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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the Olympic Games is vital in our American way of life, and unless we redouble our efforts in extending the Olympic sphere of competition and broaden the base of our competitive efforts in regard to the Games, we will find our nation falling behind in international athletics.

This statement was made by K.L. Wilson, President of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) after the 1960 Olympic Games and was intended as a warning directed to the American people. While the individual performances or American athletes had been improving consistently, United States Olympic medal production was declining as compared to the rest of the world. Other countries were achieving greater success and descending upon the United States. For the American athletes this meant a relative deceleration in their success at the Games.

Since the inception of the modern Olympic Games in 1896, the United States has enjoyed much success and experienced few disappointments. Until 1952, when the Eastern Block countries led by the Soviet Union fully joined the Games, the United States was the dominant power in the Olympics. However, during the past twenty five years (1952-1976), this American domination of the Olympic arena has diminished considerably. The opening quotation delivered by Wilson in 1961 did not appear to
stop the trend of declining American superiority. For the first time since 1896, the United States was pushed to third position in total medal accumulation when at the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) each won more medals than the United States.

Because of the growing concern given to Olympic participation and, because of the paramount importance of a successful Olympic effort to the American people and their amateur sports, this study will attempt to investigate certain governing and administrative conditions which potentially affect the state of United States Olympic affairs today. Furthermore this study will endeavor to provide some recommended solutions to perceived problems.

There are many complex reasons which might account for the relative decrease of United States superiority in the Olympic Games. While other countries have greatly improved their national attitude toward sport and are "enjoying" centralized sport programs financed mainly by government and/or industry, and while these efforts are inevetably directed toward the Olympic Games, the supporters of United States athletic programs have continued an approach following past tradition.

Within the United States the popularity of professional sports has drawn many of the top athletes away from amateur sports and some amateur athletes have actually avoided participation on a United States Olympic team because of prospective professional contracts. An example is the case of Bill Walton, a basketball player, who declined participation on the 1972 United States Olympic basketball team which lost for the first time in any Olympic contest. Another reason for the United States'
declining success in the Olympic Games is captured in sport-journalist Howard Cosell's testimony before the President's Commission on Olympic Sports. On this occasion, Cosell advised that "American athletes have suffered injustice after injustice because of power struggles within the sport establishment." [45:34] Specifically Cosell was referring to the continuous feuds between the different sport organizations, particularly between the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and between the NCAA and the USOC. These collective collisions have hampered past Olympic efforts. Other reasons which reduce United States success in medal accumulation include the lack of financial support from government or industry which leaves the USOC and other sport organizations limited in their ability to financially support the Olympic effort. Furthermore, lack of clearly defined leadership or authority within the United States amateur sports organizations has created a confused situation unique only to the United States; and the absence of well-defined authority along with the presence of inter-organizational feuds has created some severe problems which demand investigation and clarification. This study will attempt to examine some of these problems.

The problems mentioned above have hampered the effectiveness of the USOC an organization which must assume the responsibility for the United States Olympic effort. Specifically, issues such as athletes' rights, coaches' and athletes' representation, communications between the different groups, and mutual understanding of the responsibilities and objectives of the USOC have grown in importance and have affected the achievement of the entire United States Olympic effort.
As recently as 1975, Phillip O. Krumm, the former President of the USOC, observed that:

Over the years, there have been attempts to set up a dialogue at the highest level of management, but these attempts did not provide the broad spectrum of discussions which must take place if all parties concerned with the USA Olympic Games effort understand and respect each other's point of view.

Those parties Krumm referred to represent the groups most directly involved with the United States Olympic effort -- the athletes, the coaches, and the United States Olympic Committee.

During the years between Olympic Games, the athletes compete, the coaches coach, and the USOC plans forthcoming Olympic confrontations. These three groups spend this interim time working separately and independently. Not only are their activities often disparate, but these groups are scattered across the United States. Hence, both physical and philosophical distances exist within the total United States Olympic effort.

Notwithstanding these special problems, approximately one year to six months before the Games are scheduled to begin, the three representative groups begin the selection and preparation processes for the Games. During this period, all three groups comprised of elite athletes, top coaches, and the USOC's administrators gather to coordinate efforts toward planning the participation of the United States' teams in the Olympic Games. The result of this mutual and cooperative task is the formation of a unique organization which might be labeled the "Olympic Effort Organization."

According to Richard R. Lonsdale, "To achieve the task of an organization, whatever that task may be, requires the combined efforts
of a number of people working in a hierarchy of ... relationships with each other and carrying out varying duties and responsibilities." 

[5:153] The clarity of the role of each group within an organization is essential to the success of this combined effort. Each individual or group occupies a position in a certain location within the total organization. The way people behave in these positions depends partly on how they think they are expected to behave and how others actually expect them to behave. These expectations are called "roles."

Drawing from Lonsdale's observations, it is felt that the convergence of the three groups of athletes, coaches, and administrators into one Olympic Effort Organization increases the possibility for greater amounts of divergence and variance between points of view and in terms of the way each group and individual members perceive their various roles. The result of these differences in role perceptions is "role conflict."

While Lonsdale tries to pin-point the location of role conflicts and suggests that "conflicts within roles and between roles are the most common of role conflicts," [5:149] William W. Savage adds that "conflict between and among groups is a common problem at local, state, national and international levels of human affairs." [13:212]

In addition to specific role conflict, the administrators of any organization may perceive their own behavior somewhat differently from the way others perceive it. The manner in which a person or a group thinks it is expected to behave is different from the manner others really expect them to behave. For example, the USOC administrators may believe that financing is the main type of support which other
groups expect it to provide for the Olympic effort. Other interest groups, however, may look to the USOC to provide leadership and organizational support and see these as crucial and primary expectations.

To a certain degree, conflict within an organization is inevitable, healthy, and needed for productive change, creativity, and progress. Continuing conflicts between athletes and coaches have stimulated improved communications, better coaching and improvement of athletes' rights. It was intra-organizational conflicts which ultimately led to the creation of the Athletes' Advisory Council (AAC) as part of the USOC. Nevertheless, an overriding question is how much conflict can an organization tolerate and still be effective?

The coalition of different groups into an Olympic Effort Organization is liable to present an excessive amount of potential conflict. There are threatening possibilities that these groups which have been working separately will develop different and conflicting role expectations within and between themselves. This obviously will create problems for the organization and hinder the achievement of its goals. The President's Commission on Olympic Sports in its (1977) report stated that "the United States does not nearly approach achieving its full potential in sports." [23:21] Instead, it appears that the general feeling which is shared by the athletes, coaches, administrators, and the public is that the United States can and should produce a more successful Olympic performance.

Certainly, the success of the Olympic effort relies in part on the success of minimizing and reducing the major conflicts between the
involved groups. Wasteful and pointless role conflicts can certainly be reduced by analyzing and studying roles and communicating more openly and objectively.

Before continuing a discussion of the rationale, procedures and methods of this study, it is important to examine the structure and functions of the USOC.

To the USOC, a National Olympic Committee (NOC) for the United States, is given the right and responsibility to enter a team in the Olympic Games. Historically, the first Americans who formed the initial organized Olympic effort in the United States were James E. Sullivan, William Sloan, and Arthur Burnham. This group in 1896 formed the American Olympic Committee (AOC) which functioned within the already established Amateur Athletic Union (AAU).

In 1921 the Committee pulled out of the AAU and organized itself as the American Olympic Association (AOA). By 1951, the organization was incorporated when the United States Congress approved Public Law 805. This law, which continues to govern the organization, established the legal guidelines and rights of the association. The organization's current name, adopted in 1961, is the United States Olympic Committee, (USOC).

After its quadrennial meeting in April-May 1977, the USOC created a description of the organization's structure and functions.

The structure consists of the President and the officers, the House of Delegates, the Executive Board, the Athletes' Advisory Council, the Administrative Committee, and the Constitutional
Operating committees which include the finance, budget, and audit, development, Games preparation, sport medicine, international Olympic academy, investment, credentials and other standing committees.

The USOC also published the following as its major purposes and functions. As stated in their 1977 Constitution and By-Laws these include:

To arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States in, and to obtain their support for, all the amateur sport; To stimulate interest in healthful activities and competition in accordance with the amateur rules; To select and obtain the most competent amateur athletes for possible representation in the Games; To maintain the highest ideals of amateurism; To organize, select, finance and control the representation of the United States in the Olympic and Pan-American Games; To protect the rights of every individual who is eligible to participate, if selected, in any international amateur competition; to assist in the financing, organization, and administration of development programs in all amateur sports.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this doctoral thesis is to examine, compare, analyze and report the differences in the way athletes' representatives, coaches, and USOC administrators (Executive Board members), perceive the goals, duties, and responsibilities of the USOC in regard to its Olympic effort.

The major research questions which this dissertation will attempt to address are the following:
a. Are there any significant differences in the way each group perceives some of the actual and some of the desired roles of the USOC?
b. What are the major areas of agreement and disagreement, and how can role perception differences be minimized or reduced, and how can agreements be strengthened?

Rationale for the Study

Indications are that the American public, as represented by the President's Commission on Olympic Sports as well as by its amateur sports establishment, are ready to take more affirmative action to ensure a better Olympic performance by the United States.

Lately, the United States has encountered its stiffest competition in the history of the Olympic Games and for the first time has placed third in medal production in the 1976 Olympic Games. In addition, the United States failed to win the mens' team title in the first World Track and Field championships in Dusseldorff, West Germany in September 1977. In January, 1977, the PCOS published its final report after spending two years studying Olympic Sports in the United States. In its investigation the commission found several communication failures within most of the American sports organizations along with a lack of role definition. In its major recommendations (Vol. 3) the commission called for major revisions and a redefinition of authority in the amateur sport establishment of the United States.

In another organizational arena in May, 1977, the USOC closed its post-Olympic quadrennial meeting in Colorado Springs, Colorado by calling for improvements through constitutional amendments and through a restructure of this organization so it might meet the growing demands
for better performance in international competition. This meeting was labeled by many as the most historic and productive meeting of the USOC's history. More recently Don Miller, the Executive Director of the USOC commented on the major revisions in the Constitution and By-Laws of the USOC, and suggested that "we are in the midst of a very exciting era for the USOC." [46:1]

Because the USOC is itself concerned with its own improvement, it is hoped that this study will provide information that will assist the public and the sport establishment in enhancing United States performance in the Olympic Games, by clarifying role perceptions of the USOC as held by significant groups participation in the United States Olympic effort.

To date there have been no specific studies conducted in this area. The only in-depth work done has been the recently published PCOS report which devoted one chapter to USOC, and in its third volume recommended the restructuring of the amateur sport organizations. [23:1-140] Given these minimal attempts to discern and discuss the problems, no one has yet tested these aspects of the Olympic effort empirically. This thesis should not only enhance and spark the improvement of the Olympic effort but also has the potential to stimulate further much needed empirical and scientific research in the areas of the administration and organization of the USOC, the Olympic effort, Olympic sports, and the Olympic Games.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be specifically investigated.

- There will be no statistically significant differences in percep-
tions between the USOC's Executive Committee members and top National and Olympic Coaches, with regard to the goals, duties and responsibilities of the USOC.

- There will be no statistically significant differences in perceptions between USOC's Executive Committee members and members of the USOC's Athletes Advisory Council, with regard to the goals, duties and responsibilities of the USOC.

- There will be no statistically significant differences in perceptions between the top National and Olympic Coaches and the members of the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council, with regard to the goals, duties and responsibilities of the USOC.

Methods and Procedures

In order to undertake such a study, an instrument had to be developed which would accurately and reliably collect information about the perceptions of the participants. The problem of this study then was to construct and validate an instrument which would measure the perceptions of these three groups with regard to the goals, duties and responsibilities of the USOC.

For this purpose a specific questionnaire which utilized a modified Likert attitude scale was designed. Likert arranged his opinion statements so that the responses could be assigned numerical values ranging from five to one (5-1), (5)-Strongly Agree response, and (1)-Strongly Disagree, according to the interpretation of response expressions. [2:149] In this type of scale, value is the sum of all numbers assigned to the responses which a subject or a group of subjects have made. The
Likert technique, that of summated ratings, will allow numerical comparisons to be made between and within the three groups under investigation.

A pilot questionnaire was constructed and then sent to former Executive Board members, coaches, and AAC members. The returns (fifty seven percent) were analyzed and used in the construction of the final instrument.

The final questionnaire was sent by mail and collected through the use of self-addressed pre-paid envelopes. A follow-up questionnaire was mailed at a later date to insure a higher rate of return.

The three groups considered and investigated in this study were: The AAC Members, the 1976 National (fail to qualify for the Olympic Games) and Olympic coaches, and the members of the USOC Executive Board.

The questionnaire was sent to the following subjects: all members of the USOC's Athletes Advisory Council, n=40; all National and Olympic coaches on the 1976 Olympic teams, n=57; and all members of the USOC Executive Board, n=53. Total number of subjects, N=150.

The names and location of all the subjects were furnished by the USOC's Office of Communications.

Limitations

The purpose of this study as indicated earlier limits itself to identifying differences of perceptions among the sub-groups of the Olympic Effort Organization. Therefore, the study will not address itself to the effectiveness or success of the United States Olympic effort.
The writer acknowledges the need to study the perceptions of the athletes who represented the United States in the 1976 Olympic Games. However, because of difficulties in locating many of the athletes and because it was assumed that interest in this area might be minimal, it was decided to involve the group which represents these athletes on the USOC's AAC. In addition, it was also assumed that: (1) These representatives, who were elected by the athletes of each sport, are a true sample of the American Athlete; (2) This is a group of interested, knowledgeable, and involved individuals who would be willing to participate in a study of this nature.

The coaches who were selected for this study were those who had most recently been associated with the Olympic effort. This selection will exclude many other top coaches. It is believed that these coaches, a sizeable number of whom will be back as Olympic coaches in the future, truly represent the majority of the top coaches in the United States. Their perceptions are therefore significant and important to this study and its implications toward future Olympic effort.

Due to the limited literature which deals with the Olympic effort and the role of the USOC in this effort, this study has drawn its theoretical basis from educational administration theory and its research which is similar in nature.

**Definition of Terms**

**UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE** -(USOC) The organization recognized by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) as the agency through which
the U.S. athletes are entered in the Olympic Games.

THE OLYMPIC EFFORT ORGANIZATION - The coalition of the different parties (Athletes, Coaches, USOC) who are involved in the actual development, preparation, selection, and representation of the U.S. in the Olympic Games.

Administrative Role - The perceived behavior and actions of an organization's administrative body. In this study, the behavior and actions of the USOC.

Role Perception - The way an individual or a group perceives its or others' actual or desired action and behavior.

Role Conflict - Different or contradicting perceptions of one's own or others' roles.

Actual Role - The way actions and behaviors of an individual, a group, or an organization ARE perceived to be at present.

Desired Role - The perceptions of what SHOULD BE the actions and behavior of an individual, a group, or an organization.

The Executive Board - The body within the USOC which defines the policies and which has general charge of the business affairs and activities of the USOC.

The Athletes' Advisory Council - The body of athletes' representatives which serves as a source of opinion and advice to the executive board of the USOC.

Top Coaches - Coaches who have coached or are now coaching athletes who have represented or have top potential to represent the U.S. in international competition.
Format

This dissertation follows the traditional format which includes: the introduction, review of related literature, methods and procedures, analysis of the data, and summary which will include conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although no research has been accomplished in this particular topical area, research from other disciplines becomes especially suitable for meeting the needs and requirements of this study. Specifically, a thorough search which included the use of the Mechanized Information Center (MIC) at the Ohio State University, two visits to the Olympic House in New York City, and interviews with USOC personnel and scholars in the Olympic Movement Field located no empirical studies directed toward an investigation of this topic area of the intra-organizational problems of the USOC. The only literature which deals with the Olympics are historical tracings of the games, descriptions of the events in the different Olympic games and specific issues related to the games themselves. For this reason, research drawn from the field of administrative sciences will be reviewed and demonstrated to show a direct relationship with USOC observations and subsequent theoretical implications.

In the absence of such empirical research, this review will consist of three sections aimed at describing certain related administrative studies and explicating related administrative science theory.
The history of the organizational development of the USOC and the USOC's organizational structure, functions and purposes constitute other areas tapped for related research and material.

Related Administrative Studies and Theory

A decade ago sociologist Rensis Likert noted the changing trends in the scientific study of organizations. His observations saw science playing a much larger role in the human socialization process:

A series of important scientific developments have occurred during the past quarter of a century of great potential value to administration in business, government, hospitals, and schools. The social sciences, along with mathematics and statistics, have created methodologies for measuring and analyzing variables valuable both for helping an enterprise decide on which management system to use and for appraising the present state of its human organization.

[10:129]

One example of an application of the scientific method of problem solving to human, social, and organizational problems is the recent development within education of the concept of Organization Development (OD). As it is defined by Van Meter, Organization Development is:

... a rapidly expanding field of inquiry and practice which holds considerable promise not only as a means for improving organizational human relations and communications, but also as a planned way for going about the continuous process of helping to make schools and other educational organizations more human, healthy, creative and productive places for people to work, live, and learn. [15:1]

Thus, these scientific tools, which are at the hands of the administrator and administrative scientist today, in an increasing number of cases substitute for practitioner judgment in all aspects of management [10:2]
Likert would agree that a utilization of the tools of science logically fall to the leaders of organization:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experiences as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance. [10:47]

Expanding upon Likert's view of organizational interaction and relationships, Halpin and Croft (1962) observed that "how the leader really behaves is less important than how the members of his group perceive that he behaves." [7:13] These two researchers believed that "the perception of the group members of their leaders' behavior will determine the behavior of the group and will hence define the organizational climate." [7:13]

Taken together, the present application of scientific theory to organizational administration, the impact of Likert's observation, and the typicality of related administrative research have resulted in numerous more recent studies conducted in education administration, guidance and counseling, and higher education to determine differences in perceptions of two or more groups within an organization. Some of these findings are reported in the following paragraphs.

Engle (1971) studied the perceptions of teachers and principals on the effects of independent study programs upon student control. Among consistent positive perception toward the effectiveness of independent studies, the teachers and principals agreed that students were often making unwise decisions while pursuing independent study, and that teachers indicated a feeling of disrespect for
authority shown by the students. On the other hand, principals articulated the feeling that better relationships existed between students and school staff. [26:1-147]

In a second similar study conducted by Green (1972) the researcher tried to determine if significant differences existed between perceptions of secondary school teachers regarding the importance of certain functions of the secondary school principal. The major conclusions were that principals perceived administrative functions of the principal to be of greater importance than did teachers. The two groups did agree on the most important individual functions of the principal, while the differences in perception between male principals and male teachers was seen as being greater than between male principals and female teachers. The greatest differences in perception between principals and teachers were found in small schools with a 400-600 enrollment. [27: 1-297]

Another study which analyzed and compared the perceptions of two different groups was that of Juerganssen (1974). His study tried to determine and compare the perceptions of teachers and administrators in secondary schools examining the inclusion of selected aspects of collective negotiations in the specific schools. The study utilized the total population of teachers and administrators in the Missouri Synod Lutheran community secondary schools in the entire United States. The results indicated that there were significant differences in perceptions between the teachers and the administrators in these secondary schools. Generally, the administrators opposed the inclusion of collective negotiations in their schools while teachers tended to favor collective negotiations for Lutheran schools. [29:1-299]
Royce's (1975) problem was to discover the perceptions of parents, teachers and administrators toward the role of the PTA in a school district in California. The data was statistically analyzed and the results revealed significant differences between the perceptions of parents, teachers, and administrators. Royce concluded that all groups agreed that the most important goal was to develop a united effort, that the PTA had an inflexible structure problem, and that a communication gap existed and change was necessary. [31:1-297]

Within a higher educational level, Hackney (1975) examined whether perceptual discrepancies existed between counselors and administrators regarding counselor functions in Michigan Community Colleges. The study revealed significant differences between the two groups on several of the functions. The findings indicated that the differences tended to be in the degree to which the two groups perceived certain functions as important rather than whether they were appropriate. [28:1-224]

Berry (1976) in his doctoral thesis described, analyzed, and compared actual perceptions and attitudes of state officials, university and college administrators, and board of education members regarding higher education in Tennessee. The major findings of this study suggested that there were differences of perceptions with regard to the decision making process but that there was no consensus about the goal of higher education in Tennessee. Berry also noted that differences in the values and expectations of the different groups created uncertainty of goals and miscommunications. [25:1-246]
Management and organizational performance research done in an industrial setting by Likert and his associates concluded "that the influence of a subordinate's values, expectations, and skills upon his perception of his superior's behavior and his response to it" is a key variable in evaluating management systems. In an attempt to define "perception" in this sense as a key to the individual's or group's reaction to its surroundings, Ittelson and Cantril state that:

Perception is that part of the process of living in which each person, from his own unique personal behavioral center, creates for himself the world in which he has his life's experiences, and through which he strives to gain his satisfaction. [8:5]

Modifying the above, Savage claims that a clear and accurate perception of one's own behavior is very difficult to achieve, but that it is very important for an administrator to acquire accurate perceptions. [12:129]

From the standpoint of administrator's perceptions, Schmuck weighs the value and importance of perception-checking by administrators and advises that:

Perception-checking allows you to verify your assumptions about the emotions the other person is experiencing. An additional benefit of perception-checking is that it conveys the idea that you want to understand the other person. Thus it has the potential for improving interpersonal relations as well as increasing clarity of communication. [13:40]

From the opposite perspective, how the individual or the group perceives the leader's action or the organizational purpose can determine the success or failure of the organization. Griffiths (1956) concurs and comments that perceptual differences is a fundamental cause of human relation problems. [4:54] People do not see the same behavior as it
happens; they see something different when experiencing an event common to all. [4:54] Relating to the problem of different perceptions, Griffiths adds that the major problem in perceiving other people can be said to be the degree to which the purposes that we attribute to them are actually the purposes that they have. [4:61] If the administration is to function effectively with all the organization's sub-groups, it must learn as much as possible about these sub-groups. Furthermore, Griffiths believes that "there is some evidence to indicate that people perceive the job of the administrator in different ways: they have different role expectations of the administrator, and as he acts to satisfy one group he antagonizes another." [4:67]

As another area of concern, role and role expectations have been discussed by many in the administrative sciences. Thompson, for one, maintains that "the person as perceived by others is the result of his many roles." [22:486] Others define role as "a set of behaviors which are expected of people who occupy a certain position." [18:452]; or, "an organized pattern of behavior in accordance with the expectations of others." [22:486]; "A behavior repertoire characteristic of a person or a position, and a set of standards, descriptions, norms or concepts held for the behavior of a person or a position" [1:10]; "a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position" [6:6C]; or "a behavior which presents what a person is supposed to do in a given situation by virtue of the position he holds." [22:70]

Biddle and Thomas (1966) observed that "inconsistent prescriptions (or standards) held for a person by himself, or one or more others, may
create role conflict" [1:10] while others who discuss the issue of differing role perception and role expectations have advised that "Whenever a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to several expectations which are mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent, he is said to be in a situation characterized by a role conflict." [3:182]

Talcott Parsons (1957) comments that role conflict means the exposure of the actor to conflicting sets of legitimized role expectations such that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible. [12:56] And, Carroll (1974) observed that role conflict is "any situation in which the incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations." [17:51] The danger of role conflict, as Carroll sees it, is that role conflict is associated with decreased satisfaction and coping behavior that would be dysfunctional to the organization. [17:51]

It appears that the occurrence of role conflict within an organization creates obstacles which hamper the achievement of the goals of the organization. According to Biddle and Thomas, exposure to role conflict is an obvious source of strain and frustration in that it creates situations which are incompatible with harmonious integration. [1:276] The disruption of the system or role expectation might thus result in disintegration of the organization, rendering it unable to achieve its goals and satisfy the needs of its members. [16:41] Bidwell, whose study attempts to describe and discuss the perceptions of teachers, maintains that:
One source of disturbance of this system (reciprocal role expectation) is perception by teachers of administrative behavior. The teachers will be unable to predict accurately the behavior of their administrators, they will be unable to act effectively toward them in the administrative situation. The teacher will attempt to exert negative sanctions against the administrator.

[16:41]

In yet another study Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958) investigating the role of school superintendents found that expectations of school board members sometimes conflict with expectations held by the teachers. [6:540]

Thus, according to Kahn (1964) and his associates, "The presence of conflict in one's role tends to undermine his relations with his role senders, to produce weaker bonds of trust, respect, and attraction." [9:71] It becomes quite clear that role conflicts are costly for a person in terms of emotional and interpersonal sacrifices. They may also be costly to the organization, which depends on effective coordination and collaboration within and among its parts. [9:71]

Effective ways to identify and resolve these role conflicts and differences in perceptions and expectations must be found, Likert points out that large governmental agencies as well as business enterprises are suffering from failure of current attempts to solve complex problems. Cyert and MacRimmon in their work conclude that:

... an increasing amount of human activity takes place within organizations, and normative implications derived from empirical study can serve as the basis for an improvement in the health of the individual, the organization and the society.

[21:577]
The Organizational History of the United States Olympic Committee

This section will serve to trace the organizational history and development of the USOC since its inception in 1896. In retrospect, this post-civil war era marks the initial interest and emphasis given to organized sports in the United States. In time, as increased attention was given to athletics, intercollegiate and club sports evolved to a degree that prompted involved individuals to see the need to organize their activities in a collective effort.

As a result of the revival of the Olympic Games in 1896 and with the consent of the International Olympic Committee and the assistance of other prominent United States sport leaders, James E. Sullivan formed the American Olympic Committee. The AOC was a committee within the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) and represented the first attempt at organizing a United State's team for the Olympic Games. [23:336] In its early days the AOC attracted enough attention to convince President Theodore Roosevelt to serve as its honorary chairman. The Committee's funding during that period was primarily achieved through contributions solicited on a nationwide basis. [23:346]

Until 1905, the AAU was the only organization capable of planning and conducting training and selection programs for the United States Olympic Team. The Intercollegiate Athletic Association (IAA), later known as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), was formed in 1905 and started to assume its share in the Olympic effort by 1920. [23:397]
November 25, 1921 marks the initial organization date of the United States Olympic Committee. On that date in New York City the organization was formally named the American Olympic Association (AOA). At this important time, the association stated its objectives which were:

... to create and maintain a permanent organization representative of amateur sports and of organizations devoted thereto in the United States for the purpose of assuring continued interest in the Olympic Games and more particularly to constitute seasonably in advance of each Olympiad an American Olympic Committee, which shall have jurisdiction of all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States therein.

[33:1]

The Association's member organizations in 1921 included the United States Army and Navy, the AAU, the NCAA, most of the national associations representing different sports, the YMCA, and most of the national, regional, and state sport organizations. [33:23]

Assuming the honorary offices and posts within the AOA in 1921 were the President of the United States, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. The administrative officers included a President, three vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, and an auditor. [34:96]

The standing committees created at that time were the Committee on Credentials, an Executive Committee, Committee on Legislation, Finance Committee, and a Committee on Olympic Games. According to the Constitution and By-Laws of the AOA, the need to amend the constitution of the Association could be accomplished only by a vote of two thirds of the members attending the Association's quadrennial
Procedural powers to act on or amend the By-Laws of the AOA were given to the Executive Committee which numbered nine members in 1921.

The 1921 Constitution and By-Laws of the Association also specified the duties of the officers, the duties of the special committees, and the length of term for officers and committee members. By 1926 the following list of objectives and goals of the Association was added as a clarification of purpose:

- ... this association is not organized for pecuniary profit; its aims are wholly altruistic. It seeks to foster and promote at home the participation of all the people in amateur sports and the physical and moral betterment of the youth of our country by physical education, by inculcating habits of temperance, of self-reliance coupled with self-restraint; and by discipline, team-work, courage and generous rivalry; and internationally, better understanding and more friendly relations among the nations by stimulating chivalric competition in amateur sports.

In addition, by 1926, the Executive Committee had grown in size to include twenty members, and the Olympic Games Committee was given more responsibilities, among them the requirement to report in writing to the AOA on the results of the Olympic performance.

The struggle for control over amateur athletics reached its peak in 1927 when it appeared that the United States would not field a team for the 1928 Games. However, General Douglas MacArthur was elected President of the AOA in 1927 and he succeeded in getting opposing organizations to rejoin for the 1928 Olympic Games.

The Executive Committee of the AOA received even more power in 1937. It was then given the power to determine the place and time of the meetings of the Association, a function that in the past was handled by the president of the Association. The number of members
on this committee grew in 1937 to approximately forty-two. In addition, the Executive Committee received the power to appoint the very strong and important Olympic Games Committee. By 1937, only the whole membership of the AOA could add to or amend the By-Laws of the Association. [36:8-9]

To enable the Association to obtain jurisdiction over the Pan-American Games, its name was changed in 1941 to the United States of America Sports Federation (USASF). [37:2] The Constitution of 1941 details and specifies the Federation's objectives, purposes, powers and jurisdiction in the following manner: To organize, select, and finance the Olympic and Pan-American teams; Governance over all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States in these games; to arouse the public interest in the Olympic and Pan-American Games; to stimulate the interest of the public in healthy participation in sports; to maintain the highest ideals of amateurism. [38:3]

During this time period embracing the 1940's the two strongest member organizations remained the AAU and the NCAA.

On February 24, 1941, the Federation added another meeting to its schedule and now met every two years. [39:8] At that same meeting, the By-Laws of the Federation described for the first time the voluntary nature of the task performed by the member delegates who occupied positions on the different committees:

All officers and members of all committees act and serve without compensation and as a public service in aid of the educational purpose of the Federation. They shall not be personally liable in respect to any debt or other obligation incurred in the name of the Federation or any of its committees. [38:17]
The year 1945 marks another change in the name of the organization for it was then changed to the United States Olympic Association (USOA).

And, on September 21, 1950, the 81st Congress of the United States passed Public Law 805 which incorporated the USOA. [37:2] This law authorized the Association to carry on the business of organizing, selecting, training, transporting, clothing and feeding the United States teams in the Olympic Games and Pan-American Games and also gave the USOA the right to protect the use of the logotype of the Olympic Games (five rings), as well as use of the words "Olympic Games," "Olympics," and the motto of the Olympic Games "Citius, Altius, Fortius," or any derivatives of these words, or combination of words. [19:19]

The USOA created two new functions in 1951. One, which was short lived and disappeared in 1957, was a committee of three trustees; the other, the function of the executive director. [39:7] The executive director still plays a major role in the conduct of this organization. In 1951, along with the creation of the executive director position, came a drastic change in the size of the Executive Committee which was reduced from approximately forty-two members in 1937 to only four members.

The amended Constitution of 1954 reveals some added purposes of the USOA. The expanded article on purposes, powers, and jurisdiction now included the selection of the most competent athletes for Olympic competition, development of positive characteristics in American youth, and the promotion of physical and cultural education. [40:1] In 1954, the function of the executive committee was replaced by a
Board of Directors. This body consisted of seventeen members. Between meetings of the Association the Board assumed charge of the Association's affairs, business and objectives as set forth in the Association's Constitution, By-Laws, General Rules, and the act of Congress (Public Law 805). [40:12] Another organizational addition in 1954 was the adoption of a personnel chart:

At least twelve months in advance of the opening date of each Olympic or Pan-American Games the executive board (of the games committee) shall establish a personnel chart. This chart shall outline the proposed makeup of the team's party and indicate the maximum number of competitors and administrative personnel.

[40:25]

Numerous revisions and changes had, by 1954, changed the face of the USOA. By that time the USOA had published its General Rules in addition to its Constitution and By-Laws. The General Rules outlined the process of operation for the Games Committees specifying tryouts and selection of teams, selection of managers and coaches, rules concerning use of drugs, stimulants and objectionable athletic equipment, and rules for managers, coaches, medical aid, and physicians and trainers. [40:29-36] Amendments to the General Rules could be made only by vote during any regular meeting of the Association or at a special meeting called for this purpose. [40:46] Also during these growth years the Association declared that publishing a magazine, a newspaper or other publication was one of its powers and purposes. [40:4]

At the quadrennial meeting in Washington, D.C., December 4-5, 1961, constitutional revisions were made changing the official name
of the organization to the United States Olympic Committee thus conforming to the classification used by the International Olympic Committee. [33:2]

Two years later the Association, now known as the USOC, expanded the Board of Directors to a fifty-three member group in 1963 and re-instated the function of the Executive Committee as a sixteen member body selected from the Board of Directors. The Executive Committee was to discharge the functions of the Board of Directors on its behalf between meetings of the Board and subject to the general direction and approval of the Board. [41:7]

An important aspect of the organization's effort was the creation of the Committee on Development in the early 1960's. This committee's responsibilities placed greater emphasis upon sports in which the United States had enjoyed less success in the Olympic Games, and, in general, were intended to stimulate, foster and promote the moral, cultural and physical education of the youth of the United States. [41:8]

Deeper appreciation for planning was shown in 1965 when the Games Planning Committee was created. It was determined that this committee would recommend to the Board of Directors, who had appointed it, certain administrative policies for the Games Committee and for the guidance of the official United States delegation at the Olympic and Pan-American Games. [42:7]

Before the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, the USOC instituted the Games Committees. It was the intention of the USOC that these
committees, operating under the jurisdiction of the Board of Directors and supervised and evaluated by the Games Planning Committee, would be responsible for:

(1) The scheduling of tryouts or other competition for the selection of athletes to represent the United States in a particular sport event on the Olympic or Pan-American Games program; (2) the method of such selection; and (3) the persons to be nominated for final appointment to the official delegation of the United States as competitors, managers, coaches, and auxiliary personnel. [37:15]

Another important rule change occurred in 1974 when Sections 6 and 7 of Article II were added to the USOC Constitution. These sections evidenced a concern by the USOC for the competing athletes [43:2-3] and represents the first version of the "Athlete's Bill of Rights." (Appendix) Specifically, these sections spelled out the rights of the amateur athlete to participate if selected on the Olympic and Pan-American Teams and his/her right to arbitration in case of grievance. In addition to the article on athlete's rights, Article XVII of the 1974 Constitution calls for the creation of an Athletes' Advisory Council. This council, which now represents athletes from all the sports in the Olympic and Pan-American Games, was created with the objective of broadening the communications between the USOC and currently active athletes. [43:17.2]

The Present United States Olympic Committee

On April 29 through May 1, 1977, the USOC met for its quadrennial meeting in Colorado Springs, Colorado. During this meeting, which was termed by many as the most significant meeting in USOC history,
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the organization reviewed and revised its Constitution and By-Laws once again.

On the basis of its latest published Constitution, By-Laws, and General Rules and within the authority granted to it by Public Law 805, the USOC's organizational purposes, functions and structure were:

. . . to arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States in, and to obtain their support for, all the sports in the Olympic and Pan-American Games; to stimulate interest in healthful activities and competition in accordance with the amateur rules; to select and obtain the most competent amateur athletes for possible representation in the Games; to maintain the highest ideals of amateurism; to develop qualities of courage, honesty, self-reliance and like virtues in American youth; and, to promote and encourage the physical, moral, and cultural education of youth.

Among its many powers and jurisdictions, the USOC also has the power to organize, select, finance, and control the representation of the United States in the Olympic and Pan-American Games. Furthermore, it retains exclusive rights over the use of the USOC emblem and protects the rights of every individual who is eligible to participate, if selected, in any international amateur competition. If necessary, the USOC will investigate any alleged denial of athlete's rights and it promotes equal rights for coaches, administrators, trainers, managers, and any other official seeking to participate in the conduct of any international amateur athletic competition. [44:2-3]

Membership in the USOC is confined to organizations. There is, however, a provision allowing the recognition of an association with individuals. Organizations maintaining USOC membership must be active
in the administration of one or more sports on the Olympic or Pan-American Games programs or in other patriotic, educational, or cultural organizations which engage in the promotion of, or participation in an amateur sport. [44:3]

These member organizations are divided into four groups which are given letter titles. Group A includes national sport organizations representing the sports on the Olympic and Pan-American programs. The USOC recognizes only one national amateur governing body for each sport in accordance with the IOC's Rule 24. Each national governing body is recognized by the USOC as entertaining jurisdiction over all international amateur competition. According to the revised Constitution of the USOC, Group A members shall constitute a voting majority of the House of Delegates and of the Executive Board of the USOC. [44:3] Those eligible for Group B are those national organizations which contribute athletes to United States Olympic or Pan-American teams in two or more sports and are not members of Group A or other organizations that conduct nationwide competition or national championships in two or more sports. [44:5] Group C consists of organizations that administer nationwide programs in sports that are not included in the Olympic or Pan-American Games. Finally, Group D comprises the Olympic organizations for each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. [44:5]

The basic organizational structure of the USOC is defined by the House of Delegates which includes all delegates who represent the member organizations from Groups, A, B, C, and D. This body has the
authority to elect the president and the officers of the USOC, to enact, amend or repeal the Constitution and By-Laws, to admit new members, and to review the reports of the Executive Board, the Administrative Committee, the executive director, and all other committees. [44:9]

The officers of the USOC include the President, first Vice-President, a second Vice-President, a third Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. [44:10]

The Executive Board consists of the officers, the two American members of the IOC, elected members representing each sport and representatives of Groups, B, C, and D. This body has the general charge of the business affairs and activities of the USOC. It also has the responsibility of defining the policies to be followed in carrying out the purposes and objectives of the organization. [44:11]

Under the chairmanship of the President of the USOC, the Administrative Committee's responsibilities are to supervise the conduct of the daily affairs of the USOC according to the policy guidelines prescribed by the Executive Board. The Administrative Committee consists of the USOC's officers and five other voting members appointed by the USOC President and confirmed by the Executive Board. [44:15]

The athletes serving as members of the Executive Board and additional athletes (at least one from each sport in which the United States is represented at the Olympic and Pan-American Games) make up the Athletes' Advisory Council. This body's functions are to broaden communications between the USOC and currently active athletes and to serve as a source of opinion and advice to the Executive Board.
with regard to both current and contemplated policies of the USOC.
A qualified athlete to this council is an athlete who has currently
or in the past ten years represented the United States in the Olympic
or Pan-American Games or other major international competition. [44:14]

The Operation Committees which are those of Budget and Audit,
Finance, Development, Games Preparation, International Olympic Aca­
demy, Sport Medicine, Investment, and any other standing committees,
are appointed by the President of the USOC and approved by the Exe­
cutive Board. The Credentials Committee is appointed and approved
by the Administrative Committee. [44:15-17] Amendments to the
USOC's Constitution may be made by two-thirds of the votes cast at
a regularly called meeting of the House of Delegates. [44:18]

Summary

This chapter has surveyed related literature from several direc­
tions. Administrative and organizational literature and studies were
reviewed briefly and concerned the values of perception-checking and
the identification of potential difficulties as a result of intra­
organizational conflict.

The United States Olympic Committee's organizational development
was traced from its inception in terms of changes in its structure,
functions, and purposes.

The last part of this chapter presented a view of this organiza­
tion (USOC) at the present based on its latest published Constitution,
By-Laws, and General Rules.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine, compare, analyze, and report the differences in perceptions between Olympic-National coaches, athletes' representatives, and USOC's Executive Board members regarding the purposes, functions, and philosophy of the United States Olympic Committee.

It was hoped that by undertaking this research the following problematic questions might be clarified and resolved:

1. What are the key issues on which the perception of the three groups differ significantly?
2. What are the issues on which there is agreement in perceptions among the different groups.

Chapter III will consider four specific areas which include: (1) subjects of study, (2) the questionnaire, (3) collection of data, (4) the process of data analysis.

A. Subjects of Study

The subjects of this study were individuals involved with the 1976 Olympic Games effort and the current Olympic effort aimed at the 1980 Olympic Games. The specific personnel studied were the current members
of the USOC's Executive Board (n=53), current members of the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council (n=40), and the Olympic-National coaches of the United States to the 1976 Olympic Games (n=57). Total number of subjects participating in this study was one hundred and fifty (N=150).

B. The Questionnaire

A closed statement questionnaire designed for use in this study facilitated the collection of the data. The material which was used in developing this final questionnaire was drawn from several sources.

First, the review of related literature provided a rich source of information which helped to clarify the form which the questionnaire would take. This review included the constitution, by-laws, and general rules of the previous Olympic organizations (1921-1976), present constitution, by-laws, and general rules (1977), Olympic yearbooks and quadrennial reports, and the report of the President's Commission on Olympic Sports (1977).

The second source of information came from discussions and interviews with USOC personnel. Much of the material drawn from this source was contributed by Mr. Robert Paul Jr., Director of Communications for the USOC. Two visits to the offices of Mr. Paul in the Olympic House in New York City were most fruitful; and, Mr. Paul was most cooperative in providing information and assistance to the writer.

In addition to a final questionnaire, a pilot questionnaire was designed and used. This questionnaire, which included both open and closed response statements, was designed to draw ideas from individuals
who were associated with the Olympic effort in the last six years. The pilot questionnaire was much lengthier than the final instrument and was sent to past (1974-1976) members of the USOC's Board of Directors (replaced later by the Executive Board), the 1972 United States coaches at the Olympic Games, and past members of the USOC's Athlete's Advisory Council (1974-1976). Sixty-one percent (61%) of the pilot questionnaires were returned offering much additional information which proved to be a valuable resource for the construction of the final questionnaire.

In creating the final questionnaire from the information gathered and noted above, every attempt was made to construct clearly defined statements. The questionnaire also included carefully worded directions to prevent possible response errors and facilitate a speedy return of the instrument.

The format of the final questionnaire included nine pages which divided the instrument into three distinct parts. Part One requested basic demographic information such as age, level of education, income, and political affiliation as well as information pertaining to athletic experience, involvement in coaching, and role in athletic supportive capacities (organizing, scheduling, officiating, etc.). Part Two included fifty-nine statements. Subjects checked these fifty-nine statements according to their attitudinal position on a five-degree Likert scale which included "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Undecided," "Disagree," "Strongly Disagree," as possible responses. The assignment of numerical values to these responses, 5-4-3-2-1 respectively, enabled statistical treatment of the data.
The topics which requested responses in Part Two included:

1. the organizational makeup of the USOC — Statements 1-10;
2. administrative issues — Statements 11-18;
3. functions of the USOC — Statements 19-30;
4. communications within the organization — Statements 31-41;
5. issues on the philosophy of the USOC — Statements 42-59.

Part Three of this final questionnaire included two lists which were used to rank-order responses. The first proposed a list of purposes for the development program of the USOC. The participants were asked to rank in priority order what they perceived these purposes to be and how they would like to see these purposes ranked in the future. The second list presented stated and unstated purposes of the organization (USOC). The subjects were asked to rank these purposes in priority rank order.

C. Collection of Data

Mailing packets were assembled with an explanatory cover letter, a copy of the final questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. In order to create greater interest among the participants in this study, the cover letter included information regarding the name and status of the writer, the purpose of the study, the nature of the participants to be surveyed, and the role of the USOC in this study, emphasizing its approval and support.

These data packets were mailed on January 5, 1978 with a request for a speedy return. By February 3, 1978 only forty-percent of the
questionnaires were returned. It was then decided to use a follow-up letter and questionnaire in order to increase the number of respondents. These packets included a new cover letter, a copy of the same questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. For this second mailing, the new cover letter urged the participants to return the questionnaires for the mutual benefit of the general Olympic effort. In addition, this mailing provided more information on the nature of the study and stressed the importance of achieving a high percent of return. Anonymity of subjects was assured for each participating individual. These packets were mailed on February 7, 1978. Deadline for the return of this data was set for March 10, 1978 and by that date a sixty-percent return was realized.

D. The Process of Data Analysis

Each returned questionnaire was numerically coded and key punched into three groups representing (1) Athletes, (2) Administrators, (3) Coaches. Two computer programs were then used to analyze the data. The statistical analysis utilized the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) which provided an integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social science data. The use of SPSS in this study resulted in descriptive statistics of simple frequency distributions and cross-tabulation for Part One and one way analysis of variance for the data analysis of Part Two.

The cross-tabulation statistical treatment of the data from Part One provided tables with response frequencies and percent frequencies. These tables present a descriptive analysis of the coded groups with
regard to their demographic distribution, athletic experience, involvement in coaching, and role in athletic supportive capacities.

The data from Part Two utilized another program offered by the SPSS. This program used a one way analysis of variance which provided a comparison of the mean response from a Likert type scale of each group and identified the location of significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance among the groups.

Part Three was treated manually. Response grouping for the first list (1-2=1, 3-4=2, 5-6=3) and for the second list (1-3=1, 4-6=2, 7-9=3, 10-11=4) was also accomplished. On this basis of cumulative value the lists were rearranged into the priority order given to the purposes by the respondents.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The findings obtained from the statistical treatment of the data and a discussion of these results as they relate to the topic of this Doctoral study are presented in this chapter. The purpose of Part One of the instrument was to gather demographic information and other data pertaining to the degree of athletic involvement of the participants in this study. The analyzed data from this section will be presented and described briefly. Tables relevant to Part One of the questionnaire are presented in the appendix.

Part Two deals with the core of this study. Its purpose was to identify and locate the degree of variance in the perceptions of the athletes, coaches, and administrators with regard to the structure, functions, administration, communications, and philosophy of the USOC. The statistical treatment of the statements that make up Part Two provided the mean response of each group, compared the inter-relations between them, indicated if significant difference at the 0.05 level existed, and located this difference.

A. Results of the Study

The final questionnaires were sent, as previously indicated, to all members of the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council, the 1976
Olympic-National coaches, and to all members of the USOC's Executive Board. In addition to their checked responses on the modified Likert scale, the respondents utilized additional space for written comments. The rate of return of the final questionnaire was 65% or 26 of the athletes' group, 56% or 30 of the administrators, and 59.6% or 34 of the coaches group.

The following sections provide an explication of the data that was obtained from the investigation: (1) subjects' background; (2) committees' make-up; (3) administrative issues; (4) USOC functions; (5) communications within the organization; (6) issues on the philosophy of the USOC.

1. Subjects' Background

The mean age of the athletes who responded to the questionnaire was 29.7 years, while the administrators were almost a "generation" older at a mean age of 54.6 years. Mean age of the coaches who returned their questionnaires was 43.6 years.

The groups' make-up indicates that while there was only a 5.9% and 6.7% women's representation in the coaches and administrators' groups respectively, there was 34.6% women's representation in the athletes' group.

The education of the participants indicated that 38.5% of the athletes, 33.3% of the administrators, and 41.2% of the coaches had completed a B.A. or B.S. degree, while 50% of the athletes, 56.7% of the administrators, and 58.8% of the coaches had achieved or completed
some work toward a graduate degree.

The racial make-up of the groups involved in the Olympic effort indicated that black representation was 7.7% in the athletes' advisory council, 3.3% on the USOC's executive board, and 8.8% in the Olympic-National coaches. White members had a 88.5%, 93.3%, and 85.3% representation on these groups respectively.

The income level of the administrators was higher than that of the coaches while the athletes earned less than the two other groups. During 1976 and before taxes, 46.7% of the administrators earned between $30,000 and $50,000; 61.7% of the coaches earned between $10,000 and $29,999 during the same year; and 65.4% of the athletes earned $19,999 or less.

The political affiliation table indicates that most of the participants in the study consider themselves to be either mid-way between the conservative - right and the liberal left, or more favorable to the conservative right. The scale of political affiliation included choices ranging from far left, left, middle, right (conservative), far right, and undecided. Fifty-seven percent of the athletes, 46.7% of the administrators, and 35.3% of the coaches considered themselves in the "middle" while 11.5% of the athletes, 36.7% of the administrators and 41.2% of the coaches said their political views were more conservative. Only 15.4% of the athletes, 13.3% of the administrators, and 11.8% of the coaches considered themselves to be politically embracing the more liberal left.
Among the responses indicating the levels of athletic participation, athletes showed a low rate of participation in little league activities (42.3%) and in intramurals (46.2%), but a high rate of participation in world championships (84.6%), and in Olympic Games (88.5%). Administrators, on the other hand, indicated a low rate of participation in little league (13.3%), Pan-American Games (26.7%), world championships (33.3%), and Olympic Games (40.0%). The administrators' high rate of participation was 60.0% at the club level, 63.3% at the high school level, and 76.7% at the college level. Of the coaches, only 23.5% of them participated in athletic activities on the little league level; 32.4% participated in intramurals competition, and 32.4% took part in the Pan-American Games. The coaches' high rate of participation occurred in the Olympic Games (64.7%), in club events (70.6%) and in high school and college events (76.5%).

Among participants who indicated prior coaching experience, 46.2% were athletes who coached on the college level, 40.0% were administrators who coached on the club level, and 52.9% were coaches who coached on the club level. The mean number of years in coaching was 3.1 years for the athletes, 9.1 years for administrators, and 12.1 years for the coaches.

Only one athlete, one administrator, and four coaches did not respond to a question which asked if they engaged and participated in athletically supportive capacities. Those who responded included 25 athletes, 29 administrators, and 30 coaches. Of the athletes 65.4% had been involved in supportive capacities (organization,
scheduling, officiating, fund raising, etc.) for 1-5 years, 76.7% of the administrators spent 16 or more years in these capacities, and 41.2% of the coaches were involved for 6-15 years.

The highest rate of involvement in supportive capacities by all the groups was in the organization of sport events. Seventy-seven percent of the athletes, 93.3% of the administrators, and 85.3% of the coaches were involved in this capacity. In addition to the above, 69.2% of the athletes participated in officiating, as did 80% of the administrators, and 70.6% of the coaches who performed this similar function. While only 50% of the athletes assisted in scheduling, 80% of the administrators and 67.6% of the coaches engaged in the scheduling of events.

2. Organizational Make-up

Statements One through Ten on the final questionnaire were directed toward revealing the current organizational make-up of the USOC. The participants were asked to indicate their perceptions of the present representation of athletes and coaches on the USOC in general as well as on some of the particular USOC committees. In addition, responses was requested concerning suggestions for changes (Statements 4-6, and 10) and additions (Statement 8) to the make-up of this organization.

Table 1 (page 49) shows that the responses to Statements 1-3 resulted in several significant differences among the three groups. When asked if the current 20% athletes' representation on the House of Delegates, the Executive Board, and the Administrative Committee is proper and justified, the administrators demonstrated the lowest
rate of agreement on all three statements. Athletes' reactions were much stronger than the other two groups: their responses differed significantly from the administrators on all three statements and they differed from the coaches on the statements regarding the Executive Board and Administrative Committee.

Table 1

Statements 1-3

1-3. It is proper and justified to have 20% athletes' representation on the following committees of the USOC:

1. The House of Delegates
2. The Executive Board
3. The Administrative Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Delegates</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>3.7667</td>
<td>4.2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>3.3448</td>
<td>3.5926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Comm.</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>3.1333</td>
<td>3.5417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Athletes and administrators in Statement 1
2. Athletes and administrators in Statement 2
3. Athletes and coaches in Statement 2
4. Athletes and administrators in Statement 3
5. Athletes and coaches in Statement 3

Statements 4-6 were closely related to the first three statements. The respondents were asked to indicate their perception of what the percent of athletes' representation should be on the House of Delegates, Executive Board, and the Administrative
Committee. The majority of the athletes (76.9%) felt that athletes representation on the House of Delegates should be between 25% - 50%. Conversely 60.0% of the administrators and 32.4% of the coaches felt this percent should be 15% or under. Regarding the representation of athletes on the USOC's Executive Board, 80.8% of the athletes believed that it should be between 25% - 50%, whereas 66.7% of the administrators and 58.8% of the coaches indicated that athletes' representation on this board should be 15% or under. The majority (80.8%) of the athletes felt that athletes should have 25% - 50% representation on the Administrative Committee while 80% of the administrators and 67.6% of the coaches believed the proper percent representation for athletes on this committee should be 15% or under.

Table 2

Statements 4-6

4-6. If there should be a different percentage representation of athletes, what should that be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes Percent</th>
<th>Administrators Percent</th>
<th>Coaches Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. House of Delegates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or less</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or less</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or less</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses to Statement 7 showed significant differences at the 0.05 level between the administrators and the coaches and between the administrators and the athletes. The majority of the administrators (73.3%) agreed with the statement; the mean response of this group being 3.740. The other two groups showed a much lower level of agreement with the same statement. Of the athletes 46.2% disagreed and 61.8% of the coaches either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 3
Statement 7

7. Coaches are adequately represented on the USOC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>3.7407</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between the coaches and the administrators.
A new idea was presented to the participants of this study in Statement 8. The idea was that "there should be a coaches' advisory council to the USOC." The results indicated favorable responses from the athletes and the coaches: 4.105 and 4.466 mean responses for these groups respectively. Much less agreement was demonstrated by the administrators whose mean response was 2.782. Of the coaches, 47.1% strongly agreed with the statement, 65.4% of the athletes agreed or strongly agreed with it, and 53.3% of the administrators disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 4
Statement 8
8. There should be a coaches' advisory board to the USOC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>4.4667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes
2. Administrators and Coaches
The operating committees of the USOC include such committees as finance, budget, investment and development. Statement 9 asked the subjects if the make-up of these committees provided for effective management of their responsibilities. Again, significant differences were detected between the administrators who agreed with the statement (4.100) and the two other groups who did not highly favor it: 2.961 for the coaches, and 2.772 mean responses for the athletes respectively.

Table 5

Statement 9

9. The make up of the operating committees provides for effective carry-out of their responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7727</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
<td>2.9615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes.

Administrators differed significantly from the coaches and athletes on Statement 10 which dealt with the representation of these groups on the operating committees of the USOC. Of the administrators 43.3% disagreed with the inclusion of coaches and athletes on all the operating committees while 61.5% of the athletes strongly agreed and 73.5% of the coaches either agreed or disagreed with that item.

Table 6
Statement 10

10. There should be athletes and coaches represented on all the Operating Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>2.4074</td>
<td>3.9310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Athletes and Administrators.

3. Administrative Issues

The next eight statements (11-18) presented the participants with a set of issues concerning administrative action. The issues raised in this section dealt with allocation and control of USOC funds, the issues regarding the use of drugs and stimulants, and
the condition of the sport medicine program.

Table 6 shows that the reaction to Statement 11 produced no significant differences between the three groups that were investigated. Athletes, coaches and administrators all favored the statement which suggested that National Governing Bodies should be given the freedom to use USOC allocated funds at their discretion.

Table 7

Statement 11

11. Funds allocated by the USOC to the National Governing Bodies should be spent at the discretion of the National Governing Bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.9130</td>
<td>3.8667</td>
<td>4.2581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant difference between the three groups.

Next, the respondents were asked to indicate their responses to Statement 12 which was closely related to the previous question. Statement 12 asked whether the USOC should have tight control on the money which it allocates to the National Governing Bodies. It was found that while the administrators and the athletes agreed with the statement (3.60) and (2.953) respectively, the coaches disagreed with the statement resulting in a 2.400 mean response.
Table 8

Statement 12

12. The USOC should have tight control on how its allocated money is spent by the National Governing Bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.9534</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between the coaches and the administrators.

Statements 13 and 14 were concerned with the subject of the use of financial resources by the USOC. Statement 13 specified that the USOC directs most of its financial resources to the efforts of the Olympic and Pan-American Games. The athletes showed the lowest level of agreement producing a 2.692 mean response while the coaches and administrators demonstrated considerable agreement with this statement, 3.689, and 3.571 mean response, respectively. Statement 14 suggested that the USOC should direct more of its financial resources to a variety of other international competitions such as different world championships, world university games and world cup tournaments. The responses to this statement encompassed the following results: 69.2% of the athletes and 73.5% of the coaches either agreed or strongly agreed with this suggestion and their mean response was 3.590 and 3.935 respectively. The administrators on the other hand disliked this statement and 63.3% of them either disagreed or strongly disagreed with it.
Table 9

Statement 13

13. The USOC directs most of its financial resources into the selection, preparation, and transportation of its team of athletes and support personnel to the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6923</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>3.6897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between athletes and the coaches.

Table 10

Statement 14

14. The USOC should direct more of its resources into a variety of international competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5909</td>
<td>2.4815</td>
<td>3.9355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes.

The next two tables, 10 and 11, reflect the responses of the participants to Statements 15 and 16 which dealt with the current situation regarding the use of drugs and stimulants and the likelihood of future action taken to resolve this problem. The athletes differed significantly at the 0.05 level in their perception of the current handling of this issue by the USOC. They showed disagreement (2.55
mean response) to the statement which suggested that the USOC is handling the issue in a satisfactory way. 46.2% of the athletes either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The other two groups favored this statement and demonstrated significantly higher levels of agreement. Mean responses of the coaches and administrators were 3.366, and 3.760 respectively. And, 61.7% of the coaches and 70.0% of the administrators agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. The only significant difference in the responses of the three groups to Statement 16 was between the coaches and administrators. Administrators showed a 3.038 mean response indicating indecision toward the statement while coaches registered a 4.000 mean response and athletes a 3.894 mean response thus reflecting positive perceptions toward this suggestion.

Table 11

Statement 15

15. The drug, doping, stimulant and hormone issues have been handled in a satisfactory way by the USOC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
<td>3.7600</td>
<td>3.3667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Athletes and Administrators.
2. Athletes and Coaches.
16. The USOC should assume a firmer position on the drug, doping, stimulant, and hormone issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.8947</td>
<td>3.0385</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between the coaches and the administrators.

Recently the USOC has embarked upon a new program. The sport medicine program has received increased funds and attention in recent years. When asked to indicate reaction to the allocation of resources which the USOC has provided for this program, both athletes and coaches disagreed with Statement 17. The coaches and athletes showed a 2.208 and 2.714 level of mean response, respectively, and 58.9% of the coaches and 46.0% of the athletes disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Administrators, however, agreed with the support provided by the USOC to the sport medicine program. This group's mean response was 3.916 with 73.4% of the respondents among the administrators either agreeing or strongly agreeing with Statement 17.
Table 13

Statement 17

17. The USOC is providing proper amounts of resources and control for the sport medicine programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Coaches and Administrators.
2. Athletes and Administrators.

There were favorable responses of 4.318 for athletes and 4.310 for the coaches to Statement 18 (Table 14). The suggestion that the USOC make a considerably greater effort in the area of sport medicine was met with either agreement or strong agreement by 76.9% of the athletes and 79.4% of the coaches. A split response by the administrators resulted in a mean response level of 3.148. Forty percent of the administrators agreed and 36.7% disagreed with the statement.

Table 14

Statement 18

18. The USOC should make a considerably greater effort in the area of sport medicine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Responses</td>
<td>4.3182</td>
<td>3.1481</td>
<td>4.3103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Coaches.
2. Administrators and Athletes.

4. Functions

Statements 19 through 30 dealt with several functions of the USOC as well as possible functions of other organizations such as the National Governing Bodies of each sport.

The first two statements in this section (19 and 20) dealt with the question of whose responsibility the selection of athletes for the Olympic and Pan-American Games should be. Tables 15 and 16 indicate that the perceptions of the three groups under investigation were not significantly different from each other. With regard to Statement 19, athletes, administrators, and coaches strongly agreed that today the National Governing Bodies are the organizations which ultimately control the selection of Olympic and Pan-American athletes (Table 15). The respondents also agreed that the National Governing Bodies should also assume this function in the future (Table 16).

Table 15

Statement 19

19. Today, the National Governing Bodies are the bodies which organize and administer the selection of Olympic and Pan-American athletes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.1290</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.
Table 16

Statement 20

20. The National Governing Bodies should be the bodies to organize and administer the selection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>4.4625</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>4.4063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

Tables 16 and 17 display the results of the statements referring to the function of the USOC as a possible arbiter in the resolution of disputes over athletes' or coaches' selection to Olympic or Pan-American Games. The statistical analysis of the responses found no significant differences between the three groups on these issues.

Table 16 shows that coaches indicated more favorable response to this Statement 21 while the other two groups did not show an inclination either way. Table 17 demonstrates that all three groups responded similarly and that neither of them could agree or disagree with the Statement 22. Percent frequencies of responses to this statement indicate that 46.2% of the athletes, 40.0% of the administrators, and 38.2% of the coaches reacted favorably to this statement while 43.3% of the athletes, 50.0% of the administrators, and 41.2% of the coaches did not favorably respond to the suggestion that the USOC should assume the function of sole arbiter in disputes over coaches selection to Olympic and Pan-American Games.
Table 17

Statement 21

21. The USOC should be the sole arbiter in case of disputes concerning the selection of athletes to Olympic and Pan-American Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athlete</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

Table 18

Statement 22

22. The USOC should be the sole arbiter in case of disputes concerning the selection of coaches to the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athlete</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>2.9259</td>
<td>2.9643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

In comparing the results presented in Tables 18 and 19, it was found that as a whole the respondents favorably agreed that guidelines for the development programs should be set by each National Governing Body (Statement 24) and that the respondents reacted unfavorably to Statement 23 suggesting that guidelines for the development programs in each sport are set by the USOC.
Table 19
Statement 23

23. Guidelines for the development programs in each sport are set by the USOC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>2.3667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

Table 20
Statement 24

24. Guidelines for the development programs in each sport should be set by each National Governing Body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1200</td>
<td>4.2069</td>
<td>4.1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

Statements 25-27 and 28-30 presented an actual and desired function to be assumed by one of three organizations. None of the responses (Tables 20 and 21) to these statements showed any significant differences between athletes, administrators and coaches. The responses by all groups to Statements 25, 27, 28 and 30 proved to be a source of disagreement while statements 26 and 29 were favored by all three groups.
Table 21

Statement 25-27

25-27. National, regional, or state coaches are assigned to the training centers by the:

1. USOC
2. N.G.B.
3. Coaches Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. USOC</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
<td>1.4828</td>
<td>1.8077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. N.G.B.</td>
<td>3.7200</td>
<td>4.0357</td>
<td>4.3226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coaches Ass.</td>
<td>1.4615</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.

Table 22

Statements 28-30

28-30. National, regional, or state coaches should be assigned to the training centers by the:

28. USOC
29. N.G.B.
30. Coaches' Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athlete</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. USOC</td>
<td>1.3636</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
<td>1.7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. N.G.B.</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.1515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coaches Ass.</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>2.3793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference between the three groups.
5. Communications

The following statements (33-41) refer to communication issues within the United States Olympic Committee. These statements asked the subjects to relate their perceptions regarding the willingness of the USOC to share its information through communication channels which athletes and coaches have access to within the USOC. Other statements elicited responses regarding the communication between the three groups which ultimately comprise the "Olympic Effort Organization."

Only the administrators favorably perceived statement 33 which held that "the USOC is willing to share its information with interested individuals." The athletes' and coaches' perceptions differed significantly from the administrators; for, there was a favorable response of 4.066 mean response and 79.4% agreement or strong agreement by the coaches to statement 34 (Table 25). The only significant difference was found between the coaches and the administrators who had a split response and a mean response of 3.035.
Table 23

Statement 33

33. The USOC is open and willing to help when it comes to sharing its information with all interested individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.7727</td>
<td>4.0690</td>
<td>2.8095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Athletes and Administrators.
2. Coaches and Administrators.

Table 24

Statement 34

34. The USOC should be more aggressive in disseminating its information and make more of its decisions known to all interested individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.4211</td>
<td>3.0357</td>
<td>4.0667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between the coaches and the administrators.

The perceptions of the participants on the availability of open communication channels for the athletes to the USOC was surveyed in Statement 35 while perceptions toward improvement of communication channels for the athletes were requested in Statement 36. While administrators' perceptions indicated that athletes indeed have open communication channels to the USOC (Table 26), the athletes
and the coaches felt that these channels had to be improved (Table 27). From the total number of administrators involved, 96.7% agreed or strongly agreed with Statement 35. For the athletes, only 69.3% responded similarly with 91.2% of the coaches agreeing or strongly agreeing with Statement 36.

Table 25
Statement 35

35. Athletes have open communication channels to the USOC, (grievance procedure, direct way to make suggestions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.5384</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>3.3871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance were found between administrators and coaches.

Table 26
Statement 36

36. Athletes should be provided with improved channels of communication to the USOC (an improved grievance procedure and a direct way to make suggestions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>4.0117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes.
Statement 37 and 38 were similar in nature to the previous two but concerned coaches instead of athletes. The results (Tables 27, 28) show that athletes who demonstrated the closest response level to disagreement with Statements 37 were significantly different in their response from the other two groups. Meanwhile, with regard to the need for improved communication channels for the coaches, the administrators responded unfavorable with a 2.560 mean response and 56.7% of disagreement or strong disagreement. However, the coaches and athletes indicated that they agreed with Statement 38 giving 4.272 and 4.000 mean response 88.3% and 80.8% of agreement or strong agreement respectively.

Table 27
Statement 37

37. Coaches have open communication channels to the USOC, (grievance procedure and direct way to make suggestions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>3.7692</td>
<td>3.4815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Athletes and Administrators.
2. Athletes and Coaches.
Table 29
Statement 39-41

39-41. There is a need for improved communications (dialogues, liaison, representation, hearings, etc.) between:

39. Athletes and the USOC
40. Coaches and the USOC
41. Coaches and Athletes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Athl. &amp; USOC</td>
<td>3.6364</td>
<td>2.2609</td>
<td>4.1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coaches &amp; USOC</td>
<td>4.1818</td>
<td>2.5652</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Athl.&amp; Coaches</td>
<td>3.8571</td>
<td>2.9545</td>
<td>3.7200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 39
2. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 39
3. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 40
4. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 40
5. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 41
6. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 41

6. Philosophical Issues

Issues brought forward in section four of the final questionnaire included the following: (1) are pre-international competition training sessions mandatory for the United States athletes, or should they be?; (2) should the amateur sports programs in the United States use the training centers concept?; (3) what should be the criteria for the allocation of funds by the USOC for development programs?; (4) does the USOC reflect the political views of the United States?; (5) should
the USOC resist any political interference in sports?; (6) should the USOC become the Central Sport Organization (CSO) in the United States, or should its authority be limited to specific Olympic and Pan-American Games efforts?; and (7) does or should the USOC enforce the International Olympic Committee Rule of amateurism, or maybe it cannot?

Statements 44-47, and 48-51 refer to mandatory training sessions. Table 30 presents the responses to Statements 44 through 47 which stated that the USOC makes it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions for the Olympic Games, the Pan-American Games, world championships, and all other international competition. Significant differences were found between the administrators, who demonstrated levels of disagreement on all the statements, and the other two groups which agreed with Statements 44 and 45 and disagreed to a lesser degree with Statements 46 and 47. An interesting trend could be observed in the responses to Statements 48 through 51 as they are presented in Table 31.

Athletes have demonstrated the lowest levels of agreement and highest levels of disagreement among the three groups. The administrators assumed a middle-of-the-road stance on all the issues while the coaches showed the highest degrees of agreement with all four statements. Another trend that should be mentioned is that all the groups (except for the coaches in one case) indicated a gradual decline in the levels of agreement from the highest agreement levels on Statement 48 to the lowest agreement levels and disagreement levels with regard to Statement 51.
Table 30

Statements 44-47

44-47. The USOC makes it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions for:

44. The Olympic Games  
45. The Pan-American Games  
46. World Championships  
47. All international competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Olympic Games</td>
<td>3.9091</td>
<td>2.8846</td>
<td>3.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pan-American Games</td>
<td>3.8421</td>
<td>2.7692</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. World Championship</td>
<td>2.2609</td>
<td>1.6400</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. International Competition</td>
<td>1.9545</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>2.6897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 44
2. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 44
3. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 45
4. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 46
5. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 47
Table 31

Statements 48-51

48-51. The USOC should make it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions for:

48. The Olympic Games
49. The Pan-American Games
50. World Championships
51. All international competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Games</td>
<td>3.3200</td>
<td>3.7241</td>
<td>3.8788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-American Games</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>3.6897</td>
<td>3.9063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Championships</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.2963</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Competition</td>
<td>2.0535</td>
<td>2.3846</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found in Statements 48 and 49.

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Coaches and Athletes in Statement 50
2. Coaches and Administrators in Statement 50
3. Coaches and Athletes in Statement 51
4. Coaches and Administrators in Statement 51

The need for training centers is the focus of Statements 52 through 54, and the results of the participants' responses are presented in Table 34 (page 77). The participants were asked to indicate reactions to the suggestion that the United States amateur sports programs show a need for local-state, regional, or national training centers for its elite athletes. The majority of the
administrators strongly agreed (46.7%) or agreed (43.3%) with the statement that regional training centers are needed (Statement 53). They disagreed with the other two statements resulting in a 2.520 and 2.111 mean response to Statements 52 and 54. Highest in the level of agreement for both athletes and coaches was their strong agreement with Statement 53 (Table 34). Coaches and athletes differed significantly from the administrators in their perceptions on the need for local-state training centers. While administrators perceived it as unnecessary, athletes and coaches perceived it as a need.

Administrators again differed significantly from coaches and athletes on Statement 54 where they disagreed. The latter two groups (coaches and athletes) were split in their response.
Table 32

Statements 52-54

52-54. The amateur sports in the United States have a need for training centers for elite athletes:

52. Local-state training centers
53. Regional training centers
54. One national training center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local-state</td>
<td>3.8077</td>
<td>2.5200</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>4.3846</td>
<td>4.3448</td>
<td>4.3235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>3.3913</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>3.3529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 52
2. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 52
3. Administrators and Athletes in Statement 54
4. Administrators and Coaches in Statement 54

No significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found in Statement 53.

Governmental support is the issue raised in Statements 42 and 43.*

The results obtained are presented in Tables 32 and 33. The responses of all three groups to Statement 42 demonstrated that all three disagreed with it. The significant difference between the athletes and the administrators was in the degree of the disagreement. Both the

* These two statements were misplaced in the final questionnaire. They are presented here where they belong in terms of content.
athletes' group and the coaches' favorably perceived the necessity of governmental funds (Table 33), while the administrators, showing a mean response of 3.101, could not decide either way.

Table 33
Statement 42

42. The USOC should continue to refuse money from the Federal Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>1.4783</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>2.0625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between athletes and administrators.

Table 34
Statement 43

43. The USOC should accept as much money as it can get from the Federal Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.9048</td>
<td>3.1017</td>
<td>4.0313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance was found between administrators and coaches.

Athletes and coaches only slightly agreed that money for development programs is allocated on the basis of the popularity of the sport. Their mean response was significantly different from that of the administrators (Table 35) who tended to disagree with this statement. On a related state (32), all three groups agreed that money to development programs should be allocated on criteria other than the
popularity of the sport. *

Table 35  
Statement 31

31. Money for development programs is allocated on the basis of the popularity of the sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3462</td>
<td>1.8929</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between:

1. Administrators and Athletes.

Table 36  
Statement 32

32. Money for development of programs should be allocated on the basis of other criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>4.3214</td>
<td>4.2258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found in this statement.

The responses to Statement 55 (Table 37) showed no significant differences in the perceptions of the participating groups. The athletes mean response was 3.294 with the coaches' response inclining

* These two statements were misplaced in the final questionnaire. They are presented here where they belong in terms of content.
more toward agreement with the statement. At the same time, the administrators viewed the statement with more agreement than the latter two groups.

Table 37

Statement 55

55. The USOC is properly representing the political views of the United States in the international sport arena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>3.2941</td>
<td>3.9231</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found in Statement 55.

The highest rate of agreement among the groups was found in their responses to Statement 56 (Table 38). The issue at hand was the need to resist any attempt to use sporting events for political purposes.

Table 38

Statement 56

56. The USOC should forcefully resist any attempt to use the Olympic or Pan-American Games as a political arena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>4.4231</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>4.4839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences at the 0.05 level were found in Statement 56.
Public Law 805 and the authority of the USOC over the amateur sports establishment of the United States were the focus of Statement 57. The response (Table 39) showed that all the groups favored this statement. No significant differences between groups was found.

Table 39

Statement 57

57. The Congress should amend "Public Law 805" to give the USOC more legal authority so it can become the Central Sport Organization in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>4.0800</td>
<td>3.8846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found in Statement 57.

For Statement 58, the subjects were asked to respond to a remark which suggested that the USOC should strictly concern itself with Olympic and Pan-American Games-related affairs. The only significant difference was found between the athletes' response and that of the administrators. The coaches showed a mean response of 2.483 disagreeing with the statement (Table 40).
Table 40

Statement 58

58. The USOC should strictly deal with the selection, preparation, and transportation of the United States delegation to the Olympic and Pan-American Games like it did in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>1.8400</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>2.4839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance were found between the athletes and the administrators.

The format of Statement 59 was different from Statement 58 which it followed. The respondents were given three choices of response. The highest frequency of response was found in response category three. Fifty percent of the athletes, 73.3% of the administrators, and 70.5% of the coaches perceived that the USOC could not enforce the IOC Rule 26 on amateurism to its letter.
Table 41

Statement 59

59. The United States Olympic Committee:

1. Does not enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.
2. Should enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.
3. Cannot enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.

Number and percent of respondents to each possible answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not</td>
<td>23.07%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>70.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In item 60 and the final questionnaire, all subjects were asked to list in rank order the purpose of the USOC development programs. The subjects had to rank the six purposes in two lists: the first asked to rank them as perceived at present; the second asked respondents to rank these items as they would like to see them in the future. After grouping the responses into three ranking steps (1-2=1, 3-4=2, 5-6=3), the purposes were assigned numerical values from one to three. In consideration of the overall ranking, only the assignment of a number within the first step (1-2=1) of priorities was measured. The subjects were given an opportunity to indicate that they perceived all purposes to be of equal importance at present and in the future. Tables 42, 43 and 44 represent the results of the responses made by the athletes (42), the administrators (43), and the coaches (44).

Table 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>FUTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quality training</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training at the grass roots</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Training for the elite</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Development of womens' programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Construction of facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal importance</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quality Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training at the grass roots</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Training for the elite</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development of womens' programs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; construction of facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Equal importance</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Quality Training</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training at the grass roots</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Training for the elite</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development of women's programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintenance and construction of facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal importance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eleven purposes of the USOC were listed randomly in Statement 60. The participants were asked to number these purposes in rank of priority. The responses were grouped into four steps (1-3=1, 4-6=2, 7-9=3, 10-11=4). The rearrangement of the list was done on the basis of the sum of the number of times a single purpose received a ranking in the first step (1-3=1).

The listed purposes were:

1. To select and obtain the best athletes for the Pan-American and Olympic Games.
2. To stimulate interest of people in Olympic Sports.
3. To maintain the highest ideals of amateurism.
4. To organize the representation of the United States in the Pan-American and Olympic Games.
5. To finance the representation of the United States in the Pan-American and Olympic Games.
6. To raise money for the financing of the development programs.
7. To protect the rights of every participant in the Olympic effort.
8. To organize and administer long-term development programs.
9. To assist in developing the area of sport medicine in the United States.
10. To develop women's programs in the United States.
11. To publish a newspaper or a magazine to disseminate its information.
12. Equal importance.

Table 45 presents the value assigned to each purpose by each one of the groups and the final priority ranking of each purpose as determined by each group.
Table 45

Ranking the purposes of the USOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>ATHLETES</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>COACHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Discussions of Results

Each one of the subsections which were given consideration in the final questionnaire are now discussed in order of presentation.

From the data previously tabulated in this chapter and noted in the section concerning the background of the subjects, it is important to point out the differences among the groups in terms of their international competitive experience. Not so surprisingly, the individuals who occupy positions on the USOC's Executive Board indicated only 26.7%, 33.3%, and 40.0% participation in the Pan-American Games, World Championships, and Olympic Games, respectively. Athletes, on the other hand, evidenced much more experience at this level of competition. Specifically, 88.5% of them were Olympians, 84.6% had participated in World Championships, and 57.7% competed in the Pan-American Games. Coaches assumed a middle position with 64.7% of them participating in previous Olympic Games. Due to the nature of the USOC organization which concerns itself with the representation of the United States in international sport events, the participation level of athletes, coaches, and administrators might well color the responses given to certain items on the questionnaire.

The organizational make up of the USOC was given primary attention in Part Two which constituted the core of the questionnaire. Statements 1-10 revealed a significant difference between the administrators and the other two groups. Certainly, these differences are evident between the athletes and the administrators.
It is apparent that there was no agreement shown between the groups on the size of athletes' representation in the different policy making bodies of the USOC. The general trend indicates that the athletes approved of the existing situation in which 20% of the members of the House of Delegates, the Executive Board, and the Administrative Committee are or were active athletes in the past ten years (Table 1). However, this same group then indicated that this representation should grow until athletes comprised a 25-50% representation in the governing groups (Table 2). The administrators assumed an opposite stance and indicated that 15% or less athlete representation on these bodies would be sufficient. Some administrators commented that:

The average athlete is not interested. He wants the job done correctly and wants to be protected but is not too interested in the meetings, programs, and paper work.

There should not be a percent requirement for any group to be represented at any level.

Whether coaches have adequate representation on the USOC or not, and whether there is a perceived need for a special coaches advisory council was an issue that resulted in additional differences of opinion. Administrators felt that at present coaches are adequately represented on USOC bodies. These administrators also commented that "Many coaches are present if not as representatives of coaching groups." Athletes and coaches both perceived the representation of coaches on the USOC as inadequate (Table 3). At the same time, these two groups showed great interest in the creation of a coaches' advisory council.
Athletes' Comments Included:

Adequately trained coaches should be represented, but not friends of USOC staff masquerading as coaches.

Too few of the Executive Board members have international competitive coaching experience.

Coaches Advised That:

They (the USOC) never ask our advice or opinion. We must go through our federation.

Olympic House has had to be forced to listen.

Even at subcommittee level, i.e. judo, no adequate representation is made.

With regard to Statement 8 which suggested that a coaches advisory council be created, athletes noted that:

I don't believe that this suggestion has come up since I became involved (1970) but it sure makes sense.

Coaches have a better idea about what it takes to produce a winning effort than administrators. A group of coaches from many sports could formulate excellent policies.

Such a committee would help to provide a stronger program for each sport.

One coach who objected to the idea of a coaches advisory council said:

Athletic representation and athletic advisory councils and the same for coaches are unnecessary window dressing. Input should come through the sports governing bodies and their representatives to the USOC.

With concern for the make-up of the operation committees (Statement 9), the administrators, many of who are members of these committees, perceived that the current make-up of these committees facilitates effective achievement of responsibilities (Table 5). These administrators indicated that the representation of athletes and coaches on these
committees would be similar to their quota on the USOC major bodies and therefore unnecessary. Both coaches and athletes agreed that the make-up of the operation committees does not ensure an effective carrying-out of responsibilities. As expected, these two groups agreed strongly with Statement 10 with regard to representation of athletes and coaches on these committees. Additional comments regarding these statements (Statements 9 and 10) included the following:

**Administrators:**

The present staff is outstanding.

Of course, it depends on the individual selected and sometimes politics interferes.

I am a member of the Board, but I don't know how the committees were selected.

**Coaches:**

Some of these committees have been less than effective in the past and where they have been somewhat more effective, it has been due to USOC hired personnel or military support.

There should be 3-4 athletes or coaches on each committee. Rotate the representatives so each sport will have a chance to send a representative.

It is important. This will give inside knowledge of what is going on and they will be able to report to the other coaches and athletes.

Athletes don't have time to effectively participate in these activities nor do they have the experience to make a meaningful contribution.

**Athletes:**

Staffing decisions have been the key to most USOC problems -- too much dead wood and inept personnel. With a good president (as now) you get good committees, but there is no guarantee.

The whole show exists to support the athlete. If they aren't represented on all committees, they end up being manipulated for the sake of the committees' administrative ease. That is backwards.
The impact of the recent quotas set by the USOC of athlete representation seems to echo throughout this section of statements. The athletes who were given a share in the decision-making process were eager to receive a larger and wider share of participation on all USOC committees. The coaches who perceived the athlete representation to be of proper strength would have liked to see their group receive more responsibilities within the organization. On the other hand, the members of the USOC's Executive Board were not convinced that the quotas were either justified or necessary; and, they objected to any further increase in athlete representation or additional coaches representation.

The issues which were dealt with in Statements 11-18 are within an area that is presently receiving increased attention from the USOC. The 1977 revisions of the Constitution, By-Laws, and General Rules provided meaningful steps toward improvement or change within the administration of this action. The results of the study reflect this transitory period.

As indicated in Table 7, the three groups agreed that the National Governing Bodies of the individual sports should determine how they want to spend the money allocated them by the USOC. Among the comments made with regard to Statement 12 which suggested tight USOC control on the use of funds by the National Governing Bodies, opinion is reflected in the following comments:

**Athlete:** Tight? No! But yes to some guidance by the USOC.

**Coaches:** The National Governing Bodies should have an outline of expenditures and keep control of accounting procedures.
Administrators: Tight? No! But National Governing Bodies should be held accountable to the USOC for the use of funds.

Budget control yes, creative decisions no!!

Related administrative issues were presented in Statements 13 and 14. In one instance athletes and coaches differed in their reactions given to Statement 13. Coaches felt that the USOC directs most of its financial resources toward Olympic and Pan-American Games related efforts (selection, preparation, and transportation) while the athletes indicated that they did not believe that this statement was necessarily true. Nevertheless, when asked if the USOC should direct more resources to other international competitive events, athletes and coaches again reacted differently from the perceptions of the administrators. Since the establishment of the Committee on Development in 1960, the USOC has increased its support for the development of amateur sports in the United States. Part of these resources which are provided by the USOC have been used by the National Governing Bodies to finance teams which competed in other than Olympic or Pan-American Games. The athletes and coaches saw this trend to be encouraging and felt that more USOC resources should be directed toward this purpose. Comments which reflect support for Statement 14 and certain objections to it are given below:

Athlete: We lack international experience. Prior to tough competition, more resources are needed for preparation for these events.

Coaches: They (USOC) are doing more of this but need to provide more support for athletes training for these events.

Yes, as long as the Olympic effort is still paramount.
Administrators: In many sports this (other international competition) is the only way to have a team seeded high enough to stand a reasonable chance of winning an Olympic medal.

USOC resources are for Olympic and Pan-American Games only. National Governing Bodies have to do with all other international competition. National Governing Bodies may use some USOC money.

Another program which has received a great amount of support in recent years is the program on research, control, and guidance in the use of drugs, stimulants, and hormones. The results of the two statements concerned with this problem (Tables 11 and 12) reveal that athletes show the lowest level of satisfaction with the way the USOC has handled this program. In addition, the athletes were in favor of the USOC maintaining a firmer position on these issues. The administrators showed the greatest satisfaction with the present program even though their responses were relatively low with a 3.76 mean response to the stance taken by the USOC. Additional comments regarding this program included:

Administrator: They (USOC) are handling it O.K. They abide by the rules of the International Olympic Committee.

Coaches: I think they are trying harder.

They have a firm stand now. For the 1976 Olympics the USOC did a fine job.

The USOC will not take firm stand on policing all drugs throughout all sports. Therefore, American athletes suffer!!

Athletes: Weak, but improving.

Maybe not possible as the International Olympic Committee medical group controls it, but our doctors representatives should get more USOC help. Development from a medical standpoint is needed.
As indicated previously, the USOC has embarked on some new programs in recent years. One of these ventures has been the sport medicine program. Viewed from the standpoint of the administrators, the sport medicine program at its present stage is being given adequate resources by the USOC. The coaches, on the other hand, indicated disagreement with Statement 17, as shown in Table 13, and agreed that "The USOC should make a considerably greater effort in the area of sport medicine." The athletes viewed this situation in a similar manner and both these groups differed significantly from the administrators viewpoints. Comments concerning the sport medicine program included:

Coaches: Need full time paid staff. Too much reliance on volunteers and donations.

Applied research and athletic monitoring needed.

Administrator: Give it time. It cannot be expected to tackle the whole field all at once.

Athletes: The best medical minds, equipment, and information are not available for even top athletes.

The programs at Squaw Valley are a good start; however, much more attention should be placed in sport medicine.

Many comments reflected concern with efforts made by the United States to adopt the Eastern Block's approach to sports. This situation prompted the following comment from a coach: "Currently the sport medicine program is functioning well, but the Olympic development program is more important. There is no panacea in sport medicine. We are not going to compete with East Germany and Russia in this area -- not on contributions from the USOC."
In considering some of the roles that the USOC has assumed in the past along with the possibility of transferring these functions to other organizations, the participants in this study showed consensus in responding to Statements 19-30.

A transition which was suggested by the Presidents' Commission on Olympic Sports in its recommendations as well as by the USOC at the conclusion of its quadrennial meeting in 1977 seems to be gaining support among athletes, coaches, and administrators. The suggestion calls for the National Governing Body of each sport to assume greater responsibility in improving their sports-development programs and in the selection and preparation processes of the athletes for the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

According to the three groups' responses to Statement 20, these groups evidenced a strong agreement that "the National Governing Bodies should be the bodies to organize and administer the selection (of athletes) process." Similarly, a very definite showing of agreement with Statement 24 was indicated (Table 20). All agreed that "Guidelines for the development programs in each sport should be set by each National Governing Body." Comments made by the respondents only strengthen the prevailing belief that the National Governing Bodies should set the guidelines for their development programs, with the cooperation and understanding of the USOC.

**Coaches:** The National Governing Bodies develop their own Olympic development program with little influence from the USOC. Still, some basic concept guidelines are needed to be laid down by the USOC.
National Governing Bodies should set the guidelines but should be able to draw upon facilities, advice, and experience from the USOC, e.g., training centers.

Athlete: The guidelines for the development of each sport are set by that sport to be approved by the USOC Development Committee.

Administrators: Guidelines for funding are set by the USOC; programs are developed by the National Governing Bodies.

Yes! However, USOC should review and intervene when the programs are fund wasting.

It was significant to note that all the participants of this study agreed that the National Governing Bodies should assign coaches to the training centers. With the development of the training centers concept in the United States and the establishment of the two centers which are operating at the present (1978), there is a growing concern with regard to the personnel who will man these centers. This indication, drawn from the responses to Statements 28-30, substantiates that all groups agree that each National Governing Body should assign its coaches to the training centers and that this function should not be the property of the USOC or the Coaches' Associations.

The flow of information between the sub-groups of the organization as well as the flow between the organization and its environment represents an essential part of this study. The chain of statements which concerned the exchange of communications within the USOC and from the USOC to the outside make up the substance of Statements 33-41.

First, two of these USOC sub-groups, the athletes and the coaches, evidenced some dissatisfaction with the willingness of the USOC "to
share its information with all interested individuals." Although the athletes and coaches did not disagree totally, Table 23 demonstrates how removed they were from the administrators who did agree with the statement. Differences existing between the administrators on one side and the athletes and coaches on the other were significant. However, the situation as revealed in Table 34 is markedly different. While there were no significant differences between the three groups, it should be noted that although the coaches agreed with the statement by calling for more aggressive information dissemination by the USOC, the administrators were undecided in their responses.

Additional comments which follow capture the feelings of certain respondents in more detail:

Athletes: More publicity for all amateur sports.

All interested individuals can get the Olympian and the USOC Newsletter.

Coach: The USOC should get more information out.

Giving further consideration to the communication network within the USOC, the dominant trend of responses indicated that the administrators (USOC's Executive Board members) perceived the current conditions as proper. Not surprisingly, the administrators seemed to agree that athletes and coaches have "open communication channels to the USOC," and some administrators commented not only that "under the new constitution the procedure is much improved, but also that coaches should join the National Governing Bodies for direct input to the total effort."

The reaction of the other two sub-groups was significantly different. The response given by the athletes leaned toward agreement with the first
two statements, 35 and 36 (Table 25 and 26) which dealt with access to the USOC through open communication channels. They cited the creation of the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council as one reason for their somewhat mutual agreement with Statement 35. Furthermore, they contended that efforts to improve communication should be maintained continuously. This sub-group, however, was sharply at odds in responding to Statements 37 and 38. They felt that coaches do not have open communication channels and that coaches "should be provided with improved communication channels to the USOC" (Statement 38). Similarly, the coaches tended to be undecided about Statement 35, but agreed that athletes should be provided with improved channels of communications and that they themselves should be provided with the same improved means of communications to the USOC (Table 28).

In a series of Statements, 39-41, the three sub-groups of the USOC investigated in this study were asked to respond to certain statements regarding the communications among themselves. In considering the "need for improved communications between athletes and the USOC, coaches and the USOC, and athletes and coaches," some unusual findings were noted. The administrators disagreed that any need existed at all for improved communications between the USOC, the coaches or the athletes; and, they were undecided in terms of seeing a need for improved communications between athletes and coaches. On the other hand, significant differences were located for the other two groups. Both athletes and coaches did reflect a feeling that communications between the sub-groups of the USOC must be improved. In view of these findings, the following written comments support the above observation and offer some suggestions for improvement:
Administrator: National Governing Bodies should provide the means of improved communications.

Athletes: Hot line to the Olympic House.

Need a coaching committee like the AAC.

More effective use of available channels.

Coaches: Establishment of clearly defined communication channels.

More representation and meetings.

The section of this study which concerned specific philosophical issues examined three different aspects of the USOC's philosophical approach toward the Olympic effort. The first dealt with training and training centers; the second with financial sources and allocation of funds; and, the third was concerned with political representation and authority.

With regard to the response given to Statements 44-47, it was interesting to note that in spite of the fact that the statement referred to a present factual condition (i.e. the USOC makes it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions" for a variety of international events), there were significant differences between the way the administrators perceived these conditions and the way coaches and athletes perceived the same conditions.

In looking at the rule of the USOC requiring athletes to attend training sessions prior to the Olympic and Pan-American Games, there was no significant differences between the groups. It should be emphasized, however, that neither group demonstrated a high level of agreement with the need for such training although they all leaned toward agreement.
An additional interesting observation was the obvious inclination of the coaches to demand training sessions prior to World Championships and all other international competition. This attitude differed greatly from that of the athletes and administrators with regard to this concept. Some comments regarding mandatory training sessions were varied:

Coaches: With the individual coach invited also.
USOC should support National Governing Bodies wishes in this matter.

Athletes: If the athlete desires to be a part, they should attend training sessions.
Only if he or she is a part of a team event or sport.

Administrators: National Governing Bodies should do this with some exceptions.
No! This is a coaching decision.

The concept of training centers is new to amateur sport in the United States. The search for specialized responses by the participating groups as to the institution of such training centers prompted the inclusion of Statements 52-54. Clearly, there was a strong support given to the concept of regional training centers. Two such centers were already in operation during the course of this study -- Squaw Valley and Colorado Springs. The question of the need for either local, state or national training centers elicited a variety of responses. The athletes and coaches agreed on the need for local-state training centers and evidenced an inclination to agree to the need for a national training center. Nevertheless, the administrators objected to the idea proposing additional training centers in view of the already established regional centers.

It was mentioned earlier that the amateur sports establishment in the United States does not derive support from governmental funds. It
was the intention of the next two statements, 42, 43, to find out what the participants perceived as proper conduct by the USOC. Should the USOC refuse federal money or should it accept any amount that will be offered by the Government?

All three groups suggested that it was wrong for the USOC to refuse governmental support. The significant differences between the athletes and the administrators was in the degree of disagreement and not in the appropriateness of the disagreement. As expected, the three groups leaned toward agreeing with Statement 43. Although the administrators' response reflected indecision, the other two groups agreed that the USOC should use governmental money to support its programs. This question of whether the USOC should or should not accept governmental funds elicited many comments of a similar nature. Several of these comments follow:

Administrators: Accept government's money only if no strings are attached.
Athletes: Accept money without stipulation for control.
Coaches: If there are no strings attached. Otherwise no!!

The development programs of each sport presently draw funds from the USOC Development Committee. The statements which were concerned with this issue posited that: (1) the allocation from the USOC's Development Committee is done on the basis of the popularity of the sport, and, (2) that allocation from the USOC to the development programs should be made on the basis of criteria other than the popularity of the sport. While the administrators rejected Statement 31 (Table 35), the athletes and coaches were less decisive and agreeable. There were no additional comments given to this statement. However, the next
item, Statement 32, on which all three groups agreed (Table 36), elicited a large number of comments with regard to which criteria should be used when the USOC allocated funds to the development programs. These additional comments included:

Administrators:  Criteria for the allocation of funds to development programs should be: number of participants, world-wide popularity of the sport, United States world ranking, need for equipment and facilities, inability of sport to generate its own money, need for improved participation in Pan-American and Olympic Games, need in comparison to others, potential to yield a strong entry in 8 years.

Two other administrators commented by saying that: (1) the formula has been developed, and, (2) see USOC Development Committee's guidelines.

Paraphrasing and summarizing some of the coaches' comments, the general feeling appeared to be that money should be allocated on the basis of:

(1) The potential for growth; (2) the need for Olympic development effort; (3) performance effectiveness at the international level; (4) the need for greater, broad based participation; (5) percent of athletes in the sport at the world elite level; (6) whichever sport is lagging in development; and (7) the need for improved training.

The third sub-group, the athletes, wanted funds provided for: (1) underdeveloped sports; (2) building a competitor base; (3) the number of world class athletes; (4) those sports which are less developed; (5) those sports attracting a large number of participants; and (6) those which offer a chance of being a good investment for Olympic success.

The relationship shared by politics and sports provided the focus for two additional philosophical issue statements. On one item, Statement 55, the groups showed a slight inclination to agree that "the USOC is properly representing the political views of the United States in the international sport arena." The responses elicited by this
statement indicated slight agreement by two groups and partial indecision by another. The athletes indecision can be understood in light of their strong response given to the following item, Statement 56. This statement received the strongest agreement level of any other statement in this study. Very definitely, the respondents believed that politics do not belong in the sport arenas and that "the USOC should forcefully resist any attempt to use the Olympic or Pan-American Games as a political arena."

Included among the additional comments were those from:

**Administrators:**
- Sports and politics should not mix.
- International Olympic Committee rules prohibit a National Olympic Committee (USOC) from being political.

**Coaches:**
- Good luck, politics rule all!!

A very definite showing of agreement was demonstrated with regard to Statement 57. All groups perceived it necessary to amend public Law 805. It was felt that this law, which sets limits for the legal operation and authority boundaries of the USOC, should be amended so that the USOC would receive "more legal authority so it can become the central sport organization in the United States."

The last statement of Part Two of this study elicited similar responses from all three groups. The majority of each one of these groups felt that the USOC "cannot enforce the IOC Rule 26 on amateurism to its letter." Only 23.0% of the athletes and 17.6% of the coaches accepted the notion that the USOC does not enforce the IOC on amateurism. And, 11.3% of the athletes, 23.3% of the administrators, and 11.7% of the coaches felt that the USOC should enforce this rule to its letter. The
responses to this statement indicated a perceived weakness on the part of the USOC as an enforcer of the amateurism rule. Some of the comments argued that this should be the function of each of the National Governing Bodies. One respondent contended that the USOC only rubber stamps the National Governing Bodies while another said "USOC does, but should not."

Within the third part of the questionnaire, an attempt was made to arrange priority lists regarding purposes for the development programs. Each group was asked their perceptions not only at the present but with attention to the future (Tables 42, 43, and 44).

In ranking the development program purposes according to present needs and priorities, all three groups viewed the same three purposes as being of equal importance. Of these top three priorities, the acquisition of international experience was ranked first for the development programs by the administrators and coaches and was ranked second by the athletes. Quality of training through which each sport should ideally develop and improve individual and team performances was ranked second by the coaches and third by athletes and administrators. Finally, providing good training conditions for elite athletes was ranked as first by the athletes, second by the administrators, and third by the coaches.

The picture did not change much when the lists of future purposes were completed. Athletes indicated that they would like to see training for the elite remain as a number one priority of the development programs. Quality training and training at the grass roots level were ranked second priorities, and international experience moved to third
position according to the perceptions of the athletes. The administrators continued to give top priority to international experience and kept it at the top of the future priorities list. Their second priority included the dual purpose of providing quality training and training at the grass roots level. Training for the elite assumed the third position on the list. The coaches were the only group showing difference in perceived priorities from present to future. In ranking these future priorities, coaches believed that quality of training should be the number one priority followed by international experience and training at the grass roots.

Eight athletes, fourteen administrators, and seven coaches viewed the current development programs as having no rank or priority in their overall purposes. They felt that all purposes had equal importance and thus should be given equal consideration. At the same time, eleven athletes, fourteen administrators, and ten coaches perceived all the listed purposes to be important to a successful development program. They felt that in the future each purpose should be given equal treatment by the administrators of the development programs. Additional comments concerning the development programs' lists of purposes included:

Administrators: Rank different for each sport.

Coaches training should be added as number two.

Coaches: Women should share equally in above priority and I think they are beginning to.

A list of the USOC's purposes completed the data collection instrument. In this last section, subjects were asked to rank USOC purposes in priority rank-order. On the basis of their response, Table 45 was
constructed. This table shows the number of times a single purpose received a 1-3 priority ranking as well as the rank of this purpose in the newly arranged list. Similar to the previous lists of development program purposes, the responses of the three groups to these priorities did not result in definite differences.

Purpose number one which was "to select and obtain the best athletes for the Pan-American and Olympic Games was perceived by the athletes and the coaches as the current primary purpose of the USOC. The administrators ranked this purpose in fourth position. Purpose number two was ranked first by the administrators and second by both athletes and coaches. This second purpose maintained that the USOC should "finance the representation of the United States in the Pan-American and Olympic Games." The organization of the United States teams in the Pan-American and Olympic Games received high priority ranking by all three groups. It was ranked third by the athletes, second by the administrators and fourth by the coaches. Another high ranked purpose was number six which called for the USOC to raise money for the financing of the development programs. All three groups assigned a third rank to this purpose in their listing of priorities. The only other purposes which were included in any group's top four were purpose number eight ranked fourth on the coaches and athletes lists, and purpose number two ranked fourth on the athletes list.

In total, twenty-one statements revealed no significant differences between the groups that were studied. Among those responses with no significant difference, thirteen demonstrated a degree of approval,
six indicated a degree of disapproval and two indicated indecision. Those issues which were met with approval by all three groups were the following: 1) the use of USOC funds should be left to the discretion of the National Governing Bodies; 2) the National Governing Bodies are and should be responsible for the organization and administration of the athletes' selection processes; 3) guidelines for the development programs should be set by the National Governing Bodies; 4) the National Governing Bodies are and should be the organization which assigns coaches to the training centers; 5) mandatory pre-Olympic and Pan-American training sessions should be instituted; 6) allocation of funds to the development programs should be made on the basis of criteria other than the popularity of the sport; 7) regional centers are needed; 8) the USOC represents the political view of the United States well but should resist the use of the Olympic Games as a political arena; and 9) "Public Law 805" should be amended so that the USOC can become the Central Sport Organization in the United States.

The six statements met with unanimous disapproval stated that: 1) the USOC sets the guidelines for the development programs; 2) that the USOC or the coaches associations are or should assign coaches to the training centers; and 3) that the USOC should strictly operate and be responsible to the limited duties it had in the past.

For the two statements dealing with the role of the USOC as an arbiter in cases of disputes, the responses showed indecision by all three groups.
Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings of this study as well as to interpret and discuss them. The statistical treatment employed to analyze the data provided frequency and percent of frequency notations as well as an analysis of variance between the three investigated groups. The groups investigated involved: (1) members of the USOC's Executive Board (Administrators); (2) members of the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council (Athletes); and (3) United States National and Olympic coaches in 1976 (Coaches).

The results of the study were presented utilizing tables which indicated the mean response of each group to every statement. In addition, these tables indicated the location of significant differences when such differences were found. Four lists were composed reflecting the response of the subjects toward the priority ranking of the purposes of the development programs as well as the purposes of the USOC.

The last part of this chapter interpreted and discussed the results and also presented additional comments which were contributed by the participants in this study.

The results of the study indicate that for the majority of the statements presented to the subjects, the responses were significantly different at the 0.05 level of significance. The indications are that in most cases these differences occur between the administrators and the athletes, or between the coaches and the administrators. It should be noted that this study revealed only negligible differences between
the athletes and the coaches' groups.

In three sections of this study the different USOC sub-groups generally agreed with each other on the USOC's administrative functions, on most of the philosophical issues, and on the priority ranking of the purposes of development programs and the purposes of the USOC.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This study was designed to determine the perceptual differences between athlete representatives, the USOC's Executive Board members, and United States National-Olympic coaches. Athletes, coaches, and administrators were used as subjects for this inquiry; and, fifty-nine specific research statements were developed to accomplish the task. Essentially, the fifty-nine statements encompassed six central themes which tapped the following areas: (1) the USOC's committees' make-up; (2) administrative issues; (3) USOC functions; (4) communications within the organization; (5) philosophical issues; and (6) priority-rank of purposes. These six sections of the study were used to answer three crucial questions which provided the focus for the research:

1. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of the USOC's Executive Board members and athlete representatives to the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council with regard to the USOC duties, goals and responsibilities?

2. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of the USOC's Executive Board members and National-Olympic coaches with regard to the USOC's role in the Olympic effort?

3. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between athlete representatives to the USOC's Athletes' Advisory Council and National-Olympic coaches with regard to the USOC's duties, goals and responsibilities?
A specific data-collection instrument was devised and constructed by the researcher to gather data from the three specific groups of subjects. Members from each group indicated reactions on a five point Likert-type response scale, to a request for priority-ranking of purposes, and to opportunities to respond through written commentary.

The data drawn from these responses by the athlete representatives, the USOC's Executive Board members, and the coaches to the statements in the final questionnaire were analyzed to determine any significant differences accruing to each of the questionnaire statements. In addition, a one-way analysis of variance was employed for the statistical analysis. A total of 162 mean response values were reported for the study, out of which fifty-seven differed at the 0.05 level of significance. Twenty-five of these significant values were detected between the athletes and USOC's administrators and twenty-five were found between coaches and administrators while only seven occurred between athletes and coaches.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study lead to a number of noteworthy conclusions and implications. The study produced a rich amount of data not previously examined in such detail. Specifically, some of the most important implications are:

1. The data clearly supports the conclusion that there are several areas of the USOC's administrative responsibilities which produce much disagreement in terms of perception of that group's role, responsibilities, and previous activities.
2. Although some significant differences were found between the athletes and the coaches (seven), the overwhelming differences were located between the administrators and the other two groups the coaches and the athletes. Therefore, most of the concern should be given to the understanding of these differences and to attempt to minimize and resolve them.

3. The following areas revealed the most critical differences in perception among the three sub-groups of the Olympic Effort Organization:

a. Communications - The findings of this study reveal that the Olympic Effort Organization is faced with a major area of critical conflict of perceptions. The USOC's constitution provides for only one established channel of communication between its sub-groups which is the Athletes' Advisory Council (AAC). This study showed that while the administrators felt that the communication channels and processes are adequate for the organization, the other two groups realized a need for their improvement. It is therefore concluded that communications is one of the major issues of conflict that this organization is facing and one that should be resolved for the organization to be able to operate more effectively.

b. Representation - The athletes' representation on the policy making bodies of the USOC, which was established at 20% in the quadrennial meeting in 1974 [43: 2 ], was perceived as adequate by the coaches and administrators but was met with discontent by the athletes. The athletes were also dissatisfied with the way the operation committees were selected and the fact that they were not always represented. The coaches joined the athletes and revealed their concern for the adequate coaches representation on all the USOC bodies. The approval of the administrators with regard to the current situation in the operating committees, their perceived feeling for the need to reduce athletes representation to 15% or less, and their disapproval of the proposal for the improvement of coaches representation points up: A critical conflict of perception between the administration on one side and the coaches and athletes on the other.

c. Administration - Some administrative duties of the USOC were perceived differently by the three groups. The athletes and coaches reflected a demand for more emphasis on the sport medicine program, for more resources to be directed toward a variety of international events other than the Olympic Games, and suggested that the USOC establish a firmer stand on the problematic issue of drugs,
stimulants, and hormones. The administrators appeared to be indecisive about how the USOC should approach the above administrative issues. The administration's indecision and the other two sub-group's demand for change created intra-organizational conflict with which the Olympic Effort Organization must deal.

4. In three areas the three groups indicated similarity of perceptions:

a. The transfer of some USOC responsibilities from the USOC to the National Governing Bodies was met with much support by all three groups of subjects. These responsibilities included: (1) the use of funds allocated by the USOC; (2) the administration of the selection of Olympic athletes; (3) the assignment of coaches to the training centers; and (4) the set-up of guidelines for development programs.

b. The general perception of the responding groups concerning the priority ranking of development program purposes proved to be similar among the three groups. The same similarity of perceptions was indicated with regard to the priorities of the USOC's purposes.

c. Most of the philosophical issues which were raised in this study such as the acceptance of governmental aid, the relationship shared between sports and politics, regimented training, and assistance to the amateur sports did not produce any significant differences in the way the three groups perceived them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are divided into two categories which include:

(1) recommendations for practice, and (2) recommendations for further study.

1. Recommendations for Practice

Based upon the results of the study and the conclusions, the following recommendations might be fruitful in resolving the critical conflicts that were demonstrated and in strengthening the agreements
which were established in three major areas.

1. To resolve the conflict regarding representation of athletes and coaches on the policy making bodies and the operating committees of the USOC it is suggested that:

   The USOC's House of Delegates in its next meeting look into the need for: (1) reviewing and possibly revising the quota set for athletes' representation on all the committees of the USOC; and (2) the creation of a coaches' advisory council or any other body that will provide coaches with more direct relationships with the USOC.

2. To minimize the discontent demonstrated by the coaches and athletes with regard to various administrative duties of the USOC it is suggested that the USOC appoint task forces made up of experts in each area and representatives of each one of the organization's sub-groups to look into: (1) the designation of USOC funds; (2) the position of the USOC on the drug related problems; and (3) the status of the sport medicine program in relation to current needs and programs in other countries.

3. The organization should review its intra-organizational communication network. Due to the importance of proper communications within the organization and the possibility of this faulty mechanism creating other conflicts, the writer suggests that the House of Delegates of the USOC appoint a committee to study and investigate ways to improve the communications between the organizations sub-groups. This committee should look for ways to establish clear, identified, and constitutional means of communication so that perceptions and expectations of each one of the groups will be known to all and thus reduce and minimize the occurrence of conflicts.

4. The USOC should continue to improve and expand the publication of its monthly magazine The Olympian and further enhance the dissemination of information to a specific and interested public.

5. It is recommended that through the use of workshops, symposiums, and discussions (involving the coaches, athletes, administrators, and the public), the administration of the USOC can further strengthen the areas in which all three groups share common perceptions. These means should be used to achieve clearance of conflicts, identification and location of problems, exchange of ideas, and acceptance of change.
6. The search for empirical studies in the specific area with which this study has dealt revealed the little work, if any, that has been accomplished. It is therefore recommended that the USOC establish an annual scholarship or grant which will be awarded to individuals who will conduct academic research in the fields of amateur sports, the Olympic effort, and the performance of the United States in the Olympic Games. Encouragement of academic research in these areas is badly needed.

2. Recommendations for Further Study

Several related issues which warrant further study surfaced during the conduct of this research. The following are, in the opinion of researcher, viable topics for further investigation:

1. A comparative study of the United States Olympic Committee and the National Olympic Committees of some other Western European country or countries.

2. The effect of pending congressional legislation (Bill 2063) concerning the role of the USOC in the United States Olympic effort.

3. The role of the USOC in the United States Olympic effort as perceived by the National Governing Bodies of the amateur sports in the United States.

4. The role of women in the administration of the amateur sports programs and the administration of the United States Olympic effort.

5. The possible role of the USOC as the Central Sport Organization (CSO) of the United States.

The willingness of the respondents to participate and to furnish written commentary to the "Olympic Effort Perception Study" questionnaire was indeed appreciated. Furthermore, the author, especially, was motivated because of his deep concern for the United States' Olympic performance and his interest in its improvement. Therefore,
this study is offered with the hope that the United States Olympic organization, coaches, and athletes will continue to see their role in the effort as a means toward peace and brotherhood and toward enhanced international communication using a common language of athletic skill, powers, and competitive integrity.
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MINUTES, CONSTITUTIONS, BY-LAWS AND GENERAL RULES


**NEWSPAPERS**


Dear Participant:

My name is Baruch Chass, and I am a graduate student pursuing a Doctoral degree in Physical Education.

This is an original Doctoral dissertation which will study the insights of the United States Olympic Committee (U. S. O. C.). As an involved individual who is taking part in the U. S. Olympic effort, I am sure that you can appreciate the significance of such a study.

Your responses to the following statements, and your comments, will construct the perception of your respective group.

The purpose of the study is to compare the differences of perception among athletes, coaches, and the U. S. O. C. executive board members in regard to the U. S. O. C.'s duties, responsibilities, and policies.

It is hoped that you will attempt to be as open and truthful as possible when responding to or commenting on the following statements.

Much of the information used in the study as well as the names and addresses of the participants was furnished by the U. S. O. C. which gave its approval of this study.

The results of this study will be submitted to the U. S. O. C. so you can study them.

Sincerely,

Baruch Chass
Graduate Teaching Associate

BC/1em

Enclosure
OLYMPIC EFFORT PERCEPTION STUDY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Either a pen or pencil may be used to complete this questionnaire. Most of the questions may be answered by circling the proper letter or number assigned to the answers. Other questions ask for numerical ordering and/or write-in answers.

ANONYMITY IS ASSURED!!! (Your name is not required)

4-5 1. Your age at your last birthday: __________

6 2. 1. Male __________ 2. Female __________

7 3. What is your current marital status?
   1. Single
   2. Married
   3. Divorced
   4. Separated
   5. Widow/er

8 4. Do you have children? 1. No 2. Yes

9 5. What level of education have you reached?
   1. Elementary school
   2. High school
   3. B. A.
   4. Graduate school degree

10-11 6. What is your current occupation? ________________

12 7. Please indicate your ethnic background.
   1. Black
   2. White
   3. Other

8. Indicate the levels of sport in which you have competed.

13-14 1. Little League (age group)
15-16 2. High School
17-18 3. Club
19-20 4. College
21-22 5. Intramurals
23-24 6. World Championships
25-26 7. Pan American Games
27-28 8. Olympic Games

29-30 9. For how long had you participated in the sport in which you have reached the highest level of competition? ________________

31 10. Have you ever coached? 1. No 2. Yes
11. In what level have you coached the most?
1. Little League (age group)
2. High School
3. Club
4. College

12. For how long have you coached at that level? 

13. In what capacity have you been involved in sports other than as a coach or participant?
1. Fund raising
2. Scheduling
3. Organizing
4. Officiating
5. Sport Journalism
6. Facility Maintenance

14. For how long have you been involved in these capacities?
1. 1-5 years
2. 6-15 years
3. 16 years or more

15. Which of the following income levels was closest to your total income before taxes in 1976?
1. Less than $9,999 per year
2. $10,000-$19,999
3. $20,000-$29,999
4. $30,000-$50,000
5. $51,000-$99,999
6. $100,000 or more

16. How would you describe yourself politically?
1. Far left
2. Left (liberal)
3. Middle
4. Right (conservative)
5. Far right
6. Undecided

IN THE NEXT PART, PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE
SA - if your response is STRONGLY AGREE
A - if your response is AGREE
UD - if your response is UNDECIDED
D - if your response is DISAGREE
SD - if your response is STRONGLY DISAGREE

1-3. It is proper and justified to have 20% athletes' representation on the following committees of the USOC:
4. House of Delegates
5. Executive
6. Administrative Committee

4-6. If there should be a different percentage representation of athletes, what should that be?
7. House of Delegates
8. Executive Board
9. Administrative Committee
7. Coaches are adequately represented on the USOC.

Comment:______________________________

8. There should be a coaches' advisory board to the USOC.

Comment:______________________________

9. The make up of the operating committees (individuals appointed by the USOC President) provide for effective carry-out of their responsibilities. (Operating committees include: Finance, Budget, Investment, Development, etc.)

Comment:______________________________

10. There should be athletes and coaches represented on all the Operating Committees.

Comment:______________________________

11. Funds allocated by the USOC to the National Governing Bodies should be spent at the discretion of the N. G. B.

Comment:______________________________

12. The USOC should have tight control on how its allocated money is spent by the National Governing Bodies.

Comment:______________________________

13. The USOC directs most of its financial resources into the selection, preparation, and transportation of its team of athletes and support personnel to the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

Comment:______________________________

14. The USOC should direct more of its resources into a variety of international competition. (World Championships, University Games, etc.)

Comment:______________________________
15. The drug, doping, stimulant and hormone issues have been handled in a satisfactory way by the USOC.

16. The USOC should assume a firmer position on the drug, doping, stimulant, and hormone issues.

17. The USOC is providing proper amounts of resources and control for the sport medicine programs.

18. The USOC should make a considerably greater effort in the area of sport medicine.

19. Today, the National Governing Bodies are the bodies which organize and administer the selection of Olympic and Pan-American athletes.

20. The National Governing Bodies should be the bodies to organize and administer the selection process.

21. The USOC should be the sole arbiter in case of disputes concerning the selection of athletes to Olympic and Pan-American Games.

22. The USOC should be the sole arbiter in case of disputes concerning the selection of coaches in the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

23. Guidelines for the development programs in each sport are set by the USOC.
24. Guidelines for the development programs in each sport should be set by each National Governing Body.

25-27. National, regional, or state coaches are assigned to the training centers by the:

- 25. USOC
- 27. Coaches' Association

28-30. National, regional, or state coaches should be assigned to the training centers by the:

- 28. USOC
- 29. National Governing Body
- 30. Coaches' Association

31. Money for development programs is allocated on the basis of the popularity of the sport.

32-35. Money for development of programs should be allocated on the basis of other criteria.

- 32. USOC
- 33. National Governing Body
- 34. Coaches' Association

36. The USOC is open and willing to help when it comes to sharing its information with all interested individuals.

37. The USOC should be more aggressive in disseminating its information and make more of its decisions known to all interested individuals.

38. Athletes have open communication channels to the USOC (Grievance procedure, direct way to make suggestions).

39. Athletes should be provided with improved channels of communication to the USOC (An improved grievance procedure and a direct way to make suggestions).
37. Coaches have open communication channels to the USOC (Grievance, procedure and direct way to make suggestions).

40. Coaches should be provided with improved communication channels to the USOC (An improved grievance procedure and direct way to make suggestions).

41. SA A UD D SD

39-41. There is a need for improved communication (dialogues, liaison, representation, grievance procedures, hearings, etc.) between:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletes and the USOC</td>
<td>Coaches and the USOC</td>
<td>Athletes and Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 39, if SA or A, what kind? 
In 40, if SA or A, what kind? 
In 41, if SA or A, what kind? 

42. The USOC should continue to refuse money from the Federal Government.

45. SA A UD D SD

43. The USOC should accept as much money as it can get from the Federal Government.

46. SA A UD D SD

44-47. DOES the USOC make it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Olympic Games</td>
<td>The Pan-American Games</td>
<td>World Championships</td>
<td>All International Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48-51. SHOULD the USOC make it mandatory for athletes to attend training sessions for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Olympic Games</td>
<td>The Pan-American Games</td>
<td>World Championships</td>
<td>All International Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52-54. The amateur sports in the United States have a need for training centers for its elite athletes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local-State training centers</td>
<td>Regional training centers</td>
<td>One national training center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
<td>SA A UD D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. The USOC is properly representing the political views of the United States in the international sport arena.

56. The USOC should forcefully resist any attempt to use the Olympic or Pan-American Games as a political arena.

57. The Congress should amend "Public Law 805" to give the USOC more legal authority so it can become the Central Sport Organization in the United States.

58. The USOC should strictly deal with the selection, preparation, and transportation of the United States delegation to the Olympic and Pan-American Games like it did in the past.

59. The United States Olympic Committee: (Circle one response)
   1. Does not enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.
   2. Should enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.
   3. Cannot enforce the IOC rule 26 on amateurism to the letter.

60. If you feel that the development programs have or should have definite priorities, rank these 7 purposes by placing a number from 1-7 in each space provided, for present and future rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT RANK</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>FUTURE RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality training</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training at the grass roots</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training for the elite</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Development of women's programs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facility Maintenance &amp; Construction</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No one priority but equality (check)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61. The following are stated and unstated purposes of the USOC. If you consider any of them to be of a higher priority, please number them accordingly. If you feel that they are equally important, please state why:

**RANK**

1. To select and obtain the best athletes for the Pan-American and Olympic Games
2. To stimulate interest of people in Olympic Sports
3. To maintain the highest ideals of amateurism
4. To organize the representation of the United States in the Pan-American and Olympic Games
5. To finance the representation of the United States in the Pan-American and Olympic Games
6. To raise money for the financing of the development programs
7. To protect the rights of every participant in the Olympic effort
8. To organize and administer long-term development programs
9. To assist in developing the area of sport medicine in the United States
10. To develop women's programs in the United States
11. To publish a newspaper or a magazine to disseminate its information.

Others: ____________________________________________

Comments: ____________________________________________

This completes the questionnaire. If you have any additional comments, please include them on the back of this page.

I SINCERELY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED PREPAID, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH ! ! !
Dear Participant:

I would like to thank you for taking the time to fill in the questionnaire that I sent you to determine perception differences between the groups involved in the Olympic effort. This study will try to identify and then address these perception differences between coaches, administrators, and athletes.

If you have not returned the questionnaire, I would appreciate receiving it at your earliest convenience. Your answered questionnaire will help to insure an unbiased, accurate, empirical study.

Please use the enclosed, self-addressed, pre-paid envelope to return your questionnaire.

Thank you,

B. Chass
Baruch Chass
Teaching Associate

BC/1en

Enclosure
### GROUP MAKE-UP BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MARITAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA or BS</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUP RACIAL MAKE-UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACK</strong></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong></td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLITICAL AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEFT</strong></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE</strong></td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT</strong></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDECIDED</strong></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCOME LEVEL BEFORE TAXES (1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$9,999 or less</strong></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$10,000-19,999</strong></td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$20,000-29,999</strong></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$30,000-50,000</strong></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$51,000-99,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$100,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERCENT OF SUBJECTS INVOLVED IN COACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF COACHING LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERCENT OF SUBJECTS' PARTICIPATION IN EIGHT DIFFERENT SPORT LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little League</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Championships</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Games</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Games</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERCENT OF SUBJECTS' PARTICIPATION IN SIX SUPPORTIVE CAPACITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officiating</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Journalism</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YEARS OF INVOLVEMENT IN SUPPORTIVE CAPACITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 Years</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Years or More</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 24, 1977

Baruch Chass
Graduate Teaching Associate
Physical Education
The Ohio State University
337 West 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mr. Chass:

I have still been mulling over your letter outlining the nature of your thesis. You are going to be hardpressed to find a great deal of reputable printed information to cover your topic. Perhaps you can cover part of the ground through the use of the questionnaires which you discussed in your original letter.

I am having my secretary draw up a list of names and addresses of coaches and assistant coaches we had in the 1976 Olympic Games and 1976 Olympic Winter Games and these will be forwarded to you by the end of this week so that you may review them with your principals before coming to Olympic House. It does seem a shame that you have selected a topic for which there is a dearth of material and also one in which some of the material you have quoted may not give you a true broad scale perspective of the conduct of sports in the United States of America.

Cordially,

C. Robert Paul, Jr.

Will be calling for you June 6 —
Baruch Chass  
School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation  
The Ohio State University  
337 West 17th Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Baruch:

It certainly hasn't been a slow fall for those of us at Olympic House. What with Congressional Legislation hearings and the Los Angeles proposal to host the Olympic Games we have been kept busy overtime.

Don Miller has spent very little time in the office in the past months and until I get an opportunity to spend five minutes with him to discuss your situation I do not know whether we will be able to give you any financial assistance in completing your report.

Enclosed with this letter is a semi-accurate list of members of the USOC Executive Board and the Athlete's Advisory Council. We never seem to have 100% accurate addresses on everyone although we must reasonably assume that the names are the persons who have been either elected or named by their representative organizations.

Just as soon as I get some word, I shall inform you promptly.

Cordially,

C. ROBERT PAUL, JR.

Encl:

CRP:kr
March 28, 1977

Baruch Chass, Teaching Associate  
Department of Physical Education  
Ohio State University

Dear Mr. Chass:

I was delighted to learn that you will be coming to New York City early this summer to use our facilities in researching the subject for your thesis. By all means send me a copy of your final proposal so that I will have a better idea of the parameters of your study.

Cordially,

C. Robert Paul, Jr.

C. ROBERT PAUL, JR.  
Director of Communications
March 2, 1978

Dear Baruch:

A few suggestions about the attached organizational chart:

We view the "structure" in a straight line as follows:

House of Delegates
Administrative Committee
Executive Board

then...

The six officers of the USOC (should be in one box)

OK for the Athletes' Advisory Council as drawn

But I don't understand the infrastructure. I would prefer two big boxes

Head the one Constitutional Committees

Head the other one Standing Committees

Under Constitutional Committees list:

Budget and Audit Committee, Development Committee, Finance Committee, Games Preparation Committee, Investment Committee, Sports Medicine Committee, USOC-International Olympic Academy Committee

Under Standing Committees list:

Apparel, Supplies & Equipment, Eligibility Committee, Food and Housing Committee, Games Site Selection and National Training Centers Committee, International Relations Committee, Legislation Committee, Liaison with Athletes' Advisory Council, Medical and Training Services Committee,

Actually the Committee on Credentials is an ad hoc committee appointed by the president prior to the quadrennial meeting and the annual meetings of the House of Delegates.

Good luck.

Cordially,


CONTRIBUTIONS ARE DEDUCTIBLE FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES
THE CONSTITUTION, BY-LAWS, AND CENTRAL RULES
OF THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I—Name

The name of this Organization, incorporated by Act of Congress of September 21, 1950, shall be

UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,

hereinafter referred to as the USOC. (Note—A bill, H.R. 4722, was passed by Act of Congress, August 10, 1964, changing the name from United States Olympic Association to the present title listed above.)

ARTICLE II

Purposes, Powers and Jurisdiction

Section 1. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be:
1) to arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States in, and to obtain their support of, creditable and sportsmanlike participation and representation of the United States in all of the sports on the program of the Olympic Games and Pan American Games;
2) to stimulate the interest of the people, particularly the youth, of the United States, in healthful, physical, moral and cultural education through sportsmanlike participation in competitions in accordance with amateur rules;
3) to exercise exclusive jurisdiction, either directly or through its constituent members or committees, over all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States in the Olympic Games and in the Pan American Games, including the representation of the United States in such Games, and over the organization of the Olympic Games and the Pan American Games when celebrated in the United States; and in furtherance thereof to comply with and enforce all the rules and regulations of the International Olympic Committee;
4) to select and obtain for the United States the most competent amateur representation possible in the competitions and events of the Olympic Games and of the Pan American Games;
5) to maintain the highest ideals of amateurism and to promote general interest therein, particularly in connection with the Olympic Games and the Pan American Games;
6) to instill and develop in the youth of America the qualities of courage, self-reliance, honesty, tolerance, and like virtues; and
7) to promote and encourage the physical, moral, and cultural education of the youth of the United States to the end that their health, patriotism, character, and good citizenship may be fully developed.

Section 2. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and power,
1) to organize, select, finance and control the representation of the United States in the competitions and events of the Olympic Games and of the Pan American Games and to appoint committees or other governing bodies in connection with such representation;
2) to sue and be sued;
3) to make contracts;
4) to acquire, hold and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;
5) to accept gifts, legacies, and devises in furtherance of its corporate purposes;
6) to borrow money to carry out its corporate purposes, issue notes, bonds or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in each case to the laws of the United States or of any state;
7) to establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate organizations, and to receive and expel as members of the
corporation such existing organizations of a patriotic, educational, civic, or athletic character as may be deemed desirable and proper to carry out the corporate purposes:

(8) to adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(9) to adopt and alter a constitution and by-laws not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or of any State;

(10) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation;

(11) to publish a newspaper, magazine or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes; and

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation.

Section 3. The corporation, pursuant to authority granted by Public Law 805, 81st Congress, Chapter 975, 2nd Session, shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the use of the emblem of the United States Olympic Committee, consisting of an escutcheon having a blue chief and vertically extending alternate red and white bars at the base, with five interlocked rings displayed on the chief, or any other sign or insignia in imitation thereof; and of the words "Olympic," "Olympiad," or "Citius, Altius, Fortius" or any variation or combination of these words.

Section 4. Subject to the approval of the Executive Board, members and administrative officials of former U.S. Olympic teams may organize separately or jointly in units, chapters, or groups for the purpose of promoting the Olympic objectives as defined in the Constitution and By-Laws of the U.S.O.C., and may use the word "Olympic" in names adopted for and by units, chapters, or groups. The activities of those units, chapters, and groups shall be carried on and be subject to the consent and approval of the U.S.O.C.

Section 5. The corporation, pursuant to authority granted by the International Olympic Committee, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to enter competitors who will represent the United States in the Olympic Games and the Pan American Games (I.O.C. Rule 24), and to enforce in connection therewith the definition of an amateur adopted by the International Olympic Committee (I.O.C. Rule 26 and the By-Laws thereof).

Section 6. The corporation shall, by all lawful means at its disposal, protect the right of every individual who is eligible under reasonable national and applicable international amateur athletic rules and regulations to participate if selected (or to attempt to qualify for selection to participate) as an athlete representing the United States in any international amateur athletic competition, if such competition (conducted in compliance with reasonable national and applicable international requirements) involves any sport included in the Olympic Games or Pan American Games program during the Olympiad period concurrent with such participation or the attempt to qualify for participation.

Section 7. Any amateur athlete who alleges that he or she has been denied by a person or an organization which is a member of the U.S.O.C. a right established by the preceding Section shall immediately inform the Executive Director of the U.S.O.C., who shall promptly cause an investigation to be made and steps to be taken to settle the controversy without delay. Without prejudice to any action that may be taken by the U.S.O.C., if the controversy is not settled to his or her satisfaction, the athlete may submit to any regional office of the American Arbitration Association for binding arbitration, a claim against such U.S.O.C. member documenting the alleged denial not later than six months after the date of the denial except that the Association (upon request by the athlete in question) is authorized, upon forty-eight (48) hours' notice to the parties concerned, and to the corporation, to hear and decide the matter under such procedures as the Association deems appropriate, if the Association determines that it is necessary to expedite such arbitration in order to resolve a matter relating to an amateur athletic competition which is so scheduled that
compliance with regular procedures would not be likely to produce a sufficiently early decision by the Association to do justice to the affected parties, by maintaining membership in the U.S.O.C., each member agrees that any such aforesaid controversy may be submitted to binding arbitration as provided in this Section and agrees to be bound by the arbitrators’ award as a result thereof.

Section 8. Any amateur athlete who alleges that he or she has been denied a right established by Section 6 by a person or organization which is not a member of the U.S.O.C. shall immediately inform the Executive Director, who will consult with the Counselor (or Assistant Counsel) to determine whether the situation appears to be of sufficient seriousness and relevance to the obligations or responsibilities of the U.S.O.C. under its Congressional Charter to warrant action by the corporation in support of the athlete's claim. In the event that action by the U.S.O.C. appears to be warranted, the matter will be referred to the Administrative Committee, which will decide the nature and extent of the action to be taken in the case.

Section 9. The rights granted to athletes under Section 6 and 7 of this article shall equally apply to any coach, administrator, trainer, manager, or other official seeking to participate in the conduct of any international amateur athletic competition.

ARTICLE III--MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The membership of the U.S.O.C. shall be confined to organizations of the United States as hereinafter provided in this article. Individuals may nevertheless be associated with, and recognized by the U.S.O.C. by virtue of their current or past activities in the affairs of the U.S.O.C. or in the Olympic or Pan American Games, as provided elsewhere in this Constitution.

Section 2. (a) Organizations eligible for membership shall be those which take some active part in the administration of one of more sports or events upon the Olympic or Pan American Games programs and such other organizations, patriotic, educational or cultural, that are engaged in efforts to promote the participation in or preparation for any amateur sports or games competition.

(b) Organizations which as a part of their duties administer participation in or preparation for professional sports shall not be ineligible for membership if they also administer a bona fide program of amateur sport.

(c) Organizations which are purely commercial or political in character are not eligible for membership.

Section 3. Organizations which meet the requirements for membership in a group as hereinafter set forth, for Groups A to D inclusive, may be elected to membership pursuant to the provisions of Article V and upon election shall be entitled to delegates and votes at meetings of the House of Delegates as hereinafter provided. The list of member organizations of the U.S.O.C., classified by groups, shall be kept up to date by the Executive Director as an Appendix to this Constitution, and shall be made available upon request to any member of the U.S.O.C.

Group A. (National Sports Governing Bodies)

Eligible for Group A shall be those national organizations which are recognized by the U.S.O.C. as the national sports governing bodies for sports on the program of the Olympic or Pan American Games. Each member of Group A shall be identified with a sport eligible for inclusion in such Games. In accordance with I.O.C. Rule 34, the U.S.O.C. shall not recognize more than one national amateur sports governing body in each sport. Each national governing body is recognized by the U.S.O.C. as entertaining jurisdiction over all international amateur competition involving United States teams or individuals, in conformity with rules and regulations of its international federations and serving as the coordinating agency for amateur competition in that sport within the United States. Members of Group A, Olympic Division, shall be those recognized national sports governing bodies which are
members in the United States of International Sports Federations recognized by the International Olympic Committee for the purpose of administering the competitions on the Olympic program. Members of Group A, Olympic Division, shall constitute a voting majority of the House of Delegates and of the Executive Board of the U.S.O.C. Partners of Group A, Pan American Division, shall be those recognized national sports governing bodies in sports which are not on the Olympic program but are eligible for inclusion in the program of the Pan American Games.

To be recognized by the U.S.O.C. as a national sports governing body, an organization shall:

a) open its membership, directly or by affiliation, to all individuals who are amateur athletes, coaches, trainers, officials, and administrators in the sport concerned and/or to an amateur athletic organization active in the sport;

b) demonstrate its ability to administer its sport adequately in both its national and international aspects at various relevant levels of sports proficiency, and in particular to comply with all applicable international requirements (written and uniformly applied to all nations) relating to recognition as the governing body for that sport;

c) provide equal opportunity, without regard to race, creed, color, religion, age or sex for participation in its sport to all individuals who are eligible under applicable international or reasonable national amateur athletic rules and regulations and apply such rules and regulations concerning athletic competition without discrimination to all such individuals and shall not deny eligibility to any athlete except after according such athlete fair notice and hearing as to the issue of his or her eligibility;

d) be governed by a board (1) whose members are selected without regard to race, creed, color, religion, age or sex and (2) whose voting membership on a current basis is comprised of at least 50% of individuals who are actively engaged in amateur athletic competition in the sport concerned, or who have represented the United States in international amateur competition in that sport within the preceding ten (10) years. In addition, the Board shall provide for a reasonable proportion of representatives of other national amateur organizations, if any, which conduct regular national programs or competition in its sport at various relevant levels of proficiency during the current Olympic period if the sport is actually on the program of the forthcoming Olympic or Pan American Games, and which are capable of holding an annual championship at a level of proficiency appropriate to the selection of athletes to represent the United States in international competition, and in addition are capable of conducting international athletic competition in that sport.

e) be autonomous in the administration of its sport, and to that end shall exercise independent jurisdiction and control over the administration, eligibility, sanctioning authority, representation, and rules of competition for its sport; and further to that end shall be incorporated and shall hold membership in the international sports federation for its sport, or if not so presently constituted shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to become so constituted. (It is understood that a Group A member governing two different sports, may be deemed to be autonomous as to each, if a single international federation also governs the two sports, and the Group A member meets the other requirements of autonomy, i.e., functions independently of other national governing bodies.)

f) establish that it is able to perform effectively and efficiently the function of the U.S. representative to the international sports federation recognized for its sport by the International Olympic Committee or the Pan American Sports Organization.

Each Group A member shall be entitled to five (5) delegates and a total of fifty (50) basic votes, except that Athletics (track and field) and Swimming (including Diving, Water polo, and Synchronized Swimming) shall be entitled to ten (10) delegates and a total of one hundred (100) basic votes each. At least 20% of the
delegates of each member of Group A shall be athletes who have competed as members of a United States National Team in the Olympic or Pan American Games, or other major international competition, within the preceding ten years. In addition, the members of Group A, Olympic Division, shall be entitled to as many supplemental votes as may be necessary to give the division as a whole not less than a majority of all votes eligible to be cast at any meeting of the House of Delegates of the U.S.O.C. on ordinary matters of business, and two-thirds (2/3) of such votes when constitutional amendments are under consideration. These supplemental votes shall be computed prior to each meeting of the House of Delegates, and shall be allocated proportionately among the members of Group A, Olympic Division.

Group B. (National Multi-Sport Organizations)

Eligible for Group B shall be those national organizations in the United States from which directly or indirectly there have come substantial numbers of members of the United States Olympic or Pan American teams in two or more sports but which are not members of Group A for such sports, and which either hold national programs or championships in two or more such sports or competitions upon the Olympic or Pan American programs, or through the constituent or related units of which regular and nationwide competition is fostered and hold in two or more such sports or competitions upon the Olympic or Pan American programs at a level of proficiency appropriate to the selection of athletes to represent the United States in international competition.

The U.S.O.C. recognizes each Group B member as entertaining jurisdiction over competition engaged in solely by its constituents.

Each member of Group B shall be entitled to five (5) delegates and a total of fifty (50) votes. The collective representation of the Armed Forces as a member of Group B shall consist of one delegate each from the United States Air Force, the United States Navy, and one (1) military athlete as hereinafter described. At least one (1) of the delegates of each member of Group B shall be an athlete who has competed as a member of a United States national team in the Olympic or Pan American Games, or other major international competition, within the preceding ten (10) years.

Group C. (Affiliated Sports Organizations)

Eligible for Group C shall be those national sports organizations, not eligible to be a constituent of a Group A member, that function as national governing bodies in amateur sports which are not on the program for the Olympic or Pan American Games, but are widely practiced in other countries and may therefore be eligible for inclusion in future programs of the Olympic or Pan American Games. Members of Group C shall (a) comply substantially with the criteria for national sports governing bodies applicable to Group A members, (b) be affiliated with an international sports federation, if there is such a federation in that sport, (c) hold regular national championships, and (d) actively participate in such international competition as may be available in that sport.

Each member of Group C shall be entitled to one (1) delegate and one (1) vote.

Group D. (State Olympic Organizations)

Eligible for Group D shall be the Olympic organization for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia which is recognized by the United States Olympic Committee for the purpose of bringing together all interested individuals, organizations, and corporations within each state and the District of Columbia to further the purposes and goals of the United States Olympic movement in the interest of conducting and coordinating all United States Olympic Committee fund-raising activities within the State or District and of enhancing the image of the United States Olympic Committee in the State or District by establishing broad and comprehensive communications programs enabling the general public to identify more readily with the United States Olympic movement.

Each member of Group D shall be headed by the State Olympic Chairman nominated by the National Fund-Raising Chairman and approved by the Executive Board.
Each member of Group D shall be entitled to one vote for each delegate.

ARTICLE IV—Dues

The House of Delegates shall annually fix the amount of dues, not less than twenty-five ($25) dollars, for each member organization of the U.S.O.C. for the next succeeding calendar year. Such dues shall be fixed on an equitable basis and shall be due and payable on the first day of January each year. Failure to pay all dues by the first day of February, or the date of a regular or special meeting of the House of Delegates in that year, whichever is earlier, shall suspend all membership privileges of the delinquent member, including representation on the Executive Board and all committees, until all arrears are paid. Memberships shall be terminated automatically if the delinquent member remains in arrears for dues by the first day of February of the next succeeding year.

ARTICLE V—Admission and Reclassification of Member Organizations

Section 1. The House of Delegates by majority vote shall have the power to elect properly qualified members to Groups A to D, inclusive, to transfer a member organization from one group to another, and to suspend or terminate such membership, as circumstances may require; provided (a) that notice of any such proposed action on membership and of the recommendation of the Membership Committee shall have been given to the members of the House of Delegates prior to the meeting at which such action is to be taken, and (b) that the termination or denial of Group A membership shall be subject to the provisions of Sections 5 and 6 of this Article.

Section 2. The Membership Committee shall make a detailed report with recommendations to the House of Delegates on all applications for membership in Groups A to D inclusive, and all proposals for transfer of a member organization from one group to another, or for suspension or termination of such membership, showing the facts that support the proposed action in accordance with the standards and criteria for membership in each group as are specified in Article III and as may be further developed pursuant to the policies established by the House of Delegates, particularly with respect to the qualifications, votes, delegates and dues of organizations entitled to membership in Group A.

Section 3. The House of Delegates shall specify the date upon which the rights and duties of new and transferred members (including votes, delegates, and dues) shall become effective. If no date is specified such rights and duties shall become effective immediately upon completion of the action of the Board related to the admission or transfer of members.

Section 4. An organization admitted to Group A membership shall be under duty to:

(a) maintain a comprehensive program to develop interest and participation throughout the United States in the sport it seeks to govern and shall be responsible to the individuals and organizations it represents, and to that end shall, by consultation with its members, seek to minimize, and require its members to respect, conflicts in scheduling of competitions in its sport, having due regard for regular programs of competition sponsored by it and by each of its members, and for opportunities for international competition available to it and its members;

(b) keep amateur athletes under its jurisdiction informed of policy matters being considered by the organization, and should reasonably reflect the views of these athletes in its policies;
(c) honor the request of any amateur organization which is a member of or affiliated with the Group A member for permission to conduct international amateur athletic competition or programs involving United States athletes, unless the Group A member reasonably determines:

1. that appropriate steps have not been taken to protect the amateur status of athletes who will take part in the competition and to protect their eligibility to compete in amateur athletic competition conducted under its auspices and in international amateur athletic events; or

2. that appropriate provision has not been made for validation of records which may be established during the competition; or

3. that due regard has not been given to any international amateur athletic requirements specifically applicable to the competition; or

4. that the competition will not be conducted by qualified officials; or

5. that proper medical supervision will not be provided for athletes who compete; or

6. that proper safety precautions have not been taken to protect the personal welfare of the athletes or spectators; or

7. that the sports organization or other person conducting the competition refuses to submit an audited or notarized financial report of the most recent similar event, if any, conducted by the organization; or

unless it demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that holding the competition would be detrimental to the best interests of the sport.

(d) honor the right of an eligible amateur athlete to compete in any amateur athletic competition conducted under its auspices or the auspices of any other sports organization which is a member of or affiliated with the Group A member, unless it can be established that the denial was based on evidence that the person or organization conducting the competition did not meet the requirements stated in paragraph (c) of this section.

Section 5. Any member of the U.S.O.C., Executive Board, or any organization or person belonging to or eligible to belong to a Group A member, believing that a Group A member is in default of compliance with the requirements for membership set forth in Article III or the obligations imposed by Section 4 of this Article, shall after having exhausted any remedies available under the organic documents of such Group A member, be entitled to file a written complaint with the U.S.O.C., setting forth the alleged grounds of default and any supporting evidence or documentation forming the basis for the complaint. The Executive Director (with advice of the Counselor) shall, within thirty (30) days after receipt of the complaint, investigate the facts surrounding the complaint and make a determination whether, in his judgment, the alleged complaint is sufficiently meritorious as to warrant a hearing on the matter by the Executive Board.

(a) If the Executive Director finds that the complaint is not meritorious as aforesaid, he shall promptly so advise the complainant in writing of his determination, fully stating the basis for his determination. If the complainant then so requests in writing within thirty (30) days after receipt of the determination, the Executive Director shall refer the complaint and his determination to the next meeting of the Executive Board for review. The Executive Board may either (i) uphold the determination of the Executive Director or (ii) overrule the determination of the Executive Director, in which event the hearing procedures referred to in subsection (b) of this Section shall apply.

(b) If the Executive Director determines that the complaint is meritorious as aforesaid (or if his determination of non-merit is overruled by the Executive Board), he shall refer the matter promptly to the Executive Board for a hearing on the merits. Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) below, both
the complainant and the Group A member shall at such hearing be given a reasonable opportunity to present evidence in support of their respective positions. On the basis of the evidence presented, the Executive Board shall (i) if it finds the complaint to be without substantial merit, find against the complainant (in which event the matter shall be at an end) or (ii) if it finds the complaint to have substantial merit, cite the Group A member for noncompliance, in which event the Group A member shall be required by such citation to bring itself into compliance with the appropriate standard for membership (and report such compliance in writing to the Executive Director, with copy to the complainant) within a stated period, determined by the board, of not more than six months. The Executive Board shall promptly and in writing notify the complainant and the Group A member of its findings. At its meeting next following receipt by the Executive Director of a report of compliance, or upon expiration of the period fixed by the Board for compliance, whichever first occurs, the Board shall again review the matter, and shall give both the complainant and the Group A member a reasonable opportunity to be heard. If after such review, the Board determines that the Group A member has brought itself into compliance, the matter shall be at an end. If the Board determines that the Group A member is not in compliance, it shall then either (i) suspend the Group A member from U.S.O.C. membership (during which suspension the Group A member shall not be entitled to the privileges of membership) or (ii) recommend to the House of Delegates that membership of the Group A member be terminated. In the event of suspension, the Group A member shall be entitled to reinstatement only upon presentation of evidence to the Board that it is in compliance with all criteria for Group A membership set forth in Article III hereof, and in compliance with, or prepared to comply with, the criterion forming the basis of the original complaint.

(a) In the event a matter arising under this Section is referred to the Executive Board for hearing, the President with the approval of the Administrative Committee may, if he believes it will serve the interest of expeditious consideration of the complaint, appoint a hearing panel of not less than five members of the Board to hear evidence on the complaint. If appointed, such a panel shall include one U.S.O.C. officer (who shall chair the panel), two Board representatives of Group A member organizations, one Board representative of an individual Group A member organization, and one athlete who has been elected to the Board by the Athletes' Advisory Council; and shall not include any member of the Board having a direct interest, either personally or by virtue of organizational affiliation, in the outcome of the matter. A panel so appointed shall convene as expeditiously as possible; shall hear the evidence presented by the parties to the matter and shall prepare and submit a full written report (i) summarizing such evidence for the Board and (ii) forwarding to the Board any written materials desired by the parties to the matter. Upon receipt of such report and materials, the Board may elect to receive further written or oral evidence or presentations, or may decide its action on the matter on the basis of the report and materials submitted by the panel.

Section 6. (a) Any national amateur sports organization seeking to replace an incumbent as the Group A member for a particular Olympic or Pan American sport may initiate a formal proceeding for recognition by the UCOA as the national governing body for that sport by filing a written application within one year after the termination of the summer Olympic Games provided that, if two or more organizations file applications for the same sport, then in that event such applications shall be considered in a single proceeding.

(b) The application shall be addressed to the United States Olympic Committee and shall be forwarded by registered mail to the attention of the Executive Director. It shall contain the name and address of the organization filing the application and of its principal officers, and shall include a sworn statement by an authorized officer or agent, attesting to the truth of the allegations of the facts therein set forth. The application must allege with particularity: (i) that the incumbent Group A member does not comply with one or more specific requirements for Group A
membership, as set forth in Article III, or does not fulfill one or more specific obligations imposed upon Group A members by Section 4 of this Article; (ii) that the applicant has made a bona fide effort to persuade the incumbent to correct such deficiency, including filing of a complaint under Section 5 of this Article; (iii) that the applicant is prepared to show to the USOC that it is better qualified than the incumbent to comply with the membership requirements and obligations; and (iv) that due notice of the initiation of the proceeding under this Section has been given to the incumbent Group A member, by mailing to it, by registered or certified mail, a copy of this application. (If two or more applications for the same sport are filed with the USOC within a period of thirty (30) days, each applicant shall be entitled to make a copy of the other applications for its own use.)

(c) Upon receipt of an application under this Section, the Executive Director, after consultation with the Counselor, shall determine whether in his judgment the application on its face satisfies in full the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) above. In the event that it does not, he shall reject the application and notify the applicant that the application will be null and void unless the defects are cured in full within the succeeding ten (10) days; but such rejection shall be without prejudice to the filing of a new application within the time limit specified in paragraph (a). Once the application is determined fully in order, the Executive Board shall, as soon as practicable, hold a hearing at which the applicant and the incumbent shall each be given a reasonable opportunity to present evidence relative to their respective compliance with the criteria for Group A membership as set forth in Article III and their respective ability or willingness to fulfill the obligations imposed upon Group A members by Section 4 of this Article. The Executive Board shall consider the evidence and promptly determine the recommendation that it will make to the House of Delegates with respect to the matter, as follows: (i) to uphold the right of the incumbent to continue as the Group A member for its sport; or (ii) to terminate the incumbent’s Group A membership and declare a vacancy in the Group A membership for that sport; or (iii) to determine the incumbent’s Group A membership and elect the applicant (or one of them if there are more than one) to Group A membership for that sport. And of the foregoing recommendations may be made conditional upon the incumbent’s taking of remedial action, or its failure to take remedial action, within the time limits specified by the Board. The Executive Board shall, as soon as possible, by registered or certified mail, notify the applicant or applicants and the incumbent of its recommendation.

(d) If a party to the proceeding considers itself aggrieved by the Board’s recommendation, or by the subsequent failure of the House of Delegates to follow the Board’s recommendation, it may within thirty (30) days after either action submit a claim to the American Arbitration Association, with copy to the other party and the USOC, for binding arbitration under the conditions stated in Section 7 of this Article. No action on the matter shall be taken by the Board or the House of Delegates while the arbitration is pending.

(e) By maintaining membership in the USOC, each Group A member agrees to submit, on demand, to arbitration as provided herein. By making application under the terms of this section, an applicant for Group A membership agrees to submit, on demand, to arbitration as provided herein.

(f) If the final arbitration award upholds the claim of a national amateur sports organization to replace the incumbent as the national governing body for its sport, such organization shall be deemed elected to Group A membership in the USOC and the Group A membership of the incumbent shall be deemed
terminated, without further action by the House of Delegates. The USOC shall, within sixty (60) days after such award, recommend and support in any other appropriate manner the new Group A center to the appropriate international sports federation for recognition by such federations as the United States governing body in that sport, any provision to the contrary in Article III, Section 3, notwithstanding. Such action shall include, without limitation, formally advising such federation of the decision of the USOC and recommending acceptance of such action by the federation as well.

Section 7. The arbitration proceeding pursuant to Section 6 shall be subject to the following conditions:

(a) The arbitration shall proceed under the commercial rules of the American Arbitration Association, except as modified herein or by agreement of the parties, before a panel of not less than three (3) arbitrators.

(b) The USOC shall be entitled to notice of, and to representation as an observer at, all stages of the arbitration proceeding, but, except as USOC representatives may be called as witnesses at a request of any party or the arbitrators, shall not actively participate in the proceeding.

(c) The arbitrators shall use their best efforts to complete the arbitration within one year after the date of filing of a demand therefor, consistent with the requirement that the parties each be accorded reasonable time to prepare and present their respective case.

(d) The party demanding the arbitration shall have the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence: (i) that it satisfies, better than the other party, the criteria for Group A membership set forth in Article III hereof, and (ii) that it is able and willing, better than the other party, to fulfill the obligations imposed upon Group A centers by Section 6 of this Article; provided that neither party may cite, with respect to the other party, a deficiency that was caused or brought about the action of the first party.

(e) If the arbitrators are satisfied that either party is entitled to prevail over the other, but a final award is not appropriate because of minor deficiencies which in their opinion can be remedied within a reasonable time, the arbitrators may make a conditional award in favor of such party, to become final if the deficiencies are remedied within the time specified by the arbitrators. If at the expiration of the specified time, or any reasonable extension thereof, the arbitrators are satisfied that the conditions of the award have been met, the award shall become final. If, on the other hand, the arbitrators are of the view that there has not been timely compliance, they may modify or reverse the conditional award and may, in their discretion, direct that a final award be entered in favor of the other party.

(f) The arbitrators shall be empowered to attempt to cause the parties to settle their differences, without the necessity of a final arbitration award. Unless such settlement is inconsistent with the terms of the USOC Commissions charter, this Constitution, or the published rules of the International Olympic Committee, it shall be recognized by the USOC.

(g) The arbitral award shall be binding upon the parties thereto and, unless the award is inconsistent with the terms of the USOC Commission charter, this Constitution, or the published rules of the International Olympic Committee, upon the USOC.

(This amendment shall not be applicable to any controversy pending at the time of its adoption.)
ARTICLE VI—House of Delegates

Section 1. The House of Delegates of the U.S.O.C. shall have the authority to elect the officers of the U.S.O.C. and to remove the same by cause; to enact, amend, or repeal the by-laws; to admit new members, to reclassify and to terminate the membership of members as provided in Article VI to receive and review the reports of the Executive Board, of the Administrative Committee, of the Executive Director, and of all committees or other persons, concerning the activities of the U.S.O.C.; to amend the Constitution as provided in Article XXIII; and to take such other action as is customary and proper for the members of a corporation.

Section 2. Each member organization of the U.S.O.C. shall be entitled to representation at any meeting of the House of Delegates thereof by the number of delegates allotted to such member by Article XIII hereof and a like number of alternates to act in place of such delegates if absent. A lesser number of delegates present may cast the full number of votes to which such member is thus entitled, but any member not represented by at least one (1) delegate shall not be entitled to a vote at such meeting. No delegates or alternates may vote by proxy. Members in arrears in payment of dues shall not be entitled to representation or vote.

Section 3. If at any meeting of the House of Delegates two (2) or more delegates representing a member organization should fail to agree upon a question pending before the meeting, the total vote to which such member may be entitled under the provisions of this Constitution shall be counted in ratio to such difference.

Section 4. Any member organization of the U.S.O.C. may at any time, on written notice to the Executive Director of the U.S.O.C., withdraw any or all of its delegates or alternate and substitute a like number of delegates or alternates for those withdrawn.

Section 5. No delegate and no alternate shall be entitled to represent more than one (1) member organization of the U.S.O.C. No delegate and no alternate shall be entitled to represent any member organization of the U.S.O.C. unless he or she is an officer of a member of the governing board thereof or has been duly appointed by the member whose credentials he or she holds. All delegates and alternates must present their credentials to the U.S.O.C. through its Secretary no less than thirty (30) days prior to the date of the meeting.

Section 6. The following individuals shall be entitled to attend meetings of the House of Delegates, to participate in the deliberations, and to vote therein, except as hereinafter provided:

(a) Each International Olympic Committee member for the United States, and the U.S. member of the Executive Committee of the Pan American Sports Organization shall each be entitled to one (1) vote.

(b) Past officers of the U.S.O.C. or its predecessor organization, any current officers of the U.S.O.C. shall each be entitled to one (1) vote unless they are qualified to vote under another provision of the Constitution.

(c) The Counselor, the Executive Director, and the chairmen of constitutional or standing committees appointed or approved by the Executive Board, during the period of their active service in their respective capacities, shall have a voice in the deliberations of the House of Delegates but shall have no vote unless they are qualified to vote under another provision of the Constitution.

ARTICLE VII—Committee on Credentials

Section 1. Prior to any meeting of the House of Delegates, the Administrative Committee shall appoint a Committee on Credentials consisting of the Secretary of the U.S.O.C. and four (4) other persons. Subject to approval by this Committee, the Executive Director shall make up a roll of the member organizations entitled to representation at the forthcoming meeting, with the names of the delegates and alternates accredited by such member.
organizations, and of the names of individuals entitled to vote at such meeting.

Section 2. No delegate or alternate shall be eligible to represent an organization at any meeting unless he or she be certified to that effect by the Committee on Credentials, or admitted to the meeting by a majority of votes cast by the duly accredited delegates of the House of Delegates at such meeting.

Section 3. A decision of the Committee on Credentials denying voting rights to an individual at any meeting may be reversed by a majority of votes cast by the duly accredited delegates at such meeting.

ARTICLE VIII—Officers

Section 1. The honorary officers of the U.S.O.C. shall be an Honorary President and two or more Honorary Vice Presidents, as may be determined from time to time by a majority vote of the Executive Board.

Section 2. (a) The officers of the U.S.O.C. shall be a President, a First Vice President, a Second Vice President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. These officers shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast at the Quadrennial Meeting of the House of Delegates.

(b) There may also be Presidents Emeriti who shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast at the Quadrennial Meeting.

Section 3. (a) At least six months prior to the Quadrennial Meeting, a Nominating Committee of nine (9) members who are not currently officers shall be elected by the Executive Board on the recommendation of the Administrative Committee to propose a slate of officers for the next quadrennial period. At least one member of the Committee shall be an athlete who has competed on a United States national team in the Olympic or the Pan American Games or other major international competition within the past ten (10) years.

(b) The members of the Nominating Committee shall be generally representative of the various constituencies of the U.S.O.C. and shall elect their own chairman. They may not accept nomination for any office.

(c) The nominations by the Nominating Committee shall be filed with the Executive Director at least ninety (90) days, and shall be mailed to the members of the U.S.O.C. at least seventy-five (75) days, prior to the date of the Quadrennial Meeting. Additional nominations may be made by petition signed by five (5) or more organizations entitled to representation on the Executive Board, provided such nominations are filed with the Executive Director at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date set for the Quadrennial Meeting.

(d) The Executive Director shall include all nominations for officers, indicating by whom nominated, as a part of official notice and agenda mailed to members of the U.S.O.C. at least thirty (30) days before the Quadrennial Meeting.

(e) In case of a nominee’s withdrawal, death, or inability to stand for election, nominations for the office affected shall be accepted from the Nominating Committee, and/or from the floor if endorsed by five (5) organizations entitled to representation on the Executive Board.

(f) A person who has been duly elected President at a Quadrennial Meeting and is serving in that capacity, shall be ineligible for nomination and re-election at the next succeeding Quadrennial Meeting.

Section 4. The term of all officers (except honorary officers) shall run until the next Quadrennial Meeting of the House of Delegates succeeding their election or until the election and qualification of their successors.

Section 5. In the event of death, disability, or resignation of any officer, the office shall be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term by a majority vote of the Executive Board.
Article IX-- Executive Board

Section 1. The Executive Board shall have general charge of the business, affairs, and activities of the U.S.O.C. and shall define the policies to be followed in carrying out the purposes and objects of the U.S.O.C. as set forth in the Act of Congress creating the U.S.O.C. and in the Constitution, by-laws and General Rules of the U.S.O.C.

Section 2. The Executive Board shall consist of the following directors who shall each have one (1) vote, unless otherwise herein provided:

(a) The President, the Immediate Past President, the Vice Presidents, the Secretary, and the Treasurer of the U.S.O.C.

(b) The International Olympic Committee's members for the United States and the United States member of the Executive Committee of the Pan American Sports Organization.

(c) Two (2) directors to be elected or appointed in writing by the members of Group A which are recognized as the national governing bodies for Athletics (track and field) and Swimming (including diving, water polo, and synchronized swimming), and one (1) director to be elected or appointed in writing by each of the other members of Group A. Each of the Directors designated by national governing bodies in the Olympic sports shall be entitled to two (2) votes.

(d) One (1) director to be elected or appointed in writing by each of the members in Group B.

(e) One (1) director to be elected by the members of Group C at the Quadrennial Meeting, provided that this group at that time consists of five (5) or more member organizations.

(f) One (1) director to be elected by the members of Group D at the Quadrennial Meeting.

(g) Six (6) directors who have been competing athletes as members of a United States national team in the Olympic or Pan American Games or other major international competition within the preceding ten (10) years to be elected by the Athletes' Advisory Council in a manner prescribed in the by-laws. Furthermore, in the event that the total membership of the Executive Board, including the aforementioned directors, shall consist of less than 20% of athletes who have competed as members of a United States national team within the ten (10) preceding years, as hereinbefore provided, the Athletes' Advisory Council shall be entitled to elect additional directors in a number sufficient to insure that not less than 20% of the total membership of the Executive Board shall consist of athletes who have competed within the preceding ten (10) years as members of a United States national team in the Olympic or Pan American Games or other major international competition.

Section 3. The honorary officers, presidents emeriti, Counselor, Executive Director, and Chairmen of constitutional, standing, or special committees, shall be entitled to attend meetings of the Executive Board with voice but without vote.

Section 4. (a) Except as herein otherwise provided, each director shall take office at the Quadrennial Meeting of the House of Delegates and shall serve until such time as his or her successor shall have been elected or appointed in the manner prescribed in this Article.

(b) In the event the same person should be named to two (2) or more positions on the Executive Board, he or she shall be entitled to hold only one (1) such position, to be chosen by him or her, and the other position or positions shall be declared vacant.

(c) A vacancy in the Executive Board membership in classes (c) or (d) above may be created at any time upon written notice to the Secretary by action of the organization which elected or appointed the member, and such vacancy may be filled in the same manner. Action under this section with respect to classes (e) and (f) shall be taken by Group C and Group D members only at the time of a
meeting of the House of Delegates. Action by the Athletes' Advisory Council shall be taken in the manner prescribed in the by-laws. Action with respect to class (q) shall be taken by the Athletes' Advisory Council in the manner prescribed in the by-laws.

(d) In case of the temporary absence of an Executive Board member in classes (c) through (g) above, an alternate designated by the original electing or appointing organization within notice to the Secretary may attend a meeting of the Board and exercise therein all the privileges of the absent member.

Section 5. The President shall act as Chairman of the Board; in his absence the First Vice President shall preside; in the absence of the President and First Vice President, the Second Vice President shall preside; and in the absence of the President, and of the First and Second Vice Presidents, the Third Vice President shall preside. If neither the President nor a Vice President is present, the Executive board may choose a presiding officer.

ARTICLE XI--Administrative Committee

Section 1. The Administrative Committee, under the chairmanship of the President of the U.S.O.C., shall have the responsibility for supervising the conduct of the daily affairs of the U.S.O.C. according to the policy guidelines prescribed by the Executive Board, and shall perform such other duties as may be assigned to it in the Constitution, By-Laws and General Rules of the U.S.O.C. or by resolution of the House of Delegates or the Executive Board.

Section 2. The Administrative Committee shall consist of the officers of the U.S.O.C. and five (5) other voting members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Executive Board. The appointed members need not be members of the Executive Board, but shall be selected as follows:

(a) The directors of Group A shall elect a panel of six (6) candidates from organizations in Group A other than those with which any officer may be or have been affiliated, and the President shall select two (2) from this panel.

(b) The directors from Group B shall elect a panel of three (3) candidates from organizations in Group B other than those with which any officer may be or have been affiliated, and the President shall select one (1) from this panel.

(c) The directors named to the Board by the Athletes' Advisory Council shall select a panel of six (6) athletes who have competed on a United States national team in the Olympic or Pan American Games or other major international competition within the last ten (10) years, and the President shall select two (2) from this panel.

Section 3. The Immediate Past President, the IOC and F.A.O.O. members on the Executive Board, the Councilor, and the chairman of the Investments and Finance Committees, shall likewise be entitled to attend meetings of the Administrative Committee with voice but without vote. The Executive Director shall serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee.

ARTICLE XI--By-Laws and General Rules

By-Laws of the U.S.O.C. not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution, may be enacted, amended or repealed by a majority vote at any meeting of the House of Delegates or of the Executive Board, provided the prescribed prior notice shall have been given. The Executive Board may also adopt General Rules of procedure, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution or of the By-Laws, for itself and for the various committees of the U.S.O.C. with binding effect upon all persons in any way connected with the activities of the U.S.O.C.
ARTICLE XII—Meetings of House of Delegates

Section 1. The quadrennial meeting of the House of Delegates shall be held not less than two months and not more than six months after the close of the Olympic Games. Other regular meetings shall be held annually thereafter, between November 1 of one year and April 30 of the following year.

(b) The Administrative Committee, subject to the approval of the Executive Board, shall decide the place and time of such meetings. The Executive Director shall send to all members of the U.S.O.C. notice of such meetings together with an agenda thereof, and such notice shall be sent at least thirty (30) days before the date of the meeting.

Section 2. Special meetings of the House of Delegates may be called by the President, directly or through the Executive Director, on sixty (60) days written notice to each member, and must be called by the President or the Secretary when asked for by members having in the aggregate a number of votes equal to the majority of the total vote of the House of Delegates as set down in Article XIII.

ARTICLE XIII—Action at Meetings

Section 1. A quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the House of Delegates shall consist of a majority of the total vote of the U.S.O.C. membership as set down in Article XIII.

Section 2. A quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Executive Board or of any constitutional, standing or special committee shall consist of a majority of the individual members of the Executive Board or Committees.

Section 3. Actions taken at a meeting of the House of Delegates or its Executive Board, shall become effective immediately following the adjournment of the meeting, except as otherwise provided in the Constitution or By-Laws or when a definite effective date be recited in the record of the action taken.

ARTICLE XIV—Transacting Business by Mail or Telegraph

The House of Delegates and the Executive Board shall have the power to transact their respective business by mail or telegraph, if in the judgment of the President the urgency of the case requires such action; but if a majority of the total vote of the House of Delegates as set forth in Article XIII, or of the Executive Board indicate their unwillingness to decide such a matter in such manner, the President must call a meeting of the House of Delegates or of the Executive Board to determine the question at issue.

ARTICLE XV—Counselor

Section 1. There shall be a Counselor who shall act as the chief legal advisor of the U.S.O.C. and its officers, directors, and committees. He shall be nominated by the Administrative Committee and elected by a majority vote of the Executive Board.

Section 2. The Counselor shall be eligible to attend the meetings of the House of Delegates, or its Executive Board or its Administrative Committee and to act in an advisory capacity therein, including initiating advice whenever he deems it desirable; but he shall be ineligible to serve as a director and he shall have no right to vote or make motions.

ARTICLE XVI—Executive Director

Section 1. There shall be an Executive Director who shall serve as the chief administrative official of the U.S.O.C. He shall be nominated by the Administrative Committee and elected by a majority vote of the Executive
Board for a term ending with the next Quadrennial Meeting and he shall serve until his successor is elected. He may be removed at any time with or without cause by majority vote of the Board, without prejudice to his contract rights.

Section 2. All official notices or other correspondence intended for the U.S.O.C., its Executive Board or Administrative Committee, or any of its officers or committees, may be addressed in care of the Executive Director, who will be responsible for proper attention thereto.

Section 3. The Executive Director shall devote his entire time and services to the affairs of the U.S.O.C. and shall not engage in any other profession or employment. He shall receive such salary and other benefits as may be recommended by the Administrative Committee and approved by the Executive Board.

Section 4. The Executive Director shall not have the status of an officer of the U.S.O.C., but shall be entitled to attend all meetings of the House of Delegates and of the Executive Board and shall be a non-voting member of all the U.S.O.C. committees. In addition, the Executive Board may designate the Executive Director as the Secretary-General of the U.S.O.C. for all purposes for which such title is customarily used by the International Olympic Committee and other international sports organizations.

ARTICLE XVII—Athletes’ Advisory Council

Section 1. There shall be an Athletes’ Advisory Council consisting of those athletes serving as members of the Executive Board and such additional athletes, at least one from each sport in which the United States is represented at the Olympic and Pan American Games, as are elected to broaden communication between the U.S.O.C. and currently active athletes, and to serve as a source of opinion and advice to the Executive Board with regard to both current and contemplated policies of the U.S.O.C.

Section 2. Election to membership in the Council shall be made in accordance with provisions of the By-Laws. Elected athletes shall serve until the next Quadrennial Meeting or until their successors are elected.

ARTICLE XVIII—Budget and Audit Committee

Section 1. There shall be a Budget and Audit Committee appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board in the manner provided in the By-Laws.

Section 2. The responsibilities of the Budget and Audit Committee shall be as follows:

(a) To transmit the Quadrennial Budget of income and expense for the U.S.O.C. for approval by the Executive Board.
(b) To monitor performance of the operating units of the U.S.O.C., on both income and expense, in relation to the budget approved by the Executive Board;
(c) To prepare annual or other periodic recommendations for modification of the budget if necessary, for approval of the Executive Board;
(d) To audit, with appropriate professional assistance, the accounts of the U.S.O.C., and to make annual reports thereon to the Executive Board and the House of Delegates.

ARTICLE XIX—Finance Committee

Section 1. There shall be a Finance Committee appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board in the manner provided in the By-Laws.
Section 3. The responsibilities of the Finance Committee shall be as follows:

(a) To recommend to the Executive Board, and thereafter to monitor, the policies and procedures to be followed by the United States Olympic Committee in its fund-raising effort.

(b) To coordinate the efforts of the State Olympic Organizations (Group D members) to the extent that they relate to fund-raising activities.

Section 3. The responsibilities of the Committee shall be discharged in accordance with the policies prescribed by the Executive Board as set forth in the By-Laws and General Rules of the United States Olympic Committee.

ARTICLE XX—Investment Committee

There shall be an Investment Committee consisting of three members appointed by the President with the approval of the Executive Board; the Chairman thereof shall be appointed in like manner. The Committee shall serve until the next Quadrennial Meeting. It shall have responsibility for the management, in consultation with the Administrative Committee, of the invested funds of the U.S.O.C., and shall discharge such other duties and responsibilities as shall be assigned to it by the Administrative Committee or the Executive Board.

ARTICLE XXI—Committee on Development

Section 1. There shall be a Committee on Development appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board in accordance with the provisions of the By-Laws.

Section 2. The responsibilities of the Committee on Development shall be as follows:

(a) To foster the long-term development, in cooperation with national governing bodies and other organizations, of an adequate pool of world-class athletes in each sport on the programs of the Olympic and Pan American Games, from which may be selected competent representatives of the United States in such Games.

(b) To foster the closest possible cooperation between the national governing bodies and private or public organizations, such as academic institutions, non-academic centers, and government agencies, which may contribute to the building and maintenance of improved physical facilities for training and competition, to the upgrading of coaching skills, and similar matters.

Section 3. The responsibilities of the Committee shall be discharged in accordance with the policies prescribed by the Executive Board as set forth in the By-Laws and General Rules of the United States Olympic Committee.

ARTICLE XXII—Games Preparation Committee

Section 1. There shall be a Games Preparation Committee appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board in accordance with the provisions of the By-Laws.

Section 2. The responsibilities of the Games Preparation Committee shall be as follows:

(a) To recommend to the Executive Board, and thereafter to monitor, the policies and procedures to be followed by the U.S.O.C. in selecting, equipping, transporting, and generally providing administrative and technical support to the official U.S. delegation to the Pan American and Olympic Games.

(b) To analyze and evaluate the programs and procedures proposed by the national governing bodies for the selection of athletes and team officials to be recommended for final appointment to the Olympic or Pan American Teams, and to make an appropriate report to the Board before such programs and procedures are adopted.

(c) To keep in constant touch with the national governing bodies and to monitor the operation of the athlete selection system for at least six months.
prior to the opening of the Pan American Games in the case of sports on the Pan American program; for at least twelve months prior to the opening of the Winter Games in the case of winter sports; and for at least twelve months prior to the opening of the Olympic Games for sports which are not on the Pan American Program.

Section 1. The responsibilities of the Committee shall be discharged in accordance with the policies prescribed by the Executive Board as set forth in the By-Laws and General Rules of the United States Olympic Committee.

Section 4. The Committee shall make periodic reports to the Executive Board on the effectiveness of the work of the national governing bodies in the selection of athletes and team officials for the Games, and shall make recommendations for remedial action immediately upon the discovery of any serious weakness therein.

ARTICLE XXIII—Relations with National Sports Governing Bodies

Section 1. Subject to the general supervision, direction and approval of the Executive Board, each of the Group A members shall have the primary authority and responsibility for selecting and nominating athletes and team officials for its sport for final appointment by the Executive Board to the United States Olympic or Pan American teams. The program of tryouts or other competitions for the selection of athletes and the plan or method of selecting managers, coaches, and other team officials, and any material modifications thereof, shall be submitted to the Games Preparation Committee for analysis and review and then for Executive Board approval before they become effective. All business arrangements for Olympic tryouts or other Olympic events shall be approved in advance by the Administrative Committee and shall be subject to confirmation by the Executive Board.

Section 2. The president and secretary of the national sports governing bodies, or other persons designated in place thereof, for each sport on the program of the forthcoming Olympic and Pan American Games, shall serve as liaison with the U.S.O.C. on the work of the national sports governing body in the selection and nomination of athletes and team officials, and all other activities related to the Olympic effort, this liaison shall be concerned primarily with coordinating these activities with those of the U.S.O.C. Development Committee, Games Preparation Committee, and the Executive Director and his staff, in accordance with such regulations and guidelines as are set forth in the By-Laws of the U.S.O.C.

ARTICLE XXIV—Sports Medicine Committee

Section 1. There shall be a Sports Medicine Committee appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board in the manner provided in the By-Laws.

Section 2. The responsibilities of the Committee on Sports Medicine shall be as follows:

(a) To promote research in, and the practical application of, all aspects of Sports Medicine;

(b) To receive, evaluate and serve as a central depository for all studies and prepared papers on Sports Medicine and related matters;

(c) To provide—through clinics, workshops, text books and literature—a continuing education program in Sports Medicine for physicians, athletes, coaches, and trainers;

(d) To establish liaison with federal, state and local government programs dealing with Sports Medicine and sports equipment.

Section 3. The responsibilities of the Committee shall be discharged in accordance with the policies prescribed by the Executive Board as set forth in the By-Laws and General Rules of the United States Olympic Committee.
ARTICLE XXV—International Olympic Academy Committee

The International Olympic Academy Committee shall be appointed by the President and approved by the Executive Board within six (6) months after the Quadrennial Meeting and shall serve until the next Quadrennial Meeting. The members of the Committee shall include at least two (2) members of the Board of Directors and not less than three (3) other United States citizens who have achieved distinction in a field related to the philosophy of the Olympic Games, such as the history of the ancient and modern Games, sport and the fine arts, sport psychology and medicine, sport education and administration.

The Committee's responsibility shall be to formulate and recommend to the Board policies and plans for the participation of the United States in the program of the International Olympic Academy with headquarters at Olympia, Greece, and to take such action with respect thereto as the Board may direct.

The Committee shall, in addition, be responsible for developing and implementing, with the approval of the Board, those activities under the auspices of the U.S.O.C., which are designed to promote the spirit of Olympism and to encourage widespread participation of citizens of the United States in the Olympic movement.

ARTICLE XXVI—Standing Committees

The President, with the approval of the Executive Board, shall have power to appoint a Committee on Legislation, a Committee on Membership, a Committee on Eligibility, a Committee on Apparel, Supplies and Equipment, a Committee on Food and Lodging, a Committee on Transportation, a Committee on Medical and Training Services, a Games Site Selection Committee, and such other standing or special committees as may be deemed necessary, and to prescribe the respective duties and privileges of such committees.

ARTICLE XXVII—Financial Authority and Responsibility

Section 1. The Executive Board shall have the authority and the right to delegate authority to solicit, collect, or receive funds for the support of the activities of the U.S.O.C. and for financing the participation of the United States in the Olympic Games and the Pan American Games.

Section 2. The Executive Board shall have authority and the right to delegate authority to distribute funds of the U.S.O.C. for the support of its activities and for financing the participation of the United States in the Olympic Games and in the Pan American Games.

Section 3. All officers, directors, and members of committees of the U.S.O.C. shall act and serve without compensation in the aid of the educational purposes of the U.S.O.C. described in Article II, except as otherwise specifically provided in the Constitution or By-Laws.

Section 4. No individual officer, director or member of a committee of the U.S.O.C. shall be personally liable in respect of any debt or other obligation incurred in the name of the U.S.O.C. or any of its committees pursuant to authority granted directly or indirectly by the Executive Board. The Board shall adopt a standard form of contract restricting recourse for payment to the assets of the U.S.O.C.

ARTICLE XXVIII—Amendments to the Constitution

Section 1. Amendments to this Constitution may be made by two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast at a regularly called meeting of the House of Delegates and shall take effect at the close of such meeting, or at such earlier or later time as may be specified in the resolution approving the amendment.

Section 2. All proposed amendments must be submitted to the Executive Director in writing at least sixty (60) days before the meeting and then considered by the Executive board, and all
proposed amendments, together with the vote or recommendation of the Board thereon, shall be mailed by the Executive Director to each member of the U.S.O.C. in at least such number as shall represent the number of delegates to which such member is entitled. These proposed amendments and vote or recommendation of the Board shall be distributed to such members not later than thirty (30) days before the date of the meeting.

Except for such proposed amendments as are to sent out, no other amendment shall be considered, nor shall any proposed amendment to an amendment as proposed be considered unless the same merely goes to the form and not to the substance thereof. Nevertheless, if more than one amendment has been proposed on the same subject matter, and there are substantive differences between such amendments, the meeting may, after due consideration of such proposals, adopt a compromise of substance as well as form; and if the adoption of an amendment as proposed or amended or compromised is inconsistent or in conflict with other parts of the Constitution, the meeting may adopt conforming amendments appropriate to the case.

Section 3. Not later than thirty (30) days before the date of any meeting of the U.S.O.C. at which Constitutional amendments are to be considered, a notice shall be published in a newspaper or magazine of national circulation, or in a publication published by or on behalf of the corporation, setting forth the substance of the proposed amendments, the time and place of the corporation's meeting at which such amendments are to be voted upon, and a provision informing interested persons that they may submit materials for consideration by the corporation at such meeting by delivering to the Secretary, not less than five (5) days before the meeting, written data, views or arguments concerning the proposed amendments. The Secretary in his or her sole discretion shall determine whether or not an interested person may be invited to make any additional written or oral presentation for consideration at the meeting, and shall mail to all persons who submit material under this section a copy of any amendment that may be adopted at the meeting.

Section 4. Amendments to this Constitution may also be made pursuant to Article XIV, Transacting Business by Mail or Telegraph, provided that the proposed amendments are distributed to the members, together with a statement of the reasons for the vote by mail or telegraph. Members will have twenty (20) days from the date of mailing of the amendments to file with the U.S.O.C. written comments, for or against the amendments. Thereafter, the amendments, together with the comments submitted, shall be distributed to the members at least fifteen (15) days prior to the last date at which votes will be received and counted. Amendments proposed under this Section may be adopted upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of all votes entitled to be cast at a meeting of the House of Delegates and shall be effective as of the closing date for the casting of votes, or at such later date as may be specified in the proposal.

ARTICLE XXIX—Saving Clause

Failure of literal or complete compliance with provisions of the Constitution or By-Laws in respect of dates and times of notice, or the sending or receipt of the same, or errors in phraseology of notice of proposals, which in the judgment of the members at meetings held do not cause substantial injury to the rights of members, shall not invalidate the actions or proceedings of the members at any meeting.