An analysis of interorganizational relationships in health/fitness clubs: some aspects of organizational interdependence

Shuji Yamashita¹, Osamu Yamagata², Shinichi Demura³, Hiroshi Naka⁴ and Fumio Gohshi⁵

ヘルス/フィットネスクラブ経営にみる組織間関係の分析：組織相互依存性の諸相

山下 秋二¹⁾ 山形 修²⁾ 出村 慎一³⁾ 中 比呂志⁴⁾ 郷司 文男⁵⁾

抄 録

本研究は、ヘルス/フィットネスクラブの経営に従事する組織単位間の相互依存性の研究である。これらクラブ経営体は、各々自己の関与する組織間関係システムにおいて、互いに役割モデルとして認識し合ったり、あるいはまた、ビジネス目的の効率の達成にむけて、諸資源の結合・連関（ネットワーク）の仕方を模索している。本研究では、かかる意味の組織相互依存性と組織の内部特性との関係を分析した。調査データは、現在の我が国で展開されているヘルス/フィットネスクラブの上級管理職（支配人）から求めた。データ源となったクラブはいずれも多項目複合型の運動施設であり、39都道府県下に分散し、総計205箇所である。分析の結果、1)組織構造の複雑性、経営資源力、経営資源独自性の高さがクラブ間における役割モデルとしての期待を高めること、2)経営資源力が相対的に小さく、かつサービス産出量（顧客数）の多いクラブほど同業者間ネットワークへの依存度が高くなること、3)異業種（とくに一般サービス業及び関連スポーツ施設への）依存は、市場への伝達情報量、施設サービス革新の数、サービス産出量の多さ、及び市場情報の信頼性のなさなどが影響すること、そして4)ネットワークの実際の形態は、そのプロセスからみて計画的なものに創発的なものと類型化でき、前者に参加するクラブは後者に参加するクラブに比べて、組織が複雑で公式化されており、経営資源力が優位で、組織構成員の量も多く、また、市場情報の信頼性のなさを強く感じていること、などが明かとなった。

キーワード：組織間関係、組織相互依存性、役割モデル、業務提携パートナー、ネットワーク

(Japan J. Phys. Educ. 40: 1-13, May, 1995)

Introduction

Key words: interorganizational relationships, organizational interdependence, role model, business tie partners, networking

In recent years the sport industry has experienced rapid growth and development in Japan. With respect to the rate of growth during

- 1) 京都教育大学
〒612 京都府京都市伏見区深草藤森町1
- 2) 大阪成蹊女子短期大学
〒533 大阪府大阪市東淀川区相川3-10-62
- 3) 金沢大学教育学部
〒920 石川県金沢市角間
- 4) 福井工業高等専門学校
〒916 福井県鯖江市下司町
- 5) 宮城学院女子短期大学
〒981 宮城県仙台市青葉区桜ヶ丘9-1-1

1. Kyoto University of Education, 1 Fukakusa-Fujinomori-cho, Fushimi-ku, Kyoto-shi, Kyoto (612)
2. Osaka-Seikei Women's Junior College, 3-10-62 Aikawa, Higashiyodogawa-ku, Osaka-shi, Osaka (533)
3. Kanazawa University, Faculty of Education, Kadoma, Kanazawa-shi, Ishikawa (920)
4. Fukui National College of Technology, Geshi-cho, Sabae-shi, Fukui (916)
5. Miyagi-Gakuin Women's Junior College, 9-1-1 Sakuragaoka, Aoba-ku, Sendai-shi, Miyagi (981)

the 9 years from 1982 to 1990, as noted by Oga and Kimura¹⁴⁾, the health/fitness club sector, where sales soared to 14.3 times, was especially remarkable. In these circumstances every health/fitness club faces a wide range of interorganizational relationships. They perceive each other not only as a competitor but as a role model for their business. Furthermore each club may be interlocking resources and consulting mutual interests through the networking.

The major purpose of this paper is to explore some of the causes and consequences of organizational interdependence among health/fitness clubs. One aspect of organizational interdependence that is examined here is the degree to which club business organization is perceived as a role model by other organizations in the same line of business. The other aspect is the nature of interorganizational networks on which club business organization is dependent. In particular, we are interested in relating these aspects of the club business organization's relationships with other organizations to internal organizational behavior of the club (organizational characteristics and perceived diversity in market).

Thus this paper explores one aspect of the general field of interorganizational analysis. In the past, two approaches to the study of interorganizational relationships have emerged. There are those on the one hand, who view interorganizational relationships from an exchange perspective (Levine and White¹¹⁾, Tuite²¹⁾, White²⁴⁾). According to this approach, relations form when members of two or more organizations perceive mutual benefits or gains from interacting. Others, however, have adopted a power-dependency approach to interorganizational relations (Blau⁴⁾, Emerson⁶⁾, Pfeffer and Salancik¹⁶⁾). Here, it is implied that the motivation to interact is asymmetrical. The interorganizational relationship only forms when the motivated party is powerful

enough to force or induce the other to interact.

Organizations differ in the degree to which their decisions and actions are affected by other organizations. This variable was termed "system connectedness" by Emery and Trist⁷⁾ or "external accountability" by Rogers and Rogers¹⁷⁾, but we prefer to call the concept organizational interdependence, the degree to which an organization is dependent on, or responsive to, other organizations.

Most studies of organizational interdependence essentially conceive of the organization as an entity that needs inputs and provides outputs, linking together a number of organizations via the mechanisms of exchanges or transactions (Levine and White¹¹⁾, Levine et al.¹²⁾, Thompson²⁰⁾). Little is known about such aspects of the sport organizations, although interorganizational analysis has been pushed forward in sport management studies (Stern¹⁸⁾, Yatsushiro et al.²⁶⁾). Certainly, it is not easy to describe the facts of exchanges at the interorganizational level. Some types of organizational exchanges involve the sharing of clients, funds, and staff in order to perform activities for some common objective (Levine and White¹¹⁾).

We gave prominence to the information exchanges, and hence assumed that a core organization (with a higher degree of role model than any other organization) would be existing in the organizational set (as being comprised of all organizations pursuing a similar goal). That is, according to Rogers and Rogers¹⁷⁾, organizations, like individuals, may have "reference groups." It might be thought, of course, that each of the health/fitness clubs has an organization which it consistently takes into consideration in its actions and decision making.

In the next step for gaining a clear conception of organizational interdependence, we assumed that those clubs would form an interorganizational network in order to facilitate their business. Ac-

cording to Teramoto's typology on the interorganizational networks¹⁹⁾, it is suggested that the nature of club business networks must be examined in two research questions: (1) what type of industry is the "business tie partners" (partner organizations) to each club?; (2) what process does each club go through to interlock business ties?

Hypotheses

The following specific hypotheses are tested in this research:

H₁=The degree of role model varies with the organizational characteristics (i.e., organizational innovation, organizational structure, resources, and size).

H₂=The type of business tie partners varies with the organizational characteristics (i.e., organizational innovation, resources, and size), and the perceived diversity in market.

H₃=The process for interlocking business ties varies with the organizational characteristics (i.e., organizational innovation, organizational structure, resources, and size), and the perceived diversity in market.

Following some researchers, at least three types of interdependence can be distinguished: (1) horizontal interdependence, (2) vertical interdependence, and (3) diagonal interdependence (Astley and Fombrun²⁾, Fombrun and Astley⁸⁾, Pennings¹⁵⁾). Horizontal interdependence exists when all members of an organizational set compete with each other in obtaining similar resources and disposing of similar goods and services. Vertical interdependence exists between symbiotically related firms linked by sequential work flows. Diagonal interdependence exists between firms located in different but interrelated industrial sectors.

The first hypothesis is derived from the horizontal interdependence and argues that the organizational characteristics will be a good predictor of the degree of role model in the organizational set. Competitive firms enhance observational modeling each other and gain valuable market information and technical know-how by learning their competitors' activities. In the circumstances, as a matter of course, it is supposed that the health/fitness club which is being learned by other clubs has internal organizational diversity (diversity of organizational structure). It stimulates organizational innovation. Organizational innovation increases the need for resources or size. Therefore, we have hypothesized H₁.

The second hypothesis is derived from the vertical and diagonal interdependence, and also derived from a power-dependency framework of interorganizational relations in that it considers factors affecting the dependence of resources between the organizations in the relationship. The organizations seek a partner in order to keep the balance of power in the organizational set. Organizational power is fundamentally supported by means of resources and size. Organizational innovation pervades new combination of resources not only in the same line of business but also in different industrial sectors. In addition, the life cycles of particular managerial innovations in organizations are tied to and affected by many factors in their environments (diversity in market). Thus we have hypothesized H₂.

The third hypothesis suggests that linkage between an organization and another is not always provided as planned. Organizations can complement each other in the rendering of services to individual clients by means of interlocking informal business ties spontaneously. Whether interorganizational networks are formed intentionally or spontaneously is depend upon the degree of organizational innovation, internal organizational

diversity, resources, size, and the perception of diversity in market. Thus we have hypothesized H₃.

Methodology

1. Data collection

The findings are based on a sample of 205 clubs, which has been carried on business as a facility for multiple sport activities, located dispersively in 39 urban and rural prefectures of Japan. The sample was 68.3% of all the subjects of investigation (300 clubs selected at random).

The data were collected by administering a questionnaire comprising items representing the operational definitions of the variables. All the data were collected in 1991. There was no way to determine how adequately these data truly represented the entire organization's behavior with regard to an organizational interdependence, because this research collected these data only from the chief executive (as called a club manager) of each organization in the sample of clubs.

2. The measurement of organizational interdependence

There are many possible measures of an organizational interdependence. One, used by Aiken and Hage¹⁾, is the number of joint programs conducted cooperatively with other organizations. Of course it is a fine method, but the issues raised in this paper can not be discussed well enough by it. We view the organizational interdependence in two aspects: the degree of role model and the nature of interorganizational networks with a focal organization. These were then measured or classified for this research in the following manner.

The degree to which club business organization was perceived as a role model by other organizations was measured by asking club managers a

series of self-report questions, again using Likert-type scales. It was thought that the club had been perceived as a role model by other clubs when the manager recognized his own club as follows: (1) people who is starting a club business come here to seek advice, (2) staff of other clubs come here to inspect, (3) mass media or trade magazines play up here, and (4) other clubs imitate here. The response categories varied along a five-point scale of: (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) fairly often and (5) always.

The nature of interorganizational networks is determined by the industrial difference between a focal organization and organization tied with it. Therefore, to begin with, business tie partners were classified into two large types: (1) the homogeneous professions and (2) the heterogeneous professions. The latter was grouped again into three classes: (1) allied sport facility (such as golf club, tennis club, and swim club), (2) health resort (such as health spa, Kurhaus, and recreation park), and (3) general service industry (such as hotel, department store, and beauty parlor). The degree to which each of the health/fitness clubs was dependent on those respective professions was measured by five-point Likert scales focused on the following managerial problems: (1) program development, (2) information exchange, (3) earning power, (4) the will to work, and (5) social prestige.

Subsequently, interorganizational networks were classified into two types according to the process for interlocking business ties: (1) planned networking (intentionally or formally interlocked) and (2) emergent networking (spontaneously or informally interlocked).

3. The measurement of organizational characteristics

The organizational characteristics comprise four variables: organizational innovation, or-

reliability of information and the short time span of feedback are indexes of the uncertainty.

The above-mentioned four dimensions of market diversity are all defined here in terms of the perception of club business organization members. The club managers received a questionnaire measuring the four dimensions used in this research. Each questionnaire had four or five items. The respective managers indicated their responses to the items on five-point scales anchored at the extremes with polar adjectives. The following items and their response formats are the representatives.

(1) The production and marketing operations of your club are geographically...(very concentrated 1 2 3 4 5 very widely dispersed). (2) The promotional strategy your club utilizes is generally...(very limited 1 2 3 4 5 very diverse). (3) The markets that you serve are generally...(not competitive 1 2 3 4 5 very competitive and hostile). (4) In the markets that you serve, the frequency of unpredictable changes in demand is...(very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high).

5. Treatment

Principal component analysis was applied to the variables with the plural questionnaire items in order to examine the extent to which each item would be valid as a indicator of the variable. And the only first principal component scores were used in the subsequent analyses of the data. The statistical techniques employed, specially in order to test the hypotheses, were multiple regression analysis, canonical correlation analysis, and discriminant analysis.

In this paper correlations or differences which fell below .05 level of significance were considered to be substantively meaningful.

Findings

1. Organizational characteristics of a model club

Table 1 depicts the organizational characteristics of a model club. There are significant relationships between the degree to which club business organization is perceived as a role model by other organizations and organizational characteristics, excluding centralization only. The relationship between the resources power and the degree of role model is very high ($r = .497$). It is followed by the resources uniqueness ($r = .448$) and the complexity ($r = .382$).

The resulting generalizations somewhat oversimplify reality, of course, by treating each of the above independent variables separately in its relationship to the degree of role model. It may not be reasonable to expect any one independent variable to be highly related to the degree of role model, nor to assume that organizational characteristics considered in this research are independently related to a model club. Many of the independ-

Table 1 Relationships between the degree of role model and organizational characteristics

Organizational characteristics	Pearsonian product-moment correlation coefficients between each organizational characteristic and the degree of role model
Number of new sport programs	.220**
Number of new facility services	.196**
Complexity	.382***
Centralization	.142
Formalization	.323***
Resources power	.497***
Resources uniqueness	.448***
Number of personnel	.345***
Number of clients	.332***

** Significant at the .01 level

*** Significant at the .001 level

ent variables are interrelated with each other, as well as with the degree of role model. Accordingly the next step we must do is to report the findings of the multiple regression analysis for the sample. Statistical techniques like multiple correlation allow us to determine how much of the variance in dependent variable is uniquely explained by its covariance with a independent variable, while removing the covariance of both dependent variable and the independent variable with all other independent variables. Substantial proportion explained by the independent variable can be examined also by its partial correlation coefficient with dependent variable.

Table 2 indicates that a substantial proportion of the variance was explained by the nine independent variables acting simultaneously. In summary, for the sample 37.6% of the variance in the degree of role model was accounted for by the complexity (partial $r = .235$), The resources power (partial $r = .225$), and the resources uniqueness (partial $r = .182$). The other factors did not

make a significant contribution to the explained variance of the dependent variable.

2. Types of partner organizations: dependence on the homogeneous or heterogeneous profession

This section reports the relationships between the type of external organization selected as an interlock tie partner in making club business networks and internal organizational behavior of the club. The internal organizational behavior includes organizational characteristics and perceived diversity in market. Complexity, centralization and formalization, however, were excluded here from the organizational characteristics, because it was assumed that they were indexes of the intra-organizational structure and would not be influential in selecting the type of business tie partners.

Correlation between each variable and the degree of dependence on the other organizations can be found in Table 3. The correlation

Table 2 Multiple regression analysis of the degree of role model by nine independent variables

Independent variable	B (S.E.)	Beta	F-value	PAT.
Number of new sport programs	-.011(.031)	-.031	.127	-.027
Number of new facility services	.026(.026)	.084	.978	.076
Complexity	.217(.069)	.217	9.853**	.235
Centralization	.078(.066)	.078	1.410	.091
Formalization	.001(.075)	.001	.000	.001
Resources power	.255(.085)	.258	8.947**	.225
Resources uniqueness	.185(.077)	.186	5.750*	.182
Number of personnel	1.706(.106)	.123	2.380	.118
Number of clients	.031(.048)	.054	.426	.050
	R (R ²)	.613(.376)		
	F-value	11.248***		

B = Nonstandardized regression coefficients (S.E. = Standard error of B)

Beta = Standardized regression coefficients

PAT. = Partial correlation coefficients

R = Multiple correlation coefficient (R² = Coefficient of determination)

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

*** Significant at the .001 level

Table 3 Correlation coefficients between degree of dependence on the other organizations and organizational characteristics or perceived diversity in market

	Degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession network	Degree of dependence on the heterogeneous profession		
		Allied sport facility	Health resort	General service industry
Organizational characteristics				
Number of new sport programs	−.013	.132	.023	.070
Number of new facility services	.047	.145*	.060	.147*
Resources power	−.084	.071	.082	.149*
Resources uniqueness	−.054	.074	.104	.176*
Number of personnel	.050	.154*	.154*	.154*
Number of clients	.146*	.187**	.194**	.191**
Perceived diversity in market				
Number of sources of information	.108	.119	.135	.160*
Quantity of information transmitted	.195**	.248***	.268***	.265***
Lack of reliability of information	.194**	.231**	.192**	.133
Short time span of feedback	−.038	−.077	.004	−.119

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

*** Significant at the .001 level

coefficients between selected ten independent variables and the dependent variable, degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession network, are shown in the left edge of the columns. The number of clients ($r=.146$), the quantity of information transmitted ($r=.195$) and the lack of reliability of information ($r=.194$) were significantly related to the dependent variable. The following are the relationships to the heterogeneous profession.

There were significant correlations between the degree of dependence on the allied sport facility and number of new facility services ($r=.145$) as well as number of personnel ($r=.154$), number of clients ($r=.187$), quantity of information transmitted ($r=.248$), and lack of reliability of information ($r=.231$). There were significant relationships between the degree of dependence on the health resort and number of personnel ($r=.154$) as well as number of clients ($r=.194$), quantity of information transmitted ($r=.268$),

and lack of reliability of information ($r=.192$). And further, there were significant relationships between the degree of dependence on the general service industry and number of new facility services ($r=.147$) as well as resources power ($r=.149$), resources uniqueness ($r=.176$), number of personnel ($r=.154$), number of clients ($r=.191$), number of sources of information ($r=.160$), and quantity of information transmitted ($r=.265$).

Table 4 shows the findings of the multiple regression analysis of the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession network by ten independent variables. 12.7% of the variance in the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession was explained by such independent variables as resources power and number of clients.

While there was no relationship between resources power and the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession (see Table 3), it could be recognized in Table 4 that there was rela-

Table 4 Multiple regression analysis of the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession network by ten independent variables

Independent variable	B (S.E.)	Beta	F-value	PAT.
Number of new sport programs	-.024(.037)	-.066	.408	-.049
Number of new facility services	.036(.031)	.118	1.350	.090
Resources power	-.229(.100)	-.230	5.231*	-.174
Resources uniqueness	-.042(.094)	-.042	.196	-.034
Number of personnel	-1.807(1.387)	-.129	1.698	-.100
Number of clients	.150(.060)	.258	6.339*	.191
Number of sources of information	.062(.081)	.062	.580	.059
Quantity of information transmitted	.154(.079)	.153	3.806	.149
Lack of reliability of information	.132(.080)	.132	2.723	.127
Short time span of feedback	-.162(.087)	-.162	3.465	-.143
R (R ²)	.357(.127)			
F-value	2.439**			

B=Nonstandardized regression coefficients (S.E.=Standard error of B)

Beta=Standardized regression coefficients

PAT.=Partial correlation coefficients

R=Multiple correlation coefficient (R²=Coefficient of determination)

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

tively strong negative correlation between this variable and the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession (partial $r = -.174$). When the relationship between number of clients and the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession is similarly controlled for each of the ten independent variables separately, the relationship between these two variables remains relatively strong (partial $r = .191$). Quantity of information transmitted and lack of reliability of information, while significantly related to the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession when considered singly (see Table 3), are not substantially related to the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession when considered in combination with other variables.

With regard to the dependence on the heterogeneous profession, it has three indexes, i.e., degree of dependence on allied sport facility, health resort, or general service industry. Accordingly it should be given weight to each of those

variables also. Table 5 depicts the canonical correlation between three dependent variables and ten independent variables. The weightings which appear on this table suggests that the dependence on the heterogeneous profession is likely to be associated with the degree of dependence on general service industry ($w = .596$), the degree of dependence on allied sport facility ($w = .580$), the quantity of information transmitted $w = .579$), the number of new facility services ($w = .501$), the number of clients ($w = .383$), and the lack of reliability of information ($w = .353$).

The significance of canonical correlation coefficient is reported in terms of Wilks' lambda statistic and chi-square value ($\lambda = .766$, $\chi^2 = 45.532$).

3. Planned networking and emergent networking

The health/fitness clubs could select which to participate in planned networking or emergent

Table 5 Canonical correlation between three dependent variables and ten independent variables in dependence on the heterogeneous profession

Dependent variables	Weight	Independent variables	Weight
Degree of dependence on allied sport facility	.580	Number of new sport programs	-.118
Degree of dependence on health resort	-.009	Number of new facility services	.501
Degree of dependence on general service industry	.596	Resources power	-.182
		Resources uniqueness	.216
		Number of personnel	-.064
		Number of clients	.383
		Number of sources of information	.033
		Quantity of information transmitted	.579
		Lack of reliability of information	.353
		Short time span of feedback	-.208
Canonical correlation coefficient		.411	
Eigenvalue		.169	
Wilks' lambda		.766	
Chi-square value		45.532*	

* Significant at the .05 level

networking if they would interlock business ties with other organizations. On the basis of these processes, the sample was classified as planned networking group (146 clubs) and emergent networking group (11 clubs). The former were those clubs which had been interlocking business ties with a specified organization, intentionally, from the beginning. The latter were those clubs which had been interlocking business ties no more than by a spontaneous chance. In this paper, discriminant analysis was employed to determine whether the two groups were different in internal organizational behaviors (including organizational structure).

As shown in Table 6, on five of the variables there is a significant difference between the planned networking group and the emergent networking group. That is, complexity, formalization, resources power, number of personnel, and lack of reliability of information were statistically significant beyond the .05 level.

The discriminative power of total battery of variables, as well as the discriminative power of

individual variables, is reported in terms of rate of discrimination. The rate of discrimination by total battery of variables was 76.5%. Regarding the rate of discrimination by a given variable, it can be seen from the right edge of this table. The highest rate was the resources power (66.6%). Likewise, such organizational structure indexes as complexity (66.1%) and formalization (66.2%) had more influence on the discriminative power.

Conclusions and Implications

In summary, the present investigation permits four conclusions: first, club business organizations, which are perceived as a role model by other organizations in the same line of business, are more complex organizations and have higher power and uniqueness in their resources; second, the more the club business organization estimates the amount of service production (number of clients), and in contrast with this, the lower it estimates its own resources power, the more it is likely to be dependent on the homogeneous profession network; third, a high degree of dependence

Table 6 Discrimination between planned networking group and emergent networking group[†]

Variable	Mean value of each group		t-value	Discriminant coefficient	Rate of discrimination by a given variable
	Planned (N=146)	Emergent (N=11)			
Number of new sport programs	3.226	2.636	1.414	.042	57.4%
Number of new facility services	2.892	3.091	.246	-.102	51.5
Complexity	.089	-.760	2.662**	.546	66.1
Centralization	.033	-.321	1.149	.160	57.1
Formalization	.147	-.659	2.675**	.361	66.2
Resources power	.103	-.771	2.746**	.757	66.6
Resources uniqueness	.069	-.472	1.702	.001	60.0
Number of personnel	53.000	28.000	2.830**	.125	60.1
Number of clients	2477.000	1781.000	1.476	-.042	59.1
Number of sources of information	.054	-.015	.216	-.165	51.4
Quantity of information transmitted	.081	-.040	.386	-.453	52.4
Lack of reliability of information	.101	-.657	2.407*	.866	64.7
Short time span of feedback	-.030	.379	1.306	-.022	58.1
Rate of discrimination by total battery of variables				76.5%	

[†] In this table, those clubs had never participated practically in networking were removed.

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

on the heterogeneous profession (specifically the general service industry and the allied sport facility) will occur when the club has to transmit much information to the market, increases a number of new facility services, produces a large amount of service, and perceives lack of reliability of information in the market; and fourth, the investigation suggests that the practical forms of networking can be classified in terms of the process for interlocking business ties with other organizations and those clubs that had participated in planned networking, were more likely to have complex and formalized organization, hold a dominant position in terms of the facet of resources power, have a large number of personnel and perceive lack of reliability of information in the market, than those participated in emergent networking.

The first result was consistent with the hypothesis (H₁) that the degree of role model varies with the organizational characteristics, espe-

cially in organizational structure and resources. The parts relating to organizational innovation and size, however, were not supported enough. The second and third results were consistent with the hypothesis (H₂) that the type of business tie partners varies with the organizational characteristics and the perceived diversity in market. Hypothesis (H₃), which concerned with the process for interlocking business ties was warranted by the final result. Organizational innovation itself seemed not much to affect this process, however.

The data presented here suggest that organizational interdependence among health/fitness clubs poses various and implicative problems for the sport management studies. Except in the Hypothesis (H₃), where we were interested in whether interorganizational networks were formed intentionally or spontaneously, we have been concerned almost exclusively with the flow of influence from organization to organization.

We have brought up again and again two basic sorts of questions.

First of all we have been asking, "What are the characteristics of core organizations in sport market?" The mechanism by which organizational interdependence is translated into new organizational behavior involves the organizational learning, which come from the modeling a core organization's behavior. A study by Walker²²⁾ suggests that innovations can diffuse from organization to organization through interorganizational networks, in a paralleled process to that among individuals in a social system. If organizations can have opinion leadership, as individuals do, it can be said that our data on the Hypothesis (H_1) suggest the profiles of opinion leader in the organizational set.

And secondly we have been asking, "What organization is linked to what organization in networks?" Walker²³⁾ gathered sociometric data to determine the actual patterns of opinion leadership and diffusion networks among the American states. It was shown in that study that state administrators communicated most readily with their counterparts in states that they believed had similar resources, social problems, and administrative styles. A conceptual label "homophily" was assigned to this phenomenon by Lazarsfeld and Merton¹⁰⁾, in case of interpersonal networks.

We have dealt with this problem as the degree of dependence on the homogeneous profession network and suggested that a number of clients and resources power often constituted the contingency variables. Part of our data on the hypothesis (H_2) tells about it. There is little doubt that the homophily in case of interorganizational networks involves not only horizontal interdependence but also vertical interdependence. No organization is likely to engage in only information exchange relationships with other organizations. Organization, more or less, engages in power-de-

pendency relationships.

Further we have dealt with the problem of dependence on the heterogeneous profession, that is, diagonal interdependence. It is no longer the problem of the flow of influence. This pattern of interdependence exceedingly characterizes today's interorganizational networks. The implications in our data are vast and difficult to assess but will certainly affect such important outcomes as the new type of business tie partners, the network innovation, and the quality and range of services available to consumers in sport market.

This paper only provides a starting point for setting up guidelines for the study of interorganizational relationships in sport management. Perhaps future research should emphasize more careful separation of sport organization and business organization.

(Part of this paper was read at the Annual Convention of Japanese Society of Management for Physical Education and Sports, Osaka, March 29, 1994.)

References

- 1) Aiken, M. and Hage, J. (1968) Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. *American Sociological Review* 33: 912-930.
- 2) Astley, W. G. and Fombrun, C. J. (1983) Technological innovation and industrial structure: the case of telecommunications. *Advances in Strategic Management* 1: 205-229.
- 3) Becker, S. W. and Whisler, T. L. (1967) The innovative organization: a selective view of current theory and research. *Journal of Business* 40: 462-469.
- 4) Blau, P. M. (1964) Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons: New York.
- 5) Duncan, R. B. (1976) The ambidextrous organization: designing dual structure for innovation. In: Kilman, R. H. et al. (Eds.) *The management of organization design*, Vol. 1. North-Holland: New York, pp. 167-188.
- 6) Emerson, R. M. (1967) Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review* 27: 31-41.

- 7) Emery, F. E. and Trist, E. L. (1965) The causal texture of organizational environments. *Human Relations* 18: 21-32.
- 8) Fombrun, C. J. and Astley, W. G. (1982) The telecommunications community: an institutional overview. *Journal of Communication* 32: 56-68.
- 9) Hage, J. and Aiken, M. (1970) *Social change in complex organizations*. Random House: New York.
- 10) Lazarsfeld, P. F. and Merton, R. K. (1964) Friendship as social process: a substantive and methodological analysis. In: Berger, M. et al. (Eds.) *Freedom and control in modern society*. Octagon: New York, p. 23.
- 11) Levine, S. and White, P. E. (1961) Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5: 583-601.
- 12) Levine, S., White, P. E. and Paul, B. D. (1963) Community interorganizational problems in providing medical care and social services. *American Journal of Public Health* 53: 1183-1195.
- 13) Nonaka, I. (1974) *Organization and market*. Chikurashobo: Tokyo. <in Japanese : 野中郁次郎, 組織と市場>.
- 14) Oga, J. and Kimura, K. (1993) Recent trends in the sports industry in Japan. *Journal of Sport Management* 7: 249-255.
- 15) Pennings, J. M. (1981) Strategically interdependent organizations. In: Nystrom, P. and Starbuck, W. (Eds.) *Handbook of organizational design* 2. Oxford University Press: Oxford, pp. 433-455.
- 16) Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. R. (1978) *The external control of organizations*. Harper & Row: New York.
- 17) Rogers, E. M. and Rogers, R. A. (1976) *Communication in organizations*. Free Press: New York, pp. 160-161.
- 18) Stern, R. N. (1979) The development of an interorganizational control network: the case of intercollegiate athletics. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24: 242-266.
- 19) Teramoto, Y. (1987) Interorganizational network. In: Nonaka, I and Teramoto, Y. (Eds.) *Business administration*. Chuokeizaisha: Tokyo, pp. 205-230. <in Japanese : 寺本義也, 組織間ネットワーク>.
- 20) Thompson, J. D. (1962) Organizations and output transactions. *American Journal of Sociology* 68: 309-324.
- 21) Tuite, M. F. (1972) Toward a theory of joint decision-making. In: Tuite, M. F., Chisholm, R. and Radnor, M. (Eds.) *Interorganizational decision making*. Aldine: Chicago, pp. 9-19.
- 22) Walker, J. L. (1966) The diffusion of innovations among the American States. *American Political Science Review* 63: 880-899.
- 23) Walker, J. L. (1971) Innovation in state politics. In: Jacob, H. and Vines, K. N. (Eds.) *Politics in the American states: a comparative analysis*. Brown: Boston, p. 381.
- 24) White, P. E. (1974) Intra- and interorganizational studies. *Administration and Society* 6: 105-152.
- 25) Wilson, J. Q. (1966) Innovation in organization: notes toward a theory. In: Thompson, J. D. (Ed.) *Approaches to organizational design*. University Press: Pittsburgh, pp. 193-218.
- 26) Yatsushiro, T., Yanagisawa, K. and Shimizu, N. (1993) Toward for a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships in community sport. *Bulletin of Institute of Health and Sport Sciences, University of Tsukuba* 16: 1-9. <in Japanese : 八代 勉ほか, 地域スポーツの経営をめぐる組織間関係の研究>.

(平成 6 年 2 月 25 日受付)
(平成 7 年 3 月 18 日受理)