

AN ANALYSIS OF BOARD COMPOSITION IN NATIONAL SPORT FEDERATIONS IN AUSTRALIA

Trusha Modi,¹ Tharun Rana Vuyyuru,² Subhrajit Chanda³

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

There is no universally accepted definition of sport governance.⁴ The Sports Governance Principles, 2020 provided by Sport Australia defines sports governance as the brain i.e., the thinking and monitoring part of an organization.⁵ Sport Australia is a national government agency that is responsible for the implementation of governance policies and administration of government funds in various National Sporting Federations (NSFs) in Australia.⁶ Good governance has gained significant importance in light of the various corruption scandals and mismanagement in sporting organizations in recent years.⁷ However, good governance is difficult to define, measure and implement due to the fact that sports federations require a tailored application of what can be called good governance's nebulous parameters.⁸ Good governance needs to begin from the National Sporting Federation as they play an important

¹ Student, Jindal Global Law School, O.P. Jindal Global University.

² Student, Jindal Global Law School, O.P. Jindal Global University.

³ Assistant Lecturer, Jindal Global Law School, O.P. Jindal Global University. schanda@jgu.edu.in

**The authors would also like to acknowledge Rohan Erra and Swara Papat for their contribution to the data collection of this study.

⁴ RUSSELL HOYE & GRAHAM CUSKELLY, *SPORT GOVERNANCE* (1 ed. 2006).

⁵ Sport Australia, *SPORT GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES* (March, 2020), https://www.sportaus.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/912705/Sport-Governance-Framework.pdf (last visited Oct 31, 2021).

⁶ Sport Australia, *Australian Sports Commission - About*, SPORTS AUSTRALIA, <https://www.sportaus.gov.au/about> (last visited Nov 16, 2021).

⁷ Arnout Geeraert, *National Sports Governance Observer. Indicators and instructions for assessing good governance in national sports federations*, PLAY THE GAME/ DANISH INSTITUTE OF SPORT STUDIES (Nov. 2018), <https://playthegame.org/knowledge-bank/downloads/national-sports-governance-observer-indicators-and-instructions/11dd1828-1461-4a09-9a12-a996016fcd90>.

⁸ *Id.*

strategic and regulatory role in the sport ecosystem.⁹ Board composition plays a crucial part in good governance as elucidated in the Sports Governance Principles, 2020.¹⁰ Two important elements of board composition are board size and diversity.

The Sports Governance Principles are applicable to the NSFs based on the funding received from Sport Australia. Through the ‘Sport Governance Standards’ document, NSFs are expected to uphold the principles. If they fail to do so, they may be at risk of losing government funding. Many NSFs in Australia have faced governance challenges over the years, due to a number of factors. The delegate board system, where each state body elects a representative to the NSF board, has been an issue that has traditionally been problematic.¹¹ Cricket Australia is one example of a NSF that changed from the representative system of governance due to issues with self-interest and inefficiency.¹² The size and composition of the new board was the central element of the ten-point plan for change adopted by Cricket Australia.¹³ A similar approach was adopted by the Australian Football League (AFL) where a board with a small workable size, comprising people with various skills and experience was considered to be a good governance model and widely regarded as a best practice.¹⁴ These case studies highlight the importance of studying board composition in NSFs and the impact it can have on board effectiveness. However, it is not just the issue of delegate board models that is important, lesser studied factors such as board size and diversity are also influential on governance efficiency.

Sport Australia’s Sport Governance Principles, 2020 under Principle 5: “The Rulebook – Documents that outline duties, power, roles and responsibilities”¹⁵ has emphasized the importance of having a smaller board with between five and nine directors. A small, diverse and independent board is necessary for effective organizational performance. However, there is no common consensus with respect to an ideal board size. A board size between five to 12

⁹ Siegfried Nagel et al., *Professionalisation of Sport Federations – a multi-level framework for analysing forms, causes and consequences*, 15 EUROPEAN SPORT MANAGEMENT QUARTERLY 407 (2015).

¹⁰ Sport Australia, *supra* note 5.

¹¹ David Shilbury, *Australia*, in SPORT GOVERNANCE INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDIES 38–53 (1 ed. 2015).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ David Crawford & Colin Carter, *A GOOD GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE FOR AUSTRALIAN CRICKET* (2011).

¹⁵ Sport Australia, *supra* note 5.

directors is considered to provide an appropriate balance in academic literature.¹⁶ Some researchers indicate that for enhanced board coherence and, subsequently, organizational performance, an accurate board size is between six and 12 directors.¹⁷ “Principle 4: The Players- A diverse board to enable considered decision-making”¹⁸ deals with board diversity and recommends having a diverse board in terms of skills and gender. A diverse board provides higher expertise, legitimacy and assistance to the board to communicate a variety of organizational values such as open policy making, accountability and transparency.¹⁹ Greater organizational efficiency is achieved with a more diverse board.²⁰ The diversity of board can be measured using the parameters of “age, gender, ethnicity, culture, religion, constituency representation, independence, professional background, knowledge, technical skills, commercial and industry experience, career and life experience.”²¹

While these broad principles of what good governance represents are widely accepted regarding board composition, there has been limited attempts to analyze them in-depth in the Australian context. This paper addresses that gap, dealing with the issue of diversity on boards related to gender and occupational background, as well as board size. In doing so, this paper elucidates the extent to which NSFs in Australia are following good governance standards laid down in terms of board size, skill, and gender diversity.

2. METHODOLOGY

Secondary online resources were used to gather data for the Australian National Sporting Organizations (NSO) and National Sports Organization for People with Disability (NSDO). Such an approach was adopted in order to describe, analyze and interpret the board composition

¹⁶ Marc Taylor & Noel O’ Sullivan, *How Should National Governing Bodies of Sport Be Governed in the UK? An Exploratory Study of Board Structure*, 17 CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW 681 (2009).

¹⁷ James S. Linck, Jeffrey M. Netter & Tina Yang, *The determinants of board structure*, 87 JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL ECONOMICS 308 (2008).

¹⁸ Sport Australia, *supra* note 5.

¹⁹ John Michael Daley & Julio Angulo, *Understanding the dynamics of diversity within nonprofit boards*, 25 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY JOURNAL 172 (1994).

²⁰ Jeffrey L. Callen, April Klein & Daniel Tinkelman, *Board composition, committees, and organizational efficiency: The case of nonprofits*, 32 NONPROFIT AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR QUARTERLY 493 (2003).

²¹ Frances J. Milliken & Luis L. Martins, *Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups*, 21 ACADEMY AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW 402 (1996).

and board diversity of the National Sports Federations (NSFs) in Australia. By using descriptive statistics based on secondary online resources, the study presents unique insights regarding sports governance in Australia. The NSFs were classified using the Australian Sports Directory²² and data was gathered for 96 NSFs. The methodological approach adopted is corresponding to the method adopted by McLeod, Star and Shilbury (2021).²³ The advantage of this approach lies in the fact that data regarding board composition was easily accessible.²⁴ However, such study lacks internal validity, and therefore the results lack generalization.²⁵ The variables of the study are board size, occupational background, and gender diversity of the board. The first is a quantifiable variable. The second being a qualitative variable, researchers used pre-defined 12 occupational background categories.²⁶ One methodological limitation arises insofar as a person may change occupation over time and one's occupation may be so diverse to fall within two or more categories.²⁷ The gender diversity is also a qualitative variable identified only in a binary manner of "male" and "female" and such was categorized using their, title, name, image available on the online web sources.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. BOARD SIZE

According to the data, the NSFs in Australia have an average board size of 7.8 which indicates that the average number of directors on the organization's board is between seven to eight

²² *Australian Sports Directory*, SPORT AUSTRALIA, https://www.sportaus.gov.au/australian_sports_directory (last visited Nov 1, 2021).

²³ Joshua McLeod, Shaun Star & David Shilbury, *Board composition in national sport federations: a cross-country comparative analysis of diversity and board size*, MANAGING SPORT AND LEISURE (2021). DOI: 10.1080/23750472.2021.1970614 11-12-2023 17:23:00

²⁴ Hilton Heydenrych & Jennifer M. Case, *Researching graduate destinations using LinkedIn: an exploratory analysis of South African chemical engineering graduates*, 43 EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION 693 (2017).

²⁵ Ilker Etikan, *Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling*, 5 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEORY AND APPLIED STATISTICS 1 (2016).

²⁶ See Thomas J. Smith & Cynthia Campbell, *The Structure of O*NET Occupational Values*, 14 JOURNAL OF CAREER ASSESSMENT 437 (2006). The categories used in this research were Academic, Accountant, Bureaucrat/Public Administration, Business Operations and Administrations, Elected Politician, Engineer, Journalist, Lawyer, Marketing, Medical Professional, Military and Sport/Athlete/Coach.

²⁷ McLeod, *supra* note 23.

members. The Australian Sports Governance Principles, 2020 recommend that the ideal board size is between five and nine directors.²⁸ While there is no common consensus with respect to a specific ideal board size. according to some researchers, a board size between five and 12 directors will provide an appropriate balance²⁹ as the decision-making would be more efficient and quicker when a smaller group involved, and such would prevent the board from being top-heavy.³⁰ Such board size is considered to be accurate so as to bring about greater coherence and organizational performance.³¹ Some research suggests that a board with more than 10 members will have elements of inefficiency because it will not be focused³² and can be unmanageable at times, and result in slow decision making.³³ Therefore, a small board size is considered to be effective as a good governance principle. On Average, Australian NSFs are clearly adopting smaller size boards, and such may be due to smaller population. This is because Australia, being a relatively low populated country, can accommodate representatives of all sections of the society in a smaller board in case of representative or hybrid board composition structure which has more members than an independent board composition structure.³⁴ According to the study conducted, there are five NSFs namely, Bobsleigh and Skeleton Australia Ltd, Dance Sport Australia, Australian Dodgeball Federation, Floorball Australia and Modern Pentathlon Australia that have only 4 members on their board i.e., one less than the ideal board size. The highest director headcount on any Australian NSF is 14 members on the Special Olympic Committee.

3.2. BOARD DIVERSITY

3.2.1. OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND

²⁸ Sport Australia, *supra* note 5.

²⁹ Taylor, *supra* note 16.

³⁰ Kat Ingram & Ian O'Boyle, *Sport governance in Australia: questions of board structure and performance*, 60 *WORLD LEISURE JOURNAL* 156 (2017).

³¹ Linck, *supra* note 17.

³² Taylor, *supra* note 16.

³³ Ingram, *supra* note 30.

³⁴ See McLeod, *supra* note 23.

Board skill is one of the key sports governance indicators for board sustainability and performance.³⁵ Table 1 illustrates the breakdown of occupational background of the board directors within Australia. However, it should be noted that, such information is not indicative of all directors of Australia as occupational background information was not available for all the members.³⁶ Consequently, data was collected for 590 directors, equating to 86% of the total number of NSF members in Australia. The result of the study showcases that the skill set that dominates the NSFs in Australia is Business Operations and Administration (39.49%) which suggests a high corporate involvement on NSFs boards. A high corporate involvement is likely due to the rapid commercialization of the Australian domestic sports sector.³⁷ The other skill set that dominates NSFs is people with Sporting background (32.71%) i.e., an elite level athlete or a coach. The involvement of politicians and people with military background is negligible. A board comprised of people with diverse skill and not a group of similar individuals is considered to make more powerful decisions.³⁸ A board with varied expertise, fresh perspective and insights will be able to perform their duties better which results into powerful strategic decision making, hence will more effectively accomplish complex and multi-dimensional tasks.³⁹ Therefore, heavy involvement of one particular occupational background is typically not considered a good governance strategy and Sport Australia's Sports Governance Principles require the board to be diverse with an appropriate skill mix.⁴⁰

³⁵ Ross Booth et al., *Generic Models of Sports Governance and Their Potential for Sustainability*, 10 in THE SPORTS BUSINESS IN THE PACIFIC RIM. SPORTS ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT AND POLICY 233–250.

³⁶ McLeod, *supra* note 23 at 10.

³⁷ Richard Tacon & Geoff Walters, *Modernisation and governance in UK national governing bodies of sport: how modernisation influences the way board members perceive and enact their roles*, 8 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SPORT POLICY AND POLITICS 363 (2016).

³⁸ Anita Williams Woolley, Ishani Aggarwal & Thomas W. Malone, *Collective Intelligence and Group Performance*, 24 CURRENT DIRECTIONS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE 420 (2015).

³⁹ McLeod, *supra* note 23.

⁴⁰ *Supra* note 5; AUSTRALIAN SPORTS COMMISSION MANDATORY SPORT GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES (2015) <https://www.icsspe.org/system/files/Australian%20Sports%20Commission%20-%20Mandatory%20Sports%20Governance%20Principles.pdf> (last visited Oct 31, 2021).

Occupational Background	Representation on NSF Boards
Academic	2.54%
Accountant	5.42%
Bureaucrat/Public Administration	4.41%
Business Operations and Administration	39.49%
Elected Politician	0.34%
Engineer	1.02%
Journalist	0.68%
Lawyer	7.29%
Marketing	3.56%
Medical Professional	1.69%
Military	0.85%
Sport/Athlete/Coach	32.71%

Table 1: Percentage of each occupation on NSF boards in Australia

The NSFs in Australia face challenges to attract board members with highly developed skill sets.⁴¹ It is easier to attract candidates from within the sport because of their passion⁴² as opposed to directors having a specialized skill set. As illustrated in Table 2, the study results reveal that Australian Weightlifting Federation has (85.7%) and Australian Curling Federation has (75%) members on the board with a background in Sports (either as elite athletes or coaches). There are ten other NSFs which have more than 50% of board members having a background in sports. Ingram and O’Boyle (2017)⁴³ note that such a high level of involvement from people with a sporting background may not necessarily be a good practice as the persons

⁴¹ Ingram, *supra* note 30.

⁴² Russell Hoye & Sue Inglis, *Governance of Nonprofit Leisure Organizations*, 26 LOISIR ET SOCIÉTÉ / SOCIETY AND LEISURE 369 (2003).

⁴³ Ingram, *supra* note 30.

may not have the level of business acumen that may be required for the board to be successful. Another drawback is that such directors may contribute only to sport-specific discussions and not on other important topics of discussion.⁴⁴ In addition to the above drawbacks, a high proportion of directors with a sporting background on boards may compromise board independence. Independence means that the directors on the board of an organization should not have a previous affiliation with the organizations or individuals within it.⁴⁵ People with sporting background have a previous affiliation with the organization and as such this affects the level of board independence. Independent directors can potentially improve the diversity of experience and skill base that would allow the sport to grow and develop commercially.⁴⁶

However, the element of representation of athletes or retaining people with a sports background is considered to be important so as to ensure that people with knowledge of the sport remain on the board and are involved in critical decision-making processes.⁴⁷ Data collected from secondary sources in this study showed that Basketball Australia, Dodgeball Federation Australia, Golf Australia, Ice Hockey Australia and Pony Club Australia had little to no involvement of people with a background in Sports. Such involvement is important for the purpose of checks and balance so that the board does not become alienated from those they are seeking to serve,⁴⁸ as athletes are the ones that are most affected by board decisions.⁴⁹ NSFs should seek to strike the right balance between different occupational backgrounds as it is imperative to have mixture of various skills such a finance, accountancy and legal, which is clearly lacking in certain Australian NSFs, for effective board performance.⁵⁰ Therefore, NSFs should consider the skill gaps and key characteristics of the directors on the board⁵¹ and have a board that has an appropriate mix of various skills.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ Joshua McLeod, *Role of the board and directors: Board structure and composition.*, in ROUTLEDGE HANDBOOK OF SPORT GOVERNANCE 243–254 (1 ed. 2019).

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ Taylor, *supra* note 16.

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ Lucie Thibault, Lisa Kihl & Kathy Babiak, *Democratization and governance in international sport: addressing issues with athlete involvement in organizational policy*, 2 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SPORT POLICY AND POLITICS 275 (2010).

⁵⁰ Lesley Ferkins & David Shilbury, *Good Boards Are Strategic: What Does That Mean for Sport Governance?*, 26 JOURNAL OF SPORT MANAGEMENT 67 (2012).

⁵¹ Chien Mu Yeh & Tracy Taylor, *Issues of governance in sport organisations: a question of board size, structure and roles*, 50 WORLD LEISURE JOURNAL 33 (2008).

Name of the Federation	Sport/Athlete/ Coach Background	Total Board Members	Members from Sports Background (%)
Australian Curling Federation	6	8	75
Australian Weightlifting Federation Ltd.	6	7	85.71
Badminton Australia	4	6	66.67
Australian Lacrosse Association Ltd	4	6	66.67
Australian Croquet Association	5	10	50
Gridiron Australia	3	6	50
Olympic Winter Institute of Australia	5	8	62.50
Riding for Disabled Association	4	6	66.67
Rowing Australia Ltd.	5	9	55.56
Tenpin Bowling Australia Ltd	4	8	50
WAKO Australia	3	5	60
Water Polo Australia Ltd.	6	9	66.67

Table 2: NSF boards with high involvement of members from Sporting Background

3.2.2. GENDER DIVERSITY

Scholarly research suggests that gender diversity can enhance business performance, with the organization's profitability being greatest when equal numbers of men and women are present in the workplace.⁵² The results of this study showed that, overall, 33.8% of the directors on the boards of Australian NSFs are women. There has been a growth decrease towards the gender target of 40% on NSF boards from the previous years,⁵³ and not all NSFs have been able to reach the target proposed by Sport Australia (which has been enshrined in the Sport

⁵² Dwight Frink, et al, *Gender demography and organizational performance: A two-study investigation with convergence*, 28 GROUP & ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT 127 (2003).

⁵³ McLeod, *supra* note 23.

Governance Standards). This begs the question of whether there should be effective implementation of a quota system as a mechanism if we are to achieve diversity standards.

For more than three decades, academics have been looking at the relationship between gender diversity and economic performance in many industries.⁵⁴ Studies have also shown a positive relationship between gender diversity on boards and organizational outcomes.⁵⁵ Evidence suggests that not only do certain business decisions, such as acquisitions and stock offerings, result in higher declared returns when there is more gender diversity, but there are also more opportunities for advancement when there is greater gender diversity.⁵⁶ Directors on gender-balanced boards were more cognizant of their board's composition and more reflective of gender stereotypes.⁵⁷ These insights are transferable to the sport context.

In the context of critical mass theory, the critical mass of a minority group may have an influence on the culture on its structure of any organization. Kanter (1997)⁵⁸ estimated that one-third of the organization's overall strength would be required to overcome this barrier. Accordingly, women must hold at least 30% of board seats or three independent positions on the federation's board for it to reach the basic minimum ideal level of gender diversity. A lack of gender diversity has the potential to have a substantial influence on the performance of the federation as studies suggest that boards with strong gender diversity outperform organizations that do not.⁵⁹ Also, sports should be accessible to everyone irrespective of their gender, and being represented at a board-level promotes faith and confidence in the NSF and the sport. As you get to this juncture, the ethical argument becomes quite apparent since it is only fair to have equal representation of men and women in all organizations. Further, we should not be restricted by the normative cisgender heteronormative definitions of what gender is; rather,

⁵⁴ Kathleen A. Farrel & Phillip L. Hersh, *Additions to corporate boards: the effect of gender*, 11 JOURNAL OF CORPORATE FINANCE 85 (2005); Walayet Khan & Vieito, Joao Paulo, *CEO gender and firm performance*, 67 JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS 55 (2013). Cristian L. Dezsö & David Gaddis Ross, *Does female representation in top management improve firm performance? A panel data investigation*, 33 STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT JOURNAL 1072 (2012).

⁵⁵ Ramón Spaaij, Annelies Knoppers & Ruth Jeanes, *"we want more diversity but...": Resisting diversity in Recreational Sports Clubs*, 23 SPORT MANAGEMENT REVIEW 363 (2020).

⁵⁶ Jiekun Huang & Darren J. Kisgen, *Gender and corporate finance: Are male executives overconfident relative to female executives?* 108 JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL ECONOMICS 822 (2013).

⁵⁷ Inge Claringbould & Annelies Knoppers, *Doing and undoing gender in sport governance*, 58 SEX ROLES 81 (2008).

⁵⁸ ROSABETH MOSS KANTER, MEN AND WOMEN OF THE CORPORATION (1977).

⁵⁹ Jasmin Joecks, Kerstin Pull & Karin Vetter, *Gender diversity in the boardroom and firm performance: What exactly constitutes a "Critical mass?"*, 118 JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS 61(2012).

they should be fairly applied throughout the spectrum, especially in our contemporary world, which is becoming more sensitive to these discussions on a daily basis, especially in our contemporary world. Because of Kanter's understanding of gender dynamics, gender ratios, and critical mass, she came to believe that it was the organizational model, rather than an individual's personal characteristics, which was the root cause of the resultant gender imbalance at the workplace.⁶⁰ It was particularly challenging for women since they were either in dead-end positions at the bottom of the federation or in symbolic positions at the top with little to no real authority. If the proportion of women on a company's board of directors does not exceed 30% or three board seats, it is conceivable that gender diversity has very little or negative impact on the federation's operability.

We can observe from the data that there are at least 40 NSFs in Australia that operate with less than one third of membership being accorded to other genders (females as per data). Table 3 illustrates that there are five NSFs in Australia that have zero representation of female board members. Such may be because of the predominance of men in these sports. Conversely, few federations have high female representation, for instance, Australian Calisthenics Federation has all female board members, but such is likely because of the fact that these activities are normally considered too feminine and predominantly considered to be women's sports. The other NSFs such as Softball Australia and Gymnastics Australia (refer to Table 4) also have high female representation, and such may also be due to the perceived feminine nature of these sports.

⁶⁰ KANTER, *supra* note 58.

Name of Federation	Male Board Members	Total Board Members	Male Representation
Australian Polo Federation	11	11	100%
Gaelic Football & Hurling Association Australasia	10	10	100%
Muaythai Australia	5	5	100%
Floorball Australia	4	4	100%
Kung Fu Wushu Australia Limited	7	7	100%

Table 3: NSF boards with high male representation

When one evaluates the nature of the organizational position that has been assigned to women on these sporting federations, it becomes clear that a large percentage of NSFs not only fail to adhere to established standards, but they are also jeopardizing the organization's performance potential by participating in non-diverse practices. We also need to recognize that these organizations (NSFs) are voluntary in nature and demand significant investment of time and energy, as well as the capacity to balance personal and professional obligations. In patriarchal societies, women are often expected to take care of their families and carry out household responsibilities. NSFs seem to be dogmatic and oblivious to the requirements and obligations of women and their families in their current stage of operation.⁶¹

⁶¹ Johanna Adriaanse, *Gender Diversity in the Governance of Sport Associations: The Sydney Scoreboard Global Index of Participation*, 137 JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS 149 (2016).

Name of Federation	No of Male Members	No of Female Members	Total No of Members	% Female Representation
Australian Calisthenics Federation	0	12	12	100
Skate Australia Inc	1	4	5	80
Pony Club Australia Ltd.	2	6	8	75
Gymnastics Australia	3	6	9	66.67
Softball Australia	3	6	9	66.67

Table 4: NSF boards with high female representation

The more significant question is whether a reform in international sports governance is conceivable. To engage with this, Katwala proposes three potential ways for things to happen: either internally, or from outside, or by way of collapse and crisis.⁶² One such example of reform can be observed in the Norwegian parliament in 2005, which became the first in the world to enact quota legislation. As a result of the regulation, public limited liability companies must have a minimum of 40% representation on their boards of directors, regardless of gender.⁶³

4. CONCLUSION

The aim of the study was to analyze the board composition of NSFs in Australia in terms of their size and diversity. The research conducted makes a valuable contribution to the literature on sports governance in Australia. The results of the study build on previous work (namely McLeod, Star and Shilbury) by providing deeper insights with respect to the extent to which the NSFs in Australia follow good governance principles and practices regarding board size, and diversity in terms of occupation and gender. It showcases the importance of maintaining a balance of people with different skills and professional background on the board so as to reduce

⁶² SUNDER KATWALA, *DEMOCRATISING GLOBAL SPORT* (2000).

⁶³ Mariateresa Torchia, Andrea Calabro & Morten Huse, *Women directors on corporate boards: From tokenism to critical mass*, 102 *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS* 299 (2011).

the skill gap and enhance organizational performance and efficiency. There is also a need to increase the gender representation on the various NSFs, albeit Australia does perform well in this regard. The evidence provided by the study is helpful for the key stakeholders involved in policy decision making in NSFs in Australia. However, it is important to recognize the limitation of the study as data was collected through online resources. Future researchers can use primary methods to collect data and provide new insights into board composition of NSFs in Australia.

REFERENCES

- Adriaanse, J. (2016). Gender Diversity in the Governance of Sport Associations: The Sydney Scoreboard Global Index of Participation, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(1), 149-160. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-015-2550-3
- Australian Sports Commission. (2015, June). Mandatory Sports Governance Principles. <https://www.icsspe.org/system/files/Australian%20Sports%20Commission%20-%20Mandatory%20Sports%20Governance%20Principles.pdf>
- Australian Sports Directory. Sport Australia. https://www.sportaus.gov.au/australian_sports_directory
- Callen, J. L., Klein, A., & Tinkelman, D. (2003). Board Composition, Committees, and Organizational Efficiency: The Case of Nonprofits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 493–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764003257462>
- Claringbould, I., & Knoppers, A. (2008). Doing and undoing gender in sport governance. *Sex Roles*, 58, 81–92.
- Crawford, D. & Carter, C. (2011). A Good Governance Structure for Australian Cricket. Cricket Australia.
- Daley, J. & Angulo, J. (1994). Understanding the dynamics of diversity within non-profit boards, *Community Development Society Journal*, 25(2), 172-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575339409489879>
- Dezső, C. L., & Ross, D. G. (2012). Does female representation in top management improve firm performance? A panel data investigation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(9), 1072- 1089. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.1955>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S., Alkassim, R., Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*. 5(1), 1-4, 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11
- Farrell, K. A., & Hersch, P. L. (2005). Additions to corporate boards: the effect of gender. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 11(1), 85-106. Khan, W. A., & Vieito, J. P. 2013. CEO gender and firm performance. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 67, 55-66.
- Ferkins, L., & Shilbury, D. (2012). Good Boards Are Strategic: What Does That Mean for Sport Governance?, *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(1), 67-80. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.26.1.67>
- Frink D.D., Robinson R.K., Reithel B., Arthur M.M., Ammeter A.P., Ferris G.R., Kaplan D.M. & Morrissette H.S. 2003. Gender demography and organizational performance: A two-study investigation with convergence, *Group & Organization Management*, 28(1), 127-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601102250025>
- Geeraert A., (2018, November). National Sports Governance Observer. Indicators and instructions for assessing good governance in national sports federations, *Play the Game/ Danish institute of Sport Studies*. <https://playthegame.org/knowledge-bank/downloads/national-sports-governance-observer-indicators-and-instructions/11dd1828-1461-4a09-9a12-a996016fcd90>.
- Heydenrych, H., & Case, J. M. (2018). Researching graduate destinations using LinkedIn: An exploratory analysis of South African chemical engineering graduates. *European*

- Journal of Engineering Education*, 43(5), 693–705.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2017.1402865>
- Hoye, R., & Cuskelly, G. (2006). *Sport Governance* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080466965>
- Hoye, R., & Inglis, S. Governance of Nonprofit Leisure Organizations, *Society and Leisure*, 26(2), 369–387.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07053436.2003.10707627>
- Huang, J., & Kisgen, D. J. (2013). Gender and corporate finance: Are male executives overconfident relative to female executives? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 108(3), 822–839.
- Ingram, K., & O’Boyle, I. (2018). Sport governance in Australia: Questions of board structure and performance. *World Leisure Journal*, 60(2), 156–172.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/16078055.2017.1340332>
- Joecks, J., Pull, K. & Vetter, K. Gender Diversity in the Boardroom and Firm Performance: What Exactly Constitutes a “Critical Mass?”. *Journal of Business Ethics* 118, 61–72 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1553-6>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Katwala, S., 2000. *Democratising global sport*. London: The foreign policy centre.
- Khan, W., & Paulo, V. (2013). CEO gender and firm performance, *Journal of Economics and Business*, 67, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconbus.2013.01.003>
- Linck, J.S., Netter, J., & Yang, T. (2008) *The determinants of board structure*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 87(2), 308–328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.03.004>
- McLeod, J. (2020). Role of the board and directors: Board structure and composition. In D. Shilbury & L. Ferkins (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sport governance* (pp. 243–254). Routledge.
- McLeod, J., Star, S., & Shilbury, D. (2021). Board composition in national sport federations: A cross-country comparative analysis of diversity and board size. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2021.1970614>
- Milliken, F.J., & Martins, L.L. (1996). Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 402–433. 10.5465/AMR.1996.9605060217
- Nagel, S., Schlesinger, T., Bayle, E., & Giauque, D. (2015). Professionalisation of sport federations – a multi-level framework for analysing forms, causes and consequences. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(4), 407–433.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2015.1062990>
- Ross Booth et al., Generic Models of Sports Governance and Their Potential for Sustainability, In *The Sports Business in The Pacific Rim*. Sports Economics, Management and Policy (pp. 233–250). Springer. 10.1007/978-3-319-10037-1_13
- Shilbury, D. (2015) Australia. In Boyle, I., & Bradbury, T. (Eds.), *Sport Governance International Case Studies* (pp. 38–53). Routledge
- Smith, T. J., & Campbell, C. (2006). The Structure of O*NET Occupational Values. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 14(4), 437–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072706286511>

- Spaaij, R., Knoppers, A., & Jeanes, R. (2020). “we want more diversity but...”: Resisting diversity in Recreational Sports Clubs, *Sport Management Review*, 23(3) 363-373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.007>
- Sport Australia. (2020, March). Sport Governance Principles. https://www.sportaus.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/912705/Sport-Governance-Framework.pdf
- Sport Australia. Australian Sports Commission - About, Sports Australia. <https://www.sportaus.gov.au/about>.
- Tacon, R., & Walters, G. (2016). Modernisation and governance in UK national governing bodies of sport: How modernisation influences the way board members perceive and enact their roles. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 8(3), 363–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2016.1194874>
- Taylor, M., & O’Sullivan, N. (2009). How Should National Governing Bodies of Sport Be Governed in the UK? An Exploratory Study of Board Structure. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 17(6), 681–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2009.00767.x>
- Thibault, L., Kihl, L., & Babiak, K. (2010). Democratization and governance in international sport: Addressing issues with athlete involvement in organizational policy. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 2(3), 275–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2010.507211>
- Torchia, M., Calabro, A., & Huse, M. (2011). Women directors on corporate boards: From tokenism to critical mass. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 299–317.
- Woolley, A. W., Aggarwal, I., & Malone, T. W. (2015). Collective Intelligence and Group Performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(6), 420–424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214155599543>
- Yeh, C. & Taylor T. (2008). Issues of governance in sport organisations: a question of board size, structure and roles, *World Leisure Journal*, 50(1), 33-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04419057.2008.9674525>