

8-1-2009

Use of Performance Based Funding In A Sport Organization: A Case Study Of The United States Olympic Committee

James Thomas Binns

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Binns, James Thomas, "Use of Performance Based Funding In A Sport Organization: A Case Study Of The United States Olympic Committee" (2009). *Dissertations*. Paper 76.

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.

© 2009

JAMES THOMAS BINNS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Greeley, Colorado

The Graduate School

THE USE OF PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING IN A
SPORT ORGANIZATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE
UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

JAMES THOMAS BINNS

College Natural and Health Sciences
Sport and Exercise Science
Sport Administration

August, 2009

This Dissertation by: James Thomas Binns

Entitled: *The Use Of Performance Based Funding In A Sport Organization: A Case Study of the United States Olympic Committee*

has been approved as meeting the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College of Natural and Health Sciences in School of Sport and Exercise Science, Program of Sport Administration.

Accepted by the Doctoral Committee

David K. Stotlar, Ed.D, Chair

Dianna P. Gray, Ph. D, Committee Member

Robert Heiny, Ph.D., Committee Member

Vish Iyer, Ph.D., Faculty Representative

Date of Dissertation Defense _____

Accepted by the Graduate School

Robbyn R. Wacker, Ph. D.
Assistant Vice President of Research and Extended Studies
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Binns, James. *The Use of Performance Based Funding in a Sport Organization: A Case Study of the United States Olympic Committee*. Published Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 2009.

The United States Olympic Committee (USOC) changed their funding strategy after the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney, Australia. The USOC moved to a performance based funding strategy to focus on the bottom line and medal podium performance. After eight years of claiming to be an organization focused on performance based funding principles, monetary gains have been made while continuing to focus on the development of Olympic medalists. Clearly performance based funding principles have helped the USOC accomplish its stated goals.

The purpose of this study was to determine if the USOC had embraced the fundamental principles of performance based funding and used them in their development of National Governing Body (NGB) high performance plans and goal establishment. How the principles of a performance based funding strategy fit with an organization like the USOC, was the overarching research question developed for this study.

A case study using the documents from 10 different National Governing Bodies (NGBs) was used to determine the fit of performance based funding strategies and the USOC. Performance indications such as medal performance and overall financial standing of the USOC were also considered in answering the research questions.

The USOC along with the various NGBs have used performance based funding principles to secure their place in the Olympic arena. Countries from around the world fund their Olympic programs in very different manners. The government of the United States does not give money to support its athletes, but the USOC has developed a system of athlete development which focuses funds on athletes that are able to represent the United States at the highest level. The focus on athletes and athlete achievement of measurable performance fit very well with performance based funding principles. These principles have helped the USOC move to a position of strength in both competition as well as financial strength. The USOC uses performance based funding principles to develop strong NGBs which in turn strengthens the position of the USOC. The USOC is a model for other sport organizations to follow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is hard to imagine that it is time to write this part of my dissertation. First off, I would like to thank my committee for their help with this project. My advisor, Dr Stotlar really guided me throughout this process and without his help I would not have been able to finish. I would also like to thank Dr. Gray, Dr. Iyer, and Dr. Heiny for their help, these three individuals have helped me to understand the research process and the importance of attention to detail. Dr. Stotlar, Dr. Gray, and Professor Sharp also spent a great deal of time with me in the classroom and I am grateful for their dedication to their profession.

In my case there are also a number of people who I have to thank professionally. This would not have been done without the support from various people throughout my Air Force career. I would like to thank Dr. Mueh and Mr. DeAustin to have the confidence in me to send me to school. I am grateful for your support in this effort. I would also like to thank Coach Heidmous. With each career choice I have made in my life, you always seem to be standing there holding the door open to make it possible. Thanks for your help throughout my cadet years as well as over the last 7 years of my career. Sometimes I wonder where I would be without water polo and your support.

This section would not be complete if I did not mention Ryan Hall. I appreciate your effort in helping me throughout the PhD process. You were always available to help me with any question I had and I will always be grateful. I probably wouldn't even have my matrix defense done yet if it wasn't for your help.

Mr. Gambardella along with Pat Howard at the USOC also helped me immensely on this project. Thank you for taking your time to help me. I am truly impressed with all that you both do.

Lastly, I need to thank my family for all of their efforts towards the completion of my PhD program. I appreciate my parents' concern and hopefully they will know that I am grateful to them for all that they have done. To my siblings and their families, thank you for the support and friendship that you have given me. David and Amy thank you for feeding me the many times that I had to come to Colorado Springs to accomplish this project and for watching over the girls the year I was gone. I would also like to thank my in-laws for their support and concern.

Kimrie, Mallory, and Abbey, I hope that one day you will understand how important you are to me. I am proud that you are my daughters and for the people that you are. I know that you will go on to do many great and wonderful things. Mom and I look forward to many years of watching you grow. Inger, you have made all of this possible, and I can't thank you enough. This process has been a great three years and I am glad that you were there to help me along the way. I can't thank you enough for all of the sacrifices you have made to help me in my career.

I am grateful for all the help that I have received and acknowledge that I couldn't have done this alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	4
Statement of Purpose	5
Research Questions	5
Need for the Study	7
Delimitations	8
Definitions of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Return on Investment	12
Return on Objective	16
Performance Based Funding	17
Continuous Process Improvement	25
Outcome Budgeting	26
Activity-Based Costing	27
Conclusion	29
III. METHODOLOGY	30
Introduction	30
Theoretical Stance	32
Research Design	34
Sampling Procedure	37
Sources of Evidence	38
Research Instrument	44
Trustworthiness	47
Internal Validity (Credibility)	48
External Validity (Transferability)	50
Reliability	52
Data Analysis	53
Conclusion	54

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. FINDINGS	55
Introduction	55
Analysis of High Performance Plans	56
Other Examples of Performance Based Funding	82
High Performance Plan Themes	85
USOC Performance on the Podium	92
Managerial Continuity	100
Internal Validity	101
Conclusion	102
V. INTERPRETATIONS, DISCUSSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	106
Transferability to Other Sport Organizations	111
Future Research	113
Reflections	115
REFERENCES	117
APPENDIX	
A. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT RESULTS	133
B. USOC GRANTS TO NGBS (2003 -2007)	137
C. UNITED STATES OLYMPIC MEDAL PERFORMANCE (1994 – 2008)	142
D. OLYMPIC MEDAL COMPARISON BY COUNTRIES (1994 – 2008)	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	United States and Great Britain Funding Comparison	91
2.	United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance	95
3.	United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance	95
4.	National Olympic Medal Performance 1994 – 2000	97
5.	National Olympic Medal Performance 2002 – 2008	98
6.	National Olympic Medal Performance 1994 – 2008	99
7.	Performance Based Funding Principles Found in High Performance Plans	134
8.	Performance Based Funding Principles Found in High Performance Plans Through Peer Review	136
9.	USOC Grants to NGBs	138
10.	1994 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance	143
11.	1996 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance	144
12.	1998 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance	146
13.	2000 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance	147
14.	2002 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance	149

Table		Page
15.	2004 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance	150
16.	2006 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance	152
17.	2008 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance	153
18.	1994 Winter Olympic Medal Performance	156
19.	1996 Summer Olympic Medal Performance	157
20.	1998 Winter Olympic Medal Performance	158
21.	2000 Summer Olympic Medal Performance	159
22.	2002 Winter Olympic Medal Performance	160
23.	2004 Summer Olympic Medal Performance	161
24.	2006 Winter Olympic Medal Performance	162
25.	2008 Summer Olympic Medal Performance	163

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Funding of sports programs has intrigued me since I was a freshman water polo player at the United States Air Force Academy¹. At that time, the Academy's Athletic Department was looking to reduce its budget, so our coach was very cognizant of the money that he spent on our program. Funds were saved by parents supplying food and military airlift being utilized in place of commercial travel. At the time, I did not recognize the effort to protect resources; however, later on in life as the Executive Officer in the Academy's Athletic Department I saw firsthand how money was distributed to 27 intercollegiate teams and began to see disparities among certain intercollegiate sports. I began to wonder: what is the most efficient way to allocate resources in a sport organization?

Having an interest in sport funding, I became very intrigued with the recent Olympic Games in Beijing, China. I was very cognizant of the overall medal and gold medal counts at the games, partially due to the fact that I had heard of a funding strategy implemented by the Chinese called "Project 119". After the International Olympic Committee (IOC) announced that the 2008 Games would be held in Beijing, China, the government of China unveiled "Project 119", which was intended to win more medals

¹ **DISCLAIMER CLAUSE:** The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

than any other nation at the Games (Layden & Nazzaro, 2008). This program fully funded Chinese athletes in their preparation for the Games. At the end of the Beijing Games some United States athletes were commenting on how they would be able to perform at a higher level if the United States government stepped forward like the Chinese government to fully fund their training (Saunders, 2008). The United States government has never funded the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and the USOC must be fiscally responsible with the resources that they have in order to fund the entire United States team (Donate, n.d.). The fact that the Chinese Olympic athletes were funded at a different level from the United States athletes made me wonder what the funding procedures at the USOC were and whether they had a particular goal as far as medal count for the Olympic Games.

Background of the Study

To understand the complexities of the USOC funding, a review of recent history must be outlined. The USOC has an annual operating budget of \$150 million that is largely made up of sponsorship and television revenue (Zinser, 2006). This money is distributed to the 45 National Governing Bodies (NGBs) that are responsible for the individual sports that the United States sponsors at the Olympics. Finances are based on a quadrennial review, meaning that after every Olympic cycle, the funding that each NGB receives is analyzed to ensure that each sport has the resources necessary to be “successful” in Olympic competition. In 2000, the USOC changed the way that it funded the individual NGBs by moving to a performance based funding strategy. The purpose of this move was to try to make the USOC run like an efficient and self-reliant corporation answerable only to the bottom line and the top podium (Robbins, 2000). Each NGB has a

different financial requirement from the USOC, depending on their ability to generate revenue. The 45 national governing bodies rely on the USOC for between 6 and 85 percent of their funds. The committee increases funds for some NGBs and will also decrease it for others, depending on performance (Robbins). The focus on the bottom line and medal performance is a new way of thinking for the USOC, and no research has ever been conducted to determine if it has improved their overall performance.

Performance-based budgeting systems grew in popularity in the United States during the late 1990s as government looked to account for the limited resources they had to spend (Young, 2003). To help understand exactly what performance-based budgeting or performance-based funding is, these budgeting systems have the following characteristics:

Performance budgets use statements of missions, goals and objectives to explain why the money is being spent... [It is a way to allocate] resources to achieve specific objectives based on program goals and measured results . . . Performance budgeting differs from traditional approaches because it focuses on spending results rather than the money spent—on what the money buys rather than the amount that is made available (Carter, 1994, p. 2-3).

Performance-based budgeting theories are founded in the theories of Management by Objective and a Balanced Scorecard (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998). Bob Gambardella, Director of Sports Partnerships at the USOC, confirmed that the USOC uses performance-based budgeting theories to allocate resources for their various sports. (Personal Communication, October 28, 2008).

During the Olympic Games, Americans celebrate victories in the athletic arena. Michael Phelps gained worldwide fame this past summer as he won more gold medals in a single Olympic Games than anyone in history (Forde, 2008). One might assume that the outcome desired by the USOC is to generate hundreds of athletes like Michael Phelps

who dominate the medal podium. However, the current mission of the USOC is “to support United States Olympic and Paralympic athletes in achieving sustained competitive excellence and preserve the Olympic ideals, and thereby inspire all Americans” (Mission, n.d.). So what are the performance objectives established by each individual NGB and how do they relate to the funding that each NGB receives from the USOC?

Statement of the Problem

Performance based funding focuses on the results instead of the actual money that is spent (Carter, 1994). Since 2000, when the USOC moved to a performance based funding model, each NGB has been required to develop a high performance plan. Each high performance plan is an outline of how specific NGBs want to grow their sport as well as develop athletes who can succeed at international and Olympic levels (B. Gambardella, personal communication, October 28, 2008). These plans also provide a guide for resource allocation as they delineate the missions and goals of each of the organizations. Resources are allocated to help the NGBs accomplish the goals that have been established in the high performance plans.

The USOC has made a commitment to a performance based funding strategy. Performance based funding strategies have yielded mixed results in the education and business worlds (Birnbaum, 2000; Dinesh & Palmer, 1998; Poister & Streib, 1995). Although the USOC has already moved to a performance based funding strategy, is this the best strategy for this sport organization? Have they fully implemented the performance based funding system throughout the entire organization?

Statement of the Purpose

Organizations in many sectors have recently moved to performance based funding models to try to maximize the goal accomplishment of their organizations. The USOC moved to performance based funding to try to develop a system that places athletes in the best possible position to succeed at the Olympic Games and international competitions. Success can be a difficult term for a sport organization like the USOC to define because of the vast differences among sport organizations. Americans feel that a silver medal in basketball is a failure, where a silver medal in another sport without similar expectations is a huge success. The dramatic differences in the perceptions of success encourages the USOC to use performance-based budgeting, because it doesn't require a gold medal in every case. The purpose of this study is to determine whether the USOC has embraced the fundamental principles of performance based funding and uses them in their development of NGB high performance plans and goal establishment.

Research Questions

There is a great deal of information regarding the use of performance based funding systems in education and business. Although many educational systems have moved to performance-based funding strategies, Birnbaum (2000) states that this system may be ineffective in education because the business principles behind the strategies do not transfer to an educational setting. Studies show that when an organization does not achieve a higher level of success with a form of performance-based funding, it is often due to the fact that the system did not fit the organization or the organization did not implement the funding system throughout the entire organization (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998; Poister & Streib, 1995). The success of performance-based funding systems relies

on two important factors. The first is that the organization implements the system throughout the entire organization, and the second is that the performance based funding system fits the organization.

Crotty (2003) argues that people construct meaning in vastly different ways in relation to the same phenomenon. This statement supported the way that I conducted this study. The move to a performance-based funding strategy by the USOC was an opportunity to redefine the goals and mission of the organization, as well as to establish a new way of doing business. Some may look at this move as a more goal-oriented process for the USOC and its athletes, while others may view it as a way to cut funding for specific athletes. Individuals will view the effectiveness of a performance-based funding strategy in completely different ways. Constructing a meaning of the effectiveness of USOC's use of a performance-based funding strategy added depth to the study.

To ensure the study was always moving in the right direction, the main overarching research question was: How do the principles of a performance-based funding strategy fit with an organization like the USOC? In addition, the following set of specific sub-questions were asked:

- Q1 How does the USOC use the theoretical principles of performance-based funding?
- Q2 How do the goals and objectives of each individual NGB match with the principles of performance-based funding?
- Q3 How do the individual high performance plans of each NGB match with the performance-based funding principles as a theoretical background?
- Q4 How have performance-based funding strategies changed the level of on-field performance?

Need for the Study

There is a wealth of information regarding performance-based funding systems and their impact on business as well as educational organizations. However, there is a dearth of information regarding sport organizations and allocation of organizational resources. Authors like Howard and Crompton (2005) have looked at various approaches to spend money, but no one has done a study to analyze the allocation of funds toward goal accomplishment. To date, no one has determined if certain types of funding strategies are more successful for certain types of sport organizations.

Early in the sport management literature, there is a wealth of information regarding the organizational structures of sport organizations. Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, & Zimmerman (1989) define eight different types of sport organizations and their organizational structure. Nowhere in the literature do they describe how best to allocate the resources that the organization has. There is such a diverse range of sport organizations that it is necessary to try to help these organizations determine what is the best way to maximize their limited resources.

There are many sport organizations that need to understand how to spend the precious resources that they have. In my mind, the most glaring example would be a university athletic department. Sixty percent of Division I Athletic Departments run a deficit each year (Fulks, 2004). This causes the school to fund a portion of the school's sport program. The sport programs are usually written in as part of the school's mission so it is a justifiable expense. However, Bowen & Levin (2003) argue that college athletics has turned into a portion of the entertainment industry with inflated budgets and expectations that cause administrators to make decisions that they should not necessarily make. Instead of becoming involved in the arms race to employ the best coach or win the

next national championship, universities need to understand the realistic goals of their athletic programs and budget money accordingly. The study of a performance-based funding organization could help universities better allocate the limited funds that they have toward a variety of athletic programs.

Hopefully this study will cause sport organizations to more critically analyze the various reasons and methods sport organizations use to allocate their funds. Sport organizations are businesses, and these organizations need to take on business funding models when dealing with their financial obligations.

This study will also help fill a void in the literature. The organizational structure of sport organizations has been evaluated, but the introduction of financial strategies has yet to be tested. Howard and Crompton's (2005) text lacks the information to teach sport management students of the many possible means to allocate resources. Future sport managers need to learn about possible strategies for accounting and allocation of financial resources.

Delimitations

Scope of Phenomenon

The phenomenon under scrutiny did not include the winter sport NGBs. In this study, the summer sport NGBs were analyzed in regards to the use of performance based funding. Winter sports were excluded from the study to ensure that I was focused enough to correctly describe the use of performance-based funding within the summer sport NGBs.

Selection of Case

The case for this study will be the USOC. Within this case a variety of NGBs will be used. The various NGBs make up a wide variety of sport organizations from team

sports like basketball and baseball to individual sports like swimming and track and field. Sample criteria for summer sports were used to gain a purposeful sample of summer sport NGBs to produce a holistic study of the issue at hand.

Target Organization

The idea of performance based funding could be adopted by various sport organizations. Professional sports teams may use performance-based funding to try to maximize on-field performance while maximizing revenue. University athletic departments are in some sense a mix of professional sports teams and non-profit organizations like the USOC. I chose the USOC because they are not trying to profit from the decisions that they make. The fact that the USOC is a non-profit organization makes the utilization of resources all the more important since there is such a limited supply of those valuable resources. For this study, I only used this one organization.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were used throughout the study and were defined operationally to eliminate multiple interpretations:

Activity Based Costing. A costing method that is designed to provide managers with cost information for strategic and other decisions that potentially affect capacity and therefore “fixed” as well as variable costs (Kaplan & Cooper, 1998).

Balanced Scorecard. A system that is more than just tactical or operation measurement system, designed to manage the organization’s strategic vision over the long term (Kaplan & Norton, 1996a).

Case study. The exploration of a bounded system or a case over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information right in

context (Creswell, 1998). Also, an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit (Merriam, 1998).

Management by Objective (MBO). A control system designed to manage by objectives and give employees more self-control (Drucker, 1964).

National Governing Body (NGB). An NGB is an organization that governs a specific sport in the country in which it exists, within the regulations of the USOC (Wonders, 2006).

National Governing Bodies (NGBs). Two or more national governing bodies.

Outcome Budgeting. An outcome-based budgeting system places more emphasis on strategic and performance plans with measurable results, performance budgets, accountability process, a performance evaluation that de-emphasizes micro-managing of line-item spending, and annual reports for communicating to stakeholders (Aristigueta, 1999; Miller et al., 2001).

Performance-Based Funding. Performance budgets use statements of missions, goals and objectives to explain why the money is being spent. It is a way to allocate resources to achieve specific objectives based on program goals and measured results (Carter, 1994).

Return on Investment (ROI). A profitability equation that may be used to calculate past performance or future expectations (Schachner, 1973).

Return on Objective (ROO). ROO differentiates itself from ROI by focusing on a company's brand awareness or effectiveness of a marketing strategy instead of a comparison of dollars earned versus dollars spent (Vatner, 2005).

United States Olympic Committee (USOC). Established by Congress through the Amateur Sports Act of 1978; the USOC is the sole authority, within the United States, for supervision and development of sports contested in the Olympic and Pan American Games (Wonders, 2006).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this literature review is to examine past studies and research regarding a wide range of financial accounting methods that help organizations determine if they are achieving their desired goal or gaining their desired return on investment. This literature review is not meant to discuss the foundations of economic modeling, but only to gain a basic understanding of various financial principles. The wide range of topics is included to ensure that different principles of resource allocation are covered in order to gain a proper understanding of the subject at hand. The financial principles discussed are return on investment, return on objective, performance-based funding (to include management by objective and a balanced scorecard), outcome based funding, and activity based costing. Using the various principles I found, I was able to gain a greater understanding of various financial principles and in turn draw some meaning as to why the USOC choose current methods to fund their various programs.

Return on Investment (ROI)

The discussion of ROI from an economic or accounting perspective can be difficult to understand for those that are not in those disciplines (Rockland, 2005). Determining the proper ROI equation can lead to a great deal of discussion and disagreement. In a study regarding expatriate ROI, McNulty and Tharenou (2004)

provide a foundation of the research regarding the definition and basic ROI principles. ROI is an accounting term and Flamholtz (1985) defines ROI in its simplest terms as a financial ratio that expresses profit in direct relation to investment. An expanded definition for ROI was given by Schachner (1973) as a profitability equation that may be used to calculate past performance or future expectations. However, accounting and economic academicians (Abdallah & Keller 1985; Brief & Lawson 1992; Laitinen 2003; Spencer 1999) have cast doubts on the effectiveness of using only traditional accounting methods in determining ROI. Accounting measures are concerned only with past or future financial performance and often exclude nonfinancial performance indicators. In the economics literature, ROI is defined within the context of economic profit (EP) (Canibano, Garcia-Ayuso, & Sanchez 2000; Mills, Rowbotham, & Robertson 1998). EP combines a value-based approach to measure both past and future returns by including both financial and nonfinancial data in the ROI calculation. EP is then used in the economic equations of shareholder value analysis (Rappaport, 1981) and economic value added (Stewart, 1991). ROI can also be calculated by using shareholder value analysis and economic value added, where value can be defined in both financial and nonfinancial means.

Determining the actual value for the ROI is the most difficult task. As mentioned above, many different experts have different methods of calculating ROI. Some practitioners use strictly financial data while others add in certain nonfinancial information. David Rockland (2005) may have offered the best advice when determining ROI; he states that individuals should ask what managers define as ROI. Managers from different disciplines may perceive the ROI value to be different in their arenas.

Individuals must understand what values were used to calculate the number before trying to determine its significance. In order to correctly calculate ROI, one must understand the returns that managers are looking for. A desire to measure some non-financial returns has led some practitioners to adopt other various forms of ROI. Some of these variations include training and sponsorship ROI.

Training ROI

For some organizations like the United States military, their ROI comes from the training funds that are invested into their military forces (Nesselrode, 2008). Funds are spent in training, which can make it difficult to measure the ROI. In some sense, the USOC faces similar challenges in that their investment is spent on the funding of the Olympic movement throughout the United States. Donald Kirkpatrick (1998), a leader in training evaluation, notes that it is important to evaluate training and expenditures for three different reasons:

- To justify the existence and budget of the training department by showing how it contributes to the organization's objectives and goals;
- To decide whether to continue or discontinue training programs;
- To gain information on how to improve future training programs.

Some organizations commit millions of dollars in resources to some level of training, and these organizations need to evaluate the value they receive in return for their efforts (Rowden, 2005). Some professionals argue that it is not possible to calculate the ROI of training, while others quietly and deliberately proceed to develop measures and ROI calculations (Phillips, 1997; Rowden, 1998). Training ROI is essential to an

organization like the USOC, since their investments are not measured in financial outcomes but in medals or world records by United States athletes.

Sponsorship ROI

Another example of how difficult it can be to measure ROI is the sponsorship field. Berrett and Slack (1999) concluded that sport sponsorship could be an important component of a marketing strategy for business organizations. Currently AIG has a sport sponsorship contract with Manchester United valued at \$100 million over four years (Joyce, 2008). Although the decision to invest the money in this sponsorship was made prior to the current economic crisis, was this the most effective way for AIG to spend its money? Sweet (2002) stated that many corporations would be taking a closer look at how well sport sponsorship revenue contributed to the bottom line.

In order to evaluate the value of sponsorship ROI, Stotlar (2004) developed a sponsorship feedback evaluation model to help organizations determine their ROI. This model uses both quantitative and qualitative data to determine the sponsorship ROI. Hernandez and Thomas (2003) suggest that the best way to measure sponsorship ROI is to evaluate it using a test versus control approach. This approach should demonstrate how much better or worse the organization is doing after the sponsorship has been activated, hopefully giving the organization an idea on the ROI. Ukman (1996) also argues that sponsorship can be measured, but measures need to be developed. In order to develop the measures, organizations need to evaluate their objectives in order to properly measure their ROI. Researchers and practitioners alike must work together to develop a measurement tool that can be used to evaluate sponsorship ROI. In order to correctly

measure, some business leaders suggest that sponsorship and other investments should be measured by ROO instead of ROI (Dobson, 2006).

Return on Objective (ROO)

ROO differentiates itself from ROI by focusing on a company's brand awareness or effectiveness of a marketing strategy instead of a comparison of dollars earned versus dollars spent (Vatner, 2005). ROO is intended to bridge the gap that exists with ROI failing to measure some intangible aspects of an organization's investment. ROO measures whether the initial objectives of a project have been met (Krantz, 2006). Vatner (2005) argues that in order to create a valuable ROO system there are six steps a business needs to take: (1) talk to stakeholders; (2) define objectives; (3) set a value to those objectives; (4) match the meeting (resources) to those objectives; (5) put metrics in place; and (6) count and tell. Vatner (2005) used ROO to develop success meetings for business leaders; in the fourth step he discusses the allocation of resources. ROO is meant to emphasize the importance of objective accomplishment instead of solely financial return.

Recently, ROO has been gaining some acceptance as a method for business to determine the value of their investments. In 2006, over \$15 billion were up for grabs to networks that could show both the largest Nielson rating as well as "viewer engagement" (Consoli, 2006). Media outlets began to recognize that advertisers want to ensure that viewers will see the advertisement. Innovations like TiVo have made it possible for viewers to skip advertisements which are the lifeblood of television networks. In order for networks to garner advertising money they needed to show that their viewers would actually see the advertisements that the advertisers spent so much money on. The objective of viewers watching the commercial was just as important as a number like a

Nielson rating. Investors want to make sure that they receive the proper return on their investment.

Performance-Based Funding

Performance based budgeting systems grew in popularity during the late 1990's as government looked to account for the limited resources they had to spend (Young, 2003). To help understand exactly what performance based budgeting or performance based funding is, these budgeting systems have the following characteristics:

Performance budgets use statements of missions, goals and objectives to explain why the money is being spent... [It is a way to allocate] resources to achieve specific objectives based on program goals and measured results. ...Performance budgeting differs from traditional approaches because it focuses on spending results rather than the money spent—on what the money buys rather than the amount that is made available (Carter, 1994, p. 2-3).

Performance funding and budgeting systems are theoretically based in the management theories of Management by Objective (MBO) and a Balanced Scorecard (Woodley, 2005). Woodley (2005) and Dinesh and Palmer (1998) outline the theoretical background of both MBO and Balanced Scorecard. MBO and Balanced Scorecard are management theories to allocate resources focused on results instead of the money being spent. These theories would help explain why the USOC moved to a performance-based funding system in 2000.

Management by Objective (MBO)

One of the early leaders in management theory was Peter Drucker (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 1996). Drucker popularized the MBO theory of management when he published *The Practice of Management* (1954) and *Managing for Results* (1964).

Originally, MBO was introduced in the 1950's as a control system designed to manage by objectives and give employees a little more autonomy. This new theory stated that

organizations would function at a higher level if the organization worked in unison and individual contributions fit together to produce a greater whole. This effort would be done without gaps, friction, or duplication of effort (Drucker, 1955). At the time, the focusing effect of goal alignment was thought to be the best way to improve overall business performance and in turn increase profit margin (D'Aveni, 1995).

General Mills was one of the first companies to put Drucker's idea to the test by implementing a managerial performance system known as MBO (McGregor, 1960). Around the same time MBO was beginning to be used, McGregor (1960) also developed his managerial theories, Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X stated that employees inherently dislike work and therefore must be pushed by managers in order to get the greatest amount of productivity. Theory Y states that employees find work as natural as play or rest and therefore need only to be told what the end goal is and they will accomplish the work on their own. Prior to MBO, management practices were based on the rational goal model, also known as the economic model (Quinn et al., 1996). The rational goal model put an emphasis on command and control, which is very similar to the strategies a manager would need to employ if they were following McGregor's Theory X (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998).

McGregor's development of Theory Y along with emerging MBO ideas led managers to change their ideas on how best to manage and motivate their employees (Bartol & Martin, 1991). MBO principles differ greatly from command and control principles that had been previously used. Theory Y and MBO principles led to the "human relations" model, which empowered employees and encouraged collaboration (Guillen,

1994). Managers wanted employees to complete certain tasks instead of trying to manage their daily activities.

As the MBO movement began to develop and gain recognition, common elements of an MBO system were defined. The elements that are most commonly recognized are: (1) objectives established for all jobs in the firm; (2) use of joint objective setting; (3) linking of objective to strategy; (4) emphasis on measurement and control; and (5) establishment of a review and recycle system (Reddin, 1971; Reddin & Kehoe, 1974). Dinesh and Palmer (1998) later noted some commonly accepted implementation steps for consistent application of MBO across organizations.

- Identification of organizational strategy – All organizations need to start by identifying long-term strategic goals (Drucker, 1955; Odiorne, 1979).
- Collaborative goal setting – Goals should be set by both managers and employees in a collaborative effort. Goals should be consistent throughout each level of the organization (Drucker, 1955; Reddin & Kehoe, 1974).
- Rewards linked to goals – Attempts should be made to link rewards to the individual goals developed by the MBO system. Research on linking rewards to measurement (Dewey, 1995; Shaw and Schneier, 1995) shows that collaborative goal and reward setting is successful as a motivational tool.
- Development of action plan – An action plan helps identify problem areas and assists in resource allocation. Action plans encourage innovation and empower subordinates, and should again be developed by subordinates in collaboration with their supervisors (Bartol & Martin, 1991; Neale, 1991).

- Cumulative periodic review of subordinate results against targets – Management should be up to date about progress and unexpected problems, so that they can intervene if needed. For this reason, an MBO system includes periodic performance reviews to focus on gaps between goals and actual performance. The review should include praise and recognition for areas where the subordinate has performed well, as well as areas for improvement (Reddin & Kehoe, 1974).
- Review of organizational performance – The final step of MBO implementation is a regular review of the entire system, feeding back into the first step. The overall review provides an opportunity to ensure that organizational plans are being implemented as expected and that strategic goals remain as the focus (Bartol & Martin, 1991; Odiorne, 1987; Reddin & Kehoe, 1974).

Effectiveness of MBO

In theory it seems that with everyone working toward the same goal, the overall performance of the organization would increase. However, according to Odiorne (1979), General Mills' implementation was not as successful as one might think. Other organizations that used MBO have also claimed that it was more of a hindrance than a help to the organization (Van Tassel, 1995). One of the biggest obstacles to the success of MBO is the ability of the organization to establish organization-wide goal congruence. Most organizations who do not see MBO as successful use it only as a performance appraisal instead of having the organization share in a common goal (Reddin & Kehoe, 1974). These organizations who only use one step in the process fail to gain the benefits of MBO. In 1995, Poister and Streib found that only 28 percent of public organizations that used MBO used it with their entire organization, while 72 percent used MBO solely

as an appraisal system. Betchell's 1996 findings support those of Reddin and Kehoe (1974), in that communication and uncommon objectives led to failures of certain MBO systems. As with any tool, in order for it to be successful it must be used for its intended purpose. If managers want to use MBO, they must understand what it is and how best to use it in their organizations.

Balanced Scorecard

Kaplan and Norton (1992) developed the Balanced Scorecard, which is very similar to the elements and implementation steps of MBO. De Waal (2003) outlines that the balanced scorecard theory was developed to bridge the gap between management strategy and employee empowerment for continuous improvement. Implementing theoretical applications in the day-to-day operations of a business can be difficult at best and the balanced scorecard theory attempts to make the implementation somewhat easier. The central tenet of the Balanced Scorecard theory is goal congruence for the entire organization (Hoffecker & Goldenberg, 1994; Newing, 1995). The Balanced Scorecard is divided up into four separate categories: financials, customers, internal processes, and learning/innovation. Financials are concerned with past performance while the other three, customers, internal processes, and learning/innovation, are focuses on the future (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998; Newing, 1994). Measures and objectives for each category are derived from the mission and vision statements of the organization. The purpose is to have the measures for each category in line with the overall mission of the organization. Consistency with these goals is to be applied across the entire organization instead of individual subunits (Beischel & Smith, 1991; Hoffecker & Goldenberg, 1994).

Kaplan and Norton (1996a) define their Balanced Scorecard system as more than just a tactical or operational measurement system. It is designed to help organizational leaders to manage their strategic vision over the long term. In order to manage the organization over the long term, the Balanced Scorecard measurement tools are used for the following critical processes (Kaplan & Norton, 1996b): (1) clarify and translate vision and strategy; (2) communicate and link strategic objectives and measures; (3) plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives; (4) enhance strategic feedback and learning; and (5) link measures with reward. Balanced scorecard and MBO are similar in that they both stress the importance of goal congruence throughout the entire organization. The Balanced Scorecard, like MBO, emphasizes the importance of clear and measurable goals and that these goals require collaboration in their development (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998). Another similarity with MBO is that the Balanced Scorecard utilizes rewards and incentives as motivational tools (Kaplan & Norton, 1996b). Using rewards and incentives as a motivational tool is reinforced by Dewey's (1995) and Shaw and Schneier's (1995) studies on MBO. Kaplan and Norton later state that rewards and incentives should only be used after the scorecard has been in effect for some time to ensure that the right measures are in place (Calabro, 2001).

Although there are many similarities between MBO and the Balanced Scorecard, there is one significant difference. The Balanced Scorecard method of management is more focused than MBO. The difference stems from the fact that MBO is an open-ended system, and this leads managers to focus on the easily quantifiable financial measures. Focusing on financial measures can lead to managers overlooking non-financial measures that may be equally important (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). As stated previously, the

Balanced Scorecard prescribes four categories for goal measures: customer satisfaction, internal processes, innovation and learning, and financial measures (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998).

Effectiveness of Balanced Scorecard

Throughout the 1990s, the Balanced Scorecard system was adopted by many businesses throughout the United States. These businesses included the FHC Corporation, Rockwater Engineering, Apple Computer Company, Advanced Micro Devices, DHC Chemical Division, Natwest Bank, and Mobil's US Marketing and Refining Division (Corrigan, 1996; Kaplan & Norton, 1993b; Newing 1994, Vitale, Mavrillac, & Hauser, 1994). The Balanced Scorecard system has also shown great promise in improving goal congruence within business organizations (Kaplan & Norton, 1993a). Although there have been some successes with the Balanced Scorecard, there are some examples of weaknesses in the system. Newing (1994) notes that the biggest problem with the Balanced Scorecard is the complex process of developing the system. Developing the Balanced Scorecard system requires a great deal of time and effort that some organizations do not have. A Balanced Scorecard needs to be developed for each level of the organization and sometimes for specific individuals; this can be extremely costly, and the process can outweigh the benefits of the system. The time and cost of development for the Balanced Scorecard can lead some businesses to implement the system in limited parts of the business. If the entire organization does not implement the system, goal congruency is difficult to achieve and the system can be unsuccessful (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998).

Another factor that could encourage partial implementation is the nature of the current market. The market of the 1990's was much more dynamic than the market of the 1950's (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994), and businesses are now able to act more quickly and aggressively. D'Aveni (1995) defined the new, more competitive marketplace as "hyper competitive". If the marketplace is changing faster than the tools to measure business goals, the system is not effective at accomplishing its assigned objectives. This hyper competitive marketplace can force business to implement only parts of the Balanced Scorecard, which again can lead to its failure.

Because the Balanced Scorecard system applies more importance to the human element of business functions, it has gained some ground over MBO (Woodley, 2005). The Total Quality Management (TQM) principles of the 1980s have made the business environment more conducive to the human relations model necessary to implement the Balanced Scorecard successfully (Bowen & Lawler, 1992; Guillen, 1994). It is plausible that the concerns which were inherent with the command and control aspect of MBO implementation (Bechtell, 1996; Odiorne, 1979) should be reduced with the Balanced Scorecard. The Balanced Scorecard should benefit from forty years of experience with the human relations model, as opposed to what MBO had to deal with when it was implemented in the 1950s (Dinesh & Palmer, 1998).

To understand the effectiveness of the Balanced Scorecard, studies have been conducted with individual businesses to determine if the Balanced Scorecard system improves financial performance. Throughout many different studies, the results are mixed. Banker, Potter and Srinivasan (2000) and Davis and Albright (2004) studied businesses that implemented the Balanced Scorecard at some of their locations instead of

the entire business to test its effectiveness. The studies found that the Balanced Scorecard improved financial performance for the units that implemented the new system. In contrast, Neely (2007) and Griffith and Neely (2007) reach conflicting conclusions regarding the benefits from Balanced Scorecard systems. Neely (2007) showed that implementation of a Balanced Scorecard improved financial performance of two divisions but two other divisions saw the same improvement without the Balanced Scorecard. Neely could not differentiate the effectiveness of the Balanced Scorecard. Griffith and Neely (2007) showed that the use of a Balanced Scorecard was only effective in the cases where managers were also experienced. It seems clear that more information must be gathered to determine the effectiveness of the Balanced Scorecard system. Ittner (2008) published a study related to the effectiveness of measuring intangible assets and their effectiveness in driving business performance. One of the measurement systems analyzed was the Balanced Scorecard and he determined that there is a dearth of information regarding the effectiveness of some performance based funding systems like the Balanced Scorecard.

Continuous Process Improvement

Although the theories of MBO are still fundamentally sound, these principles are being changed into new business buzzwords of today (Sharp, 1991). “Continuous process improvement is an approach to gradually reduce waste, improve quality, assure a safer work area and increase productivity. The goal is to give customers what they want, when they want it – every time” (Czarnecki, Schroer, Adams, & Spann, 2000. p. 74).

Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) is the updated version of MBO. MBO and CPI are similar in the fact that CPI teams are focused on task completion (Componation &

Farrington, 2000). To ensure that this research is up-to-date with current terms, Management by Objective will be referred to as Continuous Process Improvement from this point forward.

Outcome Budgeting

Martin (1997) states that outcome budgeting was developed by the government to manage some of its various processes. The major difference between outcome budgeting and performance budgeting is that outcome budgeting focuses on outcomes and effectiveness, while performance budgeting is focused on outputs, economy, and efficiency (Hendrick & Forrester, 1999). Outcome budgeting involves the analysis of results, accomplishments, or impact, which makes it different from other types of budgeting (Martin, 1997). Other types of budgets generally target internal stakeholders while outcome budgeting attempts to communicate with and educate external stakeholders about accomplishments and their related costs (Martin). Outcome-based budgeting systems place emphasis on strategic performance plans with measurable results, on performance budgets, on accountability process, on a performance evaluation that de-emphasizes micro-managing of line-item spending, and on annual reports for communicating to stakeholders (Aristigueta, 1999, Miller et al., 2001). Using this approach, managers have the authority to manage lump-sum allocations in the best manner possible and are held accountable for their results. Also, departments are able to carry over large portions of their unspent monies (Cothran, 1993). Individual incentives are critical for the success of outcome budgeting (Larkey, 1995).

Implementation of outcome budgeting depends on policy-makers' ability to ensure that current contractual agreements are upheld (Hendrick & Forrester, 1999).

Martin (1997) indicated that implementation involves the selection of a basic approach (i.e. linking and purchase approaches) and a unit of analysis (i.e. at program or service level; agency or organizational level; and state or community level or any combination thereof). Osborne and Gaebler (1992) argue that linking approaches involves including outcomes in the budget documents, and budget processes as outputs are included in performance budgets. This approach gives external stakeholders the chance to see what resources were allocated and what planned goals were met. When considering purchasing decisions, specific resources are acquired to achieve a given goal in a quasi-contractual way (Martin, 1997). This approach is difficult to implement when compared to a more traditional method of linking expenditures to results. Martin suggests that outcome budgeting may be easier to implement at different levels of government.

Although outcome budgeting is a different means of accounting for funds than performance-based budgeting, it appears that it may not be widely accepted. Martin states, “Cutting to the chase, can outcome budgeting lead to new ways of making resource allocation decisions? If the past is prologue, the odds are not favorable” (p. 123). Although it is loosely related to performance-based budgeting, one of the founders of its economic theory does not believe that it is a viable option for the future.

Activity-Based Costing

Activity-Based Costing (ABC) is similar to many of the techniques concerned with the improvement of operating performance by connecting costs with overall performance (Neumann et al., 2004). ABC was developed in the late 1980s by Robin Cooper and Robert Kaplan to correctly determine the cost of products by using a more refined system (Turk, 1992). Cooper and Kaplan (1988) argued that traditional costing

systems lead to distorted product costs when there is diversity in the size of the products. A cost-benefit factor is used to determine costs that should be traced directly to a certain activity and which costs should be placed in a larger cost pool. The result is multiple overhead rates for allocating organizational resources to produce goods. This is more complex, but much more accurate in determining the products' cost (Turk, 1992).

Garrison, Noreen, and Brewer (2008) state that ABC is designed to be used internally for decision-making processes, and there are three ways that it differs from traditional costing systems:

1. Nonmanufacturing as well as manufacturing costs may be assigned to products, but only on a cause-and-effect basis.
2. Some manufacturing costs may be excluded from product costs.
3. Numerous overhead cost pools are used, each of which is allocated to products and other cost objects using its own unique measure of activity. (p. 310).

The differentiation of cost pooling separates ABC from other methods of accounting. ABC can be a different way to evaluate costs and can be used throughout an organization.

Cooper (1990) states that ABC can be used on a variety of different levels, and they include unit-based activities, batch-level activities, product-level activities, customer-level activities, and organization-sustaining activities. Garrison, Noreen, and Brewer (2008) also define five steps for implementing ABC within a given organization.

These steps are:

1. Define activities, activity cost pools and activity measures.
2. Assign overhead costs to activity cost pools.

3. Calculate activity rates.
4. Assign overhead costs to cost objects using the activity rates and activity measures.
5. Prepare management reports.

ABC is relatively new within the business world; however, its acceptance has been questioned. Innes, Mitchell, and Sinclair (2000) studied the growth of ABC in the United Kingdom in the late 1990's and found the ABC did not have a growth rate and that interest was leveling off. Major and Hopper (2005) determined that some employees disagreed with the costing structure, which led to distrust among the employees. These two factors meant that the data used within ABC was incorrect, and therefore the accuracy of the system was brought into question.

ABC has been applied to various business industries, such as manufacturing, information technology, medical, and many others (Garrison, Noreen, & Brewer, 2008). ABC has yet to be applied to the sports industry.

Conclusion

Managers and business leaders have a variety of ways to determine that their investment is bringing them the greatest amount of return. Today more organizations seem to be moving toward methods that not only measure hard assets, but take into consideration intangible items that are hard to measure. Methods of determining rates of return or performance measures are vital to an organization's ability to determine its effectiveness. Managers who are unable to account for valuable resources will not be able to provide the profits or success that owners or stakeholders are seeking.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Case Study

Creswell (2007) states “case study research involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system” (p. 73). In addition to Creswell’s definition of a case study, Yin (2003) outlines three situations where a case study is deemed appropriate. First, the study needs to define the type of research questions that will be asked. What, why, and how questions are best answered by a case study. Second, the amount of control a researcher has over actual behaviors must be considered, with the least amount of control being the most appropriate. Third, the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events should determine the usage of a case study design; a case study is more appropriate for contemporary events.

Based on Yin’s criteria, the study of the fit of performance-based funding strategies with the USOC satisfied all three qualifications of a case study strategy. First, the research question focuses on how the USOC uses performance-based funding principles in the development of their organization, utilizing primarily how questions. Second, the topic does not require any control of behavior by the investigator. Third, the issue is very contemporary. The USOC has been in existence formally since 1921

(“History”, n.d.) and I am only concerned with their current funding strategy and how they utilize the principles within their current organization.

The type of case study that used, an instrumental case study, is defined by Stake (2000):

A particular case is examined to provide insight into an issue or refinement of theory. The case is of secondary interest: it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else. . . . The choice of case is made because it is expected to advance our understanding of that other interest (p. 237).

Following this definition, I think an instrumental case study of the USOC was relevant because the issue of performance-based funding principles used by a sport organization was the phenomenon under scrutiny. The study of the USOC as a bounded case broadens our understanding and provides insight into the following Research Questions:

- Q1 How does the USOC use the theoretical principles of performance-based funding?
- Q2 How do the goals and objectives of each individual NGB match with the principles of performance-based funding?
- Q3 How do the individual high performance plans of each NGB match with the performance-based funding principles as a theoretical background?
- Q4 How have performance-based funding strategies changed the level of on field performance?

Essentially, these four questions served as the research questions, however, not in the traditional sense of testing a hypothesis or theory. These four questions form a base to gain a greater understanding of a particular phenomenon. The goal of this research was to explore the case in order to understand the phenomenon and retain meaningful characteristics of a real-life phenomenon (Yin, 2003) rather than to generalize beyond. The overarching research interest was to investigate how a sport organization used the principles of performance based funding.

Theoretical Stance

According to Crotty's, theoretical perspective is "the philosophical stance that lies behind our chosen methodology" (2003, p.3). It provides us with a framework to conduct a given study. Crotty (2003) argues that it is essential to establish the epistemological framework first to determine how we know what we know. I have chosen the constructionist (or constructivist) perspective in support of my stance on theory testing. Because I wanted to understand how the USOC uses the theoretical principles of performance based funding instead of testing a hypothesis, my epistemology will be constructivist.

Constructionism

Maynard states that, epistemology is "concerned with providing a philosophical grounding for deciding what kinds of knowledge are possible and how we can ensure that they are both adequate and legitimate" (p. 142). The epistemological stance that I selected was that of a constructionist, whose basic premise is that "meaning is not discovered, but constructed" (Crotty, 2003, p. 108). The constructivist believes that there is no absolute truth in the work, only meaning developed or constructed by individuals based upon their own experiences with the environment where they live. Crotty (2003) says that different people construct meaning in different ways for the exact same phenomenon. This statement made by Crotty was the way that I approached this study. The four main areas of concern in this research were: (1) how does the USOC use theoretical principles of performance-based funding, (2) how do the goals of each NGB match with the principles of performance-based funding, (3) how do the high performance plans match with the theoretical principles of performance-based funding,

and (4) how have performance-based funding strategies changed the level of on field performance. Answering these questions was the thrust of my study. The phenomenon of the USOC adopting performance based funding principles may appear to have different meaning based on the differences of each individual NGB.

In addition to each individual NGB's construction of meaning for the USOC's use of performance-based funding, as the research, I also have constructed an individualized idea on how a performance-based sport organization should operate. This constitutes a vital epistemological position that constructionism takes in relation to the interaction between the investigator and the respondents. Due to this interaction, constructionism, as an epistemological position, was adopted for the current study.

Guba & Lincoln (1989) referred to some of the specific properties of constructions that I refer to:

- Constructions are attempts to make sense of or to interpret experience, and most are self-sustaining and self-renewing.
- The nature or quality of a construction that can be held depends upon the range or scope of information available to a constructor and the constructor's sophistication in dealing with that information.
- Constructions are extensively shared, and some of those shared are "disciplined constructions," that is, collective and systematic attempts to come to common agreements about a state of affairs, for example, science (p. 71).

Lastly, my previous work experiences in a sport organization have further supported my theoretical stance on constructionism. Based on 3 years of executive experience, I have learned that organizational decisions are interpreted differently by

individuals in an organization. Different perspectives of individuals and sub-groups can mean different implementation of a given policy throughout an entire organization. The responsibility of an investigator is to bring out as many different perspectives as possible to gain a clear understanding of the issue at hand.

In summary, constructionism, as epistemology for this study, helped to identify and organize the differences in construction of meaning for the different NGBs. The essence of this study was to provide a holistic view of how well the principles of performance-based funding fit with a sport organization like the USOC. A single perspective of one NGB was not sufficient, because it would not adequately describe the phenomenon. In my opinion, if this study can generate some broader views of why particular financial systems are used within sport organizations, its usefulness will greatly increase.

Research Design

Research design consists of the logical steps that were taken to connect the research questions to data collection, analysis, and interpretation in an understandable way (Hartley, 2004). Yin (2003) defines research design as “a logical plan for getting from here to there, where here may be defined as initial set of questions to be answered, and there is some set of conclusions (answers) about these questions” (p. 20). Creswell (1998) notes that in qualitative research, a general approach is normally used, since a detailed plan is not feasible due to the potential emerging issues that can develop. As the research design for this study, I have adopted the five components proposed by Yin (2003): the study’s questions; its propositions, if any; its unit(s) of analysis; the logic of linking the data to the propositions; and the criteria for interpreting the findings.

Study Questions

To study the topics that I wanted to answer, open-ended research questions in terms of who, what where, how, and why should be used (Yin, 2003). As a greater understanding of the issue is developed, these questions may change throughout the research process (Creswell, 1998). As Merriam (1998) noted, questions about a process (how or why something happens) generally guide qualitative research, as do questions of understanding (what happened). My research questions focused on how the USOC and specific NGBs used the principles of performance-based funding to help understand the phenomenon of athletic funding. I was interested in how performance-based funding principles are utilized throughout the organization.

Study Propositions

Yin (2003) stated that each proposition focuses attention on what should be examined within the given scope of a study. He also states, “some studies may have a legitimate reason for not having any propositions. This is the condition in which a topic is the subject of exploration” (p. 22). However, the purpose of this study was to determine if the USOC had embraced the fundamental principles of performance based funding and uses them in their development of NGB high performance plans and goal establishment. Yin argues that for an exploration to be judged successful, the following requirements should be met: (a) the variety and depth of similar and contrasting perspectives on the issue of performance based funding, and (b) the evidence of evolution, if any, in the USOC use of these principles in the development of specific goals.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is intertwined with the basic problem of defining the case (Yin, 2003). Merriam (1998) states that the case is “a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (p. 27). Miles and Huberman (1994) define the case as “a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p. 25). I personally agree with Stake’s (2005) view on the selection of the unit of analysis for a study: “The case is singular, but it has subsections, groups, occasions, dimensions, and domains – many so well-populated that they need to be sampled” (p. 449). The singular case or unit of analysis was the USOC, the sole entity in the United States whose mission involves training, entering and underwriting the full expenses for the U.S. teams in the Olympic, Paralympic, Pan American and Parapan American Games (“Mission”, n.d.). Within this case, a number of subsections exist. Specifically, all of the NGBs which fall under the USOC. The single case on which I will concentrate is the USOC, but this case includes the various NGBs that fall within the USOC. This type of case study can be referred to as an embedded case study design (Yin, 2003). Stake (2005) claims that multiple case studies would be preferred over a single case study, but as Cassell and Symon (2004) have said, “access difficulties and resources” (p. 89) have made it so a wider study is not feasible to be pursued. Even in a single-unit research environment, I am confident that I gleaned the necessary information to provide insight into the USOC’s adoption of performance-based funding principles.

Linking Data to Propositions

This concept is quite self-explanatory. Once I collected the data, I was able to connect pieces of information from the case to the propositions that were stated earlier

(Campbell, 1975). Because this was an exploratory study, the purpose statement and criteria for successful exploration will replace propositions. A comparison between actual data and the successful exploration criteria was conducted as part of the data analysis.

Criteria for Interpreting a Study's Findings

Yin (2003) recognizes that there is a lack of criteria to interpret various findings and this is an enormous challenge for case study researchers. Even though Campbell developed his pattern matching technique, there is still no way to evaluate a true match between findings and propositions (Yin). In this case study, I identified similar and contrasting patterns to represent the width and depth of the findings.

Sampling Procedure

Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) state, "Qualitative research is more flexible with respect to sampling techniques than quantitative research. This flexibility reflects the emergent nature of qualitative research design which allows researchers to modify methodologies as data are collected" (p. 177). When selecting the sample, one must consider where, when, whom, and what to observe (Burgess, 1982). Non-probability sampling is often the method of choice for qualitative research, with purposeful sampling being the most common form of non-probability sampling (Creswell, 1998). Patton (1990) argues that,

The logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling (p. 169).

For this study I utilized non-probability, purposeful sampling. To gain a greater understanding of the phenomenon from multiple perspectives, I needed a sample that would generate the widest variety of perspectives. The concept of criterion-based

sampling was used when deciding which NGBs were analyzed. According to Goetz and LeCompte (1984), the research can establish the necessary criteria to include in a study and then find a sample that matches the established criteria. For the purpose of this study, I outlined the following criteria for the selection of NGBs within the case study.

1. Must be a sport that competes in the Summer Olympics.
2. Must have had a medal opportunity at the 2008 Beijing Games.
3. Must have a current high performance plan.
4. Must have established goals and objectives.

The selection criteria were created because of the wide variety of embedded subsections (Yin, 2003) within this given case. Merriam (1998) suggests that a sample within the case should be selected to study various sites, events, activities, and people comprehensively. The above criteria allowed me to select NGBs that are located throughout the United States, as well as representing a variety of team and individual sports.

Sources of Evidence

According to Yin (2003), there are six most commonly used sources of evidence and they are, “documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observation, and physical artifacts” (p. 85). Yin also argues that a major strength of a case study is the opportunity to gather data from a wide variety of sources of evidence. This factor can help in establishing validity and reliability of the case study evidence. Patton (1990) confirms Yin’s thoughts on the importance of multiple sources of evidence:

Multiple sources of information are sought and used because no single source of information can be trusted to provide comprehensive perspective. . . . By using a

combination of observations, interviewing, and document analysis, the fieldworker is able to use different data sources to validate and cross-check findings (p. 244).

Creswell (1998) adds that a case study should involve the widest array of data collection possible in order to help the research develop an in-depth understanding of the case.

Hackley (2003) argues that the application of data collection methods in a study are subject to variation. For this case study, I pursued as many sources of evidence as possible; however, the most feasible source of evidence to access was that of documentation. An informal interview was also conducted to interpret the importance of the high performance plans and also environmental factors that affect USOC decision making. Although most of the evidence will be collected through documentation, ten different NGBs were analyzed in this particular case study, which gave me a great understanding of the phenomenon at hand.

Interview

One of the most important sources of information in a case study is an interview (Yin, 2003). Merriam (1998) contends that an interview can be an opportunity to garner special types of information. Patton (1990) expounds on this concept by stating.

We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. . . feelings, thoughts, and intentions. . . we cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. We have to ask people in the world questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective (p. 196).

In this study a primary source of evidence was an informal interview. As I was gathering data from the USOC, I sat in the office of Mr. Bob Gambardella, the USOC's Director of Sport Partnerships, who was the contact that I had for the research process. The information provided by Mr. Bob Gambardella was essential in understanding the

USOC's use of high performance plans. According to the biography of Mr. Gambardella found on the USOC website, he

Oversees the USOC relationship with 11 Olympic and Paralympic sport organizations in support of the Sport Performance Division's work with the National Governing Bodies to achieve sustained competitive excellence through high performance plans and integrated allocation of USOC resources ("Key Executives, n.d.).

While gathering the information from the high performance plan, I sat at a work table in Mr. Gambardella's office and read through each plan. Throughout the process of reading through the individual plans, I would ask him simple questions regarding individual NGBs and the process to develop high performance plans. Any question that I asked Mr. Gambardella was a result of something that I had seen in a plan or in a casual conversation with him as I worked in his office. I had no outline for any questions or conversation as I began my research. His experience in the USOC provided insight that I would not have been able to get if I had only relied on the high performance plans without any additional input.

As a researcher, the most important aspect of the interview process was building a rapport with the respondent. Interviewing is both a research methodology and a social relationship that must be nurtured throughout the process (Mishler, 1986). Based on previous personal experiences, I understood that without a level of mutual respect and understanding I would not be able to interpret subtle nuances of information that an interviewer should strive to attain. I knew that Mr. Gambardella was a busy man and was offering up his time to help me. I tried to respect who he was and the many tasks that he had to accomplish while gathering vital tidbits of information to guide my understanding of the high performance plan and the USOC decision making process.

Documentation

Yin (2003) identified the following documents as legitimate, qualitative data that can be utilized by the researcher in case studies:

- Letters, memoranda, websites, and other communiqués.
- Agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other reports of events.
- Proposals, progress reports, and other internal records.
- Newspaper clippings and other articles appearing in the mass media or in community newsletters. (pp. 85-86)

Stake (1995) noted that documents can serve as “substitutes for records of activity that the researcher could not observe directly” (p. 68). There was no way to gain access or observe the meetings of 32 or more NGB Chief Executive Officers to understand how they espouse the principles of performance-based funding. Access to individual high performance plans allowed me to analyze whether or not the USOC and the various NGBs were using performance-based funding principles. Other internal documents were also used for background information, as well as filling a few gaps left by the high performance plans.

The High Performance Plan

In order to garner the information to complete the intent of this study, high performance plans were used from 10 different NGBs. To better understand why these documents were chosen a discussion of the purpose, value, and makeup of these plans are necessary. The USOC’s Resource Allocation Process document created in January of 2007, defines the purpose of a high performance plan:

High performance is defined as “Olympic and Paralympic athletes achieving sustained competitive excellence.” NGB high performance plans are the

“blueprints,” (i.e., action plans for achieving sustained competitive excellence). In summary, high performance plans streamline the annual flow of NGB information into one central, practical document that provides easy access for all USOC divisions ensures effective use of USOC and NGB resources and created stronger NGB/USOC partnerships (United States Olympic Committee, 2007, p. F-2).

High performance plans are outlines used by the USOC to ensure that individual NGBs are building sports and athlete pipelines to ensure success at the international level.

High performance plans help the USOC understand the uniqueness and opportunities of NGBs and their sports. NGBs who create high performance plans clearly detailing their goals and strategies (as well as progress made towards reaching the goals), as well as providing an overview of the resources available to activate the plan, make a stronger case for USOC financial, program and service support (United States Olympic Committee, 2007, p. F-2).

The statement above emphasizes the USOC use of the high performance plan to determine who should receive funds from the USOC and at what level those funds should be distributed. Past performances and future needs are important aspects of the plan. The high performance plan is also essential to funding, because without the submission of a quadrennial report with yearly updates, an NGB is not eligible to receive USOC funds.

In order to develop the high performance plan, each NGB establishes a team that is comprised of five to eight decision makers with diverse expertise from various levels of the NGB. These members range from the chief executive officer to athletes or other important volunteers (United States Olympic Committee, 2007). The variety of individuals helps to develop a plan that encompasses all important aspects of a given NGB. Although each high performance plan is very unique, the USOC has provided each NGB with an outline for their individual plans. The outline provided by the USOC asks each NGB to ensure that the following aspects of an organization be covered in the plan:

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Vision and Mission

- III. Value Statements/Guiding Principles (Optional)
- IV. Stakeholder Identification and Prioritization (Optional)
- V. SWOT Analysis (SWOT stands for internal Strengths and Weaknesses and external Opportunities and Threats)
- VI. Critical Success Factors
- VII. Athlete Development Pipeline (ADP)
 - A. High Performance Plan Development Team
 - B. Current ADP Model
 - C. Ideal ADP Model
 - D. Critical ADP Issues
 - E. International Competitive Analysis
 - F. Program Base
 - 1. Athlete Support
 - 2. Coaching Program
 - 3. Athlete/Coach Competencies, Education/Certification
 - 4. International Games Preparation
 - 5. International Relations
 - 6. Performance Services
 - 7. NGB Core Program Summary
 - 8. Quadrennium Budget
 - 9. Action Plan (Goals, Strategies, Tactics, Performance Measures)
- VIII. Business Development Plan

IX. Revenue Generation Plan (United States Olympic Committee, 2007, p F-3).

Of the 10 high performance plans that were analyzed, none of them were exactly alike. They all addressed most of the issues contained in the outline above, but none of them followed the outline in exact detail.

The high performance plans are vital documents used by the USOC. These documents provide a framework for USOC administrators to be able to answer difficult questions as to which NGBs should receive funding for given projects or activities. Without these documents, the funding decisions of USOC administrators would be arbitrary at best. The fact that the USOC provides a guide on how to develop the document shows that they are searching for fundamental information so they can correctly allocate precious resources.

Research Instrument

In order to determine if the USOC is adhering to performance-based funding principles, a research instrument needed to be developed. In order to develop the instrument, the theoretical principles of performance-based funding were used. Martin (1997) argues that the fundamentals of performance based funding and outcome budgeting are similar, so there is no need to add anything from outcome budgeting. Although ABC is similar to many of the techniques concerned with the improvement of operating performance by connecting costs with overall performance, it is an accounting tool and somewhat different from performance-based funding (Neumann et al., 2004). To ensure that the research tool is founded in performance-based funding I have excluded ABC ideas from the formation of the research instrument. The two theoretical

foundations that make up performance-based budgeting are management by objective, or continuous process improvement, and a balanced scorecard.

The most common recognized elements of CPI based on the theoretical background of MBO are: (1) objectives established for all jobs in the firm; (2) use of joint objective setting; (3) linking of objective to strategy; (4) emphasis on measurement and control; and (5) establishment of a review and recycle system (Reddin, 1971; Reddin & Kehoe, 1974). Dinesh and Palmer (1998) outline six commonly used implementation steps which are similar to the five elements above. The only difference is that Dinesh and Palmer add that rewards must be linked to goals. So the six principles for a performance based organization according to CPI theory would be:

- (1) Objectives established for all jobs in the firm;
- (2) Use of joint objective setting;
- (3) Linking of objective to strategy;
- (4) Emphasis on measurement and control;
- (5) Establishment of a review and recycle system; and
- (6) Rewards must be linked to goals.

The Balanced Scorecard uses measurement tools over five critical processes to ensure that an organization is functioning at the highest level. According to Kaplan and Norton (1996b) these five processes are:

- (1) Clarify and translate vision and strategy;
- (2) Communicate and link strategic objectives and measures;
- (3) Plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives;
- (4) Enhance strategic feedback and learning; and

(5) Link measures with reward

These five processes could be considered the overarching principles of the balanced scorecard theory.

When comparing the principles of CPI and a balanced scorecard, it is clear that some of them are very similar. The balanced scorecard is more current theory and the USOC has had a balanced scorecard developed for them. For this reason, I will use the five principles of a balanced scorecard as the foundation for the research instrument. Two principles from CPI that I would add to the balanced scorecard are; (1) objectives need to be established for all jobs in the firm; and (2) there needs to be an emphasis on measurement and control. The first principle is added to ensure that the principles of a performance-based organization have permeated the entire organization, and the second is added because a balanced scorecard is a measurement tool, but I feel it is important to see if the USOC is actually measuring certain performances.

For the above reasons, the research instrument contained seven items to determine if the USOC is consistent with performance-based funding theory. These seven items were:

- (1) Objectives established for all jobs in the firm
- (2) Clarify and translate vision and strategy
- (3) Communicate and link strategic objectives and measures
- (4) Plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives
- (5) Emphasis on measurement and control
- (6) Enhance strategic feedback and learning
- (7) Link measures with reward

Trustworthiness

Qualitative researchers have met a great deal of skepticism from their quantitative counterparts in regards to standards of quality in terms of validity and reliability. Both types of researchers strive to conduct their research in the most ethical manner possible. To ensure quality work, qualitative researchers should often ask the questions, “Did we get it right?” (Stake, 1995, p. 107) or “Did we publish a ‘wrong’ or inaccurate account?” (Thomas, 1993, p. 39) to ensure that “the qualitative study is believable, accurate, and right” (Creswell, 1998, p. 193).

To overcome some credibility issues, qualitative researchers have developed definitions and equivalents that substitute for traditional concepts of validity and reliability in quantitative research. Qualitative researchers LeCompte and Goetz (1982) supported the idea of mirroring quantitative concepts of validity and reliability and have urged the use of what is called positivist terminology, such as internal validity, external validity, reliability, and construct validity (Creswell, 1998). Robert Yin, a leader in qualitative research, echoes this positivist philosophy by embracing the idea that objective knowledge about our world is achievable (Gall et al., 2003).

Other qualitative researchers argue that authors who use positivist terminology facilitate the acceptance of qualitative researchers in a quantitative world (Creswell, 1998). Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, and Steinmetz (1991) insist that using quantitative terms is a defense measure and that positivist language is not “congruent with or adequate to qualitative work” (p. 95). Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose an alternative method of describing reliability and validity in qualitative inquiry. Lincoln and Guba would replace the concept of validity and reliability with the word “trustworthiness”, and with the terms credibility, transferability, and dependability. Lincoln and Guba also argue that the word

conformability should be used for internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity. Firestone (1987) examined how quantitative and qualitative research employs different means to persuade readers of their trustworthiness. He stated, “The qualitative study provides the reader with a depiction in enough detail to show that the author’s conclusions makes sense” (p. 19). Researchers have proposed a set of different terminology to replace the positivist concepts of validity and reliability in qualitative research, but to this point a set of terminology has yet to be developed (Eisner, 1991; Lather, 1993; Richardson, 1990; Wolcott, 1994).

While qualitative scholars debate the merits of changing terminologies, researchers still have the responsibility to respond to the concerns of outsiders, most of whom are unfamiliar with the credibility of qualitative research (Merriam, 1998). In this study, I refer to the definitions and tactics described by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Merriam (1998) and Yin (2003) on the issues of validity and reliability.

Internal Validity (Credibility)

In regards to qualitative research, Yin (2003) defined internal validity as “establishing a casual relationship, whereby certain conditions are shown to lead to other conditions” (p. 34). Lincoln and Guba (1985) switch the term internal validity in a qualitative study with the term credibility. Lincoln and Guba state that credibility addresses the issue of the researcher assuring the fit between actual events and the researcher’s reconstruction and representation of the same. Merriam (1998) noted that “internal validity deals with the question of how research findings match reality” and that it focuses on the meaning of reality (p. 201). Kirk and Miller (1986) claimed, “the issue of validity is not a matter of methodological hair splitting about the fifth decimal point,

but a question of whether the researcher sees what he or she thinks he or she sees” (p. 21).

Although there are many definitions for internal validity, the key points or terms for this study are fit, match, reality, and accuracy. Merriam (1998) suggests six strategies to enhance internal validity: triangulation, member checks, long-term observation, peer examination, participatory or collaborative modes of research, and researcher’s bias. For this case study, I pursued four of Merriam’s techniques to ensure internal validity.

Triangulation

Denzin (1984) identified four types of triangulation: data source triangulation, when the researcher looks for the data to remain the same in different contexts; investigator triangulation, when several investigators examine the same phenomenon; theory triangulation, when investigators with different viewpoints interpret the same results; and methodological triangulation, when one approach is followed by another, to increase confidence in the interpretation. Data source triangulation was the method of triangulation for this study. Stake (1995) states that data source triangulation looks to see “if the phenomenon or case remains the same at other times, in other spaces, or as persons interact differently” (p. 112). Data source triangulation fit in this case due to the diverse sources of data. There are 32 NGBs that should meet the sample selection criteria along with the USOC itself. The data coming in from these varied sources should enhance internal validity of the study.

Member Checking

Merriam (1998) defined member checking as a process of “taking data and tentative interpretations back to the people from whom they were derived and asking

them if the results are plausible” (p. 204). The participant is not merely a subject being studied but a critic and observer as he or she helps verify observations and interpretations. Member checking will play an important role in this study. A member of the USOC reviewed the findings to ensure their meanings were interpreted correctly.

Peer Examination

Peer examination is the process of engaging colleagues to critique findings as they emerge (Merriam, 1998). This process also played a large role in increasing the internal validity of the study. It is critical to share the findings with my colleagues who are familiar with the sport management field of study. Two colleagues went to the USOC with me and repeated the methodology of this study.

Researcher's Biases

Merriam (1998) noted that by clarifying the researcher's assumptions, worldview, and theoretical orientation at the outset of the study, the researcher's biases can be used in enhancing internal validity. Understanding the researcher's bias helps the reader discern how the data may have been interpreted (Merriam, 1998). Having worked in a sport organization, I am skeptical about the planning of an athletic budget. My background leads me to ask how the organization espouses the principles of performance-based funding and whether they live up to the idea that the USOC is truly a performance-based funding organization.

External Validity (Transferability)

Schwandt's (2001) definition for external validity in a qualitative study is:

Transferability deals with the issue of generalization in terms of case-to-case transfer. It concerns the inquirer's responsibility for providing readers with sufficient information on the case studied such that readers could establish the

degree of similarity between the case studied and the case to which the findings might be transferred (p. 258).

Case studies with essentially one sample have caused a great deal of concern for qualitative researchers in regards to generalizability. Merriam (1998) argues “a single case or small nonrandom sample is selected precisely because the researcher wishes to understand the particular in-depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many” (p. 208). Patton (1990) adds to Merriam’s thought by stating that a qualitative study should “provide perspective rather than truth, empirical assessment of local decision-makers’ theories of action rather than generation and verification of universal theories, and context-bound extrapolations rather than generalizations” (p. 491). Morse (1994) adds, “The transferability of qualitative research criterion focuses on general similarities of findings under similar environmental conditions, contexts, or circumstances” (p. 107). Understanding external validity from the reader’s point of view must also be considered. According to Merriam (1998), reader generalizability involves “leaving the extent to which a study’s findings apply to other situations up to the people in those situations” (p. 211). To enhance external validity (transformability) for this study, I used the following strategies outlined by Merriam (1998).

Rich and Thick Description

Readers need to be able to make a decision as to whether the findings from a given study are transferable to the situations that they experience. One way to ensure transferability is by providing enough description to allow the reader to transfer the results to their situation. The idea of vicarious experience (Stake, 2005) should help produce rich and thick descriptions of the phenomenon that has been observed. The better

the reader can vicariously witness the phenomenon described in written word, the more transferable the findings become.

Typicality Category

In order for readers to be able to make the findings transferable, the phenomenon should be described in the most typical way possible. Although the USOC and the various selected NGBs are unique in their goals and missions, they could be described as typical sport organizations. Any sport organization should be able to look at a different sport organization and understand why they chose a given funding policy and how that policy would fit with their organization.

Multi-Site Designs

The inclusion of embedded subsections (Yin, 2003) within the case can provide variations within the response and, therefore, increase external validity. As mentioned previously, for this study I used NGBs that are found throughout the United States and are very distinct in the type of sports they sponsor and activities they invest in. The use of these various NGBs should help strengthen external validity through the principle of multi-site design.

Reliability (Dependability)

According to Schwandt (2001), dependability focuses on the process of inquiry and the researcher's responsibility to guarantee that the process was well thought out, traceable, and documented. Yin (2003) states that reliability is reached when future investigators can reproduce similar procedures and arrive at similar results. Yin further argues that "the goal of reliability is to minimize the errors in a study" (p. 37). Lincoln and Guba (1985) state the term "consistency" should replace the term "reliability". They

prefer the term consistency because the results should be consistent and dependable with the given data collected.

Merriam (1998) suggests three distinct protocols to enhance the reliability of a given qualitative study: investigator position, triangulation, and audit trail. Yin (2003) states that a study protocol is another option to increase the study's reliability. The key is to be able to retrace the procedural steps of the study to replicate the data collection and hopefully the results. For this study I used Merriam's (1998) protocols to increase reliability. In the internal validity section, I have already addressed how I used triangulation to increase the credibility of this study. In the same section, I also addressed my position on the current study. The last piece of Merriam's protocol, the audit trail will also be a key part of this study. I tried to "describe in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry" (Merriam, 1998, p. 207).

Data Analysis

Data analysis is "the activity of making sense of, interpreting, or theorizing data . . . It involves sorting, organizing, and reducing data to something manageable and then exploring ways to reassemble the data to interpret them" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 7).

Creswell (1998) discusses seven pieces of data analysis: data managing, reading and memoing, describing, classifying, interpreting, and representing. For the case study in qualitative research, Stake (1995) outlines a process called categorical aggregation:

Categorical aggregation is where the researcher seeks a collection of instances from the data, hoping that issue-relevant meaning will emerge. In instrumental case studies, where the case serves to help us understand phenomena or relationships within it, the need for categorical data and measurements is greater (p. 77).

The first step in a categorical aggregation is to recognize the given categories. A category is a construct that refers to a given phenomenon found in the data (Gall et al., 2003). To develop his own categories, the researcher needs “to carefully study the data and identify significant phenomena, and then determine which phenomena share sufficient similarities that they can be considered instances of the same construct” (Gall et al., 2003, p. 454). Once this has taken place, the data can then be organized around certain topics, themes, or central questions open for interpretations (Cassell & Symon, 2004).

For this study, I utilized categorical aggregation as the primary means of data analysis. I utilized the high performance plan outline as a guide to look for potential categories. I understood that the themes did not necessarily have to fall in line with the outlines, but I felt that was a good place to start. I followed closely the suggestions of LeCompte and Preissle (1993) by breaking down the data more in-depth than mere descriptions, opting not to “allow readers to draw their own conclusions and risk misinterpretation” (p. 267).

Conclusion

Through this case study I hope I have given the readers an understanding of how the USOC uses the principles of performance-based funding in their daily operations. The primary reason to conduct a qualitative study was to determine how the principles are used in development of high performance plans and in turn the operation of the USOC. Methodologically, I hope to provide firsthand experience through rich and thick description so the reader can transfer the findings to his or her own situation.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The sources of evidence for this study included one interview, as well as the examination of numerous internal documents provided by the USOC or found on their website. This section of the report will outline the findings garnered from a critical look at each of the sources of evidence. Through careful study of the data, themes developed that were able to give me a greater understanding as to why the USOC chose to use a performance-based funding model and also how well they adhered to the basic principles of performance-based funding.

Performance-based funding has been used throughout the USOC to strengthen individual NGBs and ensure that these organizations are focused on producing athlete pipelines that will eventually lead to overall Olympic success. The USOC deals with NGBs that are all developmentally on different levels. Some of the NGBs are highly developed and are able to adapt to outside influences to continue to produce world-class athletes, while some NGBs struggle to maintain financial viability as well as some level of public interest. The diverse nature of the NGBs' environment in which the USOC operates makes funding decisions difficult at best. The USOC's financial and podium performance over the past eight years shows that the performance-based funding

principles are helping the USOC keep the United States at the top of international competition.

Analysis of High Performance Plans

To answer the research questions, a simple instrument was developed in the methodology section to evaluate the USOC's use of performance based funding principles. Ten high performance plans from individual NGBs were used to determine how the USOC implemented performance-based funding principles. A discussion of findings from the ten separate cases are outlined below. Compliance with the research instrument is found in Appendix A, Table 7. Below is a discussion of how each NGB met or did not meet the seven performance-based funding principles. As a reminder, the seven principles developed for the research instrument are:

- (1) Objectives established for all jobs in the firm
- (2) Clarify and translate vision and strategy
- (3) Communicate and link strategic objectives and measures
- (4) Plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives
- (5) Emphasis on measurement and control
- (6) Enhance strategic feedback and learning
- (7) Link measures with reward

Due to the proprietary nature of the various high performance plans, I have tried to ensure that important information is protected while providing enough rich and thick description to show how the principles were met. Generalizations have been made in the writing of the findings to ensure that information is protected.

Basketball

Overall, USA Basketball had a very well-developed high performance plan (United States of America Basketball, 2008). After looking through the plan, it seems that USA Basketball is playing by a different set of rules than other NGBs because of their affiliation with so many “professional” organizations like the NBA, NCAA, and other highly developed basketball organizations. These organizations appear to have a large influence on how USA Basketball is run and how athletes are developed. USA Basketball also appears to have a high potential for revenue due to how mainstream the sport is in the United States, but at the same time their costs seem to be much higher than most other NGBs. Part of this stems from the fact that professional athletes compete for USA Basketball at international competitions like the Olympics (B. Gambardeall, personal communication, February 13, 2009). These athletes are used to being treated at a high level, so USA Basketball must spend a little extra to accommodate them so that they will compete. Because basketball is so mainstream in the United States, a gold medal is expected, and therefore, costs seem to be higher.

1st Principle

Job descriptions were clearly defined for the entire organization in Appendix B of the high performance plan (United States of America Basketball, 2008). Responsibilities for board members were found in Appendix A which is also the USA Basketball Constitution. Overall it appears that USA Basketball has a good idea of what every member of their organization should be doing.

2nd Principle

The overarching purpose of the high performance plan is to clarify USA Basketball's strategy and vision to the USOC. Therefore, the fact that USA Basketball has a high performance plan meets the intent of this principle. The vision of USA Basketball was outlined, as well how that vision would be accomplished (United States of America Basketball, 2008).

3rd Principle

USA Basketball outlines a very well thought out strategic plan, but they don't offer any measurements or milestones along the way (United States of America Basketball, 2008). The only measure that seemed relevant was the winning of gold medals at the Olympic Games. Although this is a measure, there could be measures for some of the other goals that they had outlined.

4th Principle

The fourth performance-based funding principle was reached through the establishment of five overarching goals for the entire organization (United States of America Basketball, 2008). These goals dealt with the organizational structure as well as sustainment and improvement of current performances. USA Basketball did a good job of outlining how these goals would be met through the establishment of strategies to accomplish each of these goals. All future strategic initiatives seemed to be in line with the five goals of the organization.

5th Principle

The major weakness of the Basketball high performance plan (2008) stems from the fact that there are no measurement controls in place. One strategy is to increase

control over players by enforcing codes of conduct but there are no metric or measurements established to evaluate performance of the NGB.

6th Principle

There is evidence of strategic feedback through the development of the high performance plan (2008). USA Basketball recognized that their past practices were not producing desired results. To address this issue, USA Basketball ensured that the men's national team would be able to practice and compete with each other for a year or longer before the Olympics. Commitments were required from National Basketball Association (NBA) players prior to their being named to the team. The learning process displayed by USA Basketball is present in the high performance plan, even though they do not have an established feedback process.

7th Principle

As stated previously, the only measure of USA Basketball is a gold medal. There are no internal measures to determine how the NGB is doing (United States of America Basketball, 2008). Most NGBs have measures placed on their individual athletes. Because USA Basketball draws its athletes from professional leagues, they do not place some of these measurements on their individual athletes. USA Basketball did not measure up to this principle of performance-based funding.

Canoe/Kayak

USA Canoe/Kayak consists of two similar sports within one NGB. These two sports are Whitewater Slalom and Flatwater Sprint. Each of these sports had developed high performance plans that were very similar. Overall, it appears that Whitewater Slalom is a more developed organization than Flatwater Sprint. Both of these sports have

trouble attracting both athletes and spectators in the United States, and therefore it is more difficult to compete for sponsors, making them more reliant on the USOC for funds. Both sports stated that their funding pales in comparison to their primary competitors from Europe. Flatwater Sprint seems to be working hard to catch up to Whitewater Slalom and other NGBs (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008a, 2008b).

1st Principle

USA Canoe/Kayak is a very small organization with limited people on staff. Athletes have specific objectives that were established by the NGB to qualify for funding as well as health insurance. The USA Canoe/Kayak bylaws and constitution (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2009) outlines the objectives for the board of directors, as well as the specific committees and the chief executive officer. Although I could not confirm that everyone in the organization had specific objectives established, there is enough evidence to suggest that they do.

2nd Principle

The executive summaries from both the Whitewater Slalom high performance plan (2008b) and the Flatwater Sprint high performance plan (2008a) clarify the mission and vision of the organization. Each high performance plan also has a section which established strategic priorities for the organization as a whole. These plans are meant to clarify the mission and vision of USA Canoe/Kayak to the USOC.

3rd Principle

Action plans in both Whitewater Slalom and Flatwater Sprint link strategic objectives and specific measures (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008a, 2008b). For example, the action plan for Flatwater Sprint contained four performance

goals and benchmarks, seven performance strategies, and four tactics and performance measures.

4th Principle

A detailed plan to set targets and align strategic initiatives was developed by both Whitewater Slalom and Flatwater Sprint (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008a, 2008b). These plans focused on improving the organization by growing membership and developing athletes to be competitive at the Olympic level. Targets were established for individual athletes and strategic initiatives by the NGB to help develop these athletes.

5th Principle

The NGB seemed to want to exert a lot of control over their athletes and how they trained. Athletes are required to sign an athlete agreement for funding. This agreement states how often the athlete will compete and what level of performance they must attain (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008a, 2008b). Measures were also established throughout both high performance plans, and there were cases in the Flatwater Sprint high performance plan where it stated that they did not meet past goals.

6th Principle

The process of writing the high performance plan seems to be a learning process for the NGB. Executive summaries of past performance show strengths and weaknesses in the organization, and from the observations plans are established to try to remedy the weaknesses and take advantage of given strengths (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008a, 2008b).

7th Principle

Financial rewards are clearly linked to athlete performance. In the Whitewater Slalom high performance plan, a slalom podium program is outlined (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008b). This plan is funded by the USOC, and therefore a limited number of positions are available. Funding levels are based on athlete past performance. For athletes that spend the majority of their time training for a given event, this is a huge reward to be able to have some of their costs offset by a grant from the NGB through the USOC.

Equestrian

The United States Equestrian Federation is only in its fifth year of serving the USOC as the NGB for equestrian sports in the United States, but they clearly are a well established organization working to enhance equestrian events throughout the United States (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008). The United States Equestrian Federation is clearly focused on developing an athlete pipeline to ensure that the best athletes can compete at a high level and have sound, reasonable goals, based on years of historical precedents. The organization is highly developed and this was evident by the development of a meticulous budget for the next four years. The equestrian sports are divided up into three different disciplines. These disciplines are dressage, eventing and show jumping.

1st Principle

Although there are 140 staff members for the United States Equestrian Federation, there was no evidence of objectives being established for every individual in the organization. Objectives for athletes were outlined in the high performance plan (United

States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). Objectives for the board of directors and chief executive officer were outlined in the bylaws (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008b). Although there were not any clearly defined objectives, the Equestrian Federation is so highly developed I find it hard to believe that there are not job descriptions for every individual that works at the federation. From analyzing the complexity of the organization and the outline for athlete performance, I feel I can safely say that there are job descriptions and objectives for all 140 staff members at the home offices in Gladstone, New Jersey.

2nd Principle

The mission statement outlined in Chapter III of the high performance plan was very unique. It had 24 individual items to clarify what the organization is trying to accomplish (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). No other NGB that I observed had such a highly developed mission statement. The mission and vision statements are clearly trying to transmit the vision and strategy of the organization to the USOC.

3rd Principle

Chapters VII, VIII, and XI of the high performance plan are athlete development plans for the three different disciplines within equestrian (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). Each of these athlete development plans has specific action plans which contain goals, objectives and measures. All of the measures are in line with the overall mission and objective of the United States Equestrian Federation. These goals are clearly communicated to the USOC.

4th Principle

Targets have also been established for the various goals. The overarching goal of the organization is to compete at a high level at the Olympic Games. In order to reach this goal, progress is measured throughout the Olympic Quadrennium at events like the 2010 World Equestrian Games and the 2011 Pan American Games (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). These events are targeted events for the athletes to show their performance levels in preparation for the Olympic Games.

5th Principle

Measurement and control is clearly demonstrated throughout the Equestrian High Performance Plan (2008a). Each goal and objective has a specific measure to ensure that goal has been achieved. Also, a detailed four-year projected budget shows that the Equestrian Federation has an understanding of what it takes to develop an elite equestrian team. The budget also shows that they have control over their finances and know how much and when money should be spent.

6th Principle

The entire process of the high performance plan is a learning activity for the United States Equestrian Federation (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). The review of past performance in the executive summary and the international competitive analysis allow managers to understand where the organization is and what they need to do to better develop world class athletes. The United States Equestrian Federation learns from the past and incorporates those lessons in their future development.

7th Principle

The rewards that are tied to performance are in place for athletes. Athletes that reach a certain level of performance receive grants and health insurance so that they can continue their training on a full-time basis (United States Equestrian Federation, 2008a). These funds are essential for athletes to compete on a world level and are a great incentive.

Fencing

Prior to the 2008 Beijing Olympics, the United States Fencing Association had a great deal of financial difficulty, and the USOC had to give the NGB \$220,000 to allow athletes and coaches to continue preparation for the Games (B. Gambardella, personal communication, February 12, 2009). The theme of having financial difficulty resonated throughout the high performance plan, as it stated many times that success was reliant upon the ability to secure funding for the NGB (United States Fencing Association, 2008). It seemed that the United States Fencing Association is in a transition mode and trying to develop a larger base from which to draw athletes, as well as moving the sport to become more mainstream within the United States. After reading the fencing high performance plan, I felt that the United States Fencing Association is working hard to become a more professional organization.

1st Principle

Clear objectives were established for athletes throughout the high performance plan; however, there was no evidence of objectives for individual staff members. After looking at the United States Fencing Association Bylaws, it is clear that there is evidence of specific objectives for staff members throughout the NGB (United States Fencing

Association, 2001). Responsibilities for the board of directors as well as committees and officers were detailed within the bylaws. This seemed to be enough evidence to say that each member of the organization has specific responsibilities defined for his or her job.

2nd Principle

The purpose of the high performance plan is to educate the USOC about what the United States Fencing Association is working on. Although there is no clear vision or mission statement, there is great detail outlining what direction the United States Fencing Association would like to take the sport in the United States (United States Fencing Association, 2008).

3rd Principle

Overarching goals in Chapter III are turned into action plans in Chapter VII. These goals are specific to different disciplines and each gender (United States Fencing Association, 2008).

4th Principle

Chapter VII of the high performance plan has action plans for specific genders and disciplines (United States Fencing Association, 2008). Targets are set for world championship competitions that lead up to the Olympics. The United States Fencing Association would like to win one medal at each major championship for each discipline. Short-term and long-term goals are also established to link the targets with the long term objectives.

5th Principle

There appear to be very limited measures to track within the United States Fencing Association. These measures consist of winning of individual medals at given

world championships (United States Fencing Association, 2008). However there are no metrics that measure the overall performance of the organization. One metric that could be used is the membership growth within the United States. If the United States Fencing Association wants to grow its base, it should track this using some form of metric.

6th Principle

As with other NGBs, the process of developing a high performance plan every four years is a learning process in itself. Management must understand what successes they had in the past and how they are going to overcome any challenges they had in the past. The high performance plan also contained a SWOT analysis which shows that the NGB is observing their performance and trying to learn from it (United States Fencing Association, 2008).

7th Principle

The link between rewards and measures comes from individual athlete incentives (United States Fencing Association, 2008). Athletes have standards that must be kept in order to gain grant money and health insurance from the USOC.

Gymnastics

During the Beijing Games, the United States won the largest number of medals ever in a non-boycotted Olympic Games. USA Gymnastics has enjoyed a great deal of success over the past two summer Olympics, having both the men's and women's team winning medals at the past two Olympics. This success has entrenched USA Gymnastics as a solid player in the international gymnastics arena (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). From reading the high performance plan it appears that USA Gymnastics is a well-defined and well-organized entity and the members understand who

they are and what they are trying to do. USA Gymnastics is also not concerned with specific athletes, but is more concerned with the athlete development pipeline.

1st Principle

The Gymnastics high performance plan does not have any defined responsibilities for individuals within the organization, except for hints at what athletes are supposed to do (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). It does mention that athletes need to sign an athlete agreement, but never lists what requirements are in the athlete agreement. The USA Gymnastics Bylaws do outline responsibilities for major players within the organization like board members, committees, and directors (United States of America Gymnastics, 2007). Since USA Gymnastics is so well developed, it seems logical that every employee of USA gymnastics would have a job description kept at the main office in Indianapolis, Indiana.

2nd Principle

The executive summary of the high performance plan outlines how well USA Gymnastics has done in the last two Olympic cycles and lists overarching objectives and themes for the upcoming quadrennium (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). Strategy is established for the organization and communicated to the USOC.

3rd Principle

The high performance plan links the overarching objectives with the individual action plans and strategies developed in the athlete development pipeline (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). Although it links strategic objectives with programs, there are no individual measures of success. The plan talks about winning medals but that is the only measure.

4th Principle

Plans are established to strengthen the athlete development pipeline for men, women, trampoline, and rhythmic athletes (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). These plans evaluate how athletes should be developed from the lowest level all the way to the elite level. These are in line with growing the sport of gymnastics throughout the United States, which is a core objective.

5th Principle

There are efforts to emphasize measurement and control. The high performance plan talks about winning medals and gives some specifics in the action plans contained in the athlete development pipeline. For the women, this includes winning the American Cup and performance goals at the World Championships. The way that they do exercise some form of control is over their athletes. One of the weaknesses in the SWOT analysis was the misconduct of members (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). I interpreted this to be child abuse on the part of coaches and administrators. This problem is clearly something that USA Gymnastics would like to control. They want to ensure that behavior is in line with the goals of USA Gymnastics, so they require athletes to sign athlete agreements and provide services to educate and certify coaches.

6th Principle

USA Gymnastics is always learning about its performance. The evaluation required to develop a SWOT analysis as well as evaluating the international competition, ensure that USA Gymnastics is looking at its own programs and trying to determine how it can improve the organization in order to improve overall performance (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008).

7th Principle

In the action plans, they link rewards to athletes based on performance. Top athletes will be allowed to receive monetary incentives as well as insurance. Scholarships are also offered for trampoline athletes, since university programs are not in place (United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). It is interesting to note that USA Gymnastics reserves the right to withhold funding based upon the needs of the country (or in other words, USA Gymnastics).

Rowing

USA Rowing appears to be an NGB that is constantly striving to increase the awareness of the sport in the country while trying to maximize success at the Olympic Games. Historically, USA Rowing has focused on the events with eight-member teams; however, this is currently changing, as the focus has broadened to developing athletes for all events (United States of America Rowing, 2008). Although the high performance plan was clearly developed and outlined goals and initiatives for the organization, it was not as organized as other sports. At times, it appeared that the high performance plan was a work in progress as the organization improved itself and its strategies and plans. USA Rowing is also a unique NGB in the fact that they spent \$200,000 in 2007 and 2008 in litigation to determine which athletes would make the Olympic team (B. Gambardella, personal communication, February 11, 2009). Rowing athletes are generally affluent and well-educated, and this has caused some members to seek legal means in making the Olympic team instead of proving it in their athletic endeavors.

1st Principle

Like most other high performance plans, there were not any examples of objectives being established for individuals within the organization unless they were specific athletes (United States of America Rowing, 2008). However, after analyzing the USA Rowing website, two intern opportunities were found on the website for the upcoming summer (“Job opportunities and internships”, n.d.). Both of these postings for job opportunities contained objectives for each position, and it is important to note that these are interns. One could assume that if they have objectives for interns, they would also have objectives for everyone else within the organization.

2nd Principle

The vision and strategy of USA Rowing is clearly defined in Chapter III of the high performance plan (United States of America Rowing, 2008). This chapter addresses critical success factors and talks about the things that USA Rowing needs to do in order to be successful on an international level. Again, this vision is meant to be conveyed to the USOC so that the USOC will support USA Rowing with critical funding resources.

3rd Principle

The high performance plan as a whole links strategic objectives to a very limited number of strategic goals or measures. The measures that USA Rowing is concerned with are the number of boats that are in the final races at the 2012 Olympics and how many medals are won as a result of placing those boats in those positions (United States of America Rowing, 2008).

4th Principle

The only example of a target being set is that of the 2012 Olympic Performance. This is enough to say that they are in compliance with this principle, but USA Rowing might improve by developing intermediate goals prior to the Olympics (United States of America Rowing, 2008).

5th Principle

The only measurement that was apparent was the measurement of success at the 2012 Olympics (United States of America Rowing, 2008). USA Rowing needs to develop this area a great deal and work on measuring short-term goals that would lead to success.

6th Principle

After the 2004 Olympics, USA Rowing conducted a top to bottom review of their organization and has spent the last four years developing tools to help improve the organization. In 2005 a new mission was established. In 2006 a new board of directors was put in place along with new bylaws in 2007 (United States of America Rowing, 2008). These changes show that USA Rowing has learned from the past and is working toward developing a more professional organization for the future.

7th Principle

There is no evidence of tying rewards to performance that I can find (United States of America Rowing, 2008). From the time that I have spent looking at high performance plans and observing other NGBs, I am sure that athletes receive financial support and health insurance based on their performance, but there is no mention in any documents that I looked at, so I have to conclude that USA Rowing does not follow this principle.

Sailing

USA Sailing appears to be an organization that is setting itself up for a great amount of success in the coming Olympics. With the large number of returning athletes that were indentified in the high performance plan, it seems that the United States Sailing Association has the experience necessary to do very well at the Olympics (United States Sailing Association, 2008). USA Sailing also appears to be a performance-based funding organization by focusing 85% of expenditures directly to athlete support programs. The United States Sailing Association also states that the Olympic Games are their focus, and they are constantly preparing to improve their performance at these events.

1st Principle

Chapter IX of the high performance plan identifies administrative and logistical support for athletes and gives an idea of what some of the responsibilities are for members of the United States Sailing Association staff. Chapter VII has a section that outlines responsibilities for the high performance director (United States Sailing Association, 2008). These two examples led me to conclude that the organization has established objectives for everyone in the firm.

2nd Principle

The critical success factors found in Chapter V of the high performance plan outline and clarify USA Sailing's vision for the future. Chapter II also takes a critical look at the strategic objectives of USA Sailing (United States Sailing Association, 2008).

3rd Principle

One of the purposes of the high performance plan is to link objectives and measures. Attachment 1 of the high performance plan is a list of measures to determine

the funding for athletes (United States Sailing Association, 2008). This is an example of the United States Sailing Association's linking of objectives with measures. Although the measures are for athletes, the goals of the organization include the athletes' performing at a high level.

4th Principle

The United States Sailing Association outlines the plan for the 2012 Olympics in Chapter VIII of the high performance plan. This plan includes 12 performance aspects for the sailing program; it also includes a list of hopefuls and how these individuals can help the development of the sailing program. Chapter XI is an action plan that has nine specific items, which include focusing spending on athletes and helping athletes buy into performance programs (United States Sailing Association, 2008). These targets should help the NGB achieve their overall goals.

5th Principle

The control principle in the sailing high performance plan stems from the idea of trying to control athletes. Athletes are graded on eight different tasks which in turn determine their level of funding. Control is also established through the development of a budget in Chapter X (United States Sailing Association, 2008).

6th Principle

The executive summary along with the post-Beijing analysis establishes the fact that the United States Sailing Association is evaluating their past performance as they move into the future. It was noted that failure to adapt to the changing sport after the Barcelona Games made it difficult for the sailing association to compete (United States

Sailing Association, 2008). However, learning from their mistakes has helped USA Sailing make the necessary changes to be a world player once again.

7th Principle

As stated previously, Attachment 1 of the high performance plan is an outline of what athletes must do to receive funding and health insurance. Funds are only given to those athletes who meet certain standards. USA Sailing did note that athletes would be graded both objectively and subjectively (United States Sailing Association, 2008). They were the only NGB to say something to that effect.

Swimming

USA Swimming has been ranked as the number one swimming nation in the world for more than 40 years. We seek to continue this tradition of competitive excellence. When our elite athletes are successful in fulfilling their Olympic dreams our society benefits from the inspiration these athletes give us (“About USA swimming”, n.d.).

USA Swimming is the most highly developed organization that was observed during this study. The high performance plan made it clear that they exist for one reason, and that is to win gold medals. They are not concerned with individual athletes, but making sure that the pipeline is maintained so that new swimmers will rise every four years to be Olympic champions. The number of medals won by USA Swimming at the Olympics help ensure that the United States stays close to or at the top of the overall medal count. The high performance plan for USA Swimming was by far the shortest of the plans. It was a strategic look at the organization with individual goals and measures for those strategic principles (United States of America Swimming, 2008). It referenced other documents like the USA Swimming business plan which contains greater detail about individual programs and practices.

1st Principle

In the high performance plan there is no evidence of individual responsibilities for staff members (United States of America Swimming, 2008). On the website, a job opening was posted for a sports performance consultant (“Employment at USA Swimming”, 2009). The job description listed the primary responsibilities as well as other duties which would be performed. The job description included the amount of time someone would be traveling if they were hired for that job. This is evidence that every position in USA Swimming has clearly defined objectives.

2nd Principle

The executive summary of the high performance plan listed three core objectives which were also found on the website. These objectives are, (1) build the base, (2) promote the sport, and (3) achieve sustained competitive success (United States of America Swimming, 2008). These ideas are posted to educate the USOC as well as any who look at the USA Swimming website about what USA Swimming is trying to accomplish.

3rd Principle

Strategic goals are listed with individual measures. Although there were very few goals, one of the goals that were linked to measures was the number of gold medals that USA Swimming wanted to win at the 2012 Games (United States of America Swimming, 2008). This is a clear number that is measurable.

4th Principle

The performance summary and the priorities listed in the high performance plan established targets for USA Swimming and its athletes in preparation for the Olympic

Games, as well as for the development of the sport as a whole (United States of America Swimming, 2008). The targets will help USA Swimming achieve the three objectives that were established in the executive summary.

5th Principle

There are measures that are outlined for major goals as well as growing the base by a certain percentage. Like most NGBs, the biggest measures are for the individual athletes. Time standards are not established, but rather world ranking within given events (United States of America Swimming, 2008). These standards help measure where an athlete is in relation to world competition and if they will receive funds from USA Swimming.

6th Principle

The competitive analysis of the high performance plan takes a look at past performances and factors that will affect USA Swimming in the coming years. The analysis of their situation is an example of learning and leads USA Swimming to adapt some of their policies to achieve sustained excellence. The biggest example of this is the focus on open water swimming (United States of America Swimming, 2008). This is a new event at the Olympics that the United States has not performed well in, due to the fact that historically this has not been an emphasis. With added emphasis it will be interesting to see if their performance at the Olympics improves.

7th Principle

Athletes are given money based on their performance in the pool. USA Swimming has a highly developed system to determine which athletes would receive funding. Tie-breakers were established out to six places to determine financial rewards.

Scholarships were also discussed for open water swimmers, since this is not an event sponsored by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (United States of America Swimming, 2008).

Volleyball

USA Volleyball had a very successful Beijing Olympics, in spite of dealing with a great deal of personal tragedy early on in the games. The NGB's focus on athlete development and performance helped the team overcome obstacles and concentrate on the task at hand. The high performance plan gives the impression that USA Volleyball is very focused on outcomes as well as the development of athletes in all areas (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). For the past 10 years, USA Volleyball has had to split its attention between two disciplines within the same sport, indoor and beach volleyball. The growth of beach volleyball has created more opportunities for athletes while it increased support requirements for the NGB.

1st Principle

There are no specific responsibilities outlined for staff members of USA Volleyball in the high performance plan; however, there are individual benchmarks for athletes (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). To ensure that USA Volleyball complies with this principle, the website was checked and a job advertisement was found for an event coordinator ("Jobs", n.d.). This advertisement outlined the responsibilities for the position. This is proof that every position has clearly defined roles and objectives.

2nd Principle

Section I of the volleyball high performance plan contained the vision, mission and USA Volleyball's primary duties (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). These communicate the objectives of the organization to the USOC.

3rd Principle

Measures were established for both the men's and women's programs within USA Volleyball (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). These measures help the NGB maintain its focus on the overall goals of the organization.

4th Principle

Targets were set for the next four years in preparation for the 2012 Olympic Games. These targets included participation in major events as well as results at world championships (United States of America Swimming, 2008). These targets help the NGB achieve their overarching goals.

5th Principle

Measures were placed on athletes to ensure a high level of performance. Measures for the success of the entire organization include performance at world championships as well as a ratio of medals per Federation Internationale de Volleyball (FIVB) events. (FIVB is the world governing body for volleyball and sponsors events like the world championships). There was also an emphasis on trying to control the beach volleyball teams and how those teams are developed (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). Athletes generally choose their own partners, but efforts are being made by USA Volleyball to determine the best teams for the country.

6th Principle

A competitive analysis of both beach and indoor volleyball was done to determine where the United States stands in relation to their international competition (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). This analysis shows that USA Volleyball is trying to learn from past performances and improve on their processes to generate better teams to compete at international events.

7th Principle

The only tie of rewards to performance is how the athletes are awarded money and health insurance so that they can continue their training (United States of America Volleyball, 2008). Rewarding athletes based on their performance is enough to say that they are in compliance with this principle of performance-based funding.

Water Polo

USA Water Polo experienced a great deal of success at the 2008 Beijing Games, and the sport is looking to improve on this success in the coming years. The high performance plan conveyed the idea that USA Water Polo was trying to establish itself as a more businesslike organization with ideas on how to solidify the sport in the United States, as well as developing a unique American style of play (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). The United States has more age-group participants in water polo than any other country in the world, and they need to turn this advantage into continued success on the world stage.

1st Principle

Appendix A of the high performance plan has a job description for certain members of USA Water Polo. This job description outlines specific objectives for that

individual (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). Athlete objectives were also established within the high performance plan.

2nd Principle

The high performance plan contained a letter from the Chief Executive Officer that outlined the mission statement along with seven distinct individual goals (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). This letter was sent to the USOC to educate them about what USA Water Polo is trying to accomplish in the coming four years.

3rd Principle

Both the men's and women's teams outlined organizational objectives for each of their programs with desired results for each of those programs (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). Most of the measures could be answered with a yes or no statement, but USA Water Polo tried to link objectives with specific measures for those objectives.

4th Principle

Targets were established throughout the Olympic quadrennium to ensure that both the men's and women's teams were preparing for competition at the Olympic Games (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). Training plans were developed to see what competitions the United States needed to be competing in and how long training would be leading up to those competitions.

5th Principle

Both the men's and women's programs outlined prioritized objectives for their programs. These programs included the senior national team, junior national team, youth national team, and the Programs for Athletes' and Coaches' Education (P.A.C.E.).

Each one of these programs had various objectives with desired results for each objective (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). USA Water Polo placed an emphasis on measuring the success of their programs, even if it was only a simple yes or no answer.

6th Principle

Reviews of past successes and the analysis of the international competition shows that USA Water Polo is trying to take the feedback available and use it for their own improvement (United States of America Water Polo, 2008). These lessons help USA Water Polo guide the future actions of their organization.

7th Principle

Rewards were linked to athlete and coach performance. Athletes receive financial assistance based on their performance, and coaches are monetarily rewarded based on the performance of their teams (United States of America Water Polo, 2008).

Other Examples of Performance-Based Funding

The initial thrust of the research was to look at high performance plans and evaluate how these documents displayed compliance with performance-based funding principles. Throughout this research project, there were two other entities that would support the findings of this research. The two additional organizations that were evaluated were USA Track and Field and the USOC itself. USA Track and Field did not have a high performance plan because they were in the process of re-evaluating their business practices. An external organization was conducting a review of their current programs. The report produced by the external organization is an example of performance-based funding principles at work.

The other case is the USOC itself. The USOC does not have a high performance plan for the entire organization. However, the USOC developed a document called the USOC Game Plan which addressed the goals and objectives of the organization as they prepared for the 2008 Olympics. It is important to evaluate how the USOC as a whole employs performance-based funding principles in order to answer the research questions in this study. Although the cases of USA Track and Field and the USOC are somewhat different from the other cases, the exploration of their findings adds valuable information in studying the case at hand.

Track and Field

Although USA Track and Field was not evaluated, there were some findings from USA Track and Field that help support the fact that the USOC adheres to performance-based funding principles. Originally, I requested access to the USA Track and Field high performance plan because they historically have generated a large number of medals for the United States. I was told that USA Track and Field did not have a high performance plan because they had an outside agency evaluate every aspect of their organization. The group which evaluated specific areas of USA Track and Field was named the Project 30 Task Force. The name Project 30 is derived from the goal to win 30 medals at the 2012 Olympics.

The findings of the task force reinforce the fact that USA Track and Field should be an organization based on performance-based funding principles. The findings speak to each individual within USA Track and Field being held to their professional responsibilities. If everyone does their assigned tasks, the group as a whole can better accomplish its mission (Project 30 Task Force, 2009). Rewards for individual

performances were addressed as well as focusing athletes on the Olympic Games. Previously, many athletes would attend other meets in Europe to receive the appearance fee that was available to them. It is clear from the report that USA Track and Field is trying to be more accountable to the results on the athletic fields.

The fact that USA Track and Field requested this report also shows the ability to learn from past mistakes. USA Track and Field sought feedback on what they were doing correctly and how they could change current behavior. The focus on performance is also evident in the request for an external review of the organization. The Chief Executive Officer, Doug Logan, was not happy with the performance at the 2008 Beijing Games and therefore looked for help in improving the performance over the next four years. As USA Track and Field now begins to develop their high performance plan and work toward greater on-field success, it would be interesting to see what changes are made and if these actions result in 30 medals at the 2012 Games.

The USOC

The USOC as a whole was also evaluated using the USOC Game Plan written in the Spring of 2006. This document was developed by Executive Director Jim Scherr and was meant to outline the goals and objectives for the USOC. Overall, this document displayed how the USOC is trying to adhere to performance based funding principles.

The purpose of the document was to translate the vision and strategy of the USOC to its many stakeholders. The USOC Game Plan (2006) was very effective in establishing goals and objectives for every member of the organization and having clearly defined measures for the accomplishment of each goal. The goals and objectives were in

accordance with the overall vision and mission of the organization. Strategies were also formulated as a means to accomplish the goals and objectives.

One theme that was outlined in the plan had to do with sport and NGB performance. “Strong NGBs will produce a strong sport development and high performance system for their sport; weak NGBs will flounder” (United States Olympic Committee, 2006, p.20). Later in the same section, Mr. Scherr stated,

If an NGB is not viable, two serious problems occur; (1) a drain is put on the USOC’s time, resources and efforts, and (2) the sports pipeline of the NGB (from entry level to Olympian) is ineffective and the USA future in that sport becomes threatened and uncertain (p.20).

These are interesting statements in the fact that they address the idea that each NGB must display a certain level of stability or the ability of that NGB to function will be threatened. If individual NGBs are not becoming stronger organizations, they only hamper the USOC. Mr. Scherr does not go so far as to say that the NGB would be cut from the program, but it seems to be implied.

The one aspect of performance-based funding that the USOC Game Plan does not touch on is that of rewards being linked to performance. From working with individual NGBs, it is clear that the USOC rewards athletes with financial support as well as health insurance through the NGB, but athletes appear to be the ones that receive rewards based upon their performance. In order to be in compliance with this principle of performance-based funding, it would almost seem that money given to NGBs should increase or decrease based upon performance.

High Performance Plan Themes

Throughout the analysis of the high performance plans various themes emerged from the data. Although these themes may not have an impact on how the USOC

implements performance-based funding policies, they are important to note.

Understanding how the NGBs operate helps in understanding why the USOC chooses to espouse performance based funding policies.

Organizational Structure

One of the emerging themes from the analysis of the high performance plans was the level of sophistication for the various NGBs within the USOC. Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmerman (1989) define 8 different types of sport organizations and why they are organized in that manner. These organizations range from a professional bureaucratic structure to a simple structure. A simple structure is an organization that has few formal policies and systems in place to guide the organization. The various NGBs within the USOC run the gamut of the sports organizations as defined by Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmerman.

All of the NGBs are at different levels of organizational development. These different levels of development led to different types of goals and objectives. USA Swimming, which is probably the most highly developed NGB, is mainly focused on winning gold medals as well as maintaining the competitiveness of the organization (United States of America Swimming, 2008). Meanwhile, Flatwater Sprint, half of USA Canoe/Kayak, is one of the least developed (United States of America Canoe/Kayak, 2008). This half of the Canoe/Kayak NGB is working to maintain viability both financially as well as within the public eye. The USOC works with each individual NGB to ensure that if they aren't at the top of the Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmerman (1989) model, they are working their way towards it.

The level of sophistication has an effect upon performance based funding by determining what levels of goals are established for the organization. It is reasonable for USA Swimming to state that they would like win more gold medals in 2012 than they did in 2008 because the support structure is already in place (United States of America Swimming, 2008). Sports like USA Canoe/Kayak as well as the United States Fencing Association may need to focus more on their support structure instead of winning medals. The organizations that are more highly focused on medals generally do not have to spend as much time on their organization structure because the organization structure is already developed at a high level.

More highly developed organizations also focus more on the pipeline of athletes instead of individual athletes. Most NGBs that were analyzed evaluated current athletes and athletes that may return for the 2012 Games. Less developed NGBs were reliant upon the return of these athletes for success in 2012. USA Swimming and USA Gymnastics made no specific mention of individual athletes (United States of America Swimming, 2008; United States of America Gymnastics, 2008). Their focus is on the development of the pipeline which in turn produces the desired results on the podium. USA Swimming is not worried about Michael Phelps returning to duplicate his 8 gold medal performance. If USA Swimming manages the pipeline correctly, they will find athletes who are capable of taking his place if he does not return.

Funding Requests

This theme falls closely in line with the level of development of the NGB. Most of the NGBs made mention in their high performance plans that financial support was key to their future success. In a sense, the high performance plan is a request to the

USOC for some type of funding. The difference in the sports was in how the funds were requested. Some sport organizations asked in an open manner while others asked for money through the support of their programs. Other sports never really asked for money; they just compared themselves to their competition. To view the amounts of money that the USOC has given in grants to each NGB over the past five years please see Table 9 in Appendix B. Although some variability exists, funding levels have been generally consistent over the past five years.

The sports which historically have had issues trying to fund their programs placed a greater emphasis on the request for funds. Canoe/Kayak, Fencing, and Sailing were three NGBs who were very obvious in requests for funds. These sports stated that without the support of the USOC it would be difficult to compete on a world stage. Although basketball has historically done very well in international competition it was interesting to see USA Basketball make an overt request for funds. The request from USA Basketball seemed to be inconsistent when compared with the other NGBs, because one would assume that USA Basketball has plenty of funds due to its relationship with the NBA and other professional organizations.

The two most professional organizations, USA Swimming and USA Gymnastics, did not make any open requests for funds. They detailed programs that needed funds but never outlined how much they were requesting. These NGBs seemed to feel comfortable with the level of funding they received from the USOC and knew they would have enough money to compete at the highest levels. USA Swimming did make an interesting request to have the USOC influence university swim coaches to recruit United States swimming athletes. One pipeline for USA Swimming is the university swimming

programs throughout the country. If these swimmers are given scholarships, they can continue to train at little or no cost. When scholarships go to swimmers of competing nations it hurts the competitive advantage of the United States. Funds that could be directed toward United States athletes now are going to a competing nation. Although it was not a direct request for funds, it was a clear that USA Swimming was trying to garner more funds to support United States swimmers.

The last group of NGBs made indirect requests for funds by comparing themselves to the spending practices of competing nations. Equestrian, Rowing, Volleyball, and Water Polo were NGBs that made indirect funding requests by comparing their funding levels to that of their competition. Equestrian and Rowing claimed that monies spent by their European counterparts made it very difficult to compete at the same level. Volleyball noted that few countries support both the indoor and outdoor programs and only focus on one of the two, which makes it difficult for both beach and indoor teams to compete on the same level. Water Polo noted that China had made significant growth due to the fact that the Chinese resident training program was funded at a much higher level than the United States. Although these NGBs did not make overt requests for funds, they made sure that the USOC understood the fact that other nations are spending more money on particular NGBs than the United States was spending.

British Comparison

To gain a greater understanding of how many NGBs compare themselves to other nations, a simple comparison between the United States and Great Britain was done to understand some of the disparity in financial support. Like China did prior to the Beijing

Games, Great Britain has more than tripled their funding to try and win a greater number of medals when they host the games (“Summer Olympic sports”, n.d.). Table 1, found on the next page, addresses the amount of money Great Britain will spend in comparison with the United States. Although the United States and Great Britain spend equal amounts on the overall Olympic program, some sports are at a distinct disadvantage.

Table 1

United States and Great Britain Funding Comparison

Sport	Great Britain ^a	United States ^b
Canoe/Kayak	\$23,279,733.52	\$5,819,933.00
Equestrian	\$19,510,872.00	\$4,877,718.00
Fencing	\$1,800,389.91	\$450,281.00
Rowing	\$39,259,271.88	\$9,824,059.00
Sailing	\$33,427,976.61	\$8,364,862.00
Volleyball	\$1,942,530.77	486,089.00
Volleyball - Beach	\$563,960.08	\$141,121.00
Total ^c	\$366,708,537.77	\$91,609,917/Year

Note. The conversion rate at the time this table was developed was 1 £ equal to \$1.4292.

^aValues were gathered from the UK sport website and converted to dollars for easy comparison. The website is http://www.uk sport.gov.uk/index.php?content=pages&id=summer_olympic_sports_-_home.

^bValues were received through personal communication with Mr. Bob Gambardella.

^cThe total values are a compellation of all monies to be spent by the specific countries. Many sports are left out because I was unable to gain specific information for many United States NGBs.

Gender

It appears that Title IX has done an excellent job of decreasing the gender gap when it comes to Olympic Sport. Although no financial information was given as to how much money was spent when comparing men's and women's sport, it appears that each NGB compared both genders as equal in their program planning. All of the sports that

were analyzed had both male and female participants, and in the planning neither gender was given preferential treatment over the other.

USOC Performance on the Podium

To fully understand the USOC use of performance-based funding principles, it is imperative to discuss the environment in which the USOC operates and their many successful performances. The USOC competes against the world and historically has done very well in Olympic competition. The differing financial supports as well as cultural differences need to be noted to understand what the USOC is facing. Individual NGBs or athletes may request greater funding from the USOC, but it is hard to argue with the results over the past eight years.

Environmental Contrast

One factor that is important to note is the variety of means that countries can use to fund their individual programs. Each country has a different view of the Olympics and the importance that they play within its society. The importance of the Olympics can play into how much money athletes receive in their training. The importance of the Olympics in Beijing led to the Chinese creating Project 119 and increasing funds to those sports. Another example of the stark contrast in national funding of athletes was a story related by Mr. Gambardella outlining results for the Russian men's volleyball team. Recently, after the 2008 Olympics, a United States men's volleyball player was returning to the professional league he played in. One of his teammates on his professional team was on the Russian national team which won a bronze medal in contrast to the United States' gold. The Russian player had stated that Vladimir Putin had given all of the members of the Russian volleyball team a car as well as a lifelong stipend (Personal communication,

February 12, 2009). The United States player was congratulated on his accomplished and moved on with his life. The Russian athlete will receive some level of funding for his entire life, and this can be extremely difficult to understand for the United States athletes. This point addresses the fact that the USOC does not receive funding from the federal government and therefore must be very judicious with the limited funds that they have. It would be nice to support United States athletes for a lifetime, but with limited budgets it is impossible.

The fact that international competitors have the ability to communicate about what they are receiving only makes it more difficult for United States athletes to accept certain levels of funding. The American athletes may be performing at a higher level, but they are not receiving the awards that other athletes do. The USOC needs to use a performance-based funding system to ensure that rewards are handed out as equitably as possible. Performance-based funding also allows for a large number of athletes to receive at least some level of funding.

Athlete Development

The contrast in athlete development also plays a role in the success of USOC programs at the Olympic Games. The United States is a free society and allows its athletes to develop on their own until they reach a level at which they are close to competing for the United States. Other countries have a much different method of developing athletes. Wu (1992) states that China has a three-stage progression which consists of finding the most suitable sport for the child, a re-evaluation of the potential, and eventual selection of top athletes. It would be hard to imagine the government of the United States through the

Olympic committee identifying someone like Michael Phelps early on and stating he should be something else besides a swimmer.

This issue is only addressed because it is important to consider the many options that have driven the USOC to performance-based funding. Our societal structure is one of the issues. The government cannot force participation or performance, and therefore the USOC has to work with the financial resources as well as the human resources that they are presented with. If Michael Phelps had decided as a child that he wanted to be a soccer player, the results of the USA Swimming medal count would probably be a little different at the Beijing Games.

Overall Medal Counts

Performance-based funding focuses on performance. For the USOC, the biggest performance measure is that of medal counts at any given Olympic Games. The USOC moved to performance-based funding after the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. A cursory observation of Olympic Games shows that there is not a great deal of change from performances in 1994 up to recent performances in Beijing. Table 2 is a comparison of medals won at the last four Summer Olympic Games, while Table 3 is a comparison of medals won at the last four Winter Olympic Games.

Table 2

United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

Year	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
1996	44	32	25	101
2000	36	24	31	91
2004	36	39	27	102
2008	36	38	36	110

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 3

United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance

Year	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
1994	6	5	2	13
1998	6	3	4	13
2002	10	13	11	34
2006	9	9	7	25

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

The United States did much better at the 2002 Games than any other Olympic Games in history. It is impossible to connect this performance with implementation of performance-based funding, due to the increased number of medal opportunities in

snowboarding and short track speed skating. It is also important to note that the 2002 Olympic Games were held in Salt Lake City and there may have been a boost to United States athletes because the games were held in their home country. Medal counts for individual NGBs are found in Appendix C, Tables 10-17. Like the overall counts, the individual NGB medal counts are given mainly as a comparison to track performance over a given period of time.

When considering medal counts, the most interesting comparison is between nations over the last 16 years. In the eight Olympic Games that have taken place in the last 16 years, only four nations have consistently been in the top ten of medal counts. Those nations are the United States, Russia, Germany and Italy. When comparing the overall total counts for these nations, it is clear that the United States has done very well on the medal platform. No country comes close over the last sixteen years. Table 4 is a comparison of nations prior to the United States' move to performance-based funding and Table 5 is a comparison of nations after the United States' move to performance based funding.

Table 4

National Olympic Medal Performance 1994 – 2000

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	92	64	62	218
Russia	78	63	51	192
Germany	54	51	69	174
Italy	35	29	35	99

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 5

National Olympic Medal Performance 2002 – 2008

Year	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	91	99	81	271
Russia	36	58	78	199
China	87	44	51	182
Germany	52	54	49	155
Italy	27	25	32	84

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 6

National Olympic Medal Performance 1994 – 2008

Year	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	183	163	143	489
Russia	141	121	129	391
Germany	106	105	118	329
China	131	89	82	302
Italy	62	54	57	84

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

China was added in Tables 5 and 6 because of their dramatic increase in performance over the past eight years. In the years prior to the USOC's move to performance-based funding, Russia was the main competition in overall medal counts, but over the past eight years, Russia has fallen off and China has made a surge to compete with the United States. These medal counts show that over the past sixteen years' the United States has had a very high level of sustained performance while other countries have risen and fallen.

Table 5 shows that the United States has increased its overall lead in medal count since the implementation of performance-based funding. It is evident that performance-based funding principles have been successful in helping the USOC as a whole maintain a high level of performance, even though some NGBs may feel that they do not receive

sufficient funding from the USOC. Tables of medals won by each nation at various Olympic Games are found in Appendix D, Tables 18-25.

Managerial Continuity

Griffith and Neely (2007) showed that the use of a Balanced Scorecard or a performance-based funding system was only effective in the cases where managers were also experienced. Without experienced managers or some continuity to ensure that program is implemented throughout the entire organization, the performance-based funding system will fail in its objectives. The implications of a performance-based funding system cannot be evaluated without discussing the managerial situation at the USOC.

In 2003, Jim Scherr was named the interim Chief Executive Officer for the United States Olympic Committee after Lloyd Ward resigned in March of 2003; the interim title was removed in 2005 (Mickle, March 9, 2009). Prior to Ward, Norm Blake was the Chief Executive Officer and he resigned in October of 2001 after he felt he was more of a hindrance to organizational change instead of a leader (Lopez, October 6, 2000). As the USOC was trying to move to performance-based funding, they had a difficult time establishing a leadership structure to help move them in the right direction. Once Mr. Scherr was in place, the performance-based funding principles began to take hold, and he helped ensure the success of the organization.

Under the leadership of Mr. Scherr, the USOC had,

... a period of growth and success at the USOC that included significant decreases in administrative costs and a doubling in direct contributions to athletes. Meanwhile, the U.S. team succeeded in the Olympics, most recently winning a games-high 110 medals in Beijing in a year in which most people thought the hosts would beat the United States. It has been, by almost every measure, the most successful six-year period in the federation's history (Pells, 2009).

Mr. Scherr helped guide the USOC to tremendous success on the field, but he also took an organization that was facing a \$40 million deficit to over \$103 million in reserves at the end of 2008 (Mickle, 2009). It seems from the outcomes of performance on the field as well as financial viability that Mr. Scherr focused on performance-based funding principles to maximize performance and reduce costs. His focus on performance was evident as the USOC had a very successful six-year run. Mr. Scherr resigned from his position on March 6th, 2009.

Internal Validity

To enhance the internal validity of the study, member checks were accomplished to ensure that the data was being interpreted in a consistent manner. Two colleagues went to the USOC to repeat the analysis of the high performance plans in comparison to the research instrument. Of the 10 NGBs that were analyzed four of the NGBs were randomly selected for study by my colleagues. The four NGBs that were selected were the United States Fencing Association, USA Rowing, the United States Sailing Association, and USA Volleyball. The results of the data analysis are found in Appendix A, Table 8.

Of the 28 items that were evaluated, only one difference was found. This produced an inter-rater reliability score of 96.4%. In the USA Rowing high performance plan, I felt like there was evidence of an emphasis on measurement and control. My colleague felt that there was not any evidence of measurement and control. I understand why he felt there was no evidence of measurement and control, but I stand by my original assertion that USA Rowing had satisfactorily met that principle of performance-based

funding. The validation work of my colleagues helps to establish a certain level of validity for my research.

Conclusions

Based on the variety of sources of evidence I evaluated, the answer to the overriding research question I set out to study, how do the principles of a performance-based funding strategy fit with an organization like the USOC?, can be summarized in the following manner: the principles of performance-based funding have allowed the USOC to improve the overall effectiveness of the organization while maintaining a high level of performance at the Olympic Games. Performance-based funding principles have helped the USOC overcome a \$40 million deficit in 2003 and turn it into a \$103 million surplus while maintaining athlete focus on winning Olympic medals. Performance-based funding principles allow the United States to maintain a competitive advantage in most Olympic sports, even though other nations may be outspending the United States.

Additionally, the following set of sub-questions were adequately addressed throughout the study:

Q1 How does the USOC use the theoretical principles of performance-based funding?

The USOC uses principles of performance based funding in their preparation of athletes to compete at the Olympics. Goals and objectives are established for each NGB as well as performance standards for athletes. Once athletes reach certain performance standards, they are awarded with varying levels of support. Support is often monetary but can also be distributed through health insurance, scholarships, availability of residence training facilities, and training support. Although the principles of performance-based

funding are used with athletes, these principles are not used with individual NGBs. NGBs could be rewarded for meeting goals with increased funding from the USOC.

Q2 How do the goals and objectives of each individual NGB match with the principles of performance-based funding?

Overall, the goals and objectives established by the individual NGBs are generally in line with performance-based funding. One of the important aspects of performance-based funding is the ability to measure individual goals and objectives. The presence of a measurement tool is essential to track and evaluate performance. All of the NGBs focus on athlete performance and performance at the Olympic Games or World Championships. USA Swimming established a goal of building the base and established a metric for that goal. Some NGBs did leave a few goals without metrics.

One other aspect of performance-based funding that was extremely well utilized by all NGBs was the ability to learn from past performance and be receptive to feedback. All NGBs conducted internal reviews of strengths and weaknesses as well as evaluating competitors' preparation. These mechanisms were effective in helping to streamline processes for NGBs. New goals and objectives were developed from adherence to this performance-based funding principle, which hopefully will continue to raise the performance level of the USOC.

Q3 How do the individual high performance plans of each NGB match with the performance-based funding principles as a theoretical background?

The individual high performance plans match up very well with the principles of performance-based funding. Ten high performance plans were analyzed and those ten plans were evaluated against seven different principles. There were a total of seventy different opportunities to answer a simple yes/no question in regards to the high

performance plan matching performance-based funding principles. Only five times was the answer no. 92.85% of the time, the high performance plan was in agreement with performance-based funding principles (See Appendix A, Table 7). These numbers were validated through peer checks, and my peers agreed with me over 96% of the time. It is clear that each NGB has a basic understanding of performance-based funding principles and how to use them in the development of their sport programs. The USOC also helps ensure that these principles are evident by providing a template to ensure NGBs are focused on performance.

Q4 How have performance-based funding strategies changed the level of on-field performance?

This is a very difficult question to answer. There are many variables that affect the performance of athletes at the Olympic Games. Someone could train their whole life, qualify for a final event at the Olympic Games, and get horribly sick and fail to perform as expected. Performance-based funding strategies have not necessarily improved the performance of United States athletes, but they have not hindered them either. As different countries throughout the world change their funding strategies and they improve their sport performance, the United States remains constant. I believe that one reason the United States may consistently be at the top of the medal podium is due to performance-based funding principles. The USOC has had to place a greater focus on athlete funding, and performance-based funding has allowed them to do this. Their focused spending allows athletes to compete at the highest levels against all nations. Various nations place funds in sports they know that they can win; however the USOC is able to support athletes in all events at the Olympics. For these reasons, I feel that the change to

performance-based funding has allowed the United States to remain atop the Olympic podium.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATIONS, DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The phenomenon of the USOC's use of performance-based funding principles started after the 2000 Olympic Games as the USOC tried to make itself more economically viable and focused on medal platform performance. Over the past eight years, the USOC has taken great strides in its economic viability as they have moved from a \$40 million deficit to a \$103 million reserve. As their financial reserves have increased, their performances on the field have in no way decreased (Mickle, March 9, 2009; Pells, 2009). Money spent on athletes has more than doubled, and this has helped United States athletes remain at the top of individual sports. One could argue that performance-based funding principles have reworked the USOC into the model for other National Olympic Committees and sport organizations to follow. One should ask: how do performance-based funding principles transfer to non-Olympic organizations like college athletic departments or professional sports franchises? How does the USOC maintain its current level of performance as it faces an uncertain economic market under new leadership? How does goal establishment differ between NGBs, and does this difference require a change in how performance-based funding principles are applied?

Having analyzed multiple sources of evidence, the fundamental question, how do the principles of a performance-based funding strategy fit with an organization like the

USOC?, was addressed. The social culture of the United States along with limited funds have helped move the USOC to implementation of performance based funding principles. These principles have been a factor in the USOC's financial improvement as well as sustained performance over the last six years, compared with the instability of the late 1990s and early 2000s. It is difficult to imagine the USOC using any other type of funding principles.

American athletes who achieve a high level of performance at the Olympic Games become instant celebrities in our society, and the USOC understands that Americans don't really care about the athlete that finished fourth. Americans want a winner. Examples of this are people like Michael Phelps and Shawn Johnson. Michael Phelps wouldn't even come close to the sponsorship money that he is currently receiving without his performance at the games. Shawn Johnson probably would not be appearing on Dancing with the Stars if she hadn't medaled at the Olympic Games. These examples show that our society is focused on results. The USOC understands that, and that is one reason they have focused on performance-based funding principles.

Additionally, the study also allowed me to focus on a series of sub-questions that were developed at the beginning of the study. These questions helped answer and evaluate the overarching question for this research.

- Q1 How does the USOC use the theoretical principles of performance-based funding?
- Q2 How do the goals and objectives of each individual NGB match with the principles of performance-based funding?
- Q3 How do the individual high performance plans of each NGB match with the performance-based funding principles as a theoretical background?

Q4 How have performance-based funding strategies changed the level of on-field performance?

The USOC along with the NGBs use performance-based funding principles as they outline one of their most important documents. The high performance plan is a tool used by the NGBs to educate the USOC on the various programs and objectives that they are trying to achieve. The high performance plan helps the NGBs to focus on individual athletes and their performance. The high performance plan does this because the USOC has requested that this document outline what the NGBs are doing to enable athlete success. The establishment of goals along with the linking of these goals to measures ensures that NGBs understand what it is they are trying to do and gives a fixed target to work toward.

The high performance plans are documents based on performance-based funding principles. NGB directors may not understand what the principles of performance-based funding are as they are writing the plan, but the template given by the USOC ensures that the high performance plans are founded in performance based funding principles. The development of a high performance plan is something that most sport organizations should each evaluate for the development of their own sport organization. Having worked in an athletic department, I know that coaches used some of these principles that were outlined in the USOC high performance plan but I never saw them formally established through writing a plan. These plans would help coaches to formally develop their game plans and assist the athletic director in monitoring the performance of his coaches. The high performance plans help executive directors develop a systematic approach to the development of their athletes. This system helps to develop an athlete pipeline, giving the NGB a greater number of athletes to rely upon instead of one individual.

Performance-based funding principles may become even more important in the near future. Sponsorship revenue is the lifeblood of the USOC and constitutes nearly 50% of its revenue (Mickle, March 9, 2009). Historically, the USOC has had many suitors vying to purchase the rights to the Olympic Rings; however, this year is different. At the end of the Summer Olympics sponsorship deals are redone. At this time, many companies are not as quick to renew a sponsorship deal due to the unsure economic climate that is currently facing the world as a whole:

The USOC and U.S. national governing bodies have suffered from cutbacks in sponsorship spending, as well. Over the last two years, the USOC has lost a series of sponsors including General Motors, Home Depot and Kellogg's. It has yet to add any new partners ahead of the Vancouver Games (Mickle, February 16, 2009, p. 15).

Last July, after months of negotiating with the U.S. Olympic Committee, Bank of America was close to a renewal of its 16-year-old sponsorship for somewhere north of \$12 million over four years. The deal stalled over difficulties in the payment card category, but the two sides continued to talk, and a renewal now appears close. But as the financial system imploded, so has pricing. People familiar with the negotiations say that when a new Bank of America-USOC deal is completed, it could be for as little as half as much money as was on the table just seven months ago (Lefton & Mickle, March 2, 2009, p. 1).

These tough economic times have already changed how some NGBs are preparing for the 2010 Olympic Games:

The U.S. Ski and Snowboard Association cut pay for all staff by 10 percent, and USA Luge has lost more than \$1 million in sponsorship revenue since 2007. Other NGBs have struggled to land new sponsors a year out from a North American Games that many expected would be a boon to their bottom line (Mickle, 2009, p. 15).

The USOC as a whole has also been affected by the tough economic climate:

A gloomy economic forecast is prompting the USOC to trim a 425-person staff by 10 to 15 percent, with some layoffs expected within the coming months among 330 employees at the Olympic Training Center in Colorado Springs. Decreases on the programming and administrative fronts should mirror December cuts, in which the USOC, with a 2009 budget now at \$135.5 million, curbed meetings, staff travel and professional training (Gomez, 2009).

The USOC is trying to overcome some of the external challenges brought on by tough economic times, but it seems clear that performance-based funding principles could be the key in overcoming these challenges.

Currently revenue is tough to generate for the USOC, so they need to focus on spending money on the activities that will improve athletes' chances at a high level of performance at the Olympic Games. Although budgets have been established and cuts may be needed, the focus on performance helps to ensure that vital programs are funded and those that are not essential can be cut. As Mr. Scherr resigned personnel cuts were made for the USOC staff. Hopefully these cuts won't end up affecting athlete performance.

The biggest challenge may come if the economic downturn does not reverse itself in the near future. In the Olympic Game Plan, Mr. Scherr stated,

If an NGB is not viable, two serious problems occur; (1) a drain is put on the USOC's time, resources and efforts, and (2) the sports pipeline of the NGB (from entry level to Olympian) is ineffective and the USA future in that sport becomes threatened and uncertain (United States Olympic Committee, 2006, p.20).

This statement may cause one to think that NGBs could begin to be cut if funds become difficult to find. NGBs like USA Canoe/Kayak who rely heavily on the USOC for funding and are not necessarily mainstream sports in the United States may need to be to cut in order to ensure funding for the NGBs which are in a stronger position. I am sure

that this action would be a last resort for the USOC, but it could turn into a possibility if the economic environment does not turn around.

The financial concerns could also affect the manner in which goals are established for each individual NGB. Not many of the NGBs are in exactly the same place developmentally. This means that each NGB is developing different incremental goals to try to reach a high organizational and performance level. These differences mean that the USOC is left to wade through a variety of different goals as the high performance plans begin to roll in. The USOC must then decipher whether NGBs are moving in the right direction. If an organization is not developed sufficiently, why should the USOC continue to fund its programs? Should the USOC place its financial resources into an organization like USA Swimming who has a proven history of performance, or should it try to continually develop an NGB like the United States Fencing Association? The differences in goal development could potentially cause a great deal of disparity between the NGBs within the USOC.

Sport managers do not have an infinite amount of money at their disposal to be able to continue the current levels of spending. At some point, sport programs have to take a critical look at exactly what are the core objectives of their organization and what are the true costs associated with those objectives. Determining basic objectives provides organizations with greater focus in spending and managerial decisions. If programs are focused on athlete performance, the organization should be able to sustain a certain level of on-field performance while being fiscally responsible with valuable assets.

Transferability to Other Sport Organizations

I believe that there is a great deal of transferability of this study to other sport organizations. There is a dearth of information regarding why sport organizations use

certain funding structures. Having worked in a college athletic department, I don't know if funding principles had ever been discussed. The only evidence of funding principles that I ever saw were annual budgets given to sports teams to ensure that their expenses were paid.

As financial resources become more difficult to obtain in the near future, it is vital that sport organizations understand why they are spending money on certain programs. University athletic departments should understand what they are getting from the financial investments in each one of their sport teams. If they are not receiving the return that was anticipated on their investment, athletic directors need to make a tough decision as to whether that sport is continually being funded. Performance-based funding principles would allow athletic directors to more closely monitor performance of athletic teams. Establishment of realistic, yet challenging, goals with measures would help athletic directors effectively manage the performance of their coaches. Instead of being pressured to fire a coach because of boosters or fans, athletic directors would understand exactly what the coach is or is not doing for the program. If the coach isn't living up to performance standards, it becomes easier to terminate a contract for cause.

University athletic departments need to have an established plan for the development of their athlete pipeline. Each NGB at the USOC has a plan for how they will try to get to the next level of performance over the course of many years. I wonder how many college coaches actually have a plan for how they are going to develop their program over the long term. Numerous daily requirements of college coaches take some focus away from long-term stability in order to get daily tasks done. Implementation of

performance-based funding practices would force coaches to plan for the long term in order to maintain the viability of their program.

I also believe that performance-based funding would help many professional sport organizations. Performance-based funding is a balance between resources and on-field performance. Many owners in professional sport throw money at players and hope for the best. The Washington Redskins and Dallas Cowboys are notoriously famous for paying large sums of money for high-priced athletes. However, it must be asked if these athletes produced any recent success in the post-season? The same could be said for the New York Yankees in baseball. Teams should be able to achieve a certain level of success while maintaining some level of fiscal responsibility.

Future Research

Due to the dearth of information regarding funding procedures for sport organizations, there is a great deal of opportunity to expand upon this line of research. Little is known as to why specific sport organizations select certain funding strategies. Case studies much like this one should be done to determine why specific sport organizations, either professional or amateur, select certain funding strategies. Determining what factors sport managers use to make funding decisions would bring a greater understanding as to why sport managers make specific fiscal decisions. Understanding the goals of the sport organization would also help in determining which type of funding strategy is the best fit for the organization.

Researchers should also explore what types of funding strategies are best suited for sport organizations. In the literature review of this study, activity-based costing was discussed as a possible alternative to performance-based funding, but does an activity

based costing structure improve on-field performance? Is ROI a better measure for sports teams to use? Should ROO be used since sport organizations are generally trying to win some type of championship? There are many different means of determining how to allocate resources. What is the best one for a sport organization? A comparison of the variety of costing and funding structures could be analyzed with the Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmerman (1989) sport organizational model in order to determine which types of funding structures are best suited to the individual sport organizations.

One interesting study that could be done involves how different directors of the same organization use performance-based funding principles. With the resignation of Mr. Scherr in early March, 2009, a new USOC Chief Executive Officer will be put in place and inevitably some things will change. If they decide to move away from performance based funding principles, will their performance decline or improve with the implementation of new funding policies? Did Mr. Scherr's experience as an Olympic athlete shape his views of athletic performance in such a way that he was better able to manage implementation of these principles than another administrator? Did his personal experiences influence him to enforcing performance-based funding strategies?

Since funding decisions are often made by the head executive, it must be asked whether sport organizations need to be led by sport people instead of businesspeople? The two Chief Executive Officers of the USOC prior to Mr. Scherr had a traditional business background, and they were not as successful as Mr. Scherr. Now Mr. Scherr has resigned, and his replacement also comes from a traditional business background. Should the leaders of sport organizations have some knowledge of what it is like to be athletes in that organization? Did Mr. Scherr succeed at the USOC due to his experience as a former

Olympic athlete, or was his success due to other reasons? If Olympic sport managers understand what it takes to be an Olympic athlete from personal experience, are they better suited to be the leader of the USOC? Are they better suited to make financial decisions because as an athlete they were personally affected by those decisions?

That trend could also be tracked for sport organizations other than the Olympics. In the NFL, it is often said that you need a football guy to put a football team together instead of a businessman. How do personal experiences in sport help managers of sport organizations? A case study would be effective in interviewing sport managers and finding out how they view their sport experiences helping them in their roles as sport managers.

Reflections

As I set out on this research journey, I did not have any idea of what to expect. I wanted to be able to show my dissertation committee that I understand the research process and that I am able to complete a valuable research project. I wanted to be able to add a little piece of information to sport management literature and increase the overall body of knowledge. I hope that I have accomplished these things and that this research project can be used by others as a stepping stone to future research.

As I have conducted the research I feel that I have learned much more than I can ever communicate in this project. I have learned that the research process is extremely important so that methods can be duplicated by future researchers. I have also learned that the advice of those more experienced than you is very valuable throughout the research process. I am grateful for the help that I received and understand that I could not have finished this project without that help.

I think that the most important thing that I take away from this experience is a greater appreciation for what the USOC does on a daily basis. I grew up in Salt Lake City and was deeply troubled by scandals that surrounded the 2002 Games. Later, I lived in Colorado Springs and read numerous reports of ethical violations in 2002 and 2003. I guess that my impression of the USOC was not that great. After spending some time analyzing what they are trying to do, I have gained a great deal of respect for what is being done by the USOC. They work tirelessly to ensure that American athletes are given the best chance for success on an international stage. The people that I interacted with were of the highest moral character and only wanted to do what was best for the USOC. I come away from this project with a greater admiration of the USOC and the Olympic ideals.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, W. M., & Keller, D. E. (1985). Measuring the multinational's performance. *Management Accounting*, 67(4), 26–30.
- About USA swimming*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 23, 2009, from <http://www.usaswimming.org/usasweb/DesktopDefault.aspx?TabId=21&Alias=Rainbow&Lang=en>
- Aristigueta, P. M. (1999). *Managing for Results in State Government*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Banker, R., Potter, G. & Srinivasan, D. (2000). An empirical investigation of an incentive plan that includes nonfinancial performance measures. *The Accounting Review* 75(1), 61-69.
- Bartol, K. M. & Martin, D. C. (1991). *Management International Edition*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Bechtell, M. L. (1996), Navigating organizational waters with Hoshin planning. *National Productivity Review*, 15(2), pp. 23-42.
- Beischel, M. E. & Smith, K. R. (1991). Linking the shop floor to the top floor. *Management Accounting*, October, pp. 25-9.
- Berrett, T., & Slack, T. (1999). An analysis of the influence of the competitive and institutional pressures on corporate sponsorship decisions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11(1), 80-96.

- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they came from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco, Josey-Boss.
- Bowen, D. E. & Lawler, E. E. (1992). Total quality-oriented human resource management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(4), 29-41.
- Bowen, W. G., & Levin, S. A. (2003). *Reclaiming the game: College sports and educational values*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Brief, R. P., & Lawson, R. A. (1992). The role of the accounting rate of return in financial statement analysis. *Accounting Review*, 67(2), 411–426.
- Burgess, R. G. (1982). *Field research: A source book and field manual*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Calabro, L. (2001, February). On balance: A CFO interview. *CFO*, pp. 73-78.
- Campbell, D. T. (1975). Degrees of freedom and the case study. *Comparative Political Study*, 8, 179-193.
- Canibano, L., Garcia-Ayuso, M., & Sanchez, P. (2000). Accounting for intangibles: A literature review. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 19(1), 102–130.
- Carter, K. (1994). The performance budget revisited: A report on state budget reform. Legislative Finance Paper No. 91. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Cassell, C., & Symon, G. (2004). *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organization research*. London: Sage.
- Componation, P. J., & Farrington, P. A. (2000). Identification of effective problem-solving tools to support continuous process improvement teams. *Engineering Management Journal*, 12(1): 23-29.

- Consoli, J. (2006, February 27). Closing the loop. *MediaWeek*, 16(9).
- Cooper, R. (1990). Cost classification in unit-based and activity-based manufacturing cost systems. *Journal of Cost Management*. Fall, 4-14.
- Cooper, R. & Kaplan, R. S. (1988). How cost accounting distorts product costs. *Management Accounting*, 69(10), 20-27.
- Corrigan, J. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard: the new approach to performance measurement. *Australian Accountant*, 66(7), 47-48.
- Cothran, D. A. (1993). Entrepreneurial budgeting: An emerging reform? *Public Administration Review*, 53(Sep-Oct), 445-454.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
- Czarnecki, H., Schroer, B. J., Adams, M., & Spann, M. S. (2000). Continuous process improvement when it counts most. *Quality Progress*. 33(5): 74-80.
- D'Aveni, R. A. (1995). *Hyper-competitive Rivalries: Competing in Highly Dynamic*
- Davis S. & Albright, T. (2004). *An investigation of the effect of balanced scorecard implementation on financial performance*. *Management Accounting Research*, 15, 135-153.

- Davis S. & Albright, T. (2004). An investigation of the effect of balanced scorecard implementation on financial performance. *Management Accounting Research*, 15, 135-153.
- De Waal, A. A. (2003). The future of the balanced scorecard: An interview with Professor Dr. Robert S. Kaplan. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 7(1), 30-36. *Environments*, Free Press: New York, NY.
- Denzin, N (1984). *The research act*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dewey, B. (1995). Aligning work and rewards. *Management Review*, 84(2), 19-23.
- Dinesh, D. & Palmer, E. (1998). Management by objectives and the Balanced Scorecard: Will Rome fall again? *Management Decision*, 36(6), 363-378.
- Dobson, S. (2006, December 4). The measurement question. *Marketing Magazine*, 111(38).
- Donate. (n.d.). *The official site of the United States Olympic team*. Retrieved October 8, 2008, from United States Olympic Committee Web site: <http://www.usoc.org>
- Drucker, P. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. (1955). *Practice of Management*, London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Drucker P. (1964). *Managing for Results*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillian.
- Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., & Steinmetz, A. C. (1991). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. New York: Falmer.

- Employment at USA swimming*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 23, 2009, from <http://www.usaswimming.org/USASWeb/DesktopDefault.aspx?TabId=83&Alias=Rainbow&Lang=en>
- Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(4), 16-23.
- Flamholtz, E. (1985). *Human resource accounting: Advances in concepts, methods and applications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Forde, P. (2008, August 17). *An embodiment of the Olympic ideal, Michael Phelps saved the Games*. Retrieved from http://sports.espn.go.com/oly/summer08/columns/story?columnist=forde_pat&id=3539324
- Fulks, D. (2004). *Revenues and expense of Division I and II intercollegiate athletic programs: Financial trends and relationships – 2003*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Education research* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Garrison, R. H., Noreen, E. W., & Brewer, P. C. (2008). *Managerial Accounting*. (12th ed.) Boston MA: McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gomez, B. (2009, March 3). USOC to slash workforce/programs: Moves should save \$7M. *Colorado Springs Gazette*, Retrieved March 3, 2009 from http://www.gazette.com/articles/olympic_49246___article.html/million_usoc.html

- Griffith, R. & Neely, A. (2007). Incentives and managerial experience in multi-task teams: evidence from within a firm. Working paper. Institute for Fiscal Studies and Cranfield School of Management.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guillen, M. (1994). The age of eclecticism: current organizational trends and the evolution of managerial models. *Sloan Management Review*, 36(1), 75-86.
- Hackley, C. (2003). *Doing research projects in marketing, management and consumer research*. London: Routledge.
- Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C. K. (1994). Strategy as a field of study: Why search for a new paradigm? *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 5-16.
- Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organization research*. London: Sage.
- Hendrick, R. & Forrester, J. P. (1999). Budget implementation. In R. T. Meyers (ed.), *Handbook of Government Budgeting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hernandez, A., & Thomas, B. (2003, May 12), Research studies gauge sponsorship ROI. *Marketing News*, 37(10).
- History. (n.d.). *The official site of the United States Olympic team*. Retrieved October 8, 2008, from United States Olympic Committee Web site: <http://www.usoc.org>
- Hoffecker, J. & Goldenberg, C. (1994). Using the Balanced Scorecard to develop companywide performance measures, *Cost Management*, Fall, 5-17.
- Howard, D. R., & Crompton, J. L. (2005). *Financing sport* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology. (Original work published 2004)

- Innes, J., Mitchell, F., & Sinclair, D., (2000). Activity-based costing in the U.K.'s largest companies: A comparison of 1994 and 1999 survey results. *Management Accounting Research*, 11(3), 349-362.
- Ittner, C. D. (2008). Does measuring intangibles for management purposes improve performance? A review of the evidence. *Accounting and Business Research*, 38(3), 261-272.
- Jobs*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 18, 2009, from <http://www.usavolleyball.org/content/index/1706>.
- Job opportunities and internships*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 18, 2009, from <http://www.usrowing.org/AboutUSRowing/JobOpportunitiesandInternships/index.aspx>
- Joyce, G. (2008, October 3). *Economy in crisis means troubled playing fields ahead for sports*. Retrieved from http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/otl/columns/story?columnist=joyce_gare&id=3622898
- Kaplan, R. S., & Cooper, R. (1998). *Cost & Effect: Using Integrated Cost Systems to Drive Profitability and Performance*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1992). The Balanced Scorecard – measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(1), 71-79.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1993a). Putting the Balanced Scorecard to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(5), 134-142.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1993b). Implementing the Balanced Scorecard at FMC Corporation: an interview with Larry D. Brady. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(5), 143-147.

- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1996a). Using the Balanced Scorecard as a strategic management system. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(1), 75-85.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1996b). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Key executives*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2008 from
[http://www.usocpressbox.org/usoc/Pressbox.nsf/AllDocsUNID/C9B21545D64939FB8725726B0062172D/\\$FILE/Gambardella,%20Bob.pdf?open](http://www.usocpressbox.org/usoc/Pressbox.nsf/AllDocsUNID/C9B21545D64939FB8725726B0062172D/$FILE/Gambardella,%20Bob.pdf?open)
- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., Hinings, B., & Zimmerman, A., (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 3(2), 129-150.
- Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Another look at evaluating training programs; Fifty articles from training & development and technical training: Magazines cover the essentials of evaluation and return-on-investment*. Alexandria: American Society for Training and Development.
- Krantz, M. (2006). The lines are drawn: ROI vs. ROO. *Successful Meetings*, 55(6).
- Laitinen, E.K. (2003). Future-based management accounting: A new approach with survey evidence. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 14(3), 293–323.
- Larkey, P. D. (1995). *Good budgetary decision processes*. Unpublished manuscript. Carnegie Mellon University.
- Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after post structuralism. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 673-693.

- Layden, T. & Nazzaro, M. N. (2008, July 28). *Project 119*. Retrieved September 14, 2008 from <http://vault.sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1142310/index.htm>.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Ethnographic data collection in evaluation research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4, 387-400.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993) *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lefton, T., & Mickle, T. (2009, March 2). Beaten-up banks: They're being hit hard for their sports marketing deals, so why isn't the sports industry doing more to support them? *Street & Smith's Sports Business Journal*, 1.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Major, M., & Hopper, T. (2005). Managers divided: Implementing ABC in a Portuguese telecommunications company. *Management Accounting Research*. 16(2), 205-229.
- Martin, L. L. (1997). Outcome budgeting: A new entrepreneurial approach to budgeting. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting, and Financial Management* 9(1), 111-126.
- Maynard, M. (1994). Methods, practice and epistemology: The debate about feminism and research. In M. Maynard & J. Purvis (Eds.), *Researching women's lives from a feminist perspective* (pp. 14-15). London: Taylor & Francis.
- McGregor, D. (1960), *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

- McNulty, Y. M., & Tharenou, P. (2004). Expatriate return on investment: A definition and antecedents. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 34(3), 68-95.
- Merriam, S. B. (1995). "What can you tell from an N of 1?": Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 4, 51-60.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mickle, T. (2009, February 16). Pressing on. *Street & Smith's Sports Business Journal*, 15.
- Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (1996). *The Witchdoctors*. New York: Times Books.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, G. J., Hildreth, W. B., & Rabin, J. (2001). Introduction. In Miller, G. J., Hildreth, W. B., & Rabin, J. (eds.). *Performance Based Budgeting*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mills, R., Rowbotham, S., & Robertson, J. (1998). Using economic profit in assessing business performance. *Management Accounting*, 76(10), 34-38.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research Interviewing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Mission. (n.d.). *The official site of the United States Olympic team*. Retrieved October 8, 2008, from United States Olympic Committee Web site: <http://www.usoc.org>
- Morse, M. T. (1994). Just what is qualitative research? One practitioner's experience. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 88, 43-52.

- Neale, F. (1991), *The Handbook of Performance Management*, Institute of Personnel Management, London.
- Neely, A. (2007). Does the balanced scorecard work: an empirical investigation. Working paper, Cranfield School of Management.
- Nesselrode, M. C., (2008). *Developing a repeatable and reliable methodology to determine return-on-investment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia.
- Neumann, B. R., Gerlach, J. H., Moldauer, E., Finch, M., & Olson, C. (2004). Cost management using ABC for IT activities and services. *Management Accounting Quarterly*. 6(1), 29-40.
- Newing, R. (1994). Benefits of a Balanced Scorecard, *Accountancy*, 114(1215), 52-3.
- Newing, R. (1995). Wake up to the Balanced Scorecard! *Management Accounting*, 73(3), 22-23.
- Odiorne, G.S. (1979). *MBO II: a system of managerial leadership for the 80s*, Belmont, CA: Fearon Pitman Publishers Inc.
- Odiorne, G.S. (1987). *The Human Side of Management: Management by Integration and Self-Control*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Pells, E. (2009, March 6). US Olympic Committee chief executive officer Jim Scherr resigns. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved on March 6, 2009 from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/sports/sns-ap-oly-usoc-scherr-resigns,0,1667582.story>
- Phillips, J. (1997). *Return on investment in training and performance improvement programs*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Poister, T. H. & Streib, G. (1995). MBO in municipal government: variation on a traditional management tool, *Public Administration Review*, 55(1), 48-56.
- Project 30 Task Force, (2009). *Project 30 task force report*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Rappaport, A. (1981). Selecting strategies that create shareholder value. *Harvard Business Review*, 59(3), 139–149.
- Reddin, W. J. (1971). *Effective Management by Objectives: The 3-D Method of MBO*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Reddin, W. J., & Kehoe, P. T. (1974). *Effective MBO for Irish Managers*, Dublin: Mount Salus Press.
- Richardson, L. (1990). *Writing strategies: Researching diverse audiences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Robbins, L. (2000, April 15). New USOC chief gives first order to member groups: Win, or lose your funds. *The New York Times*, sec d, column 1, page 3.
- Rockland, D. B., (2005, July). Asked to calculate ROI? Don't sweat it—ask good questions from the get-go. *Tactics*, 19-21.
- Rowden, R. (1998). A practical guide to assessing the value of training in your company. *Employment Relations Today*, 25(2), 65- 73.

- Rowden, R. (2005). Exploring methods to evaluate the return-on-investment from training, *Business Forum*, 27(1), 31-36.
- Saunders, J. (Host). (2008, August 24). *The Sports Reporters* (Television Broadcast). New York: ESPN.
- Schachner, L. (1973). Return on investment: Its values, determination and uses. *CPA Journal*, 43(4), 277–281.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sharp, B. (1991). Continuous process improvement (CPI) changes corporate culture. *Canadian Manager*, 16(2).
- Shaw, D. & Schneier, C. (1995). Team measurement and rewards: How some companies are getting it right. *Human Resource Planning*, 18(3), 34-49.
- Spencer, S. (1999). Value-based international assignments. *Benefits and Compensation International*, 29(1), 36–41.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Strategies of inquiry: Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stewart, G. B. III. (1991). *The Quest for Value: A Guide for Senior Managers*. New York: HarperBusiness.

- Stotlar, D. K. (2004). Sponsorship evaluation: Moving from theory to practice. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(1), 61-64.
- Summer Olympic Sports*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 18, 2009, from http://www.ukSPORT.gov.uk/index.php?content=pages&id=summer_olympic_sports_-_home.
- Sweet, D. (2002, April 29). ROI drawing closer attention from sponsors. *Sports Business Journal*, 27.
- Turk, F. J. (1992). *The ABCs of activity-based costing: A cost containment and reallocation tool*. *NACUBO Business Officer*, 26(1), 36-42.
- Thomas, J. (1993). *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ukman, L. (1996, August 26). Evaluating ROI of a sponsorship program: Defining objectives is key to measuring sponsorship return. *Marketing News*, 5-14.
- United States Equestrian Federation, (2008a). *Equestrian high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States Equestrian Federation, (2008b). *United States Equestrian Federation bylaws*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States Fencing Association, (2008). *Fencing high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States Fencing Association, (2001). *United States Fencing Association bylaws*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Basketball, (2008). *Plan double O nine: Excellence and relevance*. Unpublished manuscript.

- United States of American Canoe/Kayak, (2009). *USA Canoe/Kayak bylaws and constitution*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Canoe/Kayak, (2008a). *USA Canoe/Kayak high performance plan: Flatwater sprint*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Canoe/Kayak, (2008b). *USA Canoe/Kayak high performance plan: Whitewater slalom*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Gymnastics, (2008). *Gymnastics high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Gymnastics, (2007). *USA Gymnastics bylaws*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Rowing, (2008). *Rowing high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Swimming, (2008). *Swimming high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Volleyball, (2008). *Volleyball high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States of America Water Polo, (2008). *Water polo high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States Olympic Committee, (2007). *Resource Allocation Process*. Unpublished manuscript.
- United States Olympic Committee, (2006). *The USOC Game Plan*. Unpublished manuscript.

- United States Sailing Association, (2008). *Sailing high performance plan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van Tassel, J. D. (1995). Death to MBO, *Training & Development*, 49(3), 2-5.
- Vatner, J. (2005, June). Effective by design; Move over ROI: Why return on objective makes more sense for planners, *Meetings & Conventions*, 45-56.
- Vitale, M., Mavrinac, S. C. & Hauser, M. (1994). DHC: the chemical division's Balanced Scorecard. *Planning Review*, 22(4), 17-45.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Advertising and marketing to the new majority: A case study approach*. Stamford, CT: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Wonders, A. W. (2006). A content analysis of the athlete development systems used by summer Olympic national governing bodies of the USOC. Unpublished Thesis. University of Northern Colorado. Greeley, CO.
- Woodley, S. K. (2005). A critical analysis of the effect of performance funding and budgeting systems on university performance. Unpublished dissertation. Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL.
- Wu, C., (1992). Talent identification in china, *New Studies in Athletics*, 7(3), 37-39.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, R. D. (2003). Performance-based budget systems. *Public Policy and Practice*. 11-24.
- Zinser, L. (2006, August 11). Challenges await, but bigger ones have passed. *The New York Times*, sec d, column 1, page 3.

APPENDIX A
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT RESULTS

Table 7

Performance Based Funding Principles Found in High Performance Plans

NGB	Principle						
	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
Basketball	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Canoe/Kayak	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Equestrian	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fencing	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Gymnastics	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 7. (Continued). Performance Based Funding Principles Found in High Performance Plans

NGB	Principle						
	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
Rowing	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sailing	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Swimming	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Volleyball	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Water Polo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Note. The seven principles that were measured are: (1) Objectives established for all jobs in the firm, (2) Clarify and translate vision and strategy, (3) Communicate and link strategic objectives and measures, (4) Plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives, (5) Emphasis on measurement and control, (6) Enhance strategic feedback and learning, and (7) Link measures with reward.

Table 8

Performance Based Funding Principles Found in High Performance Plans through Peer Review

NGB	Principle						
	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
Fencing	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Rowing	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Volleyball	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Water Polo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Note. The seven principles that were measured are: (1) Objectives established for all jobs in the firm, (2) Clarify and translate vision and strategy, (3) Communicate and link strategic objectives and measures, (4) Plan, set targets, and align strategic initiatives, (5) Emphasis on measurement and control, (6) Enhance strategic feedback and learning, and (7) Link measures with reward.

APPENDIX B

USOC GRANTS TO NGBS (2003 -2007)

Table 9

USOC Grants to NGBs

NGB	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Archery	\$594,127.20	\$485,374.51	\$534,502.60	\$578,370.15	\$632,651.13
Badminton	\$341,917.50	\$346,434.70	\$344,451.70	\$369,123.55	\$237,080.49
Baseball	\$779,994.52	\$308,201.63	\$366,188.00	\$54,000.00	\$0.00
Basketball	\$1,271,063.60	\$1,541,750.29	\$222,084.50	\$503,937.43	\$935,140.19
Biathlon	\$368,148.90	\$275,132.27	\$316,908.25	\$527,048.23	\$869,156.11
Bobsled & Skelton	\$825,083.61	\$903,045.65	\$1,243,124.50	\$589,458.40	\$1,515,897.26
Boxing	\$739,250.12	\$809,625.36	\$694,886.37	\$639,597.85	\$1,045,940.47
Canoe/Kayak	\$659,674.81	\$614,984.78	\$763,740.80	\$712,602.21	\$863,777.98

Table 9 (Continued). USOC Grants to NGBs

NGB	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Curling	\$398,398.47	\$383,747.67	\$501,896.51	\$552,056.33	\$635,622.53
Cycling	\$1,196,841.22	\$1,004,791.32	\$1,286,959.32	\$1,336,194.40	\$1,151,152.42
Diving	\$565,071.00	\$661,299.85	\$880,644.80	\$839,823.15	\$936,556.61
Equestrian	\$912,880.60	\$946,678.92	\$981,047.49	\$1,119,108.92	\$1,087,590.14
Fencing	\$580,250.41	\$538,056.17	\$714,888.31	\$662,052.10	\$795,463.50
Field Hockey	\$659,217.92	\$478,408.34	\$360,480.74	\$459,313.80	\$692,990.33
Figure Skating	\$657,919.20	\$498,969.60	\$332,822.49	\$357,405.80	\$569,908.83
Gymnastics	\$1,043,421.90	\$994,661.75	\$1,350,914.60	\$1,293,866.67	\$1,130,131.17
Hockey	\$1,189,084.50	\$1,105,355.16	\$1,396,442.20	\$1,094,035.50	\$1,306,815.30
Judo	\$375,089.47	\$370,270.10	\$335,737.86	\$429,656.67	\$610,334.37

Table 9 (Continued). USOC Grants to NGBs

NGB	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Luge	\$601,502.53	\$643,940.65	\$868,957.38	\$629,467.41	\$736,867.87
Pentathlon	\$277,629.31	\$300,317.87	\$39,182.13	\$378.60	\$500.00
Rowing	\$1,130,805.00	\$1,198,254.11	\$1,062,828.26	\$1,070,751.01	\$1,303,753.91
Sailing	\$672,319.88	\$808,001.16	\$825,166.87	\$881,753.83	\$1,053,884.38
Shooting	\$718,100.46	\$729,417.22	\$824,105.35	\$960,916.01	\$1,009,719.58
Ski & Snowboard	\$2,797,748.26	\$3,165,637.75	\$3,402,380.00	\$3,246,405.50	\$3,495,212.47
Soccer	\$1,459,815.63	\$1,368,192.29	\$1,017,001.99	\$1,187,890.33	\$1,283,415.13
Softball	\$751,971.87	\$803,824.83	\$735,471.51	\$801,369.46	\$937,602.57
Speed Skating	\$871,423.19	\$1,030,371.22	\$1,437,353.52	\$1,805,496.07	\$2,800,734.26
Swimming	\$2,432,976.43	\$2,288,703.90	\$1,908,354.85	\$1,897,826.53	\$2,228,734.25

Table 9 (Continued). USOC Grants to NGBs

NGB	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Synchronized Swimming	\$653,222.00	\$753,860.12	\$859,100.85	\$778,750.18	\$803,582.97
Table Tennis	\$298,573.62	\$332,567.96	\$330,618.00	\$244,060.39	\$197,784.07
Taekwondo	\$192,531.42	\$402,288.39	\$525,739.18	\$535,651.51	\$504,492.54
Tennis	\$405,991.57	\$486,052.97	\$354,057.80	\$80,000.00	\$117,692.77
Track and Field	\$2,950,921.79	\$2,396,653.46	\$2,603,967.22	\$2,477,099.48	\$2,242,140.46
Triathlon	\$528,781.73	\$627,764.56	\$793,592.25	\$610,610.56	\$755,181.24
Volleyball	\$936,732.82	\$926,800.98	\$678,032.49	\$890,567.99	\$1,117,335.40
Water Polo	\$717,926.00	\$681,486.78	\$854,446.60	\$705,506.46	\$746,509.18
Weightlifting	\$434,803.82	\$482,464.52	\$454,411.35	\$486,480.59	\$567,582.63
Wrestling	\$1,124,625.53	\$1,126,342.27	\$1,425,817.11	\$1,389,289.20	\$1,519,831.05

Note. Grant values were determined by tax disclosure documents found on the financial information tab of the USOC website, www.usoc.org.

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES OLYMPIC MEDAL PERFORMANCE (1994 – 2008)

Table 10

1994 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Biathlon	0	0	0	0
Bobsled & Skelton	0	0	0	0
Curling	0	0	0	0
Figure Skating	0	0	0	0
Hockey	0	0	0	0
Luge	0	0	0	0
Ski & Snowboard	2	3	0	5
Speed Skating	4	2	2	8
Total	6	5	2	13

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 11

1996 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Archery	2	0	0	2
Badminton	0	0	0	0
Baseball	0	0	1	1
Basketball	2	0	0	2
Boxing	1	0	5	6
Canoe/Kayak	0	1	0	1
Cycling	0	2	1	3
Diving	0	0	2	2
Equestrian	0	2	2	4
Fencing	0	0	0	0
Field Hockey	0	0	0	0
Gymnastics	2	2	1	5
Handball	0	0	0	0
Judo	0	0	1	1
Pentathlon	0	0	0	0
Rowing	0	3	1	4

Table 11 (continued). 1996 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Sailing	0	0	2	2
Shooting	1	1	1	3
Soccer	1	0	0	1
Softball	1	0	0	1
Swimming	13	11	2	26
Synchronized Swimming	1	0	0	1
Table Tennis	0	0	0	0
Taekwondo	0	0	0	0
Tennis	3	0	0	3
Track and Field	13	5	5	23
Triathlon	0	0	0	0
Volleyball	1	1	0	2
Water Polo	0	0	0	0
Weightlifting	0	0	0	0
Wrestling	3	4	1	8
Total	44	32	25	101

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 12

1998 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Biathlon	0	0	0	0
Bobsled & Skelton	0	0	0	0
Curling	0	0	0	0
Figure Skating	1	1	0	2
Hockey	1	0	0	1
Luge	0	1	1	2
Ski & Snowboard	4	0	2	6
Speed Skating	0	1	1	2
Total	6	3	4	13

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 13

2000 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Archery	0	1	1	2
Badminton	0	0	0	0
Baseball	1	0	0	1
Basketball	2	0	0	2
Boxing	0	2	2	4
Canoe/Kayak	0	0	0	0
Cycling	1	1	1	3
Diving	1	0	0	1
Equestrian	1	0	2	3
Fencing	0	0	0	0
Field Hockey	0	0	0	0
Gymnastics	0	0	0	0
Handball	0	0	0	0
Judo	0	0	0	0
Pentathlon	0	1	0	1
Rowing	0	1	2	3

Table 13 (continued). 2000 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Sailing	1	2	1	4
Shooting	1	0	2	3
Soccer	0	1	0	1
Softball	1	0	0	1
Swimming	14	8	11	33
Synchronized Swimming	0	0	0	0
Table Tennis	0	0	0	0
Taekwondo	1	0	0	1
Tennis	2	0	1	3
Track and Field	6	4	4	14
Triathlon	0	0	0	0
Volleyball	1	0	0	1
Water Polo	0	1	0	1
Weightlifting	1	0	1	2
Wrestling	2	2	3	7
Total	36	24	31	91

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 14

2002 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Biathlon	0	0	0	0
Bobsled & Skelton	3	2	1	6
Curling	0	0	1	1
Figure Skating	1	0	1	2
Hockey	0	2	0	2
Luge	0	1	1	2
Ski & Snowboard	2	6	2	10
Speed Skating	4	2	5	11
Total	10	13	11	34

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 15

2004 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Archery	0	0	0	0
Badminton	0	0	0	0
Baseball	0	0	0	0
Basketball	1	0	1	2
Boxing	1	0	1	2
Canoe/Kayak	0	1	0	1
Cycling	1	1	1	3
Diving	0	0	0	0
Equestrian	1	2	2	5
Fencing	1	0	1	2
Field Hockey	0	0	0	0
Gymnastics	2	6	1	9
Handball	0	0	0	0
Judo	0	0	1	1
Pentathlon	0	0	0	0
Rowing	1	1	0	2

Table 15 (continued). 2004 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Sailing	1	1	0	2
Shooting	2	1	0	3
Soccer	1	0	0	1
Softball	1	0	0	1
Swimming	12	9	7	28
Synchronized Swimming	0	0	2	2
Table Tennis	0	0	0	0
Taekwondo	1	1	0	2
Tennis	0	1	0	1
Track and Field	8	12	5	25
Triathlon	0	0	1	1
Volleyball	1	0	1	2
Water Polo	0	0	1	1
Weightlifting	0	0	0	0
Wrestling	1	3	2	6
Total	36	39	27	102

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 16

2006 United States Winter Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Biathlon	0	0	0	0
Bobsled & Skelton	0	1	0	1
Curling	0	0	1	1
Figure Skating	0	2	0	2
Hockey	0	0	1	1
Luge	0	0	0	0
Ski & Snowboard	5	3	2	10
Speed Skating	4	3	3	10
Total	9	9	7	25

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 17

2008 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Archery	0	0	0	0
Badminton	0	0	0	0
Baseball	0	0	1	1
Basketball	2	0	0	2
Boxing	0	0	1	1
Canoe/Kayak	0	0	0	0
Cycling	1	1	3	5
Diving	0	0	0	0
Equestrian	1	1	1	3
Fencing	1	3	2	6
Field Hockey	0	0	0	0
Gymnastics	2	6	2	10
Handball	0	0	0	0
Judo	0	0	1	1
Pentathlon	0	0	0	0
Rowing	1	1	1	3

Table 17 (continued). 2008 United States Summer Olympic Medal Performance

NGB	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Sailing	1	1	0	2
Shooting	2	2	2	6
Soccer	1	0	0	1
Softball	0	1	0	1
Swimming	12	9	10	31
Synchronized Swimming	0	0	0	0
Table Tennis	0	0	0	0
Taekwondo	0	1	2	3
Tennis	1	0	1	2
Track and Field	7	9	7	23
Triathlon	0	0	0	0
Volleyball	3	1	0	4
Water Polo	0	2	0	2
Weightlifting	0	0	0	0
Wrestling	1	0	2	3
Total	36	38	36	110

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

APPENDIX D

OLYMPIC MEDAL COMPARISON BY COUNTRIES (1994 – 2008)

Table 18

1994 Winter Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Norway	10	11	5	26
Russia	11	8	4	23
Germany	9	7	8	24
Italy	7	5	8	20
United States	6	5	2	13
Canada	3	6	4	13
Switzerland	3	4	2	9
Austria	2	3	4	9
South Korea	4	1	1	6
Japan	1	2	2	5

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 19

1996 Summer Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	44	32	25	101
Germany	20	18	27	65
Russia	26	21	16	63
China	16	22	12	50
Australia	9	9	23	41
France	15	7	15	37
Italy	13	10	12	35
South Korea	7	15	5	27
Cuba	9	8	8	25
Ukraine	9	2	12	23

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 20

1998 Winter Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Germany	12	9	8	29
Norway	10	10	5	25
Russia	9	6	3	18
Austria	3	5	9	17
Canada	6	5	4	15
United States	6	3	4	13
Finland	2	4	6	12
Netherlands	5	4	2	11
Japan	5	1	4	10
Italy	2	6	2	10

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 21

2000 Summer Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	36	24	31	91
Russia	32	28	28	88
China	28	16	15	59
Australia	16	25	17	58
Germany	13	17	26	56
France	13	14	11	38
Italy	13	8	13	34
Cuba	11	11	7	29
Great Britain	11	10	7	28
South Korea	8	10	10	28

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 22

2002 Winter Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Germany	12	16	8	36
United States	10	13	11	34
Norway	13	5	7	25
Canada	7	3	7	17
Austria	3	4	10	17
Russia	5	4	4	13
Italy	4	4	5	13
France	4	5	2	11
Switzerland	3	2	6	11
Netherlands	3	5	0	8

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 23

2004 Summer Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	36	39	27	102
Russia	27	27	38	92
China	32	17	14	63
Australia	17	16	16	49
Germany	13	16	20	49
Japan	16	9	12	37
France	11	9	13	33
Italy	10	11	11	32
South Korea	9	12	9	30
Great Britain	9	9	12	30

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 24

2006 Winter Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
Germany	11	12	6	29
United States	9	9	7	25
Canada	7	10	7	24
Austria	9	7	7	23
Russia	8	6	8	22
Norway	2	8	9	19
Sweden	7	2	5	14
Switzerland	5	4	5	14
South Korea	6	3	2	11
Italy	5	0	6	11

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.

Table 25

2008 Summer Olympic Medal Performance

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total
United States	36	38	36	110
China	51	21	28	100
Russia	23	21	28	72
Great Britain	19	13	15	47
Australia	14	15	17	46
Germany	16	10	15	41
France	7	16	17	40
South Korea	13	10	8	31
Italy	8	10	10	28
Ukraine	7	5	15	27

Note. Medal counts were found on the International Olympic Committee's website, www.olympic.org.