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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to apply an interorganizational network analysis model that has been previously used in a co-operative environment to an amateur sport network. The 'eclectic model' utilized four analytical approaches: structural analysis within the network based on interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects; exchange analysis, based on flows of money, information and moral support; decisional analysis of three issues based on the participants, issues and outcomes; and an analysis of Weick's 'organizing processes' based on the analysis of the same three issues from a perspective of analysis of ecological change, enactment, selection and retention processes involved in each. The study was focused on a research question. The four part question was:

(1) How does an interorganizational network operate and evolve as an overall system?
(2) How do the actors within it come to understand it?
(3) How did the network come to influence their behaviour?
(4) How is the network shaped by organizational members?

Data were collected mainly from semi-directed focused interviews and organizational documents. The interviews included both volunteers and staff members of an amateur wrestling network. Findings indicated that the eclectic
model was appropriate for the study of an amateur sport network, and that there were similar conclusions from the co-operative and sport environments.

Further, with reference to the research question, the network operated as a system with structure, resource exchange and political and decision making dynamics. The actors did indeed affect the network, and their understanding of the network was based on relative experience. How their network came to affect the actors' behaviour was not testable.

The decision making process was operating in accordance with Cohen et al.'s 'garbage can' model of decision making. The actual decision making concerning the three issues also led to some interesting conclusions with respect to the volunteers and staff persons relative authority.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although interdependency among different social units has been intuitively recognized for some time, incorporating this seemingly factual phenomenon into theoretical and conceptual schemes is of recent vintage (Negandhi, 1975:1).

Organizations as social units, which are continually striving to become more effective, must consider internal factors, as well as their external relationships with other organizations. Because of their increased bureaucratization since 1969, Canadian amateur sport organizations are not exempt from these considerations (Broome and Baka, 1978). Therefore, to gain a better understanding of amateur sport from an organizational perspective, Rose's framework for interorganizational dynamics was adopted and applied (Rose, 1982).

This thesis is a case study of interorganizational relations within an amateur sport network. It is an attempt to examine two previously unrelated areas of research using network analysis. The study is a first in Canada, in that the application of network analysis has infrequently been applied to an amateur sport network at this level. The specific network under study consists of Sport Canada and the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA), including
CAWA's committees and three provincial wrestling associations, namely the British Columbia Amateur Wrestling Association (B.C.A.W.A.), the Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association (O.A.W.A.). It is a timely study because in recent years there has been increased research in the areas of:

1. Interorganizational Theory (Benson, 1975; Rose, 1981);
2. Network Analysis (Boissevain, 1979; Benson, 1975; Rose, 1981);
3. Government involvement in sport (Olafson, 1982, 1983; Frisby, 1983); and
4. Voluntary Organizations (Frisby, 1983).

All of these themes are examined in this paper. Interorganizational theory is concerned with the study of organizational relationships and actions. It concentrates on

...the activities that take place when organizational units act to manage interdependence or to maintain their discretion within the context of network structures (Stern, 1979:246).

Network analysis related to interorganizational theory was originally employed by Stern. He viewed the network as all the linkages between organizations, and the whole network as the unit of analysis (Stern, 1979:244).

Government involvement in sport exists by virtue of a mandate from Parliament which states that the Federal Government shall attempt to "encourage, promote and develop fitness and amateur sport" (Campagnolo, 1979:3). The government is associated (primarily financially) with sport organizations. The implications of financial contributions and subsequent policy statements from Fitness and Amateur Sport to National Sport Organization's are too vast to explore here, but will be discussed later.
Voluntary organizations refers to organizations in the non-profit sector, of which all national sport organizations and provincial sport governing bodies are included. National sport governing bodies and provincial sport governing bodies usually operate under a broad mandate of promotion and development of all facets of their respective sports. These mandates are pursued with Federal and Provincial Government funds in concert with funds raised through membership and the corporate sector. Both of these areas of concern have "increasingly received more attention by scholars and researchers, as evidenced by completed masters theses, doctoral dissertations and scholarly papers..." (Olafson, 1983:1).

This has been primarily due to the fact that since the passage of The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act in 1961, the Federal Government has increased its financial support to national sport and multi sport organizations, from one million dollars to fifty million dollars in 1985. Concurrent with this increased financial support is the increased bureaucratization of sport as evidenced by the formalization of many organizations such as: Sport Canada, Recreation Canada, (renamed Fitness Canada in 1980), the National Sport and Recreation Centre (NSRC) which is home to at least sixty plus National Sport Organizations and, the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC).
Research in this area has focused upon a comparative level of analysis (Semotiuk, 1970; Corran, 1980), along with historical and federal/provincial relationship investigations (Parashak, 1978; Anderson, 1974; Webb, 1978; Dinning, 1979). There has been, however, a dearth of research relating interorganizational network analysis to sport. Originally Stern's paper examined the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and it's transformation from a loose, voluntary confederation into a dominant control agent (Stern, 1979). This was followed by Olafson's comparative analysis between Canada and Britain using network analysis (Olafson, 1983).

The present study examines the interorganizational relations within Canada's national amateur wrestling network and employed the methodology of Rose's "Eclectic Analysis of An Inter-organizational Network : A Case Study Of Six Canadian Co-operative Organizations" (1982). Her study examined organizations that were all nationally active in the Canadian co-operative sector. The analysis consisted of three stages:

1. Identification of significant patterns in the relations among organizations.
2. The exploration of how the aforementioned patterns may relate to or affect the behavior of an individual organization.
3. The attempt to understand sets of organizations as social phenomenon in themselves, and how they evolved within a broader social context (Rose, 1982:1).

Rose's as well as the present study's research was guided by a four part research question:
(1) How does an interorganizational network operate and evolve as an overall system?
(2) How do the actors within it come to understand it?
(3) How did the network come to influence their behaviour?
(4) How is the network shaped by organizational members?

The present study was also concerned with three issues; which were identified as being of national importance. The issues are outlined as follows:

(1) The site selection for the National Training Centre,
(2) the National Carding System, and
(3) the selection of the National Coach.

As will become evident in the following review of literature this type of analysis has seldom been applied to a sport environment.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years there has been a growing interest in interorganizational relations. Two claims concerning this type of relations have appeared with increased frequency.

The first is that organizations are open rather than closed systems, and accordingly, that we must bring into analysis of organizations various factors external to the structural properties of the organization itself (Zeitz, 1975:39).

An open system takes into account the effect of the environment on the organization. More specifically, "it is the consolidation of how the external environment influences the internal properties of an organization" (Negandhi, 1975:1). Both statements are in agreement, insofar as no organization is self-sufficient and able to operate totally independently of the other. All associated organizations must be accounted for in any analysis, due to their affect on the focal organization. Therefore, a critical component of any organization's environment is other related organizations. This claim has been summarized by Pfeffer and Salanick.

The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources. This problem would be simplified if organizations were in complete control of all the components necessary for their operation. However, no organization is completely self contained. Organizations are embedded in an environment of other organizations (Pfeffer and Salanick, 1978:2).
Even though there is an increased interest to understand organizational relations, research has had a narrow focus. Most articles have dealt with one focal organization as an actor affected by other organizations in the environment. This type of analysis is beneficial to understand an individual organization in its context. However, it does little for the "understanding of how sets of organizations as a social phenomena behave and adapt" (Rose, 1981:4). Warren realized that another level of analysis was required, especially one which focuses on the 'interorganizational field' as opposed to one focal organization. He viewed interorganizational relations as an exchange between a network of three or more organizations. The unit of analysis is referred to as the interorganizational field which is defined as "the properties of an aggregate of interacting organizations as distinguished from properties of the individual organizations themselves" (Warren, 1971:59). Trist has emphasized the need for research in this area specifically as related:

To a focal organization and its organizational set but to the organizational field created by a number of organizations whose inter-relationships comprise a system at the level of the field as a whole. It is the character of this overall field, as a system, which now becomes the object of inquiry, not the single organization as related to its organizational set (Trist, 1976:1).

In conjunction with this increased interest in interorganizational relations as described by Trist, there has been a renewed sociological interest in the area of social networks. Since the late sixties,
there has been an ever increasing interest in the field. There have been at least a dozen conferences and symposia, a flood of articles... the collection and consolidation of computer programmes, and, to crown this interdisciplinary activity, the establishment of the International Network for Social Network Analysis and the journal Social Network (Boissevain, 1979:393).

Mitchell has defined network analysis as:

A specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons, with the additional property that the characteristics of their linkages as a whole may be used to interpret the social behaviour of the persons involved (Mitchell, 1969:2).

Network analysis was originally employed as an instrument to study the relationships between actors with the major focus on interpersonal ties. Recently, researchers have argued that network analysis could be applied to interorganizational ties (Benson, 1975; Aldrich, 1979; Galaskiewicz, 1979; Stern, 1979). When applied to interorganizational analysis, network analysis "consists of organizational units and the linkages between them and the unit of analysis is the totality of the network" (Stern, 1979:244).

Therefore, the consolidation of these two concepts, interorganizational relations and network analysis into one research strategy seems to be a logical progression. Network analysis is a "research instrument which can help resolve certain social and theoretical problems" (Boissevain, 1979:394) related to interorganizational relations, without focusing upon one actor organization. Network analysis is also an instrument used to study the processes of
organizational relationships over time, in contrast to a static structural analysis. The application and potential of network analysis is summarized by Tichy et al.:

Network analysis is one method of conceptualizing organizations that captures the interaction of both the static and dynamic dimensions of organizations. Network analysis views organizations as social objects (people, groups, organizations, etc.) joined by a variety of relationships. All pairs of objects are not directly joined by multiple relationships. Network analysis is concerned with the patterning of these relationships and seeks to identify both their causes and consequences. Such focus, then, permits the analysis of both organizational factors and organizational processes over time (Tichy, Tushman, and Pombrum, 1980:372-373).

Stern supports the viewpoint of Tichy et al., insofar as they believe network analysis must take into account more than just a static picture of an organization. There must be a consideration of all the factors influencing an organization over a period of time.

Network analysis must consider the total context in which interorganizational activities occur. Beyond measurable determinants of network structure, it must examine information on process, political interests, historical developments and environment in order to avoid empty descriptions of interorganization relationships. (Stern, 1979:265)

Thus, Benson, Kaufman, Tolsdorf, Boissevain and Rose agree with the basic ideas outlined by Stern and Tichy et al., but emphasize that although many studies have been done in the area of interorganizational theory and network analysis, few have any generalizeable qualities. While they are in agreement with the definition of the concepts, there
exists a wide variation among researchers as to which network variables are most important. This has resulted in some studies using differing variables. The variables then tend to be situation specific for each study (Tolsdorf, 1976). The research then offers situation specific results which facilitate limited development of a sound theoretical framework on which to base future research. Benson believes that, even though there is a growing interest in the research, there is little hope of providing an adequate theoretical approach at this time, because research attention has been devoted to a variety of different elements, components and levels (1975:229). He also has stated that:

If progress is to be made in this field, an integrative theoretical framework is needed. Such a scheme should bring to order diverse concepts and explanatory principles previously proposed, providing analytical boundaries and linkages that would permit accumulation of complementary findings (Benson, 1975:229).

A review of the relevant research concerning amateur sport organizations related to an interorganizational network analysis perspective will be offered.

Interorganizational theory, or more specifically, network analysis, was originally adapted to sport in Stern's 1979 paper, "The Development of an Interorganizational Control Network: The Case of Intercollegiate Athletics". In this paper, Stern examined the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and found that it was "transformed from a loose voluntary confederation of universities into the domi-
nant control agent over intercollegiate athletics..." (Stern, 1979:242). He examined the historical transformation of the network of organizations constituting the NCAA by focusing on "(1) the processes that link structure to organizational interests" (Stern, 1979:242). He felt it was not enough to just examine structural variables. Historical as well as process variables are very important for a more complete and accurate understanding of the transformation of the interorganizational network. Stern thought that researchers had failed in this area. He observed that conclusions of studies were drawn, based upon data gathered at one time, thereby offering a limited and static picture of the organization with no reference as to how the organization got there, or where it was heading. He also believed that for network analysis to be effective, it had to take into consideration the total context in which interorganizational activity occurs.

Beyond the measurable determinants of network structure, it must examine information on process, political interests, historical development, and environment in order to avoid empty descriptions of interorganizational relationships (Stern, 1979:265).

Olafson (1983) has utilized the research of Stern, Aldrich and Benson to expand the knowledge of interorganizational theory in the area of sport. More specifically, Olafson completed a comparative analysis of Canadian and
British sport systems using network analysis in concert with Semi-Directed Focused Interviews (SDFI). He followed the SDFI protocol in order to obtain data from the Directors General in Wales, Scotland, England, Eire and Canada. Data from opinionnaires were also transcribed and analyzed using the method of content analysis. His summary was descriptive in nature, and pertained specifically to the variables: Administrative Structure, System Coupling, Multiplexity of Relationships, New Resource Systems, and Group Dynamics.

Olafson noted several parallels between the two countries with the structural variables, administrative structure, system coupling, multiplexity of relationships, and new resource systems. While examining group dynamics however, he concluded that "the factors of decision making, communication, organizational authority and influence are noticeably different" (Olafson, 1983:3).

He also felt that his Government-Legislative Involvement Model (GLI) would aide future research thereby expanding the existing knowledge and understanding of national and international sport. "Network analysis and SDFI in combination with other research methods... can be used to improve upon the research findings and thereby contribute to the advancement of understanding in this field" (Olafson, 1983:6).

Another important study in which organizational theory was applied to a sport setting is Frisby's analysis of vol-
untary amateur sport organizations from an organizational perspective using a Weberian theoretical framework. This investigation identified several research problems. The first was the examination of

... the relationships between a number of contextual variables and features of bureaucratic structure. Second, the interrelationships among the bureaucratic structural variables were also analyzed. Third, the relationship between structure and measures of both the goal and systems model of organizational effectiveness were investigated. The fourth purpose was to determine the extent to which indices of the goal and systems model of organizational effectiveness are interrelated in voluntary amateur sport organizations (Frisby, 1983:iv).

Data were collected from the Executive Directors of twenty-nine out of fifty-four National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGB) housed in the National Sport and Recreation Centre (NSRC). One of the NSGB's studies was the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA), which is examined in this study.

Frisby found a dearth of information dealing with voluntary organizations, especially from an organizational perspective. More specifically "very few researchers of voluntary organizations have employed organizational theory as a framework for understanding voluntary social action" (Frisby, 1983:4). While researching voluntary sport organizations, she again discovered a relative shortage of research from an organizational perspective - even to the point where "there has been little empirical research on the structures and functions of these amateur sport decision making bodies" (Frisby, 1983:4).
The National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGB) make decisions that affect all of the amateur sports people under their sanction or jurisdiction in their respective sports. Actually their decisions are affecting millions of Canadians who are involved in amateur sport. Very few studies have been undertaken concerning the decision making structure "even though these bodies undoubtedly have a strong influence on the development of amateur sport" (Frisby, 1983:19).

Some of her results and recommendations illustrated the importance of the continuation of research into amateur sport organizations from an organizational perspective. More specifically from an interorganizational perspective, Frisby felt that additional research was required in the area of interorganizational networking (Frisby, 1983:244).

Frisby is in agreement with Stern and his recommendation that organizations should be studied from an historical perspective. This would facilitate a more complete and accurate understanding of the transformation of the interorganizational network. Analysis should consider both the structural and process variables over a period of time which will allow a dynamic organizational picture to be examined.

To further understand the nature of voluntary sport organizations, the historical and cultural context in which their decision making bodies have developed should be examined (Frisby, 1983:244).

In sum, sport organizations are similar to other organizations in that they must be considered open systems. A sport organization is not and cannot be self sufficient. In
fact, the mere presence of this sport milieu as we know it in Canada is dependent to a large part upon a host of organizations from government to corporate sponsors.

Realizing this, it seems logical to assume that there are many factors that account for the success and maintenance of a sport program. Environmental variables or factors external to the organization must be accounted for (i.e. where are the scarce resources coming from and going to; how tightly linked both formally and informally is one organization to another?). As Pfeffer and Salanick stated this "problem would be simplified if no organization were in complete control of all components necessary for their operation" (Pfeffer and Salanick, 1978:2). Any organization is dependant on other organizations. Therefore, this whole open system concept, one where interdependency flourishes, dictates that the entire organizational field, and not just a single focal organization, must be analyzed.

This type of analysis must include static (formal) as well as dynamic (informal) variables. The overall structure must be accounted for; as must the processes involved in the organizational set.

Rose's eclectic model as illustrated, was utilized to overcome the challenges set forth by the aforementioned authors.
ECLECTIC MODEL

ANALYTICAL APPROACHES:

(1) Structural Functionalism
    - interlocking directorates, commonness
      ownership, and joint projects.

(2) Exchange Analysis
    - money, information, and moral
      support.

(3) Decisional Analysis
    - issues, participants, and outcomes.

(4) Organizing Processes
    - enactment, selection, and
      retention.

Her model was developed by melding various organizational
theories. (Structural Functionalism Theory, Exchange Theory,
Decisional Analysis, and Organizing Processes). These
theories are concerned with the structure of the network,
the exchange of scarce and valuable resources, and decision
making respectively—all of which are determinants of
organizational functions. The data required are based on
variables which are an integral part of every organization
(e.g., money, information, decision making, etc.).

Even though the precise methodology will be explained
in greater detail in the following Chapter; it should be
emphasized that the eclectic model measures both formal and
informal variables over a period of time within an entire
organizational field and not just within a single focal
organization.
2.1 Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to apply an interorganizational network model to an amateur sport environment namely the Amateur Wrestling Network in Canada. The eclectic model was developed by Rose, and is suited for a case study approach which, (as will be expanded upon later) requires the utilization of a research question and not a statement of the problem. The questions which were based upon those utilized by Rose, were as follows:

(1) How does an interorganizational network operate and evolve as an overall system?
(2) How do the actors within it come to understand it?
(3) How did the network come to influence their behaviour?
(4) How is the network shaped by organizational members?

In addition to the research questions, the eclectic model posed several inherent sub-problems: these included:

(1) The identification of structural patterns, and the implications of same on the network.
(2) The illustration of patterns of exchange and perceived influence within the network. Their implications were considered in terms of what they revealed about the processes within the network, and the explanation they offered as to how network characteristics affected the behaviour of individual organizations in the network.
(3) The selection and analysis of specific decisions in order to provide a more developmental view.
(4) A less developed technique (Organizing Processes-Weick, 1979) being utilized with the intention of understanding the more subjective processes of adaptation and evolution of the network as a social system in itself (Rose, 1981:2).
(5) The identification of the underlying rules that were operative during the emergence of the three issues:
   (i) the site selection of the National Training Centre,
   (ii) the National Carding System, and
   (iii) the selection of the National Coach.

The four research questions and attendant sub-problems were examined by accumulation and interpretation of data
employed in the analysis of the respective theories incorporated in the eclectic model. The four components of the eclectic model and their specific variables are as follows:

1) Structural Functionalism - interlocking directorates, common ownership, and joint projects;
2) Exchange Theory - information, money, and moral support;
3) Decisional Analysis - key issues, participant and outcomes; and,
4) Organizing Processes - ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention.

2.2 Significance of the Study

The examination of voluntary amateur sport organizations from an organizational perspective has been somewhat limited (Stern, 1979; Olafson, 1983; Frisby, 1983). Also, few analyses, organizational/structural, historical, or comparative, are to be found in the area of government involvement in sport (Corran, 1979). The national wrestling network consists of both voluntary organizations (i.e. national and provincial associations) and government organizations (i.e. Sport Canada). Therefore, by examining this network, the study was concerned with both voluntary amateur sport organizations and government involvement in sport, through government funded organizations as a unit of analysis.

The selection of the national wrestling network was based upon two factors: (1) the author's expertise and involvement in the network as an athlete, coach and member; and, (2) the criticism that was directed at the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA) network.
In its estimation the CAWA was the recipient of unpopular publicity. Most noteworthy was an article published in 1983 in the Montreal Gazette, by Janet Brooks, in which she challenged the decisions that the CAWA Executive had made concerning the site selection of the National Training Centre and the National Carding system, which are two of the three issues that were examined in this paper.

The excavation is in Regina and it hasn't stopped yet. A year after Canada's national training centre in Regina opened its doors, athletes still don't want to go there, some coaches resent losing their star pupils and the national coach has privately questioned the wisdom of the centre's location (Brooks, 1983:C-1).

It seemed therefore that an analysis of the decision making process in this network was warranted due to the following considerations: First, resentment and opposition was exhibited by athletes and coaches because of the National Training Centre; second, that voluntary organizations, including sport, should continue to be studied from an organizational and interorganizational network perspective (Frisby, 1983:244); and third, that the increased bureaucratization of sport has lead to a loss of autonomy for the athletes. The

... decision making power and authority, especially at the national level, is becoming more and more concentrated in the hands of the professionally trained executive members and paid professionals (Frisby, 1983:19-20).

Finally, such a study could benefit the CAWA and other National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGB's) in their decision making processes and interorganizational relations.
This interorganizational analysis employed an eclectic model because, as Rose suggests "more is revealed about the specific network under study than would have emerged from any one of the models alone or in combinations used by other researchers..." (Rose, 1981:188-189). Therefore, by following the eclectic model as closely as possible, parallel or similar conclusions would be drawn from the co-operative and sport environments with reference to interorganizational network analysis.

Thus based upon the foregoing, this investigation analyzed an amateur sport interorganizational network employing the eclectic model, and

1. extended the literature, knowledge and understanding of voluntary sport organizations, government involvement in sport, and network analysis;
2. attempted to gain a better understanding of the decision making process in an amateur sport interorganizational network; and
3. attempted to find if there were any similarities between the conclusions of Rose's study of a co-operative environment and the present study of a sport environment related to interorganizational theory, or more specifically network analysis.

2.3 Limitations of the Study

Because of the size of the national wrestling network, and due to time and financial constraints, it was not possible to reach everyone involved (See: Delimitations pg. 21) with a Semi-Directed Focused Interview (SDFI). Those who were not available for the SDFI were sent a mail questionnaire adapted from the SDFI (See Appendix C).
The data obtained from the respondents was based upon their willingness to participate and their assurances of the anonymity offered in this study. Also, the representativeness of those participating is limited by the availability of those directly associated with the study.

The limitations of history, selection and mortality as outlined by Campbell and Stanley (1966) must also be mentioned. The amount of time lapsed between the initiation of this study and the three issues may have affected the perceptions of the respondents. There may also have been a bias in the selection of the sample (i.e. Association Presidents and Professionals, etc.) and there was a turnover of some key respondents involved in the decision making process.

Another limitation to this study arises from the structure of Rose's questionnaire as a data gathering instrument. The questionnaire was used in order to remain consistent, reliable and valid with Rose's study. However, it should be noted that the questionnaire was only used with two respondents who were not related to the specific network under study; because all other responses were gathered via (face-to-face or telephone) Semi-Directed Focused Interviews.

There is a limitation in using secondary data as opposed to primary data, as Rose stated:

... there is a serious problem with using ex post facto interview and documentary data as a basis for analyzing processes which by definition
are largely subjective and temporary phenomena (Rose, 1981:67).

Two limitations of Rose's study were also applicable to the present investigation:

(1) the results will not be directly generalizeable to other settings; and,
(2) this study will not present strict causal findings.

Therefore given the paucity of the research and the current state of the art with these two concepts, the major task of this study is viewed as being exploratory and largely descriptive in nature.

2.4 Delimitations of the Study

The researcher imposed the following restrictions:

(1) Only the opinions of the President and a professional staff person (where applicable) were used; if the association did not have a professional, then the Past President was interviewed and Sport Canada consultants were also included in this study.
(2) The study pertained only to the years 1980 through 1983, because this is when the three main issues were first identified and were subsequently dealt with by the C.A.W.A.
(3) The only issues analyzed were
   (i) the site selection of the National Training Centre;
   (ii) the National Carding System;
   (iii) the selection of the National Coach.

These three issues were and still are very important. Also the issues were identified by several key individuals in the wrestling network as items of importance to the national wrestling network.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As mentioned earlier, the methodology was adapted from Rose's dissertation, and will be discussed in three sections. First, the research design is outlined; second, the variables are defined in operational terms; and finally, the techniques used to analyze the data are reviewed.

3.1 Research Design

The research strategy that was used herein is that of an 'exploratory' case study. The two distinguishing characteristics of case studies are that they attempt to examine: a) a contemporary phenomena in its real-life context especially when b) the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 1981:59).

Yin stated that case studies differ from more experimental methods which attempt to divorce a phenomenon completely from its context in order to study it without contextual interference. Case studies are also distinguished from comparative or survey research techniques which attempt to isolate selected variables for examination across contexts. However, data-gathering techniques associated with one strategy (e.g. survey research interviews in comparative
strategies) can be employed within another strategy (e.g. the case study), "but the basic choice of strategy defines the parameters for the overall design of the study" (Yin, 1981:44). The strategy selected also must be appropriate both to the setting to be examined and to the research question to be addressed (Yin, 1981:44). Therefore, based on Yin's statements the case method was chosen as the basic research method for the present study.

An interorganizational network must be studied in its real life context. The case study strategy allows for consideration of important aspects of the network's context which might have been set beyond the boundaries of a more experimental approach. A number of authors (Galaskiewicz, 1970; Stern, 1970; Tichy et al., 1980) have identified the usefulness of the case strategy in advancing understanding of such properties.

As previously discussed the research question and the theoretical model require a case study approach, because of the descriptive and subjective nature inherent within the amateur wrestling setting.

The exploratory nature of this broad question certainly lends itself to the case strategy. Further, the eclectic model used, especially with its emphasis of historical and subjective properties of the network, is well suited to the case method (Rose, 1981:52).

In summary the case study method was employed because it suits the nature of the setting to be studied as well as the nature of the research question, and theoretical model
being applied to the present study (Rose, 1981:52). Also, such analyses have much to contribute to a nascent field such as interorganizational analyses (Kalaskiewicz, 1979:38).

However, even though the case method is appropriate for this study, it does have weaknesses, as stated by Rose:

First, case studies cannot be readily generalized. Certainly, the present case findings cannot.... the network here under study comprises a system which is unique with a specific social and economic sector.... A second difficulty is that case studies are massive, descriptive documents with limited focus. They become weighted down with their own data (Rose, 1981:52).

The findings of Rose's study were not generalized directly to this investigation. However, it was hoped there would be some parallel between Rose's co-operative study and the present sport research. Also, by closely following the methodology of Rose it was unlikely that this study would become weighted down with data, or turn into a descriptive document with limited focus. Therefore, taking all factors into account, the case method, even with its weaknesses, was utilized for exploratory research concerning an interorganizational network in a sport environment.
3.2 Organizational Definitions and Methods of Data Collection

3.3 Network Organizations

Sport Canada, the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association, the British Columbia Amateur Wrestling Association, the Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association, and the Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association were all designated as being part of the specific network under study. The specific network consisted of only those organizations who were directly involved in all three of the issues: namely, the site selection of the National Training Centre, the selection of the National Coach, and the National Carding System.

All of the five organizations in the specific network are part of a larger network consisting of:

F.I.L.A. (the international wrestling governing body), Sport Canada, the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA), committees: (a) Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association,
(b) National Coaching Council,
(c) CAWA Technical Committee,
(d) CAWA Executive Committee,
(e) CAWA National Office Staff,
and the Provincial Wrestling Associations including:
(a) Alberta Amateur Wrestling Association,
(b) Manitoba Freestyle Wrestling Association,
(c) Federation de Lutte Olympique du Quebec,
(d) Nova Scotia Amateur Wrestling Association,
(e) New Brunswick Amateur Wrestling Association,
(f) Prince Edward Island Amateur Wrestling Association,
(g) Newfoundland Amateur Wrestling Association,
(h) Northwest Territories Amateur Wrestling Association
The following section of this Chapter is concerned with the identification and operationalization of the variables related to each of the four theories which constitute the Eclectic Model. The four theories are again: the Structural Functional Theory; Exchange Theory; Decisional Analysis; and Organizing Processes.

3.4 Structural Variables

Structure has been referred to by authors (Benson, 1975; Stern, 1979; Tichy et al. 1980) as administrative structure, system coupling, and prescribed network. This study follows the definition of Tichy et al. which cites the structural dimensions as the prescribed network. They describe a network as a pattern of nodes and links, where links are the ties or relations between pairs of nodes. The prescribed network is then defined as a pattern of formally defined links between nodes which could be inferred from an organizational chart (Tichy et al., 1980:375).

In the definition used herein, the network structure will refer to those structural linkages which could be inferred from an organizational chart, whether or not they have been formally defined by the organizations (Rose, 1981:54).

More specifically, the indicators of network structure are identified by the following three variables: interlocking directorates; common ownership; and, joint projects. Each of these variables must be operationalized with respect
to the present study. Interlocking directorates are defined by Burt, two organizations are said to be interlocked "... when one or more persons sits on the boards of both firms..." (Burt, 1980:557).

The common ownership that exists within the CAWA is outlined in the constitution. The CAWA Board of Directors consists of the provincially elected presidents, a Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association (CAOWA) representative and an athlete's representative. The body then elects a President, Vice President East and West, Secretary Treasurer and Technical Chairman who comprise the Executive Committee.

Common Ownership was said to exist when one or more organizations outside the network under study are members of or entitled to nominate directors to at least [one] of the [five] organizations in the network (Rose, 1981:54).

Finally, joint projects referred to those activities such as committees, investments, special projects and research in which two or more of the organizations in the network under study have been active participants (Rose, 1981:54).

Data collection followed Rose's procedures of interviews and documentation. The data was obtained through Semi-Directed Focused Interviews (SDFIs) of the organizations' elected Presidents and professional staff or of the Past President. Data were also drawn from the CAWA Annual General Meetings (AGM) Minutes, the CAWA Board Meetings Min-
utes, and program meeting minutes, as well as correspondence from 1980 to 1983. The same type of data used with regard to the Structural Variables were used for the Exchange Variables.

3.5 Exchange Variables

In keeping with the eclectic model, the second set of variables to be considered in this study pertained to the exchanges within the network. Galaskiewicz (1979), and Benson (1975) have both focused on exchange variables related to interorganizational networks. However, this thesis followed Galaskiewicz's operationalizations and data gathering techniques which were similar to Rose's. Galaskiewicz categorized exchange into three variables; money, information, and moral support. He operationalized these variables in terms of whether they had been identified as being present by the leaders interviewed. In this present study, the same three variables were used as indicators of the exchanges within the network.

Money shall be used to refer to "any transfer of funds between two organizations in the network, whether in the form of loans, investments, dues, grants, or fees for services or products" (Rose, 1981:56). Information shall refer to "the exchange of information from one organization to another, whether in the form of documents, personal contact, or meetings" (Rose, 1981:56). Finally, moral support is
herein used to refer to the "expressed support of one organization in the network for the acceptance of another's product, political positions, or mode of operation, either within the (wrestling) sector or by other institutions such as government" (Rose, 1981:57).

Data collection was again based on Rose's study, which utilized interviews and documentations to supply the data. Galaskiewicz's interview schedule had been adapted to Rose's as was the case in the present study (see Appendix A).

The data pertaining to financial exchanges were documented in the budgets etc. of the various meetings. Information exchange data were collected primarily from interviews. However, Rose found that data on information exchange could be "cross-checked through documents referring to presentations made to one organization's Board by a representative of another, and to formal procedures for sharing information" (Rose, 1981:58).

Data for the moral support variable were gathered from both the interview schedule and documentary data. Galaskiewicz's interview schedule has a section specifically focused on moral support (see Appendix A). Also, organizational records were examined for data pertaining to one organization's expressed moral support for another. Rose found that this could be in the form of "Board discussions of other organizations, motions and agreements to assist or support other organizations" (Rose, 1981:58). Therefore, the data
gathering techniques (SDPI and documentation) for the three variables related to exchange were adapted primarily from Galaskiewicz (1979).

Interviews were conducted on more than just one leader from each organization, as opposed to Galaskiewicz's study. In fact interviews were conducted both from within the specific network under study and from the larger wrestling network which mitigated the aforementioned limitations.

3.6 Decisional Variables

The next set of variables in this study relates to the dynamics or processes involved in the network over a period of time. Decisional variables, as they are known, are related to Decisional Analysis. In this form of study the researcher selected several key issues, identified the key individuals in the decision-making process, determined the outcome and then appraised its significance (Tichy et al., 1980:380). For the purpose of conducting this type of analysis, it once again became necessary to define three variables.

First, the term 'key issue' was herein defined

... as those which had been of national interest and involved all... the organizations in the network under study during the past (3) years, and which related to fundamental matters such as organizational structure (Rose, 1981:59).

The specific issues selected were identified by key figures in the wrestling network as items of national importance and most worthy of analysis. They were:
(1) The site selection of the National Training Centre;
(2) The National Carding System (carding refers to the Athletic Assistance Program that assists top level athletes with expenses incurred through training and competition. Carding is divided into three categories based on an individuals international results, where A and B cards are in the top ten in the world. C cards are given to those with international potential based on domestic results). (Government of Canada, October, 1980);
(3) The selection of the National Coach.

The second variable in need of definition was 'participant'. For this study, participants were "individuals who were formally or informally involved in raising, defining, and/or resolving the issues under question" (Rose, 1981:60). The third variable, 'outcomes', is defined as "the course of action taken, if any, as a resolution to the issue" (Rose, 1981:60).

The data gathering techniques for these three variables, issues, participants and outcomes, again were the interview and documentation design. Interviews were used to identify those who were involved in each respective issue, and also how they perceived the outcomes. This was possible due to the specific foci of Galaskiewicz's interview schedule (see Appendix A). The actual reporting of outcomes of the interviews was limited by the possible need and/or promise of confidentiality and anonymity to the respondents. Also, in order to gain a better understanding of the decision making process the interviews were not limited to the specific network under study. Interviews were conducted with individuals from all organizations in the larger wrestling network (i.e. interviews were conducted with all pro-
vincial wrestling associations). These findings were also included in the analysis.

3.7 Organizing Process Variables

The fourth and final set of variables was termed the Organizing Process Variables, because they reflected the 'organizing processes' of the network. They resemble the decisional analysis variables, and there was difficulty in distinguishing the two. Weick had developed 'organizing processes'; therefore, it was his variables and respective operationalizations that were employed in this study.

Weick identified four variables contained in organizing processes as: ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention (Weick, 1979). For the purpose of this study, 'ecological change' referred to "changes in the stream of information available to actors in the network" (Rose, 1981:61).

Three instances of ecological change have been selected for analysis. The issues selected pertained to the same three issues employed in the decisional analysis (i.e. the site selection for the National Training Centre; the selection of the National Coach; and, the National Coaching System). Each of the issues represented a significant change in the 'stream of experience' of the network's organizations. 'Enactment', was defined as "actors related to the ecological changes, whether in the form of communications
(eg. proposals) or more substantive action" (Rose, 1981:62). In simpler terms, 'enactment' is a process whereby the input of an organization is sorted out, and then particular aspects are acted upon in order to assure further action.

'Selection', for the present purpose, referred to the processes whereby attention became focused on the change under consideration (eg. setting up committees or task forces) at the level of the network as a whole (Rose, 1981:62). Retention denotes the "processes and actions whereby the change became incorporated into the historical development of the network (eg. documentation, rationalization, public announcements)" (Rose, 1981:62).

The data sources used for identifying instances of ecological change, enactment, selection and retention were the same as those used for the analysis of the three Decisional Analysis issues:

(1) the site selection of the National Training Centre,
(2) the National Carding System and
(3) the selection of the National Coach

The major difference lay in the manner of interpretation of the data. At this point, a limitation to both the Decisional Analysis and Organizing Processes was that all of the data on the highly informal processes of decision making and organizing (hotel room discussions, behind the scene politicing, etc.) could not be included in this study. Such an immense undertaking (to include all informal communication) is definitely beyond the scope of this paper. However it was hoped that enough informal data would be accessible and could be employed.
Actual data collection took three forms: (1) from documents; (2) Semi Directed Focused Interviews (see Appendix A); and, (3) questionnaires (see Appendix C).

Documents were gathered from the Annual General Meetings, Board Meetings, and any program development meetings specifically related to the three issues. The Semi-Directed Focused Interviews were tape recorded on a face-to-face basis at several of the major wrestling tournaments, or were conducted by telephone interview. It was assumed that while a face-to-face interview was more ideal, a telephone SDFI was more desirable than a mailed questionnaire. Therefore, of the interviews completed, thirteen were in person, fifteen were by telephone, and two were by questionnaires. Each interview took no more than forty-five minutes.

In summary, the organizations contained in the network were identified and four sets of variables developed from contemporary studies of network analysis were fused in the form of an eclectic model. The variables were operationalized and the methods of data collection were also discussed.

3.8 Method of Data Analysis

As mentioned earlier, the four sets of variables used in this study were those pertaining to:

(1) network structure;
(2) exchanges within the network;
(3) key decisions in the development of the network;
(4) organizing processes in the evolution of the network.
Each one will now be discussed with an outline of the appropriate method of data analysis.

3.9 **Structural Analysis**

Structural analysis data, i.e., those related to interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects within the network, were mapped and presented in the form of matrices.

The main thrust in this study regarding structural analysis was to identify the 'centrality' of "individual organizations within the network, and the 'centralization' of the network as a whole" (Rose 1981:64). The concept of centrality refers to how closely linked in structure the nodes in the network are, or the sparsity or density of the network (Freeman, 1979). A matrix was developed to include all of the organizations in the network. The method of structural analysis was strengthened because of the reliability of the public data (falsification of records e.g., board minutes, etc. is a legal offense) and the accepted validity of interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects as indices of structure (Stern, 1979; Burt, 1980).
3.10. Exchange Variables

The second set of variables pertained to exchanges in the network: money, information and moral support. Two types of analyses were employed. First, the exchange variables were mapped. Second, the data on exchange were compared to a 'reputational' analysis of perceived influences within the confines of the network (Tuchy et al., 1980:380). Both techniques will now be discussed with consideration to their respective merits.

The mapping of the money, information and moral support was straightforward. The main difficulty with this analysis technique was the necessity of using secondary data. Tuchy et al., (1980), have stated that secondary data concerning such matters are less powerful than data based on direct observation. However, acquisition of such primary data was not feasible due to financial and time constraints.

The second exchange analysis technique (pertaining to perceived influence in the network), was based on the data obtained from Galaskiewicz's adapted questionnaire. The objective was to find which organizations are perceived to be influential. This was accomplished by employing a ranking of Low, Moderate or High based on the number of times the respondents mentioned the respective organizations as a source and/or recipient. The following chart was employed to assist in the delineation of the rankings.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
N & \text{LOW} & \text{MEDIUM} & \text{HIGH} \\
10 & 0-3 & 4-6 & 7-10 \\
\end{array}
\]
The variations in the N resulted from analyzing both the specific network (ten respondents) and the larger network (thirty respondents). The sample size equalled twenty in some instances, due to the specific respondents listing three choices for a specific question. Therefore the ranking applies to each organization was based on N or the number of citations mentioned by the respondents towards the respective questions.

3.11 Decisional Analysis

The third set of variables were those pertaining to decisional analysis of the three issues. The analysis of these data were based on Cohen et al.'s, (1976) suggestions that decisions should be analyzed in terms of four factors: the issues; the solutions posed; the participants; and, the choice opportunities. Each of these elements were considered in the qualitative analysis of the three main issues. The main problem with this type of analysis is that the data were based on perceptions and documented factors as opposed to direct observation of events and behaviours. Another factor that posed some problem and should be mentioned is that not all of the key individuals remained in their positions throughout the entire three years and some new people had assumed key roles. However, it was the intent of this researcher to contact most of those involved in the decision
making process, with either a SDPI or a mailed questionnaire.

3.12 Analysis of Organizing Processes

Here the analysis is very qualitative. To the best of the author's knowledge, this was only the second time the variables of ecological changes, enactment, selection, and retention have been used to examine interorganizational networks. Rose's was the first. The data on which organizing processes were based are the same SDPI or questionnaire and documentation used in the aforementioned decisional analysis.

To summarize then, the basic research strategy was adapted from Rose's eclectic model. The following is a chart illustrating the key sets of variables and the technique of analysis for the data of the respective variables.

3.13 Summary of Research Strategy

(1) Identification of:

(a) Methodology - Rose's Eclectic Model
(b) Basic Strategy - Exploratory Case Study
(c) Key Issues - site selection of the National Training centre
   - the National Carding System
   - the selection of the National Coach
(d) Key Organizations - Sport Canada
   - CAWA
   - British Columbia Amateur Wrestling Association
   - Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association
(2) Collection of Data:
(a) Major Sources - Semi-Directed Focused Interview and documentation
(b) Minor Sources - Questionnaires

(3) Analysis of Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories and key sets of variables on which data were collected</th>
<th>Predominant focus of the analysis of data on key sets of variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Functionalism</strong></td>
<td>Map overt structure, and positional analysis of centrality within the network, and of the network as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Interlocking Directorates</td>
<td>Mapping of exchange flows, analysis on perceived influence in relations to exchange flows of organizations as either a resource source or recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Common Ownership</td>
<td>Analysis of problems, solutions, participants and choice opportunities in the decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Joint Projects</td>
<td>Analysis of organizing processes in relation to three developmental points in the network. Which organizations were involved in and what were the underlying rules at play during the decision making process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Theory</th>
<th>Illustrated in chart form and described descriptively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Moral Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Perceived Influence Within and Surrounding the Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Processes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ecological Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Enactment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Results

(5) Conclusions
(6) Recommendations
CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS

The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the results specifically related to each of the components of the eclectic model namely:

(1) Structural Analysis;
(2) Exchange Analysis;
(3) Decisional Analysis; and,
(4) Organizing Processes.

The aforementioned sections are followed by a Summary of Analyses which provides an overview of the results. The first section is

4.1 NETWORK STRUCTURE

The purpose of this section is twofold;

(1) structural patterns of the network were identified; and,
(2) subsequently mapped and

(2) the implications of this structure on the network under study were discussed.

In order to understand the network structure more fully it would be most beneficial to briefly describe each of the organizations within the network. Again the organizations within the specific Network here under study are: Sport Canada; the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association; the British Columbia Amateur Wrestling Association; the Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association; and the Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association.
Sport Canada is a funding agency of the Federal Government under the Ministry of Fitness and Amateur Sport. Sport Canada provides funds to approximately seventy National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGB) (e.g. CAWA). Housed in the National Sport and Recreation Centre (NSRC) in Ottawa, they function with the following mandate:

To provide leadership, policy direction and financial assistance for the development of Canadian sport at the national and international level. To support the highest possible level of achievement by Canada in international sport.

Sport Canada's specific goal statements are:
1. To co-ordinate, promote and develop high performance sport in Canada in conjunction with recognized national sport organizations.

2. To assist in the development of domestic sport in Canada in those areas which require coordination at the national level.

3. To provide administrative and technical leadership, policy direction, consultative services, financial resources to assist national sport organizations to function effectively as the primary agents for excellence and coordinated domestic sport development in Canada.

4. To develop federal government sport policies. (Sport Canada Mandate, March 24, 1983)

Sport Canada is divided into six units:

(1) Policy planning and evaluation unit;
(2) Association Management Unit;
(3) Sport development group;
(4) High Performance Unit;
(5) Best Ever Winter Group; and,
(6) Best Ever Summer Group

The liaison between Sport Canada and the NSGB's is via consultants in either the Association Management Unit (CAWA) or the Sport Development Group. Sport Canada provided over
$330,000 from 1980-1983 to the CAWA. This money was used for staff salaries, including National Coach, administrative costs, publications, national training centre, athletes assistance program, national team programming including travel meals/accommodations, and technical programs (i.e. steering committee meetings, National Coaching Certification Programs, etc.).

The Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA) is a non-profit society and the National Sport Governing Body of amateur wrestling in Canada. Its mandate is to:

(a) encourage and develop the widest participation and the highest proficiency in amateur wrestling in Canada; and,

(b) to coordinate and assist wrestlers, coaches, managers, trainers, and officials in the pursuit of excellence in wrestling regionally, provincially, nationally and internationally.

(CAWA Constitution)

The CAWA voting membership includes individuals representing Provincial Associations, the Privileged Members (i.e. Wrestlers Representative) and Affiliated Organizations (Officials Association).

A Director is appointed to represent each of the Provincial Associations, Wrestlers Representatives, and Officials Representatives. These Directors in turn vote on the Executive Committee members and the Technical Committee Chairmen. The Executive Committee shall pass and exercise all of the Directors between meeting of a said Board of Director's. The Executive consists of the:

CAWA President
CAWA East Vice President
CAWA West Vice President
CAWA Secretary
CAWA Treasurer
CAWA Past President
CAWA Technical Chairman

The Technical Committee consists of the:

Technical Chairman
Vice President East
Vice President West
Wrestling Representative
Research Directors Representative
Officials Representative
2 members at large

Its mandate "is to be responsible for establishing and coor-
dinating the programmes and activities sanctioned by the
Executive in accordance with the priorities and guidelines
established by the Board of Directors . . . " (Constitu-
tion, 25)

Provincial Association of the CAWA refers to a Provin-
cial or Territorial Amateur Wrestling Association organized
to foster the development of provincial or territorial wres-
tlers, coaches, trainers, managers and officials residing
within that Province or territory. (CAWA Constitution,
2-3).

As mentioned previously, BCAWA, SAWA and OAWA are all
Provincial Sport Governing Bodies concerned solely with ama-
teur wrestling in their respective province. All are non-
profit organizations governed by a volunteer Board of Direc-
tors. The aforementioned associations also employ
professional staff who administrate the daily business of
the associations.
For the present purpose structure was viewed as the overt structural patterns of interaction, whether formal or informal. The mapping of structure provided a static picture of the network and included interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects. As Tichy, et al. stated:

Positional data are the easiest type of network data to collect because most organizations have it formally mapped out. However, it is the least informative of all network methods because it fails to tap the actual ongoing process of the organization (Tichy et al., 1980:380).

Centrality or the position an organization holds within the intraorganizational field is a key concept associated with structural analysis (Rogers, 1978:488). However, this is the limit of agreement among investigators. There is no complete agreement on: (1) what centrality is; or, (2) what its conceptual foundations are; and finally, (3) how it should be measured (Freeman, 1979).

Suffice it to say the structural variables are presented and examined in terms of implications for organizational behavior, "based on the assumption that centrality relates in some way to organizational influence within the network" (Rose, 1983:76).
4.1.1 Structural Data and Analysis

This section outlines the structural variables of interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects, followed by a discussion of their implications on the network.

4.1.2 Interlocking Directorates

Interlocking Directorates (ID) refers to a situation where one or more persons sit on the boards of two or more firms in a network (c.f. Burt, 1980:557). It is assumed that this type of interlocking somehow brings organizations closer together, thereby facilitating resource exchanges and co-operation.

As mentioned earlier in this Chapter, the CAWA Board of Directors consists of Provincial Association Presidents, a Wrestlers' representative and an Officials' representative. Therefore the interlocking was only between wrestling associations. There is no interlocking between Sport Canada and any of the Wrestling organizations. The following matrix outlines the interlocking directorates:

Table 1: Matrix of Interlocking Directorates Among the Five Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CAWA</th>
<th>OAWA</th>
<th>BCAWA</th>
<th>SAWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table 1: 1 = an Interlocking Directorate 0 = no Interlocking Directorate - = inappropriate cell
The most central organization in terms of Interlocking Directorates is CAWA and this is attributable directly to the constitutional makeup of the amateur wrestling milieu in Canada. There was no Interlocking Directorate (ID) between provinces or between the wrestling organizations and Sport Canada.

In terms of centrality: as a system based on interlocking directorates the network would appear to be slightly centralized, in that there is an ID in six out of a possible twenty situations.

4.1.3 Common Ownership

Common ownership is defined as those organizations which are members of or eligible to nominate directors to at least [one] of the [five] organizations under study. Again because of the constitutional structure of amateur wrestling in Canada, all members of a Provincial Wrestling Association are members of the CAWA. Further, when provincial members elect their provincial president, they are also appointing the same individual to the CAWA Board of Directors. Therefore, based on the constitutional format, the CAWA was most centralized based on common ownership, as the following matrix illustrates:

The matrix depicts a centralized network system based on common ownership similar to the Interlocking Directorates (ID). Three out of the five organizations have common member/owners.
Table 2: Matrix of Common Ownership Among the Five Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CAWA</th>
<th>BCAWA</th>
<th>SAWA</th>
<th>OAWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table 2:  
1 = A Common Ownership  
0 = No Common Ownership  
- = Inappropriate cell

When common ownership was analyzed beyond the specific network under study to include the larger network, it was again illustrated that all Provincial Associations were members of CAWA. The matrix also outlined the common ownership between (1) Sport Canada and the COA, and (2) FILA and CAWA.

Table 3: Matrix of Common Owners/Members of the Network Under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CAWA</th>
<th>BCAWA</th>
<th>SAWA</th>
<th>OAWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFLDAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWTAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table 3:  
1 = A Common Ownership  
0 = No Common Ownership  
- = Inappropriate cell
Thus far, it is of special interest to note that Interlocking Directorates and Common Ownership are equal in their measure of centrality. Both variables when illustrated depicted the CAWA as the most centralized organization in the network. Again, this is directly attributable to the constitutional format and mandated relationships in amateur wrestling in Canada.

4.1.4 Joint Projects

The third and final variable under structural analysis is joint projects. Joint Projects was defined as those activities such as committees, investments, special projects and research in which two or more organizations in the network under study have been active participants.

The following matrix outlines some of the joint projects undertaken within the network from 1981-1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Projects Within the Specific Network</th>
<th>CAWA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SAWA</th>
<th>OAWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin., Nat'l</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Programs,</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications, Comm. Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OAWA                                      |      |    |      |      |
| Skills Award Program                      |      |    |      |      |
| Canada Cup, NTC Proposal, Nat'l Champ., Athlete Assist. |      |    |      |      |

| SAWA                                      |      |    |      |      |
| NTC Proposal, NTC, Nat'l Coach, Athlete Assist, Nat'l Champ., Nat'l Team Travel |      |    |      |      |
In many cases (i.e. National Coach (NC), National Training Centre (NTC), Athlete Assistance, National Championships) the monies are channelled through the CAWA to the Provincial Sport Governing Body (PSGB) from Sport Canada. This develops a strong indirect link between Sport Canada and the PSGB's.

Joint Projects illustrate the high degree of centrality of the CAWA in relation to the other organizations in the network. CAWA's high degree of centrality can be attributed to the funding and policies of Sport Canada. As outlined earlier NSQ's can only apply for funding support under certain categories. Therefore Sport Canada can dictate to large extent what a NSGB can and cannot do. In other words, if Sport Canada believed that National Training Centres were no longer required for the development of elite athletes, then the CAWA and the SAWA would no longer have that joint project unless; of course; they could raise the required monies internally or by corporate sponsorships. CAWA is highly centralized primarily because of the funding provided by Sport Canada. This leads to an interesting fact that Sport Canada is directly but not overtly involved in these joint projects. In reality Sport Canada and the CAWA are the most centralized organizations with respect to joint projects.
4.1.5 Overall Analysis of Structure

To summarize, Interlocking Directorates and Common Ownership are equal in terms of dictating centralization within the network. Analysis of both variables depicted the CAWA as the most centralized organization in the network, as mandated by the CAWA constitution. Joint projects, however, identified Sport Canada as being equal to the CAWA.

It appears, from a structural viewpoint that the CAWA is the most centralized organization in the network, due to: (1) the CAWA constitution and (2) the funding policies outlined by Sport Canada; even though the provincial associations are supposedly autonomous they must still interact with the national body. Therefore the 'centralization' of amateur sport networks in Canada appears to be predetermined by constitutional and financial factors. Also if one organization controls the finances, even in a covert way, it must be considered in the network structure. No matter how far removed a funding organization may appear to be, there is always some form of policies, procedures and accountability required for those funds.

Assuming that centrality is an important factor in determining how a network functions, it would appear that the CAWA would be the most influential organization in the network. Unlike Rose's study, a clear pattern of centrality is evident in this analysis, and it also must be restated that centrality is a direct result of the formal structure
of the network under study. This situation raises some interesting questions for future research as to the power and dominance within the network and its relationship with a formally designated central organization. Even though the CAWA is formally designated as being the most central organization, the members (provinces) are autonomous organizations and any power or dominance the CAWA has over its members appears to be quite limited. Suffice it to say that structural analysis has given a static picture of the network under study which illustrates the CAWA as being the most central organization. The next section examined the networks structure insofar as how the organizations are linked through exchanges of money, information and moral support.

4.2 NETWORK EXCHANGE

The purpose of this section was to identify patterns of exchange and perceived influence. The exchange variables of money, information and moral support were analyzed with regard to their implications on the network. Specifically, how the network characteristics affected the behaviour of individual organizations within the network.

Exchange analysis takes structural analysis one step further. Where structural analysis tends to suggest that structural configurations dictate actors' behaviours, exchange analysis treats actors as active individuals pursu-
ing their own self-interests. An individual's self-interest is advanced by influence over others in one's environment. Galaskiewicz believes that influence is directly related to one's position as a source and/or recipient of valuable resources (Galaskiewicz, 1979:26-27).

There have been two views concerned with exchange analysis related to interorganizational relations. The first is an asymmetric exchange as noted by Schmidt and Kochan (1977:220) who view interorganizational relations as one of perceived mutual benefits or gains from interacting. The leaders of two or more organizations are internally motivated and perceive that by interacting with other organizations, as opposed to remaining autonomous, they will be better able to attain their goals.

The second is identified as a power-dependance concept. This perspective views interorganizational relations as asymmetrical, based on exchange of resources and occurring only when one organization has the ability to force another to interact (Schmidt and Kochan, 1977:220). The former perspective has been used most often with non-profit organizations and the latter with competing private firms (Rose, 1983:91). It was felt that no organizational relationship is entirely co-operative or competitive therefore both exchange perspectives were utilized to provide a complete analysis of exchange relationships. This is in agreement with sophisticated resource-dependency models because they
consider both cooperative and competitive relationships as shaped by power and dependance (Emmerson, 1962; Blau, 1964).

Both viewpoints share three common assumptions that were applied to the present study:

(1) That a norm of rational self-interest motivates the actors in the network.

(2) That each organization in the network is itself an open system and consequently must engage in continuous exchange with other organizations in its environment in order to obtain the resources needed for advancement of its survival and self interest (Galaskiewicz, 1979:32-34).

(3) That the network as a system is defined by the sum of the exchange relationships and patterns of influence within it. (Rose, 1983:92)

4.2.1 Resource Exchange

Data were gathered on three types of resources:

(1) Money, defined as any transfer of funds between two organizations, whether in the form of dues, grants or fees for services or products;

(2) Information, defined as the exchange of information between two organizations, whether in the form of documents, personal contact or meetings; and,

(3) Moral support, defined as the expressed support of one organization in the network for acceptance of another's product, political positions, or mode of operation. (Rose, 1983:94)

4.2.2 Financial Exchange

The financial data were obtained from Annual General Meeting Minutes and other financial reports. The basic financial flows are depicted in the following matrix:

As illustrated, Sport Canada is the least dependent on other network organizations for money. However, it is primarily funded from the Department of Health and Welfare via Fitness
Table 4: Matrix Illustrating Financial Exchange Among the Five Network Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.C. Sport Canada</th>
<th>CAWA</th>
<th>BCAWA</th>
<th>SAWA</th>
<th>OAWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>funding</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 4 yr. period</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
<td>thru CAWA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAWA

Free

N/A balance

Athlete monies

Natl' assist.

Champ. returned

Natl' to S.C.

Coach, Athlete

Natl' assist.

Team Champ.

Soviet Dual

nil membership nil

N/A nil dues

nil Skills

nil Award

N/A Program

BCAWA

nil membership nil

N/A dues

nil Skills

nil Award

nil Program

SAWA

nil N.T.C.

membership nil

N/A dues

Skills

N/A Award

N/A Program

OAWA

nil membership nil

dues nil

N/A

Skills

N/A Award

N/A Program

and Amateur Sport. The CAWA is highly dependent on all organizations in the network. The OAWA is the second least dependent organization in the network; followed by the BCAWA and the SAWA.

Further all organizations receive funding from outside the network. More specifically Sport Canada from the Government (Department of Health and Welfare); BCAWA from Sport B.C.; SAWA from Saskatchewan Sport, Culture and Recreation; OAWA from the Ministry of Tourism & Recreation; and the CAWA from other Provincial Sport Governing Bodies (PSGB). This
outside funding raises an interesting question of whether a network can be reasonably treated as a closed system, especially when this type of analysis (exchange) assumes that each organization within the network is in fact an open system. Based on financial exchange, the relative anticipated levels of influence of individual organizations within the five organizations were also identified. The following table's (Table 5) relative anticipated levels were generated by the number of times respondents mentioned an organization as being a source and/or recipient of financial exchange (see Appendix A).

Table 5: Relative anticipated Levels of Influence of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Anticipated Influence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>mod-high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCACA</td>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table 5: # Citations | Ranking
0-6 | LOW
7-13 | MOD.
14-20 | HIGH

To summarize the financial exchange analysis then, the CAWA was the greatest influence followed by BCACA and SAWA. With Sport Canada and OAWA having the least amount of influence within the network as indicated by the respondents. It is interesting to note that the respondents did not acknowled-
edge Sport Canada as a funding source. This could be due to the fact that the monies are channelled through the CAWA, the highest ranked organization.

4.2.3 Information Exchange

The information exchange data were gleaned from Annual General Meeting Minutes, Special Program Development Minutes, Financial Reports, Canadian Wrestler Magazine, Ontario Wrestler Magazine, Coach Magazine as well as written memos. Data were also collected through the SDPI's specifically related to an organization's perceptions of other organizations as sources/recipients of information. The majority of the information was internally related (i.e. it involved only the organizations within the network).

Strategic information was found to be shared through a select group of individuals. This became most evident when the site was selected for the National Training Centre and individuals wanted to know how that decision was made, what were the criteria weightings, etc. Also information of a more sensitive nature appeared to be shared mainly through interactions of individuals on an informal basis. Most discussions of wrestling concerns were conducted among friends, who for the most part were not included in the specific network (i.e. not within the five organizations), however all were part of the larger wrestling network (i.e. other provincial associations etc.), which would suggest a close linkage beyond the network itself in terms of information.
exchange. Also the CAWA was seen as a source of information regarding long range concerns. The presidents and professional staff were asked to identify other organizations they perceived as being closely aligned to their organization as an information source or as a recipient of their own information (See Appendix A). The following chart outlines the results perceived information exchange as indicated by number of times organizations were cited as one of the three most important sources or recipients of information within the five organization network.

Table 6: Perceived Information Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Information Source (# of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Information Recipient (# of times mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, in terms of perceived information exchange, the CAWA was viewed as most central within the network both as a recipient and as a source of information. SAWA was at the other extreme being viewed as least centralized both on information as a recipient and as a source of information.

The information exchange results were analyzed in terms of what they would predict if information were assumed to be a resource directly related to influence. The following chart summarizes the relative anticipated influence levels
of individual organizations within the five organization
network based on analysis of exchange of information; where
the following parameters were used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># citations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Relative Anticipated Levels of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Anticipated Influence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Low-Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Exchange of Moral Support

The final exchange variable was moral support. Documented examples of this variable were somewhat limited. One event happened before this study, where all of the provincial associations took a strong stand and increased their affiliation fees to in order to re-establish the CAWA as a financially viable organization. Other documented examples of moral support were limited. A few (three) letters and memos were reviewed, and each supported the actions taken concerning one of the three issues. Beyond the aforementioned, written documentation was non-existent as far as this study's access to information was concerned. However the SDPI's did elicit pertinent responses. The moral support analysis was also predicated on the number of times
respondents mentioned an organization as a source and or recipient of moral support. The following chart has the CAWA viewed as high recipient of moral support and as a moderate source of moral support. Sport Canada was again at the other extreme, never being viewed as a moral support recipient and only once as a source of moral support. The following two charts summarize these findings.

Table 8: Perceived Moral Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Moral Support Source (# of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Moral Support Recipient (# of times mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Anticipated Levels of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Anticipated Influence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the anticipated level of influence of the individual organizations within the five organization network, based on the analysis of exchange of moral support was based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Citations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.5 Summary

The exchange variables have now been presented.

The findings which are most relevant for the consideration of perceived power and influence within the network are those which predict the relative influence of the organizations based on their relative importance in resource exchange" (Rose, 1983:108).

Therefore the organizations have been ranked overall in accordance with their individual resource exchange analysis. The results were illustrated in terms of the relative anticipated influence levels of individual organizations within the five organization network, based on overall exchange analysis of money, information and moral support. The CAWA has the highest overall ranking, followed by the BCACWA and finally the others. It should also be noted that the variables (information, financial, and moral support) were assumed to have equal weightings for the purpose of this ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Money Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Information Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Moral Support Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCACWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rankings of the relative anticipated influence levels were based on the average of the three individual
rankings (e.g. SAWA had 1 moderate and 2 lows therefore an overall ranking of low was given).

4.2.6 Perceived Influence in Relation to Exchange

The data on perceived influence were obtained in interviews. The Presidents and professional staff were asked to identify which organization, from a list of thirteen organizations, they viewed as being generally influential at the National Level. They were also asked to rank which organizations they saw as being most influential. In this fashion, data were gathered both in the network relative to a larger (wrestling) context and on perceived influence within the network itself (See Appendix A).

Table 11: Perceived National Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAWA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAWA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOQ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAWA</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBAWA</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIAWA</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFLDAWA</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWTAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It should be noted that as a group the Maritime Provinces were mentioned three times
Therefore the table has illustrated the perceived national influence of wrestling organizations as indicated by times cited as influential, from the larger wrestling network. The CAWA is perceived as having the greatest national influence within the larger wrestling network, which included all of the other provincial associations. The OAWA is a close second behind the CAWA, with Sport Canada and BCWA appearing to be also highly influential. SAWA was perceived to be moderately influential nationally. Finally, four of the five organizations in the network under study were perceived as being highly influential within the broader wrestling network.

Based on the high perception of influence with the CAWA, the respondents were again asked which organization they perceived as having national influence within the five organization network. However this time the CAWA was divided into its various units and committees; which gives a good indication of where the perceived power is within the CAWA. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Cert.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Office</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again OAWA was perceived to be highly influential within the specific network under study, along with the BCAWA, Executive Committee and Technical Committee. The BCAWA was also perceived to be highly influential, as well as Sport Canada and the CAWOA. These results identify specifically where the perceived influence was within the network under study and within an actual organization perceived as being one of the most influential organizations. It is interesting to note the Technical Committee was perceived as being as highly influential as the Executive Committee, especially when the Technical Committee was working under the auspices of the Executive Committee. It is also noteworthy that the CAWOA are perceived to be so highly influential, which could be due to many reasons:

(1) FILA is administrated by officials (they set the rules for international competitions).
(2) The President of CAWA was an internationally carded official (i.e. he was rated by the International Federation as an official worthy of officiating international sanctioned tournaments).
(3) The CAWOA (based on information from FILA) explains how rule changes will be scored, thereby altering how Canadians wrestle both nationally and internationally.

To summarize then the CAWA, OAWA, Sport Canada and BCAWA (in that order) were all perceived as being highly influential in the larger wrestling network. When dealing with the specific network under study the OAWA, CAWA, BCAWA and Sport Canada were all perceived as having national influence.
These findings were a comparison of influence levels as anticipated from overall exchange and as perceived within the network. No one anticipated level of exchange appears to be the best indicator of perceived influence at least in terms of relative levels. It should also be noted that, with the ultimate goal of developing a predictive causal relationship, an attempt was made to try and identify which indicator (money, information or moral support) was correlated to centrality within the network. A linear regression analysis was employed; however, due to the small N (sample size) no significance was found between any of the variables and centrality. Further, five correlation analyses (Pearson, Spearman, Kendall, Hoeffding, and Rank) were attempted; which resulted in the same non-significant outcome.

Table 12: Anticipated Exchange Level/Perceived Influence Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Ranking on Money</th>
<th>Ranking on Info.</th>
<th>Ranking on Anticipated Moral Influence</th>
<th>Overall Influence Level</th>
<th>Perceived Support Level</th>
<th>Perceived Level Within Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWA</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study took both Galaskiewicz's and Rose's studies one step further. SDPI's were conducted on at least one individual from every organization within the larger wres-
tling network. The two previous studies only examined the specific networks under study. The researcher went beyond the specific five organization network by collecting and analyzing data from the larger wrestling network. The same SDPI's were used and the data presented in a similar fashion (see Appendices E, F, G, H).

It is interesting to note that both the specific and larger network have identified similar findings, as evidenced in the following tables. The first table (Table 13) illustrated the relative anticipated influence levels within the larger wrestling network, based on overall exchange of money, information, and moral support. The second (Tables 14-15) presented on page 67-68 illustrate the anticipated influence levels and perceived most influential organizations respectively. The larger network has given higher overall rankings to the CAWA, OAWA and SAWA. Sport Canada received the same ranking from both groups. Under the information exchange ranking the larger network has ranked the National Office, BCAWA, OAWA and CAWA (generally) as high; where the specific five organization network identified only the CAWA as being worthy of a high ranking.

The perceived most influential wrestling organizations, as indicated by the number of times mentioned, within both the five organization network and the larger network are summarized in the table below. The rankings were based on the following:

Five Organization Network
Table 13: Relative Anticipated Influence Levels Within the Larger Wrestling Network, Based on Overall Exchange of Money, Information and Moral Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Money Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Information Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Moral Support Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Dir.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.T.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA (generally)</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Ministries</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atl. Prov.'s Together</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Anticipated Influence Levels

work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Money Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Information Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Moral Support Exchange Ranking</th>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low-Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Perceived Most Influential Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Network Ranking</th>
<th>Entire Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.I.L.A.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA (generally)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only F.I.L.A., Sport Canada, and the Board of Directors received equal rankings from both groups. Discrepancies were noted with CAWOA and BCAWA. The specific network ranked both as high, and the larger network ranked both as low. Otherwise the rankings were not too far apart.

4.3 NETWORK DECISION MAKING

Where the previous two sections have been concerned with more specific and quantifiable variables related to structure, the present section attempts to understand the process inherent in the overall network. The analysis was
aimed at the subjective aspects of the networks' development. The "network is mapped from the perspectives afforded by documenting and analyzing processes through which decisions have been made within it" (Rose, 1983:122). This section was divided into three areas:

1. brief explanation of decisional analysis, more specifically the "Garbage Can Model";
2. an analysis of three major decisions the wrestling organization dealt with from 1980-1983, and
3. a discussion as to what are the implications of the findings with respect to the network

4.3.1 Decisional Analysis

Decisional analysis has been concerned with understanding "... the nature of the decision making process in relation to the stability and growth of organizations" (Silverman, 1971:217). The present study utilized the "Garbage Can Theory" of organizational decision making as outlined by March and Olsen (1976). This theory was utilized with the intention of paralleling Rose's study.

The "Garbage Can Theory"

... attempted to describe how decisions were made. The thrust of this theory's approach was to focus less on the details of individuals' decision making, and more on the aggregate flows of people, problems and solutions through organizational networks. (Padgett, 1980:583).

Decisional analysis takes the research one step beyond that of structural and exchange analysis insofar as it treats actors as being more active and subjective than is outlined in the two previous analyses. Stern (1979) and Galaskiewicz (1979) have both utilized decisional analysis (in the
resource dependence mode) in their respective studies. Stern outlined four potential contributions to be made by decisional analysis of an interorganizational network.

(1) It can illustrate that network activity is in fact a function of the historical development of relationships and current structural characteristics of the network.

(2) It can demonstrate that network approach to interorganizations requires an analysis of the processes that link the network structure to the organizational interests within the network.

(3) It exemplifies how network concepts can be used to explain the development of interorganizational relations over time.

(4) It examines the patterns of influence within the network as they develop both by (a) organizational interests; and (b) inadvertently as by-products of the decision making process and developmental process. (c.f. Stern, 1979:243)

These potential contributions will be dealt with later in this Chapter.

Tichy et al. define decisional analysis as involving related participants, selection of a number of key issues, and appraisal of the significance of the decision making process (Tichy et al., 1980:380-381). The current study gathered data on participants, key issues, and outcomes of the decision making process. These data were then subjected to decisional analysis as outlined by Cohen et al. (1976).

4.3.2 Decisional Analysis of the Present Case

Before dealing with the specific decisions in this study, an overview of what actually happened with the C.A.W.A is warranted. The following is a brief synopsis of the C.A.W.A. activities with respect to the years under study (1981-1983) and the three issues (National Team Centre
Site Selection; National Coach Selection; and, National Carding System.

**YEAR** | **ACTIVITY**
--- | ---
1980 | Annual General Meeting
- election resulted in a new Executive Committee
- motion to have a National Training Centre and National Coach were approved in principle
- required further information
1981 | Annual General Meeting
- National Coach and National Training Centre listed under new business
- technical committee, with Sport Canada representation was responsible for the hiring process
- National Training Centre - responsibility of a sub-committee
- provinces asked to submit bids
- Ontario and British Columbia's bids were deposited in advance of Saskatchewan
- sub-committee conducted on site visitations
1982 | April 3rd - University of Regina selected as the National Training Centre
- August 1st - National Coach was hired
- poor attendance at N.T.C. by athletes
1983 | mandatory relocation clause in National Carding System
- November 24th - memo outlining that athletes could train where they deemed appropriate
- The National Coach would travel to the various sites. The N.T.C would be used for the Olympic Training Camp (May-June 1984)

The first problem facing decision making is the selection of the appropriate issues for analysis. Each issue in the present study was of national interest and importance. The issues also deeply involved each of the organizations within the network. The three issues will now be discussed and the data will be summarized in terms of issues, participants, and outcomes.
4.3.3 National Training Centre

At the CAWA 1980 Annual General Meeting a motion was passed

... that the CAWA accept the idea of National Coach in principle; more details to be presented to the Board of Directors no later than August by the Executive Committee. (CAWA, Annual General Meeting Minutes, 1980, page 4)

One year later at the CAWA 1981 Annual General Meeting an item identified as "National Coach Concept" was listed in the agenda under new business. A motion was subsequently passed to approve in principle to accept the hiring of a National Coach; and the Technical Committee was charged with immediate follow up work to establish the concept more fully (CAWA, Annual General Meeting 1981, page 7).

In concert with the hiring of a National Coach was the concept of a National Training Centre. This was due to the fact that Sport Canada would not fund any National Coach who was not located at a permanent residence of a National Team, specifically at a high performance centre.

Therefore from this point on all provinces had an equal opportunity to bid for the privilege of hosting the National Training Centre. Only three wrestling associations put bids forward, namely; BCAWA, SAWA, and OAWA. On Saturday, April 3, 1982 the site for the National Training Centre was chosen and subsequently awarded to the SAWA. It was to be housed at the University of Regina. What later ensued was a host of problems including coaches and athletes not supporting
the centre. The situation was brought to a climax when, on November 24, 1983, a memo from the CAWA President to all Provincial Presidents and full-time staff outlined that the National Training Centre would remain at the University of Regina, however, only until the completion of the Olympic Team trials and Olympic Training Camp. The National Coach would still operate out of Regina and monitor all national team members at the training site of their choice. This was made possible because the mandatory relocation clause for carded athletes was dropped by the executive committee. This will be discussed in greater detail under the third issue. To summarize, the issue was the site selection for the CAWA National Training Centre, the participants were Sport Canada, the Executive Committee, Technical Committee, BCAWA, SAWA and OAWA, and a special task committee. The outcome was the establishment of a National Training Centre at the University of Regina in Saskatchewan and the subsequent closure of same.

4.3.4 National Coach

As was previously outlined, the formal hiring process of a National Coach began in 1980 and culminated on August 1, 1982 when a National Coach was hired. His nationality caused some concern to a few of the interviewees. Some respondents felt that a Canadian should be appointed even though the chosen candidate had more experience and better qualifications. He remained with the National Team until
after the Olympics and World Championships and was subsequently employed at a United States university. To summarize, the issue was the hiring of a National Coach; the participants were Sport Canada, Executive Committee, Technical Committee, and a special task committee; with the outcome being the hiring of an individual.

4.3.5 National Carding System

The National Carding System refers to the athlete assistant program funded by the Federal Government which enables elite athletes to continue to train by easing their financial burdens. This carding procedure underwent numerous revisions over the past few years, and as one interviewee stated "it has evolved from a totally subjective process to one of mainly objective criteria with some subjective considerations".

In view of the fact that most of the elite athletes did not relocate to the National Training Centre (only four did), the CAWA instituted a mandatory relocation clause in the carding system. This proved to be "the straw that broke the camel's back" as one respondent noted. The relocation clause, as outlined in a memo from the CAWA president, stated that all B and C carded athletes must relocate to the National Training Centre or lose their carded status. To summarize, the issue was the mandatory relocation clause, the participants were the Sport Canada Executive Committee, Technical Committee, and athletes. The outcome, the manda-
tory clause was put into effect and was subsequently rescinded.

The three items have now been summarized in terms of key issues, key participants and outcomes. A summary of the issues, time frame, participants and outcomes subjected to decisional analysis is illustrated in the following table.

Table 16: Decisional Analysis Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Time Frame From Issue to Decision (approximately)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Training Centre Site Selection</td>
<td>1980-1982</td>
<td>CAWA Exec.</td>
<td>SAWA hosted the NTC at University of Regina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.C. Task Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coach</td>
<td>1980-1982</td>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Hire a coach who remained until 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA Exec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Carding System</td>
<td>pre 1980-1983</td>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Instituted a mandatory relocation clause which was subsequently rescinded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA Exec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAWA Tech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BCAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.6 Analysis of the Decisions: Problems, Participants, Solutions and Choice Opportunities

In analyzing the decisions (outcomes) all three issues are included in order to provide patterns of decision making within the network.
4.3.7 Problems

It has increasingly been recognized that research has neglected an important aspect of the problem solving process, namely problem formulation...

Few attempts have been made to study the first few stages of problem solving; that is the process by which alternative views or definitions of a problem are generated and selected for further consideration in arriving at a formulation of the problem. Nor has there been a systematic attempt to define organizational and individual factors that influence this process (Lyles and Mitroff, 1980:102).

The present study parallels Rose's by categorizing the problems as one of the four types as outlined by Lyles and Mitroff. (1980:103)

(1) Leibnitzian. A single 'believed-to-be optimal' formulation of the problem, followed by the collecting of data to support this single view.
(2) Lockeian. Data collected about the existence of a problem followed by attempts to arrive at a single formulation of the problem based on the data and/or expert consensus.
(3) Kantian. Several views held about the kind of problem, then efforts made to combine these views.
(4) Hegelian. Has two diametrically opposing views of the problem but there is strong debate.

In applying the three issues to the aforementioned categories, it would appear that all three could be categorized as Leibnitzian. The CAWA membership agreed in principle that the only way to increase international success was through the hiring of a National Coach and establishment of a National Training Centre. Therefore the 'believed to be' optimal formulation was given to the membership and they responded (by collecting data to support this single view)
by putting forth three proposals for a national training
centre, as well as by passing a motion to hire a national
coach.

The National Carding System was operative at the time
of the establishment of the National Training Centre. How-
ever, athletes were not choosing to relocate to the centre.
Therefore, the Executive Committee, again following the Leib-
nitzian type of problem definition, felt that the only way
to get the elite wrestlers on site was to institute mandato-
ry relocation. This resulted in athletes deciding to relin-
quish their cards rather than attend, which ultimately led
to the demise of the National Training Centre. These cat-
egorizations were not supportive of both Rose's and Lyles
and Mitroff's arguments that "organizations make use of the
Kantian and Hegelian models more than one might assume"
(Lyles and Mitroff, 1980:117).

Rose stated "it was observed that individuals tended to
play a key role in defining problems and pushing action on
them" (Rose, 1983:136). This was most evident and in fact
documented in two of the three issues. The third issue or
the National Carding Systems problem was again defined by an
individual; however his action was somewhat less overt
albeit documented. Another similarity between Rose's and
the present study is that both of the networks' problems
were concerned with increasing coordination within the net-
work. Both networks believed in the issues and were commit-
ed, therefore, to increasing the effectiveness of the organizations and/or their control over the external environment.

In other words, the underlying premise of all three issues was to elevate the CAWA medal production at international events. It was assumed that if all organizations worked together their rewards would far outweigh those from any single organizational effort. This also proved to be the case in Rose's study.

4.3.8 Participants

The data on the participants in the decision making process was completed under two formats. The first paralleled Rose's study where only the presidents and professional staff were interviewed. The second was an in depth interview schedule which included every organization in the larger wrestling network. Again only the presidents and full time staff were interviewed except for the CAWA working committees whose members were also interviewed. This extensive interview schedule presented the researcher with an in depth profile and understanding of the decision making from within the network. A decision participation matrix identification, in which individuals participated, on whether they favoured the outcome of each decision, is illustrated in the matrix below. The 'A's' are representative of organizational presidents, and 'B's' of professional staff and committee members. In each cell a positive and or negative sign appears. The first symbol indicates whether they were
involved in the decision making process. The second represents their agreement with the outcome. For example the individual represented by B-1 was not directly involved in any decisions but agreed with all of the outcomes.

Table 17: Decision Participation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>National Carding System</th>
<th>National Training Centre</th>
<th>National Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further it is interesting to examine the interpersonal relations among the individuals involved. "If individuals have varied participation in decision making, they may influence and be influenced by their formal and informal contact network leaders" (Rose, 1983:141). This was exemplified in two interviews. One respondent said that personally he disagreed with a decision, however, because of his position "politically" he had to agree with it publicly. Another individual stated that the various committees are easily swayed and "they will vote based on the last thing they hear".
Therefore in pursuing this line of reasoning the respondents were asked to indicate with which other individuals did they have the most frequent formal contact by virtue of their official position. Also, with whom did they have the most frequent informal contact, and who did they considered to be friends. The data was summarized, in relation to the reported formal/informal contact among the respondents, on the following matrices. The rows were the individual respondents and the columns represent their contacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18: Matrix of Reported Formal Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Number/Respondent #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: + indicates frequent contact
      o indicates limited or no contact
      - indicates inapplicable cells

It is interesting to note that there are no symmetrical relationships (i.e. where A reports B and B reports A). This could be due to a top down management situation where formal documents would emanate from the CAWA down to the Provincial Associations.
Table 19: Reported Informal Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Number/Respondent #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: + indicates frequent contact  
  o indicates limited or no contact  
  - indicates inapplicable cells

Data were also gathered on how individuals perceived the decision making process within the network. Each person was asked to indicate whether he viewed the CAWA decision making process as generally being one of:

1. vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or groups again and again in discussions of national issues, so that the same persons or groups are always found together in coalition
2. there are constantly changing coalitions between various groups or persons, so that the coalitions are different depending on the specific issue being considered
3. relatively little argument takes place because there is a high consensus among the various leaders and groups about what needs to be done.

Fifty per cent of the respondents interpreted the CAWA's decision making process as one of vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or groups. Forty percent described the decision making process as one of constantly changing coalitions based on the issue. Ten percent believed the decision process was one of little argument because resolution was brought about by key leaders with little or no overt debate.
In this network certain individuals (for various reasons) were influential in the decision making process. Also, this influence transcended all three issues; which would be an interesting question for future research insofar as identifying where the power was based. Is the power automatically ensured with an elected position, or is it personality traits or some other factors that enable an individual to have such an impact on an organization?

Rose's study found that the decision making process in the co-operative network seemed "to be political, but more in depth research at an individual level would be required to relate the political process to patterns of perceived and/or resource-based influence and power" (Rose, 1983:146). The extensive interview schedule of the present study paralleled Rose's results insofar as it identified that two decisions were resource-based influenced.

The data on participation can offer one more finding, in that individuals do not always play the roles that both they and others perceive them to play. This became evident during the interviews when certain respondents felt their's was an insignificant influence on the decision, or that other individuals played a key role; when in fact, the data supported the contrary view towards both.
4.3.9 Choice Opportunities

As Cohen et al. ascertains, choice opportunities,
...become defined by the problems and solutions at the moment, that problems 'choose' among currently available choices and that decision makers tend to distribute their time and energy to choices and problems in a 'fire station' manner (Cohen et al., 1976:25).

This became all too apparent as soon as the issue was raised in 1980. There did not appear to be sufficient long range planning as well as contingency planning. The CAWA was quite literally operating by crisis management. To summarize the decisional analysis, the main findings are illustrated in the matrix below.

Table 20: Summary of Decisional Analysis: Four Main Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Patterns in the Network Under Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>appeared to be developed in accordance with the Leibnitzian category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>structural and internally oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>appeared to have stable coalitions throughout the three issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>tended to be created by crises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.10 Completion of Decisional Analysis

The present findings were examined in terms of whether they supported the eight characteristics of the 'garbage can' decision processes by Cohen, et al. (1976:1-25).
First, Cohen et al. (1976:9) suggested that "resolution of problems as a style for making decisions is not the most common style", except where so doing cannot be avoided. This appeared to be the case with the present study. If increasing medal production was the underlying thrust then the resolution of the three issues could not in fact be avoided, and ultimately influenced the crisis style management.

Second, Cohen, et al. (1976:9) believed that problems are less likely to be solved when the decision makers are placed under high energy demands. This again was supported in the present study, in that each issue involved a major change in each network organization; and all were being resolved in a year to a year and a half time span. There appeared to be pressure placed on the key individuals in the decision making process. This was highlighted during the SDFI's. Several of the key participants mentioned the pressure they were under. Third, Cohen, et al. (1976:10) suggest that there is a "tendency of decision makers and problems to track each other through choices". This is especially true in the present study, because all three problems are integrally related, and the resolution of one issue had a direct effect on the other issues.

Fourth, Cohen et al. (1976:10) argue that "good organizational structure would keep both problem activity and problem latency low...", which was not testable given the current interorganizational structure and data.
Fifth, Cohen et al. (1976:10) suggest that the decision making "process is frequently sharply interactive", with many outcomes produced by particular and unanticipated combinations of problems, choices, and participants. Here the present study did not support Cohen et al. The outcomes in all cases were quite limited regardless of the choice and participant availability. However, it would appear that had different participants been involved at key positions in the network, the outcome would most assuredly be different.

Sixth, Cohen et al. (1976:10) state that "important problems are more likely to be solved than unimportant ones"). Again the present study supports Cohen et al. The issues were all of major importance, however the apparent resolution actions of one issue created more issues of equal magnitude. There was a crisis style of management operating without any concern for the underlying problem of increasing national efficiency and effectiveness. As one respondent noted "Sport Canada's dollars are aimed at international excellence; and the volunteer leaders are involved at the high school and university level, and that's where they (the volunteers) would like to see the development". Further, "provincial governments have monies for international travel; and international travel is a national decision and program. They (provincial associations) should be putting their money into the grass roots development". Therefore by examining the aforementioned quotes, it is evident that there
are some serious underlying concerns of how to fulfill the
CAMA mandate with these inherent problems.

Seventh, Cohen et al. (1976:10-11) note that "impor-
tant choices are less likely to resolve problems than unim-
portant choices". Again the current research supported the
garbage can model. All three issues had important choices
attached; and in two instances the problems were not
resolved.

The final characteristic suggested by Cohen et al.
(1976:11) relates to the "likelihood that a choice will be
made regarding a particular issue". They felt that choices
are more likely to be made on issues of intermediate impor-
tance than those of either very low or high importance. The
three issues were all viewed as being of major importance
for the wrestling network. Again the underlying national
efficiency and effectiveness was never addressed, which
could support Cohen et al. However, it is felt that more
research in this area would be required to offer support of
this concept.

4.4 NETWORK ORGANIZING PROCESSES

4.4.1 Network Organizing Processes

Thus far the interorganizational network has been stud-
ied from three separate analytical perspectives; (1) struc-
tural analysis; (2) exchange analysis; and (3) decisional
analysis. All have been beneficial in the explanation of a
network's development. However, all three perspectives, both singularly and as an aggregate, have been limited in their explanation of how network comes to influence their behaviour, and how it is shaped by them (Rose, 1981:51).

It was with the aforementioned question in mind that the fourth perspective has been developed which assumes that the network is a subjective phenomenon which evolves through 'organizing processes' (Weick, 1979). Network organizing processes attempts to discover what 'organizing rules' were active within the network during the time of study. The ultimate aim is to infer something of interest about the underlying mechanisms at work within the network as an evolving social system. This section will be presented in three areas. First, the origins of the organizing processes will be discussed. Second, the perspective will be applied to the current study. Third, the implications of the findings will be discussed.

4.4.2 Origins of the Perspectives

This perspective has been developed by Weick (1979) and he argues that the main concern of organizational studies lies in the understanding of the phenomenon of organizing. Weick contends that

... organizing which is defined as a consensually validated grammar for reducing equivocality by means of sensible interlocked behaviours. To organize is to assemble ongoing interdependent actions into sensible sequences that generate sensible outcomes (Weick, 1979:3).
Weick also relates the process of organizing to environmental adaptation.

When organizing processes are assembled they seem to resemble the process of natural selection. We intend to capitalize on this resemblance and to model organizing after those processes presumed to produce natural selection (Weick, 1979:130).

The four components of organizing are ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention (Weick, 1979:130). Ecological change "provides the enactable environment, the raw materials for sense-making" (Weick, 1979:130). Ecological change refers to the changing "flows of experience that engage people and activities" (Weick, 1979:130). The activities can be both within and between organizations. Ecological change is also the source for the remaining three elements: because it provides "the enactable environment, the raw materials for sense-making" (Weick, 1976:130).

Enactment

... is the only process where the organism directly engages an external 'environment'. All processes subsequent to enactment work on edited raw materials and whatever episodes have been extracted by enactment. The external environment literally bends around the enactments of people... The enactment, as it becomes linked with ecological change, merely provides the equivocal raw materials which then may be seized or discussed by the selection process (Weick, 1979:131).

This can be described as an actor's response to some ecological change, or to which environmental stimuli he pays attention.

Selection is the process where an organism or social system imposes various structures on equivocal displays in
attempting to reduce their equivocality. It is used in making cause maps through which the organism either succeeds or fails to make useful sense of its environment (Weick, 1979:131). Selection then refers to the process of attention being focused on the change under consideration (i.e. establishing committees).

Retention involves storage of the products of successful sensemaking. The contents of retention are referred to as the 'enacted environment' (Weick, 1979:131). Therefore retention is processes where actions become incorporated into the development of the networks. In order to understand Weick's concepts and language more fully a quote by Wicker is useful.

Organizing is portrayed as a natural selection process. From the complex of events (ecological changes) that a person or group might attend to, certain features are isolated and acted upon (enactment). Results of these actions then become the focus; they are classified and interpreted (selection). The chosen interpretations are subsequently stored (retention) (Wicker, 1980:714).

4.4.3 Analysis of Organizing Processes

The analysis on this fourth perspective is focused on the same three issues as the decisional analysis: (1) National Training Centre site selection; (2) selection of National Coach; and (3) National Carding System. The difference lies in the conceptualization of the issues. Decisional analysis treated the issues as discrete decisions made in the network over the past few years. Organizing
processes analysis regards the issues more as major developments through which the national network has emerged and evolved out of the broader wrestling sector over the past few years. Therefore, two main streams of analysis are required: (1) perceptions of the ten key actors are analyzed for their implications regarding enactment, selection and retention; and, (2) the adaptation of the network as a whole is assessed from the perspective of collective patterns of enactment, selection and retention (Rose, 1983:163).

4.4.4 Individual Patterns

Enactment was utilized to explain some of the data on perceptions of the ten respondents in the network. Enactment is the process which classifies certain aspects of ecological change for future attention (selection). All of the respondents were asked to rank the following three issues in terms of priority for the national organizations (see Appendix A).

(1) the selection of the National Coach
(2) the National Training Centre site selection
(3) the National Card System

All three issues were identified as being of major importance. This could be due to the time it took to complete all of the SDFI's (approximately one year). Interviews were conducted when the National Training Centre was in operation, and continued until after the centre was closed and the coach had resigned. This could have had a direct impact on the responses (i.e. as the time changed, so did the priorities).
However, eighty percent of the professional staff felt that the site selection for the National Training Centre was most important. Further they were all in agreement that the concept of 'a' centre or of 'multi' centres was the most important current issue under consideration. The perception of the professional staff could possibly be explained by an exchange perspective in that if multi centres are decided upon the chances are increased that a centre will be located in their province which would provide additional monies and, possibly, coaches and athletes to their province.

In this study, as was the case in Rose's, individuals played a key role in the enactment stage. In two issues an individual affected the environment of others by bringing issues to their attention. In view of the fact that a single individual affected an entire organization: "it would be interesting for later research to assess the 'politics' of enactment specifically" (Rose, 1983:166). In the present study there were numerous conversations, back room meetings, etc. that the researcher was not made privy to, and even though it was mentioned as a limitation to this study, its importance should in no way be underestimated.

When considering the selection process individuals again played key roles. In two of the issues no action was taken until a volunteer selected it. Also, in the case of all three issues various structures were imposed with the intent of decreasing the equivocality. One in particular
caused several respondents to mention it during the interviews. Individuals were upset at the National Training Centre site selection process. Specifically, the manner in which the National Training Centre Proposal would be assessed. In this instance there was no previously enacted environment which with to assist their decision; and the imposition of the selection criteria could have caused increased equivocality instead of reducing it.

The retention process is also interesting in that it...

seems that enactments, as Cohen et al. (1976) suggest about solutions, become attached to individuals in the retention phase (Rose, 1983:168).

Rose found that individuals became associated with resolutions in their favour, and an enactment regarding that individual was created and retained by others. This even resulted in individuals becoming more or less influential based on this process. Two key actors did not seek re-election for a variety of reasons which could have been interpreted as a loss of influence. Also the perceptions of individuals were undoubtedly altered based on issues and actions, but it would require further research to establish a basis for these altered perceptions. As Rose states, an interesting future research study would be an analysis of "the distinctive perceptions of Presidents and CEO's, and whether they can best be accounted for by processes within organizations, or at the level of the network as a whole" (Rose, 1983:169).
4.4.5 The Network as a Whole

The organizing processes analysis could also be applied to the evolution of the network as a whole over the period of time covered in the study. In order to provide confidentiality the results are displayed in a matrix. The organizations are numbered as are the issues. The stages of organizing processes are listed in the cells as; E = Enactment; S = Selection; and R = Retention.

By analyzing interviews and documentary data the various stages were designated to appropriate cells. For example, when the motion was passed at the 1980 Annual General Meeting to have a Training Centre, action was taken by all organizations within the network. Committees were established at three provincial associations (to establish a bid proposal) and the CAWA Special Task Committee (to review proposals and make a selection). Sport Canada was also acting according to their mandate with regard to this issue (member of selection committee). Therefore, an 'S' would be inserted into each of the organizations cells under the respective issue.

The subsequent selection of a site, and its implementation would be involved in the retention process, which would cause an 'R' to be inserted in the various cells.

It is important to note that two organizations were involved in all three issues. As far as an evolution evaluation it appeared as though little development had taken
Table 21: Matrix of Organizing Processes in Three Issues, Showing Involvement of the Organizations in Enactment Selection and/or Retention
Organization/Issue     1  2  3  4  5
NTC  1  E S R  E S R  S  S R  S
NC  2  E S R  E S R  S  S R  S
NCS  3  E S R  E S R  -  -  -

place on the surface. However, during the interviews of the entire network there appeared to be a movement to disband the N.T.C. The retention phase (selection of N.T.C. site) acted as a catalyst to band the other organizations together to rectify the situation. The same two organizations were intensely involved in all three issues. Therefore, the present study can reaffirm Rose's thoughts in that the network

... shows a pattern of growing interdependence, and suggests that as the network evolves as a system through the selective organizing processes around issues, it also develops a more systematic character in a dynamic sense (Rose, 1983:172).

More research of a longitudinal nature may result in similar findings, such as the 1984 Quadrennial Plan formulation and implementation, which was developed by the CAWA. However, the present study was limited to the three year period.

It is interesting to note that, as in Rose's study, the wrestling organizations are currently showing a greater concern with national coordination at the different levels: (1) structural; (2) exchange; (3) decision and (4) process lev-
els of enactment. As mentioned earlier the CAWA has recently completed a Quadrennial Planning Process which should alleviate most of the past problems, identify the key goals, develop long and short range plans and outline how the objectives will be met via a critical path or implementation process as well as an evaluation of their progress. If data were still being collected, it would undoubtedly show a growing interdependence and coordination at the national level.

To summarize the findings the exploratory data did suggest that mechanisms are in fact present, and not accounted for in the previous analyses. Although the data did not suggest an evolution of the network, it could have been due to the limited time period the study covered.

It is interesting to note Weick's understanding of evolving systems:

...an observer watches events happen, imposes on these happenings some preconception about order, and this preconception then allows the observer to watch the changing instances, compare them, and see whether there is a progression toward orderliness in those portions being observed. If there is, evolution has occurred. (Weick, 1979:119).

Therefore by Weick's definition, when the wrestling network realized the problems associated with the three issues, and they entered into the Quadrennial Planning it constituted evolution; albeit beyond the limitations of the present study.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this Chapter is to (1) summarize the analysis from the previous Chapter in relation to the research question; and, (2) discuss the implications of these findings.

As previously mentioned this study has been a case study, and as such a four part research question has been employed instead of a formal hypothesis. The research question investigates:

1. How an interorganizational network operates and evolves as an overall system?
2. How the actors within it come to understand it?
3. How it comes to influence their behaviour, and
4. How it is shaped by them.
   (Rose, 1981:177)

In assessing this question four main analytical approaches have been applied, and each has contributed to the overall understanding of the network.

HOW AN INTERORGANIZATIONAL NETWORK OPERATES AND EVOLVES AS AN OVERALL SYSTEM?

The first approach, structural analysis, assisted in the mapping of the linkages throughout the network, based on the data related to interlocking directorates, common ownership and joint projects. The analysis revealed the Canadian
Amateur Wrestling Association as being the most central organization. This result was believed to be largely attributable to (1) constitutional makeup and (2) the funding policies of the Federal Government.

The second approach, exchange analysis, illustrated the flows of money, information and moral support within the network, as well as perceived influence of organizations in the network. Here again the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA) was perceived to have the most influence within the network, even though Sport Canada provides its funding. The Executive and Technical Committees within the CAWA were identified as being the most influential groups within the CAWA. It was also interesting to note the perceived level of influence the officials committee had in relation to the coaches association. This could be due to the longevity of the two groups. The officials have been very well organized for many years while the coaches are still attempting to become more viable within their own ranks. As one respondent noted "watch out for that coaches association, in a couple of years they'll be a force to be reckoned with".

All of the five organization networks were identified by both themselves and the larger network as having national influence. However, no single exchange variable proved to be an indication of perceived influence.
The current study also went beyond that of Galaskiewicz's and Rose's, by attempting to include data from the larger network.

Further, the analysis of exchange and perceived influence highlights the importance of incorporating external network variables. While examining Sport Canada's exchange relationship within the network, it is interesting to note that the government agency had a low overall ranking of predicted level of influence. This ranking was given in spite of the key role Sport Canada plays within the network especially where finances are concerned at a national level.

Therefore the exchange analysis provided the flows of resources within the network, and complemented the structural analysis. However, a more in depth explanation as to the operation and evolution of the network was required.

The third approach or the decisional analysis was based primarily on the Garbage Can Model (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972). This analysis utilized three issues of national importance to the network. All three issues were assessed in terms of the problems involved, and were subsequently categorized as Leibnitzian:

... a single "believed-to-be optional" formulation of the problem, followed by the collection of data to support this single view (Lyles and Mitroff, 1980:103)

The participants and choice opportunities were also identified, and the findings were examined in terms of whether or not they supported the "garbage can" model of
decision making. Cohen et al. identified eight characteristics of decision making. Where testable the current research supported all but one of the characteristics. Cohen et al. believe the decision making process is interactive with many outcomes produced by combinations of problems, choices and participants (Cohen et al., 1976:10). The present research found this not to be so, in that all of the outcomes were limited regardless of the choice and participant availability.

Support for Cohen et al. was illustrated by the network's subjective and political operation as opposed to an open and rational process. This became clearly evident in the selection of the training centre site and the mandatory relocation clause of the carding system.

Decisinal analysis viewed the operation and evolution of the network as a set of organizations in terms of decision making. The fourth approach examined the same network setting as processes of organizing. This analysis showed network operating as an adaptive system evolving through the processes of enactment, selection and retention. To summarize, the network operated as a system with structure, resource exchange, and political and decision making dynamics. The network also appears to have a strong subjective or informal trait in operation.

HOW THE ACTORS WITHIN THE NETWORK COME TO UNDERSTAND IT AND BE AFFECTED BY IT?
Even though the present study did not provide an exact explanation of the operative underlying mechanisms existing within the network, through which the actors would come to understand it and be affected by it, the Organizing Processes did demonstrate the importance of the subjective dynamics in the network analysis, especially when considering that a single actor affected the entire network in the enactment stage. Also, there was little evidence that the actors viewed the network as an entity unto itself. Instead actors seemed to discuss each specific organization and/or actor. This could be explained as an inherent characteristic in interorganizational studies. Insofar as, in

... organizations, the structural arrangement of departments and work groups is represented graphically on organizational charts. At the interorganizational level, however, representations of a network's configuration are seldom published, and, consequently, participants must construct their own (Boje and Whetton, 1981:379).

This would make it more difficult for actors to perceive the underlying dynamics operating throughout the network.

It therefore seems reasonable to assume that "development of understanding may come about after the shaping of the network which is then understood, especially through retention processes" (Rose, 1981:181).

HOW THE NETWORK IS SHAPED BY THE ACTORS WITHIN IT?

As previously mentioned, the informal processes at play should not be underestimated. The decisional analysis and
organizing processes data provided an illustration of key actors affecting the entire network. This is an area that most assuredly requires further investigation. Studies relating "the importance of carefully linking research on individual behaviour and or on an individual's power related to inter-organizational relations would be worthy of research. The present study's findings indicated that certain actors did indeed shape the network through their behaviour.

COMPARISON WITH ROSE'S STUDY

A final objective was to illustrate any parallel findings between the two studies (Rose's and the present). While several similar findings have been presented a summary of both studies in relation to the theoretical approach and major findings were outlined in the following table.

The research methodology developed by Rose did achieve the majority of stated objectives, and is correct in its approach to study both the structure and processes over a period of time in order to analyze a network. This combined approach, as the eclectic model could well be described, has been advocated by others.

Combined analyses of structure and activity show the importance of a historical perspective, reflect the influences of political interests groups and give considerations as to how structural characteristics may interact (Stern, 1979:246).

Zey-Ferrell when referring to combined analyses stated that:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Perspective and Focus of Analysis</th>
<th>Rose's Main Findings and Applications of Approach</th>
<th>Present Study Main Findings and Application of Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural-Functionalism Structural mapping and positional analysis</td>
<td>Close-knit network, with CUC as most central organization, and with important outside linkages mapping of overt network features</td>
<td>not as close knit as the co-op network the CAWA was most central mapping of overt network features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Theory</td>
<td>Specialized roles within the network related to influence, and with important influences from outside the network Mapping flows of resources and perceived influence, more informal picture</td>
<td>Key actors were related to influence Mapping flows of resources and perceived influence, more informal picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role and Systems Theory</td>
<td>Importance of issues in influence, with decision-making supportive of garbage can concepts Mapping of informal network dynamics, actual behaviour and development over time</td>
<td>Supported garbage can model in all but one characteristic Mapping of informal network dynamics, actual behaviour and development over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional analysis of key issues according to a 'garbage can' model</td>
<td>Increasing interdependence through organizing processes of enactment, selection and retention, importance of subjective processes and evolution Begin mapping evolution of the network as a social</td>
<td>Interdependence was increased as illustrated by the development of a Quadrennial Plan Evolution of network was not as overt as Rose's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
system built through social construction by participants

Only through the comparison of these alternatives in the analysis of specific types of organizations will we glean the real benefits of each alternative perspective and begin to construct more relevant theory (Zey-Farrell, 1981:30).

Although the eclectic approach is justified, there still exist some inherent problems in Rose's methodology. Rose stated that case studies results too often become massive descriptive documents with limited focus (Rose, 1982:52).

Rose felt that based on her familiarity and involvement with the organization under study, hers would not fall prey to the latter problem (Rose, 1981:53). She was correct in her assumption. However, the point that should be made is that only a person with a strong background and understanding of a network is qualified or capable to competently assess the network.

Most successful network analyses rely heavily upon an investigator's intimate knowledge of the context and history of the network studied (Aldrich, 1979:283).

This limitation severely restricts the assessment of networks. Therefore, "if progress is to be made in this field, an integrative theoretical framework is needed" (Benson, 1975:230). Ideally a framework where a researcher need not be from within the respective network.

Further, caution should be exercised when reporting network analysis results, no matter who the researcher is,
or where he is situated (within or outside) the network under study. The results should be practical and of relative importance. There is a tendency, as Rose has alluded, to produce a document with limited focus. Network analysis must produce relevant and understandable findings.

It must not become an esoteric end in itself whose practitioners can communicate only with each other about scientific puzzles of interest only to themselves (Boissevain, 1979:394).

If an individual is attuned to the subtleties (i.e. informal processes) and to the location of key actors (i.e. at the intersections of communication and resource channels) within the network, then he can use this information to his advantage and enhance his own self interests and career path. Granovetters's (1974) study revealed that over sixty percent of his sample of professional, technical, and managerial people reported that they received their jobs through personal contact. This attests to the importance of understanding the network insofar as it may influence, ones career, especially when considering that some view "organizations as battlegrounds for stakeholders, both inside and outside, who compete to influence the criteria for effectiveness so as to advance their own interest" (Kanter et al., 1981:322). Another practical application of understanding the network is related to organizational change. Network analysis has tremendous potential in this area.

First, as a diagnostic tool for planning change. Second, it is potentially a good diagnostic tool for measuring the true effects of a change effort on both the prescribed and emergent networks (Tichy et al., 1983:397).
A manager's success could therefore be enhanced by his understanding and evaluation of the network. As the present study illustrates, if key actors had been able to diagnose the network (i.e. resentment towards the Regina site selection) none of the ensuing problems would have occurred. Also the application of network analysis to the CAWA would assist in the evaluation of their Quadrennial Plan. It would be possible to measure what effects the plan has had on the network to date.

Also, the questionnaire proposed by Rose did not prove to be as effective a research tool as anticipated. This problem was overcome by SDPI's, both face to face and over the telephone. It should be noted that on several occasions respondents requested that the tape recorder be turned off or "if you quote me on this I'll deny it". They would then speak their mind freely; which brings us to the next point. Rose illustrated the problem with using ex-post facto information, and a limitation of this present study was the inaccessibility to the informal meetings, conversations, etc. Information of an informal nature should in no way be underestimated. The results of the interviews outlined several "behind the scenes" actions that were never identified in a formal manner, even though they still affected the outcome. The informal processes should be researched in greater detail specifically related to the source of power and decision making. On a more practical note, an understanding of
the network can prove most valuable. "While some relationships are mandated, most are locally initiated and arise from the needs of network participants". (Boje and Whetton, 1981:379).

It became quite evident that the organizations were open systems, and one could postulate that networks themselves are open systems. Therefore where network analysis was originally used for analyses between actors, then between organizations, it is quite possible that network analysis could be used to study the structure and processes between networks.

Taking all of the aforementioned points into account, research concerning network analysis should be based on the assumptions of the eclectic model. None the less, action must be taken to develop a more generic model which yields quantifiable results.

While collecting data the researcher was exposed to a national sport governing body and its inner workings. This interaction raised some interesting points, which will herein be outlined. National sport governing bodies are, as has been previously discussed, non-profit organizations run by volunteer administrators, and housed in Ottawa. The elected volunteers may or may not have the formal education/experience necessary to function at this level. As Greaves stated "Training programs for volunteer sport administrators are minimal, and in some cases the volunteers may never
possess the capabilities to accomplish the task" (Greaves, 1976). In addition Gilbert views sport governing bodies as nickel and dime operations in Canada with volunteer officials working in their spare time in their basements. Now they have money, but those same men will probably never lose that old nickel and dime philosophy (Gilbert, 1973:18).

Even certain respondents were vocal with their view on the volunteers:

(1) government became involved in sport because of the 'kitchen table approach' to amateur sport in Canada. It appears that all they have done is move the table;
(2) with reference to the technical committee; "conglomerate of knee jerk reactions".

While the aforementioned quotes raise some serious concern regarding volunteerism; it should be noted that amateur sport could not survive without the support of volunteers. However, amateur sport in Canada is at a point in time where the volunteer administrators must have a background in and an understanding of: organizational development, long and short range planning, program development, human resources, conflict and financial management, etc. This became most evident during the research.

Also, when considering the structure of amateur sport in Canada, Taylor feels there is "no hierarchy of command or control and any agency can communicate with any other agency at any level" (Taylor, 1976:3). He illustrates the fact that there is in most cases no upward chain of command or overall system to this structure, which can result in a provincial sport governing body not sharing the national po-


spective. This could, and often does, lead to organizations pursuing different goals within the network, ultimately resulting in conflict.

Further, Gowan views the structure of NSGB as an open system requiring sound management.

The external forces acting on a national sport governing body are great and considerable, organizational stability and flexibility is required to meet the demands (Gowan, 1980:7).

The stability should be ensured through the professionals. Volunteers are elected for term positions of various duration. Therefore efforts should be employed to maintain stability with the professional staff.

In summation, a NSGB:

(1) is controlled by volunteers, who may or may not be qualified,
(2) may have different organizations within the network pursuing different goals,
(3) is at best loosely structured with no chain of command, and
(4) is continually acted upon by considerable external forces.

Couple the aforementioned points with Cohen et al.’s "garbage can" model of decision making, and it is amazing that decisions are even made. Consider the characteristics supported in this study:

(1) resolution of problems as a style for making decisions is not the most common style,
(2) as the energy required increases, decisions are less likely to be solved,
(3) decision makers and problems tend to move together from choice to choice,
(4) organizational structure is related to decision making
(5) process is sharply interactive,
(6) important problems are more likely to be solved,
(7) important choices are less likely to resolve problems, and
(8) choice failures are related to choices of most and least
importance (Cohen et al., 1976:9-12).

In summary the four analyses have been discussed, as have the other findings and their applications to this study. The conclusions and recommendations for future research are presented in the next Chapter.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to apply an interorganizational network methodology to an amateur sport environment. The research methodology employed a case study approach which called for a research question and not a formal hypothesis. The four part question was:

(1) How does an interorganizational network operate and evolve as an overall system?
(2) How do the actors within it come to understand it?
(3) How did the network come to influence their behaviour?
(4) How is the network shaped by organizational members?

This question was addressed using four analytical approaches, where each contributed to the overall results. The findings were discussed in relation to the present study and in relation to other research findings.

The following are the conclusions drawn from this study and proposed areas for future research. The conclusions of this study are as follows:

(1) How does an interorganizational network operate and evolve as an overall system?
The network operated as a system with structure, resource exchange and political and decision making dynamics.
(2) How do the actors within it come to understand it?
Understanding of the network came about after the shaping of the network.
(3) How did the network come to influence their behaviour?
This was not testable.
(4) How is the network shaped by organizational members?
The network was indeed affected by the actors within it.
(5) The eclectic model was adequate for the analysis, however, more refinement is required. Specifically a more generic model that can be utilized by any researcher and not just a knowledgeable actor within the network.

(6) The assumptions upon which the eclectic model is based were applicable to the present study.

(7) There were several similarities between the co-operative and sport environment. An attempt to create greater interdependence and coordination at a national level was evident in both studies. Further, resource based decisions and certain actors key roles in the enactment stage were identified.

(8) The decision making process operated primarily in accordance with Cohen et al.'s 'garbage can' model.

(9) The decision making should have been more interactive and have included the professional staff.

(10) NSGB's should actively recruit volunteer administrators with the necessary skills.

(11) Leadership should primarily be derived from the professional staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

(1) Analyze a NSGB in relation to other NSGB's, the NSRC, Sport Canada, Fitness Canada, COA, etc.,

(2) Analyze how the Best Ever Winter, Summer and Sport Development Group are situated with respect to centrality and Sport Canada's policies and activities,

(3) Analyze an actor's power in relation to network analysis (i.e. how an actor shapes the network),

(4) Where a mandated structure exists, obtain a measure of network variation based on the incorporation and socialization of new key actors,

(5) Conduct future research concerned with quantifying the subjective processes involved in network analysis, by utilizing content analysis,

(6) Attempts should be made to identify and quantify the informal communications between key actors,

(7) Conduct further studies using "Organizing Processes" related to an interorganizational network should be conducted, and

(8) Measure the effectiveness of a network as related to an organization's effectiveness (i.e. pursuing similar goals)
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SEMI-DIRECTED FOCUSED INTERVIEW

1. Here are three items identified as important issues for the Canadian amateur wrestling network to deal with. In your opinion which issue is the most important for the wrestling organizational body at this time?
   1. The selection of the National Coach.
   2. The National Training Centre site selection.
   3. The National Carding System.

2. Here are three descriptions of how networks of organizations might deal with such issues:
   1. Vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or groups appear again and again in discussions of National issues, so that the same persons or groups are always found together in coalition.
   2. There are constantly changing coalitions between various groups or persons, so that the coalitions are different depending on the specific issue being considered.
   3. Relatively little argument takes place because there is a high concensus among the various leaders and groups about what needs to be done.

3. In general, how would you characterize the situation among the Canadian amateur wrestling organizations during the past few years? Does it fit closer to the first, second, or third description?

   I would now like to discuss briefly three issues that have been important at the national level over the last few years.

4. First, I would like to discuss the National Carding System. Did you participate in any way in that decision making process? Yes (how?) or No.
   What was your original position toward it?
   1. For it?
   2. Against it?

5. Second, I would like you to consider the selection of the site for
the National Training Centre. Did you participate in any way in that
decision making process?
Yes (how?) or No
What was your original position toward it?
1. For it?
2. Against it?

6. Third I would like you to consider the selection of the national
Coach. Did you participate in any way in that decision making
process?
Yes (how?) or No
What was your original position toward it?
1. For it?
2. Against it?

7. Would you please indicate which three of the other National/
Provincial members or executives with whom you most frequently meet
socially or informally?

8. And when you think of your best friends within the larger
wrestling community, would you include the aboved named person?

9. With which three of the other National/Provincial members or
executives do you have the most frequent formal contact?

10. With which three do you most frequently discuss long range
wrestling concerns?

11. With which one did you most frequently discuss:
1. The selection of the National Coach.
2. The National Training Centre site selection.
3. The National Carding System.

12. Here is a list of as many wrestling organizations, directly or
indirectly active at the National level, as I could think of. Which
would you say are generally influential at the National level?

F.I.L.A.
Canadian Olympic Association
Sport Canada
Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association (CAWOA)
CAWA Coaching Certification Committee
National Coaches Council
CAWA Technical Committee
CAWA Executive Committee
CAWA National Office Staff
British Columbia Wrestling Association
Alberta Amateur Wrestling Association
Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association
Manitoba Freestyle Wrestling Association
Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association
Federation de Lutte Olympique du Quebec
Nova Scotia Amateur Wrestling Association
New Brunswick Wrestling Association
Prince Edward Island Amateur Wrestling Association
Newfoundland Amateur Wrestling Association
North West Territories Amateur Wrestling Association

13. Can you think of other influential wrestling organizations I may have missed?
Yes (which?) or No

14. Which three of the groups you have named do you see as most influential? Why?

Now I would like to ask you about some of the ties your organization has with other National/Provincial organizations. Please remember I am interested in organizational ties, not personal relations among individuals.

15. Upon which three of the other National/Provincial organizations does yours most rely for important information regarding wrestling or matters that might affect them?

16. To which three other National/Provincial organizations would yours be most likely to pass on important information regarding wrestling in Canada or matters that might affect them?

17. To which three other National/Provincial organizations does yours give the most substantial funds as payments for goods or services received, or as dues or grants, or as loans or investments?

18. From which three National/Provincial organizations does yours receive the most substantial funds as payments for services rendered or goods received, or as loans, grants, dues or investments?

19. To which three National/Provincial organizations do you feel yours would be most likely to offer the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?

20. From which three National/Provincial organizations do you feel yours would be most likely to receive the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?

21. We again have a list of wrestling organizations. Would you please indicate for me the ones with which you are associated at this time as a:
   1. Director
   2. Board Member
   3. Member
   4. Official
   5. Coach
   6. Athlete
   Or for which you have previously served as a:
   1. Director
   2. Board Member
   3. Member
   4. Official
5. Coach
6. Athlete

Here again is the list of Canadian wrestling organizations.

F.I.L.A.

Canadian Olympic Association
Sport Canada

Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association (CAWOA)
CAWA Coaching Certification Committee
National Coaches Council

CAWA Technical Committee
CAWA Executive Committee

CAWA National Office Staff

British Columbia Wrestling Association

Alberta Amateur Wrestling Association

Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association

Manitoba Freestyle Wrestling Association

Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association

Fédération de Lutte Olympique du Québec

Nova Scotia Amateur Wrestling Association

New Brunswick Wrestling Association

Prince Edward Island Amateur Wrestling Association

Newfoundland Amateur Wrestling Association

North West Territories Amateur Wrestling Association
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LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Sir,

I am currently a graduate student, fulfilling the requirements for a M.EK degree, at the University of Windsor, under the guidance of Dr. G Olafson.

My thesis is an investigation dealing with interorganizational relationships between amateur wrestling organizations in Canada. More specifically, this study will examine three issues that the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association has dealt with over the past few years.

The key issues are (1) the site selection of the National Training Centre, (2) the National Carding System, and (3) the selection of the National Coach.

I am requesting your participation because you are one of those most qualified to comment on these amateur wrestling organizations inter-relationships, and the aforementioned key issues.

Please find enclosed a questionnaire, instructions, and a stamped self addressed return envelope. Thank you in advance for your time and expediency in answering this questionnaire.

Yours Truly,

Dan Brannagan
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QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your perceptions of how the network of Canadian amateur wrestling organizations operates. Some of the questions relate to information I may already have, but it is important that I obtain your current perceptions. Other questions may seem to relate to you personally. Again, these will give essential data for mapping the network, but any information you provide will be used in confidence, rather like the data used in the Canadian Census.

Please answer each question and provide a brief explanation of your answers in the space provided.

1. Here on this paper are three items identified as important issues for the Canadian amateur wrestling network to deal with. In your opinion which issue is the most important for the wrestling organizational body at this time? (WHY?)

1. The selection of the National Coach.

2. The National Training Centre site selection.

3. The National Carding System.

2. Here are three descriptions of how networks of organizations might deal with such issues:
1. Vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or groups appear again and again in discussions of National issues, so that the same persons or groups are always found together in coalition.

2. There are constantly changing coalitions between various groups or persons, so that the coalitions are different depending on the specific issue being considered.

3. Relatively little argument takes place because there is a high consensus among the various leaders and groups about what needs to be done.

In general, how would characterize the situation among the Canadian amateur wrestling organizations during the past few years? Does it fit closer to the first, second, or third description; and why?

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. (Other) explain.

I would now like to discuss briefly three issues that have been important at the national level over the last few years.

4. First, I would like to discuss the National Carding System. Did you participate in any way in that decision making process?

1. Yes (how?)
2. No

What was your original position toward it?
1. For it? Why?

2. Against it? Why?

5. Second I would like you to consider the selection of the site for the National Training Centre. Did you participate in any way in that decision making process?
1. Yes (how?)

2. No

What was your original position toward it?
1. For it? Why?

2. Against it? Why?

6. Third I would like you to consider the selection of the national Coach. Did you participate in any way in that decision making process?
1. Yes (how?)
2. No

What was your original position toward it?
1. For it? Why?

2. Against it? Why?

7. Would you please indicate which three of the other National/Provincial members or executives with whom you most frequently meet socially or informally?

8. And when you think of your best friends within the larger wrestling community, would you include the above named person? Why or why not?

9. With which three of the other National/Provincial members or executives do you have the most frequent formal contact?

10. With which three do you most frequently discuss long range wrestling concerns?

11. With which one did you most frequently discuss:

1. The selection of the National Coach.
2. The National Training Centre site selection.

3. The National Carding System.

12. Here is a list of as many wrestling organizations, directly or indirectly active at the National level, as I could think of. Which would you say are generally influential at the National level?

F.I.L.A.
Canadian Olympic Association
Sport Canada
Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association (CAWOA)
CAWA Coaching Certification Committee
National Coaches Council
CAWA Technical Committee
CAWA Executive Committee
CAWA National Office Staff
British Columbia Wrestling Association
Alberta Amateur Wrestling Association
Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association
Manitoba Freestyle Wrestling Association
Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association
Fédération de Lutte Olympique du Québec
Nova Scotia Amateur Wrestling Association
New Brunswick Wrestling Association
Prince Edward Island Amateur Wrestling Association
Newfoundland Amateur Wrestling Association
North West Territories Amateur Wrestling Association

Which ones are generally influential?

13. Can you think of other influential wrestling organizations I may have missed?

1. Yes (which?)
2. NO

14. Which three of the groups you have named do you see as most influential? Why?

Now I would like to ask you about some of the ties your organization has with other National/Provincial organizations. Please remember I am interested in organizational ties, not personal relations among individuals.

15. Upon which three of the other National/Provincial organizations does yours most rely for important information regarding wrestling or matters that might affect them?

16. To which three other National/Provincial organizations would your organization be most likely to pass on important information regarding wrestling in Canada or matters that might affect them?

17. To which three other National/Provincial organizations does yours give the most substantial funds as payments for goods or services received, or as dues or grants, or as loans or investments?
18. From which three National/Provincial organizations does yours receive the most substantial funds as payments for services rendered or goods received, or as loans, grants, dues or investments?

19. To which three National/Provincial organizations do you feel yours would be most likely to offer the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?

20. From which three National/Provincial organizations do you feel yours would be most likely to receive the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?

21. We again have a list of wrestling organizations. Would you please indicate for me the ones with which you are associated at this time as a:

1. Director
2. Board Member
3. Member
4. Official
5. Coach
6. Athlete

Or for which you have previously served as a:

1. Director
2. Board Member
3. Member
4. Official
5. Coach
6. Athlete

Here again is the list of Canadian wrestling organizations:
F.I.L.A.
Canadian Olympic Association
Sport Canada
Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association (CAWOA)
CAWA Coaching Certification Committee
National Coaches Council
CAWA Technical Committee
CAWA Executive Committee
CAWA National Office Staff
British Columbia Wrestling Association
Alberta Amateur Wrestling Association
Saskatchewan Amateur Wrestling Association
Manitoba Freestyle Wrestling Association
Ontario Amateur Wrestling Association
Fédération de Lutte Olympique du Québec
Nova Scotia Amateur Wrestling Association
New Brunswick Wrestling Association
Prince Edward Island Amateur Wrestling Association
Newfoundland Amateur Wrestling Association
North West Territories Amateur Wrestling Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUSLY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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CAWA ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organization

Board of Directors

Membership

Appointed to represent each of the following

(A) Provincial Associations;
   One director to represent each province or territory
(B) Canadian Amateur Wrestling Officials Association
(C) Wrestler Representative

Elected officers of the association and are members of the Board of Directors

(A) President
(B) Past President
(C) East Vice-President
(D) West Vice-President
(E) Secretary
(F) Treasurer
(G) Technical Chairman

CAWA Executive Committee

CAWA Technical Committee

(A) Technical Chairman
(B) VP East
(C) VP West
(D) Wrestlers Representative
(E) Research Representative
(F) Officials Representative
(G) Two members at large
(H) Junior Development Representative

CAWA National Office Staff

(A) Executive Director
(B) Technical Director
(C) Secretary
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FINANCIAL ANTICIPATED LEVELS OF INFLUENCE WITHIN THE LARGER NETWORK

Relative Anticipated Levels of Influence of Individual Organization Within the Larger Wrestling Network, Based on Analysis of Financial Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Anticipated Level of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Ministries</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
<td>Mod-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low-Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sport Canada's level of influence is viewed as low because it only directly funds the CAWA. The respective provincial governments fund the majority of the provincial Amateur Wrestling Association's budgets. The "other" organization refers to corporate sponsorship/membership fees/or donations.
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PERCEIVED INFORMATION EXCHANGE WITHIN THE LARGER NETWORK

Perceived Information Exchange as Indicated by the
Number of Times Organizations Were Cited as One of the Three
Most Important Source or Recipients of Information Within
the Larger Wrestling Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Information Source (# of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Information Recipient (# of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Anticipated Level of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Directors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Comm.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAWA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAWA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA (generally)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Ministries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G
### MORAL SUPPORT ANTICIPATED LEVEL OF INFLUENCE
### WITHIN THE LARGER NETWORK

Relative Anticipated Level of Influence of Organizations Within the Larger Wrestling Network, Based on Analysis of Exchange of Moral Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Moral Support Source († of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Moral Support Recipient († of times mentioned)</th>
<th>Anticipated Level of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Comm.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Comm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.T.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Ministries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atl. Prov.'s Together</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

PERCEIVED NATIONAL INFLUENCE WITHIN THE LARGER NETWORK

Perceived General National Influence of Wrestling Organizations as Indicated by the Times Noted as Influential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Certificate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Directors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Comm.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Comm.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Office</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.T.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Ministries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atl. Provinces Together</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

PERCEIVED NATIONAL INFLUENCE

Perceived Most Influential Wrestling Organizations as Indicated by the Number of Times Mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWOA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWCA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Comm.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Comm.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWA (generally)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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