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ABSTRACT

In 2005, softball was excluded from the 2012 Olympic Games, along with baseball. Following the removal, the International Softball Federation (ISF) began its efforts to reinstate softball to the Olympic Programme. The purpose of this study was to analyze what, if any, influences the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and other involved organizations had on the ISF during its initial two bids to regain softball’s Olympic status between its exclusion at the 117th Session in Singapore and the 125th Session in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 2013. Relying on extensive interviews with key actors and an analysis of both primary and secondary sources, this study argues that the majority of institutional isomorphic changes emanated from the IOC during these reinstatement attempts. In addition, the ISF was influenced by the International Baseball Federation, the Olympic Council of Asia, and other stakeholders within the Olympic Movement.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

On 21 August 2008, following the Japanese women’s softball team’s defeat of the team from the United States of America (USA) in the final match of the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, softball’s brief 12-year appearance on the Olympic Programme came to an end. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) had released its decision to remove softball, along with baseball, from the 2012 London Summer Games Programme at the 117th IOC Session in Singapore on 8 July 2005. Since their decision, the International Softball Federation (ISF) has launched two campaigns to seek reinstatement to the 2016 and 2020 Summer Olympic Games. Despite its efforts, both attempts failed, with the second failure resulted in a transition in the ISF leadership in 2013.

Between 2005 and 2013, the ISF’s reinstatement process involved interactions with the IOC, other International Sport Federations (IFs) and those seeking inclusion to the Olympic Games during the same period. It also interacted with other organizations that may have affected this process. This study will consider and review the influences exerted upon the ISF by these organizations.

Theoretical Framework

Throughout the period of 2005 to 2013, the ISF may have experienced a number of influences from many different sources that affected softball’s reinstatement to the Olympic Games Programme. Although the ISF failed in its attempts to be included in the Olympic Games during this period, it intended to become homogenized with other organizations whose governed sport or sports were included in the Olympic Games.
Programme. The theory that explains the homogenization within a specific organizational field is named neo-institutional theory. Developed by Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell, this theory uses three factors, coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism, to explain how an organization is influenced by other organizations within the Olympic Movement to become similar, or homogeneous. Neo-institutional theory will be used by the researcher to analyze how the ISF was influenced by other organizations within the Olympic Movement.

An IF benefits from being included on the Olympic Programme in several ways. The recognized organization is granted “monopoly-like power” over the specific sport or sports within the realm of the Olympic Movement. The sport governed by a recognized organization is significantly promoted through the Olympic Movement around the world. Financially, the organization receives considerable funding from the IOC when compared to those not recognized or included. Thus, IFs may want to seek inclusion or reinstatement to the Olympic Programme in order to acquire or keep such benefits.

In an effort to thoroughly understand the influences that were exerted upon the ISF by the IOC and other organizations during softball’s Olympic reinstatement efforts, the researcher has spoken directly to those who were involved in this process. This meant interviewing specific experts in the field, such as the ISF president at the time, key IOC members, and others who were engaged in the process. In addition, a review of related documents and materials such as press releases, meeting minutes from the involved organizations and media reports on the topic have also been useful to establish a better understanding of the issue. Therefore, a qualitative research design has been utilized for the purpose of gaining in-depth knowledge of the interaction between the ISF
and other involved organizations during its attempts to reinstate softball.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to analyze what, if any, influences the IOC and other involved organizations had on the ISF during its attempts to regain softball’s Olympic status from its exclusion at the 117th Session in Singapore to the second failure at the 125th Session in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 2013. In order to answer this question, the researcher has first asked a number of sub-questions, for example, why the ISF was seeking reinstatement to the Olympic Programme, and what had been done by the ISF to achieve its goals. In addition, the researcher has asked which organizations may have exerted influence upon the ISF during its attempts, and then what influences these organizations may have exerted upon the ISF during this period of time.

**Significance and Implications of the Study**

Since the IOC revised the *Olympic Charter* to include, at most, 28 sports in the Summer Olympic Programme at the 114th Session in Mexico City, it means that in order for a new/returning sport to be added/reinstated an existing sport would need to be dropped from the Olympic Games Programme.\(^5\) This study provides insight into the failures of the ISF’s Olympic reinstatement attempts. Sport organizations and IFs seeking Olympic inclusion or reinstatement could model the positive actions, if any, taken by the ISF and avoid the negative ones. As such, it is argued that this research project is of significant interest to individuals seeking knowledge of previous reinstatement efforts as well as those individuals hoping to understand the process of how a sport organization is influenced by others during such attempts.
Endnotes


5 During the course of completing this research project, the IOC approved Olympic Agenda 2020 at the 127th IOC Session from 8 to 9 December 2014 in Monaco. The agenda abolishes the artificial 28 sports limit over the Summer Olympics. Instead, events can now be added or removed from the programme on a Games-to-Games basis. The agenda also allows the Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games to propose one or more sports to be included on the programme for that edition of the Games.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Softball

Softball originated from a variation of baseball, whose own origin has been debated for over a century. The history and development of early softball, compared with its parent, baseball, is relatively clear and precise. Softball, as we know it today, was neither named softball nor played the same way when it was first invented. The sport was first called “indoor base ball,” which by its very name clearly indicates the origin of the game.

Unlike other popular indoor sports, such as basketball and volleyball, indoor baseball was not invented out of a deliberate desire to conduct physical activity indoors. The appearance of indoor baseball was rather an invention by accident compared to the purposeful creation of basketball and volleyball. Indoor baseball was invented in Chicago in 1887, very specifically, on American Thanksgiving. A narrative can be found in an early indoor baseball guide published in 1891 by George W. Hancock, the “father of indoor baseball.” It provides a very descriptive picture of how indoor baseball emerged. On Thanksgiving Day, 24 November 1887, a group of Yale and Harvard alumni were sitting around the Farragut Boat House waiting for telegraphic reports of their schools' annual football game. As the story was told, a Yale alumnus threw an old boxing glove towards a Harvard supporter. The boxing glove was batted back by a broom. One of the men, George Hancock, a reporter for the Chicago Board of Trade, was intrigued and began to set up wrestling mats as bases on the floor, and suggested that they should play baseball in the Boat Club gymnasium. Thus, the boys
were split into two teams to play the first ever indoor baseball game, without rules. Having returned home, Hancock made up some rules and brought a ball and a bat specially crafted for this new sport the following Saturday. Two nines played the first contest, thus originating the game of indoor baseball.\textsuperscript{3}

The game was instantly popular in Chicago and then spread to other areas. In Chicago, vast indoor baseball clubs quickly emerged during the winter of that year. Cities in the Midwest were visited by indoor baseball teams from Chicago, thus spreading the seed of the game. In 1895, eight years after the first indoor baseball was pitched in Chicago, a similar sport, named “Kitten Ball,” was adopted to keep a group of firefighters busy during their idle time in Minneapolis, MN.\textsuperscript{4} Indoor baseball then reached the Northwest, followed shortly thereafter on the East coast. By 1900, the game of indoor baseball had been played in almost every part of the USA, except the extreme South.\textsuperscript{5}

Although indoor baseball grew quickly across the country, prior to the formation of the Amateur Softball Association of America (ASA), various forms of the sport existed at one time. Hancock designed the first set of rules and directed the manufacture of the ball and bat that were used for the game. Two years later, after he invented indoor baseball, Hancock published the first set of standard indoor baseball rules.\textsuperscript{6} With indoor baseball spreading quickly, the games played by various groups differed somewhat in almost every aspect, from the name to the rules, from the size of the bats and balls to the distance of the bases.\textsuperscript{7} First appearing in 1926, the name “softball” was initially used within the state of Colorado, and later in 1932, was accepted over many other names by a subgroup of the National Recreation Congress.\textsuperscript{8} Softball has been the nationally recognized name of the game ever since.\textsuperscript{9}
In 1933, two symbolic events signified a remarkable development for softball: the first national softball tournament was held in Chicago, and the success of the tournament led to the founding of the ASA in the same year. These events, in turn, facilitated the codification of the rules and unification of the organization of softball. During the first four decades of softball’s history, the sport presented an absence of standardization. From the size of the balls and bats used to the length of bases, most of the elements of the game varied from league to league. Even the name of the game showed diversity: indoor ball, kitten ball, playground ball, diamond ball, etc. The first national tournament, which was wisely scheduled as part of the Chicago World’s Fair, attracted 55 teams from across North America to participate. These teams competed for the first national championship in three categories. However, the participating teams all used different sized balls back home. As a result, the organizer had to make a decision that a fourteen inch ball would be used in the tournament. Nonetheless, scheduling the tournament during the World’s Fair introduced the game to people from all over the country and the world. In addition, its success provided the basis for establishing a permanent national association called the ASA.

The 1933 national tournament identified a need for the standardization of rules. The beginning of this standardization process actually began a few years earlier. In 1923, the Playground and Recreation Association (renamed the National Recreation Association in 1930) formed a committee to standardize the rules of playground ball. In 1926, Walter Hakanson of the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) of Denver, Colorado, suggested softball as the official name to the committee. The committee then grew into a joint committee with representatives from the National Recreation
Association, the YMCA, the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the American Physical Education Association. In 1934, the committee further expanded to add the ASA, the National Softball Association, the Catholic Youth Organization and the Young Men’s Hebrew Association, and named as the Joint Rules Committee on Softball. The committee then published the official rules titled *Official Rules of Softball, Playground Baseball and Diamond Ball* in the same year. The standardized rules made games much easier between leagues and the cities in which the game was played. As a result, the ASA was able to organize consistent and fair tournaments around the country, which facilitated softball’s accelerated growth.

In addition to the accelerated growth of softball, the standardization of softball also resulted in an increase of female participants. Women’s participation in modified baseball can date back to as early as 1860s. Women’s roles in society began to change during the early twentieth century. More women participated in modified baseball, just as in various other areas of society. Many forms of modified baseball, such as kittenball, diamond ball, and indoor baseball, were used in physical education programs for females by colleges and high schools prior to the standardization of softball. However, the inconsistency of the rules used in modified baseball sports caused problems educating students in a unified manner or facilitating competition among groups who played different forms of the game. The formation of ASA in 1930s and its promotion of high level competition boosted softball’s popularity in women. The standardization of the rules of softball provided the opportunity for women to play toward a national championship of a modified baseball sport. Such an opportunity for women did not exist in baseball, which had been kept the domain of males as much as possible.
biggest selling point of the game, emphasized by the ASA, was that everyone, all ages and both sexes, could play softball.\textsuperscript{20}

Despite being very early in its development, softball quickly spread internationally. Being their geographic neighbour, and closest to the birthplace of softball, Canada was logically the first country to introduce softball outside of the USA. As early as 1896, an indoor-baseball league had been formed in Hamilton, Ontario.\textsuperscript{21} Geographic distance was not an issue for softball to spread. The YMCA teachers and the Chinese students who studied at American universities brought softball, still called indoor baseball at the time, to China around 1913. It was mainly practiced in Catholic schools in major cities. In 1915, a women’s softball team from the Philippines participated in a demonstration match of softball during the Second Far East Games hosted in Shanghai, China.\textsuperscript{22} This is the first softball game recorded in Chinese historical documents, which also indicates that softball had been played in the Philippines prior to this date. Softball was introduced to Japan in 1921.\textsuperscript{23} In 1939, Gordon Young, a Canadian, who was the director of physical education in New South Wales, introduced softball to Australia.\textsuperscript{24} By 1940, one year prior to the USA declaring war on Japan during World War II, the ASA had already listed commissioners from five provinces in Canada (Saskatchewan, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia), three USA possessions (Philippines Islands, Hawaii and Puerto Rico) and five foreign countries (England, New Zealand, Australia, Brazil and Mexico) in its official guide.\textsuperscript{25}

Troop movements during World War II played an important role in the spread of softball internationally and of boosting its popularity where it had already been introduced. During the war, the USA military forces played and taught the game
wherever they were stationed. In 1951, six years after the end of World War II, the foreign associations affiliated with ASA had increased to thirteen countries and regions, with representation on all five continents.26

**Development of the International Softball Federation**

In order to govern the game of softball, which had grown into an international sport, the ISF was established. The ISF, founded in the USA, had five member national federations when it started to function actively in 1965, and had grown to 130 member federations by the end of 2013 (see Appendix I for a list of 125 of the members and a coverage map).27

In regards to the ISF’s establishment, there are two opinions on this issue. The commonly referenced version of the establishment of the ISF is 1952, as is stated on the ISF’s official website.28 On the other side of the dispute, Lynn Embrey, the author of *Batter up! The history of softball in Australia*, asserts that the ISF was formed in Austin, Texas, in September, 1950.29 So far, two pieces of evidence support Embry’s contention that the ISF was formed two years earlier than what is widely accepted. The first piece is from a three-fold pamphlet produced by the ISF during the 1960s. On page 2, it states: “In 1950 the International Softball Federation was formed in Austin, Texas, U.S.A., for the purpose of guiding the game on its fast growing international course.”30 Since the pamphlet included the result of the first Women’s International Championship, which was held between 13 and 21 February 1965, and used a simple future tense when mentioning the first Men’s International Championship which would be held between 23 and 30 October 1966, thus one can conclude that the pamphlet was produced between the two events, in 1965 or 1966. An argument could be that it had been 13 to 15 years past the
formation of the organization, and the time of the formation could be a simple
typographical error on the pamphlet.

If the first piece of evidence may appear weak given the significant lapse of time,
the second piece provides a review within less than one year after the occurrence of the
event.\textsuperscript{31} The second piece of evidence comes from \textit{Collier’s Year Book 1951: Covering the Events of the Year 1950}. An entry identifying the International Federation of Softball is listed in the section of SOFTBALL. It states that:

The formation of an international organization to promote the inclusion of softball in the programme of the Olympic and Pan American Games highlighted one of the most successful years in the history of this sport. Pointing toward recognition of the game in time for the 1956 Olympics, the International Federation of Softball was created in Austin, Tex., in September, under the auspices of the Amateur Softball Association (A.S.A.). Executives of the various national groups present named N. J. Barach, president of the A.S.A., as the first president of the Federation, and voted him authority to apply for participation rights in both the Pam American and Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{32}

The statement clearly indicates that the International Softball Federation was created in September, 1950, in Austin, Texas, and the first president of the federation was named, instead of being elected. This statement supports the contention of the formation time mentioned in the pamphlet.

In addition, the statement indicates that the ISF was created under the auspices of the ASA. Since softball was invented in the USA, and the ASA acted as the organization managing affiliated foreign associations prior to the formation of the ISF, it is logically understandable that the ASA played a primary role in the establishment of the ISF. As a matter of fact, the ISF had been sharing office space with the ASA before the ISF moved to Plant City, Florida, in 1999.\textsuperscript{33} Two years later, in 1952, the ISF had its first elected president, N. J. Barach, and other officers.\textsuperscript{34}
Although the ISF was formed and had its officers elected in early 1950s, current evidence shows no record of other activities between 1952 and 1962. During this period of time, the ASA still played a central role in international softball. Teams from outside of the USA kept participating in the national championships held by the ASA. In 1962, a push from the Australian Women’s Softball Council, renamed Australian Softball Federation ten years later, marked the first step of changes in the ISF’s role on the international softball stage. Three Australian officials attended the ASA Women’s Major Fast Pitch National Championship which hosted nineteen teams, including one each from Canada and Japan, between 15 and 22 August 1962, in Stratford, Connecticut. The Australians raised the possibility of hosting an international tournament with each country sending a team. Having returned home and following some groundwork, softball officials from the four countries (USA, Canada, Australia, and Japan) met again later and decided to hold the first women’s fast pitch softball world championship in 1965, in Melbourne, Australia. The decision of organizing a world championship required the ISF to become an actively functioning international federation. The ASA, with sufficient personnel and funding resources, took the task of operating the ISF. The men who assumed these responsibilities were the new executive director of the ASA, Don E. Porter, and W. W. “Bill” Kethan, the ASA president.

Between 13 and 21 February 1965, five countries, USA, Japan, New Zealand, New Guinea and the host Australia, participated in the historic first championship, with the host country being crowned as champions. During the tournament, the ISF held its first congress, passed its by-laws, and elected Kethan as its president and Porter as secretary-general. In 1966, the ISF held its first men’s world championship in Mexico.
City with 11 participating countries between 23 and 30 October. The men and women had their next world championships in 1968 and 1970 respectively, and have held it every four years since then. The ISF also started the junior world championships for both men and women in 1981, and then rescheduled the junior women’s world championship to the year after every women’s world championship since 1987.37

Besides organizing international tournaments for softball, another purpose of the ISF was aimed at staging softball at the highest level, the Olympic Games. The idea of being included in the Olympic Games was implanted in their officials’ minds prior to the formation of the ISF. Kethan recalled a meeting with Avery Brundage, second Vice-President of the IOC at the time, in January 1946. During the 1946 ASA’s annual meeting, Brundage and Kethan had lunch together at La Salle hotel in Chicago. Brundage mentioned that “perhaps one day softball would become a part of the Olympic Programme.”38

The first effort, although a failed attempt, to get softball on the Olympic Programme came from Australia after Melbourne was selected as the host city for the 1956 Games.39 The next noticeable attempt was carried out soon after Kethan was elected as the President of the ISF in February 1965. He urged Porter to seek Olympic inclusion at the 1968 Mexico City Games. Porter started by contacting the IOC and asking for recognition. The ISF’s initial request for the recognition was deferred at the 63rd Session held in Madrid in October 1965.40 Following two years of communication with IOC officials, the ISF filed an official application along with its constitution and by-laws on 7 January 1967, requesting recognition by the IOC as the international governing body of amateur softball.41 The IOC approved the application from the ISF
at the 65th Session held in Tehran from 6 to 8 May 1967.\textsuperscript{42} Since then, the ISF had been an IOC recognized IF until it merged with the International Baseball Federation (IBAF) to form a single organization for both baseball and softball in 2013.

At the end of 1968, the ISF submitted its first application to be included on the Olympic Programme in Munich. In his letter to Porter on 7 January 1969, J. W. Westerhoff, Secretary General of IOC, expressed that “the Executive Board in general is against any additional events in the Games. As it stands at the moment, everybody wants to reduce the size and cost of the Games.”\textsuperscript{43} The ISF filed its second application on 1 April 1971 for the 1976 Montreal Games. A historic change of the ISF’s strategy occurred later in its application. Initially it was applying for both men’s and women’s competitions to be included on the Programme. Two months later, the ISF removed the men’s component of the application and kept the women’s component only.\textsuperscript{44} This strategy remained consistent for the next 42 years, and played an important role in softball’s eventual inclusion.

A strategy for a sport to be included on the Olympic Programme is to be a demonstration sport at the Olympic Games. Several sports, such as Judo, badminton and baseball, have used this strategy to help achieve their goals.\textsuperscript{45} Softball had two opportunities to be listed as a demonstration sport at the Olympic Games, the 1984 Los Angeles and 1992 Barcelona Games. Unfortunately, however, neither of them was realized. Since the 1992 Games in Barcelona, Spain, the IOC has stopped including demonstration sports at the Olympic Games. The result of this decision required softball to use another strategy to achieve its goal of being an Olympic sport.
Softball in the Olympic Games

Finally, softball was included, as an exceptional case, on the Programme of the 1996 Atlanta Games, at the 97th IOC Session held in Birmingham, UK, in 1991. Its inclusion, however, was somewhat unusual. Prior to 1991, hosting cities of the Olympic Games were decided at the Session six years ahead of the event, and the Programme for those Games were usually set at the same Session. When Atlanta was elected as the host city of the Centennial Olympic Games on 18 September 1990, at the 96th Session in Tokyo, softball was not on the Programme. As Ron Radigonda, the Executive Director of the ASA indicated, Juan Antonio Samaranch, the IOC President at the time, was the driving force of softball’s inclusion. He pushed for softball’s addition to the Programme for the Atlanta Games with the main purpose of increasing gender equity in Olympic participation. Since softball was only applying for its women’s competition, its inclusion added 120 female athletes to the Games. Because of the popularity of softball in the USA and the existing venue for the competitions, the Atlanta organizing committee agreed to the shorter than normal timeline.

In 1996, softball gave a successful debut on the Olympic stage. Eight teams qualified to compete in the Olympic Games, with the hosting team, USA, winning the gold medal. Combining the birthplace of the game, the dominance of the home team, and the reaction of the crowds and the broadcast viewers, it is logical to conclude that members of the ISF were confident of softball’s continuation in the Olympic Programme. The confidence seemed very reasonable, and their expectations were soon realized. At the IOC Executive Board meeting held between 5 and 8 November 1996 in Cancun, Mexico, it was decided to provisionally include softball on the Programme of the 2000
In 2000, the USA softball team won the gold medal for the second time in Sydney. At the IOC Executive Board meeting held between 11 and 13 December 2000 in Lausanne, it was decided to include softball, along with taekwondo and triathlon on the 2004 Athens Olympic Games Programme officially. As a matter of fact, rather than at the successful 1996 Atlanta Games, this was the time when softball really secured its position in the Olympic Programme. However, it did not take long for a commission of the IOC to cast doubt on its inclusion in the Programme.

In 2001, following the finalization of the Programme of the Athens Games, the IOC president requested the Olympic Programme Commission (OPC) to undertake further work in reviewing the Olympic Programme and recommending the Programme of the 2008 Beijing Games. The results of that review saw softball, along with baseball and modern pentathlon, recommended for exclusion on the Programme of the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games by the OPC in its report released in 2002 (hereinafter referred to as “OPC 2002 report”). Three months later at the 114th Session in Mexico City in November, the Executive Board decided that the recommendations of excluding the three sports should be directly voted on by the IOC Session. Fortunately, for the sake of softball, the Session did not accept the recommendation right away, but decided to postpone the decision on the exclusion until after the 2004 Athens Games to allow the related IFs to implement changes. The Session also approved the principles of a systematic review for the Olympic Programme and mandated the OPC to launch this review. In addition, it was decided that a maximum number of 28 sports would be utilized for future Summer Games. Softball seemed to survive the crisis, yet it was
just the beginning of its fatal failure of being excluded from the Olympic Programme; and although the decision to establish a 28-sport cap seemed irrelevant at that time, it would become a major block for softball’s Olympic reinstatement attempt.

From 14 to 23 August 2004, the USA softball team defeated every opponent and won the gold medal at the Athens Games, with nine straight wins and merely one run against in the final game. Three Olympic gold medals in a row was certainly a grand victory for the USA team. However, having such a dominating team at the Olympic Games may not necessarily have been a positive factor for the sport of softball.

After softball’s first appearance as an official sport on the Olympic Programme, the ISF was preparing its fourth showcase at the Olympic Games, when it was both shocked and surprised by the announcement excluding softball from the 2012 London Games. On 24 May 2005, the OPC submitted a fully developed report to the 117th IOC Session. The report did not make any recommendation on keeping or removing any sport, but provided detailed information of each sport in the Olympic Programme for the IOC Session to make its decisions. Later the same year, on 8 July at the 117th IOC Session held in Singapore, it was released that softball was not selected for the Programme for 2012 London. One day later, the reason why both baseball and softball were excluded from the Olympic Programme was provided. For baseball, it was the absence of the clean and best players; while for softball, it was lack of universal appeal.

A more detailed explanation of the reason for softball’s exclusion can actually be found in the OPC 2002 report. This report reviewed softball’s participation on a global level, and concluded that:
 [...] softball is popular in certain countries, but this popularity is not reflected throughout entire regions or continents. This has resulted in relatively low global broadcast and press levels.

In addition, the high cost of venue construction for the Olympic competition was noted. In particular this is caused by the need for softball-specific venues for competition and training, and the fact that due to the relatively low global participation, there are few cities having existing venues at the required level, or a demand for the use of such venues following the Games.\textsuperscript{56}

The lack of popularity can be rationalized by a simple examination of the medal table and participants of the Olympic Games. Coming from the birth place of the sport of softball, the USA women’s softball team was expected to be dominant. Moving towards the 1996 Games, it had won five out of eight world championships and kept a record of 110 wins and only one loss in the prior decade of international competition. The USA won all three gold medals in the Olympic Games prior to the decision of softball’s exclusion. The silver and bronze medals were divided up by Australia (one silver and two bronze) and Japan (one silver and one bronze), with an exception of the silver medal in 1996 Atlanta Games won by China. At every Olympic Games, where eight teams qualified for the competition, the total number of participants was twelve. Five out of the twelve teams, USA, China, Australia, Japan and Canada, participated in all three Games, with Chinese Taipei and Italy twice, and the remaining five teams, Netherlands, Puerto Rico, New Zealand, Cuba and Greece, each entered once.

The actual vote count was kept confidential when the IOC announced the decision to remove baseball and softball. It was not until the ISF requested the release that they were made aware that the tally was 52-52, which meant that softball was voted off the Olympic Programme with one abstention.\textsuperscript{57} Although the member’s name has never been released, one additional vote for inclusion would have provided the ISF with the
required simple majority to stay on the Programme.\textsuperscript{58}

Those involved in the softball tournament started their competition at the 2008 Beijing Games with significant hope for the future, and the result of softball’s possible last appearance on the Olympic stage gave everyone a surprise. The Japanese team defeated the dominant USA team 3-1 in the gold medal game. Although the unexpected outcome could be seen as an ironic response to the IOC’s rationale for excluding softball, it did not change the fact that softball would not be on the 2012 Olympic Programme. The removal of softball, along with baseball, marked the first sports to be removed from the Programme since 1936.

**The Olympic Movement and Structure**

The modern Olympic Movement along with the IOC, was created, by Baron Pierre de Coubertin on 23 June 1894 at the Paris International Congress. The first attempt of reviving the Olympic Games was brought up at the celebration of the formation of the Union des Societes Francaises de Sports Athletiques, on 25 November 1892. However, the motion of organizing modern Olympic Games did not receive many positive responses. Coubertin felt that most of the delegates perceived the Olympic Games as the same “mysteries of Eleusis or oracle of Delphi; things that were dead and could only be revived in a comic opera.”\textsuperscript{59} Despite the failure of the first effort, Coubertin prepared a second attempt by organizing an international congress, discussing the problem of amateurism in name only. Seventy-eight delegates from nine countries participated in the congress. This time, Coubertin’s plan of reviving the Olympic Games received unanimous support. Thus, on 23 June 1894, the Olympic Movement and the IOC were officially established.
The Olympic Movement

Coubertin’s devotion to sport was originally inspired by the loss of the Franco-Prussian War, where he attributed the loss to the physical inferiority of the average French youth. By the time Coubertin made the decision to revive the Olympic Games, he had outgrown the revenge that had been motivating him since his childhood. The inspiration of his interest in sports gradually shifted to a humanistic vision of a peaceful world. This vision developed into the values of Olympism, which are “a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind.”

To represent Coubertin’s spirit, the modern Olympic Movement, as defined by the IOC, is “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.” It encourages “a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles.” The climax of the movement is the Olympic Games which brings together the world’s top athletes at the great sports festival every two years.

“The Olympic Movement encompasses organizations, athletes and other persons who agree to be guided by the Olympic Charter.” Three main constituents of these organizations and individuals are identified, the IOC, the IFs and the National Olympic Committees (NOCs). The IOC plays the leading role in the Olympic Movement and recognizes the other organizations in the movement. The IFs, recognized by the IOC, govern their respective sports on a worldwide level in the movement. The NOCs represent their respective territories to qualify athletes to participate in the Olympic
Games. Besides the three main constituents, the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOGs) are also important components of the Olympic Movement. Although OCOGs are not permanent entities, they take main responsibilities to ensure the Olympic Games are celebrated on time. In addition, the National Sports Federations (NFs) are the direct entities that unite the athletes for a specific sport in a given territory. These five actors, the IOC, the NOCs, the IFs, the OCOGs, and the NFs, together form the classical system of the Olympic Movement.63

As an IF that is guided by the *Olympic Charter*, the ISF acts within the Olympic Movement. The ISF may have been influenced, directly or indirectly, by the above five types of entities in the process of its pursuit of Olympic reinstatement.

*Structure and Role of the IOC*

The IOC is the supreme authority and provides leadership of the Olympic Movement, whose mission is “to promote Olympism throughout the world and to lead the Olympic Movement.” 64 The IOC has 16 roles listed in the *Olympic Charter*, from promoting education of youth through sport to ensuring the regular celebration of the Olympic Games (see Appendix II).

Different from most other international organizations, which consist of nations or representatives of nations around the world, members of the IOC are natural persons, from various nations and territories, who are representing and promoting the IOC’s interests within their respective nations and territories. Currently, the maximum number of the IOC membership is 115, which consists of 70 independent members who are not associated with any function or office, 15 active athletes, and 30 members because of the position they hold within an IF or NOC. 65
The powers of the IOC are structured in three levels: the Session, the IOC Executive Board, and the President. The Session is the general meeting of the IOC, which all the members are obliged to participate. It is considered to be the IOC’s supreme organ that makes final decisions such as amendments to the *Olympic Charter*, the selection of the President, the host city of the Olympic Games, and the recognition of IFs (see Appendix III). The IOC holds a regular Session every year, and the president or a written request of more than one third of the members can call for a Session.66

Between the regular annual Sessions, the Executive Board is the organ that makes major decisions for the IOC. The Executive Board, chaired by the President, consists of four Vice-Presidents and ten other members, all of whom are elected by the Session. Every year, the Executive Board meets four or five times to assume the overall responsibility for the administration of the IOC and the management of its affairs (see Appendix IV). The Executive Board is able to delegate powers to its members, commissions within the IOC, and outside persons or entities.67

The President, elected by the Session through secret ballot, is the third level of the IOC’s administration. The President takes charge of the IOC when the Session or the IOC Executive Board is unable to be assembled to make decisions (see Appendix V). The term of the President is eight years with a renewable four years.68

Unlike the three governing levels of the IOC, commissions within the IOC do not hold administrative powers. They are created for the purpose of advising the Session, the Executive Board or the President on certain issues.69 For example, the OPC is created for reviewing and analyzing the Programme of sports, disciplines and events, as well as the number of athletes in each sport for the Summer and Winter Olympic Games,
and making recommendations to the Executive Board in this regard.\textsuperscript{70}

\textit{Structure and Role of the IFs}

An IF, the second of the three pillars of the Olympic Movement, is described as “a group of National Sports Federations and continental federations, at times completed by individuals, that wishes to promote and develop a specific sport or a group of sports disciplines on a world level.”\textsuperscript{71} Currently, there are nearly 100 IFs throughout the world governing almost 150 sports or disciplines. In order for a sport to be included on the Olympic Programme, an IF must be established and recognized by the IOC first. Out of the 100 IFs, only about 60 of them are recognized by the IOC. Although the IFs are perceived as independent and autonomous entities, the Olympic Movement and the IOC played a very influential role in the formation of many IFs. While only three out of the recognized IFs existed before the IOC, which are the International Gymnastics Federation formed in 1881, and the International Rowing Federation and the International Skating Union both established in 1892, most of them were created and developed through interactions with the IOC.

Despite the various scopes of the IF, the structure of them could be called essentially identical. The sizes and influence of IFs vary dramatically, from ones governing events equal or even bigger than the Olympic Games to ones managing just one sport/discipline with very few NF members. However, the structure of each IF can be seen as a copy of the IOC, powered with three levels of governance: a legislative body, an executive body, and a president, with various consultative committees. At the top of each IF is the legislative body, usually the Congress or General Assembly consisting of representatives of all the member NFs. Just as the Session to the IOC, the Congress or
General Assembly meets once every year or less often to make final decisions such as electing the members of the executive body, modifying the statutes, admitting new members, and approving the budget. The low frequency of the Congress meetings leaves large administrative room for the executive body to fill in.

The executive bodies of the IFs, commonly named the “Council” or “Executive Committee,” are usually elected by the Congress of the respective IF. The Council or Executive Committee usually meets several times a year to implement the decisions made by the Congress. The members of the council include a president, one to two vice-presidents, a treasurer, a secretary general and a few general members. The chairman, most of the time the president, and the secretary general retain very strong power within these councils, and sometimes exert considerable influence on both the legislative and executive bodies.

The IFs play a vital role in the Olympic Movement. For IFs managing sports on the Olympic Programme, one of their tasks is to assume the technical responsibility for the competitions and the running of them at the Olympic Games. They are also responsible for establishing the selection criteria for the athletes or teams at the Games in collaboration with the IOC. Besides the responsibilities within the Olympic Movement, the IFs have other tasks of legislation and execution, such as recognizing member NFs and promoting their sports around the world (see Appendix VI).72

The financing of an IF comes from various resources, including annual fees paid by the member NFs, the proceeds of fines and penalties, the sale of television broadcast rights, marketing rights, and contributions from the IOC. Among the different sources, the contributions from the IOC from the sale of television broadcast rights of the Olympic
Games accounts for a vital part of the income for some of the Olympic IFs. Once an IF loses its appearance on the Olympic Programme, it will stop receiving the Olympic television rights payment. This is a major reason why IFs want to achieve and maintain their Olympic Status.

Instead of dealing with the IOC alone, the IFs formed an organization, the General Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF) in 1967, later known as SportAccord, to protect their common interests as a counterweight to the powerful influence of the IOC. The GAISF has 108 members, including 92 sports federations, both Olympic and non-Olympic, and 16 associate members, which are organizations conducting activities closely related to the IFs. In an effort to undermine the negotiating power of the SportAccord, the IOC encouraged the Olympic IFs to form their own associations. Thus, the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF) and the Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations (AIOWSF) were created in 1982. The IFs that were recognized by the IOC but not yet on the Programme also formed their own entity, the Association of Recognized International Sport Federations (ARISF) to represent their common interest and serve as the forum for its member IFs. As a result, the power of the SportAccord is divided by designating executive council members from the above associations. Out of the eight council members, two are designated from members of ASOIF, one from AIOWSF, and two from ARISF. The remaining three council members are the president, one member designated by the Alliance of Independent Member of SportAccord, and one designated by the Association Members that do not belong to any of the above groups.
Structure and Role of the NOCs

The third pillar of the Olympic Movement is National Olympic Committees. Currently, there are 204 NOCs, whose missions are mainly to promote and develop the Olympic movement, and to select a team in their respective territories for competing at the Summer and Winter Olympic Games. In order to be recognized by the IOC, each NOC must bring together at least five NFs, three of which must be on the Olympic Programme. The NOCs appear to be territorial representatives of the IOC. As a matter of fact, being independent of the IOC, an NOC is a grouping of NFs administrated under the law of their own territories.

The NOCs also have organizations of their own. The Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC) was formed in 1979 to represent the interests of the NOCs mainly in their affairs with the Olympic Movement, even though it never initiated actions against the IOC. In addition to the ANOC, NOCs from different continents have their own respective associations: the Association of National Olympic Committees of Africa (ANOCA), the European Olympic Committees (EOC), the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA), the Oceania National Olympic Committees (ONOC), and the Pan American Sports Organization (PASO). All the five associations are affiliated to the ANOC. Each of them holds continental multi-sports events (junior level for the EOC) with their own member NOCs.

Structure and Role of the OCOGs

Although the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOG) is not included as one of the three pillars of the Olympic Movement, it does play a vital role in staging every Olympic Games. Unlike the three pillars, the OCOG, whose life span
normally lasts about eight to nine years, is not a permanent entity. The host city of the
Olympic Games is now determined seven years ahead. Once the host city is announced,
the OCOG is created within the next eight months with a few staff members, part of
which are inherited from the Candidature Committee. It then has about six years to
prepare for the Olympic Games. The structure of the organization changes significantly
with increasing size about half a year prior to the Olympic Games. Once the Games is
over, the organization shrinks again to a few dozen staff members and eventually
disbands within one or two years.75

Besides its irreplaceable role in staging the Olympic Games, the OCOG is also
able to influence the adding of sports to the Programme, even though it is the IOC’s
responsibility to make final decisions. Sports that have originated from or are popular
in the host country tend to contribute to medals for the host. Thus, the OCOG would try
to add such sports to the Programme. Judo, a modern combat sport that started in Japan,
was added to the Summer Games Programme at the 1964 Tokyo Games and contributed
three gold medals and one silver medal to the host team. Handball is a very popular
sport in Europe. It first appeared at the 1936 Berlin Games, and then officially joined the
Programme at the 1972 Munich Games. Sometimes, such sports do not make the
official Programme, but the OCOG can still introduce them as demonstration sports,
which could lead to a better chance to be included in the future. For example, the
Korean sport taekwondo was a demonstration sport at the 1988 Seoul Games, and later
became a full medal sport at the 2000 Summer Games, contributing three gold medals
and one silver to the Korean team. Although the IOC decided to eliminate
demonstration sports from the Olympic Games after 1992, the OCOG still has the
possibility of staging a sport at the same time as the Olympic Games. For instance, the 2008 Beijing Organizing Committee received permission to organize a tournament for Wushu, a form of martial arts, during the Olympic Games.

**Defining Organizations and Institutions**

A number of authors have attempted to define organizations in the published literature. For example, Doede Keuning defines organizations as “a cooperative goal-realizing unit in which participants consciously enter into a mutual relationship and work together in order to attain common goals.” Derek Rollinson also indicates that an organization is a “social entity brought into existence and sustained in an ongoing way by humans to serve some purpose, from which it follows that human activities in that entity are normally structured and coordinated towards achieving some purpose.” Both definitions define organization from an inside perspective with some similar elements, such as the goal of the organization, while they also vary in their own ways. Keuning’s definition focuses on the individual and group level more, while Rollinson emphasizes the structure of the organization.

Although a single definition of the term organization has not been widely accepted, a list of the essential elements that are commonly included in various definitions is provided by Packianathan Chelladurai in his book *Managing Organizations for Sport and Physical Activity: A Systems Perspective*. Chelladurai summarized four components of a typical definition in the classical view of organizations:

1. More than one person;
2. The members’ contributions are specialized;
3. These specialized functions are coordinated;
4. A common goal is being sought.

Jerome Quarterman agrees with the above summary in his co-edited book *Contemporary...*
Sport Management, and defines a sport organization as “a deliberately structured and coordinated system of individuals and groups with special skills and talents in the sport industry working together to achieve a common set of goals.” By the above definition, the ISF can be described as an organization that is a deliberately structured and coordinated system of individuals and groups with special skills and talents in the realm of softball working together to achieve a common set of goals, one of which is to reinstate the sport on the Olympic Programme. However, without including any element of the environment of organizations, all the above definitions lack the ability to describe the organizations’ external interactions.

In order to address the effects of the organization’s environment, a systems view tries to include the element of being linked to the external environment into the definition of organization. Daft attempts to define organizations as social entities that are goal-directed, are designed as deliberately structured and coordinated activity systems. He further states that “an organization cannot exist without interacting with ... elements of the external environment.” The systems view of organizations not only draws out the basic elements in the classical view, but also emphasizes the relationships among these elements, and their interactions with the environment. Chelladurai also shares the idea that an organization can be perceived as an open system, which interacts with the environment in which the organization resides. He asserts that “organizations are open systems in that they influence and are influenced by the social, cultural, and economic conditions of the community in which they operate.”

To clarify the external environment of a given organization, the term “organizational field” was used by DiMaggio and Powell. They defined organizational
field as:

Those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products.  

Richard W. Scott further indicates that an organizational field encompasses three components:

1. A diverse array of organizations working within a given arena or domain—the given individual organizations themselves;
2. The exchange partners, customers, competitors, intermediary actors, regulators, and funding agents—their organization set; and
3. The existence of organizations exhibiting the same general features and competing for the same resources—their organization population.

Scott asserts that the concepts of organizational field, set, and population enable scholars to establish a more visible and palpable image of the relevant environment for a given organization.

In the case of the ISF, its organizational field is the Olympic Movement, while all the organizations within the Olympic Movement compose the organization set of the IFs. Within its organizational field, all of the IOC-recognized IFs that intend to include their sports or those that are already on the Olympic Programme are competing for the same resources. Thus, they can be seen as the organization population of the ISF.

Institution is a term that sometimes causes confusion with organizations. In Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities, Scott provides an encompassing definition of institutions: “Institutions comprise regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life.” Scott further explains that institutions exhibit distinctive properties:

1. Institutions are social structures and relatively resistant to change;
2. Institutions are made up of symbolic elements, associated behaviors and material resources;
3. The central ingredients of institutions are symbolic systems, which consist of rules, norms, and cultural-cognitive beliefs.

He asserts that regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements are the three pillars of institutions. For this study, the institutions in question are the rules, norms, and beliefs that functions within the realm of the Olympic Movement.

**Institutional Theory**

*Introduction*

Chelladurai proclaims that “a systems view of organizations is extremely useful for portraying the social, cultural, and economic forces that impinge upon the organization.” Three theoretical frameworks have been developed for understanding environmental dynamics: (1) stakeholder theory; (2) institutional theory; and (3) resource dependence theory.

Among these three theories, institutional theory provides a view of inter-organizational relationships that describe how organizations survive and succeed through congruence between the organization and the expectations from its environment. It explains how organizations become isomorphic, which is institutionally similar and structurally alike, through the same or similar environmental pressures. A significant volume of research utilizing this theoretical approach can be found within the realm of sport management. Some highlights include works from Scott R. Jedlicka and Thomas M. Hunt using institutional theory to explain the shift in attitude of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization towards anti-doping policy; Jonathon R. Edwards, Daniel S. Mason, and Marvin Washington examining the pressures exerted upon Alberta’s provincial amateur sport organizations by
the provincial government through institutional theory;\textsuperscript{89} and Becca Leopkey and Milena Parent investigating the emergence and evolution of Olympic legacy and its governance by applying institutional theory as a theoretical framework.\textsuperscript{90}

Although the ISF did not succeed in reinstating softball to the Olympic Programme, it did become similar to other organizations (IFs) in its organizational field, the Olympic Movement. Institutional theory provides a strong foundation for deepening our understanding of what influences the ISF might have received during the process of its Olympic reinstatement attempts.

\textit{Early Institutional Theory}

Although institutional theory is used to explain organizational behaviour, the emergence of institutional theory is much earlier than the beginning of study on organizations. Early institutional theories were formulated between 1880 and the mid-20th century, and practiced in three disciplines: economics; political science; and sociology.\textsuperscript{91}

The earliest institutional arguments arose in Germany and Austria in the late 19th century. A collection of economists led by Gustav Schmoller believed that “economic processes operated within a social framework that was in turn shaped by a set of cultural and historical forces,” and “[historical] and comparative research was required to discern the distinctive properties of particular economic systems.”\textsuperscript{92} On the other side of the debate was the Viennese economist Carl Menger, “who insisted on the utility of simplifying assumptions and the value of developing economic principles that were both abstract and timeless.”\textsuperscript{93} The debate sharpened and perfected the arguments of both sides and nurtured a number of American institutional economists who were trained in
Germany. Three of them, Thorstein Veblen, John Commons, and Westley Mitchell, became quite influential by the turn of the century. Although there were important differences in their views, all three institutional economists emphasized the importance of change. However, only a few economists attempted to carry forward the institutionalists’ agenda until the rise of the new institutional economics in the 1970s.

Early institutional theory in political science focused on the legal framework and administrative arrangements characterizing particular governance structures mainly on a nation-state level. Later in the mid-1930s and continuing through the 1960s, the institutional perspective of political science was challenged and supplanted by the behaviourist.94

Compared to economists and political scientists, sociologists have been paying much more attention to institutions. Hebert Spencer viewed society as an organic system with specialized institutional subsystems evolving through time. These concepts were adopted by William Graham Sumner. Sumner developed the idea of institution with two components: concept, which provides the purpose or functions of the institution; while structures materialize the concept of the institution. Later generations of sociologists recognized the centrality of institutions as a sociological focus.95

Despite the early start of the study of institution by economists, political scientists and sociologists, most of these early works paid very little attention to organizations. It was not until the 1940s and 1950s, theorists started to categorize organizations as distinctive types of social forms, distinguished from nation-state institutions and the behaviour of individuals.96
Old-Institutional Theory vs. Neo-Institutional Theory

Works of institutional theory began to connect to organizations in the 1940s, the results of which saw “old-institutional theory” establish its dominance until the 1970s. The leading figure of the old-institutional theory is Philip Selznick. Selznick and his colleagues tend to distinguish organizations as mechanistic instruments designed to achieve specified goals and organizations as adaptive, organic systems affected by the social characteristics of their internal and external environments. Selznick views institution as a process that reflects the organization’s own distinctive history, the people who have been in it, the groups it embodies and the vested interests they have created, and the way it has adapted to its environment.97

Talcott Parsons focused on examining the relationship between an organization and its environment. Parsons argued that wider normative structures within societies serve to legitimize the existence of organizations; in addition, they legitimize the necessary main functional patterns of operation to implement the values of the organizations. Parsons sees organizations as having three distinctive levels: the technical, managerial and institutional. The technical level is the production activities; the managerial level is control and coordination activities; and the institutional level is concerned with relating the organization to the norms and conventions of the community and society.98

The founding arguments of neo-institutional theory were introduced by David Silverman. Silverman proposed an “action” theory of organization in contrast to Parsons’ and Selznick’s structural-functional views of organization, which is overly concerned with stability, order and system maintenance. Contrary to the prevailing
systems view, which sees a social system constrained by a series of impersonal processes, the action theory argues that action derives from the meanings that people attach to their actions and emphasizes the constraints on people are the way in which they socially construct their reality.99

John Meyer and Brian Rowan developed the view of institutions as complexes of cultural rules. They assert that organizations are not simply the product of increasing technical sophistication, but result from the increasing rationalization of cultural rules. Meyer and Scott and DiMaggio and Powell further elaborated on the environmental perspective. Meyer and Scott proposed that all organizations are shaped by both technical and institutional forces. DiMaggio and Powell indicated that coercive, mimetic, and normative mechanisms are three important isomorphic processes that change the institutions of organizations. Both groups of authors identified the organizational field as a distinctive level of study in institutional theory.100

Isomorphism and Three Pillars of Institutions

Isomorphism is the term used to represent the movement towards similarity of form or structure. DiMaggio and Powell define isomorphism as a “constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions.”101 Organizational fields display considerable diversity in both their approach and form when they are initially established. However, the organizations within the fields become isomorphic, that is similar, in their forms and practices through the maturation of the fields.

In addition, DiMaggio and Powell proclaim that there are two types of isomorphism: competitive and institutional. They suggest that competitive isomorphism
“is most relevant for those fields in which free and open competition exists.” But “it does not represent a fully adequate picture of the modern world of organizations.” They further indicate that because “organizations compete not just for resources and customers, but for political power and institutional legitimacy, for social as well as economic fitness,” the competitive isomorphism needs to be supplemented by institutional isomorphism, which takes the outside world, other organizations, into account.\textsuperscript{102}

Three mechanisms of institutional isomorphic change are identified by DiMaggio and Powell: “1) \textit{coercive isomorphism} that stems from political influence and the problem of legitimacy; 2) \textit{mimetic isomorphism} resulting from standard responses to uncertainty; and 3) \textit{normative isomorphism} associated with professionalization.”\textsuperscript{103}

Coercive isomorphism occurs when external political and social influences exert pressures, formally and informally, on organizations to behave in similar ways. The fact that the ISF receives a portion of its budget from the IOC could create such coercive pressure. In conjunction with the financial support it receives from the IOC, the ISF may also receive specific requests to modify its structure or activities.

Mimetic isomorphism is concerned with organizations imitating other organizations and becoming similar to them in their quest for legitimacy and support from their environments. DiMaggio and Powell assert that “when organizational technologies are poorly understood, when goals are ambiguous, or when the environment creates symbolic uncertainty, organizations may model themselves on other organizations.” For example, when softball was dropped from the Olympic Programme, a symbolic uncertainty about whether it can go back on the Programme was created by the environment. As one of very few IFs that is headquartered in the USA, the ISF
responded by opening an office in Lausanne, Switzerland, in February 2009, where dozens of other IFs have established their headquarters.\textsuperscript{104}

Normative isomorphism is associated with professionalization; similar behaviour resulting from the value and belief systems of decision makers. DiMaggio and Powell indicate that there are two sources of professionalization: “the resting of formal education and of legitimation in a cognitive base produced by university specialists,” and “the growth and elaboration of professional networks that span organizations and across which new models diffuse rapidly.” Most managers and their supporting personnel in similar positions acquired their organizational norms through similar mechanisms.\textsuperscript{105}
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides information relative to the methodology that has been used for this study. The goal of this chapter is to explain the approach that has been used thereby establishing its appropriateness to address the research question. The chapter includes sections on the philosophical worldview that guided this study, the research question, research design, data sources, data analysis, ethical procedures, limitations, and delimitations.

Philosophical Worldview

In order to design a research project, it is important to identify the philosophical worldview proposed in the research. Such information helps explain why the researcher chooses the research approach(es) for the project. A philosophical worldview, although hidden in research most of the time, can be seen as a set of basic beliefs and guidelines that direct human action, the research in this case. A different worldview often leads to the adoption of different research approaches. Four main worldviews are cited by John Creswell in his text *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, which are: the postpositivist worldview; the social constructivist worldview; the advocacy and participatory worldview; and the pragmatic worldview.¹

Researchers holding a postpositivist worldview believe that a relatively stable and objective reality exists. Careful observation and measurement are how postpositivists obtain knowledge of the objective reality. However, this reality can only be known imperfectly and probabilistically. The laws or theories governing the world, as a part of the objective reality, need to be tested and refined, in order to understand them. In
addition, the postpositivists pursue separation between the researcher and the subject of research, and believe the separation produces the best exposure of the tested theories. The postpositivist worldview often results in quantitative research.  

Another worldview that is often proposed in research is the social constructivist worldview. Social constructivists also believe that the world is independent of human minds as postpositivists do. However, contrary to the postpositivists, the social constructivists believe that human knowledge of the world is always socially constructed by the subjective meanings of individuals’ experiences, which are varied and multiple. In order to gain such knowledge, open-ended questions need to be used that are broad and general. Qualitative research is mostly utilized by researchers with such a worldview.  

The advocacy and participatory worldview carries what social constructivists believe even further. In the advocacy and participatory worldview, not only is the knowledge of the world varied and multiple, but the reality of the world and the research inquiry are also intertwined. In other words, the lives of the participants and the researcher may be changed by the research action agenda. This worldview can be a foundation for both qualitative and quantitative research.  

Finally, the pragmatic worldview, which is the worldview that guides this study, is different from all three of the aforementioned worldviews. The pragmatic worldview focuses on solutions to a research problem. Thus, by using this worldview, researchers are free to choose any research approach available in order to address the research question, which often results in mixed-methods approaches. Instead of choosing from the duality between reality of the world independent of the mind and within the mind, pragmatists believe in what works at the time. Therefore, the knowledge gained through
a pragmatic worldview is tied tightly to the situation studied. It is also important to acknowledge that in a pragmatic worldview, the gained knowledge is interpreted with the researcher’s unbiased and biased perspectives, because the researcher has a strong interest in softball, as well as a rich experience in working with national, continental, and international softball federations.5

Research Question

The research question guiding this study can be articulated as follows: What, if any, were the influences of the IOC and other involved organizations on the ISF during its attempts to regain Olympic status following softball’s exclusion at the 117th Session in Singapore in 2005 to the decision rendered at the 125th Session in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 2013? The researcher raised four sub questions, in order to answer the research question:

1. Why did the ISF seek softball’s reinstatement to the Olympic Programme?
2. How did the ISF seek reinstatement during this period?
3. What organizations influenced the ISF during its attempted reinstatement?
4. What influences did these organizations have on the ISF during this process?

Research Design

Research designs, also known as modes of inquiry, include two main types: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative research is “a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables.” It uses statistical techniques to test and refine theories with statistical results, while qualitative research uses non-quantitative techniques to gain an in-depth understanding of a research problem.
Qualitative research is defined as “a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem.” It generally serves the purpose of describing a problem, issue, phenomenon, or situation without providing quantified data, but with insights into the study subjects with rich details. A combination of both the quantitative and qualitative research is called mixed-methods research, which uses both techniques as a complementary method to each other. In this study, a qualitative research design was used to answer the research questions that have been raised.

Within qualitative research falls template analysis, which is a style of thematic analysis. Compared to other qualitative research strategies, such as grounded theory, or interpretative phenomenological analysis, template analysis provides researchers with a strategy that better fits in the pragmatic worldview. In addition, the flexibility of the coding structure in template analysis allows researchers not only to develop a set of rudimentary templates, but also to continue revising them.

Semi-structured interviews and document analysis were used to conduct this qualitative research. Semi-structured interviews are very popular within the field of sport management. They often start with an initial question that guides the interview, which is followed by probing questions for the researcher to gain additional information, as it is often to be expected that the respondents have had a particular experience that will be elaborated on beyond the set questions. The researcher set out to conduct 12 interviews with key actors, with 10 of the interviewees generated through expert sampling and 2 interviewees identified through an expended expert sampling list. Due to a number of factors beyond the researcher’s control, a total of seven interviews were
conducted, five of which were from the original 10 interviewees identified for this study. The five interview participants from the original list included Don Porter, former President of the ISF; E.T. Colvin, North America continental Vice President of the ISF; Richard Pound, former Vice President of the IOC; Xu Yang, Secretary General of the CSA and Ron Radigonda, former Executive Director of the ASA. Because of the low response rate from the original list, the researcher expended the candidate interviewees to include other senior managers from the same organizations. The interviewees from the expended list included Rex Capil, former chairman of the Softball New Zealand, and Michael Schmidt, Executive Director of the WBSC and the IBAF (See Appendix VII for detailed biographies). Candidate interviewees recommended via snowball sampling during the interviews overlapped those were identified in the original list, which confirmed that the importance of these individuals during softball’s Olympic reinstatement attempts. The participants represent key actors during the process of such attempts, and have had extensive experience within the Olympic Movement. Interviews were conducted with these individuals in order to gain their knowledge on the process by which the ISF attempted to reinstate softball to the Olympic Programme. The interview candidates were contacted via telephone, E-mail, and/or fax. The use of semi-structured interviews, including both open- and close-ended questions, allowed the interviewer to probe with flexibility and to ask follow-up questions (see Appendix VIII for interview scripts).

Document analysis is a method most frequently used in qualitative studies, sometimes as a supplement to other methods such as interviews and observations. This method provides the necessary history of the organization in question and the context
surrounding it. It is also an advantage to the researcher that the “nonreactive” nature of reviewing documents does not require the cooperation of the research subjects.¹²

Data Sources

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used to explore and examine the influences that were exerted upon the ISF during its attempts to regain softball’s Olympic status. Primary sources of data included interviews with aforementioned interviewees, who were involved during the process in question. The interviewees were carefully chosen because of their firsthand knowledge and experience of the research topic. Thus, neither confidentiality nor anonymity was provided to the interviewees.

Primary sources of data also included historical documents, such as press releases from the ISF, press releases, reports, and the Olympic Charter from the IOC online archives, publications and rules from the OCA, as well as articles from the press relating to the softball’s reinstatement attempts. Secondary sources of data included interviews of the identified key players conducted by other parties.

Data Analysis

Due to the geographic location of the interviewees, the interviews were conducted over the phone in a period varying between 25 minutes and 45 minutes. The interviews were digitally recorded with the participants’ oral consents. The recordings were saved on a secured computer in a secured location at the University of Windsor. Following the interviews, the recordings were transcribed verbatim. For interview conducted in Chinese, the transcripts were translated into English by the researcher. The translations were then reviewed by a qualified person to ensure the accuracy. In order to provide a means to lower the social risks on the interview participants, member checking was
utilized. Four of the seven participants gave the researcher approval without reviewing the transcripts. The completed transcripts were sent to the three participants who requested a review at the end of the interview for revising and/or comment.

After the transcript reviews from the participants were completed, the researcher analyzed both the primary and secondary sources of data by conducting template analysis. An initial template of themes was established based on the neo-institutional theory for coding. Emerging themes were then added to the template while it was applied to the full data set. The information collected from the interviews allowed the researcher to interpret the participants’ perspectives of what influences were exerted on the ISF from other organizations.

Triangulation involves “examining the consistency of information generated by different data collection techniques, or by examining different data gathered by the same collection techniques.” With the purpose of reducing the likelihood of misinterpretation and verifying the repeatability of the interpretations, data-source triangulation was used among the findings from the interviews, other primary data sources, and the findings from secondary data sources in this study. Consistency of information generated by different participants was examined. In addition, the findings from other primary data sources and from secondary data sources were used to either confirm the thoughts and perspectives of the participants, or to contrast their thoughts and perspectives.

**Ethical Procedures**

The approval of the University of Windsor’s Research Ethics Board (REB) was acquired prior to the interviews being conducted for this study. As part of the policies
and procedures outlined by the REB, the researcher completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2) tutorial on research ethics. Prior to participating in the study, participants were given a Letter of Information and a Consent Form, explaining the purpose and design of the study, and what they could expect to encounter as participants in this study. All participants gave their oral consent to participate in the study as well as to being recorded during the interviews. Oral consent was provided and recorded at the beginning of the interviews as an alternative to the hardcopy consent forms. Contact information of the Chair of the REB was also provided to the participants should they have any question or concern regarding the study.

**Limitations**

The researcher acknowledged the following limitations to the study and has attempted to minimize them:

1. Due to the limited sample size of the study, it is not suggested to generalize the information gathered in this study to other IFs.

2. The participants’ responses to the interview questions may have been misinterpreted by the researcher even after clarification was sought.

3. Not all individuals that the researcher wished to interview for this study agreed to participate and/or were available for interviewing.

4. Not all documents pertaining to this research project were made available for examination by the researcher. These include, but were not limited to, contemporary IOC meeting minutes, the meeting minutes from the ISF, the IBAF and the WBSC.

5. Considering the researcher’s experience working as an administrative
official at a softball NF, the researcher’s bias is acknowledged (see Appendix IX for researcher’s personal biography).

**Delimitations**

The researcher has delimited the study to the timeframe of 2005-2013. The timeframe starts in 2005 because that was when softball was voted out of the Olympic Summer Programme, along with baseball. It ends in 2013 when softball failed, for the second time, to be selected during the 125th Session at Buenos Aires. In addition, both key players to softball’s inclusion in the Olympic Programme changed in the ISF and the IOC. Both Don Porter and the IOC President Jacques Rogge, left their positions as president after this point in time.

The participant recruitment period was confined to one month due to time constraints.
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CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Reasons for Seeking Reinstatement

Being included in the Olympic Programme plays a vital role in the development of a sport. According to the document submitted by the ISF to the OPC for the 2016 bidding federations’ report to the IOC (hereinafter referred to as “OPC 2016 report”), “Inclusion in the Olympic programme is critical to the continued global development of a sport which so clearly enshrines Olympic ideals and which has so much to offer the Olympic Movement.”¹

The OPC 2016 report provided a clear overview of the impacts on softball broken down into four aspects. The first half of the following paragraph highlights the financial importance of inclusion to the sport and the ISF:

Olympic funding will enable the ISF to maintain the momentum of global development built up in recent years.

It will allow the ISF to continue to foster global development in many ways, including the supply of softball equipment to member federations whose own resources are limited, enabling them to encourage participation and develop programmes within their own countries. Equally, it will enable the ISF to continue to deliver vital educational programmes for both officials and athletes.

Olympic funding will also enable softball to maintain its presence at multi-sport events such as the World Games, Asian Games and Pan-American Games. Each of these events provides an important touch-point with diverse communities, introducing them to the sport, awakening interest and encouraging participation.²

The importance of Olympic funding is also reflected in ISF’s President Porter’s statement of how softball was affected by the exclusion. According to Porter:

[…] being dropped from the Olympic Programme, right away funding became a problem because the IOC provides a substantial amount of funding to the International Federations of sports on the Olympic Programme and so that funding stopped after the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing.³
Former Executive Director of the ASA, Ron Radigonda, agreed, stating,

[…] when softball was a part of the Olympics, the ISF received a portion of the television rights money from the IOC after each Olympic Games participated. So, when they were no longer participating in the Olympics, they were no longer receiving any of the television money that was distributed by the IOC for the International Federations.4

The Secretary General of the CSA, Xu Yang, echoed the ISF’s report by stating:

Because the modern Olympic Games is a well commercialized multi-sport festival, the participating IFs receive a portion of the sponsorship of the Olympic Games. Such funding would be absent if the sport was excluded from the Olympic Programme. [...] from what I heard, an Olympic sport [federation] could receive about $4 million dollars [per quadrennium]. If this figure is correct, it makes up over 50 percent of the ISF’s funding in recent years.5

Although the figure of the funding received may not be accurate, it was consistent to other “ballpark” figures from other sources. Rex Capil, former chairman of Softball New Zealand, recalled the figure falling between $4 and $5 million dollars each Olympic Games.6 Lacy Lee Baker, the Executive Director of the National Fastpitch Coaches Association estimated the funding would have been more than $7 million dollars every four years.7 Porter also mentioned the amount of funding received, “[…] in the beginning, between about $4 million dollars to a top amount of $8 million,” was received by the ISF8 In addition to the direct funding from the IOC, Xu Yang also believed that the inclusion had an impact on other financial resources of the sport. He stated:

If [softball] is included in the Olympic Programme, being on such a platform, it would raise some attentions and investment from corporations, society and governments. Without such a platform, or not being on the platform, the attention received and investment will decrease.9

The impact on the sport certainly goes beyond the financial aspects. The OPC 2016 report indicated that the development of the sport would benefit from inclusion, stating:
Likewise, the regional qualification system developed for the Olympic Games has provided a significant stimulus for creating interest in our sport around the world. Participation in the Games will provide further opportunities to build upon so much that has been achieved to date.\(^\text{10}\)

The document submitted by the WBSC to the OPC for the 2020 bidding federations’ report to the IOC (hereinafter referred to as “OPC 2020 report”) contained similar comments:

[...] the inclusion in the Olympic programme would enable the newly-formed IF, the WBSC, to more effectively grow its disciplines in regions of the world where resources and access are often a challenge. The Olympic Games would not only allow the expansion and acceleration of existing development programmes, but would also ensure that NOCs and public authorities, invest in these disciplines.\(^\text{11}\)

Xu Yang expressed concern about the effect of exclusion on the development of softball, especially among youth and children:

Some youth, or children, choose the sport based on what international platform it is on. If [softball] is not on such an international platform, they may not choose this sport to participate in, or not choose it as a lifetime hobby to develop.\(^\text{12}\)

He further suggested that such concern could be addressed by being included in the Olympic Programme. Furthermore, he emphasized the impact on the operational level of the organization in two aspects, one of which was the authority and credibility over the affiliated NFs, stating:

For a sport to be globalized, the ISF [...] needs to have the ability to coordinate and solidify its affiliated NFs. If [softball] is on the Olympic Programme, the NFs will have much stronger intentions to participate in the sport. For the NFs, it is inevitable to affiliate with the ISF in order to compete on the Olympic platform. Thus, it will be much easier for the ISF to solidify its affiliated NFs if softball is on the Olympic Programme.\(^\text{13}\)

The OPC 2020 report echoed this statement by indicating that “Olympic inclusion would also greatly strengthen the authority and credibility of the WBSC in relation to the professional players, teams and leagues around the world.”\(^\text{14}\) The other aspect of the
impact on the operational level of the organization Xu Yang mentioned has to do with the interaction between the ISF and other IFs, stating:

For an international organization, the interaction with similar sports is necessary if it desires to improve its better development. And the Olympic Games is a very good platform for such interactions. It is a must for other sports to use as a reference for their development [of softball], including the experiences of market operation, technical experiences, and other administrative experiences. 15

In addition to the impact on the sport of softball and its world governing body, the inclusion of the sport would also have an impact on the ISF’s affiliated NFs. The OPC 2016 report highlighted the financial impact on the NFs:

While the importance of direct Olympic funding to softball cannot be underestimated we are mindful of a second critical financial issue. Our inclusion on the Games Programme confers critical Olympic status, making our national federations more likely to receive essential funding from their National Olympic Committees and Sports Ministries. This endorsement is likely to prove particularly important at a time when international financial turbulence means that all such funding is, inevitably, under intense scrutiny. 16

Radigonda further explained the process:

It affected the funding for the USA not being on the Olympic Programme. […] United State Olympic Committee (USOC) fund for sports who participate in the Olympic and Pan American Games. And when softball was removed from the Olympic Programme, ASA / USA Softball funding from the USOC was drastically reduced. 17

Porter indicated that the effect was not only on the funding level but also on the organization’s development. He has stated that:

[The exclusion] created a problem within various countries where some countries looked to Olympic sports as elite sports that were worthy of more support financially; and therefore if you weren’t an Olympic sport in some countries, your sport might not get attention and might not get any funding. The funding of sports was up to each NOC within a country to determine. So, that presented two problems: stopping the sport from being funded as well as the development of the sport within that country. It also makes it very difficult when you are trying to promote and develop a sport in various countries and there’s no financial support to do that. 18
Lastly, being the largest multi-sport event, the Olympic Games essentially plays a life-changing role on the athletes who have the opportunity to participate. Thus, it is impossible to omit the impact on the athletes. According to the OPC 2016 report:

The Olympic Games generate a living narrative for all of the sports it embraces. The Games create heroes whose achievements on the greatest stage of all earn them the appreciation, respect and attention among an audience which extends far beyond that for a World Championship. The athletes who succeed at the Olympic Games have the stature to make them ambassadors not simply for softball but for sport and the Olympic Movement.\(^{19}\)

To summarize, the ISF sought Olympic reinstatement for the financial support it could have received both from the IOC and other sources due to its Olympic status. In addition, its inclusion was also pursued due to the advantage brought to the development of the sport and the credibility of the organization. Softball’s inclusion in the Olympic Programme would also financially benefit the ISF’s affiliated NFs, and essentially benefit the athletes who participate in the sport. Xu Yang provided a summary of these advantages by describing the Olympic Games as “[…] an excellent platform, a platform to showcase softball in front of the whole world, and a chance for softball athletes from all over the world to participate in a multi-sport games.”\(^{20}\)

**Reasons for Softball’s Exclusion**

In order to understand how the ISF prepared itself for its reinstatement efforts, it is important to examine the reasons why softball was removed from the Olympic Programme in the first place. The identification of these reasons provided the ISF a reference point from which to develop its strategies and thereby direct its actions in its reinstatement attempts. In ISF President Porter’s opinion, the exclusion of softball from the Olympic Programme occurred because “[…] the IOC felt that they needed to change the program to give opportunities to other sports that they felt would add something to
the Olympic program.” Such an opinion was confirmed in his discussion with the author. He stated that “it was [...] the feeling of some within the IOC, including the President, that they wanted to see the possibility of other sports being added to the Programme.” Although important, when looking deep into the issue, it is much more complicated than the inclusion of other sports.

The reason why sports were removed from the program emerged prior to softball’s exclusion. First, a cap of 28 sports, 301 events and approximately 10,500 athletes was approved for the Summer Games in 2002, at the 114th Session in Mexico City. Such a decision was mainly for the purpose of addressing the continued growth of the Olympic Games since 1980, which led to significant organizational challenges facing the OCOGs. However, the 28-sport cap created a problem when new sports wanted to be added to the Olympic Programme. Porter believed that the campaign of cutting sports from the programme starting in 2005 and was mainly due to the IOC’s intention to add new sports on the programme. He stated that:

The IOC, under the President of that time, Jacques Rogge, felt that there should be changes in the Programme and they wanted to review the possibility of other sports having an opportunity to participate in the Programme but in order to do that they would have to remove some sports in order to make room for new sports.

All 28 sports were voted on at the 117th Session in Singapore. Unfortunately, baseball and softball were the two sports removed from the programme thereby making room for potential sports.

Following the decision to exclude softball, the question was soon asked, why softball? Based on the IOC’s official statement, it seems very clear that softball was removed from the Olympic Programme because of its perceived lack of universality.
The OPC 2002 report supports such a conclusion, as mentioned in Chapter II. However, Porter disagreed with the IOC’s opinion of softball not being a global sport, and argues that this “is not the case because of the facts and figures that say otherwise.”

Furthermore, according to the ISF, the issue related to the competition venue was not perceived as a main contribution to softball’s removal. Porter indicated that the cost of the venue was not excessive, especially when pre-existing venues were being used.

Furthermore, he argued, the Olympic venues tend to be utilized after the Games.

Porter realized the exclusion might have had something to do with the ongoing association between baseball and softball, even though he was never informed of this through any official channel. When asked for comments on the relationship between softball’s exclusion and the IOC members’ perception of softball being women’s baseball, Porter did believe such a perception existed. In highlighting this point, he stated,

I think at one time it might have been the case because some IOC members who I had personal contacts with weren’t really familiar with softball, and some knew baseball only in certain instances. I think some identified softball as a version of women’s baseball. So, there may have been some confusion on that, […].

Yet, he was unsure how much such a perception contributed to the exclusion: “[…] but I’m not sure that really added to the issue as whether or not softball should remain on the Olympic Programme.”

On the contrary, such a perception was reflected in perspectives from within the IOC, and was considered as a key reason for softball’s exclusion. According to Richard Pound:

[The removal of softball was] a complicated series of issues. I would say in an organization where roughly half the members are European and are not particularly familiar with baseball and softball, and also the same would be true in large parts of Africa as well, that baseball and softball were viewed as essentially the same sport. Furthermore, baseball had been very problematic, in the sense that we were not
getting the best players from the countries involved. Baseball was very aggressive about not taking any steps to reduce drug use and the relationship with professional baseball at the time was very bad, and so I think people voted against baseball for that reason. I believe they thought softball was essentially women’s baseball [...]  

Baseball was removed because of the absence of the best athletes and its insufficient doping control, which softball did not share. In Pound’s opinion, such reasons were projected onto softball because of the IOC members’ unfamiliarity of the two sports, which caused softball’s removal. Xu Yang echoed this analysis, when he said:

In general, it was argued that softball was similar to baseball. And baseball has some aspects not approved by the IOC. For example, the professional players from Major League Baseball in the USA did not participate in the Olympic Games, which affected the attraction of the Olympic Games because it was not at the highest competition level. That is part of the reasons. Others said, the inactive execution of anti-doping policies was also part of the reasons. In addition, the IOC members’ unfamiliarity of baseball and softball during their discussion was part of the reason too. When they were voting, they did not know the two sports very well, and it might have had an impact on their vote, especially given the fact that baseball and softball were not as popular in Europe as in America and Asia. European IOC members occupy a bigger proportion in the IOC. Thus, relatively more members with limited understanding [of the sports], could affect the vote.

As such, it can be argued that being perceived as “women’s baseball” was a significant “unwritten reason” for softball’s exclusion from the Olympic Programme. 

Although the perception of softball being women’s baseball had something to do with the IOC members’ misunderstanding of the two sports, the foundation for their confusion can be traced back to softball’s management. Within the Olympic Movement baseball and softball were different sports managed by independent international governing bodies at the time of their exclusion. However, a few historical and organizational factors of the ISF might have contributed to the confusion. Prior to baseball and softball’s inclusion on the Olympic Games, baseball was listed as a demonstration sport at the 1984 Olympic Games. Porter had been working together
with Robert Smith, the President of the IBAF at time, to get both women’s softball and men’s baseball officially included on the Olympic Programme. When applying for inclusion in the 1992 Olympic Programme, W. W. “Bill” Kethan said that “we will continue our efforts to convince the IOC that softball and baseball are ideal sports for the Olympic Games.” When baseball was included on the 1992 Olympic Programme as a medal sport, softball was perceived as a possible gender balance to baseball. In addition, Porter tried to approach an IOC member under a single world governing body named International Confederation of Amateur Baseball/Softball. A letter from Porter to James Worrall, a retired Canadian IOC member, was obtained on the letterhead of the International Confederation of Amateur Baseball/Softball. In the letter, Porter tried to seek the support of Worrall for softball’s inclusion on the Olympic Games. Although the organization did not last long, it would be impossible to suggest that the existence of such a combined organization, and its communication with the IOC member on its letterhead, did not leave a perception suggesting softball’s association with baseball.

In addition to the issues at the world level, the national level of softball’s management was also problematic. Many of the ISF’s affiliated NFs have administrative ties with baseball. Riccardo Fraccari, President of the IBAF, indicated that 40 percent of its 125 plus affiliated member NFs were joint federations with softball. This was especially prevalent in Europe as the majority of the European NFs were joint federations. WBSC Executive Director, Michael Schmidt, who is also the IBAF Executive Director and former ESF Vice President, indicated that “[…] the baseball and softball federations in Europe are often combined federations – about 70% are combined. They might have seen both sports always as one.” E.T. Colvin, the
ISF’s Vice President – North America, also indicated that “a lot of [Latin American NFs] are joint federations.” The joint federations had existed for a long time in many countries, especially where shared facilities and support structures were essential for both sports to survive. This perceived association could be one of the significant reasons for the confusion within the minds of many IOC members, especially for the members from Europe.

In addition to the disadvantage from its perceived association with baseball, softball was not without its own problems. As stated in the OPC 2002 report, low popularity was one of the more obvious reasons for softball’s exclusion, especially in Europe and Africa. Such low popularity can be reflected in both Pound and Yang’s statements indicating that the IOC members from Europe and Africa were unfamiliar with baseball and softball. It was also reflected in the ISF’s later efforts of development, which were focused mostly on Europe and Africa. Besides the lack of universality, difficulty in television broadcasting coordination was also a concern. According to Xu Yang, “it takes a very long time to broadcast baseball and softball, and its uncertainty of length also affected its television broadcasting and communication.” Such a characteristic contributed to a relatively low global broadcasting coverage.

**Reconsideration at 2012 Olympic Games**

The ISF’s immediate reaction to the IOC’s decision was to request that they reconsider their decision to remove softball from the 2012 Olympic Programme. Within three months of their removal, Porter led a softball delegation composed of himself, the ISF Director of Competition, Laurie Gouthro, and six athletes to meet with President Rogge, to address the vote resulting in softball’s removal. The ISF’s efforts were
successful and resulted in a potential reconsideration of the decision.

Rogge indicated that he had received a petition, signed by 45 IOC members, asking for a reconsideration of baseball and softball’s exclusion.\textsuperscript{44} Noting the petition, he decided to conduct a two-step vote process for the reconsideration. The first step was a vote taken on the reconsideration and if it should be included on the agenda of the 118th Session in Torino during the 2006 Winter Games. The second step, if supported, would see a vote on the decision to exclude softball. Unfortunately, softball did not receive the required votes to proceed to the second step, with 43 votes for and 47 votes against.\textsuperscript{45} Rogge believed that the previous decision to remove softball was supported by the results. He said, “The IOC session here twice took the same decision. And that is something I believe we have to respect.”\textsuperscript{46} Thus, the door for softball and its inclusion in the 2012 Games was closed.

\textbf{Bidding for Inclusion at the 2016 Olympic Games}

Going into 2006, the ISF had to shift its focus away from Olympic reinstatement temporarily due to an important event in its schedule. The XI Women’s World Championship, held from 27 August to 5 September, were to be staged at the same venue where the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games softball competitions would be held. The championship also served as the Olympic Test Event for softball, as well as a qualification for four teams for the 2008 Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{47} Following the successful staging of the championship, the ISF was able to refocus on its Olympic reinstatement attempt, but this time for the 2016 Olympic Games.

During a meeting held on 31 August 2006, six months after the IOC’s decision in Torino, the ISF decided to form a Strategic Task Force. The Task Force had but one
mission, regaining softball’s Olympic status for the 2016 Olympic Games at the 121st Session in 2009. Former IOC President Samaranch agreed to serve as the honorary chairperson in October. The rest of the Task Force was comprised of ISF and national softball federation officials, IOC members, NOC members, and international business and media representatives. The Task Force held its first meeting in January 2007 in Lausanne, Switzerland. The symbolic location, home to the IOC and many other sport governing bodies, was deliberate. An integrated strategic plan which covered international communication and Olympic Family relations was drafted at the meeting. The Task Force held its second meeting from 14 to 15 April at the ISF’s headquarters in Plant City, Florida. The integrated strategic plan was further discussed at that meeting and was developed into the blueprint that directed the campaign for ISF’s 2016 reinstatement efforts.

The official blueprint was released in June 2007, when the ISF launched “Back Softball,” the campaign for the reinstatement of softball at the 2016 Olympic Games. The blueprint contained ten points (see Appendix X) designed to better fulfill the criteria used by the IOC to assess sports for the Olympic Programme (see Appendix XI), and to address the issues that resulted in softball being voted off the Programme. When examining the blueprint point by point, the emphases of the ISF’s reinstatement plan coincidently match the reasons mentioned above. The first seven points on the blueprint were targeting the universality and/or popularity of the sport. They were planned to be done by increasing worldwide softball population, especially in youth, women and people with disabilities, by improving the competition level of the sport in certain areas, by leveraging the continuous usage of the existing facilities, and by enlarging the television
coverage to strengthen the communication of the sport. Point No. 8 was designed to differentiate softball from other sports. More specifically, it was intended to clarify the confusion caused by its association with baseball without identifying the sport by name. Point No. 9 was for the development of diverse administrative personnel with a focus on gender equity. Finally, Point No. 10 addressed the additional value softball provided to the Olympic Games.

The blueprint reflects what the ISF perceived as the reasons why softball was voted off the Olympic program, and it directed the ISF’s action through the reinstatement attempt for the 2016 Games. It is clear that the ISF put an emphasis on the universality and popularity aspect of the sport in its blueprint. Other issues such as diversity of the administration and the association with baseball were also listed, yet not given the same priority as universality and popularity.

The ISF devoted its efforts on making progress in every aspect of the blueprint. Prior to the 2008 Beijing Games, the ISF published a report to demonstrate the achievements it had accomplished since softball was removed from the Programme (see Appendix XII). As Don Porter described it:

A comprehensive health-check of our sport worldwide and it is clear that we are making progress against all the ambitious targets we set ourselves when we launched the Back Softball campaign for the reinstatement of softball to the Olympic Programme in 2016.

Some of the highlights in the report demonstrated the achievement in increasing universality and popularity of the sport, including the increase in the number of affiliated NFs from 126 to 130, the 20% increase in worldwide participation, and highlighting the fact that softball was integrated in school systems in the countries of more than half of the member NFs. New media, such as Facebook, YouTube, and Sportingo were
introduced as additions to more traditional media for increased popularity.\textsuperscript{58} On the infrastructure side, European training centres were established in Russia and Italy to support the development of softball.\textsuperscript{59} Another means used by the ISF to increase popularity in Europe was to open an office in Lausanne, Switzerland. Porter believed this move would also “forge stronger relationships with member federations and potential new federations in Europe.”\textsuperscript{60} Despite the associated high operation and maintenance costs, the ISF kept the office throughout the bidding campaign for the 2016 Games. “Since softball was not reinstated for the Olympic Programme we saw no sense for us to continue to have an office there. […] Our federation felt that having the office there wasn’t necessary.”\textsuperscript{61} Eventually, the office was closed after the Back Softball campaign folded.

Distancing itself from baseball was another important part of the ISF’s reinstatement strategy, although it was not emphasized as a high priority. This strategy was designed to attack the biggest unwritten reason for softball’s exclusion, association with baseball, and was maintained through the entire Back Softball Campaign. It was perceived that “the International Softball Federation has always made a priority of refuting any connections with baseball.”\textsuperscript{62} As listed in the blueprint, the ISF urged those affiliated NFs which were still in a joint federation with baseball to be independent. By April 2008, ten NFs were listed on the progress report which had been working to become separated from baseball, with seven from Europe, two from Africa and one from Asia.\textsuperscript{63}

Despite its efforts, the ISF was struggling to achieve the unstated goal of escaping the shadow of baseball. First, not all federations sharing similar relationships agreed
with such a move. Harvey Schiller, former President of the IBAF from 2007 to 2009, indicated that “many federations have contacted us saying it’s their desire to stay combined and there are probably a lot of reasons – the relationship that pre-existed, the joint use of fields and in many, many cases the economics.” Furthermore, he expressed that “each federation has to do what’s in its own best interest but where it’s worked together I would hope they would stay together.” Schiller’s statements clearly indicated that a disagreement over the necessity of separating the merged national federations existed between the ISF and the IBAF. The ISF itself acknowledged that it was unable to enforce its own policy and achieve zero contact with baseball. In 2008, Porter signed the regional training centre agreement in Italy with Fraccari, who had been the President of the Italian Baseball Softball Federation since 2001. In addition, Fraccari had been the first Vice President of the European Baseball Confederation since 2005, and what is even more ironic was that he was elected the President of the IBAF in 2009 after Schiller.

Indeed, the ISF encountered some difficulties in its quest of requiring affiliated NFs to separate from their joint baseball federations, yet it was able to resist calls from the IBAF to work together on Olympic reinstatement. Contrary to the ISF, which had been distancing itself from baseball and trying to promote softball as a sport for both men and women, the IBAF accepted the request and tried to embrace baseball’s association with softball because baseball did not have a women’s discipline. In Pound’s opinion, “[the ISF and IBAF] certainly understood the arrangement that [they] would be considered loosely as a single federation and that the men’s event would be baseball and the women’s would be softball.” Such an opinion was reflected in Schiller’s statement
that “a lot of people believe baseball and softball might do well to go into the Olympic together – men’s and women’s […]” Thus, the IBAF tried to partner with softball officially, and raised a joint bid proposal, which was delivered to Porter by Schiller personally in February 2009. However, Porter rejected the proposal in just a few days, stating that:

Having looked at all the factors involved, the ISF has decided that softball will not combine with any other sport and stands by the current proposals to the International Olympic Committee submitted in our recent response to their questionnaire.

The ISF proposal to the IOC is for an elite women's softball discipline with the option of an elite men's discipline if desired. In addition, he further emphasized that the best way to expand softball was “[…] to remain firmly independent in all the major multi-sport Games – including the Olympic Games.” By the time the Executive Board made the decision of which sports would be recommended to the IOC Session, softball had maintained its bid as a single sport with a women’s discipline only.

The ISF’s rejection of the joint bid proposal ended the IBAF’s attempt to pair up with softball as baseball’s official gender equality. However, it did not stop the IBAF’s efforts to be recognized as a full discipline. In April 2009, the IBAF started to head in the opposite direction, seeking the inclusion of women’s baseball. Schiller introduced the consideration of including women’s baseball in the IBAF’s proposal, stating:

There’s been a great amount of talk about adding women’s baseball over the past year but recently the growth of the sport in places where baseball is already popular, as well as the request by new federations to increase the number of young girls playing in baseball, has led us to move ahead and amend our 2016 proposal.

Although such a move was most likely too late for a positive result of the IOC’s short-list
decision in four months, it was certainly not too late to have some negative effects on softball. Baker wondered “what the ‘women’s baseball’ factor will do to the vote. They are both bat and ball sports, and they both have women named ‘Donna’ lobbying for their attention […].” She further criticized the IBAF, noting that its action “can only confuse an already befuddled International Olympic Committee. And […] baseball is going head-to-head with softball, and it’s very unlikely that both sports will be invited back.” Indeed, it was too late for women’s baseball to be included in the IBAF’s proposal to the IOC, and baseball was submitted as a single sport with a men’s discipline only.

Besides baseball and softball, the other five sports bidding for inclusion at the 2016 Games were golf, rugby sevens, karate, roller sports and squash. The IOC Executive Board met on 13 August 2009 in Berlin and identified two of the seven sports for a vote in the IOC Session in October, which did not include softball. To be voted as a recommended sport, it had to receive an absolute majority of the total 14 valid ballots, thus 8 votes. The sport receiving no ballot or the least is excluded from the next round until a winning sport is generated. When more than one sport received the least number of ballots, a sub-round was used as a tie breaker, and the one with the least ballots was excluded from the next round. Roller sports and squash were excluded by receiving no votes in the first round of the election for the first sport. Rugby won the first spot by receiving 9 votes in the second round. Then it took four additional rounds to elect golf as the second recommended sport, winning with 9 votes in the last round. During the entire election process, baseball and softball never received more than two ballots, and baseball did not make it to the final round for the second sport (see Appendix
XIII for detailed votes).\textsuperscript{76} Softball’s 2016 Olympic bidding journey stopped before even reaching the real final trial; so did baseball. Schiller seemed to anticipate this moment. He commented hours before the voting began:

If we are rejected the decision will be based on the roster sizes of both baseball and softball. I don’t believe one can be brought in without the other based on gender concerns.

We have reached out to softball on numerous occasions including the last hours to no avail. If baseball is added, there may be concerns with the women's game and vice versa for softball. They should have listened!\textsuperscript{77}

**Bidding for Inclusion at the 2020 Olympic Games**

Following the failure of the 2016 bid, the ISF did not immediately move to launch its next campaign for the 2020 Olympic Games. Instead, the organization did some self-renovation on its administrative leadership and brand image. The ISF XXIV Congress elected a new Secretary General, and the 1st and 2nd Vice Presidents in October 2009. A new position of Non-Spanish-speaking Caribbean Vice President was also created.\textsuperscript{78} Two weeks after the Congress, the ISF announced a modernized logo, incorporating all five Olympic colours and the Back Softball logo. At the same time, the ISF’s official Web domain also changed from www.internationalsoftball.com to www.ISFsoftball.org.\textsuperscript{79} Within six months of that change, the ISF set up a Twitter account to further embrace interacting with fans through social media.\textsuperscript{80} Half a year later, the ISF then hired Helios, a company that had been helping manage other successful Olympic bid campaigns, to fully manage sponsorship on behalf of the organization.\textsuperscript{81}

During the XII Women’s World Championship in Caracas, Venezuela, from 23 June to 2 July 2010, the ISF’s Board of Directors met and formally decided to continue...
efforts of reinstatement to the Olympic Program. Only this time, the Board of Directors voted unanimously to support proposing a full sport – both women’s and men’s fast pitch softball – for consideration for the 2020 Olympic Games. About a month after the ISF’s decision, Fraccari, the newly elected President of the IBAF, proposed a joint baseball-softball bid again to the ISF for the 2020 Games, stating that it was the “only way back in to the Olympic program” for both baseball and softball. Porter rejected the IBAF’s proposal in early August 2010, and emphasized the independence of softball and its capability to meet all the criteria for Olympic inclusion on its own in his response to Fraccari. What he did not know at the time was that something would soon change the relationship between baseball and softball.

The rejection from the ISF seemed harsh to the IBAF and with no possibility to be changed. However, the communication between the two organizations did not simply stop. The ISF had already started to reconsider if proposing softball as a single sport was the best way to approach their attempts at Olympic reinstatement since the unsuccessful result of the Back Softball campaign, and especially after discussions with various IOC members, many of whom indicated that a joint bid from baseball and softball would be stronger for both. Porter indicated:

[…] after 2009 when the campaign for 2016 was concluded and golf and rugby seven were approved for that Programme. We had to take another look to see whether or not an independent bid would be more successful than a joint bid. Such reconsideration and ongoing consultation with various IOC members led to resumption of the communication between the two IFs in 2011. Porter indicated that they:

[…] had several discussions during February and March and again in London during SportAccord as to whether there is a way we could work together but still retain our identity as individual sports. I think that’s very important, both to us and to baseball.
While the ISF and the IBAF started to discuss the possibility of a joint bid, something happened on the other side of the planet that not only boosted the communication, but also provide a chance to put the idea of a joint bid into practice in the Asian Games, the second largest multi-sport Games next to the Olympic Games. During the 2010 Guangzhou Asian Games, the OCA held its 29th General Assembly. The sports programme for the next Asian Games, 2014 Incheon, Korea, was supposed to be approved during this meeting, but the organizing committee and the OCA were unable to reach an agreement. The OCA required a maximum 35 sports programme, which included the 28 sports approved for the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Olympic Games, and 7 additional sports from a pool of 10 sports. The 7 additional sports “may be proposed by the organizing committee, and decided by the OCA President, with approval of the [Executive Board] subject to the ratification of the [General Assembly].”\(^85\) The 7 additional sports proposed by the Incheon organizing committee included baseball, bowling, kabaddi, sepak takraw, softball, squash and wushu, but the OCA preferred cricket and karate to be included. The disagreement pushed back the approval of the sport programme, and the Executive Board planned to resolve it during its meeting at the 2nd Asian Beach Games in Muscat from 8 to 16 December 2010.\(^86\)

At the Executive Board meeting, the OCA tried to replace baseball and softball with cricket and karate. Eventually, an agreement was reached on 8 December 2010, due to the fact that the OCA has the sole authority to approve the sports programme of the Asian Games. Cricket and karate were added on the programme as the OCA required, and the organizing committee was able to keep baseball because of its popularity in Korea, but not softball.\(^87\)
The SCA reacted immediately to this decision. As the President of the SCA, Low Beng Choo presented a passionate plea to the OCA Executive Board during its 57th meeting on 31 January 2011. Low asked the Executive Board to consider including softball in the 2014 Asian Games as baseball’s female discipline of one sport yet under the two respective separate independent Asian Sport Federations. The SCA’s request received the full support from the Baseball Federation of Asia (BFA). OCA President Sheikh Ahmad Al-Fahad Al-Sabh, who was also an IOC member, approved of the proposal and recommended that softball be included in the 2014 Asian Games along with baseball. In addition, his suggestion that baseball and softball should be treated as one sport in all future Asian Games was widely supported in the meeting. With the OCA President’s approval, the inclusion of softball in the Asian Games was very close to being guaranteed. The sports program was later approved by the Executive Board on 13 July 2011, and submitted to the General Assembly on the next day for ratification. The final affirmation of the joint-proposal was anticipated given the OCA President’s previous approval.

The successful inclusion of softball in the programme of the 2014 Asian Games as a discipline of baseball was a result of an agreement between the ISF and the IBAF. Both presidents of the ISF and IBAF were on hand to hold talks and await the programme to be officially ratified by the OCA. Considering Low’s position in the SCA and the ISF, as well as the impact of the inclusion on the ISF’s Olympic bid, sufficient attention was paid by Porter, who felt the success of the joint bidding in the Asian Games presenting a possible alternative for the ISF to approach its Olympic reinstatement. When interviewed about the possibility of joining with baseball, he referred to the Asian
Games in the following statement, “there were ways we felt we could work together, and we have done that in some other parts of the world in some competitions where we’ve been able to share venues and scheduling times and other technical parts of our sports.”

The presence of Fraccari also emphasized the significant symbolic meaning of such a historical event in the process of cooperation between baseball and softball.

Nevertheless, the success of baseball and softball’s first joint bid in a multi-sport Games still marked a milestone in their cooperation, and implied a brighter future for the possibility of a joint bid for inclusion in the Olympic Games. Fraccari expressed his sense of optimism:

> Softball's pairing with baseball as part of the Asian Games program is a great sign given to us by the Olympic Council of Asia.

> We are all very happy with the positive outcome here in Tokyo, as this will guarantee the inclusion of more female athletes. This result is also a strong indicator of the cooperation between the baseball and softball camps, and speaks of the potential for our institutions to move forward in such a manner.

Schmidt echoed Fraccari’s comments, stating “I think that was just a first step or first try to see how they were to work together, and to check the possibility. […] It was successful, and softball could stay also in the Asian Games through combining with baseball. So, that was a first step in the final direction.”

As a matter of fact, the cooperation of the two sports had already started to spread to other parts of the baseball and softball world even before the OCA announced softball’s inclusion. Although technically the joint bid for the Asian Games was an effort between the SCA and the BFA, such an action was perceived as a further compromise on the ISF’s policy of resisting cooperation with the IBAF. Since most of the European NFs were already joint federations and given Fraccari’s deep involvement
in both European baseball and softball, such a renewed spirit between baseball and softball was soon reflected in Europe. During the Confederation of European Baseball (CEB) annual Congress held on 10 to 13 March 2011 in Brussels, top officials from the European Softball Federation (ESF), including President Andre van Overbeek, who was also the ISF Vice President – Europe, and those from the CEB, including President Martin Miller, who was former President of the German Baseball and Softball Federation from 1988 to 2001, met to discuss the development of baseball and softball in Europe and the possibility of collaboration between the two organizations. A joint statement from the CEB and the ESF was released on 11 March 2011 at the CEB Congress. According to the statement:

[…] after many years of separate development, it will now be far more productive for the two sports and their Continental Federations in Europe to work together to promote and develop baseball and softball, grow participation and broaden the impact of the sports on the European sporting landscape.96

The collaboration would begin with youth player development, facility development, combining events, joint ventures for funding, and joint Congress. The statement also indicated that the cooperation of the two organizations was part of the changing climate of the relation between baseball and softball. They both believed that the alliance of the ESF and the CEB would have a wider significance, possibly leading to a future joint bid for inclusion in the Olympic Games.97 Given the changing environment and emerging momentum, such a vision of a joint bid soon started to materialize.

Since the ISF and the IBAF had already worked together on the Asian Games event, it was a natural move to take a step further down the road, toward their shared goal of Olympic reinstatement. On 1 April 2011, the two IFs publicly announced that “they [had] agreed to explore the feasibility of collaborating on a single, joint presentation to
the IOC seeking to restore softball and baseball onto the Programme of the Olympic Games in 2020." The two organizations continued to meet and discuss the possibility of a joint bid during the SportAccord convention in London, UK, in April, 2011. In London, they also had an opportunity to meet with the IOC sports director Cristophe Dubi, who oversees the sport components of the Olympic Games and manages relations with the IFs. In Low’s memo to the ISF Board of Directors and affiliated NFs, a description of the discussion was provided as following:

[The] meeting was to discuss the proposed joint collaboration between IBAF and ISF for the re-inclusion of both sports, Softball and Baseball, as one (1) for purposes of the Sports Programme for the Olympics, with both sports maintaining independence and running the respective sport under the respective International Federations. We also discussed how the proposed collaboration would be taken by the IOC in terms of the provisions of the Olympic Charter.

Porter indicated that Dubi was “somewhat positive at the time, but he couldn’t commit to anything because he had to review this with others as there were some possibilities of some legal issues and whether or not the Olympic Charter would allow it.”

The two IFs soon realized that there were issues to be addressed, including the insistence of the two organizations continuing “as separate and independent international federations.” Porter admitted that “although we think it’s advantageous to work together, there are a lot of issues, including meeting certain requirements in the IOC Charter. Only one federation can represent a single sport.” Unlike the Asian Games where baseball and softball’s joint bid was proposed by two independent federations, the IOC “indicated to both ISF and IBAF that any joint Softball-Baseball bid would have to be made by a single entity and not by 2 separate International Federations.” The answer to the IOC’s single entity requirement was forming the WBSC. Such an answer, however, did not come easily to either IF. Since the ISF and the IBAF resumed their
discussion in February 2011, it took 20 months for the two organizations to finally reach
a formal agreement. Porter explained the reason for taking such a long time:

There were a lot of things that had to be discussed in regards to how the joint
organization, the WBSC, would operate, how the distribution of voting power and
positions, official positions, officers and so forth and that took a lot of discussion
back and forth until we and the IBAF felt that everything that been discussed and
re-discussed over a period of time was okay and worked for both baseball and
softball.

Low urged the ISF members to submit suggestions on the joint bid, including the
name for the joint campaign, the name for the “softball-baseball” sport, on events and
activities for the campaign, and how the NFs could assist the campaign.104 However, in
three months, only two responses were received. She then encouraged the member NFs
to attend the next congress, in Oklahoma City, USA, from 27 to 30 October, 2011, where
a half day forum was to be held. She indicated that “the focus of the Forum would be
‘Joint Softball-Baseball Bid – Do we agree or not?’ and ‘Innovations and Changes to
Improve our Sport – The Way Forward?’”105 The congress decided to support the
continuation of talks with the IBAF.106 The Presidents from the IBAF and the ISF
seized every opportunity to discuss the details of the joint bid.107 The two organizations
also agreed to have a shared booth at the SportAccord convention in Quebec City,
Canada, from 20 to 25 May, 2012. Although a joint bid was unavailable to be submitted
to the IOC during the convention, Rogge did give a positive comment on the joint bid,
stating, “we will examine the memorandum of understanding that the 2 Federations will
send us and we will come back to them as soon as possible. But yes, a joint bid between
baseball and softball is a possibility.”108

Eventually, the two organizations announced the plan to merge into a single IF in
July 2012. A joint letter from Porter and Fraccari was submitted to the President and
Executive Board of the IOC. The letter stated the intention of proposing a single sport bid with two disciplines, men’s baseball and women’s softball, under a single IF for inclusion in the 2020 Olympic Programme. In October 2012, the IBAF and the ISF agreed on creating a new international federation to govern both baseball and softball exclusively, and signed a Memorandum of Understanding outlining the procedure for establishing the joint IF was signed by Porter and Fraccari in New York City, on 11 October 2012. Yet, the merger still needed to be approved by the congress of both the IBAF and the ISF to be official. By the end of the month, the ISF had held its special congress, and voted for the new IF for both baseball and softball with 71 percent in favour. The newly formed organization would manage the proposal to the IOC for inclusion of men’s baseball and women’s softball as two disciplines of a single bat-and-ball sport. In order to achieve the reinstatement in a short period of time, the head of the ISF consulted with the Helios Partners again, in November 2012, only this time together with the IBAF President. The two organizations agreed to let Helios Partners assist their campaign. The name of the new organization, the World Baseball Softball Confederation, was chosen prior to their presentation to the OPC in December 2012. The ISF and the IBAF made their presentation to the OPC for inclusion of baseball and softball in the 2020 Games, marking their first unified effort under the WBSC. In April 2013, the new federation, WBSC, was constitutionally born in Tokyo after the IBAF convened its congress approving the documents. Porter and Fraccari were co-Presidents of the new IF. A new campaign for baseball and softball’s reinstatement, “Swing for the Fences,” was also launched at the same time. However, about two months before the launch of the WBSC’s new campaign, the
unexpected exclusion of wrestling from the Olympic Programme dramatically altered baseball and softball’s path back to the Programme.\textsuperscript{116} Only seven months ahead of the vote for the sports on 2020 Games, many IOC members considered it was a mistake to remove wrestling, a traditional sport in the Olympic Games. Pound indicated that:

\[
\text{[\ldots]} \text{the IOC had also removed wrestling from the program and that caused a lot of difficulties, because it’s such a traditional Olympic sport. A majority of the members felt that it should be added back on and when they did that, there was no additional room for any new sports, [\ldots].} \text{\textsuperscript{117}}
\]

Even some of the officials from baseball and softball considered it was a mistake by the IOC to remove wrestling, and expected that wrestling to be the one reinstated.

According to Colvin:

\[
\text{[\ldots]} \text{once they removed wrestling there was such an uproar and outcry. [\ldots] I think there was such an outcry from so many countries when that happened that there was no way that baseball/softball could overcome that. [The IOC] quickly said “hey we made a mistake by taking wrestling out. We better put it back in.” We felt like that from the very beginning that it was going to be an uphill battle to try to overcome. It was one of those deals where even baseball and softball people looked at it and said “why would they do that? Why would you take the sport of wrestling out, as popular as it is, especially as popular as wrestling is in Europe and Asia?” We didn’t even understand why they did it. When it happened, we said “look we have no idea why they would do something like that to the sport of wrestling.” We even thought they ought to put it back in. [\ldots] It doesn’t matter that wrestling was beating us. It was just a matter of them correcting a mistake that they shouldn’t have made.} \text{\textsuperscript{118}}
\]

Radigonda made a similar statement:

\[
\text{[\ldots] when wrestling was removed, the outcry came about from all corners of the world, even from Russia, USA, every corner of the world got involved and say ‘you couldn't take wrestling out because it was one of the original sports of the Olympics.’ [\ldots]It had everything to do with that fact that people didn't want wrestling to be removed. That's why it got reinstated. I don't really think there was an opportunity for another sport to even have a chance to get put back on.} \text{\textsuperscript{119}}
\]

With such a strong opponent, baseball and softball still managed to make the cut for a final vote at the IOC Session, along with squash and wrestling.\textsuperscript{120} However, in the
end, wrestling polled 49 votes to win in the first round of voting, with baseball-softball second with 24 votes and squash third with 22 votes, at the 125th Session in Buenos Aires, in September 2013. Wrestling’s success, which led to inclusion on the 2020 and 2024 Olympic Programme, was described as “universally perceived as the likeliest winner in this three-way contest.”
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CHAPTER V
DISCUSSIONS

Throughout the two bids for inclusion in the Olympic Games, the ISF was the sole entity representing softball and interacting with other organizations affiliated with the Olympic Movement. This was supported by Radigonda who stated that the “ISF was the one recognized by the IOC, and they are the one who took care of all the business with the IOC.”\(^1\) He further indicated that although the NFs might conduct activities to support the ISF’s reinstatement efforts, the NFs did not interact with the IOC, the IBAF, or other organizations during their reinstatement efforts. During the reinstatement process, the ISF was influenced by a number of people and organizations, including the IOC, the IBAF, and the OCA. Using the neo-institutional theory as previously described, allows the researcher to divide these influences into three different categories of isomorphic changes: coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. These influences are discussed under each category as following.

**Coercive Isomorphism**

Coercive isomorphism is the first category, 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.”\(^2\) Such pressures may be felt as force, as persuasion, but they “can provide the guidelines by which an organization needs to abide by to seek recognition/acceptance from a regulatory agency.”\(^3\) In the case of the ISF, the regulatory agency was the IOC. This relationship was highlighted when Fraccari indicated that it was the IOC “approving our merger initiative and entrusting us to proceed in this direction.”\(^4\)
The IOC’s affects contain informal and formal influences. Informal influences include discussions with the IOC members, their suggestions, and the IOC Presidents’ agenda. The importance of communication with the IOC was recognized during the ISF’s Back Softball campaign for the 2016 Games, and was reflected in the establishment of its Lausanne office. Such an influence played a considerable role in the ISF’s bid for inclusion in the 2020 Olympic Games, especially during the later effort of joint bidding with the IBAF. The discussions with IOC members can be identified as the main reason why the ISF changed its position on mounting a joint bid after it had previously refused the IBAF’s proposal in August 2010. When asked the reason, Porter answered that:

[…] we felt at that instance we really didn’t need to tie ourselves to another sport until we had more conversations with other IOC members in different countries that felt perhaps a joint bid might be more successful.

[…] a number of us had opportunities to discuss very specific details with IOC members including a number of Executive Board members as to whether or not we should combine and the importance to softball and baseball. And the opinion of a number of IOC members that we, myself and others, had conversations with was that yes, a combined bid would present perhaps a stronger bid.5

Capil’s comments also echoed the IOC’s directions, indicating the only way for softball to be considered was a joint bid with baseball. He said:

I think it was the fact that it was highlighted that it was really a direction or the way that the IOC indicated would gain more support if it was a joint bid. […] so basically softball had to make the call by joining or having a joint bid. [It] was really the only way that they could see us seriously considered as a viable option for 2020. So it was finally listening to the direction or the directive that was provided by the IOC.6

When the ISF and the IBAF approached each other and agreed to work towards a joint bid, the initial plan was to propose inclusion via two separate and independent IFs. It was again the discussion with the IOC members that facilitated the understanding of the need to create a new federation. Porter said:
We’ve been discussing the best way to proceed with a lot of IOC members […]

I think the IOC, again various members, just felt that a stronger bid could be made by having both sports tied under one, so to speak, “umbrella” organization and that it would be more favourable to IOC members than two separate bids.

Capil also echoed the sentiment when he commented on the IOC’s expectations related to softball’s proposal for the 2020 Games:

I think [the IOC] wanted it to be shared with a joint bid, in a collective bid between baseball and softball. It would be able to cover both male and female involvement and I also think they wanted a united front, I suppose, to be in the proposal together.

Although Porter would not provide the name of specific IOC members who he had contact with, some of the names can be identified through other sources. Two of them were Pound and Al-Sabh. Pound indicated that he did have interactions with the ISF officers, and especially Don Porter. Porter recognized Pound’s contribution to softball, when he stated:

Dick Pound was always a good friend to our sport. […] and I think he felt that softball should be included back in the Olympic Games. I think it was also his opinion at one time, I think it was even public, that he felt that softball should not have been taken out of the Olympic program.

So, Dick Pound, yes, he’s always been supportive and very helpful in many things within in the Olympic movement.

Al-Sabh held the position on baseball and softball that they should have a combined proposal in the Asian Games. Although no evidence available suggesting what had been discussed during his meeting with the ISF and IBAF in Japan, in July 2011, it is reasonable for the researcher to speculate that Al-Sabh could hold the same position on their Olympic proposal, and could have discussed his position with them.

Such influences from the IOC overpowered the divergent opinions within the ISF.

A combined bid was supported by voices from Europe and Latin America where a
significant number of NFs were combined with baseball. As indicated by Schmidt, “for a lot of the combined federations a combined bid was for sure the right solution, because for them it is one sport.” Nevertheless, opinions against the joint bid did exist within the ISF, such as those voiced by various members from North American NFs and Oceanian NFs, which were relatively stronger forces within the ISF compared to the European and Latin American NFs. They preferred a separate bid with softball only, but they agreed that the IOC’s opinion played a significant role in softball’s inclusion attempts. As the Vice President – Oceania of the ISF, Capil said:

We believe that if we were serious about getting women’s softball roster back on the Programme, we found that [joint bid] was really our only option; but we would have preferred it to be a single men’s and women’s softball ballot that was put up.

Colvin also made similar comments relative to the North American’s perspective:

In North America, which represents Canada and the United States, we were, I don’t want to say opposed, but we did not support going together to go in as one. […] But […] , we didn’t do anything or make any type of effort to fight getting back in there. We just let everybody know we did not like it.

They both understood that the driving force of the IOC’s opinion exerted significant power on the idea of joint bidding for inclusion in the Olympic Programme. Capil said, “but [we] understand that [a single softball ballot] was not going to be considered favourably and so agreed to the joint approach with baseball.” Colvin also stated, “we didn’t think it was the best thing for us to do, but we didn’t do anything to try and keep it from happening, because we knew it was going to happen.” Such discussions soon clarified the IOC’s position to the ISF. It became clear that “the IOC is trying to make sure that all sports are open to both men and women, and the only practical way of doing that to have any chance of success was to have this hybrid federation.” Eventually, it
led to the ISF’s special congress in October 2012 to approve the merger of the two
federations.

The President of the IOC was also a significant influence on the ISF. As
President of the IOC at that time, Jacques Rogge’s personal intention to add new sports
played a vital role in the campaign of reviewing sports on the Olympic Programme. As
Porter mentioned, it was Rogge’s intention to facilitate the changes in the Olympic
Programme, and when “no other sports were approved at the 2005 IOC Session being
included in the Programme, […] President Rogge wanted to extend the process and so
they decided to again consider a certain number of sports to be added to the Olympic
Programme.”19 Pound also indicated that “[…] the fact that the President of the day was
very enthusiastic about rugby and had played it himself”19 played an important role in
adding new sports.

Formal influences from the IOC include the Olympic Charter, decisions of the
IOC Session, Executive Board, and reports of the IOC’s commissions. One of the major
sources of formal influences bestowed upon the IFs from the IOC is the Olympic Charter.
The Olympic Charter outlines the formal regulations that an IF must abide by if it wants
to achieve its goals within the Olympic Movement. The main goal of meeting with IOC
sports director Cristophe Dubi was to “see whether there were any problems from the
IOC’s standpoint. […] and see if there were any problems legally or as it refers to the
IOC Charter.”20 According to Rule 26 of the Olympic Charter:

In order to develop and promote the Olympic Movement, the IOC may recognise
as IFs international non-governmental organizations administering one or several
sports at world level and encompassing organizations administering such sports at
national level.21

Such a rule requires a single IF to be recognized for one sport prior to being added to the
Programme. Thus, it became necessary to create a new unified IF. The WBSC was thus created to represent baseball and softball as one sport before the IOC. Furthermore, even though the creation of the WBSC was a direct result of the IOC members’ suggestions, technically, it still needed to be recognized by the IOC as the world governing body of baseball and softball within the Olympic Movement.22

The second source of formal influences comes from the final decisions made by the IOC Session, the IOC’s supreme organ. At the 114th Session in Mexico City, the decision of establishing a cap of 28 sports, 301 events and approximately 10,500 athletes affected the strategy that the ISF adopted for their reinstatement attempts. For the 2016 Games, the ISF proposed softball as a women’s only sport. When answering why the men’s discipline was not included, Porter said,

We proposed one and only one at the time because the IOC was looking at the numbers, meaning the total number of athletes, which I believe was 10,500 athletes and that's capped and we wanted to be careful not to increase those numbers. That might make it difficult for our chances to be readmitted and so we decided to continue with our initial effort, which was to include women’s softball.23

When it came to the 2020 Olympic Games, the cap of 28 sports continued playing a role in the formation of the WBSC. Since there was only one spot available when wrestling was dropped from the Programme, it became very clear that baseball and softball would not make the reinstatement together as two separate sports. And the discussion with the IOC members implied that neither baseball nor softball would succeed if the reinstatement of the other was rejected. Thus, the only logical step was to merge the two sports into one. Radigonda’s statement revealed the rationale behind this decision:

[…] if we stay separate in our bid, it would mean that we would be competing against baseball for the one spot. If the two federations join into one bid, that meant there was no longer the competition of the diamond sports against each
other. [...] and by joining, we open the door for both sides. Here's the other part I think it's important, by joining with baseball, and having a singular bid for the Olympics, we become the largest sport based on participation in the world that is no longer on the Olympic Programme.24

The decisions from the Executive Board also affected the ISF substantially. The power of the Executive Board makes it able to set the tone of the IOC Sessions. Sports need to be recommended by the Executive Board in order to be voted by the Session. Softball’s failure to be shortlisted by the Executive Board with a very low vote provided a strong indication to the ISF that its strategy for the 2016 bid did not work. Such indication facilitated the reconsideration of the approach for softball’s reinstatement.

“Following that, the ISF then decided that it should take another look at trying to regain the Olympic status and started a negotiation with the [IBAF],” Porter said.25 For the 2020 Games, it was the Executive Board’s decision that one spot would be available for the Programme by dropping one sport during its meetings in Quebec City, Canada, from 23 to 25 May 2012. Rogge said, “We will make changes in the program and we will add one sport to the 2020 Games during the September 2013 session.”26 It was also the Executive Board’s decision to recommend that wrestling not be included on the list of core sports for the 2020 Olympic Games during its meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland, from 12 to 13 February 2013. Thus, wrestling would have to join baseball/softball and the other six sports to compete for the one vacancy.27 And again, during the Executive Board’s meeting in St Petersburg, Russia, from 29 to 31 May 2013, it was decided to recommended baseball/softball, squash and wrestling be proposed to the 125th IOC Session for possible inclusion on the 2020 Olympic Programme.28

A fourth formal influence comes from the OPC’s reports. Although the commissions in the IOC do not have the authority to make decisions, they do provide
recommendations to the Executive Board and the Session, as well as the rationales for those recommendations. The detailed explanation of the recommendation of excluding softball in the OPC 2002 report provided a guideline for the ISF to develop its Back Softball campaign blueprint. Such direction can also be found in the baseball-softball joint bidding process. The criticism on the cost of the baseball/softball venue urged their consideration of sharing venues and space in the Athletes’ Village.29 The WBSC proposed a streamlined six-day tournament for both baseball and softball running consecutively in one venue and using the same space in the Athletes’ Village.30 According to the OPC 2016 report, the cost for infrastructure of the baseball venue was $10 million USD,31 and $8 million USD for softball.32 By sharing venues, the cost for infrastructure in the combined bid for inclusion at the 2020 Games was reduced to $8 million USD for both sports.33

The bottom line is that the IOC, because of its monopolistic authority over the Olympic Programme, exerted tremendous coercive isomorphism on the ISF, both formally and informally. Thus, the most important strategy for the ISF was to understand what the majority of the IOC members were looking for in a sport and an IF. As Porter stated, “IOC members are the ones that vote on many things including the Olympic Programme structures. We thought that a lot of those members felt that a joint bid would be much more acceptable to the IOC membership.”34 After submitting a joint letter with Porter to the IOC for approval of the joint bid and merger, Fraccari also expressed a similar statement:

We have learned a lot from being excluded from the Games. And we have spent a lot of time listening to the IOC. After much reflection internally, but more importantly, after having spoken to many, many friends in the Olympic Movement, we understood that merging our two IFs was in our best interests, not
only for Olympic inclusion, but also and especially for our two sports in the long run.35

Schmidt shared the same opinion on this, stating that “If a sport wants to be in the Olympics it has to talk to the IOC, the sport has to listen to the IOC and learn from the IOC. A sport that wants to be in the Olympics has to follow and listen very well to the IOC, and deal with the IOC, and be a part of the Olympic Family.”36

**Mimetic Isomorphism**

The second category of the influences is mimetic isomorphism. According to DiMaggio and Powell, “uncertainty is also a powerful force that encourages imitation. […] Organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful.”37 When softball was excluded from the Olympic Programme, it was the first sport excluded in 69 years. Since there was no precedent recent enough to provide a roadmap of what would happen, it created dramatic uncertainty for softball’s future. Such uncertainty encouraged the ISF to model itself after other IFs whose governed sports were still on the Programme.

Although there is no direct evidence to suggest which specific organization(s) the ISF tried to model itself after, several actions during the reinstatement attempts reflected the imitation of more successful IFs. First, the ISF set up an office in Lausanne, Switzerland, where the IOC was headquartered. Porter indicated the reason for setting up an office there was to model other IFs, in order to have close contact with the IOC. He said:

At the time, it was felt that being in close proximity to the IOC headquarters was advantageous because many of the Olympic sports and even some non-Olympic sports had their headquarters in Lausanne and it was felt that if we were going to be campaigning and making contact with the IOC that perhaps having office arrangements would be advantageous.38
Hein Verbruggen, Chairman of GAISF, one of those organizations headquartered in Lausanne, also commented on the ISF having an office in Lausanne:

> Europe is a significant growth area for softball and it is important for the sport to have a base in the heart of Europe to manage the planning and marketing of the sport’s development. It is also very important to be close to the other summer federations to share best practices and solutions to some of the challenges faced by the global recession. In this respect Lausanne is the perfect place for the ISF to have an office. Equally, other federations will benefit from softball’s strengths in anti-doping policy and inclusiveness, particularly among women and young people.39

His comments not only highlighted the establishment of the office, but also indicated how such a move could lead to further imitation of others’ best practices. In addition, the proximity certainly was not only in the favor of the ISF imitating other IFs, but it was mutually beneficial to both sides.

Another means that embodied the organizational modeling is innovation. Modeling through innovation could be done consciously; it could be imitating others with imperfect attempts; and it could “unconsciously innovate by unwittingly acquiring some unexpected or unsought unique attributes […]”.40 During the second reinstatement attempt, the ISF changed its Web domain. The original Web domain was www.internationalsoftball.com, which did not reflect the name or abbreviation of the organization. Furthermore, the dot com suffix did not indicate the nature of the ISF as a non-profit organization. Originally, it was suggested that dot com be used mainly for companies, while for non-profit organizations, dot org was recommended. Although such suggestions soon became unsuitable, and registrants have the freedom to choose dot com or dot org, dot org domain is still generally used by non-profit organizations.41
abbreviations and end with dot org. For example, www.iaaf.org is the Web domain for International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF), www.fivb.org for International Volleyball Federation (FIVB), www.ibaf.org for International Baseball Federation (IBAF), and www.igfgolf.org for International Golf Federation (IGF). The ISF changed its Web domain to www.isfsoftball.org in November 2009, which clearly shows its abbreviation, sport, and the nature of the organization. The new Web domain used the same structure as what the IGF did, which coincidentally defeated softball just a few months prior to the change for a spot on the 2016 Programme. Although, without further evidence, it is not possible to definitively conclude that the ISF modeled itself on any other IF, it is safe to say that the change of the Web domain made the ISF more consistent with other IFs within the Olympic Movement. Although lacking the sources of the models, other innovations in the realm of social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Sportingo and the YouTube channel, could also be identified as organizational modeling.

In addition to the choice of the new Web domain with the same pattern as the one used by the IGF, the ISF also conducted another action similar to the IGF. The ISF, and later the WBSC, consulted with the Helios Partners, which was the consulting support provider to the IGF’s successful bid for inclusion at the 2016 Olympic Games. Helios Partners played an active role in the positioning of golf, aligning the IGF’s policies with the Olympic Movement’s goals and objectives, and creating bid materials and presentations. The Executive Director of the IGF, Ty Votaw, valued the services from Helios Partners, stating that, “Helios fulfilled a critical function as part of our team, helping get our message across effectively and make a powerful case for the return of golf to the Olympic Programme.” What drew the attention from the ISF was Helios’
successful history in helping cities and sports achieve their Olympic bid aspirations. Porter highlighted “their proven track record and impressive list of clients and contacts have all given us great confidence in taking them on for this important service to our Federation and our sport.” Two years later, the heads of both the ISF and IBAF engaged Helios Partners seeking the professional and experienced agency help to support their joint bid, and this was only a month after the two organizations signed the Memorandum of Understanding. Fraccari expressed the expectation that Helios would help get messages from the joint bid delivered, he said, “We have a great story to tell and Helios is the perfect partner to help us articulate that.”

**Normative Isomorphism**

The third category of the influences is normative isomorphism, which primarily relates to professionalization. DiMaggio and Powell defined professionalization as “the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work, to control the ‘production of producers,’ and to establish a cognitive base and legitimation for their occupational autonomy.” The value and belief systems gained through formal education and the growth and elaboration of professional networks are the two aspects of professionalization that lead to normative isomorphism.

In the case of the ISF, key individuals involved in the bidding process share similar background, such as involvement in the work of their own NFs, continental/international confederations, and their own NOCs. Don Porter was President of the ISF during the two bidding campaigns. Prior to his involvement in the ISF, Porter was named the Executive Director of the ASA. He served the U.S. Olympic Committee as chairman and member of a number of committees from 1984 to 1998.
Low Beng Choo, was the deputy Secretary General during the first campaign, and then the Secretary General. She was also President of the SCA, a member of the OCA, and Vice President of the Olympic Council Malaysia. She was a national athlete in softball and netball, obtained her Bachelor of Laws from the University of Malaya and Master of Science in Information Technology from University of Straffordshire, UK. From the other side of the table, Riccardo Fraccari, as the President of the IBAF, was the President of the Italian Baseball Softball Federation and a member of the Italian National Olympic Committee Council. He was also former First Vice President of the European Baseball Confederation from 2005 to 2009. Such similar experiences could result in similar cognition of how IFs interact with the IOC, and similar strategies adopted to behave within the Olympic Movement.

Professional firms were another source of normative isomorphism. Helios, the same group of personnel who had helped golf’s successful reinstatement, was assisting the ISF and later the WBSC with its bidding attempt. Because of the limited number of such firms within the Olympic bidding industry, it is probable that the same firm would be hired quite often. Schmidt indicated that “at the end, you have to say that there are only a certain number of companies around that do bids related to Olympics, whether it's for cities or for sports. So, if you want to have a really experienced Olympic involved company, there are only a handful of them that you can choose from.”47 Thus, the same value and belief systems were able to be applied across different IFs.

In addition, according to DiMaggio and Powell, “the professionalization of management tends to proceed in tandem with the structuration of organizational fields.”48 The exchange of information among IFs helps contribute to a commonly recognized
The IOC, being the central organization of the organizational fields, recognizes key IFs, such as IGF and the International Association of Athletics Federations by granting their governed sports to be selected on the Olympic Programme. Such recognitions give these IFs legitimacy and visibility, and lead competing IFs to copy aspects of their structure or operating procedures in hope of obtaining similar rewards. The statures and policies of the IOC were also reinforced by having representation on the boards of other organizations. IOC member Al-Sabh, as a result of being the President of the OCA, was able to demand a unified proposal from baseball and softball, which reinforced the IOC’s stature in the Asian Games. Thus, the IOC, as the central organization, manages to have its policies and structures being copied throughout the organizational field, the Olympic Movement. The IOC’s centrality is reinforced as IFs seek to secure positions in the Olympic Programme.

**Unfinished Business for the 2020 Games**

The second failure of softball’s reinstatement attempt was followed by the ISF’s 26th Congress in Cartagena, Colombia, in October 2013. During the congress, Porter announced his retirement from the role of President. Porter had been in the position for 26 years, since 1987; if one includes the 22 years he was the Secretary General, Porter had served the ISF for 48 years. Although the retirement appeared close to the result of softball’s bid for 2020 Games, Porter confirmed that they were not related. He said, “The 2020 decision has nothing to do with my decision, I had intended to step down after 46 years, which I felt was enough and allow for new leadership to take over and guide Softball that hopefully will include a return to the Olympics.”

Dale McMann, a Canadian, was elected as the new ISF President shortly thereafter.
Although the joint bid effort from baseball and softball failed to secure inclusion at the 2020 Olympic Games, the unified organization, WBSC, was retained. Unlike the International Confederation of Amateur Baseball/Softball, which disappeared after the inclusion of baseball and softball, it seemed the WBSC would continue to govern both baseball and softball into the foreseeable future. When explaining the future of the WBSC, Schmidt stated:

[…] this merger of the two federations which might have seen at the first that serving for the Olympics is growing and getting more productive every day for the benefit of both sports. I think as my total personal opinion, this merger was the right thing to do for these sports.

Of course, it takes some time to combine two federations that were separate for over 50 years. It's not something you can do within one day. Of course the Softball Division still takes care of softball technical issues as well the Baseball Division is doing this for baseball, but all other programmes, coaching clinics, administration, etc. are combined. And of course there is one board, one WBSC executive board, and the world governing body for Baseball and Softball is the WBSC.  

In May 2014, the WBSC held its inaugural congress in Hammamet, Tunisia, where Fraccari was elected as the first President of the WBSC, with Porter standing down in the election. The new leader for both baseball and softball would deal with the IOC, led by its new leader, Thomas Bach, elected at the 125th Session.  

Although the results of the vote at the 125th Session was final, the fate of baseball and softball is far from determined. Once again, the power of the IOC President’s office over the governance of the Olympic Movement would be demonstrated. Only two months after his election, Bach indicated that baseball and softball still had a chance of being included in the 2020 Olympics, especially considering both sports enjoyed high popularity in the hosting city, Tokyo. When being asked about the inclusion of baseball and softball at the 2020 Olympic Games at a news conference in Tokyo, Bach stated that
“this will be under discussion,” and further emphasized that he was “open for more flexibility in the Olympic program.” At the 127th IOC Session from 8 to 9 December 2014 in Monaco, Bach’s Olympic Agenda 2020 received unanimous approval from the membership. The agenda contains 40 recommendations, including abolishing the artificial 28 sports limit over the Summer Games. The new framework for the Summer Games Programme is based on the number of athletes, officials and events, instead of the number of sports. The OCOGs are also allowed to propose one or more sports to be included on the Programme for that edition of the Games.

Agenda 2020 cleared the way for the Tokyo OCOG to request for baseball and softball’s inclusion at the 2020 Olympic Games. It is, however, still too early to celebrate. As Schmidt stated, “[Agenda 2020] was decided only in December [2014] and until now there is no procedure approved on how this might be proposed. Of course, if the question is ‘if baseball and softball are a major sports in Japan,’ the answer is yes. The IOC has first to discuss and set up the procedures to implement the Agenda 2020 and only after that we will know more.” Thus, the inclusion of baseball and softball in the Olympic Programme remains unfinished business.
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Concluding Comments

The primary purpose of this research project was to analyze what, if any, were the influences of the IOC and other involved organizations on the ISF during its attempts to regain Olympic status following softball’s exclusion at the 117th Session in Singapore in 2005 to the decision rendered at the 125th Session in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 2013. In this case, the influences the ISF received during its Olympic reinstatement attempts included coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphisms. The primary source of influences is coercive isomorphism, and it 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 on the Olympic Programme.

In regard of the reasons why the ISF sought softball’s reinstatement to the Olympic Programme, the financial support from the IOC and other sources to the ISF and the sport of softball was the initial reason for the ISF’s reinstatement efforts. Its inclusion would also improve the development of softball around the world and the credibility of the ISF among its affiliated NFs. Furthermore, the ISF’s affiliated NFs would also benefit from softball’s reinstatement. The NFs would be able to receive more funding from respective NOCs, thus the development of their programmes may continue growing. Lastly, its inclusion would allow the participating athletes to reach higher than previously possible, as well as to earn them the appreciation, respect and attention in front of the entire family of the Olympic Movement.

In terms of how the ISF sought reinstatement, two different approaches were
selected to conduct the bids for inclusion at the 2016 and 2020 Olympic Games. Although softball did not achieve its goal of reinstatement, the improvement during the two attempts can still be identified. The bidding for the 2016 Olympic Games was carried out by the ISF itself, proposing softball as a sport with a women’s only discipline. The bid was presented without sufficient input from the IOC, and resulted in a lower number of ballots and a failure at the election during the IOC Executive Board meeting. The efforts made for inclusion at the 2020 Olympic Games resulted in a joint bid with baseball following extensive discussions with the IOC. Although baseball and softball did not make the Programme, their joint bid made it much further in the process, and received significant support when compared to their previous attempt.

The organizations that influenced the ISF during its reinstatement attempts included the IOC, the OCA, the IBAF, the IGF, and other IFs, as well as consulting firms in Olympic bidding industry, which individually or collectively exerted coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism upon the ISF. The IOC was the primary source of coercive isomorphism, which included both informal and formal influences. Informal influences came from discussions with the IOC members, their suggestions, and the IOC President’s personal agendas. The discussions with the IOC members and their suggestions provided not only a direction for the ISF and moved them toward a joint effort with the IBAF, but also information on how to approach the IOC when it finally agreed to work with baseball. The IOC President’s personal agendas played a significant role in leading the direction of the Olympic Programme. President Rogge initiated the entire process of reviewing sports, dropping sports and adding sports, which caused softball’s original exclusion, as well as its failure to secure reinstatement.
shifted from Jacque Rogge to Thomas Bach, the new President’s intention of making the Olympic Games more flexible immediately opened a door for baseball and softball to be added back to the 2020 Olympic Games.

Formal influences from the IOC include the *Olympic Charter*, decisions of the IOC Session, Executive Board, and reports of the IOC’s commissions. The *Olympic Charter* requires each sport to have an international governing body. Thus, in order to propose baseball and softball as a single sport with separate disciplines for men and women, a single unified IF is required. The IOC Session makes the final decisions on the governance of the Olympic Movement. By creating an artificial cap of 28 sports, the Session limited the flexibility of the Olympic Programme. The cap, together with the Executive Board’s recommendations, made only one spot available for the 2020 Games, thereby leaving softball no viable option other than to merge with baseball.

IOC commissions’ reports provided detailed information that directed the ISF and later the WBSC’s reinstatement efforts.

Although it is difficult to identify the exact IFs which were modeled, the ISF also received mimetic isomorphism from other IFs consciously or unconsciously. Setting up an office in Lausanne, Switzerland, changing the organization’s Web domain to one more consistent with other IFs, and engaging a consulting firm which helped mount a successful sport inclusion campaign, are all examples of mimetic isomorphism at work.

Normative isomorphism was also identified through the ISF’s reinstatement efforts. The IOC, being the central organization of the Olympic Movement, exerted normative isomorphism through organizations such as the IGF and OCA upon the ISF. Professional firms such as Helios also assisted the normative isomorphic changes within
the Olympic Movement. The similarity of the personnel from the ISF and the IBAF was another source of the normative isomorphism that led the ISF towards amalgamation of the two organizations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study was conducted with the hopes of providing insight into the success and failures of the ISF’s Olympic reinstatement attempts. Thus, sport organizations and IFs seeking Olympic inclusion or reinstatement could model the positive actions taken by the ISF and avoid the negative ones. Using neo-institutional theory as the framework for this study allowed the researcher to identify and categorize the influences exerted upon the ISF during its two reinstatement attempts. Three primary categories were used in order to identify these influences: coercive isomorphism, mimetic isomorphism, and normative isomorphism.

Although this study was not designed to be generalized across other IFs, future studies could examine other IFs and their approach to Olympic inclusion or reinstatement using the same methodology. Since 2005, there have been already three IFs experiencing exclusion from the Olympic Programme, baseball, softball and wrestling. Of those three, only wrestling has been successful in its efforts to get back on the Programme. Future studies on wrestling’s successful reinstatement could allow for comparisons between the IFs and the similarities and differences of how they conducted their respective sport bids. Future research projects could also attempt to replicate this study using institutional theory on softball’s continental confederations, such as SCA, and take a more in-depth look to see if it experienced similar isomorphic influences in the respective continental multi-sport games context.
Due to the recent changes in the Olympic Movement, resulting, in part, for the adoption of Agenda 2020, the Olympic Programme will be more flexible, and events could be added or removed from the Programme on a Games-to-Games basis. Such changes created significant uncertainty for every sport within the Olympic Movement. For instance, track and field may never be removed as a sport, but certain events within the sport could still be excluded in future Olympic Games. Thus, even a strong IF, such as the IAAF, may have to conduct reinstatement attempts in the future just as the ISF did in the past. As the research in the Olympic reinstatement area is quite limited, having a more thorough understanding of the process by which an IF approaches the IOC for reinstatement would help future sport organizations and OCOGs on proposing additional events. With a better understanding of such a process, these IFs and OCOGs would be able to reduce their individual learning curves if they were already equipped with the necessary knowledge.
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### Appendix I
International Softball Federation Member Federation List with Recognition Year

**Africa (19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana (BOT)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Namibia (NAM)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso (BUR)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Nigeria (NGR)</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon (CMR)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Senegal (SEN)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia (GAM)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sierra Leone (SLE)</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea (GUI)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>South Africa (RSA)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau (GBS)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tunisia (TUN)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (KEN)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Uganda (UGA)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho (LES)</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Zambia (ZAM)</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia (LBR)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Zimbabwe (ZIM)</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali (MLI)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oceania (12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Samoa (ASA)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Micronesia (FSM)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (AUS)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>New Zealand (NZL)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands (COK)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Palau (PLW)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam (GUM)</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea (PNG)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Samoa (SAM)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands (MRS)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Solomon Islands (SOL)</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**America (34)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Cayman Is. (CAY)</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua &amp; Barbuda (ANT)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Colombia (COL)</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (ARG)</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Costa Rica (CRC)</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba (ARU)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Cuba (CUB)</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas (BAH)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize (BIZ)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Ecuador (ECU)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda (BER)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>El Salvador (ESA)</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (BOL)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Guatemala (GUA)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (BRA)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Haiti (HAI)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.V. Islands (IVB)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Honduras (HON)</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (CAN)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Jamaica (JAM)</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua (NCA)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>United States (USA)</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama (PAN)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Uruguay (URU)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru (PER)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Venezuela (VEN)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico (PUR)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Virgin Islands (ISV)</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks &amp; Caicos Is.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia (22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei (BRU)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Korea (KOR)</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (CHN)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Malaysia (MAS)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei (TPE)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Mongolia (MGL)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (HKG)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Nepal (NEP)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (IND)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>P.R. of Korea (PRK)</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (INA)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Pakistan (PAK)</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (IRQ)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Philippines (PHI)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Rep. of Iran (IRI)</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Singapore (SIN)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (JPN)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Thailand (THA)</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (JOR)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Uzbekistan (UZB)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan (KAZ)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Vietnam (VIE)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe (38)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia (ARM)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Israel (ISR)</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria (AUT)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Italy (ITA)</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (AZE)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Lithuania (LTU)</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus (BLR)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Malta (MLT)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (BEL)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Moldova (MDA)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (BUL)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Netherlands (NED)</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (CRO)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Norway (NOR)</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (CYP)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poland (POL)</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic (CZE)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Romania (ROU)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (DEN)</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Russia (RUS)</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (FIN)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>San Marino (SMR)</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FRA)</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Serbia (SRB)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (GEO)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Slovakia (SVK)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (GER)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Slovenia (SLO)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain (GBR)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Spain (ESP)</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (GRE)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sweden (SWE)</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Switzerland (SUI)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (HUN)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Turkey (TUR)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (IRL)</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ukraine (UKR)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member federations of the International Softball Federation (2014)

- **Member**
- **Non member**
Appendix II
Mission and Role of the International Olympic Committee

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 relating to the medical care and 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 III
Powers of the Session of the International Olympic Committee

1. To adopt or amend the Olympic Charter.

2. To elect the members of the IOC, the Honorary President, honorary members and honour members.

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

4. To elect the host city of the Olympic Games.

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.

6. To approve the annual report and accounts of the IOC.

7. To appoint the IOC’s auditors.

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 organizations.

9. To expel IOC members and to withdraw the status of Honorary President, honorary members and honour members.

10. To resolve and decide upon all other matters assigned to it by law or by the Olympic Charter.

Appendix IV
Powers, Responsibilities and Duties of the International Olympic Committee Executive Board

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:

1. it monitors the observance of the Olympic Charter;
2. it approves all internal governance regulations relating to its organisation;
3. it establishes an annual report including annual accounts, which it submits to the Session, together with the auditors’ report;
4. it submits a report to the Session on any proposed change of Rule or By-law;
5. it submits to the Session the names of the persons whom it recommends for election to the IOC;
6. it establishes and supervises the procedure for accepting and selecting candidatures to organise the Olympic Games;
7. it establishes the agenda for the Sessions;
8. upon the proposal of the President, it appoints – or dismisses – the Director General. The President decides on his compensation and may take sanctions;
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;
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;
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;
12. it creates and confers the honorary distinctions of the IOC;
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 V
President of the International Olympic Committee

1. The Session elects, by secret ballot, a President from among its members for a term of eight years renewable once for four years.

2. The President represents the IOC and presides over all its activities.

3. 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.

4. If the President is unable to fulfil the duties of his office, the Vice-President who is senior in such office replaces him 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 VI
Tasks of the International Federations

1. To promulgate and control the application of worldwide rules on sports practice.
2. To set the length and organization methods of competitions.
3. To define standards for sports facilities, equipment and material.
4. To classify competitors by category.
5. To establish and endorse the list of world and continental records.
6. To draw up medical regulations aimed at protecting athletes and to fight against doping.
7. To attribute and control international competitions, and at times organize them.
8. To train and accredit international judges and referees.
9. To promote the development of their sport worldwide.
10. To co-operate with the OCOGs, with Olympic Solidarity and with other pertinent organizations.
11. To levy sanctions on athletes, officials and NFs that do not respect the rules of the sport in question.

Source: “Olympic System,” 70.
1. Don E. Porter
   - Former co-President of the WBSC from 2012 to 2014
   - Former President of the ISF from 1987 to 2013
   - Former Secretary General of the ISF from 1965 to 1987
   - Former Executive Director of the ASA from 1963 to 1965
   - Played a key role in the IOC’s recognition and inclusion of softball, as well as the two reinstatement attempts

2. E. T. Colvin
   - Current North American Vice President of the ISF since 2009
   - Former President of the ASA from 2003 to 2005 and again from 2011 to 2013

3. 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 to 1991 and again from 1996 to 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 World Anti-Doping Agency from 1999 to 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

4. Xu Yang
   - Current Secretary General of the CSA since 2007
   - Has been in charge of the overall softball development in China since 2007
   - Has been the Chinese Softball National Team Leader for several times since 2007

5. Rex Capil
   - Current Oceania Vice President of the ISF since 2013
   - Former Chairman of the Softball New Zealand from 2006 to 2012
6. Ron Radigonda

- Executive Director of the ISF from 2014
- Former Executive Director of the ASA from 1998 to 2013
- Had been involved with the ASA for over 30 years
- Served as Chair of numerous committees within the ASA
- Had guided the ASA through a variety of changes and economic difficulties
- Served as a delegate and committee chair for the ISF
- Had attended numerous men’s and women’s international events

7. Michael Schmidt

- Current Executive Director of the WBSC since February 2013
- Current Executive Director of the IBAF since February 2013
- Served as a high-ranking official at the Austrian Baseball Federation since 2000 and currently the Vice President Softball since 2007
- Former Vice President for marketing of the ESF from 2009 to 2013
- Served as an advisor and liaison during IBAF and ISF’s merger negotiations
- Helped direct the framework, concessions and strategic-planning for the establishment of WBSC
- Oversaw the daily bid operations for baseball and softball’s inclusion on the 2020 Olympic Games Programme


Appendix VIII
Interview Scripts

Questionnaire Outline for Official from International Softball Federation:

General Information

1. What are your experiences with the International Softball Federation?
2. How do you describe your role in softball’s Olympic sport bids?
   a) Elaborate on your duties during the bid for 2016 Games?
   b) Elaborate on your duties during the bid for 2020 Games?

Effects of Exclusion

3. In your opinion, why was softball voted off the Olympic Programme?
4. In your opinion, how was the sport of softball affected by the exclusion from the Olympic program?
   a) What about the organization itself (e.g., financially, authoritatively)?
   b) What benefit could the re-instatement bring to softball?
   c) And to the ISF?

Execution

5. What was the purpose of setting up an office at Lausanne, Switzerland?
   a) Who had influence on this move?
   b) Did it fulfill its purpose?
6. Why did the ISF launch the Strategic Task Force?
   a) Who had influence on this move?
   b) Did it achieve its goal?
7. Softball has been a women’s only sport on the Olympic program. Did ISF propose both men and women to the IOC?
   a) The bid for 2016 Games (Back Softball)?
   b) The bid for 2020 Games (prior to the joint bid with baseball)?
   c) Who had influence on this issue?
8. What other actions did the ISF conduct to try to regain its Olympic status?

Influence from the IOC

9. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to
softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2016 Games?
   a) Did the IOC expect softball to be submitted as a women’s only or both men and women’s sport?
   b) Did the IOC expect softball to differentiate itself from baseball?
   c) How much did the IOC influence the decision of not bidding together with baseball?
   d) In your opinion, did softball meet the expectations?
10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the ISF prior to having received the official bid for the 2016 Games?
11. What were the expectations of the IOC when it came to softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2020 Games?
   a) Did the IOC expect a joint bid from baseball and softball?
   b) How much did the IOC influence the joint bid?
   c) In your opinion, did baseball and softball meet the expectations?
   d) Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   e) Where did you gain the knowledge of these expectations?
12. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a joint bid from the ISF and the IBAF, prior to having received the official bid for the 2020 Games?
Influence from other organizations
13. Did the IBAF try to influence softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2016 Games?
14. Did the IBAF try to influence softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2020 Games?
   a) Which organization suggested the joint bid with baseball?
   b) Why did the ISF refuse a joint bid at the beginning?
   c) Was that decision influenced by any organization? IOC, ISF, IBAF, or any other?
   d) Why did the ISF accepted it a few months later?
   e) Was that decision influenced by any other organizations such as the IOC, ISF, IBAF, or any other?
   f) What influence did the IBAF have on the ISF after the joint bid agreed?
15. What influences did other International Sport Federations and organizations have on the ISF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?
   a) Competing IFs, such as rugby, golf, and wrestling?
b) Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games?

16. Did you interact with specific individuals or organizations in regard to softball’s Olympic bid?

   a) Did they influence your bid?
   b) If so, in what way?

Reflection

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

18. Is there any other person involved in the ISF’s re-instatement attempts that you can recommend for an interview?
Questionnaire Outline for Official from International Baseball Federation:

General Information

1. What are your experiences with the international softball?

2016

2. So you were the Vice President Softball of the Austrian Baseball Federation since 2007 and Vice President of the European Softball Federation since 2009, were you involved in any of the softball’s lobbying for the 2016 Olympic Games in those capacities?

3. In your opinion, as a softball official in the ESF, what was the European’s perception of the IBAF’s joint bid proposal for the 2016 Games?
   a) And why it was refused?

2020

4. Could you elaborate on your role during the joint bid attempt for 2020 Games?

5. In your Doha Goals Forum’s bio, it says that you served Mr. Porter and Mr. Fraccari as an advisor and liaison during merger negotiations which resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding being reached in October 2012. So you must be involved in the joint bidding before your official appointment to the Executive Director. Could you elaborate on that?

6. I understand that the ISF refused the joint bid proposal in August 2010. But the two federations started discussions in February 2011. What changed their attitudes?

7. What role did the joint bid of baseball and softball in 2014 Asian Games play in the attitude change?

8. What role did the IBAF play in the joint bid of baseball and softball in 2014 Asian Games?

9. The IBAF and ISF planned to propose a joint bid with two separate IFs, what caused the change of it to under a single IF?

Influence from other IFs

10. The WBSC tried to consult with Helios Partners?

11. How did you know the Helios Partners?

12. Did it have anything to do with their successful experiences with the Golf’s Olympic bid?

13. How did the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games influence this?

14. Did you interact with specific individuals or organizations in regard to baseball
and softball’s Olympic bid?
   a) Did they influence your bid?
   b) If so, in what way?

Reflection

15. Is there anything relating to baseball and softball’s Olympic bid that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on?
Questionnaire Outline for Official from International Olympic Committee:

General Information

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

2. In what capacity were you involved with the softball’s Olympic sport bid proposals?
   a) Elaborate on your role during the bid for 2016 Games?
   b) Elaborate on your role during the bid for 2020 Games?

Effects of Exclusion

3. In your opinion, why was softball voted off the Olympic Programme?
4. In your opinion, how the sport of softball was affected by the exclusion from the Olympic program?
   a) What about the ISF itself (e.g. financially, authoritatively)?
   b) What benefit could the re-instatement bring to softball?
   c) And to the ISF?

Execution

5. To your knowledge, what did ISF do during its Olympic bid for 2016 Games?
6. To your knowledge, what did ISF do during its Olympic bid for 2020 Games?

Influence from the IOC

7. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2016 Games?
   a) Did the IOC expect softball as a women’s only or both men and women’s sport?
   b) Did the IOC expect a joint bid from softball together with baseball?
   c) Did the IOC expect softball differentiating from baseball?
   d) How much did the IOC influence the decision of not bid together with baseball?
   e) In your opinion, did softball meet the expectations?
   f) Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
8. Did you interact with specific individuals from the ISF during its Olympic bid for 2016 Games?

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

10. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to baseball and softball’s Olympic sport joint bid for 2020 Games?

   a) Did the IOC expect a joint bid from baseball and softball?
   b) How much did the IOC influence the joint bid?
   c) In your opinion, did baseball and softball meet the expectations?
   d) Who was responsible for setting these expectations?

11. Did you interact with specific individuals from the ISF or IBAF during its Olympic bid for 2020 Games?

12. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a joint bid from the ISF and IBAF prior to having received the official bid for the 2020 Games?

Influence from other IFs

13. What influences did other International Sport Federations and organizations have on the ISF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?

   a) Competing IFs, such as rugby, golf, and wrestling?
   b) Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games?

Reflection

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

15. Is there any other person involved in the ISF’s re-instatement attempts that you can recommend for an interview?
**Questionnaire Outline for Official from National Sport Federation:**

**General Information**

1. What are your experiences with the International Softball Federation?
2. In what capacity were you involved in softball’s Olympic sport bids?
   a) Elaborate on your role during the bid for 2016 Games?
   b) Elaborate on your role during the bid for 2020 Games?

**Effects of Exclusion**

3. In your opinion, why was softball voted off the Olympic Programme?
4. In your opinion, how was the sport of softball affected by the exclusion from the Olympic program?
   a) What about the ISF itself (e.g. financially, authoritatively)?
   b) What benefit could the re-instatement bring to softball?
   c) And to the ISF?

**Execution**

5. To your knowledge, what did ISF do during its Olympic bid for 2016 Games?
   a) Did the ISF try to propose with both men and women’s softball?
   b) Did the ISF seek or refuse a joint bid with baseball?
6. To your knowledge, what did ISF do during its Olympic bid for 2020 Games?
   a) Did the ISF try to propose with both men and women’s softball prior to the joint bid with baseball?
   b) Which organization suggested the joint bid?
   c) Who could have influenced ISF’s refusal at the beginning, such as the IOC, ISF, IBAF, or any other?
   d) What do you think changed the ISF’s mind a few months later?
   e) Who could have influenced the second decision, such as the IOC, ISF, IBAF, or any other?

**Influence from the IOC**

7. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to softball’s Olympic sport bid for 2016 Games?
   a) Did the IOC expect softball as a women’s only or both men and women’s sport?
b) Did the IOC expect a joint bid from softball together with baseball?

c) Did the IOC expect softball differentiating from baseball?

d) How much did the IOC influence the decision of not bid together with baseball?

e) In your opinion, did softball meet the expectations?

8. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a bid from the ISF prior to having received the official bid for the 2016 Games?

9. From your understanding, what were the expectations of the IOC when it came to baseball and softball’s Olympic sport joint bid for 2020 Games?
   a) Did the IOC expect a joint bid from baseball and softball?
   b) How much did the IOC influence the joint bid?
   c) In your opinion, did baseball and softball meet the expectations?
   d) Who was responsible for setting these expectations?
   e) Where did you gain the knowledge of these expectations?

10. In your opinion, was the IOC in support of a joint bid from the ISF and IBAF prior to having received the official bid for the 2020 Games?

Influence from other IFs

11. In your opinion, what influences did other International Sport Federations and organizations have on the ISF prior to and during its Olympic sport bids?
   a) Competing IFs, such as rugby, golf, and wrestling?
   b) Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games?

12. Did you interact with specific individuals or organizations in regard to softball’s Olympic bid?
    a) Did they influence softball’s bid?
    b) If so, in what way?

Reflection

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

14. Is there any person involved in the joint bid that you can recommend for an interview?
Appendix IX
Researcher Biography

Yu Zhou, also known as Joey Zhou, is a Master of Human Kinetics candidate in sport management at the University of Windsor. He received his B.S. in environmental science from the Peking University and M.S. in marketing from the University of Birmingham. Prior to studying at the University of Windsor, Joey worked for the Chinese Softball Association (CSA) for five years. His position at the CSA started as an internship with responsibility of interpreting for the women’s national softball team’s head coach, who was an English speaker from the USA. He was officially employed by the CSA after the internship, and was promoted to national team manager and later program director. During the employment with the CSA, he also took short-term secondments in multi-sport games, where he had experiences of dealing with continental and international sport federations and the International Olympic Committee. A detailed list of job responsibilities is provided on the following page.

Besides professional ties to softball, Yu Zhou is also tied to softball personally. His wife used to be a professional softball player for over 14 years, who has won the national championship and was selected onto the Chinese national team several times.
2005 – 2011  Chinese Softball Association, Beijing, China

Program Director (Aug. 2007 – Apr. 2011)
- Conducted the national tee-ball and slowpitch softball development programs
- Organized national softball championships and other tournaments
- Organized national coach and umpire clinics
- Organized media conferences and interviews
- Published athletics programs, schedules, media guides, brochures, etc.
- Represented CSA on several continental and international softball conferences

- Chinese National Softball Team (CNST) manager and interpreter for 2006 (Beijing, China) and 2010 (Caracas, Venezuela) World Softball Championship; and 2006 Doha Asian Games
- CNST team leader for tournaments with professional teams, collegiate teams and amateur teams in USA, Canada, Australia and Japan
- Liaison between CNST and its major sponsors

- CNST interpreter for the American head coach
- Liaison between Chinese Softball Association and International Softball Federation, Amateur Softball Association of America, National Professional Fast Pitch League, and other organizations
- Translated publications for internal use: Official International Softball Rules, English to Chinese; International Softball Federation Coaching Textbook, English to Chinese

Sep. – Dec. 2010  2010 Guangzhou Organizing Committee for the Asian Games, Guangzhou, China

Competition Administrative Manager (Short-term secondment)
- Operated competition office at the softball venue
- Supervised athletes services, official services, competition information services, and equipment management
- Trained and managed 40 volunteers to assist in my office

May – Aug. 2008  2008 Beijing Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games, Beijing, China

Athletes Services Manager (Short-term secondment)
- Supervised athletes services at the baseball venue
- Trained and managed 28 clubhouse attendants

2004  Dynasty Sports Marketing (DSM), Shanghai, China
National Media Manager

• DSM was the exclusive marketing company managing the China Baseball League
• Liaised with the Chinese Baseball Association, local and national media
• Dealt with CBL local broadcaster
• Prepared news releases to the media
• Maintained information and photos updates into the CBL web sites
• Organized media conferences and interviews
Appendix X
Back Softball: Campaign Blueprint

In the drive to get Softball re-instated in the Olympic Programme for the Games of the XXXI Olympiad in 2016, the ISF is proud to announce the following campaign blueprint for the next two years. This will be revised and updated as required.

1. Increase Number of Nations Playing Softball
   It is the intention of the ISF to increase the number of participating National Softball Federations from 128 to 150 by October 1st 2009 and then push for a further increase to 160 National Softball Federations by the 2016 Olympic Games.

2. Increase Number of Worldwide Participants Playing Softball
   The drive to increase National Softball Federations will be part of an overall commitment by the ISF to increase the number of worldwide Softball participants – especially youth - from a current impressive level of 8.4 million to an estimated 12.5 million, an increase of 25% by October 1st 2009. The ISF will then be seeking a further 25% in number of worldwide participants by the 2016 Olympic Games.

3. Increase Number of Youth Accessing Sport Through Softball
   The ISF is totally committed to increasing worldwide, the number of young people playing Softball. Each National Federation will increase the percentage of players under age 15 who are regularly playing Softball.

4. Place Even Greater Emphasis on Opportunities for Women in Sport
   The ISF is to place an even greater emphasis on increasing the number of federations and participants across the Middle East, highlighted by providing women and girls in the region with an accessible and acceptable route to sporting participation.

5. Provide Even Greater Worldwide Access to People with Disabilities
   The ISF is to develop further programmes and opportunities across the world to allow people with disabilities to play softball on a regular basis. This will be monitored from now on and percentage increases on participation of people with disabilities will be expected across all National Softball Federations.

6. Provide Softball Equipment / Coaching Where There is Most Need
   The ISF pledges to develop further its initiative of providing regions of the world that are suffering from man-made or natural disasters with free softball equipment and coaching clinics to train new coaches. This will require even closer working relationships with organisations such as the IOC and United Nations (such as the United Nations High Commission for Refugees).

7. Increase the Amount of Worldwide Television the Sport Enjoys
The ISF recognizes the vital importance of television and pledges to increase by at least 25% the amount of free to air worldwide television coverage of Softball in two important categories:

a. Number of countries broadcasting Softball competitions

b. Number of worldwide viewers watching Softball events and activity

This will assist in achieving other elements of this blueprint and will assist in securing more prestigious commercial partners – each paying greater levels of commercial fees for the development of the sport.

8. Increase the number of dedicated Softball Federations

Wherever viable, the ISF will seek to create independent Softball Federations that are not integrated within other sports or federations. This will help avoid confusion over identities and will further strengthen the central administration for the worldwide development and growth of the sport.

9. Achieve Even Greater Inclusion and Internationalization in the ISF

The ISF will use the Back Softball campaign as a platform to internationalize even further the administration of the sport. The best international candidates will be chosen for administrative posts and the administration will strive to reflect the ratio of gender and people with disability contained in the sport.

10. Back Softball Campaign to be Conducted in True Spirit of Olympism

The ISF pledges to ensure that the Back Softball campaign will be run in the spirit of fair play and will uphold all the values of Olympism. However, the ISF is mounting this campaign to succeed and not just to take part. The ISF aims to prove that Softball is an asset for the Olympic Movement by meeting and exceeding all criteria used by the IOC to evaluate sports for the Olympic Programme for the Games of the XXXI Olympiad in 2016.

Source: “Back Softball - Blueprint for Olympic Return in 2016,” 3-4
## Appendix XI
### Evaluation Criteria for Prospective Olympic Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 General</td>
<td>1 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>2 Governance</td>
<td>2 Good governance basic principles</td>
<td>Existence of a Code of Ethics; Alignment of IF's Code of Ethics with the principles and rules of the IOC Code of Ethics; Existence of transparent and enhanced internal dispute resolution mechanism; Submission to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) of all disputes which cannot be settled amicably or through local arbitration or mediation; types of disputes for which the CAS is used; number of cases in which the IF is involved.</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Strategic planning process</td>
<td>6 Existence of a multi-year strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gender equity in elected bodies</td>
<td>8 Comparison between numbers of women and number of men in the executive board (or equivalent).</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Illegal and irregular betting</td>
<td>9 Rules and procedures to fight against competition fixing</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 History and Tradition</td>
<td>7 Olympic Games</td>
<td>Year of introduction to the Olympic programme; number of times the sport has been included in the Olympic programme.</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 World Championships</td>
<td>12 Number of World Championships and Junior World Championships were first held for each discipline or sport, for men and women.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other multi-sports Games</td>
<td>15 Number of times each recognised discipline or sport has been included in the selected multi-sports Games (World Games, Universiade, Commonwealth Games, Continental Games – All Africa Games, Asian Games, Pan-American Games and Mediterranean Games).</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Universality</td>
<td>10 Number of affiliated national federations</td>
<td>Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federations which correspond to National Olympic Committees.</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Active member national federations</td>
<td>17 Number of National Federations which organised National Championships for men and women during the two years preceding the upcoming Olympic Games.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Popularity</td>
<td>19 Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Junior World Championships for men and women.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Global spread of excellence - Olympic Games</td>
<td>22 Number of medals awarded at the last two editions of the Olympic Games.</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Global spread of excellence - World Championships</td>
<td>24 Number of medals awarded at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 General public appeal</td>
<td>26 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Youth appeal</td>
<td>27 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Athletes</td>
<td>29 Best athletes’ participation in the Olympic Games.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Spectators - Olympic Games</td>
<td>30 Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games.</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Spectators - World Championships</td>
<td>32 Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Media - World Championships</td>
<td>34 Written media accreditations granted (TV, written press and internet journalists) at the last World Championships.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Press coverage</td>
<td>35 Written press coverage during the Olympic Games. Quantitative and qualitative data gathered through a study requested by the IOC and run by an external company.</td>
<td>Third party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Television coverage - Olympic Games</td>
<td>36 TV coverage during the Olympic Games. Quantitative and qualitative data gathered through a study requested by the IOC and run by an external company.</td>
<td>Third party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Digital media</td>
<td>37 IF official website: Number of unique visitors &amp; visits during the year.</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 IF official website: Number of unique visitors &amp; visits during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 olympic.org and OCOG website: Number of visits in the dedicated section of the website during the year</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 olympic.org and OCOG website: Number of visits in the dedicated section of the website during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 YouTube: Number of videos viewed per sport during the year</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 YouTube: Number of videos viewed per sport during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Facebook: Number of fans &amp; unique active users during the year</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Twitter: Number of followers during the year</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 List of major sponsors and the kinds of benefits (cash, VIP, discounts, services, other) received</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Athlete representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 Possibility for athletes to vote within the decision-making bodies of the IF (commissions &amp; technical committees, executive board or equivalent)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Athletes' commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 Existence of an athletes' commission within the IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Athlete Career Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Election process for the IF athletes' commission</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Athletes' entourage</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Existence of an Athlete's Commission within the IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Athletes' health</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td>52 Medical Commission representative on IF executive board (or equivalent)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Athletes' health</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 Number of out-of-competition anti-doping tests (blood and urine with respective percentage) carried out in the last two years by all approved drug-testing agencies and percentage of tests conducted or financed by the IF</td>
<td>IF/WADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Scope of development programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Existence of an Athlete's Commission within the IF</td>
<td>IF/WADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 Number of Anti-Doping Rule Violations</td>
<td>IF/WADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Development of the IF</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 IF's financial distribution system to support National Federations and continental associations</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 Summary of the three main development programmes</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59 Existence of sport development programmes or events for young people</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Technical evolution of the sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Existence of means to control the technical evolution within the sport regarding venues, sports equipment (items used by athletes in the practice of the sport) and competition clothing (items worn by athletes and subject to IF technical specifications)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Gender equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>61 Comparison between National Federations which took part in female vs male qualifying events for the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Sport for All</td>
<td></td>
<td>62 Existence of a Sport for All Commission within the IF and/or specific Sports for All initiatives</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Transparency and fairness on the field of play</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 Existence of a Sport for All Commission within the IF and/or specific Sports for All initiatives</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64 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 Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 Existence of ethics rules for technical officials (e.g. code of conduct, sanction system, etc.)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 Existence of IF's rules of appeal and athletes' right to appeal</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67 Existence of policies and/or guidelines on the environment</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Use of any evaluation criteria such as the Sustainable Sport &amp; Event Toolkit (SSET)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Income &amp; Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td>69 Use of acknowledged standards of accounting; verification of accounts by an independent auditor; publication of accounts on IF website</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Venue costs at the Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 Total income in the 2008-2011 period (membership fees, Olympic revenues, marketing, broadcasting, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Technology requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>71 Total expenditure in the 2008-2011 period (administrative costs, operational costs, development costs, fight against doping, fight against competition-fixing, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Television production</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 Ability to share venues with other sports</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>73 Level of technological complexity and costs required at Olympic Games competition venues for each specific sport/discipline</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 Costs and complexity of television production per sport/discipline at the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix XII
Back Softball Progress Report as of April 2008

In the drive to have softball reinstated on to the Olympic programme for the Games of the XXXI Olympiad in 2016, the ISF has made significant progress towards reaching the ambitious targets outlined in the BackSoftball campaign blueprint launched in June 2007. The highlights of this progress, set against our blueprint’s ten pledges, include:

1. Increase Number of Nations Playing Softball
   - The number of nations with softball federations has risen from 126 to 130 since 2005
   - Some of the countries that have most recently reached out to initiate softball are Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Mali, and Sierra Leone.
   - Three new Regional Training Centers have been established: in the Dominican Republic, Italy, and Russia.

2. Increase Number of Worldwide Participants Playing Softball
   - The number of softball participants has increased worldwide by an estimated 20% over the last two years especially as softball now embraces new disciplines such as beach softball, arena softball (indoor), and wheelchair softball.

3. Increase Number of Youth Accessing Sport Through Softball
   - Seventy countries have now integrated softball into their school systems making this over half of all 130 countries with NFs
   - The ISF Development Program has assisted 46 of these countries to receive aid to increment their school programs
   - A good 14 countries have received ISF starter kits for their school programs
   - The IV Junior Girls’ World Cup (16-and-under, fast pitch) is scheduled for late summer 2009 in Plant City, Florida, USA.

4. Place Even Greater Emphasis on Opportunities for Women in Sport
   - The new softball federations in Iraq, Iran, and Jordan are at the forefront in helping introduce team sports to Arab women
   - A recent survey has shown that as there are no restrictions on softball uniforms, so cultural and religious sensitivities throughout Asia and Africa can be accommodated within the sport.
   - 2004 Olympic Softball gold medalist Jessica Mendoza has been confirmed as President-elect of the Women’s Sport Foundation
   - The ISF was a major supporter at the highly successful IOC Women and Sport Conference in March 2008
   - ISF Deputy Secretary General Low Beng Choo has been recently appointed to the IOC Women and Sport Commission
   - Annie Constantinides, who is also on the ISF Technical Commission for the 2008 Olympic Softball competition, has recently been appointed to the ISF Executive Council, making six women on the Board
5. Provide Even Greater Worldwide Access for People with Disabilities
- Softball was included at the Special Olympics World Summer Games 2007 in Shanghai
- Overall worldwide participation of softball in the Special Olympics has grown a solid 27% since 2005
- Highest growth areas are East Asia (over double) and the Middle East/North Africa (almost double)
- The ISF is close to finalizing a version of wheelchair Softball for potential inclusion in the Paralympic Games.

6. Provide Softball Equipment / Coaching Where There is Most Need
- Since 2002 the ISF has sent out over USD$2.25 million worth of equipment to 91 countries.
- More than 34 softball clinics were conducted for players and coaches by the ISF for its member federations to continue softball’s growth and development between 2005-2007

7. Increase the Amount of Worldwide Television the Sport Enjoys
- The ISF XI Women's World Championship in 2006 in China was videocast over the official event website, www.2006softball.org
- 200 million people in China watched the Opening Ceremonies and first game (China vs. Great Britain)
- 2007 Men's Fastpitch World Cup in Prague: five games were shown on Czech National TV
- ISF VIII Junior Women's World Championship in 2007: live webcasts with over a half-million page views on the event website, plus daily highlights were posted on YouTube.
- Games from the 4th Central American Junior Female Softball Championship Games (plus Opening & Closing Ceremonies) were carried live on national TV (Love TV and CBC), marking the first time first time in Belize that an international championship was televised live around the country.
- The International Challenge Series in Australia (March 2008) had 17 games webcast on World Championship Sports Network's website

8. Increase the number of dedicated Softball Federations
- More and more national softball federations are working to become wholly independent from other sports. These include Austria, Denmark, DPR Korea, Georgia, Great Britain, Ireland, Lesotho, Moldova, Spain, and Zimbabwe.
- This reflects the fact that softball is a separate and independent sport and aims to have all national Federations independent by 2010.

9. Achieve Even Greater Inclusion and Internationalization in the ISF
- The Executive Council of the ISF is now comprised of members from 17 countries.
- The ISF Executive Council is now composed of 33% women, surpassing the IOC’s recommended 20% composition
10. *BackSoftball* Campaign to be Conducted in True Spirit of Olympism

- Despite the intense competition between sports seeking inclusion on the programme of the Olympic Games in 2016, the *BackSoftball* team has attended over 25 Olympic events and gatherings in the last two years and has honored the Olympic values of respect and fair play at all times.
- The ISF is at the forefront of these sports in seeking a self-regulated code of conduct and ethics for the 2016 campaign.

Appendix XIII
IOC Executive Board Vote Results

COMMISSION EXÉCUTIVE DU CIO – Berlin, le 13 août 2009
IOC EXECUTIVE BOARD – Berlin, 13 August 2009

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

1er tour / First 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>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>

2e tour / Second 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>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>
COMMISSION EXÉCUTIVE DU CIO – Berlin, le 13 août 2009
IOC EXECUTIVE BOARD – Berlin, 13 August 2009

ELECTION DU 2È SPORT / ELECTION OF THE 2ND SPORT

1er tour / First 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>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>

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

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>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>

3e tour / third 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>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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