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ABSTRACT

In 2003, the World Amateur Golf Council (WAGC) changed its name to the International Golf Federation (IGF), thereby taking the first step in allowing golf to return to the Olympic Programme in 2009. The purpose of this study was to analyze what, if any, were the influences on the IGF as it went from creation, to development, to subsequent re-instatement on the Olympic Programme in the span of six years. Through interviews and document analysis, the primary source of influence came from the International Olympic Committee (IOC) during this process. In addition, the IGF was influenced by the International Tennis Federation (ITF), and also by the founders of the organization, and other individuals within the realms of the Olympic Movement and the world of golf.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIOWF</td>
<td>Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOC</td>
<td>Association of National Olympic Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOCA</td>
<td>Association of National Olympic Committees of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOIF</td>
<td>Association of Summer Olympic International Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARISIF</td>
<td>Association of IOC Recognized International Sports Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>European Olympic Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFA</td>
<td>Fédération Internationale de Football Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIBA</td>
<td>International Basketball Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAISF</td>
<td>General Association of International Sports Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>International Sport Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGF</td>
<td>International Golf Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>International Olympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>International Rugby Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITF</td>
<td>International Tennis Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPGA</td>
<td>Ladies Professional Golf Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>National Sport Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>National Olympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>Olympic Council of Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOG</td>
<td>Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOC</td>
<td>Oceania National Olympic Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASO</td>
<td>Pan American Sports Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Professional Golfers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;A</td>
<td>Royal and Ancient Golf Club of St. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCGA</td>
<td>Royal Canadian Golf Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Research Ethics Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPS2</td>
<td>Tri-Council Policy Statement (second edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGA</td>
<td>United States Golf Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGC</td>
<td>World Amateur Golf Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

The sport or game of golf, used interchangeably throughout this study, has been played and practiced for many years by many people all around the world.高尔夫，as we know it today, was originally played on the Old Course at the St. Andrews Golf Club in Fife, Scotland beginning in the 15th century. However, the origins of the game have their roots in a number of places and there is much contention between scholars as to where the game first originated. Scholars point to five ball and stick games in particular that may have been the catalyst for the modern sport of golf. These include, the ancient Roman game of paganica, the Flemish game of chole, the French game of jeu de mail, the Scottish game of shinty, and finally the Dutch game of kolven. Although each of these games have parts that resemble the modern sport of golf, scholars have not been able to agree as to which of these early ball and stick games has a direct connection to modern golf.

Although unable to agree as to the origins of modern golf, scholars do agree that the first written reference to the sport comes from King James II of Scotland who banned the playing of golf as it was impeding the soldiers’ archery practices in 1457. Despite this decree, soldiers continued to play golf and it was mainly played in Scotland until the eighteenth century when Scottish immigrants brought it to England. Golf then spread to other parts of the British Empire, including Canada, Australia, and the United States in the nineteenth century.
During the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the sport of golf was played quite extensively in a number of the countries within Europe, and evidence suggests it was a very popular sport amongst middle and high-class individuals.\(^8\) In fact, it was so popular that the organizers of the 1900 Olympic Games in Paris, France decided to include it as an Olympic sport.\(^9\) As there were no codified rules guiding the organizers’ decisions to include one sport over another, they simply decided to add it to the program of events in the Games. This was the first time that golf had been included in the quadrennial festival and if its proponents had their way, it certainly would not be the last. In 1904, during the St. Louis Purchase Exposition, golf was once again one of the sports included in the Olympic Games.\(^10\) This time its inclusion in the Games of the III Olympiad was made possible by the efforts of Albert Lambert.\(^11\) Mr. Lambert played in the 1900 Olympic golf tournament and once he found out that the Games were going to be held in his hometown of St. Louis, he, along with his father-in-law Colonel George McGrew, organized the 1904 Olympic golf tournament.\(^12\) The 1904 Olympic golf tournament would be the last time that golf was in the Olympic Games.\(^13\) There were many attempts to subsequently include golf in the Olympic Programme including, 1908, 1920, 1936, and in 1996, however none of these attempts were successful.

As the Olympic Games expanded in both size and influence throughout the twentieth century, it became much more difficult for sports to be included in the festival. In 2002, during the 114\(^{th}\) Session of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the IOC decided to cap the number of summer sports, events, and athletes to 28, 300 and 10,500, respectively, on the Olympic Programme.\(^14\) Since the IOC capped the number of summer Olympic sports to 28, a sport would have to be dropped from the Olympic Programme in
order for a new sport to be included.\textsuperscript{15} In addition to capping the number of sports, events, and athletes, the IOC also decided to complete a review of the Olympic Programme after each rendition of the Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{16} In order to help them complete this review, the Olympic Programme Commission “developed a set of criteria to be used in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each sport and the value that each sport adds to the Olympic Programme.”\textsuperscript{17} The evaluation criteria set out by the Olympic Programme Commission includes 33 items under seven main headings, including: history and tradition; universality; popularity; governance; athlete welfare; development (of the International Sport Federation or IF); and costs.\textsuperscript{18} These criteria are used by the IOC to provide the justification for allowing or disallowing a sport to be identified as an Olympic sport.

Since its creation in 2003, the International Golf Federation (IGF) required many pieces of the Olympic puzzle to fall into place to ensure that both the organization and the sport of golf were recognized as an International Sport Federation by the IOC.\textsuperscript{19} During its creation, development, and quest to gain recognition, the IGF may have been influenced in many ways by the IOC, by the IFs already recognized by the IOC, and also, by other organizations that are involved in the Olympic Movement. Thus, this study will consider and review the influences exerted upon the IGF by these and other organizations.

**Theoretical Framework**

During the formation and development of the IGF, the organization may have experienced a number of influences from many different sources that enabled it to
become homogenized with other organizations that exist within the realm of the Olympic Movement. The theory that explains this type of homogenization is termed neo-institutional theory. This theory is used to explain how organizations within a specialized organizational field tend to become similar, or homogenous, over time. Using the coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphisms developed by Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell, neo-institutional theory will be used to display how the IGF became homogenized with other organizations. An international sport organization gains legitimacy within the Olympic Movement by gaining the recognition of the IOC as the IF governing a particular sport. Recognizing an IF as such will grant it “monopoly-like power over a sport” within the realm of the Olympic Movement, as this significantly diminishes the possibility of a similar governing body gaining legitimacy for the same sport.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, developing sport organizations may want to acquire this type of legitimacy as soon as possible and one of the ways in which to do so would be to use the systems that have been developed by other IFs that have achieved IOC recognition.

In order to gain a thorough understanding of the amount of influence bestowed upon the IGF by other organizations during its creation and development, the investigator needed to speak directly to those who were involved in the organization’s development. This means interviewing individuals who have a profound knowledge of the creation and development of the organization. In addition, a review of the documents and materials that reside in both the IOC and IGF archives was completed in an attempt to gain a better understanding of these influences. Therefore, a qualitative research design was required in order to complete a thorough review of the IGF’s rise to Olympic recognition.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is as follows:

1. To analyze what, if any, influences the International Olympic Committee and other organizations had on the International Golf Federation as it rapidly went from creation, to recognition, and subsequent re-instatement of the sport of golf on the Olympic Programme at the 121st Session in Copenhagen, Denmark in 2009. In order to answer the primary research question, three sub-questions must first be answered.
   a. Why and how did the IGF gain IOC recognition?
   b. Which organizations could have exerted influence upon the IGF during its formation and development?
   c. What influences did these organizations exert upon the IGF from the time of its creation to golf’s re-instatement onto the Olympic programme?

Significance and Implications of the Study

This study provides a foundation upon which other sport organizations and IFs can establish their arguments as they attempt to secure a spot on the Olympic Programme, should one become available in the future. Since this study documents the processes involved in getting a spot on the Olympic Programme, it is suggested that other organizations seeking a similar outcome model their Olympic bid after that employed by the IGF. As such, it is argued that this research project will be of significant interest to individuals seeking the recognition of the Olympic Movement as well as those
individuals hoping to understand the process by which a sport achieves recognition and subsequent inclusion in the modern Olympic Games.

1 According to the Oxford English dictionary, a sport can be defined as “an activity involving physical exertion and skill in which an individual or team competes against another or others for entertainment,” whereas a game can be defined as “a form of competitive activity or sport played according to rules.” Both terms have several meanings and definitions, however these are the two definitions that best describe these terms for the purposes of this study. There is a considerable amount of debate in the literature as to whether golf is a sport or a game, which is beyond the parameters of this study, and is why the terms sport and game when referring to golf will be used interchangeably.


3 Ibid., 11-13.

4 Ibid., 11-15.

5 Ibid., 10.


7 Ibid., 381.


9 Ibid.


11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.

13 The 2016 Summer Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil will mark the first time that golf will have been an Olympic sport since the Games of the III Olympiad.


15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.


18 Ibid.

19 The founders of the IGF may have wanted golf to become an Olympic sport to gain legitimacy as a sport worldwide, to be part of the largest multisport festival in the world, and possibly to reap the financial rewards that comes with being part of the Olympic Games. The IOC may have wanted golf to become an Olympic sport due to the revenue that the sport generates through television contracts, sponsors, and ticket sales.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Golf

Introduction

As previously noted, long before the establishment of the IOC in 1894, and significantly before the IGF changed its name from the World Amateur Golf Council in 2003, golf had been played in Europe for many years. Although scholars do not necessarily agree upon the true origin of the modern game of golf, they can all agree that it was first developed and practiced in Scotland. As the Scots emigrated to other parts of the world, they brought golf with them for others to learn. Golf quickly spread across Europe and eventually reached all six continents.

The Origins of Modern Golf

There is no clear evidence to suggest that the modern game of golf was derived from any particular ball and stick game. However, scholars have pointed to a few games that may have been the catalyst for the development of modern golf. One of these games is the ancient Roman game of “paganica,” which was played with a ball similar to that of the early golf ball made of a leather bag filled with feathers.\textsuperscript{1} Another game that golf may have been derived from is a Flemish game known as “chole.”\textsuperscript{2} Chole, like golf, is a “cross-country game” played with one ball and mallets by two teams who attempt to hit the ball towards a goal located as much as a mile away from the starting point.\textsuperscript{3} Prior to the beginning of the game, each team bids on how many strokes it will take to get the ball to the goal and the team who bid the lowest number of strokes is allowed three strokes to
hit the ball as close to the goal as possible.\footnote{4} After the three strokes have been taken, the opposing team is allowed to hit the ball away from the goal, and the game only ends when the ball gets to the goal or does not reach the goal in the number of strokes bid.\footnote{5} Another game that golf may have been a derivative of is the French game of “\textit{jeu de mail},” which is played with a mallet and one or several balls with the goal of getting the ball to the target in the fewest number of strokes.\footnote{6} Scholars have also pointed to the Scottish game of shinty, a Celtic version of field hockey, to be a possible root of golf.\footnote{7} Shinty is a team sport that is played on an outdoor field with a small cork ball with a leather skin and each player uses a stick called a caman. The object of the game is to get the ball in the other teams goal using the caman.\footnote{8} Finally, the game that most resembles the modern game of golf is the Dutch game of “\textit{het kolven}” simply known as “\textit{kolven}.”\footnote{9} Kolven was generally played in a walled court known as a “\textit{kolf-bann},” which was usually attached to an inn.\footnote{10} However, there is evidence to suggest that it was also played in churches, in cemeteries of churchyards, and on the ice of frozen lakes and rivers.\footnote{11} Kolven was played by teams of two with one ball and two posts in the ground at each end of the kolf-bann, varying in length between forty and one hundred and thirty feet.\footnote{12} The team who struck the posts in the fewest number of strokes was deemed the winning team.\footnote{13}

\textit{Development of Modern Golf}

Whatever the origins of modern golf, scholars can agree that golf, as we know it today was first developed and practiced in Scotland. In fact, golf was so popular in Scotland in the 15\textsuperscript{th} Century that the Parliament of King James II of Scotland, who was in a lengthy war with England, issued a decree in 1457, declaring golf to be illegal as the
citizen army was playing golf instead of practicing archery. This is the earliest known written reference to the game of golf.

Golf continued to be played only in Scotland by average folks until early in the 17th Century. In 1603, King James IV of Scotland was the first person of Royalty to play golf. He soon became King James I of England and subsequently built the Blackheath golf course in England, which was the first golf course built outside of Scotland, to introduce the game to English nobles. As golf became more popular, primarily in Scotland, golfers were eager to organize matches against each other to test their skills. This led to the formation of numerous golf clubs and golf societies throughout Scotland, most notable was the Honourable Company of Edinburgh Golfers, which played its golf at the Links of Leith. This golf society was formed in 1744 and was comprised of primarily lawyers and judges, who developed a small list of rules, which were generally followed by golfers throughout Scotland. However, this set of rules only lasted for ten years, when a new golf society was formed in St. Andrews.

In 1754, 22 men from Fife, Scotland formed The Society of St. Andrews Golfers, which played its golf on the Old Course at St. Andrews. Its foundation was marked by a match that was played for a silver club adorning the cross of St. Andrew on the Old Course. At this time, the Old Course was the only course at St. Andrews, which consisted of eleven holes. However, instead of playing all eleven holes only once, players would play eleven holes once and then they would play the same eleven holes backward. They would finish the round at the same place at which they began, thus a round of golf would consist of twenty-two holes. However, this changed in 1764 when The Society of St. Andrews Golfers converted the first four holes of the Old Course into
two holes, reducing a round to 18 holes.\textsuperscript{26} As the home of the Honourable Company, the Links of Leith, was slowly deteriorating and the Old Course at St. Andrews was becoming quite popular with the general public, the Society of St. Andrews Golfers soon became the ruling body of the game of golf.\textsuperscript{27} With its rising popularity, many other golf clubs regarded St. Andrews and the 18-hole golf course as the standard within Scotland and England, and this would eventually become the worldwide standard that continues to be adhered to today.\textsuperscript{28}

As time passed, The Society of St. Andrews Golfers continued to play its golf on the Old Course at St. Andrews, and in May 1776 the members agreed to meet “… once a fortnight for golf and for dinner.”\textsuperscript{29} These meetings took place at numerous locations until 1817, when the St. Andrews town hall underwent renovations and the Upper Hall was loaned to The Society of St. Andrews Golfers for its spring and fall meetings.\textsuperscript{30} Prior to its second re-location, The Society of St. Andrews Golfers invited the Duke of St. Andrews, King William IV, to become its patron in 1834.\textsuperscript{31} After having agreed to do so, The Society of St. Andrews Golfers asked King William IV if it could get his permission to change its name.\textsuperscript{32} Much to the delight of the Society of St. Andrews Golfers, he allowed it to do so, and The Society of St. Andrews Golfers became known as the Royal and Ancient Golf Club of St. Andrews (R&A).\textsuperscript{33} The newly named R&A continued to hold its meetings at the newly renovated St. Andrews Town Hall until 1856, when the St. Andrews Town Council decided to build a new town hall.\textsuperscript{34} In exchange for donating £50 towards the construction of the new town hall, the R&A was given permission by the St. Andrews Town Council to continue to hold its meetings there, which it did until 2002.\textsuperscript{35} In 2002, the R&A decided to move the annual meetings to the St. Andrews
Fairmont Hotel, as the St. Andrews Town Hall could not accommodate the increasing number of people who were attending these meetings. 

*Establishment of the Rules of Golf*

As golf clubs began to be established in the latter part of the eighteenth century and into the early nineteenth century, play was governed by the rules developed at each individual golf club. This was acceptable for playing at one’s home club, but as players from numerous clubs began to challenge one another to matches there were many disputes over which rules were to be followed. As such, the development of a universal set of rules was necessary in order to eliminate the confusion and disputes over which rules were and were not to be followed. During this time, many clubs looked to the R&A to devise this universal set of rules. In 1897, the R&A finally decided to do so and the “official” Rules of Golf were established. Since 1897, the R&A has created a Rules of Golf Committee, the makeup of which include members of the R&A and individuals representing golf organizations around the globe. The R&A is now recognized as the worldwide governing body of the Rules of Golf, except for those areas governed by the Rules of Golf established by the United States Golf Association (USGA).

*Golf’s Global Emergence*

During the eighteenth century the game of golf made its way to England and to other parts of the world, thanks to Scottish emigrants. The first known reference to golf in Canada dates back to 1824 when a Christmas announcement was made about a game of golf being organized at Priest’s Farm in Montreal. However, it took until 1873 for
the first golf club to be established in Canada, which was the Royal Montreal Golf Club founded by a Scottish emigrant named Alexander Dennistoun. The establishment of the Royal Quebec Golf Club in 1874 and the Toronto Golf Club in 1875 followed the establishment of the Royal Montreal Golf Club. The following year, the first match between golf clubs took place in Canada, which was between the Royal Montreal Golf Club and the Royal Quebec Golf Club. After this match took place, matches were frequently played between the Royal Montreal Golf Club and the Toronto Golf Club, and later between numerous new clubs that would be formed at the end of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century.

As the sport of golf continued to grow in Canada, the secretary of the Royal Ottawa Golf Club, Alexander Simpson, and other members of golf clubs in Ontario and Quebec wanted to create “a representative and authoritative body to further the best interests of the game and to extend its popularity.” The result of this collaboration was the formation of the Royal Canadian Golf Association (RCGA), now known as Golf Canada, in 1894. The first president of the RCGA was elected in 1896 and he was the Honourable George A. Drummond of Montreal. As the president of the RCGA, he was responsible for directing the activities of golf [in Canada] and to set the foundation for a national organization, which would include members from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The game of golf not only reached Canada, but also spread throughout the world to countries such as Australia, Great Britain, and the United States. Although golf originated in Scotland and was dominated by Scottish players for many decades, the U.S. has become the dominant golf nation in the twentieth century. Between 1900 and 1930, the number of golf clubs in the U.S. grew from 1,000 to 6,000. In addition, the
Professional Golfers’ Association (PGA) was formed in 1916, which has now become, along with the PGA Tour, arguably one of the most recognizable golf organizations in the world. To illustrate just how popular golf has become in the early twenty-first century, current estimates suggest that roughly 60 million people play golf worldwide, and since the establishment of the Royal Montreal Golf Club in 1873, roughly 32,000 golf courses have been established worldwide.

Formation of the IOC

Known as the founder of the Modern Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin was born in Paris on 1 January 1863. From a very young age Coubertin was inspired by the Franco-Prussian War, which devastated France and had a notable impact on the Coubertin family. His goal was to reform the French sport and educational systems during the initial years of the Third Republic. During his years as an elementary and high school student, Coubertin was known to be a very competent student in the areas of the letters, history, and pedagogy, and was a skilled athlete in horsemanship, fencing, and gymnastics. After high school, Coubertin attended the University of Paris and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree, a Bachelor of Sciences degree, and a Bachelor of Laws degree.

In 1892 Coubertin made his first attempt at reviving the Olympic Games. On 25 November at the conclusion of a conference for sport reform in the French educational system, he announced to those in attendance that he was going to revive the Olympic Games. Although the idea was well received by all in attendance, the patrons did not understand that Coubertin was serious about the revival of the Olympic Games. Even
Coubertin was shocked by the reaction stating, “I was prepared for irony and protest, but not indifference. People applauded, wished me well, but failed absolutely to understand that I was serious.” In hopes of making his dream come true, Coubertin and a number of his acquaintances organized another congress in 1894 to discuss the issue of amateurism, and to once again suggest that the Olympic Games be revived. The result of this Congress was the revival of the Olympic Games and the establishment of the International Olympic Committee.

The Olympic Movement

Although it could be argued that the International Olympic Committee operates as a single entity, it is in fact part of a much larger organizational structure, known as the Olympic Movement. According to the IOC, the Olympic Movement is defined as, “…the concerted, organised, universal and permanent action, carried out under the supreme authority of the IOC, of all individuals and entities who are inspired by the values of Olympism.” In addition, the Olympic Charter suggests that there are three primary constituents who comprise the Olympic Movement, as well as a number of secondary organizations. The main entity in this framework is the IOC whose primary purpose is to oversee all activities pertaining to the Olympic Games. The second entity, whose role is vital to the survival of the Olympic Movement, is that of the IFs who are the worldwide governing bodies of their respective sports and/or disciplines. These IFs are tasked with overseeing all aspects of their sports and/or disciplines at the Olympic Games. The third primary members of the Olympic Movement as stated by the Olympic Charter are the National Olympic Committees (NOCs), which are the representatives of the IOC in their respective nations despite the fact that they are legally
independent of the IOC. The NOCs are also vital to the survival of the Olympic Movement as they are the organizations that develop the qualification criteria that athletes in their respective countries must meet in order to represent their country at the Olympic Games. Despite being considered as secondary members of the Olympic Movement, the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOGs) are also essential components of the Olympic Movement. The OCOGs are vital to the survival of the Olympic Movement because these organizations organize, plan, and execute the Olympic Games, and without them the Games may not exist.

**Structure and Role of the IOC**

The IOC is the primary constituent within the Olympic Movement and it is considered to be a non-governmental organization (NGO) whose mission is, “… to promote Olympism throughout the world and to lead the Olympic Movement” (See Appendix I). The IOC consists of the Session, the Executive Board, and the President. The Session is the general assembly of all the members of the IOC and is considered to be the supreme organ of the IOC. The Session is generally convened once a year, or at the request of the President of the IOC, or by a third of the IOC members if there are matters to be discussed and dealt with immediately. The Session of the IOC is charged with a number of tasks including, but not limited to, the amendment of the Olympic Charter, the selection of IOC members, Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and members of the Executive Board (See Appendix II).

The Executive Board of the IOC, as chosen by the members of the Session, includes the President of the IOC, the Vice-President, and ten members. The Executive Board’s main responsibility is that of the administration of the IOC and the management
of its affairs (See Appendix III). As the leader of the IOC, the President is elected by the Session through a secret ballot for an eight-year term, with the possibility of being re-elected for another four-year term at the end of the first term. The President is the sole representative of the IOC whose main purpose is to oversee all aspects of the IOC’s affairs and to ensure that everything is operating efficiently and effectively within the IOC (See Appendix IV).

Structure and Role of the IFs

As the second primary constituent of the Olympic Movement, the IFs are vital to the survival of the Olympic Movement as they are the governing bodies of all Olympic sports and/or disciplines. According to the Olympic Charter, a sport must have an IF as its governing body in order to be recognized by the IOC. The IOC currently recognizes roughly 60 IFs; 35 of which can be on the Olympic Programme at once, twenty-eight for the Summer Olympic Games and seven for the Winter Olympic Games. IFs can be characterized as NGOs and are responsible for the governance of one or multiple sports internationally. These IFs are also non-profit organizations, which adhere to the legislation set forth by the country in which their headquarters are situated. The governance structures of these IFs are homogeneous, as each will have a General Assembly or Congress and an Executive Board or Executive Council. The General Assembly consists of a number of National Sport Federations (NFs) and continental federations, and is the supreme body of the IF. The General Assembly has a number of responsibilities, including the creation and/or modification of statutes, the election of executive members, and the development of rules. Furthermore, the Executive Board of the IF consists of the President, Vice President, Treasurer, and a host of other members,
which represents the interests of the entire membership. According to Thoma and Chalip, the Executive Board has been given a number of duties to perform including those found in Appendix V. While the two main components of an IF are its General Assembly and Executive Board, each IF may also form sub-committees that are tasked with addressing a specific area of the IF, such as a Finance Committee or Medical Committee.

Although IFs are independent organizations, many of them have formed associations with one another. These associations were formed to ensure that a close relationship with the IOC would be maintained, while allowing the IFs to retain their authority, independence, and autonomy. Four main groupings of IFs currently exist, which include the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF). The ASOIF defends the common interests of all its associated IFs while ensuring collaboration amongst them and other members and non-members of the Olympic Movement. Moreover, the Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations (AIOWF) collaborates with those IFs whose sports are on the winter Olympic Programme and also with those IFs associated with the General Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF), currently known as SportAccord. Furthermore, the Association of IOC Recognized International Sports Federations (ARISF) is comprised of all IFs recognized by the IOC that are not on the Olympic Programme. One of the primary objectives of the ARISF is “to act as a spokesperson, and to defend and coordinate the common interests of its members whilst maintaining their authority, independence and autonomy.” Finally, the GAISF is the overarching organization whose members consist of all Olympic and non-Olympic IFs, in addition to
other international sport event organizers, with a mission to “… UNITE and SUPPORT its members in the co-ordination and protection of their common aims and interests, while conserving and respecting their autonomy.” The GAISF also provides a multitude of services to its members in order to ensure that the sports movement they have helped to create remains sustainable, and has a respectable governing system.

Structure and role of the NOCs

Regarded as the third primary constituent of the Olympic Movement, the NOCs are the IOC’s territorial representatives. The NOCs are generally non-profit and non-governmental organizations whose primary objectives are to select and send national teams to both the Summer and Winter Olympic Games, to promote and develop the ideals of Olympism in their respective countries, and to uphold each policy set forth by the IOC which applies to the NOC’s country of origin. As the Olympic Games have grown in size over the past decades, the IOC now recognizes over 200 NOCs with a limitation of one NOC per country. While each NOC must consist of at least five NFs affiliated with an IF whose sport is on the Olympic Programme, each NOC will generally consist of 20 NFs and other individuals as stated in the Olympic Charter.

Although the NOCs are considered to be independent entities, they have also founded an organization that brings together all NOCs, which is known as the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC). The ANOC, founded in 1979, represents the interests of its entire membership while providing their input regarding the Olympic Movement, specifically concerning the Olympic Games. The ANOC’s structure is similar to that of other Olympic organizations as it has a General Assembly, an Executive Council, a number of commissions, and numerous representatives in other
organizations affiliated with the Olympic Movement. While the ANOC is the primary grouping of NOCs there are five continental associations of NOCs, which include the Association of National Olympic Committees of Africa (ANOCA), the Pan American Sports Organization (PASO), the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA), the European Olympic Committees (EOC), and the Oceania National Olympic Committees (ONOC).

Structure and Role of the OCOGs

Although they are considered to be secondary members of the Olympic Movement the OCOGs are vital to the sustainability of the Olympic Movement, specifically to the sustainability of the Olympic Games. However, prior to the creation of an OCOG the Olympic Games must be awarded to a host city, which occurs seven years in advance of the staging of the Games. Once the host city is awarded, the IOC and the representative NOC sign a contract and confirm their commitment to create an OCOG. Once the OCOG is created it becomes the primary stakeholder of the Games as per the signed contract, in addition to being the IOC’s primary communications partner throughout the organizational process of the Games.

Although the Games are awarded to a city, they have taken on such importance that governments at all levels within the host country have not only had to assist the OCOGs financially, but also through other means such as providing security and transport for the Olympic Games. In fact, recent OCOGs have almost become government organizations as they have been dominated by public authorities and have had government officials appoint their members. OCOGs are interesting organizations in that they only exist for roughly 8-9 years and their organizational structure changes as it moves through different phases of the Games. According to Chappelet and Kübler-
Mabbott, an OCOG begins as “… a classical functional organization (finance, human resources, information technology, marketing, communication etc.)” and transitions into “…a decentralized field operation divided into as many units as there are competition venues or logistical areas (Olympic Village, media centers, accreditation, etc.).” After going through the numerous organizational changes necessary to successfully host and stage the Olympic Games, the OCOG must close all of its accounts and draft an official report prior to dissolving at the conclusion of the Olympic Games.

**Development of the International Golf Federation**

Recognized by the IOC as the governing body of the sport of golf worldwide, the International Golf Federation was not formed until 2003. However, the predecessor of the IGF, the World Amateur Golf Council (WAGC), was founded in the late 1950s. The WAGC was long considered to be the worldwide governing body of golf, which has held a men’s and women’s team championship biannually since 1958 and 1964, respectively.

It was in late 1957 that the United States Golf Association (USGA) began receiving requests to play team matches against multiple countries. Although it was a positive dilemma for the USGA to have to deal with, it provided them with a significant challenge, as it would not have been feasible for them to play against all of these nations separately. Finally, after receiving yet another invitation to play a match, this time from Japan, the USGA Executive Committee proposed that the foundation of an international team event was a necessity. This would allow the USGA team to play in one large event against many of the countries that previously submitted requests to play matches against them. It would also provide other countries not necessarily looking to play against the USGA team, an opportunity to compete against a number of countries that
they may not have otherwise had the chance to compete against. In order to begin the
process of creating an international team championship, the USGA sent representatives to
Scotland in March 1958 to discuss their idea with members of the R&A. Once the
USGA proposed this idea to representatives of the R&A, it was very well received and a
larger meeting was scheduled to take place later that year.\textsuperscript{119}

Two months following the first meeting between the USGA and the R&A, representatives from 35 countries gathered in the White House Rose Garden, invited by
President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in Washington D.C. to discuss the idea of creating an
international team event.\textsuperscript{120} This meeting was organized by the USGA and the R&A, in
collaboration with the U.S. Department of State and Pan American Airlines. In addition,
an anonymous group known as the Friends of American Golf provided funding for each
representative to attend the meeting.\textsuperscript{121} With 32 member organizations present, the
WAGC was created along with a number of governing Articles.\textsuperscript{122} Once it had been
established, the WAGC held its first men’s International Team Championship in October
1958, which was hosted by the R&A on the Old Course at St. Andrews, Scotland.\textsuperscript{123} The
inaugural event could be interpreted as being quite successful, as 115 players
representing 29 countries competed in the 72-hole stroke play tournament. At the end of
the four-day tournament the Australian team and the American team found themselves
tied and an 18-hole playoff was needed to crown a champion.\textsuperscript{124} At the conclusion of a
hard fought playoff, the Australian team defeated the American team by two strokes and
was awarded the Eisenhower trophy.\textsuperscript{125}

Two years after holding the inaugural International Team Championship in St.
Andrews, Scotland, it was the USGA’s turn to host the second annual men’s event and
they did so on the East course of the Merion Golf Club in Ardmore, Pennsylvania. The next major step that the WAGC took was in 1964. After having received an invitation from the French Golf Federation to send the U.S. Curtis Cup team to play a match against the women’s French team, the USGA suggested that the French Golf Federation invite other countries as well in hopes of creating a similar event to that of the men’s World Amateur Team Championship. The French Golf Federation welcomed this idea with open arms and Vicomtesse de Saint Sauveur of France and Mrs. Henri Prunaret of the United States planned the event. Having played against many international teams, Vicomtesse had become friends with Ricardo and Silvia Espirito of Portugal and she had heard that they had a trophy in their possession that was supposed to be used for a tournament that was no longer played. She asked them if they would be willing to donate the trophy for the women’s International Team Championship and they graciously agreed to do so.

Now that there was a trophy to play for, the French Golf Federation hosted the inaugural Women’s World Amateur Team Championship at the St. Germain Golf Club near Paris, France in October 1964. While the competition was fierce amongst the 25 teams who competed, the French team beat the American team by one stroke after the 72-hole stroke play tournament, claiming the inaugural Espirito Santo Cup. At the conclusion of the championship, it was unanimously decided that the WAGC would henceforth sponsor and organize the Women’s World Amateur Team Championship.
Since 1958 and 1964, the World Amateur Golf Council has held the Men’s and Women’s World Amateur Team Championships every two years. Since its foundation in 1958, the World Amateur Golf Council has remained relatively unchanged as the facilitator of both the Men’s and Women’s World Amateur Team Championships. However, in 2003 the WAGC changed its name to the International Golf Federation and following formal application and review, it was subsequently recognized by the IOC as the official IF for the sport of golf. This change was critical in an attempt to reinstate golf on the Olympic Programme, as a sport must have an IF as its official international governing body in order to gain recognition by the IOC and the Olympic Movement. In order to help explain golf’s re-instatement as an Olympic sport, institutional theory will be applied to the case of the IGF.

Defining Institutions

Institutions and organizations, used interchangeably throughout this study, have not been broadly defined in the literature. However, many authors have attempted to define institutions and organizations by virtue of their own knowledge of these entities. One such definition was provided by Richard L. Daft in the tenth edition of Organization Theory and Design. Daft states,

“organizations are (1) social entities that (2) are goal-directed, (3) are designed as deliberately structured and coordinated activity systems, and (4) are linked to the external environment.”

He also states that,

“the key element of an organization is not a building or a set of policies and procedures; organizations are made up of people and their relationships with one another. An organization exists when people
interact with one another to perform essential functions that help attain goals.\textsuperscript{140}

Chelladurai also shares the idea that the primary components of an organization are the individuals who comprise them. He claims that an organization requires no less than two people to be formed, and that the members of an organization each perform specialized functions, which are coordinated in nature, who are all working towards a common goal.\textsuperscript{141} With regards to sport organizations achieving a common goal, Hernández claims that the best way for sport organizations to do so is through “organization, administration, and management,” which he claims are “the most reliable driving forces of sport organizations in any country.”\textsuperscript{142} Hernández further claims that sport organizations must organize sound structures of interdependent and interactive segments into an entire system. In addition, the multiple segments of the entire system must work together to achieve clearly established goals and objectives.\textsuperscript{143}

In addition to Daft’s definition of an organization, W. Richard Scott developed an “omnibus definition of institutions” in \textit{Institutions and Organizations}. Scott claims that,

\begin{quote}
“Institutions consist of cognitive, normative, and regulative structures and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behavior. Institutions are transported by various carriers- cultures, structures, and routines- and they operate at multiple levels of jurisdiction.”\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

Scott further states that in this definition, institutions are comprised of symbolic systems, which are cognitive constructions and normative rules, and regulative processes that occur through and are shaped by social behaviour.\textsuperscript{145} According to Scott, “regulative systems, normative systems, and cognitive systems- all of these elements have been identified by one or another social theorist as vital components of institutions.”\textsuperscript{146} In fact,
he has termed these vital components of institutions as the “three pillars of institutions.” Appropriately for this study, the institutions of interest are those that exist within the realm of the Olympic Movement.

**Institutional Theory**

*Introduction*

Theorists and social scientists alike have studied institutions and institutionalism for many years. The study of institutionalism represents a unique method of studying “social, economic, and political phenomena; yet it is often easier to gain agreement about what it is *not* than about what it *is*.¹⁴⁸ There are a number of reasons for why this ambiguity exists.¹⁴⁹ First of all, many scholars who have written about institutions have not provided an adequate definition of an institution.¹⁵⁰ Second, the word *institutionalism* has different meanings in different academic disciplines; and finally, those who study institutionalism in the field of organizational theory vary in the emphasis they place “on micro and macro features, in their weightings of cognitive and normative aspects of institutions, and in the importance they attribute to interests and relational networks in the creation and diffusion of institutions.”¹⁵¹

*The Old Institutionalism vs. Neo-Institutionalism*

As previously mentioned, the study of institutionalism is not particularly new and it can be divided into two categories: “old institutionalism” and neo or “new” institutionalism.¹⁵² Neo-institutionalism can be traced back to Philip Selznick and colleague’s “old institutionalism,” however there are many differences between Philip Selznick’s old institutionalism and neo-institutionalism.¹⁵³ The old institutionalism is
very political in its examination of “group conflict and organizational strategy.” In addition, the old institutionalism is used to describe organizations that are deeply entrenched in the local communities they are tied to by the many relationships developed between personnel and by agreements that are established between organizations through face-to-face interaction. Finally, although both approaches of institutionalism agree that institutionalization constrains organizational rationality, each approach identifies different causes of constraint. The old institutionalism emphasizes the vested interest organizations have placed within a specific organizational field as a result of political tradeoffs and the formation of alliances. By contrast, the new institutionalism has generally downplayed conflicts of interest either within or between organizations, or it has displayed how organizations respond to these conflicts through the development of intricate administrative structures. In addition, instead of describing organizations that are deeply embedded within their local communities, the new institutionalism turns its attention to non-local environments. These environments are generally organizational sectors or fields that are linked to industries, professions, or national societies. Finally, the new institutionalism identifies the source of constraint created by organizational rationality, as the relationship between stability and legitimacy and the influence of common understandings that are rarely spoken about. Although both the old and new institutionalisms have a number of distinct differences, they do have a few commonalities. Both methods share skepticism towards “rational-actor models of organization, and each views institutionalization as a state-dependent process that makes organizations less instrumentally rational by limiting the options they can pursue.” Additionally, both forms of institutionalism stress the importance of the relationship
between organizations and their environments, and both stress the importance of the role that culture plays in shaping organizational reality. Finally, both approaches promise to expose several aspects of reality that are “inconsistent with organizations’ formal accounts.”

Development of Neo-Institutional Theory

According to Walter Powell, the first neo-institutional arguments were originally developed by John Meyer et.al., and Lynne Zucker and Richard Scott in 1977, and 1983, respectively. This theoretical construct suggests that:

“formal organizational structure reflected not only technical demands and resource dependencies, but was also shaped by institutional forces, including rational myths, knowledge legitimated through the educational system and by the professions, public opinion, and the law.”

Prior to delving deeper into this theoretical construct, it is important to note that a formal organization has been defined by Meyer and Rowan (1977) as, “systems of coordinated and controlled activities that arise when work is embedded in complex networks of technical relations and boundary-spanning exchanges.” They suggest that organizations are motivated to include the current organizational practices and procedures used by organizations in a certain organizational field, which have been institutionalized in society. By doing so, they claim that organizations increase their legitimacy and their potential to survive in the given organizational field.

Walter Powell argues that the main idea of this theoretical construct, that organizations are deeply intertwined within the social and political environments in which they are surrounded, is “that organizational practices and structures are often either
reflections of or responses to rules, beliefs, and conventions built into the wider environment.\textsuperscript{170} Formal organizational structure, as stated by Meyer and Rowan, is a blueprint for activities that include an organizational table.\textsuperscript{171} In this instance the table highlights the list of offices and departments; it highlights the number and type of positions, and also highlights the programs that are in place within this structure.\textsuperscript{172} These components are then linked by well-established goals and policies that are the foundation of a rational theory of how and why these components will be interconnected.\textsuperscript{173}

According to Meyer and Rowan, the main focus of organizational theory is to define the conditions that allow a formal rationalized structure to evolve.\textsuperscript{174} Meyer and Rowan assumed that the rational formal structure was “the most effective way to coordinate and control the complex relational networks involved in modern technical or work activities.”\textsuperscript{175} However, they suggest that the problem with this assumption was that existing theories suggested that the management of activity was the foundation upon which formal organizations had been able to succeed in the world during that time period.\textsuperscript{176} As they were unsatisfied with the prevailing theories, Meyer and Rowan recognized that formal structures of organizations are not only products of their own internal activities, but are also shaped by the “widespread understandings of social reality” in their modern societies.\textsuperscript{177} They suggest that many inner workings of modern organizations are heavily influenced by “public opinion, by the views of important constituents, by knowledge legitimated through the educational system, by social prestige, by the laws, and by the definitions of negligence and prudence used by the courts.”\textsuperscript{178} The components of formal structure are thought to be expressions of highly
influential institutional rules that act as myths bound on specific organizations.\textsuperscript{179}

Meyer and Rowan suggest that the observation that organizations are influenced by phenomena within their environment and that these organizations tend to become quite similar to them or tend to become “isomorphic” with them, is not a new revelation.\textsuperscript{180} They believe that this isomorphism occurs because formal organizations tend to become paired with the environments within which they exist via technical and reciprocal exchange relationships.\textsuperscript{181} According to Meyer and Rowan:

\begin{quote}
Isomorphism with environmental institutions has some crucial consequences for organizations: (a) they incorporate elements that are legitimated externally, rather than through their efficiency; (b) they employ ceremonial assessment criteria to define the value of structural elements; and (c) dependence on externally fixed institutions reduces turbulence and maintains stability. As a result, it is argued here, institutional isomorphism promotes the success and survival of organizations.\textsuperscript{182}
\end{quote}

Therefore, this theoretical construct suggests that organizational success does not depend on the efficiency with which an organization’s activities are managed.\textsuperscript{183} Instead, organizational success depends on the ability of organizations to become isomorphic with the environment in which they exist.\textsuperscript{184} The organizations that are able to do so will gain the legitimacy and the necessary resources that they require in order to survive in their environments.\textsuperscript{185}

\textit{DiMaggio and Powell’s Institutional Theory}

In 1977, John Meyer wrote two influential papers on the study of organizational theory, along with Brian Rowan, that “set out many of the central components of neo-institutional thought.”\textsuperscript{186} These papers, along with another paper that was published by
John Meyer and Richard Scott, aided with the clarification and development of “institutional principles in the context of formal organizations.” As the works of Meyer, Rowan, and Scott influenced them, DiMaggio and Powell wanted to build upon the existing neo-institutional thoughts. At the time, they believed that a substantial amount of organizational theory set out “to explain variation among organizations in structure and behavior.” However, instead of attempting to explain how organizations differ, DiMaggio and Powell asked why there is a significant amount of homogeneity amongst organizations when comparing their organizational forms and practices.

During the initial stages of their existence, organizational fields show significant diversity in their approach and form. However, as the organizational field becomes well established the organizations within that field tend to become homogenized. The term that best describes this process is isomorphism. DiMaggio and Powell define isomorphism as a process by which units within a specific population that face the same set of environmental conditions are forced to resemble one another. At the population level, this suggests that the characteristics of organizations within a specific field are modified to resemble the environmental characteristics; the number of organizations within a specified field is determined by the environmental carrying capacity; and finally, the different organizational forms are isomorphic to the different forms seen within the environment in which the organizations exist. DiMaggio and Powell argue that there are two forms of isomorphism, which are competitive isomorphism and institutional isomorphism. Competitive isomorphism “emphasizes market competition, niche change, and fitness measures.” This form of isomorphism is argued to be most relevant for fields where there is free and open competition. In contrast, institutional
isomorphism is focused on other types of organizations. $^{198}$ Organizations compete for more than just resources and customers, they compete to gain political power and institutional legitimacy, and they compete for social and economic fitness. $^{199}$ This form of isomorphism is beneficial “for understanding the politics and ceremony that pervade much modern organizational life.” $^{200}$

DiMaggio and Powell identify three types of institutional isomorphic change: “1) coercive isomorphism that stems from political influence and the problem of legitimacy; 2) mimetic isomorphism resulting from standard responses to uncertainty; and 3) normative isomorphism, associated with professionalization.” $^{201}$

Coercive Isomorphism is a result of both formal and informal pressures that are placed upon organizations in a specific field by other organizations within that same field on which they are dependent, and also by the cultural expectations that exist within that specific field. $^{202}$ In this case, the WAGC may feel pressure from a number of different sources within the organization and organizational field, such as from the IOC, other IFs, and from other individuals or organizations that comprise its organization and organizational field. $^{203}$ Mimetic isomorphism results from the uncertainty and ambiguity which new organizations experience when entering a specific organizational field. $^{204}$ DiMaggio and Powell state “organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate and successful.” $^{205}$ Instead of trying to develop the federation from the ground up, it may have been easier for the WAGC to adopt a model used by other IFs that have already legitimized themselves within the field. $^{206}$ Finally, the third type of institutional isomorphic change is normative isomorphism, which stems from professionalization. In their interpretation,
DiMaggio and Powell believe that professionalization is “the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work.”

DiMaggio and Powell cite two characteristics of professionalization that are sources of isomorphism. The first is “the resting of formal education and of legitimation in a cognitive base produced by university specialists.” Institutions such as universities and professional training centres are vital to the development of the organizational norms that are learned, developed, and shared by professional managers and their supporting staff. The second characteristic is “the growth and elaboration of professional networks that span organizations across which new models diffuse rapidly.” In addition to universities and professional training centres, professional and trade associations are also important vehicles by which normative rules regarding organizational and professional behaviour are transferred. In the case of the WAGC, the individuals who were at the helm of the organization at the time of the IGF’s creation needed to learn the norms of the organizational field in which their organization existed. One would assume that this would have been done through formal education and/or training, and through interactions with individuals involved with other IFs that are already established within the organizational field.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will highlight the methodology used in this research endeavour. The goal of this chapter is to specify how this study was conducted in order to address and answer the research questions posed. The chapter includes sections on the philosophy that guided this study, the study’s design, data sources, data analysis, ethical procedures, limitations, and delimitations.

**Philosophical Worldview**

For the investigator to address the research questions at hand, it was necessary to develop a strategy, also known as a research design, in order to do so. John Creswell defines research designs as,

“plans and the procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. It involves the intersection of philosophical assumptions, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods.”

According to this definition, it is of the utmost importance to identify the research philosophy used to guide this study, as a research design involves philosophical assumptions.

A philosophical worldview can be defined as “a basic set of beliefs that guide action.” In essence, a worldview allows the investigator to guide the approach that is used for a particular research project. John Creswell cites four worldviews that researchers can subscribe to, and they include: The postpositivist worldview; the social
constructivist worldview; the advocacy and participatory worldview; and the pragmatic worldview.⁴

Also referred to as the scientific method, the postpositivist worldview is subscribed to by individuals who generally engage in quantitative research and who hold a deterministic philosophy of cause and effect relationships. Postpositivist research usually consists of determination, reductionism, empirical observation and measurement, and theory verification.⁵

Although the postpositivist worldview covers a substantial number of research areas, the advocacy/participatory worldview arose in the 1980s and 1990s from individuals who believed that the postpositivist worldview did not adequately address issues of social justice. This particular worldview focuses on the needs of marginalized groups and individuals within our society. The research that is conducted using this worldview generally contains an agenda for reform in an effort to change the lives of the participants, the organizations in which people live and work, and possibly the life of the investigator. Participatory/advocacy research is generally conducted in collaboration with the participants, so as not to further marginalize them, which provides them with a united voice for reform and change.⁶

In addition to the postpositivist and participatory/advocacy worldviews, the pragmatic worldview is another worldview, generally subscribed to by mixed methods researchers. Using this worldview, researchers are free to choose how they would like to conduct their research in order to gain a thorough understanding of the research problem, which generally consists of both quantitative and qualitative data.⁷
Finally, the fourth worldview is the social constructivist worldview, which is the philosophical worldview that has been used to guide this study. The social constructivist worldview is characterized by researchers who assume that individuals attempt to better understand “the world in which they live and work.” Instead of developing a few categories in which the researcher can place the subjective meanings of the individuals’ personal experiences, they look for a number of different viewpoints. Therefore, the research project begins to rely heavily on the participants’ perspective of the situation in question. In order to gain a thorough understanding of the participants’ viewpoint, the researcher is required to pose more open-ended questions as opposed to close-ended questions. This approach allows the study to be more open, and reduces the possibility of the study being guided by the researcher’s own biases towards the subject being studied. This is an important point to consider, as the primary researcher in this study is not only a fan of the sport of golf, but is also an active and competitive player in the sport. Although the primary researcher has played a major role in developing this project, the social constructivist worldview was selected to guide this study because it allows the study to be guided primarily by the thoughts and interpretations of the participants.

**Research Design**

A qualitative approach has been used to answer the research questions that have been posed. Qualitative research has been defined as “a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem.” In this case, the researcher has assessed how the IGF went from creation to IOC recognition in the span of six years. To do so, the investigator set out to conduct 12
interviews with key actors. However, after allocating a period of six months for potential participants to be contacted and respond to the interview request, only four interviews of the original group were conducted as not all of the individuals who were contacted to participate agreed to participate or were available to participate. The interview participants were Richard Pound of the IOC, John Buyers of the Brazil Golf Confederation, Scott Simmons of Golf Canada, and Jeff Thompson who is also with Golf Canada (See Appendix VI). These participants represent key actors during the period in which the IGF went from creation, to development, to subsequent re-instatement on the Olympic Programme. Interviews were conducted with these individuals in order to gain a better understanding of the process by which the IGF returned golf to the Olympic Programme. The interview candidates were contacted via phone and/or E-mail. The use of interviews allowed the researcher to gain a better understanding of how the IGF was formed, developed, and subsequently recognized as a legitimate organization within the realm of the Olympic Movement. In addition to conducting interviews as the primary sources of data, the investigator also used secondary sources to either confirm or contrast the information gathered from the interviews.

Data Sources

Both primary and secondary sources of data have been used to examine the influences that were exerted upon the IGF during its creation, development, and representation as the international sport federation for the sport of golf. In essence, triangulation was used in order to increase the validity and reliability of the data collected, which has ultimately strengthened the findings of this study. The primary sources of data included the interviews conducted with the four interview participants and
official reports from the IOC. The decision to interact with these individuals was made because each of them had in-depth knowledge of how the IGF was formed, and how they were able to return golf to the Olympic Games. In addition, each of the interview participants were involved with the IGF in some capacity throughout its creation, development and eventual re-instatement of golf onto the Olympic programme.

The secondary sources included publications obtained from the IOC archives in Lausanne, Switzerland, such as IOC press releases, and articles and materials obtained from other media outlets relating to the International Golf Federation’s trials and tribulations in attaining IOC recognition. In addition, some materials were obtained from libraries, and interviews of individuals involved with the IGF as it relates to the IOC.

Data Analysis

The interviews that were conducted for this study consisted of both open and close-ended questions in order to allow the researcher to obtain as much information as possible from the participants (see Appendix VII). The interviews were conducted over the phone in a period of no longer than thirty minutes and each interview was digitally recorded. Once the interviews were complete, the digital recordings were saved on a secured computer in a secure location. The investigator then listened to each recording and transcribed them verbatim. Once this was complete, the interview transcripts were edited and sent to each participant for their review and/or comment.

After this process was complete, the investigator sought to make sense of both the primary and secondary sources of data by coding in hopes of seeing the emergence of themes and patterns. Coding has been defined as “the process of organizing the material
into chunks or segments of text before bringing meaning to information.”

Coding allows the researcher to take the qualitative data and organize it in a logical manner. The data were first placed into chunks according to what source they came from (i.e., interviews, journal articles, etc.). These chunks were then further broken down and placed into sub-headings according to their content. Finally, these chunks were placed into smaller sub-headings according to what section of the thesis these chunks would be used in. The information collected from the interviews allowed the researcher to gauge the participants’ perspectives of the IGF’s rise to IOC recognition. The secondary sources were used to either confirm the thoughts and perspectives of the participants, or to contrast their thoughts and perspectives.

**Ethical Procedures**

This study was conducted with the approval of the University of Windsor’s Research Ethics Board (REB). In keeping with the policies and procedures outlined by the REB, the primary investigator completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2) tutorial on research ethics. Prior to participating in the study, participants were provided with a Letter of Information Form and a Consent Form (see Appendix VIII) detailing the purpose of the study, the design of the study, and what they could expect to encounter as participants in this study. In addition, the contact information of the Chair of the REB was provided to the participants if they had any questions or concerns regarding the study.
Limitations

The researcher acknowledges the following limitations to the study:

1. The information gathered from this study should not be generalized across all international sport federations as the case of the IGF is unique;
2. The information that was gathered by the investigator may be interpreted differently by other key actors not interviewed for this study;
3. Not all of the individuals that the investigator contacted to participate agreed to participate and/or were available to participate;
4. Not all information residing in the IOC and IGF archives relating to this research project was made available for examination by the investigator;
5. Since the researcher is an avid fan and competitor in the sport of golf, an attempt to minimize researcher bias from this study was made by acknowledging said biases.

Delimitations

The researcher has delimited the study in the following ways:

1. All participants of this study are currently involved, or have previously been involved with the IGF in some capacity;
2. The participant recruitment period was confined to six months due to time constraints;
3. This study was confined to the timeframe of 2003-2009, as this was the period of time of the creation, development, and recognition of the IGF, and the subsequent re-instatement of the sport of golf onto the Olympic Programme.
2 Ibid.
4 Research Design, 6-10.
5 Ibid., 6-7.
6 Ibid., 9.
7 Ibid., 10-11.
8 Ibid., 8.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Mixed Martial Arts, 47.
12 Ibid., 4.
13 Triangulation can be defined as using multiple data sources in order to confirm a researcher’s conclusions. Thomas, Jerry R. & Nelson, Jack K. Research methods in physical activity 4, h ed. (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2001): 345.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

IGF’s 2005 Olympic Bid

In 2003 the World Amateur Golf Council changed its name to the International Golf Federation (IGF). This name change is arguably one of the most significant steps that the sport of golf made en route to becoming a part of the Olympic Programme once again. This is due to the fact that the Olympic Charter states that a sport must be governed by an International Sport Federation in order to be recognized by the IOC. Having made the name change, the IGF could then make an attempt to get golf back in the Olympic Games. They did so for the first time in 2005 for the 2012 London Games. The next piece of the puzzle that fell into place that allowed the IGF to apply for inclusion on the Olympic Programme was a review of the Olympic Programme by the IOC’s Olympic Programme Commission. This review consisted of sending a questionnaire to the 28 Summer Olympic International Federations and culminated in a report on the Olympic Programme. According to the IOC:

The report is the outcome of a two-year process, which began at the IOC Session in Mexico City in 2002. At this extraordinary Session, the IOC decided to systematically review the composition of the sports programme after each edition of the Olympic Games to ensure that its composition continues to be relevant and meet the expectations of future sporting generations. After that, the Olympic Programme Commission, in collaboration with the International Federations, defined 33 criteria to be used as the basis of the evaluation questionnaire.

In addition to sending the questionnaire to the 28 summer Olympic International Federations that were already on the Olympic Programme, the IOC also sent the questionnaire to a few other recognized summer Olympic International Federations,
including the International Golf Federation, “in order to widen the analysis to other sports that could potentially add to the quality and popularity of the Programme…” Once the IOC received and reviewed all of the questionnaires, a first draft of the report was prepared. The draft report was then sent to each of the federations with an analysis of their sport, which gave them the opportunity to comment, amend or add any further information if they so desired.

After the final report was produced and reviewed by the IOC membership, a vote was taken at the 117th Session of the IOC in Singapore on the 28 sports that were to be included on the Summer Olympic Programme. In order for a sport to remain on the Programme, a majority vote of more than 50% was needed. The results of the vote saw all but two sports, baseball and softball, remain on the Olympic Programme. Both baseball and softball received less than a majority vote from the Session and were both removed from the Programme of the 2012 Olympic Games. As two sports were removed from the Programme, there was now room to potentially add two more sports to the Programme, as the IOC allows a maximum of 28 sports to be on the Summer Olympic Programme at any one time. Five candidate sports were vying for inclusion on the Olympic Programme and the Session voted on which, if any, of the five sports would receive the required votes. The five sports that were vying for inclusion were golf, rugby, roller sports, karate, and squash. Two votes occurred: the first of which was to nominate two sports for inclusion on the Olympic Programme and the second was to vote on the inclusion of the two sports that were nominated. The first vote took seven rounds to complete and it saw both squash and karate nominated for inclusion (see Appendix IX). Unfortunately for the IGF, golf was voted out in the first round of
voting as it received the lowest number of votes of the five sports that were vying for inclusion.\(^\text{12}\) Once the two sports were nominated for inclusion, the Session voted separately on whether any of the two sports would be included on the Olympic Programme.\(^\text{13}\) After both sports were voted on by the Session, neither of them received the required two-thirds majority vote and therefore they were not included on the Programme of the 2012 Olympic Games (see Appendices X).\(^\text{14}\)

**IGF’s 2009 Olympic Bid**

Since its bid to become an Olympic sport in 2005 was not successful, the International Golf Federation remained a recognized International Sport Federation and would go back to the drawing board with the hope of re-applying to be on the Programme of a future Olympic festival. As the IGF was aware that the next Olympic Games to which they could apply would be the 2016 Olympic Games, they wasted very little time in getting a proposal started. The first step that the IGF took was to form an Olympic Golf Committee. The sole purpose of this committee was to coordinate golf’s bid to become an Olympic sport.\(^\text{15}\) This committee consisted of members of The R&A, PGA European Tour, USGA, PGA of America, LPGA Tour, and Augusta National Golf Club, and was led by Ty Votaw, who was the PGA Tour’s Executive Vice President of Communications and International Affairs.\(^\text{16}\) According to the Chief Executive of The R&A and one of the founders of the IGF, Peter Dawson, Ty Votaw was “…uniquely qualified to lead this effort on behalf of the International Golf Federation.”\(^\text{17}\) This notion, according to Dawson, was due to Ty Votaw’s experiences dealing with numerous international golf organizations as a member of the executive staff of the PGA Tour, as well as with his previous experience as the Commissioner of the LPGA Tour.\(^\text{18}\)
As the Olympic Golf Committee was devoted to getting golf onto the Olympic programme, it needed to sway the IOC members in its favour. In an effort to do so, the committee made two formal presentations to the IOC, the first of which was made to the IOC Programme Commission at the IOC headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland on 13 November 2008.\textsuperscript{19} This presentation was made by Ty Votaw and Peter Dawson, who highlighted, “…golf’s worldwide participation and diversity; the sport’s economic and charitable impact and its commitment to the youth of the world.”\textsuperscript{20} The presentation also included a series of short films featuring top players in the sport expressing their support for golf’s bid.\textsuperscript{21} According to Ty Votaw, the IGF wanted to include these players in the presentation, as he stated, “We felt it was critically important to show that many of the games’ biggest stars are saying supportive and positive things about golf’s bid for the Olympics.” In addition to including the top players in the sport, Golf Canada, in conversation with the IGF, suggested that the trophy won by George Lyon in the 1904 Olympic golf tournament be brought to the IOC headquarters for the presentation.\textsuperscript{22} The members of the IGF’s Olympic Golf Committee agreed and one of Golf Canada’s staff members, Karen Hewson, joined the IGF for the presentation at the IOC headquarters with the trophy.\textsuperscript{23} According to Scott Simmons, having the trophy at the presentation made a significant impact, as he stated:

\begin{quote}
…it made a big impact, you know, just having the trophy sitting there all polished up and having the IOC delegates, and I’m not sure who was there from the IOC to listen to the bid, but apparently the trophy made a big impression so that’s how we were involved.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Once the presentation was made by the IGF, the next step in the process was for the IGF to submit a formal document to the IOC Programme Commission in response to a questionnaire sent out by the IOC (See Appendix XI).\textsuperscript{25} The IGF’s response to the
questionnaire was a 76-page document that, “sought specific information on various topics relevant to golf’s bid, including how golf would be presented if it were part of the Olympic Games and information on golf’s worldwide appeal and governance structure.”26 According to Votaw, the IGF worked diligently to gather input from many of the world’s leading players and golf organizations in order to address a number of issues that were pertinent to the document.27 One key point that was included within the document was the format to be used during the Olympic Games. The tournament format will be a 72-hole individual stroke play event for both the men and the women. The event was proposed to have 60 players in each the men’s and the women’s competitions and the Official World Golf Rankings will be used as the primary determinant of eligibility.28 The document also emphasized the fact that golf now had a single, unified voice in its pursuit of a spot on the Olympic Programme and it highlighted a commitment by the member organizations of the IGF to adjust their schedules so that no other golf tournament conflicted with the Olympic golf tournament.29 This would, in turn, allow the game’s best players to compete in the Olympic golf tournament.

Once the IOC’s Programme Commission reviewed each of the bid documents prepared by the seven International Sport Federations vying for inclusion on the Programme, each IF had the opportunity to provide further comments to the IOC’s Executive Board in the form of a presentation.30 After the IOC received the comments from each IF, the Executive Board voted on which of the sports, if any, would be recommended to the Session of the IOC. At its meeting on 13 August 2009, the IOC’s Executive Board voted on which, if any, of the seven sports vying for inclusion would be recommended to the Session for inclusion.31 Two votes were taken and the successful
sports, if any, needed to receive a majority of 8 votes in order to be recommended to the Session for inclusion. The result of the first vote saw rugby sevens recommended to the Session for inclusion with 7 votes in the first round and 9 votes in the second round. Fortunately for the IGF, the result of the second vote saw the sport of golf recommended to the Session for inclusion with 3 votes in the first round, 6 votes in the second round, 7 votes in the third round and 9 votes in the fourth round. Now that the IOC’s Executive Board had recommended the sports of golf and rugby sevens for inclusion on the Olympic Programme, they were to be voted on by the Session of the IOC (See Appendix XII). According to the President of the IOC, Count Jacques Rogge, “Golf and rugby scored high on all the criteria… they have global appeal, a geographically diverse line-up of top iconic athletes and an ethic that stresses fair play.” When asked about the Executive Board’s decision, Votaw stated, “We’re obviously thrilled that the IOC Executive Board has recommended that golf should be added to the 2016 Olympic Programme… We believe we have presented a compelling case as to why golf should be added and we look forward to the IOC’s final vote in October.”

Now that the IOC Executive Board had recommended the sport of golf for inclusion on the Olympic Programme, the IGF had to make one final presentation to the entire IOC membership at the 121st Session of the IOC in Copenhagen, Denmark on 9 October 2009. For this presentation, the IGF called upon a number of international players to participate in the presentation in order to demonstrate that they had received the support of a number of the world’s top players. Ty Votaw echoed this sentiment, when he said:
We have demonstrated to the IOC Executive Board throughout the evaluation process that golf’s bid to become an Olympic sport has received unprecedented support from both amateur and professional golf organizations around the world and leading international players… Now, we must reaffirm this support before the full IOC membership and we couldn’t be more pleased than to have Padraig [Harrington], Suzann [Pettersen], Matteo [Manassero] and Michelle [Wie] help to communicate this support during our final presentation.\(^{40}\)

After the presentations were made by the IGF and the International Rugby Board (IRB), the Session took a vote on whether or not these sports would be qualified to join the Olympic Programme. Each sport was voted on separately in alphabetical order, and the results of the votes were not revealed until after the second vote had taken place. The results of the votes saw rugby sevens receive 81 votes in favour and 8 against with 1 abstention, while golf received 63 votes in favour and 27 against with 2 abstentions.\(^{41}\) With both sports receiving a simple majority of more than 50% of the votes, they were now officially on the Olympic Programme of the 2016 Olympic Games.\(^{42}\) When asked about how he and the IGF felt about the decision that was made by the IOC, Peter Dawson said:

> The International Golf Federation is absolutely delighted by today’s results. We thank the IOC for the thorough process and we are looking forward to playing our part as a member of the Olympic Movement… This is great for golf and we hope to be of great benefit to the Olympic Games as well.\(^{43}\)

This marked the first time that golf had been on the Olympic Programme in over 100 years, and by the time the Olympic golf tournament begins in Rio de Janeiro in 2016, it will be 112 years since the last stroke of golf was made in the Olympic Games.
Coercive Isomorphism

Throughout the entire bid process, the IGF was influenced by a number of people and organizations, including the IOC and the International Tennis Federation. Using the theoretical framework of neo-institutional theory, which has been described within the methodology section of this paper, allows the investigator to divide these influences into three different categories of isomorphic changes. The first of which is coercive isomorphism, which “results from both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function.” In addition, coercive isomorphism provides guidelines that an organization must abide by if it wishes to be recognized and/or accepted by a regulatory agency. In the case of the International Golf Federation, the regulatory agency was the International Olympic Committee.

One of the major sources of influence bestowed upon sport organizations seeking IOC recognition is the Olympic Charter. The Olympic Charter outlines the minimum requirements that a sport organization must achieve if it wants to be recognized as the IF for that particular sport. The first requirement is that a sport must have an IF as its governing body of the sport worldwide. According to Rule 25 of the Olympic Charter, “In order to develop and promote the Olympic Movement, the IOC may recognise as IFs international non-governmental organisations administering one or several sports at world level and encompassing organisations administering such sports at national level.” This IF must then be recognized by the IOC as the only IF for that sport, which grants that IF monopoly-like power over the sport within the realm of the Olympic
Movement, as there can only be one IF governing each Olympic sport.\textsuperscript{47} Although there is no direct evidence to suggest that the World Amateur Golf Council changed its name to the International Golf Federation for the sole purpose of being recognized as the IF for golf worldwide, the available evidence suggests that this was the reason for the change. In addition, Rule 25 of the \textit{Olympic Charter} also states, “The statutes, practice and activities of the IFs within the Olympic Movement must be in conformity with the \textit{Olympic Charter}, including the adoption and implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code. Subject to the foregoing, each IF maintains its independence and autonomy in the administration of its sport.”\textsuperscript{48} Adhering to the World Anti-Doping Code was a major concern for one of the senior members of the IOC, Richard W. Pound. Since the IGF had not adopted a World Anti-Doping program prior to its Olympic bid, Mr. Pound allocated significant effort in convincing the Commissioner of the PGA Tour, Tim Finchem, and members of the IGF to do so.\textsuperscript{49} As this was the case, Dawson and Votaw’s interactions with Pound were focused on golf adopting a World Anti-Doping Code, which the IGF has done.\textsuperscript{50}

Another major form of coercive influence that the IOC bestowed upon the IGF was that the IOC wanted to have the best players in the world play in the Olympic golf tournament. According to Rule 45, by-law 1.6 of the \textit{Olympic Charter}, “Prior to any decision on the inclusion of any sport in the programme, the Session may establish specific criteria or conditions for inclusion.”\textsuperscript{51} In this instance, the IOC needed to be reassured that the IGF would be able to provide the best players in the world to play in the Olympic Games in 2016. According to Pound, “…part of the deal, whether written or unwritten, was that if we do this and move mountains on your behalf, we will expect to
have the best players in the world there.” This was a concern for the IOC because tennis, a sport with a similar governance structure as that of the sport of golf, had always sent the top ranked women to the Games but not always the top ranked men. Therefore, the IOC, according to Pound, suggested that the IGF needed to deliver the best players in the world, which meant that they needed to fit the Olympic golf tournament into the time frame of a normal PGA Tour event, which consists of four days of tournament play.

Finally, it was noted that the IGF was not structured the same way as other IOC recognized IFs prior to their bid, which the IOC wanted the IGF to change. Responding to this request, while in the process of making its bid, the IGF was also in the process of restructuring its organization. When the World Amateur Golf Council became the International Golf Federation, its sole purpose was to run the World Amateur Team Championship. Prior to this name change, the WAGC was managed by members of the PGA and the R&A. According to Scott Simmons:

It was kind of a volunteer based organization. Peter Dawson from the R&A and at that time David Fay from the USGA kind of took chairs. It’s primary purpose was to run a World Golf Amateur Championship, and of course all the members of the IGF were the various countries, the various federations around the world who would participate in those championships and there probably was more membership beyond those that participated in the championships, but there wasn’t a lot of meetings. There were various correspondences that would come out relative to different international golf information. But there really wasn’t a lot of activity for it outside of the World Amateur Golf Championships.

As such, the IOC became concerned with the fact that the IGF was not structured in the same fashion as other International Sport Federations. According to Jeff Thompson:
I think that when the IOC looked at bodies such as FIFA or FIBA, where it really is oversight for the sport globally, there was a whole new set of by-laws constructed, the governance structure was changed, and I’m not sure if you’ve looked at it or not, but there is representation by all the professional tours now that never was a part of the IGF in the past, and then there’s the classic National Federation representation. So that was a big change for the IGF.  

This restructuring, according to Thompson, occurred, “Sort of in lock step, I think they committed to getting it done at the same time as the bid was being reviewed.” In fact, the IGF did not complete the ratification of the new constitution until after the IOC accepted its Olympic bid. In addition to not having the new constitution ratified until after the bid was accepted, the IGF also did not have a President, Vice President, or Executive Director at this time. Golf was officially added to the Olympic Programme on 9 October 2009 and Antony Scanlon was appointed as the Executive Director of the IGF on 2 August 2010. Furthermore, the IGF did not appoint Peter Dawson and Ty Votaw as the President and Vice President, respectively, until 15 December 2010. Therefore, although the IGF may have told the IOC that it had restructured their organization prior to its bid, as stated by Thompson, this was certainly not the case. The IGF did not complete the restructuring process until after golf had been re-instated onto the Olympic programme.

Mimetic Isomorphism

When the World Amateur Golf Council became the IGF in 2003, it was entering uncharted territory within the realm of the Olympic Movement and other IFs. The uncertainty and ambiguity that the IGF was facing may have encouraged its members to imitate what already existed. DiMaggio and Powell suggest that organizations have a
tendency to model themselves after other organizations within their respective fields that they perceive to be legitimate and/or successful.\textsuperscript{65} Meyer and Rowan also echoed this sentiment as they stated, “organizations are driven to incorporate the practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work and institutionalized in society.”\textsuperscript{66} In the case of the IGF, the International Tennis Federation (ITF) may have provided it with a framework by which it could model itself and its bid after. In fact, the IGF spoke with the ITF in an effort to properly model its organization and its bid.\textsuperscript{67} Since the sports of both golf and tennis are similar in a number of aspects, including in their governance structures, their tournament formats, and their worldwide popularity, the IGF worked with the ITF and gained valuable knowledge on the process of applying to the IOC for inclusion on the Olympic Programme.\textsuperscript{68} The IGF felt that by doing this it would increase its chances of becoming an Olympic sport.\textsuperscript{69} According to Jeff Thompson:

I know that the IGF did a lot of consulting work with tennis because they have a similar structure in that they have amateur tennis and professional tennis and are fairly new to the Olympics and they are a big money sport. What were the trials and tribulations they went through? So, I think they received some key learning’s from Tennis.\textsuperscript{70}

Although there is no direct evidence to suggest that speaking with the ITF did help the IGF to re-instate golf onto the Olympic Programme, it is plausible to suggest that this would have helped them. First of all, speaking with the ITF about its Olympic bid would have allowed the IGF to get a better idea of how the process works and what is expected by the IOC. Secondly, it would have allowed the IGF to ensure that it not only met the criteria set forth by the IOC but to exceed those requirements in an effort to create the strongest bid possible. Finally, and possibly most importantly, this would have
allowed the IGF to gain a better understanding of how to properly structure the organization. Since the IGF was in the process of re-structuring, speaking with the ITF would have provided it with a number of valuable insights and ideas on how to structure the organization in a format consistent with other IFs within the realm of the Olympic Movement.

**Normative Isomorphism**

Finally, the third form of isomorphic change is that of normative isomorphism, which is concerned with professionalization and the ability of members of a specific occupation to establish the conditions of their work and process by which their work is completed. As previously mentioned, DiMaggio and Powell have identified two characteristics of professionalization that they consider to be sources of isomorphism. The first of which is knowledge gained through formal education obtained through a university or a similar institution. The second characteristic is the growth of professional networks that involve a number of people and organizations. In the case of the IGF, Peter Dawson and Ty Votaw, the President and Vice President of the IGF respectively, were both university educated and both had a significant amount of experience in the golf industry. Peter Dawson had played golf from a very young age and had competed in tournaments well before heading to Cambridge University. While at Cambridge, he played for the University golf team and upon graduating, began working in the golf industry. He became a member of the R&A in 1994 when he was asked to join the Rules of Golf Committee. Mr. Dawson eventually became the Chief Executive of the R&A, the Joint Secretary of the IGF, and most recently, the President of
the IGF. As for Ty Votaw, he also had extensive knowledge of the sport, as he was the President of the LPGA Tour for a number of years, and prior to joining the IGF, was the PGA Tour’s Executive Vice President of Communications and International Affairs.

As evidenced by their positions held prior to joining the IGF, both Dawson and Votaw had a significant amount of knowledge regarding international golf organizations. With these experiences, Dawson and Votaw were able to transition into leadership positions within the IGF and provide guidance for the organization during its Olympic bid. In addition, these experiences would have allowed Dawson and Votaw to gain a thorough understanding of how international golf organizations are structured, and transfer that knowledge to the IGF’s re-structuring process. In addition to Dawson and Votaw, the IGF hired Antony Scanlon from the IOC to be its Executive Director, who also brought with him a diverse set of skills that would have been and will continue to be beneficial to the IGF.

According to DiMaggio and Powell, a significant aspect of professionalization is known as filtering, which is the hiring of individuals from a narrow field of candidates with similar backgrounds and a specific skillset. In this case, the IGF hired Dawson, Votaw and Scanlon who each had similar skillsets and similar professional backgrounds. Therefore, the IGF was able to add a new level of professionalization to the organization through these additions. In turn, these additions allowed the IGF to go from a governing body only concerned with administering the World Amateur Golf Championships to being an IOC recognized IF and having its sport on the Olympic Programme in the span of six years.
Legacy of Golf in the Olympic Games

Prior to having sent its bid to the IOC, the IGF’s primary goal was to return the sport of golf to the Olympic Programme. As this was achieved in 2009, one can conclude that the IGF had achieved its goal. However, the IGF did have other goals that it was hoping to achieve, one of which was to grow the game worldwide. When asked if the IGF had achieved its goals, John Byers of the Brazil Golf Confederation said, “100%, of course, I’m sure.” Additionally, Byers suggested that the IGF had further goals, stating, “They have further goals and they will become visible when golf matures as an Olympic sport. But, the first step was to become an Olympic sport, and therefore that was achieved and well done.” This notion was further reinforced by Scott Simmons:

…the goals would be to grow the game worldwide. The Olympic Movement is massive and Canada has the highest participation in the world; 1 in 5, 20% of our population play the game. There are other countries in the world where probably not a shot of golf has ever been struck, or there are probably countries in the world where their participation rate might be 1 or 2 percent, and the whole idea or objective is to grow the game worldwide. So yes, the IGF has definitely achieved their objectives.

Being re-instated onto the Olympic Programme was a huge step for the sport of golf. Not only will this have the potential to increase the participation rate worldwide, it will also provide the countries in which the Olympics are held a lasting legacy of the sport of golf. This idea was echoed by John Byers:

Golf is a hugely popular game in various countries; if you’re from Canada you most likely understand that. But possibly those in Indonesia, possibly in Brazil even, it’s not a particularly well-developed game and therefore the idea of including it as an Olympic sport generates a huge amount of interest in a game that’s not necessarily well known locally. If you open up opportunities for financial support, financial development, and the growth
of the game, I’m convinced that one of the reasons the authorities, the IGF, wanted golf to be recognized as an Olympic sport is to grow the game worldwide.\textsuperscript{84}

In addition to growing the game worldwide, another legacy of having golf in the Olympic Games will be that young children will now be able to look up to their golf heroes and see them win a gold medal. Scott Simmons certainly believes that will be the case:

Well one thing I’m a big believer in, and in fact I was speaking at a conference on the weekend, heroes are so important to drive participation in sport, and to help our kids. Generally, a lot of us are influenced by heroes and as a result take up the sport. I think having golf in the Olympics will only help create more heroes for our young kids to aspire to, which is good for society.\textsuperscript{85}

Jeff Thompson also believes that having heroes to cheer for at the Olympic Games will have a huge impact on increasing participation in the sport of golf. He states:

…we’re certainly talking about it here as an opportunity to generate even greater awareness and excitement of the sport and the opportunity doesn’t come around very often where you could really leverage the power of heroes and the impact they have on youth to get them interested in the sport. I think bringing it more mainstream will help us a lot, we want to take the opportunity to talk about the players we have in the system who potentially could have opportunities in Rio and beyond.\textsuperscript{86}

In fact, Thompson believes that some of the more underdeveloped golf nations are already feeling the effects of having golf on the Olympic Programme.\textsuperscript{87} One country that is really feeling this effect is China. Prior to golf being on the Olympic Programme, China really did not recognize golf as being a significant sport.\textsuperscript{88} However, once the sport of golf became an Olympic sport, it significantly increased its interest and investments.\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, Thompson believes that having golf in the Olympic Games will increase the investment in facilities and programs in other countries.\textsuperscript{90} Not only will these countries have new and/or improved golf facilities, they will need people who
understand the sport of golf to run these facilities. In addition, these facilities will need to have individuals who are able to teach people how to play the game and provide coaching for individuals of all ages and levels of ability.

Perhaps the largest legacy of having golf in the Olympic Games will be felt by the host country of the Olympic Games, which will be Rio de Janeiro in 2016. According to John Byers, one of the biggest legacies will be increased funding in the sport of golf in Brazil:

Well, one of the most important things is that we will start to get federal funding; in other words, the governments of Brazil will supply federal fund money to develop the game. And that is hugely important because up to now, there has been no golf funding because golf was not an Olympic sport.

Furthermore, Byers believes that having a championship golf course and a driving range with a “fully blown golf academy” will also leave a lasting legacy in Rio de Janeiro. As Rio de Janeiro, and by extension Brazil, do not have a championship golf course, this will allow it to not only host the Olympic golf tournament, but also host other international events that could potentially bring more funding to a country that is currently underdeveloped from a golf perspective. Therefore, having golf in the Olympic Games will not only have a significant impact in the host country of the Olympic Games, but also in countries all around the world.

2 Although the IGF may have wanted to apply for the 2008 Olympic Games, this was not a possibility as the IOC states that the earliest a sport can be included on the Olympic Programme is seven years in advance of the Games.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Concluding Comments

The primary purpose of this investigation was to analyze, what, if any, influences the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and other organizations had on the IGF as it went from creation, to IOC recognition, and finally to securing a spot on the Olympic Programme in 2009. In this case, the primary source of influence came from the IOC, as it is the agency that establishes the rules that each sport must abide by if it wants to become part of the Olympic Movement and/or the Olympic Games. As such, the Olympic Charter was a major factor in this instance as it is the document that sets out the rules that each sport seeking IOC recognition must adhere to. In particular, the Olympic Charter states that each sport must first have an International Sport Federation (IF) as its governing body. Second, the Charter states that each recognized IF must abide by the World Anti Doping Code. Finally, the IOC has the authority to establish any criteria that it deems necessary for each IF vying for inclusion on the Olympic Programme. In the case of the IGF, the IOC wanted to be reassured that the IGF would be able to get the best players in the world in the Olympic golf tournament and therefore included it as criteria specific to the IGF.

In addition to understanding the influences that were placed upon the IGF during its bid to re-instate golf onto the Olympic Programme, the investigator also wanted to understand why and how the IGF was seeking IOC recognition. Being recognized as the IF for a particular sport grants that organization monopoly-like power over the sport
within the realm of the Olympic Movement. This is due to the fact that the IOC may only recognize one IF as the official governing body of that particular sport worldwide. Therefore, this guarantees that a particular organization has control over every national governing body and each athlete competing in the sport for which it governs. IOC recognition is also the first step in allowing a sport to become an Olympic sport, which was the primary goal of the IGF and the sport of golf. There were a number of organizations that exerted influence on the IGF during its formation and development, including the IOC. The International Tennis Federation (ITF) was another organization that exerted a significant amount of influence upon the IGF. While the IGF was developing the organization and creating its bid to become an IF on the Olympic Programme, they did some consulting work with the ITF in an attempt to understand what it did and how it became an Olympic sport. The IGF sought the aid of the ITF because the sports of tennis and golf are similar in several different aspects, which were previously discussed in this document. Based on the information obtained, it is clear that these organizations exerted influence upon the IGF in a number of different ways. As the governing agency of the Olympic Movement, the IOC set out the rules and regulations that the IGF needed to adhere to in order to become an IOC-recognized Olympic IF. Furthermore, the ITF helped the IGF shape its bid and the organization into a traditionally structured IF, which ultimately allowed the sport of golf to be re-instated onto the Olympic Programme at the 121st Session in Copenhagen, Denmark in 2009.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study was conducted with the hopes of providing future sport organizations that are seeking to become IOC-recognized International Sport Federations a foundation
upon which they can build their IF and their Olympic bid. The primary goal of this study was to provide an understanding of the process by which the IGF went from creation, to development and eventual re-instatement on the Olympic Programme. Using neo-institutional theory as the theoretical framework for this study allowed the investigator to identify and categorize the influences experienced by the IGF during this period of time. Three primary categories were used in order to identify the influences exerted upon the IGF. They included coercive isomorphism, mimetic isomorphism, and normative isomorphism.

Although this study addressed a specific case, future studies could be aimed at other IFs and their paths to IOC recognition. As there are a number of sports already on the Olympic Programme, but only a small volume of research has been conducted on these IFs, there is opportunity to further investigate and highlight the process by which a sport becomes an Olympic sport. In addition, more research in this area would allow for comparisons between IFs and the similarities and differences of how they became Olympic sports, which could help to identify the best possible route for a sport to become an Olympic sport. Future research projects in this area could also focus on other organizations, such as National Olympic Committees (NOCs), and how various sports organizations under their jurisdiction become recognized by the NOC. Furthermore, future research could attempt to replicate this study using institutional theory and an organization affiliated with the IGF, such as Golf Canada, and take a more in-depth look to see if it experienced similar isomorphic influences in becoming a recognized national governing body by its National Olympic Committee.
As the research in this area is quite limited, having a more thorough understanding of the process by which a sport becomes an Olympic sport would help future sport organizations and sport organizers. With this understanding, these organizations and individuals would have the required knowledge base in order to successfully create, develop, and operate these organizations as they strive to receive IOC recognition. In addition, further research would allow for an increased understanding of other IFs and how they became Olympic sports, allowing new organizations to model themselves after successful IFs. Being recognized as an IF by the IOC is a significant accomplishment. Becoming an IF with their sport on the Olympic Programme is one of the most prestigious honours any sport organization could possibly receive because this instantly legitimizes a sport organization and the sport that it governs.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Mission and Role of the IOC

The mission of the IOC is to promote Olympism throughout the world and to lead the Olympic Movement. The IOC’s role is:

1. to encourage and support the promotion of ethics and good governance in sport as well as education of youth through sport and to dedicate its efforts to ensuring that, in sport, the spirit of fair play prevails and violence is banned;

2. to encourage and support the organisation, development and coordination of sport and sports competitions;

3. to ensure the regular celebration of the Olympic Games;

4. to cooperate with the competent public or private organisations and authorities in the endeavour to place sport at the service of humanity and thereby to promote peace;

5. to take action to strengthen the unity of the Olympic Movement, to protect its independence and to preserve the autonomy of sport;

6. to act against any form of discrimination affecting the Olympic Movement;

7. to encourage and support the promotion of women in sport at all levels and in all structures with a view to implementing the principle of equality of men and women;

8. to lead the fight against doping in sport;

9. to encourage and support measures protecting the health of athletes;

10. to oppose any political or commercial abuse of sport and athletes;

11. to encourage and support the efforts of sports organisations and public authorities to provide for the social and professional future of athletes;

12. to encourage and support the development of sport for all;

13. to encourage and support a responsible concern for environmental issues, to promote sustainable development in sport and to require that the Olympic Games are held accordingly;
14. to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries;

15. to encourage and support initiatives blending sport with culture and education;

16. to encourage and support the activities of the International Olympic Academy (“IOA”) and other institutions which dedicate themselves to Olympic education.

APPENDIX II

Power’s of the Session of the IOC

The power’s of the Session are the following:

2.1 To adopt or amend the *Olympic Charter*;

2.2 To elect the members of the IOC, the Honorary President, honorary members and honour members;

2.3 To elect the President, the Vice-Presidents and all other members of the IOC Executive Board;

2.4 To elect the host city of the Olympic Games;

2.5 To elect the city in which an ordinary Session is held, the President having the authority to determine the city in which an extraordinary Session is held;

2.6 To approve the annual report and accounts of the IOC;

2.7 To appoint the IOC’s auditors;

2.8 To decide on the awarding or withdrawal by the IOC of full recognition to or from NOCs, associations of NOCs, IFs, associations of IFs and other organisations;

2.9 To expel IOC members and to withdraw the status of Honorary President, honorary members and honour members;

2.10 To resolve and decide upon all other matters assigned to it by law or by the *Olympic Charter*;

APPENDIX III

IOC Executive Board Responsibilities

The IOC Executive Board assumes the general overall responsibility for the administration of the IOC and the management of its affairs. In particular, it performs the following duties:

3.1 it monitors the observance of the *Olympic Charter*;

3.2 it approves all internal governance regulations relating to its organisation;

3.3 it establishes an annual report including annual accounts, which it submits to the Session, together with the auditors’ report;

3.4 it submits a report to the Session on any proposed change of Rule or By-law;

3.5 it submits to the Session the names of the persons whom it recommends for election to the IOC;

3.6 it establishes and supervises the procedure for accepting and selecting candidates to organise the Olympic Games;

3.7 it establishes the agenda for the Sessions;

3.8 upon the proposal of the President, it appoints – or dismisses – the Director General. The President decides on their compensation and may take sanctions;

3.9 it provides for the safe keeping of all minutes, accounts and other records of the IOC in compliance with the law, including minutes of all Sessions, IOC Executive Board and other commission or working group meetings;

3.10 it takes all decisions, and issues regulations of the IOC, which are legally binding, in the form it deems most appropriate, such as, for instance, codes, rulings, norms, guidelines, guides, manuals, instructions, requirements and other decisions, including, in particular, but not limited to, all regulations necessary to ensure the proper implementation of the *Olympic Charter* and the organisation of the Olympic Games;

3.11 it organises periodic meetings with the IFs and with the NOCs at least once every two years. Such meetings are chaired by the IOC President, who determines the procedure and the agenda after consultation with the relevant bodies;

3.12 it creates and confers the honorary distinctions of the IOC;
3.13 it exercises all powers and performs all duties not attributed by law or by the 
*Olympic Charter* to the Session or to the President.

APPENDIX IV

Responsibilities of the IOC President

1. The President may take any action or decision on behalf of the IOC when circumstances prevent it from being taken by the Session or the IOC Executive Board. Such action or decision must be submitted promptly for ratification by the competent organ.

2. If the President is unable to fulfill the duties of their office, the Vice-President who is senior in such office replaces them until the President has recovered his ability or, if he is in a condition of permanent disability, until a new President is elected at the next Session. This new President is elected for a term of eight years renewable once for four years.

APPENDIX V

Responsibilities of the Executive Councils of the IFs

The Executive Council represents the interests of the entire membership of the IF and is given specific duties to perform, which may include:

1. To elect new national federation members, subject to congress or membership approval;
2. To sanction, suspend or expel NF members;
3. To make urgent decisions that cannot wait until the next congress;
4. To call a special congress, if the need arises to approve special powers for the president in urgent situations.

APPENDIX VI

Interview Participant Biographies

Richard Pound

- Counsel in Montreal office of Stikeman Elliott and a member of the firm's Tax group
- Current member of the IOC
- Former Vice President of the IOC from 1987-1991 and again from 1996-2000
- Former Chairman of the IOC’s Olympic Games Study Commission
- Former Chairman of the IOC’s Coordination Commission for the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta
- Directed all Olympic television negotiations, marketing and sponsorship between 1984 and 2001
- Founding Chairman of WADA from 1999-2007 and is a member of its foundation board
- Former Director of the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games
- Currently a member of the International Council Arbitration for Sport

Scott Simmons

- Currently the Executive Director of Golf Canada
- Former Director of Marketing and Communications between 1992 and 2000 for the predecessor of Golf Canada, the RCGA
- Currently a member of the IGF’s Administrative Committee
- Principal negotiator behind the agreement to have Bell Canada be the title sponsor of the Canadian Open
- Achieved the launch of Golf Canada, major network broadcast partnerships, and over $7 million in sponsorship revenues
- Served as the Vice-President of Marketing and Business Development for The Beer Store for five years
- Former senior manager with Procter and Gamble, IMG, Sales and Merchandising Group and Lakeport Brewing LP
- Played a key role in the development of a 10-year business plan for the RCGA while working for IMG

John Byers

- Currently the Director of Rules and International Affairs at the Brazilian Golf Confederation
- Currently a member of the IGF’s Board and has served on the Board for several years, including during the timeframe of 2003-2009
- Key figure in the development and implementation of the junior golf program in Brazil aimed at introducing young people between the ages of 7 and 14 to the sport of golf
- Served as a Rules Official at The Open Championship on multiple occasions
- Served as a Rules Official for a multitude of other tours and organizations including, but not limited to, the Web.com Tour, the European Tour, and the PGA Tour

Jeff Thompson

- Currently the Chief Sport Officer for Golf Canada and he oversees the growth and development of the sport of golf at the grassroots and competitive levels
- Attends IGF meetings when Scott Simmons is unable to attend
- Served as the Executive Director of the former Canadian Ladies Golf Association (CLGA) from 2002-2004 and was instrumental in the amalgamation of the CLGA with the RCGA in 2004
- Served as the Executive Director of Alpine Ontario from 1997-2002
- Served as the Head Coach/Athletic Director at the [Canadian] National Ski Academy from 1990-1997
- Represented Canada internationally in the sports of Triathlon and Alpine Skiing
RICHARD POUND - Questionnaire Outline:

General Information

1. What positions have you held as a member of the International Olympic Committee?

   • Of the many positions that you have held as a member of the IOC, which one allowed you to gain the most knowledge regarding the Olympic programme?

2. In what capacity were you involved with the International Golf Federation’s Olympic sport bid proposals?
   Probe: First, second, and third proposal?
   Elaborate on your knowledge of the proposals.

   • How did you become involved with the IGF and its Olympic sport bids?

3. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to an Olympic sport bid by the IGF?
   Probe: Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   Expectations for the official document, and for the oral proposals?
   In your opinion did the IGF meet the expectations?
4. In your opinion, what influences, if any, did other International Sport Federations have on the IGF prior to and during the Olympic sport bids?  
   Probe: The use of successful bids from other IFs in the past?

Olympic Bid Process

5. Can you describe your role in the implementation of the successful IGF Olympic sport bid?

   • What were the regulations set forth by the IOC for the Olympic sport bid?  
     Probe: Was the Olympic Charter the main contributor of these regulations?

   • Did you interact with specific individuals from the IGF?  
     Probe: Did they influence your decision on whether or not to allow them to become an Olympic sport?

6. How far in advance of the IGF’s submission of the successful Olympic sport bid document, did you become aware of its bid?

7. Were you in communication with the IGF throughout the entire bid process?  
   Probe: How much did the IOC influence the IGF’s bid?

Reflection/Conclusion
8. Did your duties and responsibilities evolve throughout the process, yes or no?

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

9. Reflecting on the announcement by the IOC that the IGF’s bid was successful, do you believe that the IGF achieved its goals?

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the IGF prior to having received the official bid document?

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

11. Is there anything relating to the IGF’s Olympic bid that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on?

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
SCOTT SIMMONS - Questionnaire Outline:

General Information

1. Have you had any experiences, prior to becoming a member of the IGF Administrative Committee, with the IGF?
  
   • How were these experiences similar or different after you were a member of the IGF Administrative Committee?

2. In what capacity were you involved with the International Golf Federation’s Olympic sport bid proposals?
   Probe: First, second, and third proposal?
   Elaborate on your role and the duties it entailed?

   • What factors influenced you to take on this role?

3. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to an Olympic sport bid by the IGF?
   Probe: Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   Expectations for the official document, and for the oral proposals?
   In your opinion did the IGF meet these expectations?

4. In your opinion, what influences, if any, did other International Sport Federations have on the IGF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?
   Probe: The use of successful bids from other IFs in the past?
Olympic Bid Process

5. Can you describe your role in the implementation of the successful IGF Olympic sport bid?

- What were the regulations set forth by the IOC for the Olympic sport bid?
  Probe: Was the Olympic Charter the main contributor of these regulations?

- Did you interact with specific individuals from the IOC or other organizations?
  Probe: If so, how did they influence the IGF’s proposal?

6. How far in advance of the submission of the successful Olympic sport bid document did you and the IGF Administrative Committee begin discussing the IGFs Olympic sport bid proposal?

7. Were you in communication with the IOC throughout the entire bid process?
  Probe: How much did the IOC influence the IGF’s bid?

Reflection/Conclusion

8. Did your duties and responsibilities evolve throughout the process, yes or no?
9. Reflecting on the announcement by the IOC that the IGF’s bid was successful, do you believe that the IGF achieved its goals?

10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the IGF prior to having received the official bid document?

11. Is there anything relating to the IGF’s Olympic bid that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on? Is there anyone else who you feel that I should be looking to speak to in regards to this topic? (Could you get me in contact with those individuals?)
JOHN BYERS - Questionnaire Outline:

General Information

1. Have you had any experiences, prior to becoming a member of the IGF Board, with the IGF?
   • How were these experiences similar or different after you were a member of the IGF Board?

2. In what capacity were you involved with the International Golf Federation’s Olympic sport bid proposals?
   Probe: First, second, and third proposal?
   Elaborate on your role and the duties it entailed?
   • What factors influenced you to take on this role?

3. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to an Olympic sport bid by the IGF?
   Probe: Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   Expectations for the official document, and for the oral proposals?
   In your opinion did the IGF meet these expectations?

4. In your opinion, what influences, if any, did other International Sport Federations have on the IGF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?
   Probe: The use of successful bids from other IFs in the past?
Olympic Bid Process

5. Can you describe your role in the implementation of the successful IGF Olympic sport bid?

- What were the regulations set forth by the IOC for the Olympic sport bid?
  Probe: Was the *Olympic Charter* the main contributor of these regulations?

- Did you interact with specific individuals from the IOC or other organizations?
  Probe: If so, how did they influence the IGF’s proposal?

6. How far in advance of the submission of the successful Olympic sport bid document did you and the IGF board begin discussing the IGF’s Olympic sport bid proposal?

7. Were you in communication with the IOC throughout the entire bid process?
  Probe: How much did the IOC influence the IGF’s bid?

Reflection/Conclusion

8. Did your duties and responsibilities evolve throughout the process, yes or no?
9. Reflecting on the announcement by the IOC that the IGF’s bid was successful, do you believe that the IGF achieved its goals?

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the IGF prior to having received the official bid document?

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

11. Is there anything relating to the IGF’s Olympic bid that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on?

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________
JEFF THOMPSON - Questionnaire Outline:

General Information

1. Have you had any experiences, prior to becoming a member of the IGF Administrative Committee, with the IGF?

   - How were these experiences similar or different after you were a member of the IGF Administrative Committee?

2. In what capacity were you involved with the International Golf Federation’s Olympic sport bid proposals?
   
   - Probe: First, second, and third proposal?
   
   - Elaborate on your role and the duties it entailed?

3. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to an Olympic sport bid by the IGF?
   
   - Probe: Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   
   - Expectations for the official document, and for the oral proposals?
   
   - In your opinion did the IGF meet these expectations?

4. In your opinion, what influences, if any, did other International Sport Federations have on the IGF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?
   
   - Probe: The use of successful bids from other IFs in the past?
Olympic Bid Process

5. Can you describe your role in the implementation of the successful IGF Olympic sport bid?

- What were the regulations set forth by the IOC for the Olympic sport bid?  
  Probe: Was the Olympic Charter the main contributor of these regulations?

- Did you interact with specific individuals from the IOC or other organizations?  
  Probe: If so, how did they influence the IGF’s proposal?

6. How far in advance of the submission of the successful Olympic sport bid document did you and the IGF Administrative Committee begin discussing the IGF’s Olympic sport bid proposal?

7. Were you in communication with the IOC throughout the entire bid process?  
  Probe: How much did the IOC influence the IGF’s bid?

Reflection/Conclusion

8. Did your duties and responsibilities evolve throughout the process, yes or no?
9. Reflecting on the announcement by the IOC that the IGF’s bid was successful, do you believe that the IGF achieved its goals?

10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the IGF prior to having received the official bid document?

11. Is there anything relating to the IGF’s Olympic bid that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on? Is there anyone else who you feel that I should be looking to speak to in regards to this topic? (Could you get me in contact with those individuals?)
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: The Development of an International Sports Federation: An Examination of the International Golf Federations’ Association with the Modern Olympic Movement

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Michael Ayotte, Masters Candidate, from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. This study is in partial fulfilment of a Master’s Degree in the Faculty of Human Kinetics.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Michael Ayotte’s supervisor, Dr. Scott Martyn at the University of Windsor at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2434 or email: smartyn@uwindsor.ca.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to analyse what, if any, were the influences exerted upon the International Golf Federation as it rapidly went from creation, recognition, and subsequent re-instatement of golf into the Olympic Games.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a telephone interview at a time convenient to your schedule. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks for this study are minimal. As a participant, you will be asked to share you knowledge, expertise, and opinions relating to golf’s re-instatement as an Olympic Sport for the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro. These opinions and comments will be public knowledge after this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Participants may benefit from answering the interview questions because the articulation of one’s thoughts towards the subject matter can be a rewarding experience. In addition, participants are contributing to knowledge that is relevant to their field. This study will potentially assist in better understanding the process by which a sport becomes an Olympic sport, which will ultimately assist in guiding future sport organizations looking to gain International Olympic Committee (IOC) recognition.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

There will be no payment for participation within this study. Participants will be compensated with a token of appreciation following the interview.

CONFIDENTIALITY
As a participant, you have been specifically selected due to your involvement in the process of re-instating golf as an Olympic Sport. As such, confidentiality will not be provided since it is your perspective being targeted. Interviews will be digitally audio recorded and transcribed, and if you choose to do so, you will be forwarded a transcribed copy to review, modify, comment, and approve or reject. If otherwise approved, your comments will be referenced and may be used in the final document, however there is no guarantee that you what you share will be included.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Participation in this study is optional. As a participant you will be allowed to withdraw during the interview and/or up until you approve the transcript. At the end of the interview, if you choose not to review the transcript you are then committing to the study and will be unable to withdraw following that point of time.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

Participants have the right to request results pertaining to their participation within this study. You will be asked prior to your interview if you wish to be sent a copy of the conclusions of the research project. Furthermore, feedback of the results will be posted on the University of Windsor REB website.

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study The Development of an International Sport Federation: An Examination of the International Golf Federations’ Association with the Modern Olympic Movement as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

____________________________________
Name of Participant

____________________________________
Signature of Participant                                _______________________

____________________________________
Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

____________________________________
Signature of Investigator                                _______________________

____________________________________
Date
## APPENDIX IX

Nomination vote for sports to be voted on for Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Karate</th>
<th>Rugby</th>
<th>Roller Sports</th>
<th>Squash</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Round</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Round</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Round</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Round</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Squash is elected as one of the two nominees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Karate</th>
<th>Rugby</th>
<th>Roller Sports</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Round</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Round</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Round</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karate is elected as one of the two nominees.

*Source: “British Karate Federation”*
### APPENDIX X

Vote on sports nominated for inclusion on 2012 Olympic Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote on the Inclusion of Squash in Rule 46 of the Olympic Charter</th>
<th>Vote on the Inclusion of Karate on Rule 46 of the Olympic Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 39</td>
<td>Yes: 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 63</td>
<td>No: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash is not included in Rule 46 of the Olympic Charter</td>
<td>Karate is not included in Rule 46 of the Olympic Charter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: “British Karate Federation”*
### APPENDIX XI

Evaluation criteria for prospective Olympic sports

#### Evaluation criteria for sports and disciplines - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 General</td>
<td>Value added</td>
<td>Value added by the sport to the Olympic Games; Value added by the Olympic Games to the sport</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of a Code of Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment of IF's Code of Ethics with the principles and rules of the IOC Code of Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Governance</td>
<td>Good governance basic principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of transparent and enhanced internal dispute resolution mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of a multi-year strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of key strategic priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 History and Tradition</td>
<td>Gender equity in elected bodies</td>
<td>Comparison between number of women and number of men in the executive board (or equivalent)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegal and irregular betting</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Universality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of medals awarded at the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of NOCs per continent that won medals at the last two editions of the Olympic Games for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Popularity</td>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Junior World Championships for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two World Championships for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the qualifying events for men and women for the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two World Championships for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federation which correspond to National Olympic Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations which organized National Championships for men and women during the two years preceding the upcoming Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Continental Championships for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Junior World Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two World Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the qualifying events for men and women for the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two World Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federation which correspond to National Olympic Committees</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federation</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which organized National Championships for men and women during the two years preceding the upcoming Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Continental Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Junior World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of NOCs per continent that won medals at the last two editions of the Olympic Games for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of medals awarded at the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of medals awarded at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries per continent that won medals at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of the sport among the general public. Survey requested by the IOC and run by an external company around Games time</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of the sport among young people. Survey requested by the IOC and run by an external company around Games time</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps taken by your IF to present your sport in the most interesting and attractive manner, in particular to young people</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best athletes’ participation in the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two World Championships</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of medals awarded at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written press coverage during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV coverage during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written press coverage during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written press coverage during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written press coverage during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Technical evolution of the sport</td>
<td>Existence of means to control the technical evolution within the sport (regarding venues, sports equipment, items used by athletes to practice the sport) and competition clothing (items worn by athletes and subject to IF technical specifications)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gender equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sport for All</td>
<td>Existence of a Sport for All Commission within the IF and/or specific Sport for All initiatives</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Transparency and fairness on the field of play</td>
<td>Steps taken by the IF to ensure that the outcome of the competition will be as objective and fair as possible, including selection &amp; evaluation process for judges, training and certification and impact of judging on results</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Existence of ethics rules for technical officials (e.g. code of conduct, sanction system, etc.)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Use of acknowledged standards of accounting, verification of account by an independent auditor, publication of accounts on IF website</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Income &amp; Expenditure</td>
<td>Total income in the 2006-2011 period (membership fees, Olympic revenues, marketing, broadcasting, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total expenditure in the 2006-2011 period (operational costs, development costs, fight against doping, fight against competition-fixing, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Value for sports at the Olympic Games</td>
<td>Ability to share venues with other sports</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Technology requirements</td>
<td>Use of technological compatibility and costs required at Olympic Games competition values for each specific sport/discipline</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Television production</td>
<td>Costs and complexity of television production per sport/discipline at the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elite athletes</td>
<td>Possibility for athletes to vote within the decision-making bodies of the IF (committees &amp; technical committees, executive board or equivalent)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Athlete representation</td>
<td>Existence of an athlete’s commission within the IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Athlete Career Programme</td>
<td>Election process for the IF athlete’s commission</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Athletes’ entourage</td>
<td>Existence of initiatives or specific tools (e.g. code of conduct, licence system for agents, etc.) to inform and monitor the athletes’ entourage (coaches, agents, medical staff, etc.)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Athletes’ health</td>
<td>Existence of initiatives or specific tools (e.g. injury and illness surveillance systems and pre-competition health checks)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medical Commission representative on IF executive board (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Longitudinal scientific strategies to monitor and ensure the health, safety and security of athletes (e.g. injury and illness surveillance systems and pre-competition health checks)</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Existence of initiatives or specific tools (e.g. code of conduct, licence system for agents, etc.) to inform and monitor the athletes’ entourage (coaches, agents, medical staff, etc.)</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Existence of rules to sanction members of the entourage who are found to be involved in matters such as doping, sexual harassment, etc.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of the IF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scope of development programmes</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

The above list of criteria and items are very slightly for the Recognised International Federations (no questions on past Olympic Games and additional questions on added value).
## APPENDIX XII

Executive Board Vote Results

### COMMISSION EXÉCUTIVE DU CIO – Berlin, le 13 août 2009

IOC EXECUTIVE BOARD – Berlin, 13 August 2009

### ÉLECTION DU 1ER SPORT / ELECTION OF THE 1ST SPORT

#### 1er tour / First round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majorité requise / Required majority - 8

#### 2e tour / Second round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IOC Executive Board – Berlin 2009
**ELECTION DU 2ᵉ SPORT / ELECTION OF THE 2⁰ SPORT**

**1er tour / First round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Majorité requise / Required majority - 8**

**Tour supplémentaire pour le 1er tour / Sub-round for First round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2e tour / Second round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Bulletins valables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Majorité requise / Required majority - 8**

**3e tour / third round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Bulletins valables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4e tour / Fourth round
Bulletins valables / Valid Ballots 14
Majorité requise / Required majority 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Sports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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