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Research Background

Organizational studies in sports

Theory:
• Organizational theory
  • Institutional theory
  • Social network theory
• Collaborative governance

Methods:
• Qualitative
• Quantitative
• Network approaches

Theme #1: Institutional & organizational change

Theme #2: Inter-organizational relationships & collaboration

Contexts:
• Concussions in sports
• Event leveraging and legacy delivery
• Corporate Social Responsibility


Sport Policy Institutionalization: Examining the Adoption of Concussion Legislation Across States

Theoretical Motivation

Institutional studies in SM

What’s been studied

- Adoption of new sport practices/structures among sport orgs (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001)
- How broader field-level pressures lead to homogeneity among sport orgs (Vos et al., 2011)

What’s missing

- Adoption of new sport policies across geographic boundaries (e.g., states, provinces)
- How local community-level pressures influence variation in sport policy adoption
Research Focus

Research question:

– What institutional factors influence the adoption of sport policies across geographic boundaries?

– Focus on the effects of disruptive events, state norms, local advocacy, and inter-state networks on the speed of concussion legislation adoption
Theory and Hypotheses

Institutional trigger: Disruptive events

• Definition: Initiating events that can “sharply end what has become locked in by institutional inertia” (Hoffman, 1999, p.353)

• Provide opportunities for creating new policies or practices (Meyer, 1982)

• H1: States with high-profile youth sport concussion incidents will adopt youth sport concussion legislation sooner.
Theory and Hypotheses

Cultural pressure: State norms

• Definition: Institutionally-prescribed norms, ideologies, or values that affect or constrain organizational behavior (Scott, 2001)

• Empirical indicators
  – State policy innovativeness (Boehmke & Skinner, 2012)
  – State culture of youth safety

• \textit{H2a}: The greater the policy innovativeness within a state, the sooner a state will adopt a youth sport concussion legislation.

• \textit{H2b}: The greater the number of youth safety policies adopted within a state, the sooner a state will adopt youth sport concussion legislation.
Theory and Hypotheses

Political pressure: Local advocacy

- Definition: Advocacy refers to “the mobilization of political support through social persuasion” (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p.221)
- Advocacy efforts can affect the “speed at which the political system addresses problems” (Reid, 2006, p.345)
- **H3: The greater the concussion advocacy resources, the sooner a state will adopt youth sport concussion legislation.**
Social pressure: Inter-state networks

- Social pressure can operate through networks among organizations, including state legislatures (Vogus & Davis, 2005)
- Geographical proximity (Davis & Greve, 1997)
- Neighboring states may be used as a reference to determine what is legitimate and appropriate (Berry & Berry, 1990)
- \textit{H4: The greater the proportion of neighboring states’ adoption, the sooner a state will adopt a youth sport concussion legislation.}
## Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>48 states, 154 observations, 2009-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td>Probability that a state adopted the legislation during calendar years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td>Disruptive events, state’s policy innovativeness, state’s culture for youth safety, local advocacy, neighboring states’ adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Fiscal health, party control, state population, NFL teams, football participation rate, soccer participation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Survival analysis, Cox proportional hazard model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
<td>Interviews with key actors involved in the legislation process; archival documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Cox Regression of Concussion Legislation Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive events</td>
<td>0.99** (0.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97** (0.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30*** (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy innovativeness</td>
<td>2.70*** (0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27*** (0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71** (1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture for youth safety</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33* (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.37* (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77* (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring state adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12 (0.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21 (0.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.83 (1.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State population</td>
<td>0.000 (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.003 (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFL teams</td>
<td>0.07 (0.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.67* (0.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football rate</td>
<td>-199.44 (132.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-254.46+ (133.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer rate</td>
<td>113.84 (121.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likelihood ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>-138.15</td>
<td>-135.67</td>
<td>-139.50</td>
<td>-139.77</td>
<td>-138.18</td>
<td>-132.83</td>
<td>-128.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald x</td>
<td>7.00**</td>
<td>12.28**</td>
<td>5.16*</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>23.89***</td>
<td>41.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Significance tests are two tailed for controls and one tailed for hypothesized effects. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. NFL = National Football League.

*p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
### Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disruptive events (DEs)</strong></td>
<td>Function as triggers; create social pressures and direct activists’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader innovative norms</strong></td>
<td>Broader innovative norms may shape receptivity to adopt new sport policies more consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Actors outside the decision-making entity may significantly shape a new sport policy adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy &amp; DEs</strong></td>
<td>Disruptive events can be leveraged by strategic actors to propel the passage of new sport policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-state networks</strong></td>
<td>Consider the conjoint influence of intra- and inter-state factors on sport policy adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local institutional context</strong></td>
<td>Consider the local institutional context as a source of opportunities for sponsoring change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical Implications

• Relevant to other countries seeking for concussion policy changes
  • Canada
  • Australia
  • New Zealand
  • ……

• Relevant to other sport policy changes, including those related to athlete safety
  • Heat acclimatization
  • Preventing cardiac arrest death
  • Preventing abuse of athletes
### What’s Next?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme #1</th>
<th>Institutional &amp; organizational change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line #1: Organizational translation of institutional change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical context/case: Concussion in sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #2: Effect of multilevel institutional, inter-, and intra-organizational factors on the establishment of new sport practices/structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical context/case: Development of collegiate esports programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme #2</th>
<th>IORs &amp; collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line #3: Governance of event-leveraging and/or legacy delivery partnership in post-Games era</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical context/case: Ontario Parasport Collective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #4: Network analysis of IORs and partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical context/case: Ontario Parasport Collective; sport-community partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Philosophy

**Higher Purpose:**
How sports can become a power for social change?

**Philosophy & Approaches:**
- Experiential learning
- Use diverse approaches to keep students’ attention
- Bridging theory and practice

**Ultimate Value:**
Turn knowledge into actions and make an impact!
Mentoring Philosophy

Higher Purpose: How sports can become a power for social change?

Philosophy & Approaches:
• Develop mentor-mentee relationship from an early stage (e.g., initial interview)
• Set expectations and make the symbiotic relationship beneficial for both parties
• Be available and attentive
• Be a friend. Encourage, listen, & support!

Ultimate Value: Make an impact! Make a difference!
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