirically as core dimensions of organizational structure, and demonstrated their effectiveness in determining archetype designs.

Dimensions of Organizational Structure

The first dimension, specialization, refers to “the extent to which organizational tasks are broken down and allocated to different organizational segments” (Slack & Hinings, 1992, p.119). Levels of specialization in NSOs were explored according to their professional, volunteer, and support staff roles, as well as by the number of committees

present (Kikulis et al., 1992). The extent of the different levels of specialization was obtained by counting the number of differentiated roles or units that existed within the organization. For example, executive director, CEO, and head coach are all different roles that are held by professional staff in certain NSOs (Kikulis et al., 1995b).

The second dimension is formalization, which refers to the existence of written rules and regulations which are used to guide the overall operations of the organization (Slack & Hinings, 1992). A simple rating scale (0 being the absence of, to 4 being extensive formal procedures) is used to measure the extent to which NSOs employ job descriptions for volunteers and professionals, work plans, policies, procedures and terms of reference (Kikulis et al., 1995a). Formalization was measured across administration, athlete services, athlete support systems, decision making, and evaluations.

The final structural dimension is centralization, which refers to the hierarchical level in the organization where final decisions are made. This component helps to determine where the power of decision making lies, and how centralized or decentralized decision makers are in the organization (Kikulis, et al., 1995b). Areas of decision making related to NSOs involve selection of athletes, coaches and officials, training programs, and administrative systems. The level of centralization of these choices are measured first by the locus of decisions, or the level at which decisions were made. Second, involvement in decision making was measured to determine the extent to which various levels in the hierarchy are involved in the decision making process. Finally, the concentration of decision making assesses the extent to which decisions are made by volunteers.

Organizational Values

Organizational values and beliefs are also key components in organizational design (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). The three values are termed domain, principles of organizing, and criteria of effectiveness, and were established by the Aston group (Hinings, Brown, & Greenwood, 1991; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). A fourth value, orientation, was added in a study produced by Kimberly and Rottman (1987).

The first value is known as domain. The appropriate domain for NSOs range from one extreme that values broad programs centered on increasing participation at all skill levels, to the other which contains specific programs and activities aimed towards elite athletes competing in international competitions. The domain of NSOs is influenced by its responsibilities to its key stakeholders and by its need to acquire resources. As a result, the federal government can have a great influence in this category.

Principles of organizing are the second value. This category reflects the formal structures that NSOs have in relation to job responsibilities and rules. These formal structures are reflected by the degree of standardization of policies and procedures, level of specialization of roles, roles of paid staff and volunteers, and the hierarchy of roles, all of which are expressions of organizational values.

The third value, the criteria of effectiveness, is seen as a measure of success, which can be difficult to define in NSOs. It can be evaluated in terms of membership satisfaction, quality or diversity of programs, or measured by the quantity of medals won in competitions. All NSOs must conform to their environments, or key constituents and, as such, they “must adopt standard systems of operating to ensure effectively coordinated programs” (Kikulis et al., 1992, p. 351).

The final value is orientation, which examines the sources of legitimization, resource support that NSOs receive, and the role that these resources play in shaping the organization. NSOs receive funds from membership fees, fundraising, corporate sponsorship, unconditional federal government grants, and federal funding with ties to the attainment of specific objectives. It is from these sources of funding that expectations relating to the organization's objectives, activities, and structures are created.

Archetypes in the Management Literature

The different archetypes found in many different Canadian NSOs were originally based on five organizational design types identified by Mintzberg (1979). Mintzberg used a variety of different design parameters and contingency factors to produce the five configurations common to all businesses and organizations. They are: simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisionalized form, and adhocracy. The studies produced by Kikulis et al. (1992) and Slack and Hinings (1987, 1992) drew on these five design types to create amateur sport organization-specific archetypes. More precisely, they drew on the simple structure to create the kitchen table type, professional bureaucracy for the executive office archetype, and a hybrid between simple structure and professional bureaucracy to create the boardroom design. It is important to discuss the other three organizational designs suggested by Mintzberg as recent changes in NSOs may have caused them to shift into one of these other designs, not found in the past.

A machine bureaucracy is an organization that produces a relatively standardized output. A machine bureaucracy is highly uniform, contains formalized communication channels, routine operating procedures, and a centralized hierarchy of authority. "When an integrated set of simple, repetitive tasks must be performed precisely and consistently

by human beings, the machine bureaucracy is the most efficient structure, indeed the only conceivable one” (Mintzberg, 1979, p.333). Many sport-related companies focused on the production of equipment use this design type (Slack & Parent, 2006). However, it is unlikely that Canadian NSOs will accept this model as they are responsible for many diverse roles and do not produce a single repetitive product. With the introduction of the new sport policy, and specifically the participation pillar, NSOs must become even more diverse and offer a greater range of services.

The second type is the divisionalized form, which occurs when a large central headquarters works to coordinate a group of separate autonomous organizations. A major advantage of this system is that the autonomy of the divisions removed the head office from the day-to-day operational issues, allowing it to focus on long-term strategy (Slack & Parent, 2006). The geographical spread of the separate divisions also produces a lower risk to the company as problems can be dealt with in an individual manner. This organizational form works well for companies who operate in many diverse markets. NSOs may have reason to switch to this design type in reaction to the participation pillar if they choose to assign responsibility to organize and implement participation programs to PSOs. Depending upon the amount of autonomy given to the PSOs, NSOs would not have to worry about the day-to-day running of their programs.

Mintzberg’s (1979) final design form is known as adhocracy. Organizations adopting this form characteristically have low levels of formalization, little vertical complexity, and high levels of differentiation. They are geared toward markets where high levels of innovation are required, thus the organization must be able to adapt quickly to change. University departments and research units often employ this type of

organizational design (Slack & Parent, 2006). This is also a potential design that NSOs could utilize to deal with the changes presented in the new Sport Policy. It would allow the organization to adapt quickly to change in order to secure funding from Sport Canada. It may not work well as an overall design structure for some of the larger organizations currently operating under an executive office archetype; but for smaller NSOs, it presents a flexible model that may be beneficial for approaching recent changes.

A new amateur sport-specific archetype was developed by Stevens (2006), which was named the amateur sport enterprise. This new model is based on the merger between the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association and Hockey Canada to become the Canadian Hockey Association. The amateur sport enterprise is seen to encompass “both commerce-based values and community-based structures” (Stevens, 2006, p.97). Stevens developed the amateur sport enterprise by studying a single NSO, so the generalizability of this archetype is unknown. However, it will be considered as a potential archetype. Also, the possibility exists of discovering another new design that is not yet found in the literature.

As demonstrated, archetypes provide us with a more detailed understanding of different organizational structures and their components, and when used as a conceptual tool, they become very useful in helping to better understand organizational phenomena such as change (Kikulis et al., 1992), which is briefly discussed below.

Organizational Change

A variety of change patterns within organizations have been proposed in the works of Amis, Slack, and Hinings (2004), Beckert, (1999), Doz and Prahalad (1987), Greenwood and Hinings, (1988), and Tushman and Romanelli (1985). The common theme of all their research is that major organizational change does not typically occur

incrementally. Instead, change is usually characterized by long periods of stability punctuated by short, intense periods of rapid alterations (Kikulis, et al. 1995b). This provides the basis of an evolution-revolution model of change. Evolutionary changes occur slowly over a long period of time as organizations constantly make small adjustments in strategy, structure, or systems. On the other hand, revolutionary change happens in response to major environmental or strategic changes that require immediate shifts in strategy, power structure, and/or controls (Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986). This model acknowledges the agency or choice that exists in the hands of individuals during their daily routines and while faced with major structural change. Organizational members are faced with difficult choices related to how they are to proceed in the face of revolutionary change. These choices are influenced by past decisions, values, and interests that work to either constrain or enable organizational change. Cousens (1997) and Tushman et al. (1986) further explained that successful organizations contain individuals in power positions able to foresee the need for revolutionary change and able to initiate it before crises occurred. However, no indication was given as to how this foresight could be achieved.

Another strong component to consider when looking at organizational change comes from Giddens's (1986) idea of structuration. He believed that human agency and social structure are in a relationship with each other, and that it is the recurrence of the acts of individuals which reproduces the structure. This means that while social structures exist, such as traditions, institutions, moral codes, and established ways of doing things, they can be changed when people start to ignore them, replace them, or reproduce them differently (Giddens, 1986). Giddens's theory has been extended to organizations notably

through the works of Barley (1986), Li, Stan, and Berta (2002), Orlikowski (1992), and Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood (1980)

In organizations, structuration theory has been used to examine how structures are continually produced and recreated by their members. Technology has also been examined extensively as an agent that can change structures within an organization as it moves from a man-made device that, once embraced, becomes embedded into the structure of an organization (Orlikowski, 1992). Structuration theory acknowledges the agency of humans and the effects that change may have upon structures in an organization. This is an important idea in this study as I will be examining how organizations, and consequentially the people who run them, are reacting to the change in principles by Sport Canada towards increasing levels of participation.

For this study, I specifically examined strategic change, which is a change involving fundamental shifts in organizational design or orientation (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). These organizational changes may come in the form of shifts in resource allocation, or basic changes in organizational goals, structures, strategies, or culture (Harrison & Shirom, 1999). Strategic change comes from Chandler's (1962) work highlighting how organizational structure is thought to follow strategy, especially in times of rapid expansion or change. From the organizational change approaches presented, it can be noted that the basic ideas focus upon the coherence between structural design elements and organizational values, which form the basic understanding behind archetype designs and patterns for organizational change.

The addition of the QPP to Canadian amateur sport incited a great deal of research regarding strategic change in NSOs. Research completed by Kidd (1988), Macintosh et

al. (1987), and Slack and Hinings (1992) suggested that NSOs unquestioningly complied with and became passive receptors of the federal government's pressure to conform to high performance sport initiatives in order to secure funding. This work was later questioned by Kikulis et al. (1995a) who demonstrated that NSOs resisted this change by maintaining agency through passive activity and ceremonial or superficial conformity. The use of archetypes also worked to highlight that, although NSOs may all have been facing the same environmental pressures for change as a result of the QPP, NSOs' reactions varied (Kikulis et al., 1995b).

Methods

This paper focuses on the impact that the participation pillar of the new Canadian Sport Policy has had on NSOs. The enhanced participation pillar could be measured in many different ways such as a program or impact analysis. However, due to the relative youth of the policy, it is likely that the largest area of change thus far would be upon the organizational structure of NSOs. As no other research has been done regarding the new sport policy, this project is mostly exploratory and descriptive in nature. In order to carry out the objectives of this project, a qualitative research methodology was used. It incorporates three separate data collection techniques.

Data Collection

First, a short questionnaire was e-mailed to the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) or Chief Operating Officers (COOs) of all Canadian NSOs funded by Sport Canada under the Sport Funding Accountability Framework (SFAF). The e-mail addresses were acquired from each organization's web page and questionnaires were sent out with a brief information letter detailing the intent of the study (Appendix C). One follow-up reminder

was sent out to all participants by e-mail within three weeks of when the questionnaires were sent out in order to increase the response rate. Of the 56 NSOs that qualified, responses were received from 25 NSOs (45% response rate), a good return for a voluntary questionnaire (Mangione, 1995). The average years of experience of the CEOs were 7.6 years in their current positions, varying between 1.5 years and 19 years of experience. Participants not in their current positions prior to the implementation of the CSP were asked to corroborate their answers with another member in the organization who was in their job before 2002. The responses provided a basic understanding of what was happening in NSOs, as well as insights into what NSOs were doing in response to the new pillar and how it is impacting organizations. The questionnaire data also provided information regarding the value of potential interview candidates.

The second data collection method used was a document analysis, which consisted of mission statements, organizational documents, press releases, programs, initiatives, and websites regarding participation for NSOs. Documents were collected from material available on NSO web pages. Any missing information was requested directly from participants. The documentation assisted in comparing NSO structures and initiatives before and after 2002 to determine the extent of structural and activity changes the organizations have made in response to the pillar of enhanced participation. It also provided a better understanding of the specialization of NSOs, which is a key component of organizational structure. Documents were only collected from the ten organizations participating in the interviews.

The third data collection method used was in-depth semi-structured interviews with CEOs and COOs of selected NSOs to further understand questionnaire responses.

Ten participants were selected for the interviews based on the information gathered from the questionnaires (see table 3-1).

Table 3-1 Representations of NSOs

NUMBER	NSO REPRESENTATION
2	Winter Team Sports
2	Winter Individual Sports
2	Summer Team Sports
2	Summer individual Sports
2	Multi-Sport Organization

The participants were required to have knowledge of the organization both pre- and post-adoption of the new policy to be able to determine the changes that have taken place as a result of the new pillar. An interview guide was used to help lead the discussion (Appendix D). The questions were all based on the criteria used by Kikulis, Slack, and Hinings' 1992-1995 research regarding NSOs organizational values and structure. These questions allowed the interviews to focus on the impact of the policy on the participants' respective organizations, especially regarding their organizational structure, operations, and new participation initiatives. Using questionnaires, interviews, and archival material allowed for data triangulation, which helped to protect against false or misleading information (Yin, 2003). Data collected through interviews was transcribed verbatim from the recording device. They were then converted to an electronic Word file, for analysis.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this paper examined the NSOs selected for interviews by utilizing a pre/post organizational analysis of the organizational changes resulting from the new pillar. With the interview data and questionnaires, ATLAS.ti 5.0, a qualitative data analysis program, was used to assist in the coding and organization of the data produced from the interview. The organizational structures and values outlined by Kikulis et al. (1992; 1995a, 1995b) provided the basis for the coding. These values helped to identify the initial codes. These initial codes were used to establish emerging themes from the data, which were then broken down into more specific categories which provided higher order themes (e.g., Domain – Elite Leaning). A comparison of the interview and archival material assembled in the data collection process was also completed. The archival material was reviewed in order to ensure that there were no discrepancies in the information provided from the interviews.

Results and Discussion

You're talking Greek to me! I don't know anything about this participation pillar. I'm trying to stay on top of what comes down from Sport Canada because it does come to me, but after we talked last time I went back on to the Sport Canada web site and I'm not finding this stuff anywhere. (Winter Individual Sport Representative)

We have made it very clear that growing the sport and getting more people playing [sport] is our priority. We see having an elite pathway and program as a way to inspire kids are part of that equation. Participation and elite don't run contrary to each other, the two elements work to feed one and other. (Winter Team Sport Representative)

These quotes effectively highlight both ends of the vast spectrum that exists between various NSOs and their efforts to respond to the participation pillar of the CSP. In this

section each of the components that produced the Canadian NSO archetypes, as described by Kikulis et al. (1992, 1995a, 1995b), were examined to determine if they were barriers, facilitator, or stabilizers towards change resulting from the new pillar. First, however, is an overview of the participation programs that NSOs have initiated in response to the new participation pillar.

New NSO Initiatives Resulting from the Participation Pillar

From the 10 NSOs studied in-depth in this study, only two actually initiated new programs from the funding they received from the participation pillar. For the two organizations that produced new programs only one (Summer Team Sport) had sufficiently developed an initiative to begin offering it to the public, which was only made possible due to securing corporate sponsorship for the initiative. The only other NSO (Summer Individual Sport) attempting to produce a new participation program was unable to implement it due to a lack of funding and knowledge. Most organizations (seven of ten) chose to pass the money down to existing programs at the PSO level or to revive programs that had run and failed in the past (see table 3-2).

Table 3-2 NSO Participation Programs.

NSO	New Programs	Re-introduction of Old Program	Increased Funding for Existing Programs	No Participation Programs
Summer Team Sport	√		√	
Summer Team Sport				√
Summer Individual Sport	√			
Summer Individual Sport		√		
Winter Team Sport		√	√	
Winter Team Sport			√	
Winter Individual Sport			√	
Winter Individual Sport			√	
Multi Sport		√	√	
Multi Sport			√	

NSOs that failed to introduce new programs made minor changes to their existing programs that were aimed to attract new demographics or under-represented groups identified in the CSP. Only one NSO (Summer Team Sport) mentioned re-educating their coaching staff to better deal with the participation focus. A single NSO (Summer Team Sport) was denied a federal funding grant for their participation program, and as a result, have not been able to deliver any participation initiatives. Thus, very few new initiatives were developed related to the participation pillar.

Organizational Structure

Canadian NSOs have demonstrated resistance to change in the past, and often only do change in response to major federal pressure (Kikulis et al., 1995a, 1995b). This study's findings highlighted that the implementation of the participation pillar in the new CSP has elicited the same sort of response as in the past. As will be seen, the various organizational structures (and values) were found to be either barriers or facilitators to change. For this study facilitators were seen as agents that promoted change, barriers were factors deemed to resist change.

Specialization. This is a difficult measure to assess in terms of participation because all Canadian NSOs, regardless of their size or classification, rely very heavily upon dedicated volunteers, as well as their paid staff, to implement and run their programs. An analysis of NSOs' organizational charts / leadership structures, found on their web pages, revealed that many participation units in NSOs strongly resembled each other. All NSOs have at least a part of one job dedicated to participation programming, as well as having at least one participation committee. Four of the ten participation committees existed previous to the CSP. The committees almost always contained

volunteers, a staff member, and often a member from an affiliated PSO. The major point to recognize, however, is having a renewed focus upon participation at the national level in response to the new pillar seems to only increase the need for volunteers. NSOs therefore have to be careful in their recruitment and mobilization of capable people in key participation areas in order to ensure program success. Specialization is viewed as a barrier to structural change due to NSOs' increased need to rely upon volunteer support run participation programs requires additional organizational resources. A substantial increase in volunteers would ultimately have a direct effect upon the number of different roles present in the organization.

Formalization. Formalization differs among the NSOs in response to the participation pillar. NSOs that had a focus on participation prior to 2002 have done very little to address participation because they believed that it has always been a part of their organization, and as such, there was no need to address it. The only instances where a formalized policy was put in place as a response to the pillar was when NSOs had added a staff or shifted portfolios to create a participation development position. In these cases, formal job descriptions were written and added to existing policy guidelines. The general response was summarized by one NSO representative who stated:

It was just a question of re-aligning responsibilities of existing staff, so they would assume a specific portfolio related to that. We gradually put more resources into it; we didn't really change anything in terms of our policies and plans. (Multi Sport Representative)

These statements mirror the findings of Kikulis et al. (1995a) who found that NSOs when faced with change often respond with pacifying activity or ceremonial conformity.

As such with these larger organizations able to simply use their existing rules and regulations to guide the overall operations, they immediately scored high (3 or 4) on

Kikulis et al.'s (1995a) proposed scale of formalization. The other half of the sample, which continues to struggle to implement their programs, has not yet reached a level where it is possible to produce viable written policies to guide their overall operations. Most of these organizations scored a 2 or 3 on the rating scale. As a result, formalization has been termed a weak barrier because many NSOs will have to implement new policies in response to the pillar, while many others will need to adjust current policies to accommodate the mandates of the pillar.

Centralization. Decision making in NSOs regarding participation almost always came directly from the staff members most closely affiliated with the participation portfolio and the respective CEOs. In some NSOs, federal grants were used to directly fund a permanent position that looks after participation initiatives for their organization. These employees were charged with designing and implementing new participation programs for either PSOs or affiliated clubs. "What we try and do is to develop the resources so that they [PSOs] don't have to re-invent the wheel" (Winter Team Sport Representative). Decision making is a combination of three things. First, NSOs must have leadership for participation development from their staff and various committees. Second, is dependant on the CEO's representational leadership to the board, in making them believe in their programs and ideas. Third relates to getting the PSOs to buy into the program. This should be an easy task as PSOs are the traditional sport bodies responsible for promoting participation. The board is where all final decisions involving budgetary consideration must go to get approval. By controlling the funds, boards play a critical role in the direction of NSOs. This tiered system of decision making often results in a barrier to change, as new programs and ideas are rarely implemented quickly. Only in a single

case was the power of decision making not with the board and CEO. One summer team sport let decision making in participation “lie with the PSOs, because that’s where the funding goes” (Summer Team Sport Representative). The CEO, however, went on to say that it is crucial that PSOs align themselves better with their NSO.

Volunteers have an important role to play in every NSO because they are ultimately responsible for implementing many of the participation programs at the grassroots level. Yet, volunteers have a varied degree of input regarding participation programs across all NSOs. Volunteers often sit on various committees which gives them power in the development process. In many cases, however, input from volunteers may depend more on the NSO’s working relationship with its PSOs as stated by one winter team sport CEO “In those areas where we are carrying the freight entirely, we involve them, but they have input as opposed to any level of control over it.” If an NSO has a poor relationship with its PSOs, who recruit the majority of the volunteers, then their voice would clearly be marginalized.

Organizational Values

The various categories that make up NSOs’ institutional values demonstrated significantly more differentiation from one another than for their organizational structures. This resulted in many organizations making significant strategic changes to their organizational values in response to the pillar. Others, however, merely maintained the status quo.

Domain. The domain of Canadian NSOs is an area that contains much variation but appears to have undergone very little change in response to the pillar. According to polling during the interview process, NSOs are split between having their organizational

values lie either towards elite achievement or claiming a balance between elite and participation. When asked to define what percentage of their resources are split between elite and participation, CEOs claimed their organizations to be as much as 97% elite value orientated. Most NSOs ranged between 75-85 % percent elite focused and only 25-35% participation based. CEOs acknowledged that this represented a small change since the induction of the CSP, but not by more than 10% in most cases. In some larger NSOs, there was little discernable change as the organizations claimed to balance elite and participation goals well before the inception of the new CSP. It should be noted that all the organizations that claimed a balance in their goals were all larger NSOs, with many resources already at their disposal.

NSOs claiming to balance values regarding elite and participation goals, however, may face a different reality. More than one of these ‘balanced’ organizations that claimed no discernable difference between elite and participation goals also realized the need for their athletes to achieve results. As one CEO stated, “We have to get results because if we don’t our funding will disappear. Our funds are driven on excellence and podium results because that’s where we receive our money and that’s what we are measured on” (Multi Sport Representative). This quote reflects Kikulis et al. (1995c) finding that in times of change the last area to change is the one most closely tied to the core of the organization, which in this case is excellence and results.

Statements such as this one indicate that domain is a major barrier to change because of the strong dependency on a single source of income, the federal government. It demonstrates that participation is something NSOs are willing to pay lip service to, and will incorporate into their policies, yet are mostly unwilling to commit actual resources to

support it given that their degree of success is still measured based on elite-level goals, thus showing a disconnect between the new CSP and the SFAF. This scenario therefore highlights a superficial compliance with the new participation pillar. One CEO from an individual winter sport supported this by claiming that sports need to focus on achievement and results because with winning comes media spoils and sponsorship, which in turn lead to an increase in participation for sport. This view of participation allows for the organization to simply superficially integrate the participation goals in the CSP directly into their existing elite focused orientation.

Principals of organization. Eight of the ten organizations in the study have either added a new position on their staff or created a new development portfolio in an existing job in response to the participation pillar. In organizations where a new position was created, oftentimes, participation development is not the only portfolio individuals carry. In most cases, however, these changes resulted in very little impact on or change in specific NSO organizational structures. As one CEO put it,

We have changed but it has nothing to do with anything that is coming from Sport Canada. We have decided to take on a much more expanded role for our National Sport Organization in regulations, leadership, direction, and membership development. But it wasn't driven by Sport Canada, it was driven by common sense. (Winter Individual Representative)

Some of the positions or committees created to tackle the pillar were: domestic development manager / coordinator, manager of club development, national development committee, and database director. The fact that, in many cases, the role of participation development is only a part-time portfolio provides a fair representation of its perceived worth in the organization. The inability to commit full resources to participation staff makes this a barrier for change. This is especially true when, at the other end of the

spectrum, eight out of the ten NSOs had at least one full-time position designated for elite activities.

Criteria of effectiveness. Corporate money and support is being given to a select few NSOs to help further their participation goals. NSOs that have been able to secure alternative funding for their participation initiatives are further along in their program development. For many organizations, a more immediate challenge is trying to instil an organizational culture that is open to participation. Changing a long-established elite-focused culture is the first step towards delivering an effective participation program (Summer Team Sport Representative). Many organizations, are struggling to find a balance in their programming:

Providing guidance to the rest of the organization is also a key proponent of many strategies. Guidance is especially critical at the grassroots level because as one CEO put “There is a constant tussle between are we doing this for fun or are we doing this to produce Olympic champions? We are trying to say that we are doing it for both, recognizing that the majority of kids going though will not become Olympic Champions. However, you still have to be offering programs that allow the youngster that has that desire that they will have to tool kit available. (Winter Individual Sport Representative)

From the interviews, only one CEO mentioned trying to blend high performance and participation into the same program; every other NSO treated them as mutually exclusive.

It is difficult to asses the success of NSOs participation programs at this point as many of the organizations are still struggling to deliver their initiatives. When this is considered it becomes quite difficult to determine what is successful, and then why or how? The reality is, however, that many NSOs feel as if they will not be able to run an effective participation program under any circumstance due to the lack of funding with which they currently have to work. Thus, as it currently stands, effectiveness seems to be lacking. One representative stated,

If they were to put \$250,000 on the table to get a real promotional strategy, to push our sport in the school system, push it in the community, then you would have a much greater impact. Right now at \$30,000 (SFAF) and a bit of my staff time, we can't really do more than we are doing. (Multi Sport Representative)

Organizations are finding it difficult to implement programs on their own, as money available from federal sources is not enough to cover all aspects of the program such as promotion and equipment costs. Historically, the most common measure of success for NSOs has been how many medals they have won, not how many people are participating in their sport. As one CEO stated, "Winning medals results in greater federal support and sponsorship dollars, participation doesn't get you that" (Summer Individual Sport Representative). There appears to be still more criteria related to excellence, both financial and athletics performance based. Participation-specific measures, such as membership increases, have yet to be emphasized. As long as NSOs' success is directly linked to elite-level funding, the criteria of effectiveness will remain a distinct barrier to change toward participation.

Orientation. The value of orientation is an important factor in determining if change is occurring in NSOs as a result of the participation pillar. A major facilitator in this value is the Sport Participation Development Program (SPDP) funding project, simply because there was no funding for participation prior to its inception in 2002. Not every NSO, however, was guaranteed federal funding for participation through the SPDP, as evidenced by the denied claim of one participating organization in this study. Other NSOs that received SPDP grants questioned its real value, as one CEO stated: "If it wasn't for the SPDP we wouldn't be where we are today. However, our sponsor put a significant amount of money towards our programs, a hell of a lot more than what Sport Canada gives us" (Summer Team Sport Representative). The majority of the larger NSOs

were successful in attracting sponsorship to their programs which provided them with significant extra resources, and/or funding. One NSO has a sponsor that has contributed commercial time on television and roughly 1,200 uniforms a year to high schools. They are also paying for one team out of every province to attend the national championship. Program sponsorship can therefore be a major facilitator towards change in this case.

Many smaller, 'less marketable' NSOs, however, have been unsuccessful in gaining corporate support. As a result, many NSOs also offer up conflicting responses to the feasibility of attracting corporate sponsors for grassroots activities. Some NSOs believed that corporate sponsors will like the grassroots, inclusion angle that is afforded from the participation pillar. Others NSOs do not believe that participation programs are high profile enough for corporations to strongly invest in. As one CEO stated, "I don't know very many altruistic corporations out there who just give out money with very little return on their investment" (Winter Team Sport Representative). Only five of the ten organizations were successful in gaining sponsorship for their programs, making it just as much a barrier to change as a facilitator depending on the size of organization. Organizations without external corporate assistance have generally been unsuccessful in creating and developing their participation programs. Other NSOs believed their small existing membership base makes it impossible to compete against some of the larger organizations, leaving little hope for future corporate assistance.

Organizational Change

When evaluating change based on Canadian NSOs' organizational structure and values in response to the new participation pillar, it is obvious that there are many barriers to overcome. Of the seven organizational categories, six of them were clear

barriers to change, while one other contained aspects that conceivably make it both a barrier and facilitator (see table 3-3). This provides a difficult atmosphere for a revolutionary archetypical design shift in NSOs.

Table 3-3 Organizational Structure and Values – Barriers and Facilitators to Change.

	Barriers	Facilitators
Organizational Structure		
Specialization	Increased reliance on volunteers	
Formalization	Little policy change	
Centralization	Tiered system of decision making	
Organizational Values		
Domain	Dependant upon federal funding	
Principals of Organization	Participation is part time portfolio	
Criteria of Effectiveness	Measure of organizational success is elite results	
Orientation	Small NSOs struggle to gain sponsors	Potential for corporate sponsorship

The strong presence of the federal government has, however, imposed isomorphic changes in Canadian sport organizations, at least in the past. When looking at organizational- and field-level predictors of isomorphic change produced by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), it becomes apparent that NSOs are currently developing a greater degree of similarity to each other. Organizational isomorphism is likely to occur when there is increased uncertainty, and ambiguous goals within the established parties (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Both of these are currently evident in NSOs as they work to implement new participation programs and struggle to establish their organizational domain between elite and participation. It has also been demonstrated (e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Oliver 1991) that the more ambiguous the goals in an organization, the

more likely they are to mimic other successful organization. Smaller NSOs therefore seem more likely to mimic the activities of some of the larger more successful organizations.

Upon examination of field-level predictors of isomorphic change, there are three points that stand out. First, the higher the level of interaction between the field and state, the more isomorphism occurs. The simple addition of the participation pillar to the CSP allowed the federal government to expand its influence into an area where they had no previous jurisdiction. Second, the greater reliance the field has on a single source, the greater the isomorphism. With the SPDP program being, for most NSOs, the sole provider of funding for participation programs, this only increases their dependency upon federal funding and related (forced) conformity. Finally, the fewer the number of organizational models present, the quicker isomorphism occurs. With the federal government historically putting pressure on NSOs to conform to specific organizational standards they believe to be ideal (Slack & Hinings, 1987, 1992, Kikulis et al., 1992, Thibault et al., 1993, Kikulis et al., 1995a, 1995b), they have actively worked to reduce the number of institutional models available.

With a strong divide between large and small NSOs, findings show that NSOs seem to fit into one of two models, either the boardroom or executive office designs. As seen in the level of specialization and formalization across the NSOs participating in this study, elected boards and formal policies and procedures are in place, displacing the possibility of the kitchen table model. Smaller NSOs appeared to be stuck in the executive office archetype. This is evident in their common domain's orientation towards elite competition and in the rigid boards whose criteria of effectiveness is still measured

in podium finishes. Larger NSOs have access to greater resources for both elite and participation, which allowed for more flexibility in their organizational values. With greater funding, changes in domain and orientation could be achieved. They were also able to afford the specialized staff needed to handle the increased scope and demand created by the participation pillar. The kitchen table and other archetypes may exist in Canadian NSOs; however, they were not encountered in this study.

Isomorphic change has also greatly reduced agency in NSOs, as many organizations were forced to abide by guidelines set by the federal government or risk losing funding. NSOs were left with a strategic choice only in how they chose to run their programs, and even that is misleading as the divide between large and small NSOs and the different resources available to both further limits their ability to change.

Recent Policy Document

Following the carrying out of the interviews, in February of 2006, Sport Canada released a paper entitled *Formative evaluation of the participation elements of the sport support program*. The Sport Support Program (SSP) is a broad reaching funding program which the federal government uses as the primary means of delivering funds for initiatives related to the CSP. The paper recognizes the emphasis that has been placed on participation spending since the adoption of the CSP, and seeks to provide a preliminary evaluation of the participation elements of the SSP. The study was commissioned to provide evaluation on participation programs to support decision making about program renewal.

The paper indicates that NSOs are very supportive of the participation initiatives, with encouraging preliminary participation numbers, and a large number of projects

being undertaken. It also reiterates that one quarter of all participation funding is being given towards support of NSOs' participation projects, with much of the rest going towards the federal, provincial/territorial bilateral agreements (Heritage Canada, 2006). In section 4.6 however, Sport Canada acknowledges that NSOs are struggling in some areas. They state that NSOs;

...do not have a lot of detail in their participation numbers from delivery partners and, with the exception of their own project projections; they do not have benchmarks with which to compare results. They also noted that they have not received feedback from Sport Canada about their monitoring reports. (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p.35)

The report elaborated further about monitoring and reporting problems, adding later that;

Capturing reliable sport participation data, especially the tracking of longer term participation, i.e. after the sport participation project, has been identified as a concern by a number of funding recipients. This information is asked for by Sport Canada as part of the monitoring report. However, a number of NSOs, MSOs and PSOs expressed concern that the organizations delivering the projects currently do not have the resources or expertise to do this. (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p.36)

These findings reflect many of the barriers faced by NSOs in terms of changing their organizational structures and values. The lack of knowledge and resources required to handle data can be seen as a lack of organizational specialization in having too many participation positions being part of a dual role within NSOs. It also can be reflected in NSOs' principals of organization in not giving the resources needed towards ensuring successful participation programs. Not being able to accurately measure how many people are participating in their sport is an indication that NSOs are struggling to evolve from a system where they had only 14 provincial and territorial members to one where they are partly responsible for all participants.

This report demonstrates that Sport Canada has an idea of some but not all of the problems NSOs are facing in fully implementing the participation pillar into their

organizations. The report also touches upon an important problem that all future research regarding the participation will face, which is how to measure success. Sport Canada states that:

Currently, it is not clear if the criteria for success should be increased in the number of participants during a project, and/or if the project attracts new participants (rather than participants who were already active in another sport), and/or if the participants stay involved in sport after they have completed the initial introductory program (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p.38).

This is a problem that was faced in the early stages of this study when it was decided that the pillar was too young to evaluate program outcomes. It is a critical question that will have to be addressed by Sport Canada, NSOs, and researchers in order to successfully evaluate any initiatives produced or related to the participation pillar.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the Canadian sport system is split in its ability and desire to respond to the new participation pillar. The struggles encountered in implementing new participation projects help to reinforce Kikulis et al.'s notion that Canadian NSOs are "resistant to change in areas of their organization that would result in losing power and control" (1995a, p.281). The existing archetypes for Canadian NSOs described by Hinings and Slack (1987, 1992) and Kikulis et al. (1992, 1995a) served as valuable comparisons to examine change within the NSOs. When evaluating the organizational values and structures in terms of barriers and facilitators of change, it was discovered that six of the seven areas produced significant impediments to change. Faced with so many obstacles, it is not surprising that NSO archetypes remained similar to existing models by comprising either the boardroom or executive office designs.

The study also confirmed how organizations experiencing similar external pressures will react in different ways (Kikulis et al., 1995b). In response to the participation pillar, NSOs made the (relatively) biggest change in their organizational values. This is to be expected as introducing participation as a priority for NSOs was a 180 degree turn from the solely elite-focused standard that existed prior to 2002. Introducing participation as a federal responsibility effectively meant that NSOs would be a prime delivery medium for government funding, leaving NSOs little choice but to comply with the change. The relative lack of change in NSOs' organizational structure, however, may be a more important indicator of the real effect of the participation pillar. The fact that very few organizations made significant structural changes to their organization indicates that many NSOs either already felt that they are effectively dealing with participation or that they still do not see it as an important priority for their organization. These feelings are summed up well by an executive at a winter team sport NSO:

Would we prefer a system that allows the feds to focus on high end and high performance, and allows the provinces and territories to focus on a system that feeds that? Absolutely we would. Until that exist, though, we are happy to take federal funds for participation.

As the CSP is relatively young in terms of public policy, there are many more avenues to examine as it matures. Once NSOs have had more time to get their programs actively running, it would be worthwhile to examine the effectiveness of any future initiatives that have been implemented. Is a higher segment of the population actually participating in sport? Are they attracting new or marginalized groups into their programs? How has success or failure affected NSOs' structures? As time may be a factor for organizational structure and design changes, it would also be worthwhile to revisit this issue in 5-10

years to determine whether time is a factor or whether the barriers to change are a stronger force. These are all questions that will need to be answered in time to ultimately determine the success of the participation pillar.

References

- Amis, J., Burton, T.L. (1996) Beyond Reason: formulating Sport Policy in Canada. *Avante*, 2(2), 17-36.
- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18(2), 158-198.
- Barley, S. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: evidence from observation of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 78-109.
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 20 (5), 777-799.
- Canadian Heritage. (2002). *The Canadian Sports Policy*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Chandler, A.D., (1962). *Strategy and Structure*. Cambridge, M.A.: MIT Press.
- Cousens, L. (1997). From Diamonds to dollars: The dynamics of change in AAA baseball franchises. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 316-334.
- DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Doz, Y.L., Prahalad, C.K. (1987). A process model of strategic redirection in large complex firms: The case of multinational corporations. In Pettigrew, A. (Ed.), *The Management of Strategic Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 63-83.

- Giddens, A. (1986). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Greenwood, R., Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. *Organization Studies*, 9, 293-316.
- Greenwood, R., Hinings, C.R. (1993). Understanding strategic change: The contribution of archetypes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1052-1081.
- Harrison, M., Shirom, A. (1999). *Organizational Diagnosis and Assessment: Bridging Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Health Canada (1987) *National Recreation Statement*. Ottawa.
- Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class, power, and the Canadian state. In P.J. Galasso (Ed.) *Philosophy of Sport and Physical Activity: Issues and Concepts* (p. 11-31) Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sports organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 27, 343-370.
- Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995a). Toward an understanding of the role of agency and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 273-299.
- Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R. (1995b). Sector specific patterns of change in organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(1), 67- 100.
- Kimberley, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 595-622.
- Li, Stan & Berta, W.B. (2002). The ties that bind: strategic actions and status

- structure in the US investment banking industry. *Organization Studies*, 23(3), 339-368.
- Macintosh, D. Bedecki, T. & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). *Sport and Politics in Canada: Federal Government Involvement Since 1961*. Kingston ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Macintosh, D. & Whitson, D. (1990). *The Game Planners: Transforming Canada's Sport System*. Kingston ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Mangione, T.W., (1995) *Mail surveys: Improving the quality*. London: Sage
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic response to institutional processes. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145-179.
- Orlikowski, Wanda J. (1992). The duality of technology: rethinking the concept of technology in the organization. *Organization Science*, 3, 398-427.
- Pugh, D.S., & Hickson, D.J, Hinings, C.R, Turner, C. (1968) Dimensions of organizational structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13, 65-105.
- Pugh, D.S., & Hickson, D.J, Hinings, C.R. (1969). An empirical taxonomy of structures of work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 115-126.
- Pugh, D.S., & Hickson, D.J. (1997) *Writers on Organizations*. (5th ed.) London: Sage Publications.
- Rail, G. (2000) Contextualizing the Mills Report: Professional Sport, Corporate Welfare and the Canadian State. *Avante*, 6(1), 1-18.

- Ranson, S., Hinings, B & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 25, 1-17.
- Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 12, 185-193.
- Slack, T., Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in National Sport Organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*: 6, 114-132.
- Slack, T., Parent, M. (2006). *Understanding Sport Organizations: The Application of Organisation Theory*. (2nd Ed.). Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.
- Stevens, J. (2006). The Canadian hockey association merger and the emergence of the amateur sports enterprise. *Journal of Sports Management*, 20, 74-100.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., Hinings, B., (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in non-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*: 7, 25-43.
- Tushman, M.L., Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In Cummings, L.L. and Staw, B. (Eds.), *Research in organizational Behaviour*, vol. 7. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 171-222.
- Tushman, M.L., Newman W.H., & Romanelli, E. (1986). Convergence and upheaval: Managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution. *California Management Review*, 29, 29-44.
- Yin, R.K., (2003). *Case Study Research, Design and Methods* (5th Ed.) London: Sage Publications.

CHAPTER 4

Conclusion

The focus of this master's research project was to examine a major policy change in the Canadian sport system and discover the agendas behind the change, and its immediate organizational effects. The participation pillar of the new Canadian Sport Policy (CSP) provided this opportunity, as it gave the federal government a greater responsibility through funding initiatives to involve itself in sport at a grassroots level.

The examination of the pillar was accomplished using two distinct approaches. First, an examination of how and why participation was added to the CSP was conducted using Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams policy model. This was accomplished by utilizing a thorough document analysis of all major federal policy papers beginning with the Mills Report (1998), believed to be the first document mentioning the possibility of a federal role in sport participation, through to the minutes of the National Summit on Sports. From the document analysis, key stakeholders representing various influential groups in the policy process were selected for semi-structured interviews. These were used to determine and examine the various agendas working for and against the addition of participation to the CSP.

The second approach focused on the impact the new pillar is having on Canadian national sport organizations (NSOs), specifically in terms of any changes that may have occurred in their organizational structure and values. The study relied on a framework provided by previous research conducted by Slack and colleagues (1987-1995) relating to the QPP in the mid-1980's. This project utilized data from a brief questionnaire sent out to all Canadian NSOs, interviews with Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) or Chief

Operating Officers (COOs) from various NSOs, and a thorough document analysis. These tools were used to examine the extent to which NSOs have changed organizationally as a result of the new participation pillar. Together, these two approaches present an overview of the participation pillar from its inception to the present day impact that it is having upon the Canadian sport community.

This chapter offers an overall discussion of the research project. First, a critique of the methods used in this study is presented. Next, Kingdon's three streams model is reviewed in relation to the policy process during the creation of the participation pillar. This is followed by an examination of the role agendas play in sporting and public communities during the creation of the CSP's participation pillar. A presentation of the barriers to and facilitators of change in organizational structure and values, as well as the role of isomorphic change is then offered. Finally, contributions to the field and possible avenues for future research conclude the thesis.

Methods Critique

The various methods utilised for data collection in the study proved to be appropriate, yet each one had discernable pros and cons. The questionnaire used in paper two provided the study with background information pertaining to the state of participation in NSOs, and was useful in helping to determine many of the questions asked during the interviews. The questionnaire method did, however, have flaws that need to be considered. The questionnaires were sent out via e-mail and even with extensive reminders, it proved difficult to get prompt replies from participants. A second problem arose from the fact that we were asking questions about an event that took place prior to 2002, and not all participants were in their current positions since that time.

Participants were asked to back up any information provided with someone who was in their organization prior to 2002; however, it is difficult to determine if this was followed. In a few cases, respondents left questions blank if they could not answer rather than ask someone else in the NSO for a sufficient answer. Nevertheless, the questionnaires served their purpose, which was to provide basic information and help choose interview participants.

Both papers in the study utilized a document analysis which provided a thorough understanding of existing policy and organizational structures and values. The documents used also proved valuable in helping to identify and determine the various stakeholders and key personnel for the interviews. The collected documents were also used to corroborate information provided from the interviews where possible. The interviews conducted in both papers provided the study with detailed information and opinions that formed the basis of both papers. The interviews proved to be a great tool; however, there was a definite learning curve involved in utilizing them properly. The early interviews sometimes did not turn up the same depth of information as many of the later ones, likely because of a lack of experience in knowing how and when to probe participants for more details. Interviewing is a skill that takes practice to become confident with, and as such, scheduling a few informal interviews beforehand or even having a supervisor sit in on the first couple of interviews may have proved beneficial to this study.

Kingdon's Multiple Streams

All three of Kingdon's streams (problem, policy and political) are clearly identifiable in the creation of the participation pillar; however, they did not relate to one another in the manner the model would have predicted. All of the key stakeholders

interviewed agreed that increasing obesity rates, especially among children, decline in sport participation rates, and narrow elite focused sport development system indicated that the problem stream existed. There was, however, no clear focusing event to draw attention to all of these problems as is often the case in the development of the problem stream. A stable majority government and a Canadian public receptive to change in sport due to recent Olympic Games failures gave rise to clear and predictable policy and political streams.

Agenda

In the absence of a major focusing event, Sport Canada elected to situate participation as a priority on their agenda due to the other goals they wanted to see achieved in the CSP. In order for Sport Canada to make the CSP a completely inclusive document, participation had to be added as a leverage point to gain the support of all the provinces, territories, and major stakeholders in sport.

The policy process in the build up of the CSP was not congruent with Kingdon's notion of agenda setting in which problems rise or fall as stakeholder priorities. The indicators and feedback established participation as an area of concern for stakeholders; however, it did not result in its elevation on their agendas. It was only when Sport Canada and the federal government decided participation was the solution to making Canadian sport more connected, and inclusive, did it become a significant agenda item. The importance of participation on Sport Canada's agenda did not arise from low levels of involvement in sport, or the obesity crisis, instead it gained its prominence when Sport Canada identified it as the only way to get all provinces and territories involved in the CSP. Kingdon's (2003) method stresses that problem recognition is critical to agenda

setting; however, in the case of the participation pillar, it was only when a problem was viewed as a solution that it began to gain prominence on Sport Canada's agenda.

Another key element gleaned from this research is the impact that a single individual motivated to leave a mark on the political landscape can have upon all levels of the policy process. In this situation, the drive and direction from the honourable Denis Coderre had definite implications on the outcome of the policy. This research confirms Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams model of the policy process serves as an effective way to analyse the development of sport policies. However, this research contributes to the model by identifying the considerable impact a single, motivated person can have in influencing the direction and development of a policy. It also expanded upon Kingdon's (2003) view of agenda setting where problems rise and fall on stakeholders' priorities. This research demonstrates that a solution to other policy problems may also rise on stakeholders agenda and help define agendas. This research highlights the strong need for stakeholders to critically examine the agendas of others involved in the policy process. Stakeholder have many reasons, both personal, and professional, for pursuing their goals, all of which need to be identified and examined when making important policy decisions.

Organizational Structure and Values and Change

When the seven organizational structures and values taken from Kikulis et al.'s (1995) research into archetypes in Canadian NSOs are examined as barriers or facilitators to change, we find that six of those values pose distinct barriers towards implementing participation initiatives. The ability of NSOs to change as a result of the new participation pillar was impeded by a broad range of barriers in the organizational values of domain, criteria of effectiveness, and orientation, and in the organizational structure categories of

specialization, formalization, and centralization. Only the organizational value, principals of organization, was found to be a facilitator of change; however it also contained aspects that could make it an equally strong barrier.

These barriers and facilitator to change can also be reflected in broader management terms. The most significant barriers were a strong dependency on the federal government for program funding and, a lack of corporate sponsorship for smaller NSOs, which are financial management issues. This highlights a resource-dependence perspective to the situation (cf. Armstrong-Doherty, 1996). This perspective is supported by elements of power (e.g., Davis & Thompson, 1994), and stakeholder management (e.g., Freeman, 1984) being evident in the conflicting measures of success that have traditionally been towards elite achievement. Likewise, the lack of resources to add full-time participation staff demonstrates a need for better financial and human resource management. These barriers have served to divide the NSOs participating in this study into one of two established (Kikulis et. al, 1995a) archetypes, the boardroom for larger NSOs, and the executive office design for smaller NSOs.

There is evidence however, of isomorphic changes occurring within archetypes as a result of the participation pillar. When looking at organizational- and field-level predictors of isomorphic change, it becomes apparent that NSOs are developing a greater degree of similarity to each other within each archetype. Organizational isomorphism occurs when there is increased uncertainty and ambiguous goals within the established parties. These criteria are clearly evident in NSOs' organizational value of domain. The addition of the participation pillar has created a perceived lack of resources in many NSOs, uncertainty over sustainable participation funding, and trying to incorporate new

participation initiatives into an elite-focused atmosphere. Domain was easier to determine prior to 2002 due to federal budget restraint in the 1990's during which contributions to NSOs were cut by as much as 25%, and priority was given to support high performance sport programs. (Canadian Heritage, 1998, 2001). These factors made it clear that federal funding was to be allocated to programs and NSOs could orient themselves accordingly.

These factors are dividing NSOs between the larger organizations with more available resources and the smaller organizations that are struggling to react to the new pillar. This information points to the organizational size having a seemingly strong impact upon a NSO's ability to incorporate the participation pillar into their existing structures. As such, smaller NSOs may need additional financial and human resources before they are able to fully integrate the pillar into their organizations. As a result of this divide, there appears to be two distinct financial tiers, where the organizations in each tier are becoming more like one another

An examination of field-level predictors reveals even more indicators of isomorphic change. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), the higher the level of interaction between the field and state the more isomorphism occurs. In this case, the addition of the participation pillar to the CSP allowed the federal government significant authority in an area where they had no previous jurisdiction, which only extends their influence over NSOs. Also, the greater reliance the field has on a single source, the greater the isomorphism. This is especially relevant because in many cases, the federal government is a NSO's sole provider of funding for participation programs. Finally, the fewer the number of organizational models present the quicker isomorphism occurs. With the federal government historically putting pressure on NSOs to conform to specific

organizational standards they believed to be ideal (Slack & Hinings, 1987, 1992, Kikulis et al., 1992, Thibault et al., 1993, Kikulis et al., 1995a, 1995b), they have actively worked (consciously or not) to reduce the number of institutional models available. As a result NSOs have been pushed into models that have strongly entrenched organizational values such as criteria of effectiveness and domain that despite federal government pressure to conform one again to a new model that includes participation there has been little evidence of actual change.

There are two implications to these findings. First, they demonstrate that there are significant barriers in NSOs' structures and values that are limiting the ability of NSOs to respond to federally-mandated changes. The extent that these barriers are having on other policy areas needs to be explored further. Secondly, the division of large and small NSOs in terms of available resources is growing, with isomorphic changes occurring between the different groups widening the divide. Smaller NSOs will have to employ new strategies in the future to reverse the trend and close the resource gap.

Contributions to the Field and Future Research

This study provides many benefits to the understanding of sport policy and organizational change. This is especially apparent when considering the relative youth (early 1980s) of the field of sport policy. Houlihan (2005) believed that sport policy had been marginalized when compared to the extensive amount of public policy research and theory devoted to social welfare or the environment. He believed this to be especially true as sport continues to gain recognition by governments of the world as a major policy area. A further indication of the lack of scholarly study in the field is in the fact that the

first published journal specific to sport policy and its research is to be launched in 2009. This research therefore helps to develop the small knowledge base in sport public policy.

A further need for this research is demonstrated in the fact that almost all of the work regarding sport participation produced thus far focuses on participation as a component of physical activity (Houlihan, 1991). Physical activity contains a very broad range of topics that often focus on its relationships with health promotion, injury prevention, etc. This study focuses specifically on sport participation as it relates to sport policy in Canada, as well as on the structural and functional impact it has had on NSOs, which are the highest level of the Canadian sport delivery system. This approach serves to isolate sport participation in a manageable way, providing data concerning it as a whole and autonomous field rather than as a part of physical activity.

This study helps to determine the extent to which a new policy can be an agent of change. The new Canadian Sport Policy has given those working in NSOs the ability to change the structure of their organization as they see fit. Noting the extent of these transformations provides great insight into the ability of new policies to promote change in sport. It also provides sport managers in NSOs valuable information regarding the state of the participation pillar and how other NSOs are handling it.

This research contributes to the field by further examining and developing the existing knowledge base relating to the formation and implementation of sport policy. It has provided an in-depth investigation of the participation pillar by examining the policy process and the reasons behind its inclusion in the CSP to some of the initial effects that it is having upon the structure and values of NSOs, the primary delivery agents of the pillar. The examination of this pillar of the CSP from inception to implementation

explores a wider continuum of the policy process than is often found in sport policy research. It is also one of the first studies to specifically examine an aspect of the new CSP to determine its impact upon Canada's sporting environment. The participation pillar was isolated to gain a better understanding of the particular state of this interesting pillar. However, it is likely that there is a direct interconnectivity or links between the inclusion of participation and the other pillars, specifically the interaction one which seeks to increase collaboration, communication and cooperation among all partners in sport (Canadian Heritage 2002), which can all be brought together through participation. Further research needs to be undertaken in order to properly understand the extent of the links forged between the various pillars, and the impact that they may have between one and other.

The findings have also helped reinforce Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams theory of the policy process as an effective tool for use in the domain of sport. The study, however, also adds to the model by highlighting the significant impact a single individual can have on the creation of a new policy, as well as exploring the effects of promoting a solution to a problem on an agenda, rather than the traditional ascent of individual problems within stakeholder agendas. It also highlights that these differences may have arose due to the difference in governance between the United States and Canada.

The study also reinforced the effective use of Kikulis et al.'s (1995) methods pertaining to archetypes and organizational change established during the implementation of the QPP. The creation of the participation pillar created circumstances similar to those witnessed during the QPP. However, the parameters set as a consequence of the QPP have had an impact on the degree of change possible due to new policy directions such as

the CSP. Nevertheless, this project's findings help reinforce the use of organizational values and structure effectiveness in exploring NSOs' ability to change in response to new federal government policy. These findings indicate that sport managers are likely to face many organizational barriers to change when implementing new programs and initiatives. As a result of the many barriers facing NSOs in initiating participation programs, they may ultimately be better served by simply passing participation funding down to their affiliated PSOs.

Now that an initial exploration of the effect of the participation pillar upon NSOs has been completed, there is still a need for further research into the topic. As more and more participation programs are started, it would be beneficial to investigate if the programs are attracting more participants to sport? Are the participants continuing to engage in the sport? Are new participation policies truly effective in increasing and maintaining participation? What is needed to maintain participation?

Also, an examination of how perceived success or failure in the delivery of participation programs and the long-term effects of NSOs would be useful. It could then be determined if NSOs that have had success with participation are more likely to develop a new organizational model or archetype than those who have failed. A more detailed analysis of isomorphic change could then be done between the NSOs perceived as a success and those deemed a failure.

Finally, the research pertaining to public policy formation can also be tested against the other CSP pillars to determine any similarities or differences that exist in their creation. Determining the agendas of the key stakeholders towards all of the four pillars

in the CSP would provide a much more detailed evaluation into the motives that shaped the entire process.

References

- Armstrong-Doherty, A. J. (1996). Resource dependence-based perceived control: An examination of Canadian interuniversity athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 49-64.
- Canadian Heritage. (1998). *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Canadian Heritage, (2001). *Towards a Canadian sport policy: Report on the national summit on sports*. Ottawa: Sport Canada.
- Canadian Heritage (2006). *Formative evaluation of the participation elements of the sport support program*. Ottawa: Sports Canada.
- Davis, G. F., Thompson, T. A. (1994). A social movement perspective on corporate control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 141-173.
- DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Houlihan, B. (2005) Public sector sport policy: Developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 40(2), 163-185.
- Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sports organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 27, 343-370.
- Kikulis, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995a). Toward an understanding of the role of

- agency and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 273-299.
- Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R. (1995b). Sector specific patterns of change in organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(1), 67- 100.
- Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 12, 185-193.
- Slack, T., Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in National Sport Organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*: 6, 114-132.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., Hinings, B., (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in non-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*: 7, 25-43.
- Soelberg, P. O. (1967). Unprogrammed Decision Making. *Industrial Management Review*, 8, 19-29.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

1. What is the name of your organization??

2. Has your organization adopted a position or policy in regard to Sport Canada's Sport Participation/Development stream (formerly Sport Participation Development Program)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. (a) Has your organization initiated any new programs or promotions designed to increase participation in your sport or to increase membership in your organization?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. (b) If yes, can you briefly describe these initiatives?

4. Have you received any extra funding from the federal government or corporate sponsors for Sport Participation Development? If yes, then from what programs, sponsorships or grants?

5. Have there been challenges faced by your organization as a result of the participation pillar or the Sport Participation Development stream funding block?



uOttawa

Appendix B

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SPORT PARTICIPATION DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE AND ITS IMPACT ON NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

Consent Form

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
de la santé

École des sciences de
l'activité physique

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Health
Sciences

School of Human
Kinetics

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Masters Student Christopher Houston from the department of Human Kinetics at the University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Jean Harvey, and Dr. Milena Parent. The purpose of the study is to examine how sport participation became a responsibility of Sport Canada in the new Canadian Sport Policy, and how the participation pillar is impacting on National Sport Organizations. The results of this study will be included in Christopher Houston's Masters Thesis. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your expert knowledge regarding the issues at hand. Please read the information below, and ask questions about anything you do not understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

- This interview is voluntary. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time. If you choose to withdraw at any time the information collected thus far will be returned to you immediately. We expect that the interview will take between 30 and 60 minutes, and will be held at a location suited to your convenience.
- Unless you give us permission to use your name, title, and/or quote you in any publications that may result from this research, the information you tell us will be confidential.
- We would like to record this interview on audio cassette so that it can be used for reference while proceeding with this study. We will not record this interview without your permission. If you do grant permission for this conversation to be recorded on cassette, you have the right to revoke recording permission at any time

Assurance of my confidentiality has been guaranteed by the investigators. I understand that no names will be used within the contents of the research study and that all personal information will be kept under lock and key for a period of ten years post publication after which, the data will be destroyed. The content of the interviews will

☎ 613 562-5852
☎ 613 562-5149

125 Université / University
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada

www.uOttawa.ca

only be used for the purpose of identifying themes during a content analysis and highlighting issues raised by stakeholders.

Your anonymity will be protected by using only a broad title, such as NSO one when directly quoting information. Only the student investigator and his supervisors will have access to the raw data. The interviews will be transcribed and analyzed using qualitative data analysis software. The software program will facilitate the coding and retrieval of the data by highlighting the themes that appear in the interviews. A copy of your transcript will be provided to you for review so that you may ensure the accuracy of the details. At this time, you will be able to make any modifications deemed necessary. Your interview details will be part of a larger pool of data and will be used in technical reports and paper submissions to scientific journals.

All data collected including archival material, interview tape recordings, transcripts, notes and data analysis will be secured by the student investigator in a locked filing cabinet in the supervisor Jean Harvey's office at the University of Ottawa which requires a key for access. Only the student investigator and supervisors will have access to the information.

Please contact Chris Houston at _____ with any questions regarding this study. If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Tel.: 613-562-5841, Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

Acceptance: I, _____, agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Christopher Houston of the *Department of Human Kinetics, at the University of Ottawa*, which research is under the supervision of Dr. Jean Harvey and Dr. Milena Parent.

(Please check all that apply)

☐ I give permission for this interview to be recorded on audio cassette.

☐ I give permission for the following information to be included in publications resulting from this study:

☐ Name of my Organization ☐ my title ☐ direct quotes from this interview

Name of Subject _____

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____

Signature of Investigator _____ Date _____



uOttawa

Appendix C

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN FEDERAL POLICY ON SPORT PARTICIPATION AND ITS IMPACT ON NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

Questionnaire Information Letter

Your participation is kindly requested for a research study conducted by Masters Student Christopher Houston from the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Jean Harvey, and Dr. Milena Parent. The study seeks to examine the the new pillar of enhanced participation in the Canadian Sport Policy. More specifically, the study will investigate how sport participation became an issue in the Canadian sporting agenda leading up to its inclusion in the new policy, how it is being implemented, and what some of its initial effects on national sport organizations (NSOs) are. The purpose of this study is to a gain a more detailed understanding of the issues surrounding the inclusion of sport participation to federal sport policy in Canada. This study will help to gain important information and feedback regarding the new Canadian Sport Policy and the direction in which it is leading Canadian sport. Also, due to the youth of the policy, very little research has been conducted on it up to now. Because of your first-hand knowledge and experience regarding NSOs, the new Canadian Sport Policy, and the circumstances surrounding it, your participation is key in furthering the knowledge base in this area.

Should you agree to participate, your participation would consist of filling out a short questionnaire pertaining to your organizations response to the participation pillar of the new Canadian Sport Policy, as well as to the Sport Participation Development funding block. The questionnaire should take 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

Confidentiality will be ensured by storing the raw and coded data under lock and key, which will only be accessed by the student investigator and his supervisors directly involved in the project. The data will be stored in the office of Dr. Jean Harvey for ten years following the publication of the research. Upon the expiration of the stated storage time, all files and information will be destroyed. Anonymity will be protected as the name of your organization will be known only by the research team, and will not be disclosed. Participation is voluntary and any questions you may have will be answered as quickly and thoroughly as possible. It is important to understand that it is your right to withdraw from the research study at any point. Data recorded prior to the moment of withdraw will only be

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
de la santé

École des sciences de
l'activité physique

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Health
Sciences

School of Human
Kinetics

☎ 613 562-5852
☎ 613 562-5149

125 Université / University
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada

www.uOttawa.ca

used should you give your consent, otherwise it will be destroyed and not incorporated into the study.

If you choose to participate in this research study, please complete the questionnaire and return it via the previously addressed, postage paid envelope provided for you.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact Chris Houston, Student Investigator, at _____, e-mail _____, Dr. Jean Harvey, Supervisor at 613-562-5800 x 4277, or Dr. Milena Parent, Supervisor, at 613-562-5800 x 2984. Any questions regarding the ethical concerns or conduct of this study should be addressed to the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, at 613-562-5841 or ethics@uottawa.ca.

Sincerely,

Chris Houston, M.A. candidate
Student Investigator

Dr. Jean Harvey, PhD
Supervisor

Dr. Milena Parent, PhD
Supervisor



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
de la santé

École des sciences de
l'activité physique

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Health
Sciences

School of Human
Kinetics

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN FEDERAL POLICY ON SPORT PARTICIPATION AND ITS IMPACT ON NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

Policy Information Letter

Your participation is kindly requested for a research study conducted by Masters Student Christopher Houston from the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Jean Harvey, and Dr. Milena Parent. The study seeks to examine the new pillar of enhanced participation in the Canadian Sport Policy. Specifically, the study will investigate how sport participation became an issue in the Canadian sporting agenda leading up to its inclusion in the new policy, who were the main stakeholders pushing for its inclusion in the policy, and how it is thus far being implemented in the Canadian sport system. The purpose of this study is to gain a more detailed understanding of the issues surrounding the inclusion of sport participation to federal sport policy in Canada. This study will help to gain important information and feedback regarding the new Canadian Sport Policy and the direction in which it is leading Canadian sport. Also, due to youth of the policy very little research has been conducted on it up to now. Because of your first hand knowledge and experience regarding the new Canadian Sport Policy and the circumstances surrounding it, your participation is key in furthering the knowledge base in this area.

Should you agree to participate, I (Chris Houston) will personally contact you to set up a face-to-face interview, or a phone interview should the first option not be available. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour, and will be conducted in English. I will also seek your permission to tape-record the interview so that it may be transcribed and used for analysis. If you do not agree to being recorded, I will simply take notes during the interview.

Confidentiality will be ensured by storing the raw and coded data under lock in Dr. Harvey's office at the university and will only be accessible to the student investigator and his supervisors directly involved in the project. The data will be stored for ten years following the publication of the research. Upon the expiration of the stated storage time, all files and information will be destroyed. Participation is voluntary and any questions you may have will be answered as quickly and thoroughly as possible. It is important to understand that it is your right to withdraw from the research study at any point. Data recorded prior to the moment of withdraw will only be used should you give your consent, otherwise it will be destroyed and not incorporated into the study.

If you choose to participate in this research study, please complete and return the consent form provided to University of Ottawa Master's

613 562-5852
613 562-5149

125 Université / University
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada

www.uOttawa.ca

Student Chris Houston, student investigator of this study. Mr. Houston can be contacted directly by either email at chouston@uottawa.ca or by telephone 613-

The transcript of the interview will be provided to you for your review before it is used in the data analysis so that you may add, delete or modify the transcript in anyway.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact Chris Houston, Student Investigator, at chouston@uottawa.ca, Dr. Jean Harvey, Supervisor at 613-562-5800 x 4277 or Dr. Milena Parent, Supervisor, at 613-562-5800 x 2984. Any questions regarding the ethical concerns or conduct of this study should be addressed to the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, at 613-562-5841 or ethics@uottawa.ca.

Sincerely,

Chris Houston, M.A. candidate
Student Investigator

Dr. Jean Harvey, PhD
Supervisor

Dr. Milena Parent, PhD
Supervisor



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
de la santé

École des sciences de
l'activité physique

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Health
Sciences

School of Human
Kinetics

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN FEDERAL POLICY ON SPORT PARTICIPATION AND ITS IMPACT ON NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

NSO Information Letter

Your participation is kindly requested for a research study conducted by Masters Student Christopher Houston from the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Jean Harvey, and Dr. Milena Parent. The study seeks to examine the new pillar of enhanced participation in the Canadian Sport Policy. Specifically the study will investigate how sport participation is being implemented in national sport organizations (NSOs), and how it is affecting these organizations' structures and values. The purpose of this study is to gain a more detailed understanding of the issues surrounding the inclusion of sport participation to federal sport policy in Canada. This study will help to gain important information and feedback regarding the new Canadian Sport Policy, direction in which it is leading Canadian sport, and what it means to NSOs. Also due to the youth of the policy, very little research has been conducted on it up to now. Because of your first-hand knowledge and experience with NSOs and the new Canadian Sport Policy, your participation is key in furthering the knowledge base in this area.

Should you agree to participate, I (Chris Houston) will personally contact you to set up a face-to-face interview, or a phone interview should the first option not be possible. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour, and will be conducted in English. I will also seek your permission to tape-record the interview so that it may be transcribed and used for analysis. If you do not agree to being recorded, I will simply take notes during the interview.

Confidentiality will be ensured by storing the raw and coded data under lock and key in Dr. Harvey's office at the university which will only be accessed by the investigator and supervisors directly involved in the project. The data will be stored for ten years following the publication of the research. Upon the expiration of the stated storage time, all files and information will be destroyed. Participation is voluntary and any questions you may have will be answered as quickly and thoroughly as possible. It is important to understand that it is your right to withdraw from the research study at any point. Data recorded prior to the moment of withdraw will only be used should you give your consent; otherwise it will be destroyed and not incorporated into the study.

If you opt to participate in this research study, please complete and return the consent form provided to University of Ottawa master's student Chris Houston, student investigator of this study. Mr. Houston can be contacted directly by either email at _____ by _____

☎ 613 562-5852
☎ 613 562-5149

125 Université / University
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada

www.uOttawa.ca

telephone r by fax at). The transcript of the interview will be provided to you for your review before it is used in the data analysis, so that you may add, delete, or modify the transcript as you so choose.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact Chris Houston, Student Investigator, at, Dr. Jean Harvey, Supervisor at 613-562-5800 x 4277 or Dr. Milena Parent, Supervisor, at 613-562-5800 x 2984. Any questions regarding the ethical concerns or conduct of this study should be addressed to the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, at 613-562-5841 or at ethics@uottawa.ca.

Sincerely,

Chris Houston, M.A. candidate
Student Investigator

Dr. Jean Harvey, PhD
Supervisor

Dr. Milena Parent, PhD
Supervisor

Appendix D

Interview Protocol on Canadian Sport Policy Development

Research Questions:

1. What factors led the federal government to add participation to the new Canadian Sport Policy?
2. What were the agendas of the key stakeholders in the formation of the Canadian Sport Policy?

Question 1

- 1.1 - Was sport participation an area in the Canadian sport system that that was identified as a “problem area” prior to the creation of the new Canadian Sport Policy in 2002? Why or why not?(Problem Stream)
- 1.2 - Where there any decisive events or crisis that indicated a problem with the way sport participation was being handled in Canada prior to the new policy? (Problem Stream)
- 1.3 - What are some of the reasons or factors (indicators) that brought the responsibility of sporting participation to Sport Canada? (Problem Stream)
- 1.4(a) - In your opinion, what was the national mood regarding the climate of amateur sport in Canada during the creation of the new Canadian Sport Policy? (Political Stream)
- 1.4(b) – Was the public receptive to changes? Demanding change? Satisfied with the current conditions? (Political Stream)

Question 2

- 2.1(a) - Where there any specific groups or organizations that targeted sport participation as an area in Canadian sport that was in need of change or (re-organization)? (Policy Stream)
- 2.1(b) – Who where they and in your opinion what was their motivation/agenda for the change? (Policy Stream)
- 2.2 - How much, if any, influence was afforded to coalitions or interest groups (ie. sport matters group) during the process of creating the new policy? (Political Stream)

Interview Protocol on Organizational Analysis of National Sport Organizations

Research Question:

What is the impact of the participation pillar on NSOs in terms of (a) new initiatives produced as a result of the pillar; and (b) in terms the organizations' structure and operational values?

Question 1(a)

1.1(a) Is your organization aware of the new participation pillar in the new Canadian Sport Policy?

1.2(a) How has your NSO responded to the new pillar? Have you initiated new programs? Increased membership? Increased awareness of your existing programs?

1.3(a) How successful have the new participation programs/initiatives been?

Question 1(b) - Organizational Values

1.1(b) Is there any difference in the values your organization holds towards either elite level athletic achievement or broad based participation programs? (Domain)

1.2(b) What does the new participation pillar in the Canadian Sport policy mean to your organization? How did it affect policy and procedure? Personnel roles? (Principals of organization)

1.3(b) What has your organization done to ensure that effectively coordinated participation programs are/will be implemented? (Criteria of effectiveness)

1.4(b) Has the new participation pillar had any impact on your sources of funding; i.e. membership fees, corporate sponsorship, federal funding, etc.? (Orientation)

Organizational Structure

1.5(b) What is the approximate ratio in your organization between paid staff and volunteers in participation based activities? (Specialization)

1.6(b) How have new participation initiatives put forth by your NSO affected the structure and operation of the organization? (Specialization & Centralization)

1.7(b) How has your organization worked internally to deal with the participation pillar? For example have standardized policies or guidelines been set for participation initiatives? Are there formal job descriptions for employee's and volunteers working towards expanding participation. Did they exist before the new sport policy? (Standardization and formalization)

1.8(b) At what organizational level are the majority of decisions regarding expanded sport participation made? How many different people are involved in the decision making? Do volunteers have a say in the process? (Centralization)