

**Board Governance and Strategic Orientation in
Nonprofit Sport Organisations with a Dual
Board System**

By

Chien Mu YEH

PhD in Leisure, Sport and Tourism

School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism

Faculty of Business

University of Technology, Sydney

2008

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.



Acknowledgement

I would like to express my appreciation to the following individuals for their guidance, support and assistance towards the completion of this thesis.

I would like to thank my principal supervisor, Professor Tracy Taylor, for mentoring me throughout my Ph.D. journey, making it one of the most enlightening and humbling experiences in my life. From the initial selection of the topic, conceptualisation and all the way to completion, Tracy provided invaluable insight, guidance and constructive advice. More importantly, Tracy was more than a supervisor. Tracy always took my situation into consideration, even caring for my family. Tracy constantly gave me emotional support and told me even where to find “free food”. Tracy, you taught me a great deal and I am truly grateful.

I would like to thank Associate Professor Russell Hoye, for providing valuable support and advice. Even though Russell was based in Melbourne considering my research clearly from different viewpoints and giving me priceless advice was invaluable. Thank you Russell.

I would like to also express my appreciation to Dr. Narelle Smith and Dr. Davy Wong from the Department of Mathematical Sciences. Narelle and Davy helped me during my data analysis by providing valuable advice which increased my appreciation of statistical analysis.

A special thank you to Con Menictas, a Ph. D. candidate from the School of Marketing in the Faculty of Business, for his advice on my data analysis. Con was always patient and helped me in understanding data from fresh perspectives. When I was often confused, Con would lighten the mood by making me laugh and enriched my Ph D journey with his “advanced” sense of humour.

To all my teammates, thank you for spending time with me during many weekends playing volleyball, which helped me gain energy to maintain the Ph D journey.

To the people who are board members, general secretaries and staff in the Taiwanese nonprofit sport organisations, I thank you for your voluntary participation in my research. Without your assistance, I would never have completed this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my sweet dear beloved wife. Pei-Ling raised our son practically on her own while I was 9 hours flight-time away from Taiwan. Pei-Ling never once complained at my absence, rather, asking that I focus on my thesis and to buy her a Kangaroo doll for a present. I am indebted forever to you Pei-Ling for being a far better spouse that I could ever be. I thank you and I will always love you with all my heart.

Table of Content

Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the research	1
1.2 Research aim	2
1.3 Research problems and justifications	3
1.4 Overview of methodology	8
1.5 Contributions of this research	8
1.6 Scope of this research	11
1.7 Definitions	11
1.8 Outline of this thesis	12
1.9 Summary	13
Chapter Two: Literature Review	14
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Governance structure	14
2.3 Board roles.....	16
2.3.1 One-tier board in for profit organisations.....	16
2.3.2 One-tier board in nonprofit organisations.....	18
2.3.3 The board of supervisors	20
2.3.4 Board roles in sport organisations	23
2.3.5 Research rationale.....	25
2.4 Board composition.....	26
2.4.1 Board size	26
2.4.2 Board independence.....	30
2.4.3 Other variables of board composition.....	33
2.5 Strategic orientation.....	35
2.6 Governance in sport management research	44
2.7 Strategy in sport management research	51
2.8 Governance in Taiwan.....	54
2.9 Strategy and board governance.....	60
2.10 Theoretical framework.....	61
2.10.1 Theoretical framework of board governance.....	62
2.10.2 Conceptual map	67
2.11 Synthesis and problem statement.....	69
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	72
3.1 Introduction.....	72
3.2 Considerations and research design.....	72
3.3 Stage 1: Preliminary study.....	75
3.3.1 Measurement issues	75
3.3.2 Language and cultural context.....	80
3.3.3 Focus group interviews.....	81
3.3.4 Pilot study	83
3.3.5 Population.....	84
3.3.6 Data analysis.....	85
3.4 Stage 2: Survey approach 1 in Non-Summer Olympic sport organisations	86

3.4.1	Sample selection	86
3.4.2	Instrument	87
3.4.3	Survey procedure	87
3.4.4	Data analysis	88
3.5	Stage 3: Survey approach 2 in Summer Olympic sport organisations	91
3.5.1	Sample selection	91
3.5.2	Instrument	92
3.5.3	Survey procedure	93
3.5.4	Data analysis	94
3.6	Stage 4: Semi-structured interviews	96
3.6.1	Sample selection	96
3.6.2	Instrument	97
3.6.3	Interview procedure	97
3.6.4	Data analysis	98
3.7	Ethical considerations	100
3.8	Summary	101
Chapter Four: Results		102
4.1	Introduction	102
4.2	Board roles	102
4.2.1	Respondent characteristics	102
4.2.2	Quantitative analysis of roles of directors	104
4.2.3	Qualitative analysis of roles of directors	110
4.2.4	Quantitative analysis of roles of supervisors	113
4.2.5	Qualitative analysis of roles of supervisors	117
4.2.6	Other board roles	119
4.2.7	Board roles summary	121
4.3	Board composition and strategic orientation	123
4.3.1	Board composition (chi-square test)	123
4.3.2	Strategic orientation	126
4.3.3	Board composition and strategic orientation (chi-square test)	126
4.3.4	Directors' composition and strategic orientation (chi-square test)	129
4.3.5	Directors' composition and strategic orientation (multinomial logistic regression)	130
4.3.6	Supervisors' composition and strategic orientation (chi-square test)	133
4.3.7	Supervisors' composition and strategic orientation (multinomial logistic regression)	134
4.4	Board composition (interview findings)	136
4.4.1	Who are board members?	136
4.4.2	Board recruitment and selection	140
4.4.3	Size of the board	143
4.5	Board roles and strategic orientation (survey results)	144
4.5.1	Assumptions of MANOVA	144
4.5.2	Roles of directors and strategic orientation (MANOVA)	145
4.5.3	Assumptions of discriminant analysis	147
4.5.4	Roles of directors and strategic orientation (discriminant analysis)	150
4.5.5	Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation (MANOVA)	154
4.5.6	Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation (discriminant analysis)	156
4.5.7	Dual board system (interview results)	159

4.6 Summary.....	160
Chapter Five: Discussions and Conclusions.....	164
5.1 Introduction.....	164
5.2 Board roles of directors and supervisors	164
5.3 Board composition.....	172
5.3.1 Board size	174
5.3.2 Board independence.....	176
5.3.3 Board election.....	178
5.4 Strategic orientation and board composition	180
5.5 Strategic orientation and board roles	183
5.6 Limitations of the study	186
5.7 Contributions	187
5.8 Implications for governance theory	188
5.9 Implications for practice	191
5.10 Recommendations for the further research.....	194
5.11 Concluding statement	195
References.....	197
Appendix.....	219

List of Tables and Figures

Table 2.1 Empirical studies of Miles and Snow's (1978) typology	39
Table 2.2 Governance literature in sport management.....	46
Table 2.3 Research on organisational structure and change.....	50
Table 2.4 Strategy research in sport management.....	52
Table 3.1 Research design	75
Table 3.2 Roles of directors.....	83
Table 3.3 Roles of supervisors.....	83
Table 3.4 Data collection and analysis of research questions	85
Table 3.5 Breakdown of the sample	87
Table 3.6 Breakdown of sample in terms of strategic orientation.....	92
Table 4.1 Demographic data of respondents	104
Table 4.2 Pattern matrix (a) (Second round roles of directors).....	107
Table 4.3 Component correlation matrix (Second round roles of directors).....	107
Table 4.4 Factor structure (roles of director).....	108
Table 4.5 Factor content of roles of directors.....	109
Table 4.6 Pattern matrix (Second round roles of supervisors)	115
Table 4.7 Component correlation matrix (Second round roles of supervisors).....	115
Table 4.8 Factor structure and Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α)	116
Table 4.9 Factor content of roles of supervisors.....	117
Table 4.10 Composition of respondents	125
Table 4.11 Strategic orientation between participant organisations.....	126
Table 4.12 Board composition in terms of strategic orientation	128
Table 4.13 Board size of participant organisations in terms of strategic orientations	129
Table 4.14 Directors' occupation * strategic orientation.....	130
Table 4.15 Model fitting information	131
Table 4.16 Classification	131
Table 4.17 Parameter estimates	132
Table 4.18 Supervisors' occupation * strategic orientation.....	133
Table 4.19 Model fitting information	134
Table 4.20 Classification	134
Table 4.21 Parameter estimates	135
Table 4.22 Roles of directors by strategic orientation.....	145
Table 4.23 Director role and strategic orientation: Tests of between-subjects effects	146
Table 4.24 Director role and strategic orientation: Multiple comparisons.....	147
Table 4.25 Director role and strategic orientation: Data transformation.....	149
Table 4.26 Summarized results of discriminant analysis of strategic orientations in terms of roles of directors.....	150
Table 4.27 Director roles and strategic orientation: Classification results.....	153
Table 4.28 Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation: Descriptive statistics.....	154
Table 4.29 Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation: Tests of between-subjects effects.....	155
Table 4.30 Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation: Multiple comparisons....	155
Table 4.31 Summarised results of discriminant analysis of strategic orientations in terms of roles of supervisors.....	157
Table 4.32 Roles of supervisors and strategic orientation: Classification results	158

Table 5.1 Comparisons of board roles between Inglis et al.'s framework and a dual board system	167
Figure 2.1 A structure of a dual board system.....	15
Figure 2.2 Conceptual map.....	68
Figure 3.1 Analysis strategies of interview data.....	100
Figure 5.1 Internal and external protection roles of supervisors	169

Miles and Snow's (1978) model which incorporates four strategic types (defender, prospector, analyser, and reactor) was employed to examine the relationship between governance and strategic management. It was found that board gender, age, tenure, educational level, size and independence were not related to strategic orientations. Strategic orientations could only differentiate directors and supervisors by occupations. In addition, strategic orientations could be distinguished by directors' roles associated with 'Manage Vision & Purpose', 'Board Duty', 'Stakeholder Focus', and by supervisors' roles related to 'Monitoring Results' and 'Board Duty & Process'.

Board members generally had sport knowledge and were coaches, referees, retired players, local representatives, physical educators, lecturers/professors in sport-related subjects and sport lovers. Directors with little sport knowledge were on the board to be resource providers, head members or bring business skills to the board. Business people or politicians were generally usually elected as the chair because of their substantial financial resources or influential powerbase. A large board was able to bring resources and provide various advice to nonprofit sport organisations. However, conflicts between board members and difficulties in arranging board member meetings were drawbacks of a large board. BoS roles could be compromised when supervisors had close relationships with directors, when supervisors were recommended by the chair/general secretary, or when funds were personally provided by the chair. There was a consensus that the dual board system was generally viewed as a good system because board members who distribute and use funds were kept at arms length from supervisors.

This research contributes to the body of knowledge concerning the director/supervisor governance of nonprofit sport organisations. Specifically, it articulates the identification of board roles, and the examination of the relationship between director/supervisor governance and strategic orientation. Directors and supervisors' roles can be viewed in the context of agency theory, resource dependency theory, institutional theory, stewardship theory, managerial hegemony theory, and stakeholder theory. To survive in a competitive environment, nonprofit sport organisations with a dual board system need to consider appropriate strategic governance in which the board of

directors governs the organisation by providing strategic leadership and the board of supervisors monitors the governance performance of the board of directors.