



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

스포츠매니지먼트석사학위논문

**SPORTS GOVERNANCE AS A KEY  
SUCCESS FACTORS OF  
EFFECTIVENESS SERVICE DELIVERY  
IN A NON-PROFIT SPORTS  
ORGANISATION:  
THE CASE STUDY OF LESOTHO  
SPORTS AND RECREATION  
COMMISSION**

2020년 07월

서울대학교 대학원

체육교육과

LEBOHANG MOSHOESHOE



Ministry of Culture, Sports  
and Tourism



Korea Sports Promotion Foundation

---

이 논문은 문화체육관광부와 국민체육진흥공단 지원을 받아 수행된 연구임

This work was supported by Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism and Sports Promotion Foundation

## **Acknowledgements**

My thanks giving goes out to all those who have helped me complete this proposal with whom this project may not have been possible. In particular, I would like to thank my tutor **Inai** for some excellent conversations, support and the perceptive comments that have kept me on track juggling this proposal as well as other life commitments. My appreciation also goes out to my wife **Mantoetsi Moshoeshoe** for supporting me throughout the last 1 year of my course. I would also like to forward my heartfelt appreciation to my children, Mabotle Moshoeshoe (the angel) and her big brother, Junior. J. Moshoeshoe for their patience and understanding whilst doing my research. My further gratitude goes to my supervisor, professor **Kwon, Sun Yong** for his extensive and helpful comments on early drafts. My best thanks giving goes to my classmates for their support all step of the way throughout the year.

## **ABSTRACT**

# **SPORTS GOVERNANCE AS A KEY SUCCESS FACTORS OF EFFECTIVENESS SERVICE DELIVERY IN A NON-PROFIT SPORTS ORGANISATION: THE CASE STUDY OF LESOTHO SPORTS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**

LebohangMosoeshoe

Global Sport Management, Department of Physical Education

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

It is argued that is difficult to test the effectiveness of non-profit sport organizational service delivery. As a result, many studies have been conducted on this issue. Some researchers developed the model of measuring the organizational service effectiveness while some argued that those models cannot give realistic result as they do not concentrate on other issues of importance. Though there is a lot of disagreement on this issue the conclusions were drawn from other model like multidimensionality and competency values model.

The opinion is that the effectiveness of service delivery can be measured by looking at the expectation the consumer has on the delivery of a service. Another conclusion is that the quality of the service depends also on the satisfaction of the service provider (the employee). This is due to the argument that when an employee is not satisfied he will also not give the best service to the consumer. As a result, the consumer's judgment will not be on that organization as producing and delivering poor service.

These ideas bring another issue of judgment on whether the service is good or poor. Many researchers also argued about this matter but they agreed that the effectiveness of the nonprofit sport organization service delivery can only be judged by the person who uses the service. But also, another concern is how the employee's happiness will be maintained so that they will deliver quality service to the clients. The concept of governance brought forward. The governance described by other scholars as only dealing with the planning part of the organization not directly involved with the everyday running activity of a nonprofit sport organization. The clear distinction made between types of governance. Thus, systemic governance, political (or democratic) governance and corporate (or organizational) governance. The first is concerned with the competition, cooperation, and mutual adjustment between organization in business and/or policy systems. The second approach is concerned with how governments or governing bodies in sport steer, rather than directly control, the behavior of organization. The last one is concerned with normative, ethically-informed standards of managerial behavior. In regard to this study the focus is on the better sport governance.

This concept of sport government relies between democratic governance and organizational governance. One suggestion is that the term can be changed to better sport governance. This will leave a room for improvement for better governance practices by stakeholders in a sports fraternity. Other scholars of sports management suggestion is that, the board as a starting body can strategically take an opportunity on this notion to use sport governance principles as the tools to improve the service delivery of a nonprofit sport organization. The idea is that, the board can simply plan and provide a good working condition to everyone in a sport organization, facilitate the happiness of the service provide by employee, in return the consumer (stakeholders) will be satisfied. As a result the customers will consider and judge the service provision as effective.

These explain the concept of inseparability. The concept explains that there is no way that the service can be separated from its provider and consumer. It further shows that the service provision and delivery depend on the person providing it and also the person consuming it. These issues are important to the management and to the board member of the organisation. The concept simply says that everyone in the organisation considered as client and need to be taken care of, as everyone providing service to one another internally, and chain goes from the top policy maker to the bottom employees who give service to the external consumer.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of nonprofit sport organisation service delivery to the stakeholders (clients), where the stakeholders in the context of this study are referred to the internal individual (e.g. employee and volunteers) and the external member of the organisation (e.g. media houses, sponsors).

A non-probability purposive and convenient sampling method was used to select the participants sampling this current study. Non-random sampling (convenient sample) as a sampling method used to get readily available population sample. The population size was 150 respondents who were directly affiliated to Lesotho Sports and Recreation Commission. They were demographically equally divided according to gender groups. There were total of 8 groups who were considered internally and externally. The external stakeholders were representatives from 36 sports federations, media houses, athletes, general spectators, business community while the internal stakeholders were Lesotho Sports and Recreation Commission staff members, Lesotho Sports and Recreation Commission board members, Lesotho National Olympic Committee board and staff, and the government officials. Also, the same quota was taken from all those representatives. The numbers of 150 open ended questioners were designed delivered via emails, social media (whatsApp) and hand delivery. The nature of the items in the questionnaire was that respondents had to select answers which best represent their opinions. The design of this study was quantitative research...

The validity and reliability of the all variables appearing in the questioner was obtained using Cronbach's alpha Reliability test. There were 6 independent variables and one dependent variable. Four principles of sports governance of better sports governance repeated two times as implemented sport governance and influential factors of effectiveness service delivery. One measure of central tendency (mean) was used to analyze the data collected from the questionnaire.

The findings of this study concluded that the implementations of the better sports governance directly contributing and influencing effectiveness of service delivery in Lesotho Sports and Recreation Commission though the finding revealed that the service delivery was significantly good, the stakeholder's satisfaction was not influenced by effectiveness service delivery.

Therefore, the recommendation is to do future research on what exactly influencing the satisfaction of the sports clients.

---

**Key words** : Better governance. Nonprofit organization. Service.  
Effectiveness. Stakeholder

**Student number:** 2018 – 29552

## Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of contents.....	iv
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1.Introduction.....	1
1.2.Definition and understanding of the term organization.....	1
1.3.Sport organization.....	3
1.4.A distinctive description for profit and non-profit sport organizations.....	7
1.5.Non-profit sport organizationand stakeholders.....	8
1.6.Stakeholders in a non-profit organization.....	10
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
2.1.Governance.....	18
2.2.Good sport organizational governance .....	11
2.3.Good governance principles.....	14
2.4.Good sport governance evaluation methods.....	19
2.5.Service delivery in a nonprofit organization.....	20
2.6.Service in the context of sport organization.....	26
2.6.1. Service quality in the context of sport organization.....	29
2.6.2. Effectiveness of service delivery in a non-profit sport organization .....	32
2.7.Understanding the link between good governance and service delivery...37	
2.7.1. Previous studies.....	41
2.8.The purpose of the study.....	42
2.8.1. Research questions.....	43
CHAPTER 3. METHODS.....	46
3.1 Research design and methods.....	46
3.1.1 Research design.....	46

3.1.2	Rational for the selection of the respondent.....	48
3.1.3	Sampling.....	50
3.2	Survey.....	56
3.3	Data collection and analysis.....	61
3.3.1	Data collection.....	61
3.3.2	Data analysis of survey.....	63
3.4	Validity of data.....	64
CHAPTER 4.	RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	65
4.1.	Introduction.....	65
4.2.	Variable.....	65
4.2.1.	Mission.....	65
4.2.2	Organizational Capability.....	66
4.2.3.	Best sports governance principles.....	67
4.2.3.1.	Democracy.....	67
4.2.3.2.	Transparency.....	68
4.2.3.3.	Accountability.....	68
4.2.3.4.	Social responsibility.....	68
4.2.3.5	Effectiveness service delivery.....	69
4.3.	Results.....	71
4.3.1.	demographic analysis.....	74
4.3.2	Reliability test results.....	74
4.4.	Hypothesis testing results.....	74
4.4.1.	‘H 1. Effectiveness service delivery of a non-profit sport organization Were significantly influenced by Better sports governance Princiles.....	74
4.4.2.	‘H 2. Effectiveness service delivery of a non-profit sport organization were significantly influenced by other organizational factors, Mission and Capability.....	75

4.4.3. ‘H 3. Satisfaction of the clients influenced by effectiveness service Delivery’ .....	77
CHAPTER 5. RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	78
5.1. Introduction.....	78
5.2. Demographic distribution.....	78
5.2.1. Gender.....	78
5.2.2. Relationship of the respondents with LSRC.....	78
5.3. Research questions.....	79
5.3.1. Factors contributing to the implementations of better governance.....	79
5.3.1.1. Democracy.....	80
5.3.1.2. Transparency.....	81
5.3.1.3. Accountability.....	81
5.3.1.4. Social responsibility.....	82
5.3.2. What are the factors influencing and contributing to the effectiveness of a service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization?.....	83
5.3.3. What influences satisfaction of the stakeholders in regards to better sport governance principle and effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization.....	86
5.4. CONCLUSIONS.....	87
5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	88
5.5.1. Study limitations.....	88
5.5.2. Future research.....	89
REFERENCES.....	91
APPENDIX.....	106
KOREAN ABSTRACT.....	127

## **List of Tables and Figures**

Table 1. Distribution of the population sample.....	56
Table 2. Questioner.....	60
Table 3. Demographic frequency table.....	69
Table 4. Gender frequency.....	70
Table 5. Reliability test statistics.....	72
Table 6. Sports governance factor table.....	75
Table . Mission and capability.....	76
Table 8. Score satisfaction table.....	77

# **Chapter 1.introduction**

## **1.1. Introduction**

It has been an argument that developing a classification of the observed phenomena is fundamental to any form scientific inquiry, “To classify things is to bring parsimony and mental order to one’s view of them” (Hamrick, 1984, p 27). It is therefore very important to understand anything before one can try to get into details on the complication matters. With this regard, I will start by explaining and giving a clear background of what is an organization, which will lead to a clear understanding of a sports organization. Finally, the two will bring us to bottom of the matter, which is nonprofit sports organization.

Some of the most important topics that are going to be covered include the issues of governance which will provide the clear understanding of cooperate governance and the term “good sport governance” later this term will be translated into “better sport governance”. Lastly, the discussion will be whether better sport governance practices can significantly influence effectiveness of service delivered by sport organization to the stakeholders.

## **1.2. Understanding the definition of an organization**

According to Rue & Byars (2009), an organization is a group of people working together in some type of concerted or coordinated effort to attain objectives. Similarly, Hitt, Black, Porter, & Hanson (2007) viewed an organization as inter connected set of individuals and groups who attempt to accomplish common goals through differentiated functions and intended coordination. Another argument that is not far from the other two explanations above explain an organization as a tool people use to coordinate their actions to obtain something that they desire or value – that is to achieve their goals. (Jone, 2010, p. 2)

There are several elements appearing on the description of an organization; people or more than one person, goals and system and that each organization has a distinct purpose, this purpose generally expressed as goals. The meanings further explains that each organization is composed of people and every organization has a systematic structure that defines the limit of each member.

Simon (1997, p.18-19) further explain an organization as pattern of communications and relations among a group of human beings, including the processes for marking and implementing decisions.

This pattern provides to organization members much of the information and many of the assumptions, goals, and attitudes that enter into their decisions, provides also a set of stable and comprehensive expectations as to what the other members of the group are doing and how they will react to what one says and does. The sociologist calls these patterns a “role system”

Many scholars classified an organization into two types, profit making organization and or non-profit making organization. “Traditionally organizations are categorized on the basis of whether their purpose is to make profit”, Chelladurai (2014) supports this notion. For the purpose of this study, the focus will be on a non-profit making organization. However, the next headings will give the clear distinctive explanation of sport organization, profit oriented sport organization and non-profit sport organization.

### **1.3. Sport organization**

Most researchers point out that a group of people who are working together to attain a specific goal in sports are called organization, and most of them are publicly and privately owned. Some are voluntarily organized and they are involved in the provision of sport products and services.

The meaning provided by Robbins (1990) stated that, “sports organization is a social entity involved in the sport industry; it is goal-directed, with a consciously structured activity system and a relatively identifiable boundary.” The five key elements stipulated by this explanation are social entity; Involvement in the sports in industry; Goal-directed focus; consciously structured activity system and relatively identifiable boundary. These five key elements explained as follows:

**“Social entity:** All sport organizations are composed of people or group of people who interact with each other to perform those functions essential to the organization.

**Involvement in the sports in industry:** What differentiate sport organization from other organization, such as banks, pharmaceutical companies, and car dealership is the former’s direct involvement in one or more aspects of the sport industry, for example through production of sport related product or services. While agencies like banks, pharmaceutical companies and car dealership can be and have been involved in sports (primarily through sponsorships).

**Goal-directed focus:** All sport organizations exist for a purpose, it can be for making profit, encouraging participation in a given sport, or

winning Olympic medal. These goals are not usually easily obtainable by an individual, but by members working together. Sport organizations may have more than one goal, and individual members may have different goals from those of the organization.

**Consciously structured activity system:** The interaction of people or group of people in sports organization does not occur through random chances; rather there is conscious structuring of activity systems such as marketing, production and service development. The main functions of sport organization are broken down into smaller tasks or group of tasks; the mechanisms used to coordinate and controls these tasks helps to ensure the attainment of goals.

**Identifiable boundary:** Sport organization need to have a relatively identifiable boundary that distinguishes members from non-members. Members of a sport organization usually have an explicit or implicit agreement with the organization through which they receive money, status, or some other benefit for their involvement. For some sports organization, particularly those in the voluntary or nonprofit sector, the boundaries may not be easily identified as in those sport organization concerned with making a profit or those in the public sector. Nevertheless, every sport

organization must have boundaries that helps distinguish members from non members, but these boundaries are not fixed and may change over time.”

All these explanations and examples about the sport organization essentially incorporate four elements;

- (i) more than one person is needed to form a sport organization
- (ii) Those people called members when they jointly come together, their contributions are specialized
- (iii) Moreover, those specialized functions are coordinated. This brings us to what we call a division of labor.

Slack & Parent (2006); Smith & Stewart (1999) showed that many researchers have documented the distinctive characteristics of sport organization and the list is the relatively consistent. Smith & Stewart (1999) go on stipulating that the difference between sport organization and business organization is the way they measure performance. On the other hand, Hoye&Cusckelly (2007) pointed out that the main purpose of business organization is to make profit.

The understanding of sport organization will help to understand the difference and similarity of sport industry with other industries, the sport organization with any other organization and specifically the non-profit sport organization, which is basis of this study.

#### **1.4. A distinctive description for profit and non-profit sport organization**

The term non-profit organization is used to refer to an entity formed to provide social services rather than being formed to seek profit. ....  
“While the organization’s revenues may exceed expenses, the excess must be used for the common good of society. It cannot directly benefit the members, and it cannot be referred to profit” (pp. 432-433). Many sport organizations such as sporting, good manufactures and athlete management companies considered as for profit organizations; the majority of sport organizations that provide participation opportunities and promote sport categorized as non-profit sport organization. (Hoye&Cuskelly, 2007)

There has been a debate around the usage of the words profit and non-profit organizations. Some scholars pointed out that an individual business providing fitness services is an example of a profit organization (even if it does not actually make a profit), whereas a university intramural

department offering the same service is an example of a non-profit organization (even if its receipt exceeds expenses) see Chelladurai (2014, p. 62). On the other hand, Hopkin (2001) distinguish non-profit organization from for profit organization in a legal perspective using a doctrine of private inurement. The doctrine stated that for a nonprofit organization to be tax exempted, it must be organized and operated so that no part of its net earnings inures to benefit of any private shareholder or individual” (p. 900). It is from this perspective that though the issue of revenue distribution not clearly specified, the nonprofit sport organization can also make revenue.

### **1.5. Non-profit sport organizations and stakeholders**

All organizations have a management structure that determines relationships between the different activities and the members, and subdivides and assigns roles, responsibilities, and authority to carry out different tasks. Organizations are open systems that affect and are affected by their environment (Business dictionary.com).The environment in the context of sport organization can be classified into two, the internal environment and the external environment.

A non-profit board ensures that sport organization conducts its mission without striving to make profit and that the benefits it creates

delivered to its members or individuals it exists to serve (Hoye&Cuskelly, 2007). The board is the internal structure; both internal and external environment can affect it. Kikulis (2000) explains board of a nonprofit organization as a volunteer at the top of the hierarchy of authority and the most common governance structure presenting sport organization. From this perspective, the conclusion can be that there are different types of sport organizations.

The above notion about the voluntarism and the service provider is supported by another one that the sport organization operate as voluntary or nonprofit organization; the funds they generate are used to further activities that benefit their membership or communities where they are based. Some sport organizations, particularly those from public sector, have as their primary function to aid and assist other organization in delivery of sports (Slack & Parent, 2006, p.4).

Examples of these non-profit organizations can be hierarchically or in an ascending order from international to country level. NOSOs are nonprofit organizations relying on federal and state government grants, supplemented by revenues from memberships, competition, and program fees, and, depending on the size and profile of the organization, sponsorship.

Consequence of the conversion from volunteer-administered entities to professionally structured and managed organizations supported by volunteers, governance practices by these non-profits become blurred struggling to define the roles of volunteers in relation to professionally appointed staff (Shilbury, 2001).

### **1.6. Stakeholders in a non-profit sport organization**

The word stakeholder defined as group or individuals who can affect or affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives' (Chappelet, 2016). For nonprofit sport organization, there are many stakeholders and these can include sponsors, funding bodies, staff, public, communities, and government (Australian Sports Commission, 2005). Leapkey& Parent (2009) research consider how stakeholder might influence strategic activities of such as risk management in an organization.

The stakeholder's theory in sport clubs by Thiela&Jochen (2009) stated that sports clubs are nonprofit organizations, they have some impact features that must be taken into consideration and that their chief characteristics are that: they are oriented towards the fulfillment of the interest of their membership. The findings from imperial evidence of stakeholder management in sports clubs shows that the sports clubs that

have good relationship with their external stakeholders will receive more financial and non-financial support from them (Marc, Francesco, Eduard & Nuria, 2011). All stakeholders in sports fraternity identified and discussed according to their tasks by Chappelet (2016) in three systems: The Classical Olympic System; the regulated Olympic System and the total Olympic system. The list covers 24 stakeholders including sports organizations, media, governmental agencies and community representatives.

Example of non-profit sport organization, which is a stakeholder in the International Olympic Committee but also serving the interests of their stakeholders, is the National Olympic sporting organizations (NOSOs) in Australia. It is responsible for the provision of sports services to the community. Its tasks include amongst others, the delivery of programs designed to foster participation and those required to identify and develop elite athletes (Shilbury, 2001).

Another example is the Lesotho sport and Recreation Commission (LSRC) (Lesotho sports and recreation act, 2002). LSRC mandate is to provide leadership in the development of sport and recreation in Lesotho. Its objectives include, giving direction to the development of sport and sporting activities at both national and international levels and to promote the

importance of sport in national development; to promote public awareness of sportsmanship, recreation and leisure amongst other, (Lesotho sport and Recreation act, 2002).

## **Chapter 2. Literature review**

### **2.1. Governance and good governance**

The term “governance” used to refer to the exercise of authority within a given sphere, (Hewitt de Alcantara, 1998). Researchers like Hoye& Auld, 2001; and Hoye (2006); define governance as a critical component of managing a sport organization since it is concerned with issues of policy and direction for the performance of sport organization. It is difficult to define governance, but it is perhaps easier to recognize it in practice. It involves the use of power to direct, control and regulates activities within an organization. It deals with the high-level issues of strategy and policy direction, transparency, and accountability and is not concerned with daily operations, which are the responsibility of management.

Hossen, (2011), describes good governance as “not something that can easily achieved, much like the development and maintenance of the management-governance relationship, which exists within sport organizations (SOs).” By definition, managers within SOs are usually goal driven focused and often practical. The expectation is that they should be highly motivated to make an example to everyday staff within the

organization. In contrast, good governors should be thinkers. They are required to focus on the long-term aspects of the organization in relation to outcomes, values, vision and “high level strategic direction rather than operational strategies and goals” (Kilmister, 2006, p. 173). Good governors should establish a clear relationship with the CEO and make them accountable for their performance in that role. Boards that operate effectively within SOs add value to the organization that is greater than what the CEO or general staff can contribute.

Based on above discussion, it is clear that having an appropriate governance system in place; clearly indicate good monitoring of organization activities to deliver benefits to the sport organizations, members and society. Good governance also subsumes informal, non-governmental mechanisms and thus allows non-state actors be brought into the analysis of societal steering (Lemos&Agrawal, 2006, p. 298). In that regard, the notion of governance through so-called “governance networks”, used to describe public policy making and implementation through a web of relationships between state, market and civil society actors, has gained prominence in governance literature in recent years (Klijn, 2008, p. 511).

## **2.2. Good sport organizational governance**

Lately good governance referred to as the ideal type of governance to correct societal ills, founded on structural attributes such as the rule of law, transparency, citizen participation, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability, especially in a manner that is free from corruption (Matembe, 2010). It is usually referred to as “corporate governance” or “good corporate governance” in the cooperate world, which relates to the various ways in which private or public held companies are governed in ways which are accountable to their internal and external stakeholders (OECD, 2004, p.11).

It often used as a synonym for efficient management, thus governance can be used in modern corporations as corporate governance. Kaufman & Kraay (2008, p. 4) define governance as the traditions by which, and institutions in which, authority in a country is exercised. The Australian Sports Commission (ASC) (2015), having carried out much research in this area, regards governance as concerning three key issues:

- Ensuring that an organization develops strategic goals and direction
- Ensuring that the Board monitors the performance of the organization to ensure that it achieves these strategic goals

- Ensuring that the Board acts in the best interests of the members

Following the existing literature, governance does not only explore the capacity of the state in decision-making, but also explores the governing arrangements, which refers to more than the institutions of government (Kelly, 2006, p. 607). As a result, various types of governance and interpretations have increased over the years, namely good governance, corporate governance, collaborative governance, e-governance and urban governance.

There is now a general consensus that sports governance should combine elements of corporate governance, as applied in the business world (Mallin 2011), and democratic governance, as advocated for the public sector, most notably by the World Bank (Bevir 2010). In fact, sport organizations blend certain characteristics of commercial organizations (especially when they sell broadcasting or marketing rights for their events) with those of public organizations (when they draw up rules for their sports and their events). However, for the purpose of this study the following section will only focus on good governance of a non-sport organization.

Chelledurai (2014, p. 62) pointed out that, “All government agencies are nonprofit organizations”. Slack & Parent (2006, p 4) further

explains that some sport organizations, particularly those from public sector, have as their primary function to aid and assist other organizations in delivery of sports. It is from these two notions and above explanation that I draw a conclusion that also proper governance (good governance) in the non-profit sport organizations can assist in the effectiveness of service delivery.

From this context, it is clear that good governance can play an integral role in the nonprofit sport organization effectiveness of service delivery. However, there is one question remaining. “An organization is a deliberate arrangement of people to accomplish some specific purpose. (Robbins, Coulter, Laeach, & Kilfoil, 2010, p. 10). This means that a non-profit sport organization has a purpose of achieving something its members desired and value – that is to achieve their goals, Jones, (2010) pointed out that; the question is what can happen if governance is not good?

The Australian Sports Commission (2015) commented that poor governance has a variety of causes, including director inexperience, conflicts of interest, failure to manage risk, inadequate or inappropriate financial controls, and poor internal business systems and reporting. Ineffective governance not only affects the particular Olympic Sports

Organization (OSO) but also may undermine confidence in the sport industry as a whole. (Camy& Robinson, 2007, p.24)

### **2.3. Good governance principles**

Chappelet, (2017) explained that, “Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, governmental and intergovernmental bodies, national and international sport governing bodies and academics have put forward numerous lists – more than 30 in total – of governance principles for sport organizations” .

The IOC President, Jacques Rogge, in his opening speech of the First European Conference on the Governance of Sport held in 2001, also emphasized the principle of good governance and suggested that common features that should underlie all sport bodies include responsibility, democracy, transparency and solidarity. His argument was that if sport organizations complied with these principles, they would strengthen their position and provide considerable benefits to the stakeholders of sport, especially the clubs and athletes. In a subsequent address at the 2006 First Seminar on the Autonomy of the Olympic and Sport Movement, Jacques Rogge again emphasized the importance of sport good governance, in particular the need to be transparent, and stated that it is the responsibility of

the Olympic Movement to work in total transparency (Camy& Robinson, 2007, p.23.)

#### **2.4. Good sport governance evaluation methods**

Because of the acceptance, that setting out principles or guidelines of good sport governance is insufficient without an effective evaluation or governance measurements methods, Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013) published various methods of evaluating sports' good governance. In their previous studies, they put in place and include among others the Basic Indicators for Better Governance of International Sport (BIBGIS).

The IOC's 'Basic Universal Principles of good governance of the Olympic and sports movement' (IOC, 2008), the BUPs, which is long catalogue of some 120 guidelines (mostly expressed as recommendations) was also drawn up in 2008 and approved by Olympic Congress in 2009. The Danish organization Play the Game published its Sports Governance Observer, which uses 36 indicators to assess four areas of governance (Geeraert 2015) and the 20 mandatory principles for sports governance (AIS, 2015) introduced by Australian government. At the end of the same year, also the UK government's strategy for sport (HMG 2015) called for a new governance code in the UK (section 8.4, p. 64-65).

In 2016, the General Assembly of the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF) endorsed 50 governance indicators covering five key principles (ten indicators for each principle: Transparency, Integrity, Democracy, Sports development and solidarity, and Control mechanisms), drawn up by an ad hoc taskforce (ASOIF, 2016). Suggestions are made that IFs within the ASOIF must now assess whether these indicators respected in their organization. Rather than the ‘good governance’ so often alluded to since the World Bank first popularized the term, the objective should be to ensure ‘better governance’ within each organization and governance has to be monitored over time in order to determine whether it is improving.

## **2.5. Service delivery in a nonprofit organization**

In this context of sport organization as explained in the above chapters describing a nonprofit sport organization, such organization is a service provider, and the sport product is a service itself. According to Chelledurai, (2014) all most all sports and recreation organizations classified as service orientated organizations. Organizations from traditional industries, sport organizations face the challenge of meeting the rising

expectations of spectators. These spectators are sport product consumer which is service.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005) asked; what and how much value was created in the process of service delivery?" A significant aspect of service provider- client interface is the amount and type of information exchanged between the client and provider in the production of the service (Chelladurai, 2014). A successful philosophy that focuses on total quality orientation in the transaction of the provider with the consumer asks organizations to define clearly their customers for being able to identify and respond to needs, but also to influence what is perceived service quality by the targeted segment of the market (Papadimitriou & Karteroliotis, 2000).

The consumers' encounter with the service staff is probably the most important aspect of a service, as the intangibility of services automatically makes the customer contact a vital determinant of the quality of service experience. In this context, Verma (2012) classified service employees according to customer-contact and non-customer-contact employees. "Customer-contact employees, come into contact with customers in the process of the service provision" (Verma, 2012, p. 170).

Examples for customer-contact employees in a sports environment are stewards, or sales personnel in retail. Non-customer-contact employees are those who contribute to the service production, but not meet the customers. Those back-end employees, such as electricians or kitchen help, support the delivery of the product but not seen in any as customer-contact employees. In the sport organization context the example of such support staff employees are accountants, administrators, office assistants and clerks.

As mentioned above, special importance must be to customer-contact employees, as they have direct bearing on the quality of the service experience. Verma (2012) differentiated high-contact and low-contact services. This differentiation automatically provides a better understanding in the operational and system requirements. Customer contact refers to the physical presence of the customer in the situation. “The extent of contact refers to the percentage of time a customer ought to be in the system out of the total time it takes to serve him or her” (Verma, 2012, p.170). In high-contact service, service personnel interact for a certain period with the customers, like a guest service employee. In contrast, a low-contact service describes a very short period of interaction with the customer, like a ticket-taker, or an attendant. Furthermore, service personnel also classified

according to visibility. There are visible service personnel, like salespersons, and invisible service personnel such as cooks.

It is common that sport organizations receive varying feedback from their customers depending on different employees. When interacting with high-contact service personnel, customers assume significance to skills like social graces, communication, language, and to personality traits like friendliness, extroversion, energy or politeness (Verma, 2012). A key success factor for service personnel is being able to relate emotionally with the customer. Chelladurai (2014) used this contrast to categories service in to consumer and professional services. They distinguish consumer serves as largely based on low-skill and routine services including renting of facilities and retailing of goods and professional services as largely based on knowledge, expertise, and special competence of employee (the service provider).

Cho whan (2015) identified several factors, which may significantly improve the quality and performance by Careful selection and training of personnel; laying down norms, rules, and procedures. That was to ensure consistent behavior; ensuring consistent appearance, and ;reducing the importance of personal contact by introducing automation and

computerization wherever possible to ensure the high-contact service personnel in a professional service being dexterous in public relations and inter-personal skills, and the low-contact employees having high technical and analytical attributes,

Customer-contact employees in a professional service have a key role in delivering service quality. However, setting standards and communicating rules and norms are not enough to guarantee service quality in an environment, which is devoid of other positive motivators and stimuli (Kandampully, Mok, & Sparks, 2001). Marriott & Brown (1997, p. 34) formulated a simple but meaningful philosophy about the treatment of employees in a service environment: “Take care of your employees, and they will take care of your customer”. As Kandampully et al. (2001) worked out, it is essential for sport managers to create a service environment that not accomplished by words alone but by observable actions that promote good service.

It is important for an organization policy maker to develop a plan and working ethics that will enable manager and staff to work in harmony. In a night shell, creating a successful and healthy working climate is a key success factor for service business success. Cook (2004, p. 6) said, “The

quality of external service delivery is a reflection of the quality of service that people within the organization provide each other". This means that employees who do not feel valued or appreciated are less likely to deliver excellent service (Cook, 2004) that in turn results in a correlation between employee satisfaction measures and customer satisfaction measures. The above statement concludes that by improving employee satisfaction, successful service organizations are able to deliver superior service to customers.

Employee Grönroos (1998) used a triangle to illustrate that customer and employee relationships of services are directly affected by traditional external marketing and the interactive marketing between customers and employees in the service encounter, and indirectly affected by the internal marketing directed at employees (Hennig-Thurau & Hansen, 2000). This implies that the quality of the service produced and delivered depend on the satisfaction of a person producing it (employee), but at the same time the quality of the product (service) will be valued by the person receiving. As the interaction between the employee and the customer seriously affects the overall customer experience, service organizations must ensure that their employees have the traits of customer service orientation, Grönroos (1998).

Hennig–Thurau& Hansen (2000, p. 162) noted that relationship marketing should not be limited to frontline employees but should be extended to all personnel, as “high internal service quality and internal customer orientation are just as important as external service quality and customer orientation”. Meaning that in a sport organization regardless of type, nonprofit sport organization or profit oriented sport organization, all the internal people within the sport organization are regarded as client who consume the internal service, and the mode of providing that service to them also influence the way they will provide the service to external clients.

## **2.6. Service in the context of sport organization**

It is very important to explaining and classifying things as that bring parsimony and mental order to one’s view of them (Hambrick, 1984, p. 27). It is also of importance to start by looking at service in this phenomenon as a term so that it will help to give a better understanding of the whole study. According to the criteria of whether an organization is producing goods or services, almost all sports and recreation organizations classified as service organization (Chelladurai, 2014, p. 23). This is from the notion that sport organizations exist to provide sport port product and service in the sport industry (Chelladurai, 2005). In the context of this study, service is a

product of sport organization. The product of any organization may be goods, services, or both. Goods are a physical object that produced at one time and used later. In contrast, a service is a “time-perishable, intangible experience perfumed for a customer acting in the role of co-producer” (Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmon, 2011, p. 4). In this context, the goods refer to all sports physical tangible products that can be seen or those that can be produced by sport organization and provided to the consumer or client.

The phrases “goods are produced and services are performed” (George, 2008, p. 23, following Ratthmell, 1974, p. 1) show that service is different from goods even if they can both be the sport organization’s products. Bothma (2007) as any activity describes Service or benefit a supplier offers a customer that is intangible and does not results in anything tangible. Service, also defined by Gronroos, (1990); Lovelock, 1991; Sasser, Olsen, & Whyckoff, (1978); Schneider & Bowen, (1995) as an intangible occurrence, process, or performance that is produced and consumed simultaneously. They continue explaining that the nature of a service better understood by highlighting its pertinent attributes (Characteristics). They also said that the service attributes most frequently discussed are intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity, and simultaneity.

According to Kotler, Bowen and Makken (2006, p. 42) there are four characteristics of service, they are; intangibility, variability, inseparability and perishability. All these means, services cannot be seen; tested; felt; heard or smelled before purchased. The second means that quality of services depends on who provides them and when, where and how, while the third and the last means that service cannot be stored for later sale or use and services cannot be separated from their providers, respectively.

Out of all these meaning, it should better pointed out clearly, that goods might be used in the production of service. For example, in athletics or road run (marathon), an athlete may want a running shoe that is good to him/her, the specialist will use a high-quality equipment (machine) to test such athlete foot and recommend the correct running shoes. The athlete did not buy equipment, but rendered a service provided by specialist using specialized equipment.

In addition, that specialist might happen to be a coach provided by the sport organization. The coach will use a computer to draw a draining schedule for the athletes and use a training facility to provide the athlete with a training the athletes need. This means the athlete just received the serves rendered by sports organization. Goods properly called by

Chelladurai, Scott & Haywood-Farmer (1987) as facilitating goods and facilities.

### *2.6.1. Service quality in the context of sport organization*

Service quality is defined as customer's overall conception of the relative inferiority or greatness of the organization and its service (Bitner&Hubbert, (1994); Keiningham et al.(1995). The former implies the satisfaction feeling that the client has for the service provided by the organization. Klaus (1985) explained that as a total net value of benefit perceived in the service encounter over what had expected. Meaning the sport product consumer had a certain perceived value about the product (service). According to the Parasuraman, Zeithml, Valerie, Berry Leonard (1985), service quality adjusted using function of three characters which are consist with pre-purchase of customer expectations, perceived process quality and perceived output quality.

They further defined service quality as a gap between customer's expectation of service and customer's perception of the service experience. Lewis & Booms, (1983) noted that "service quality aim to meeting the requirements of the customer's expectation regularly". Under customer expectation, customers think, service provider should offer excellent and

unbelievable service rather than they believe (Parasuram, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). This implies that customers always compare service quality of the firm via expectation of the service and perception of the way the service has been performed (Gronroos, 1984; Lehtinen & Lehtinen, 1982; Lewis & Booms, 1983; Parasuraman et al., 1985). As a result, in order to maintain standard of service quality, customer's behavioral objectives are important (Bitner, 1990). The 'Service Quality Theory' (Oliver, 1980) can explain interaction of customer's behavioral objectives and service quality.

According to Service Quality Theory introduced by Oliver (1980), if performance of the service firm does not meet customer's expectation, customers will judge that firm has 'low quality' and also, if performance of that service firm exceeds the expectation of the customers, customers will judge firm has 'high quality'. Parasuraman et al., (1991) developed service quality model including multi-dimensions to measure the service quality. Service quality scale consists with very important criteria to measure the customer's perception and quality of the service (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Service quality reflected from five dimensions such as assurance, empathy, reliability, responsiveness and tangible (Adhikari & Das, 2016).

The term satisfaction is a feeling (Kotler, 2009) that extending across the entire consumption horizon (Oliver, 1980). It is with this regard that satisfaction determined by comparing costs which customers give up to get a service and reward, which customers receive as response (Tam, 2004). Therefore, customer satisfaction defined as an outcome of purchase and use came because of buyers' comparison of the reward and costs of purchase (Churchill & Surprenant, 1982).

Customer satisfaction defined as an emotional response, which results from a cognitive process of evaluating the service received against the costs of obtaining the service (Woodruff, Clemons, Schumann, Gardial & Bums, 1991). In other ward, service quality determined by the customer satisfaction and feeling of pleasure or distress came from comparing the perceived performance or out come in relation to the exceeded expectation of the nonprofit organization service provided. Apart from using attribute of various sport services, there are two issues highlighted Chelladurai & Chang, (2000):

(a) Standard by which service evaluated and

(b) Who should be the judge of the service quality?

### *2.6.2. Effectiveness of service delivery in a non-profit sport organization*

The effectiveness of non-profit sports organizations, high performance sports programs and in campus recreation programs has become a growing research interest. (Madella, Bayle & Tome 2005; Wolfe, Hoerber&Babiak 2002). Therefore, it is of importance to show what it takes to say the non-profit sport organization is effective.

Jones and Pendlebury, (2010) stated that structural, political and symbolic in order to produce movement towards goals in specific effectiveness refers to the success or otherwise the rate of achieving objectives. The further explain, “it concerns with performance outputs regardless of the amount of resources used. Effectiveness relates to goal achievement.

However, the central question in this regard is, whether goals and objectives achieved within the limitations of allocated resources? The issue of scarce resources and the manner they are managed to meet the needs and aspirations of the people is central to governance and service delivery.”(Jones and Pendlebury, 2010)

National Olympic sporting organizations (NOSOs) in Australia are

responsible for the provision of sports services to the community. This includes the delivery of programs designed to foster participation and those required to identify and develop elite athletes. Typically, the structure of NOSOs mirrors Australia's federated model of government in which state sporting organizations make up the NOSO and are predominantly responsible for the delivery of sport services in their state (Hoye & Auld, 2001; Shilbury, 2001).

The term effectiveness and efficiency often used interchangeably. In an organizational perspective, specifically a nonprofit sport organization, they are queried different (Steers & Black, 1994). Organizational effectiveness is the prime dependent variable in many organizational contexts (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991), and it also multidimensionality. It is the cause of conceptual ambiguities and measurement difficulties. What constitutes effectiveness is in itself a paradox (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991). There appears to be no universal agreement on precisely what organizational effectiveness means, as organizational effectiveness means different things to different people.

The majority of authors agree that organizational effectiveness requires measuring multiple criteria and the evaluation of different

organizational functions using different 8 Shilbury& Moore, characteristics, and it should also consider both means (processes) and ends (outcomes) (Shilbury& Moore, 2006). These bring the conclusion that organizational effectiveness is the ultimate dependable in any organizational analysis. It was noted earlier that, an organization is social entity that set out to achieve certain purposes (Robbins, Coulter, & Kilfoil, 2012, p. 10). The managerial functions and processes are done to archive those purposes, meaning that whether purposes are archived or not it is critical to the analysis of an organization and management.

The other meaning is that organizational effectiveness is a theoretical core of all organizational models and it is final dependent variable in most organizational studies (Chelladurai, Szyszlo, Haggerty, 1987, p. 111). Recently, interest to effectiveness studies has been strong in sports organizations and researchers such as (Bayle & Madella, 2002; Papadimitriou& Taylor, 2000; Wolfe & Putler, 2002; Shilbury& Moore 2006; Papadimitriou, 2007; and Balduck, 2009; and Ibrahim, 2013) studied Effectiveness in sport organizations. To assess the organizational effectiveness there should be models in place. A number of authors have studied organizational effectiveness from different perspectives and with different criteria (Champbell, 1977; Steers, 1975; steers & Black, 1994).

The five significant models of organizational effectiveness are examined within the general framework of a systems perspective

(a) The goal model,

(b) The system resource model,

(c) The process model,

(d) The process model, and the multiple c- constituency model and the competency values approach.

The goal attainment approach, the system resource approach and the internal process approach if the theoretical model to apply that cannot be considered reliable and adequate criteria in measuring organizational effectiveness (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Zammuto, 1984), because their orientation is one-dimensional, (For example, the emphasis goal attainment approach on output) and focus on only a dimension. This issue is a very sensitive in nonprofit organizations, because nonprofit organizations such as sports federations develop their activities in various fields, pursue multiple goals and are active with the attitude multiple stakeholders' satisfaction and regard to changes and growing demands against the external environment.

Due to difficulties in obtaining a reliable model for measuring organizational effectiveness, some researchers of Sports Management such as Chelladurai (1987, p. 11) Frisby (1986, p. 22) and Koksi (1995, p. 12) suggest organizations need to be evaluated with different parameters simultaneously and so the use of a multi-dimensional approach. Zammuto (1984, p. 614) suggest that “organization effectiveness fundamentally is value-based concept in that the whole of the evaluation processes requires the application of the value judgments, from the selection of the constituencies and weighting of the judgments to the development of the recommendations for future organizational performance”.

Balduck (2009, p. 2) investigated management and program effectiveness using the competing values approach as a theoretical framework at Belgian sport clubs and showed the dimension satisfaction, competition goal, acquiring sports members, and information and communication were significant predictors of the program effectiveness level. Rojas (2000, p.19) study literature review of nonprofit organizational effectiveness from which four models of organizational effectiveness was selected. Results showed that the competing values approach is the most proper approach to evaluating organizational effectiveness in nonprofit organizations. On the other hand, Shilbury& Moore (2006) stated that

multiple constituency Model is as requirements and it is components of the competing values approach. Thus, the most effective of multi-dimensional approach is competing values approach of Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981, p.18).

In the context of good governance of nonprofit sport organization, Camy & Robinson (2007) stated that the Olympic Sport Organization's effectiveness would best improved by applying the principles of governance in a way that is acceptable to the culture, politics and power systems within the organization.

## **2.7. Understanding the link between better governance and service delivery**

In order to comprehend the link between good governance which Chapplet (2017) proposed to use better governance instate of good governance and effective service delivery, it is prudent to clarify what service delivery and good governance entails in the context of this study.

The link between the two concepts, better sport governance and good service delivery, were highlighted in the world Banks 2004 *World Development Report*. The report focused on the accountability structures and processes (World bank, 2004). It is since then that the sectorial

specialists' become aware that the governance interventions can contribute to service delivery improvement and there is a growing recognition that both technical and governance elements are necessary facets of strengthening public service.

The meaning provide by Henry & Lee (2004) shows that, “corporate or organizational governance is concerned with normative, ethically-informed standards of managerial behavior with the focus at only four principles, namely: democracy; responsibility; Equity, and last but not one effeteness.” It is therefore clear that corporate governance can provides means for resolving unethical or socially unexpected behaviors such as racism; discrimination or conservatism also can assist in the delivery of service

Effectiveness is included as other principle of good governance practices in the above paragraph. Organizational effectiveness is a theoretical core of all organizational models and it is final dependent variable in most organizational studies (Chelladurai, Szyszlo& Haggerty, 1987). Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accounting (CIPFA) (2007, p. 1) stated that proper governance has a significant role to play in effective service delivery in public institutions. This principle of good sport

governance can be linked to service delivery through the type of effectiveness, namely “performance” which Chappelet, 2017, explain its neutral meaning include “success”, “impact”, “failure” or “benefits” which is defined differently by different stakeholders.

Measuring success in nonprofits has been described by Sawhill& Williamson (2001) as “mission impossible,” largely because nonprofits have not traditionally relied on “profit” as a primary measure of performance. The nonprofit literature (Bryson, 1995; Drucker, 1990; Forbes, 1998; Oster, 1995) is consistent in recognizing the difficulties of measuring success and by default the mission that nonprofits seeks to achieve. This literature notes the need for multiple measures (Forbes, 1998; Sawhill& Williamson, 2001), and consequently, this article reports the use of a multidimensional framework designed to measure effectiveness in a specific cohort of nonprofit organizations

According to the former South African Management Development Institute (SAMDI) (2002, p. 5) service delivery is the systematic arrangement for satisfactory fulfillment of the various demands for services, by undertaking purposeful activities with optimum resource use to delivering effective, efficient, and economic services resulting in

measurable and acceptable benefits of the customer. Thus, service delivery entails the activities of public officials, activities that require public officials to establish exactly what the public wants, and how best to fulfill those needs.

Service delivery is characterized by inter alia a high level of corruption, inequality, inadequate capacity for effective accountability of financial resources, persistent shortages in infrastructure implementation, inadequate community support, and limited communication amongst stakeholders (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2009; UBOS 2004, p.19)

Cook (2004' p. 6) said, "The quality of external service delivery reflects the quality of service that people within the organization provide each other ..... that in turn results in a correlation between employee satisfaction measures and customer satisfaction measures". This means that employees who do not feel valued or appreciated are less likely to deliver excellent service. The above statement concludes that by improving employee satisfaction, successful service organizations are able to deliver superior service to customers.

Cook (2004, p. 6) stipulated that, "the quality of external service delivery is a reflection of the quality of service that people within the

organization provide on each other”. Meaning that employees who do not feel valued or appreciated are less likely to deliver excellent service, and by improving employee satisfaction, successful service organizations are able to deliver superior service to customers. These customers according to the explanation given in the above chapters referred as clients of the nonprofit sport organization or stakeholders who can affect or affected by the activities of an organization.

### *2.7.1. Previous studies*

Parent &Hoye, (2018) pointed out that subject of sport organization performance in relation to governance practices has been explored by authors, such as Hoye (2004), Hoye&Cuskelly (2003) and Hoye& Doherty (2011). Their focused was on a range of drivers of the performance of non-profit sport boards including structure, power, board composition, and leadership interactions, but not specifically the adoption of a set of governance principles on the overall sport organization’s performance.

Excellence in public service delivery was one of the key themes of international public sector reforms in the 1980s and 1990s. Large battery of approach built up to help governments with service improvement. Some of these are legislative (Bovaird&Halachmi, 2001). Bovaird&Löffler (2002)

further stated that governments realized that, while excellent service delivery remains important, it is not sufficient.

One response of government, sport organizations, and independent agencies on the development of an increasing number of suggested governance principles and guidelines designed to counter failures in governance, such as democratic structures/democracy, accountability, transparency, professionalization, control/supervisory mechanisms, fairness, solidarity/social responsibility, equality, (Chappelet&Mrkonjic, 2013).

## **2.8. The purpose of the study**

Though there are lots of study about good governance and service delivery, I did not find one which directly points out whether good sport governance can influence good service delivery. As a result, the **purpose** of this study is therefore to **examine** influential factors contributing to **effectiveness** of service delivery (programs) provided by nonprofit sport organization to its stakeholders based the on the elements of good sport governance principle. In the context of this study, the nonprofit sport organization is the Lesotho Sport and Recreation Commission (LSRC) in Lesotho.

The elements that will be examined are under four (4) principles guide lines that are used by Chapelet&Kübler-Mabbot (2008), namely; democracy (structures, standards and process), transparency (access and timely disclosure of information), accountability, and social responsibility of a non-profit sport organization effectiveness on service delivery to stakeholders.

According to Camy& Robinson, (2007) a stakeholder is anyone who has a stake or interest in the organization. In the article where Chapelet (2016) was following Freeman (1984), he define stakeholder in an organization as ‘any group or individual who can affect or affected by the achievement of the organization’s that interest may not be material or financial; it could. For example, be emotional or symbolic, such as the interest that the public has in the performance of the nation’s athletes at the Olympic Games. Thus, the stakeholder community includes everyone who affected by an organization. Understanding in the relationship between good governance principles practices and performance on service delivery will held and assist all stakeholders to make a sound decision.

### *2.8.1. Research questions*

Answers to the following questions will help to the objective achievement of this study, which will later be interpreted and evaluated:

RQ1. Which factor contributing to the implementation of better sports governance principles in a nonprofit sport organization?

RQ2. What are the factors influencing and contributing to the effectiveness of a service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization?

RQ3. What influences satisfaction of the stakeholders in regards to better sport governance principle and effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization.

In order to answer the above research questions, the corresponding study hypotheses were formulated as follows:

‘H 1’. Effectiveness service delivery of a non-profit sport organization is

significantly influenced by better sports governance principles.’

‘H 2’. The effectiveness of service delivery significantly influenced also by other factors like good organizational mission and capability to execute dissention’.

‘H3’. The client’s satisfaction is significantly motivated by successful and effectiveness service delivery.

**Key words** : Better governance. Nonprofit organization. Service.

Effectiveness.Stakeholder

## **Chapter 3. Methods**

### **3.1. Research design and method**

This chapter describes the methods used in this study. Firstly, a research design, research approach, research setting, sampling methodology and data collection instrument used are presented.

#### *3.1.1. Research design*

Skinner, Edwards, & Corbett, (2015) in research methods for sport management they describe quantitative research as a type of research in which the sport management researchers decides what to study, ask specific, narrow questions, collections quantifiable data from participant, analyses these numbers using statistic and conducts the inquiry in an unbiased, objective manner. Their description confirmed by Dey (2003) when clearly stipulated that quantitative research deal with numbers. It relies more on random sampling and structured data collection instruments that fit diverse experiences into predetermined response categories.

It is in this regard that this current survey employed quantitative method. Three research questionnaire which were about whether better government principle can influence effectiveness of service delivery of a

nonprofit sport organization in Lesotho were developed based on the theory found in the literature review, chapter two. Five hypotheses were derived from those three research questions based also on the understanding of theory. The research goals of this current were tightly tied with the research questions, so the goals of the current research were to examine the influential factors of better governance principles in to the effectiveness of nonprofit sport organization service delivery. The satisfaction level from stakeholders was measured as to find how much the governance principles and other factors contributed to influence on the effectiveness of service delivery.

Bryman& Bell (2015), in business research methods suggested that if set of hypotheses were formulated to be confirmed or rejected during the research process, that kind of research is following deductive approach. In this current survey, better sports government principles, which implemented by a nonprofit sport organization, were identified. Those govern ent principles were democracy, transparency, accountability and social responsibility. These four better sports government were then test if they can influence effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization. Stakeholders satisfaction was used as a test dependable variable testing they were satisfied due to effectiveness service delivery.

The above process justified by Aimis and Silk (2005) as they say this type of research in which the researcher decides what to study, asks specific, narrow questions, collects quantifiable data from participants, analyses these numbers using statistics and attempts to conduct the inquiry in an unbiased, objective manner. Creswell (2008) also pointed out the most prevalent points in today's researchers that were employed on this survey:

- Collecting and analyzing information in a numeric form;
- collecting scores and then using them to measure the performance of individuals and organization;

### *3.1.2. Rationale for the selection of respondents*

Depending on the research question, participants randomly assigned to different treatments. The statistics and details of the responses obtained from the following population, which were almost all stakeholders representatives of sports in Lesotho. They are affiliates and clients getting service from Lesotho sports and recreation commission, those were:

- (i) LSRC board members and commissioners,

- (ii) LSRC staff members (Sports Development Division of LSRC,
- (iii) The Chief executive office and other staff members in the senior positions and junior positions),
- (iv) The Ministry of gender Youth Sports and Recreation staff from the top to the junior positions (these are the people dealing with policy development and funding under the jurisdiction of nonprofit sports organizations in Lesotho).
- (v) sports leaders from sports bodies,
- (vi) business community (mostly those supplying service to LSRC and those sponsoring LSRC activities),
- (vii) Media houses (journalists, radio and television sports presenters, etc.),
- (viii) Athletes and
- (ix) the general people (spectators).

Sports bodies in the context of this study refer to sports associations and clubs that affiliated and work closely with Lesotho Sport and Recreation (LSRC) at various levels.

### *3.1.3. Sampling*

Kemper, Stringfield and Teddlie (2003, p. 280) suggested that “although purposive sampling techniques are commonly associated with qualitative methods, purposive sampling can be used within studies with either, a qualitative or quantitative orientation and quite common in mixed methods studies”. In this study, I used non-probability purposive sampling approach. I purposely chose individuals who have rich information related to the central issues of the study (Kemper, Stringfield&Teddlie 2003; Patton 2002). King, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1987) also suggest that the best way to explore issues is to ask the people who were involved with it. In this sense, I adopted purposive sampling in this study. I chose this method of sampling because I intentionally decided to selected participants who have experience and full understanding of what the studied organization and the key concept of better sports governance implemented (Creswell & Plano Clark 2007, p. 112).

There are six common techniques of purposive sampling from which to choose (Kemper, Stringfield&Teddlie 2003, p. 278), namely; convenience sampling; extreme/deviant; case sampling; confirming/disconfirming cases and typical case sampling; Homogeneous case sampling; stratified purposive sampling and random purposive sampling and Opportunistic and snowball sampling.

Of these six techniques, this study was using a convenience sampling technique for gathering opinions from a different subgroup. Still focusing on the purposely selected groups which are directly involved with the issues of studied organization, the questionnaires were given to those who were readily available within the specific selected group. These groups also affiliated with this nonprofit sport organization. The groups are listed in 3.1.3 under rationale for selecting participants could provide the in-depth information and best data source on the better sport governance.

Based on the demand side and supply side stakeholder's theory provided by Ben-Ner and Gui (1993), two sample groups were purposely selected and categorized as the nonprofit sports organizations' **internal** clients (service supply stakeholders) and **external** key stakeholders or clients (service demand or receiver stakeholders).

A total number of 150 respondents were selected for the survey. The respondents for the survey involved all LSRC clients listed above, both internal and external stakeholders. Internal key stakeholders: the top management group who are directly involved in a better sport governance decision making and sports policy development from the government side, LSRC board members and LSRC staff member to senior and junior management groups directly responsible for managing and delivering Sports programs (services).

External key stakeholders: sports leaders attached to any sports association or club that participate in the delivered programs, business fraternity, media house (journalists), athletes and the spectators. Specifically, these groups are the ones directly affected by sport governance principles practices, either positively or negatively.

The first group, the internal key stakeholders, comprised 75 participants, among them were 19 government servants attached to district sports offices as the sport policy overseer, they are the ones who are monitoring and evaluating sports programs. The statuses of the respondents were determined by their grade of employment.

For example, grade of employment for senior management groups is G4 and F6. They were the top management group, senior management group and middle management group. The top management group involves two types of employee: Administrative and recreation and Sports officers. The senior management group and middle management group all involve the senior sports of employment. This group of respondents holds high posts in the public sports organizations of Lesotho and their number is limited.

The second and the third group of participants were 13 LSRC members and 19 commissioners' respectively. The second groups were 13 LSRC staff members. These were the key line managers of the organization and generally were the chief operating officers of the individual departments, divisions or branches. In most situations, they are involved in policy implementations, programs implementations and overseeing quality of service delivery sports programs in the country.

Third was a group of individuals democratically elected to the board from 36 different national sports federations in Lesotho. Because of their relationship with LSRC, their contribution in this study assisted in the achievement of targeted goals and objectives.

It is important to get their involvement in assessing best practices associated with the organizations 'operation, because these people would provide a holistic view of the organization and they have wide understanding about the implications of strategic development on the running of the organization's activities (Babiak, 2009; Zairi&Jarrar, 2001). Information gathered from them helps in discovering important input on organization's directions and key drivers for success (Niven, 2008).

The second group, the external key stakeholders, comprised 75 participants. They were 19 sports leaders attached to sports associations or clubs at national and district levels that participate in the programs (services) provided by LSRC, 19 business community, 19 athletes, 19 media houses radios and television sports programs presenters and journalists and 19 spectators. They were important resources for the study because they were knowledgeable about sport governance principles practices implemented by the studied non-profit sport organization, about the success and failure, in-depth of the programs also implemented and the courses. They also have a wealth of information associated with the questions under this study. They were involved directly in the better sport governance principles practices and the programs implementation.

Thus knowledgeable about issues of better governance and what might influence the good service delivery.

In the Lesotho sports context, sports bodies are not only involved as sport service provider key stakeholders but they also form part of the public sports organization customers that received services. Therefore, the selected samples for this study suited the multiple constituency approach because they represented various roles. This is in line with Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991, p. 127), whose definition is that the constituents may be the resources providers, the recipients of organizational output, or the members of the organization engaged in throughput processes.

In accordance with this notion, the surveys with selected senior sports development officers and sports leaders at various levels other LSRC client mention above, also support the multiple constituency approach. This approach also involved the collection of data from multi-organizational levels. In this sense, the perceptions of respondents from different levels expected to be different.

Data gathered from this approach provided meaningful information for answering the research questions and capturing full perspectives of the targeted population. This is in line with Boyne (2003) who endorsed the

usefulness of the multiple constituency approach for investigating public service improvement. Public service improvement is a dynamic phenomenon; it is usually concerned with the performance of multi-organizational networks rather than the achievement of single organizations'. Therefore, this study gathered data from nonprofit sports organizations at national and districts levels, and from sports associations or clubs at national, state and district levels.

Table 1 below illustrates the selection of the population sample.

Table 1

Distribution of population sampling

INTERNAL RESPONDENTS	Numbers	EXTERNAL RESPONDENTS	Numbers
1. Government officers	19	1. Business community	19
2. LSRC Board members	17	2. Media (journalists)	19
3.LSRC Staff members	13	3.Athletes	19
4.Association committees	25	4. Spectators	18
TOTAL	75		75
			150

### 3.2. Survey

Permission to collect data for this study was granted telephonically from the relevant individual stakeholders of which almost all of them are sports association members which subscribed with Lesotho Sports and

Recreation Commission, Ministry of Gender, Youth, Spots and Recreation, other stakeholders like media houses, Journalists, local business owner and managers which normally sponsors LSRC, LSRC board members and staff.

Sources involved three distinct data in this study. The first is the scholarly literature, government documents and policies in the area of good sport governance. Scholarly materials were sourced from various online journals such as Sport Journals, Seoul National University Library and Google Scholar. The literature review provided a basis for identifying the key variables and the development of hypotheses.

The second stage includes data collection by preparing a questionnaire with the help of indicators used in the NSGO project 2017 and BIBGIS published by Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013). During this period, the collection of lists of participants, email addresses and telephone numbers were carried out. I contacted the participants through email, text messages and online phone social media (WhatsApp). Survey research method was adopted to address the research questions, using the questionnaire as the main instrument. Survey data was obtained through pre-determined questions that were sent to the respondents via internet and social media.

In order to examine the influential factors of effectiveness service delivery, the organizational mission were measured as to find out whether it satisfied the criteria and follow the guidelines proposed by Pearce and David (1987). They believed that, if those guidelines followed correctly, the organization would develop the good strategies that will defiantly lead the organization to archive its goals successfully. The understanding was that if those guideline scores were high then the effectiveness of service would also be high.

In addition, the better sport governance principles level implemented by the non-profit sport organization measured, and then the influential level of better sport governance was examined. The influential level of better sports governance principles to effectiveness of service delivery used two stages of study was conducted. The first stage was a comprehensive review of the literature to further understand and to state an overview of the topics concerned in the research. The second stage was the development of the survey questioner. The questionnaire consisted of five sections. There were twelve questions; all those questions were close-ended questions. Table 2 shows details of the questionnaire designed.

Neuman (2007) explain that scaling rates an ordinal interval or ratio measure of a variable expressed as a numerical score. Questioner consisting of 7-point Likert scale, in which only the minimum and maximum value was labeled. This kind of questions was developed in order to access specific type of information.

Table 2.

*Questionnaire*

<b>Division</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>References</b>
Section 1	Gender Age Occupation Number of years	Demographic question	Geeraert, (2017)
Section 2	Mission	Characteristics of organisation	Norris, (2011); Chappelet&Mrkonjic (2013)
Section 3	Democracy Transparency Accountability Social Responsibility	Better sports governance principles	Norris, (2011); Chappelet&Mrkonjic (2013)
Section 4	Democracy (Service) Transparency (Service) Accountability (Service) Social Responsibility (Service) Organisation capability	Factors influencing effectiveness of service delivery	Norris, (2011); Chappelet&Mrkonjic (2013)
Section 5	Service satisfaction Score		Sharff, (2012)

Section 1. Was asking the participants to provide demographic information, their gender, age, occupation, and experience in years and last their relationship with the studied organization together with the years they affiliated with the organization. Section 2 was asking the respondents to choose the characteristics which best described their organizational mission statement. The third section was question about the better sports governance

principles implemented by the organization using the indicators of good governance principles. In the fourth section, the questions were asking the respondents about the sports governance factors contributed to the effectiveness of service delivery. The last section was about the satisfaction measurement using the score of 1/10 to 10/10.

### **3.3. Data collection and analysis of the survey**

#### *3.3.1. Data collection*

The questionnaire method of data collection was utilized. The questioners were distributing to the target audience using emails, social media application (WhatsApp) and others were hand delivered by the researcher assistant at the ground. The quantifiable information was collected and analyses using scientific statistics data analyses descriptive statistics and linear regression. Results from collected dater were used for understanding the research problem.

The reason for collecting this type of data is to generate a comprehensive understanding of the factors that can lead to successful service delivery due to implementation of better sport governance principles and practice. In order to collect the data, the ground researchers were hand delivered questionnaires to survey a cross-boundary population of

constituents that are involved with LSRC and service delivery. Questionnaire method was used by considering the following points by Kumar (2005)

1. If the study was about issues that respondents might feel reluctant to discuss with an investigator, a questionnaire may be the better choice as it assures anonymity.

The current research was conducted in Lesotho and the respondents were board members, committee members, staffs and club members from the national sport associations/federations, athletes, business community and journalists. Some of the questions were sensitive questions. Therefore, anonymity was essential, and confidentiality was very much essential.

2. The geographical distribution of the population: Questionnaire was the best choice when the potential respondents were scattered over a wide geographical area.

The scope of the current research was Lesotho as I was not present in the scope of the research the best method to reach the potential respondents was emails, social media (WhatsApp) and some of the questionnaires were hand delivered by two researcher's assistants at the

ground. I designed the questionnaire with reference to indicators taken from the NSGO project 2017. “The indicators were devised by the author of this report on the basis of insights from related theories and a review of more than 30 relevant sets of good governance principles that exist. The questionnaires delivered personally by team of researchers and distributed to 150 respondents at their work place or convenient places.

### *3.3.2. Data analysis of the survey*

After collecting data, statistical software package for Social Science (SPSS) was used to analyse the multi-variate data from the questionnaire. The data analysis in this survey includes descriptive statistics and linear regression. Descriptive statistics were used to analyses demographic data, gender, relationship groups of participants and number of returned responses. Simple regression test was also run as to test whether dependent variable (service delivery effectiveness) was depending on the independent variable, better sport governance principles practices and other organizational factors, which are mission and capability. The simple regression also used to test if the satisfaction of stakeholders were influence by effectiveness service delivery. .

### **3.4. Validation of data**

Reliability refers to the degree to which a measure of a concept is stable '(Bryman 2004, p. 543) and validity is referring to the issue of whether an indicator (or set of indicators) that is devised to gauge a concept really measures that concept (Bryman 2004, p. 72).

The reliability and validity in this study was maintained by Cronbach's alpha methods. According to Hair et al (2006) and Bae (2002), Cronbach's alpha is the most popular method used to measure internal consistency of scale among other methods such test retest reliability.

## **Chapter 4. Results and findings**

### **4.1. Introduction**

This chapter describes the results from the survey that was consists of a sample of 150 responded from all almost stakeholders' representatives in the sport fraternity in Lesotho. The demography of the participants in the survey firstly reported.

Better sport governance principles were used as influential factors of effeteness of service delivery in the organization. The purpose of the analysis was to ensure that each item or statement primarily influence the other in the proposed categorization. A regression analysis conducted to determine the influential factors of service delivery and if service delivery can influence satisfaction of stakeholders and only those items with a factor loading of 0.5 or selected for inclusion in a factor.

### **4.2. Variables**

#### *4.2.1. Mission*

Sawhill and Williamson (2001) emphasized that indicators for measuring success in the non-profits sector should spell out a link between

the organization's mission, vision, goals, strategies and service. They clearly pointed out that the success indicators used in their study (impact, activity and capacity) provides a linkage between the organization's mission, vision, goals, strategies and service.

#### *4.2.2. Organizational Capability*

Grant (2005) defined the term organizational capability as a firm's capacity to undertake a particular productive activity. On the other hand, Carpenter and Sanders (2009) admitted that capabilities and competencies refer to the same concept, as they defined organizational capabilities as: a firm's skill in using its resources (both tangible and intangible) to create goods and services. A synonym that is often used to describe the same concept is competences ... In essence; they are the combination of procedures and expertise that the firm relies on to engage in distinct activities in the process of producing goods and services.

I therefore understated that organizational capability influenced service delivery directly.

### *4.2.3. Best sports governance principles*

#### *4.2.3.1. Democracy*

Access to representation in decision-making should be available to those who make up the organization's internal constituencies such as players, supporters and managers as well as owners.

The understanding is that the better most of the elements of democracy are implemented the better effectiveness of service delivery.

#### *4.2.3.2. Transparency*

This is explained as the clarity in procedure and decision-making, particularly in resource allocation. Organizations charged with care of public good such as sport have a particular obligation not simply to act in a fair and consistent manner but also to be seen to do so. The work of the organization should as far as possible be open to public inspection.

The understanding is that the better most of the elements of transparency are implemented the better effectiveness of service delivery.

#### *4.2.3.3. Accountability*

Sporting organizations are not only responsible for financial investors also to other investors as well, who invest other resources. Other emotional investors like athletes, coaches, parents, supporters, sponsors etc. The understanding is that the better most the elements of accountability are implemented means better effectiveness of service delivery.

#### *4.2.3.4. Social responsibility*

Societal responsibility measures the degree the sport organization helps their principle stakeholders, especially by programs and income redeployment. Sport development activities, responsibility to take care of the grass roots activities are contribution to social responsibility programs.

I therefore believe that, contributions to the stakeholders in return affects, the success of the organization (service deliver effectiveness). This responsibility expressed towards employees and more generally towards all the stakeholders affected by the sport organization

#### *4.2.3.5 Effectiveness service delivery*

Literature from organizational theory in chapter 2 reveals that there are four major approaches to measuring organizational effectiveness. These

approaches are the goal attainment approach; systems approach; process approach; and multiple constituency approach. Briefly, these four approaches assume that an organization is an open system that consists of input, throughput and output (Slack & Parent 2006). The systems approach relates to organizational input, the process approach relates to organizational throughput, the goal attainment approach relates to organizational output and finally the multiple constituency approach relates to all aspects of organizational input, throughput and output.

In this study, I believe that the high the mean scores of the independent variables it means the higher the effectiveness of service delivery.

### 4.3. Results

#### 4.3.1. Demographic analysis

Table 2. Display the results from statistical analysis of the survey.

*Table 3.*

*Demographic frequency table*

Variable	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		St. Deviation
					Statistics	Error	
Gender	140	1	1	2	1.50	.042	.502

LSRC Relations	140	7	1	8	4.74	.189	2.240
Age groups	139	8	1	9	5.31	.161	1.899
Occupation	140	9	1	10	5.51	.258	3.052
Experience	140	32	2	34	8.29	.660	7.814
Relation years	139	32	1	33	11.31	.641	7.561
Valid N (listwise)	138						

Table 3. Display the results from gender statistical frequency analysis of the survey.

*table 4.*

*Gender frequency*

Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative percent	Mean	Range
Male (1)	70	7	50%	50.0	1.50
Female (2)	70	7	50%	100.0	1
Valid responds	140	1.4			
Total Sample	150	1.5			

A total of number 150 questioners distributed to 150 LSRC clients who are internal and external stakeholders. Statistical cumulative frequency analyses were conducted to calculate percentages of males and females who completed the questioners successfully and 93% of the responses was found. The results of these participants displayed in table 2 above. Total of 140 respondents who are distributed equally Male (1) = (N) =70 = 50% and

Female (2) = (N) = 70 = 50% were found to take part in a survey with a mean of 1.5 and a range of 1.

#### *4.3.2. Reliability test results*

Table 5.below display the results of all variables in the questioner together.

Table 5

*Reliability test statistics*

Variable	No. of Items	Name of Items	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Mission	7	Mission_1	.807
		Mission_2	
		Mission_3	
		Mission_4	
		Mission_5	
		Mission_6	
		Mission_7	
Capability	7	Capability_1	.630
		Capability_2	
		Capability_3	
		Capability_4	
		Capability_5	
		Capability_6	
		Capability_7	
Democracy	6	Demo_P6A	.614
		Demo_P6B	
		Demo_P6C	
		Demo_P6D	
		Demo_P6E	
		Demo_P6F	
Transparency	6	Trans_P2A	.695
		Trans_P2B	
		Trans_P2C	
		Trans_P2D	
		Trans_P2E	
		Trans_P2F	
Accountability	6	Account_P3A	.837
		Account_P3B	
		Account_P3C	
		Account_P3D	
		Account_P3E	
		Account_P3F	

Service level	6	Demo.infl. fact_6A	.837
		Demo.infl. fact_6B	
		Demo.infl. fact_6C	
		Demo.infl. fact_6D	
		Demo.infl. fact_6E	
		Demo.infl. fact_6F	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2A	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2B	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2C	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2D	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2E	
		Trans. Infl.fact_2F	
		6	
	Trans. Infl.fact_2B		
	Trans. Infl.fact_2C		
	Trans. Infl.fact_2D		
	Trans. Infl.fact_2E		
	Trans. Infl.fact_2F		
6	Account.Infl. fact_3A	.815	
	Account.Infl. fact_3B		
	Account.Infl. fact_3C		
	Account.Infl. fact_3D		
	Account.Infl. fact_3E		
	Account.Infl. fact_3F		
6	Social.Infl. fact_4A	.655	
	Social.Infl. fact_4B		
	Social.Infl. fact_4C		
	Social.Infl. fact_4D		
	Social.Infl. fact_4E		
	Social.Infl. fact_4F		
Satisfaction	13	Satisfaction level_A	.741
		Satisfaction level_B	
		Satisfaction level_C	
		Satisfaction level_D	
		Satisfaction level_E	
		Satisfaction level_E	
		Satisfaction level_F	
		Satisfaction level_G	
		Satisfaction level_H	
		Satisfaction level_I	
		Satisfaction level_G	
		Satisfaction level_K	
		Satisfaction level_L	
		Satisfaction level_M	

Reliability test of all 10 variables were done using Cronbach's alpha. There were 6 independent variable and one dependent variable. Four principles of sports governance of better sports governance repeated two times as implemented sport governance and influential factors of effectiveness service delivery. Refer to table 5 for more details and clear understanding. All the variables showed that they provided valid and reliable responses as they were all ranging on top of .60. The ranges were from .614 minimum and .879 maximum validity.

#### **4.4. Hypothesis testing results**

*4.4.1. 'H 1. Effectiveness service delivery of in a non-profit sport organization*

*significantly influenced by Better sports governance principles.*

As shown in table 6 at the bottom the multiple regressions was run as to test the if the effectiveness of service delivery were significantly influenced by the principles of better sports governance implemented by the nonprofit sports organization. The results showing a significance figure as the p – value were much lower than .05. The regression formula was (F (4, 135) = 6.284, p < .000) with the R- square of .16. The most influential factors were transparency and social responsibility with p < .007 both of

them. Independent variable that did not significantly showing the influence to the effectiveness service delivery was Democracy with  $p > .946$  and accountability with  $p > .314$ .

Table 6.

*Sports governance factors table*

Dependable variable: Satisfaction

Model Regression Residual	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardize d coefficient Beta	T	Significanc e	F	Sig
	B	Std. of Error					
Constant	52.98 0	6.767		7.829	.000	6.28 7	.00 0
Democracy	-.011	.168	-.006	-.068	.946		
Transparency	.531	.193	.375	.274	.007		
Accountabilit y	.199	.196	.145	1.011	.314		
Social responsibility	-.636	.234	-.278	-.272	.007		

\*R Square = .157 (Adjusted R Square = .132)

4.4.2. *'H 2. Effectiveness on service delivery of a non-profit sport organization was significantly influenced by other organizational factors, Mission and Capability.*

Table 7.

*Mission and Capability table*

Dependable variable: Satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	T	Significance	F	Sig
Regression	coefficient		coefficient				
Residual	B	Std. of	Beta				
		Error					
Constant	26.571	5.441		4.883	.000	16.332	.000
Capability	.657	.129	.390	5.081	.000		
Mission	.261	.108	.185	2.421	.017		

\*R Square = .193 (Adjusted R Square = .181)

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict if the effectiveness of service delivery could be influenced by the organizational capability and the implementation of mission strategies to achieve organizational objectives. The results found shows p-value of .000, which is significantly lower than .05. The regression formula was (F (2, 138) = 16.332,  $p < .000$ ) with the R- square of .193. Two of tested dependable variables, organizational capability and mission found to be influential factors to effectiveness of service delivery with  $p < .000$  and  $p < .017$  respectively.

4.4.3. 'H 3. Satisfaction of the clients influenced by effectiveness service delivery'

Table 8.

*Score satisfaction table*

Dependent variable: Satisfaction score level

<b>Model</b>	<b>Sum of square</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>Mean square</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig</b>
Regression	90.751	1	90.751	.072	.709	.842
Residual	17539.537	137	128.026			
Total	17630.288	138				

\*R Square = .005 (Adjusted R Square = -.002)

The results from table 6 above show no significance figure where p-value was  $p > .842$ . A simple linear regression was calculated to predict if the satisfaction of the clients could be influenced by the effectiveness of service delivery in the nonprofit organization,  $b = .072$ ,  $t(137) = 18.608$ ,  $p < .842$ . A regression equation was found to be  $F(1, 137) = .709$ ,  $p < .842$ . The  $R^2$  is .005. (Not significant)

## **Chapter 5. Discussions**

### **5.1. Introduction**

This chapter discusses the findings of the survey in chapter 4. It will be more of the descriptive and interpreting the results in details as to provide the clear understanding of the finding according to the literature review and findings from other studies. Each finding from chapter 4 will be discussed under its own heading as clarify what the finding implies.

### **5.2. Demographic distribution**

#### 5.2.1. Gender

Gender were distributed in a way that there were retune in response of N=140 people. There were equal number of male and female (male = 70 and female =70) with a mean (M) = 1.5 and range (r) = 1. The gender percentage was 50% male and 50% female. Since some of questions in a survey were asking the issues about gender, especially the democracy principles questions. The equal number was done to balance the opinion equation between male and female.

#### 5.2.2. LSRC relationship with the respondents.

The results revealed that from a total sample of 150 respondents who were drawn purposely from different representative stakeholders' replications directly associated with LSRC, only 140 turn over response were collected. This turn over made 93% of the sample. The population were divided and selected purposefully equally in terms of gender and representatives' group of respondents. There were about eight groups, which were divided equally internally and externally. These groups are presented in table 3 and 4 in chapter 4. The results also showed the total number of 70 males and 70 females as explained in chapter 4.2.1 above under gender. These numbers are significantly equally distributed in terms of gender and relationships groups.

### 5.3. **Research questions**

*3.3.1. RQ1. Which factor contributing to the implementation of better sports*

*governance principles in a nonprofit sport organization?*

The hypothesis in line with above research question was testing whether the effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organizational significantly influenced by better sport governance principles.

The overall results were positively revealing the significance p- value. Four independent predictor variables, namely democracy, transparency, accentually and social responsibility were determining the significance of the dependent variables, effectiveness service delivery. The null hypotheses were not rejected as the results confirming better sport governance principles directly contributing and influencing to the performance of LSRC.

The idea extracted from the notion that governance also includes giving sports organizations a direction or a strategy designed to archive their goals (Hoye&Cuskelly, 2007, Slack & Parent, 2006) is proven in this survey.

#### *5.3.1.1. Democracy*

In the survey, the participant's opinions were that the regression degree of freedom and the residual degree of freedom between democracy and effectiveness service delivery  $p < .946$ . The null  $H_0$  was then rejected because there was no significance that democracy could contribute in to effectiveness of service delivery at LSRC.

Geeraert (2015) pointed out that when the international and any other sports federations lack the term limits of selected members in the office, the results will be abuse of power, lack of accountability, weak internal democracy, adverse power and accumulation risks will be increased.

#### *5.3.1.2. Transparency*

“There are many other stakeholders in sport, and if more actors are able to monitor the organizations, it will decrease the likelihood of unethical behavior. If you know that more people are watching you, you will have less incitement to behave unethically” (Geeraert, 2015). The survey results agreed with this notion as showed a significance between transparency and effectiveness of service delivery. The respondents perceived transparency and effectiveness service delivery as related.

The p- value was much lower that range of regression. Simply the results explained that the stakeholders considered LSRC as practicing the elements this principle. There is a selection criteria in place, information is available and well disseminated to the all stakeholders and published material on the internet for everyone consumption

#### *5.3.1.3. Accountability*

The stakeholder does not perceive LSRC as aligned its self with this principle of better sport governance. The survey results on a multiple regression revealed not significant p-value which very high than the degree of freedom and the residual degree of freedom between accountability and effectiveness service delivery. It is clear from the p-value that stakeholders are not happy with the reporting systems and the responsibilities the staff members, management and the board members are handling the accountability issues.

Geeraert (2015) stated that the implementation of the separation of powers in the organizations governance structure and a system of rules and procedures that ensures that staff and officials comply with internal rules and norms referred to as internal accountability and control of an organization. In addition, that stimulates learning and decrease the likelihood of power imbalances, abuses of power and unethical conduct

#### *5.3.1.4. Social responsibility*

It is explained by Geeraert, (2015) in Playthegame that, social responsibility can influence the success of a company, differentiating itself from competitors and building a better image and reputation and creating

consumer goodwill and positive employee attitudes and behavior, resulting in a 'win-win' scenario for the company.

In the stakeholder's point of view, LSRC is taking care of the public and its clients, internal and external stakeholders. They have positive view towards it in terms of social responsibility. This was portrayed by the significant results in this survey contacted in a multiple regression analysis where other four better sport governance were analyzed.

*5.3.2. What are the factors influencing and contributing to the effectiveness of a service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization?*

In this part of the survey the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) were that service delivery effectiveness influenced by other factors in a nonprofit sport. The tested factors were organizational mission and objectives, and organizational capability. Multiple regressions were contact and the results on anova table revealed the significance p-value.

The above explained that both mission and capability are good catalysts of effectiveness service delivery. More importantly, LSRC clients perceived their organizational mission and objectives understandable, clear

and executable for good performance of the organization. They also believed on the organization personal, being lower staff, management and board members.

A large-scale study conducted by Parhizgari ,Ronald & Gilbert (2004) in the United State, which involved 28 private and 41 public sector organizations with 11,352 cases. The results of the study found that achieving an organizational mission was the most important measure for assessing organizational effectiveness in both public and private sectors. In addition, supportive policies towards the workforce; appropriateness of organizational design; working conditions; pay and benefits; positive supervisory practices; workforce loyalty and pride; operational efficacy; and customer-oriented behavior were found to be other measures. Similarly, the results of this survey show the same conclusion drawn from the mentioned study.

From the current study mission was also found to contribute significantly to the effectiveness service delivery of nonprofit sport organization. The results of a study reveal that the client's perception and of service delivery is satisfying. Meaning that due to good organizational

mission and goals as an input to achieve good result, it is managing to deliver to its clients..

Organizational capabilities are one of the important factors that contribute to the organization's performance. Schreyogg and Kliesch-Eberl (2007, p. 914) highlighted that organizational capabilities are depicted as critical success factors 'which are associated with the organization's excellence. The reason being is that organizational capabilities represent mutual integration of organizational systems, processes, structure and resources that enable the organization to achieve its strategic goals These measures were related to organizational internal structures and processes.

The current study supported by previous studies as the findings shows that the organizational capability, which is said to be related to the internal structures and process of the nonprofit sport organization, significantly positive influencing the effectiveness of service delivery. This organizational capability includes among others problem solving, leadership, teamwork, ability to formulate policies, communication skills, financial management skills and ability to plan strategically to mention but few.

*5.3.3. What influences satisfaction of the stakeholders in regards to better sport governance principle and effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization.*

It is pointed out that one of the measurements of effectiveness service delivery is the level of satisfaction of the stakeholder or clients. (Chelladurai& Haggerty 1991). There are some other results from other studies where the organizational effectiveness studies in the sports domain that also proves client's satisfaction is an indicator of effectiveness service delivery (Babiak 2009; Chelladurai& Haggerty 1991; Cunningham &Beneforti 2005; Daprano, Pastore& Costa 2008; Papadimitriou 2007; Papadimitriou & Taylor 2000; Wolfe, Hoerber&Babiak 2002)

Opposed to the past findings, this survey shows that even though there is a satisfaction on stakeholders, which approves the past studies finding, but here the client's satisfaction seems not to be motivated by the effectiveness service delivery. The results were significantly higher than the null hypothesis. Stakeholders confirmed that they are satisfied with the service delivery, but they seemed not happy with what influences that service. Meaning, in regard what was tested from other two hypotheses, they are not happy with the lack of practices of better sports governance.

## **5.4. Conclusion**

The conclusions drawn from this survey are that some of better sport governance principles are directly contributing to the effectiveness of service delivery. Mission and capability also have direct influences to the effectiveness of service delivery. Though, stakeholders can be happy with service delivery, they still need more than effectiveness of service delivery its self.

can be implemented by the nonprofit sport organization but cannot necessarily be aligned with the organizational mission. It is quite clear from the survey that there are better governance principles implemented by LSRC but the client does not view them as organizationally mission motivated.

The three influential factors of effectiveness service delivery that are being studied in this survey, namely organizational mission, organizational capability and four better sport governance principles, significantly influence the effectiveness of the nonprofit sport organization service deliver positively. They are also jointly found to be good influential factor of effective service delivery.

It in these regards, the conclusion is therefore, confidently drawn from the results that, better sport governance, also directly influencing effectiveness service delivery, not only giving direction to the administration as was found from other sport management studies.

The last conclusion that is drawn by this survey is that though the past studies showed that the satisfaction of the clients rely on the effectiveness of the sport organizational service delivery, in this study the rests are different in the sense that, the service delivery is highly effective, and the clients even approve that it is effective. However, from the score they significantly show that their satisfaction is not motivated by effectiveness of service delivery alone.

## **5.5. Recommendations**

### *5.5.1. Study limitations*

This study did not check the client's perceptions according to gender point of view. The assumption is that there might be different opinions if the focus might be gender based. Due to time limit the respondents were given smaller period to answer the question. Only one

week was given to return their responses so they complained about time majority of them were working.

The country where the study was conducted is mountainous and other place were not accessible so most of the population sample selected from the townships, so the other stakeholders did not have chance to take part in this survey. Budget constrain was also other factor as the researchers had to spend money to deliver questions to some of the participants who does not have access to internet and social media.

Some of the important information were not found because of the method of study. Respondents were not able to express their feelings, so they skipped some of the questions.

#### *5.5.2.Future research*

I recommend that future research be done on this study and concentration should be on what other factors influences stakeholder's satisfaction if they are not satisfied by effectiveness of the service delivery. I still believe that based on different groups perceptions, the results on the factors influencing effectiveness of service delivery might change if studied deeply.

Lastly, I recommend that further study on this topic should qualitative study as to find other reasons influencing effectiveness service delivery. In that, respondent will be able to express their feelings.

## Reference

- (ASC), A. S. (2015). *Governance*. Retrieved 6, 22, 2016, from [www.ausport.gov.au: http://www.ausport.gov.au/supporting/clubs/governance](http://www.ausport.gov.au/supporting/clubs/governance)
- (CIPFA), C. I. (2007 , August 2,). *Delivering Good Governance in local Government framework*. Retrieved August 27, 2019,, from [http://www.dorsetfire.co.uk/pdf/Good\\_Gov\\_2007.pdf](http://www.dorsetfire.co.uk/pdf/Good_Gov_2007.pdf)
- (LSR), L. S. (2011', 2, 4,). *lsrc.org.ls*. Retrieved August, 19,, 2019,, from [http://lsrc.org.ls/documents/LSRC\\_Constitution\\_Ammended.pdf](http://lsrc.org.ls/documents/LSRC_Constitution_Ammended.pdf)
- (PG), (. P. (2015). The legitimacy crisis in international sports governance. *Sports governance observer 2015*. Copenhagen: Author.
- The Business Dictionary*. (2017). Retrieved 8 14, 2019, from [www.businessdictionary.co: http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/governance.html](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/governance.html).
- Adhikari, K. &. (2016). Service quality and customer satisfaction in private sector bank; An emperical study. *Indian Journal of Reaserch*, 04-05.
- AIS. (2015). *ASOIF Governance Task Force (GTF)*. Lausanne: Association of Summer Olympic International Federations.
- AIS. (2015). *Australian Mondatory Sports Governace Principle*. Australian Govrnmant.
- ASOIF. (2016). *Governmental Task Force (GTF)*. Lausanne: Association of Summer Olympic International Federations.

- Balduck, A. L. (2009). Management and Program Effectiveness in Belgian Sports . *Club Working paper series*, 1-9.
- Bayle, E. &. (2002). Development of a taxonomy of performance for national sport organizations. *European Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2,1!/21.
- Bayle, E. &. (2003). *Le dirigeant sportif fe'de'ral aujourd'hui et demain*. Rapport pour l'Acade'mie Olympique du CNOSF.
- Bothma, B. (2007). *International Marketing ( 1st ed)*. Sout Africa: Oxfort University press.
- Bourguignon, A. (1995). Peut on de'finir la performance? *Revue Franc ,aise de Comptabilite ', 269, 53!/61*.
- Bovaird, T. &. (2001). 'Learning from International Approaches to Best Value',Politics and Politics. 29(4):451-63.
- Bovaird, T. &. (2002). Moving Excellence models of Local Service Delivary to Benchmarking "God Local Governance",. *International Review of Administrative Siences*, 68(1):9-24.
- Boyne, G. A. (2003). What is Public Service Improvement? *Public Administration*, 211-270.
- Bryman, A. &. (2007). *Business Research Methods (2nd ed)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cafrad. (2010). *Anti-Corruption Office in the Institutions in Africa Organised*. Tangier : Morocco.

- Cameron, K. S. (1986). Effectiveness as paradox: Consensus and conflict in conception of organizational effectiveness. *Management Science*, 32, 539!/553.
- Campbel, J. (1977). *On the Nature of Organisational Effectiveness*.
- Campbell, J. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, .
- Camy, J. R. (2007). Managing Olympic Sports Organisations:. *Human Kinetic*,, 23-29.
- Caruana, A. (2002). Service loyalty. The effects of service quality and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(7/8), 811-828.
- Catsambas, T. T. (2003). 'Using Appreciative Inquiry to Guide an Evaluation of the International Women's Media Foundation Africa Program',. *New Direction for Evaluation*,, (100)41-51.
- Cemy,J, R. L. (2007). Managing Olympic Sport Organisations. *Hu man kinetics*, 23- 29.
- Chadwick, S. &. (n.d.). The business of sport management (eds.). *Harlow: Pearson Education*, 25-42.
- Chappelet, J. &. (2013). *Existing governance principles in sport: A review of published Action for good governance in international sports organisations Final Report* .  
Copenhagen: Play the Game/Danish Instituteliterature. In J.Alm (Ed.),.

- Chappelet, J. a. (2013). 'Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport (BIBGIS): An assessment tool for international sport governing bodies',. IDHEAP Working papers 1/2013File [Online] Retrieved from: [https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB\\_7BDD210D3643.P001/R](https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB_7BDD210D3643.P001/R).
- Chappelet, J. L. (2008). The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System, The governance of the world. *Politics and International Studies*.
- Chappelet, J. L. (2016). From Olympic administration to Olympic governance, 866-48. *Sport in Society*, 19:6, , DOI: 10.1080/17430437.2015.110, 739-751.
- Chappelet, J. L. (2017). Beyond sport governance: the need to improve the regulation of international sport. *Sport in Society*.
- Chappelet, J. L. (2018 ). Beyond governance: The need to improve the regulation of international sport. *Sport in Society*, 21(5), 724–734. doi:10.1080/17430437.2018.1401355.
- Chappelet, J. .. (2016). From Olympic administration to Olympic governance. *Sport in Society*, 739 - 751.
- Chappelet, J. L. (2016). From Olympic administration to Olympic governance. *Sports in society*, 739 - 751.
- Chelladurai, P. &. (1991). 'Measures of Organizational Effectiveness of Canadian National Sports Organization',. *Canadian Journal Sports Science*,, 16 (2) 126-33.
- Chelladurai, P. &. (2000). Sport Management Review. *Elsevier*, 3 (1), 1-22 .

- Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and Multiple Perspectives of Organizational Effectiveness', . *Journal of Sport Management*, , 1 ( 1) 37-47. .
- Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and multiple perspectives of organizational effectiveness. . *Journal of Sport Management*, 1,, 37-47.
- Chelladurai, P. (2001). *Managing organizations for sport & physical activity. A system perspective*. Scottsdale, Ariz: Holcomb & Hathaway.
- Chelladurai, P. (2014). *Management organization for sport and physical activity: a systems perspective (4th ed.)*. Holcomb Hathaway: Publishers, Inc.
- Chelladurai, P. S. (1987). .Systems-based dimensions of effectiveness: The case of national sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Science*, 111-119.
- Chelladurai. P., S. F.-F. (1987). Dimensions of fitness service: Development of mode. *Journal of sport Management*, 1,159-172.
- Cho, W. H. ( 2004). Choi, K. SThe relationships among quality, value, satisfaction and behavioral intention in health care provider choice: A South Korean study. *Journal of Business Research*, 913-921.
- Churchill, G. &. (1982). An ivestigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. , . *Journal of Marketing Research*, 491-503.
- Cook, S. (2004). *Measuring customer service effectiveness*. Burlington,: VT: Gower.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cunningham, J. &. (2005). 'Investigating indicator for measuring the health and social impact of sport and recreation programs in Australian indigenous communities', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*,. 40 (1) 89-98.
- Daprano, C. M. (2008). 'NIRSA Members' Perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness'. *Recreational sports Journal*, vol. 32., 16-27.
- Daprano, C. M. (2008). 'NIRSA Members' Perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness'. *Recreational sports Journal*, (32)16-27.
- Etzioni, A. (1960). Two approaches to organizational analysis: A critique and a suggestion. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, , 5(2): 257-278.
- Eydi, H. R. ( 2012). Designing Model of organizational effectiveness in sporting Federations of Iran. . *Sport management journal of Mazandaran*, 14,, 6-21.
- Eydi, H. R. (2011). Compressive review of organizational effectiveness in sport. *Sport management international journal*, *Choregia*, 7 (1) 6-21, .
- Fitzsimmons, J. &. (2011). *Service management: Operations, strategy, and information technology (7th ed.)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholders Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frisby, W. (1986). Measuring the organizational effectiveness of national sport Governing bodies. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science*, 11, 94-99.
- Geeraert, A. (2015 ). *The Legitimacy Crisis in International Sports Governance. Sports Governance Observer 2015*. Copenhagen.: Play The Game.
- Geeraert, A. (2015). *Sports Governance Observer 2015: The Legitimacy Crisis in International Sports Governance*. Copenhagen.: Play The Game.
- George, R. ((2001). *Marketing South Africa in tourism and hospitality (1st. ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- George, R. (2001). *Marketing South Africa in tourism and hospitality (1st. ed.)*. . Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. . *European Journal of marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- Gronroos, C. (1990). *Service management and marketing: Managing the moment of truth in service competition..* Lexington: , MA: Lexington Books.
- Hair Jr., J. F. ( 2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis (6th. edn)* . New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Hambrick, D. (1984). Taxonomic approaches to studying strategy: *Some conceptual and methodological issues.*, 10(1), 27-41.
- Hennig-Thurau, T. &. (2000). *Relationship marketing-Gaining competitive advantage through customer satisfaction and customer relation.* Berlin, Germany: Springer Verlag.
- Henry, I. a. (2004). Governance and ethics in sport. *In* .
- Henry, I. a. (2004). Governance and ethics in sport. *In*.
- Hessen, M. &. (2011). Problems and Possibilities of Good Governance in Bangladesh Hurdles to Achieve Sustainable Development. *www.academica.edu.*
- Hestely, W. S. ( 1990 ). Organisational economics: An impending revolution in organisation the theory? *Academic of Management Review*, , 15 (3), 402-420.
- Hewitt de Alcantara, C. (1998). *Uses and Abuses of the Concept of Governance.* Oxford, United Kingdom:: Blackwell publisher.
- Hitt, M. A. (2007, 12). *Management. Frenchs Forest.*, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- HMG. (2015, December). Sporting Future: A new for an active nation,.
- Hopkins, B. R. (2001). Law and taxation .In T. D. Connors ((3rd ed.). *The nonprofit handbook: Management:New York*, 893-921. .
- Hoye, R. &. (2001, 2 6). Measuring board performance of voluntary sport organisations. *Journal of Volunteering*,, pp. 109-116.

- Hoye, R. (2006, 3 16). Leadership within voluntanry sport oranisation boards. *Non-profit Management & Leadership*, pp. 297-313.
- Hoye, R. C. (2007). *Sport Governance*. Bosten: Elsevier.
- Ibrahim, A. H. (2013). Organizational Effectiveness of Iraq Sport Federations,. *Sport management international journal, Choregia*,, 9 (1) 70-85.
- IOC. (2004). Basic Universl principle of good governance of the Olympic and sports movement LaUSANNE. *IOC*.
- IOC. (2008). *Basic universal principles of good governance of the Olympic and sports movement Lausanne*:. Lausanne:: IOC.
- Jone, G. R. (2010). *Organisational theory, Design, and Change (6th ed.)*. Upper Saddle Rever: Peason.
- Jone, R. &. (2010). *Puublic Sector Accounting (6th Ed.)*. Englend:Edinburgh Gate: Peason.
- Jordan, A. (2008). The governance of sustainable development: taking stock and looking forwards Environment and planning. *C: Government and policy*,, 26, 17-33.
- Kandampully, J. M. (2001). *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism, and leisure*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Kaufmann, D. &. (2008. ). Governance Indicators:Where are we, Where Should We Be Going? . *The World Bank Research Observer*,, 23:1-30.

- Keiningham, L. R. (1995). Return on quality (ROQ): Making service quality financially accountable. *Journal of Marketing*, , 59, 58-70.
- Kelly, J. (2006). Central Regulation of English Local Authorities: An Example of Meta-governance??. *Public Administration*, 184:603-62.
- Kikulis, L. M. (2000). Continuity and Change in Governance and Decision Making in National Sport Organisations: Institutional Explanations. *Journal of Sport Management*, pp. 293-320.
- Kilmister, T. (2006). Governanc. In I., Trenbeth & C., Collinns (Eds.). *Sport Business Managent in Nwezalent*, 184-201.
- Klaus, P. G. (1985 ). Quality epiphenomeon: The conceptual understanding of quality in face service encounter.
- Klijn, E. (2008). Governance and governance networks in Europe,. *Public Management Review*, 10(4), 505-525.
- Koski, P. &. (1998). Professionalization and organizations of mixed rationales: The case of Finnish national sport organizations. . *European Journal of Sport Management*, 5,7!/29.
- Kotler P., B. J. (2006). *Marketing for hospitality (4th ed.)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kotler, P. (2009). Marketing the unappreciated work house. *Marking Leader*, 2,2-4.

- Lehtien, J. R. ( (1982)). Service quality; A study of quality dimensions. . *Service management institution.*, Helsinki: Unpublished working paper.
- Lemos, M. a. (2006). Environmental governance. *Annual review of environmental resources*, 31, 297-325.
- Lewis, R. C. (1983 ). The marketing aspects of service quality. Emerging perspectives in service marketing, . *American Marketing Association Chicago*,, 99-104.
- Madella, A. B. (2005 ). The organisational performance of national swimming federations in Mediterranean countries: A comparative approach. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 5(4):207-220 .
- Marc, E. . ( 2011 ). Empirical Evidence of Stakeholder Management in Sports Clubs: The Impact of the Board of Directors,. *European Sport Management Quarterly*,, 11:4, 423-440.
- Marriott, J. W. (1997 ). *The spirit to serve – Marriott's way*. : HarperCollins Publishers: New York, NY.
- Matembe, M. ( (2010) ). The Connection Between Anti-Corruption Institutions and Promoting Good Governance.
- Mills, P. K. ((1980) ). Toward a core typology of service organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 255-265.
- Minnaar, F. &. (2005). Public Management in the Informal Age. *Pretoria : Van schaik*.

- OECD. (2004). Principles of corporate governance. Paris: OECD.
- Oliver, R. L. ( 1980). A Cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*,, 460-469.
- Oster, S. M. (1995). *Strategic management for non-profit organizations: Theory and cases*. New Yor: New York: Oxford University Press.
- P., C. (2014). *Managing Organiasatios*. Scottsdale, Arizonia 85250: Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers, Inc.
- Papadimitriou, D. (2007). Conceptualizing effectiveness in a non-profit organizational environment, Vol. 20 No. 7., *International Journal of Public Sector Managemen*.
- Papadimitriou, D. T. (n.d.). Organizational effectiveness of Hellenic national sports organizations: A multiple constituency approach. , . *Sport Management Review*, 3, 23-46,.
- Papadimitriou, D. &. (2000). 'Organisational Effectiveness of non-profit organisational Environment'. *A Multiple Constituency Aproach'*, Sport Managent Review, 3, pp. 23-46.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. ( (1985), ). “A conceptual model of service quality and it’s implications for future research”,. *Journal of Marketing*, , Vol. 49, pp. 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1988 ). SERVQUAL – a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.

- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420-450.
- Parent, M. &. (2018). The Impact of governance principle on sport Organisation' governance practices and performance:A systereview. *Cogent Social*, 4 (4): 1503578 <https://>.
- Parhizgari, A. M. (2004). 'Measures of organizational effectiveness: private and public sector performance',. *Omega*,, 32 (3) 221-9.
- Quinn, R. E. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organization, All analysis. *Management Science*,, 29, 363-377.
- Quinn, R. E. (1991). The psychometrics of the competing values culture instrument and an analysis of the impact of organizational culture on quality of life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*,, 5, 115-142.
- Research', i. A. (n.d.). Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research,. California,: Sage Publications, Inc.,.
- Robbins, S. P. ( 2010 ). Management Canadian (11th ed.). *solution manual*, <http://findtestbanks.com/appdatas/uploads/2018/09/>.
- Rojas, R. R. (2000). A review of models for measuring organizational effectiveness among for-profit and nonprofit organizations. . *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, , 11(1), 97-104.
- Rue, L. W. (2009). *Management: Skill and application (13th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hil Irwin.

- San Francisco, C. J.-B. (n.d.). *Business Management in New Zealand*. Wellington Cengage Learning, 147-175.
- Sasser, W. E. (1978). *Management of service operations*. Rocleigh, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sawhill, J. C. (2001). 'Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Non-profit Organizations', *Non-profit Management and Leadership*, 11 (3) 37-186.
- Schneider, B. &. (1995). *Winning the service game*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Schreyogg, G. &-E. (2007). 'How Dynamic Can Organizational Capabilities Be? Towards a Dual-Process Model of Capability Dynamization', *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 913-33.
- Shilbury, D. M. (2006). A study of organizational effectiveness for National Olympic Sporting Organizations., *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1), pp. 5-38.
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administration behavior: A study of decision-making behaviors in administrative organization (4th ed.)*. New York: The free Press.
- Skinner, J. E. (2015). *research Methods for Sport Management (1st Ed.)*. USA: Routledge.
- Statistics(UBOS), U. B. (2004, 4 30). *National Service Delivery Survey (NSDS) report, 2004*. Retrieved 4 30, 2011, from [onlinefiles/uploads/uboshttp://www.ubos.org](http://onlinefiles/uploads/uboshttp://www.ubos.org)

- Steers, J. &. (1994). *Organisation behavior (5th Ed.)*. New York: Harper Collins College Pub.
- Tam, J. L. (2004). Customer satisfaction, service quality and perceived value: an integrative model. . *Journal of Marketing Management*, 20(7-8), 897-917.
- Tashakkori & Teddlie, C. (n.d.). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*. Sage Publications, Inc., California,, 273-96.
- Thiela, A. ( 2009). Characteristics of voluntary sports clubs management: A sociological perspective. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 9(1):81–98.
- Verma, H. V. (2012). *Services marketing – Text and cases (2nd ed.)*. New Delhi, India:: Pearson Education Working Pape.
- Wolfe, R. H. ( 2002). 'Perception of the Effectiveness of Sport Organisations: . *The Case of Intercollegiate Athletics*', *European Sports Management Quarterly*,.
- Woodruff, R. B. (1991). The Standards Issue in CS/D Research: Historical Perspective. , Dissatisfaction & Complaining Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction*,, 4,103-109.
- Zammuto, R. E. (1984). *Academy of Management Review*. *A comparison of multiple constituency models of organizational effectiveness*, 9, 606!/616.

## APPENDIX A. SURVEY

### QUESTIONNAIRES

SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES  
GLOBAL SPORTS DREAM TOGETHER MASTERS PROGRAM

INFORMATION TO PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED IN RESEARCH
---

#### **You are invited to participate**

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled **Sport governance as a key success factor of effectiveness service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization – the case Lesotho Sport and Recreation Commission.**

This project is conducted by a student researcher **Mr. MoshoesheLebohang** as part of a Masters study at Seoul National University under the supervision of professor **Kwon, Sun Yong** from School of Management sciences, Seoul National University, South Korea.

#### **Project explanation**

The main aim of this research is **examining** influential factors and impact contributing to **effectiveness** of service de livery (programs) provided by nonprofit sport organization in Lesotho to its stakeholders using the elements of good/ sport governance principle. This research will try to generate an understanding of what constitutes a success in relation to Mass Sports programs.

### **What will I be asked to do?**

You are invited to participate in a survey, which will take about 30 minutes. This survey is to assess information of **Good Governance as a key Success Factor for effective service delivery**; examine factors contributing to effective service delivery.

### **What will I gain from participating?**

Your participation will contribute to a wider understanding of how elements of better sport governance be used as a key success factor of effective service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization in Lesotho.

### **How will the information I give be used?**

Your information provided in the survey will be treated confidentially. You will remain confidential. The data will be aggregated in such a way that you would not be identified.

### **What are the potential risks of participating in this project?**

Minimum risks have been identified from participating in this project. Throughout the exercise, if you feel not comfortable or require more explanation, please feel free to raise the issue with the researcher. Your answers, statements or comments will not be used in a way that will enable you to be identified. However, you are free not to reveal any information that you think is too confidential or to withdraw at any time.

### **How will this project be conducted?**

This research will use the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach to explore factors that lead to effectiveness of service delivery due to elements of better governance principles. AI approach was chosen because it is a culturally sensitive approach that focuses on the positives of human experience rather than finding faults or gaps. This survey will involve selected Senior Sports Development Officers from the nonprofit sport organizations, sport personnel in the Ministry (department of sport and Recreation), business community, media houses, Sports Leader from sports

associations or clubs' athletes and the public. A Data gathered from this survey will only be used to EXAMIN if better sport governance principles are factor for effective service delivery in a nonprofit sport organization.

### **Who is conducting the study?**

This research will involve the Seoul National University, Global Sports Dream Together Master's (DTM) Program in South Korea. The research is being conducted under the supervision of Professor **Kwon, Sun Yong** (Phone: +82 10 4686 2481) and tutor Inai (Phone: +82 10 4499 0179).

This research is a DTM study being undertaken by a student researcher, LebohangMoshoeshe (Phone: +82 10 8074 2622 or email lebomosh21@gmail.com).

Any queries about your participation in this project may be directed to the Principal Researcher listed above.

If you have any queries or complaints about the way you have been treated, you may contact board of Biometrics Committees in the National University.

### **QUESTIONNAIRE:**

#### **Good Governance as a key Success Factor for effective service delivery in a Nonprofit Port Organisation in Lesotho**

(Service delivery refer to any sport related activity programs, events or managerial which focus to achieve the mandate/ vision of the organisation)

### **INTRODUCTION:**

This survey examines issues related to elements of good/better governance principles if they can contribute in to the effectiveness of service delivery by a nonprofit sport organization in Lesotho.

This questionnaire has been given to you because you have contributed in the planning and implementation of good/better governance principle that may be the influential factors of effective service delivery in the organization. The survey aims to identify the factors, which contribute to successful service delivery of this organization.

The items in this questionnaire are grouped into Six (6) sections:

- A. Demographic question
- B. Characteristics of your organization
- C. Questions about the elements of good/better governance principles practiced by the organization
- D. Factors of good / better governance affecting principles affecting or contributing to the effectiveness of service delivery
- E. Stake holder's perception about good/ better governance principles contribution factor to the effectiveness of service delivery by the organization.
- F. Stake holder's satisfaction the elements of good / better governance principles contribution on the effectiveness of service delivery by the organization.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Please provide your answers by placing an X in the appropriate box and add any other comments you think will be helpful.

Your responses will be held in confidence and individual respondents will not be identified.

The word ORGANISATION in the context of this study is referred to Lesotho Sport and Recreation Commission.

This survey does ask information about your organization but this is only for analytical purposes.

Please return this questionnaire by using the enclosed self-addressed envelope by **7<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2019**

**A QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND THE ROLE YOU PLAY IN THE  
IMPLIMENTATION OF GOOD/BETTER GOVERNANCE PRICIPLE'S  
ELEMENTS**

1. Are you: 1.1. Male

1.2. Female

2. Age:

≤ 18	19 -25	26 - 30	31 - 35	36 – 40	41 – 45	46 – 50	51 - 55	56 - 60	61≥

3. I am working in a (you are free to choose more than on job):

- |   |                          |                             |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3.1. Sport Organisation at Ministry Level<br>at District Level        | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3.4. Sport Association/Club | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.2. Sports Organization at LSRC Board Level<br>Media                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3.5. Sport Stake holder     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.3. National Sport Association Committee Level<br>Business community | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3.6. Sport stake holder     | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Others (please indicate): \_\_\_\_\_

4. I have been in this organisation for \_\_\_\_\_ years.

5. My position in the organisation (LSRC) is:

- |                              |                          |                              |                          |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Internal stake holder</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <b>External stake holder</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5.1. Board member            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.5. Government Senior Level | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5.2. Staff Senior Level      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.6. Sport Association       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5.3. Staff Middle Level      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.7. Business Fraternity     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5.4. Staff Junior Level      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.8. Media Houses            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5.9. Others (please indicate) \_\_\_\_\_

6. I have been in this organisation (LSRC) for \_\_\_\_\_ years

**B. CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR ORGANISATION**

7. Which of the following statements would best describe your organisation’s mission? For each statement, please circle your opinion in the appropriate box on

a scale of -3 to +3 where -3 is extremely not applicable and +3 is extremely applicable.

<b>Extremely Not Applicable</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Extremely Applicable</b>
<b>ORGANISATION'S MISSION</b>						<b>Please Circle</b>		
<b>7.1. To inspire and facilitate development and growth of sport and recreation</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.2. To promote transparency within the organisation and other stake holders</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.3. To ensure sustainable resource based and accessible facilities</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.4. To embark on programs and initiatives that ensure effective and efficient coordination</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.5. To maintain the democratic environment among internal and external stake holders</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.6. To develop attractive and quality sport and recreation through dynamic leadership</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>7.7. To encourage accountability in every aspect of the organisation</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

**C. QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ELEMENTS OF BETTER GOVERNANCE  
PRINCIPLES PRACTICED BY THE ORGANISATION**

8. What are the elements of better governance principle implemented by the organisation?

Highly Unfulfilled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Highly fulfilled
	Highly unfulfilled	Unfulfilled	Slightly unfulfilled	No knowledge or option	Slightly fulfilled	Fulfilled	Highly fulfilled	
<b>8.1. Democracy</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>A. The board members are democratically appointed</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>B. The organization offers to the candidates standing for election opportunities to present their program/manifesto</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>C. The decisions on allocation of major events are made through a democratic, open and transparent process</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>D. The organization has gender equity guidelines for its leading officials</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>E. The organization provides opportunity for stakeholders to be represented/ participated within the organization, in its policy processes</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>F. The criteria for a bid for major events are communicated to its</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

members in good time	
----------------------	--

Highly Unfulfilled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Highly fulfilled		
<b>8.2. Transparency</b>	<b>Highly unfulfilled</b>		<b>Unfulfilled</b>		<b>Slightly unfulfilled</b>		<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly fulfilled</b>	<b>Fulfilled</b>	<b>Highly fulfilled</b>
<b>A. The Vision of the organization is clearly defined and communicated</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			
<b>B. The organization publishes its internal regulations</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			
<b>C. The organisation published selection criteria for all stakeholders in their respective field and information is accessible</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			
<b>D. The organisation published monthly/quarterly/yearly press release and organise press conference if there is anything for public consumption</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			
<b>E. The organisation published its financial report</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			

<b>F. The organization publishes main event reports with detailed and relevant information</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
--	----	----	----	---	---	---	---

	Highly Unfulfilled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Highly fulfilled
<b>8.3. Accountability</b>	<b>Highly unfulfilled</b>		<b>Unfulfilled</b>	<b>Slightly unfulfilled</b>		<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly fulfilled</b>	<b>Fulfilled</b>	<b>Highly fulfilled</b>
<b>A. The board supervise the CEO appropriately</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3		
<b>B. The board supervise management appropriately</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3		
<b>C. The organization has an internal financial or audit committee</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3		
<b>D. The organization's finances been externally audited by an independent auditor</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3		
<b>E. The board annually evaluates its own composition</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3		

<b>and performance</b>							
<b>F. All stake holders are held accountable of whatever activities they did</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

<b>Highly Unfulfilled</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Highly fulfilled</b>
<b>8.4. Societal/social responsibility</b>	<b>Highly unfulfilled</b>	<b>Unfulfilled</b>	<b>Slightly unfulfilled</b>	<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly fulfilled</b>	<b>Fulfilled</b>	<b>Highly fulfilled</b>	
<b>A. The organization offer consulting to its members in the areas of management or governance</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>B. The organisation implements a policy combating discrimination in sport</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>C. The organisation implements a policy for the promotion of environmental sustainability</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

D. The organisation implements a policy to promote gender equality in sport	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
E. The organisation implements a policy on social inclusion through sport	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
F. The organisation implements a policy on promoting the dual career of athletes	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

**D. FACTORS OF GOOD / BETTER GOVERNANCE AFFECTING PRINCIPLES AFFECTING OR CONTRIBUTING TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE DELIVERY**

9. Indicate by circling any number your perception about the elements of good / better governance practice as the factors for effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organisation. For each statement, please circle your opinion in the appropriate box on a scale of -3 to +3 where -3 is **Highly not affecting** and +3 is **Highly affecting**.

<b>Highly Not affecting</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Highly affecting</b>
<b>9.1 Democracy</b>	<b>Highly not affecting</b>	<b>not affecting</b>	<b>Slightly not affecting</b>	<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly affecting</b>	<b>Affecting</b>	<b>Highly affecting</b>	
<b>A. Democratically appointed of a board members encourages all board members to perform well so as to be elected again</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>B. The standing offered by the organization to the candidates for election provide opportunities for stakeholders to select the candidate with better the program/ manifesto</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>C. The decisions on allocation of major events are made through a democratic, open and transparent Process as a result no one will sabotage the events</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>D. The gender equity</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

<p><b>guidelines provided by the organization for its leading officials makes every gender felt represented as a results service can be delivered to every one</b></p>	
<p><b>E. The organization provides opportunity for stakeholders to be represented/ participated within the organization, in its policy processes, this helps all stakeholders to race their needs for the service they need</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-3            -2            -1            0            1            2            3</p>
<p><b>F. The criteria for a bid for major events are communicated to its members in good time so everything will be in time with best service</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-3            -2            -1            0            1            2            3</p>

<b>Highly Not affecting</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Highly affecting</b>
<b>9.2. Transparency</b>	<b>Highly not affecting</b>	<b>not affecting</b>	<b>Slightly not affecting</b>	<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly affecting</b>	<b>Affecting</b>	<b>Highly affecting</b>	
<b>A. The Vision of the organization is clearly defined and communicated so this assist all stakeholder to work on achieving its goals</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>B. The organization publishes its internal regulations and this helps every one not to go wrong</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>C. The fact that the selection criteria for all stakeholders are published and accessible makes everyone to work hard to meet the required standards</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>D. The</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

<p>organisation monthly/quarterly/yearly press release and press conference open the room for comments from the general public for better service delivery</p>							
<p>E. The organisation published its financial report so the sponsors fell save to invest more</p>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<p>F. The organization publishes main event reports with detailed and relevant information so this good for evaluation for better service in the future events</p>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

<b>Highly Not affecting</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Highly affecting</b>		
<b>9.3. Accountability</b>	<b>Highly not affecting</b>	<b>not affecting</b>		<b>Slightly not affecting</b>		<b>No knowledge or option</b>		<b>Slightly affecting</b>	<b>Affecting</b>	<b>Highly affecting</b>
<b>A. The</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3			

<p><b>CEO is managing all kind of resource properly, being human or financial, due appropriate board supervise (Punctual and happy personnel deliver service effectively)</b></p>							
<p><b>B. Supervision of management appropriately by the board helps help programs to run smoothly in time</b></p>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<p><b>C. An internal financial or audit committee assist allocation of</b></p>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

<b>funds to be directed where it is planned.</b>							
<b>D. The externally financial audited by an independent auditor also assisted the planned service to be effectively delivered</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>E. The annually performance evaluation and composition of a board helps the board to improve its service delivery and take corrective measures</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>F. All stake</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

<p><b>holders made sure to perform well as they know that they will be held accountable of whatever activities they did</b></p>	
---	--

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>Highly Not affecting</b>							<b>Highly affecting</b>	
<b>9.4. Societal/social responsibility</b>	<b>Highly not affecting</b>	<b>not affecting</b>	<b>Slightly not affecting</b>	<b>No knowledge or option</b>	<b>Slightly affecting</b>	<b>Affecting</b>	<b>Highly affecting</b>	
<b>A. The consultation offered by the organization to its stakeholders in the areas of management or governance assisted them to deliver service effectively</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
<b>B. Nondiscrimination policy in sport implemented by the organisation helps the service to be delivered effectively to every stakeholder</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

<b>C. The promotion of environmental sustainability policy implements by the organisation assisted in the protection of environment (peace, stability and healthy life style)</b>	-3      -2      -1      0      1      2      3
<b>D. The promotion of gender equality in sport by the organisation assist in the gender in balance in regard to effective service delivery</b>	-3      -2      -1      0      1      2      3
<b>E. The service is delivered effectively to all stake holders due to implementation of social inclusion policy through sport</b>	-3      -2      -1      0      1      2      3
<b>F. Educational and careers improvement to the athletes due to the implementation of a policy promoting the dual career</b>	-3      -2      -1      0      1      2      3

10. Thinking about elements of good governance principles in regard to effective service delivery in question 8, how would you rate the following organisational capabilities (ability to use elements of good/better governance to produce services) (1 is Extremely Poor Developed and 7 is Extremely Well Developed).

Extremely Not Capable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely Capable
<b>ORGANISATION'S MISSION</b>				<b>Please Circle</b>				
<b>A. Problem solving</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>B. Leadership skills</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>C. Team work</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>D. Ability to formulate policies</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>E. Communication skills</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>F. Financial Management Skills</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>G. Ability to plan strategically</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

**G. Stake holder's satisfaction the elements of better governance principles contribution on the effectiveness of service delivery by the organisation**

This area is intended to identify your satisfaction in regard to principles of-better governance contribution to the effectiveness of service delivery in a nonprofit sport organisation.

11. With each of the different areas of better governance principles elements bellow, please circle the level of your satisfaction in the effectiveness of service delivery by nonprofit sport organisation in a scale of -3 to +3 where -3 is **Extremely Unsatisfied** and +3 is **Extremely Satisfied**.

<b>Extremely Unsatisfied</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	<b>Extremely Satisfied</b>
------------------------------	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

Different areas of good/ better governance	Please Circle						
<b>A. The board decision making</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>B. Policies planning and implementation</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>C. Board democratic selection process</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>D. Gender equality promotion and representation</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>E. Work ethics, rules and regulations</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>F. Publication of accessibility of organizational information</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>G. Clear selection criteria in every selection activity</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>H. Press release and conferences for the everyone consumption</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>I. Monitoring and evaluation process</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>J. Financial control systems</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>K. Internal and external financial audit</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>L. Organizational resources management</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<b>M. Stakeholders inclusion and representation in the decision making</b>	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

12. Using negative marking system in a 10-point scale. The marks start from -10/10 to 10/10 where -10/10 = -100% and 10/10 = 100%. How much can you give the organization for the effectiveness of service delivery due to the elements of good / better governance principles? Please circle appropriate score in the table below.

YOUR AVERAGE SCORE										
-10/10	-8/10	-6/10	-4/10	-2/10	0	2/10	4/10	6/10	8/10	10/10

## 국문초록

비영리 스포츠단체 내 효과적인 서비스전달의 핵심 성공요인으로서  
의 스포츠거버넌스 :  
레소토 스포츠 및 재발행 커미션 사례를 중심으로

레보향

글로벌스포츠매니지먼트

체육교육과

서울대학교대학원

비영리 스포츠 조직적 서비스 제공의 효과를 검증하기 어렵다는 주장이 있으며 이에 따라 많은 관련 연구가 수행되었다. 일부 연구자는 조직적 서비스 효과성 측정 모델을 개발했으며, 일부는 이와 같은 모델이 다른 중요 이슈에 집중하지 않기 때문에 현실적인 결과를 제공할 수 없다고 주장했다. 이 문제에 대해 많은 의견 차이가 있지만, 결론은 다차원성 및 역량가치 모델과 같은 다른 모델에서 도출되었다.

서비스 제공의 효과는 소비자가 서비스 제공에 대해 기대하는 바를 살펴봄으로써 측정할 수 있다는 의견이다. 또 다른 결론은 서비스의 질도 서비스 제공자(종업원)의 만족도에 달려있다는 것이다. 이는 종업원이 만족하지 못 할 때 소비자에게도 최상의 서비

스를 제공하지 못할 것이라는 주장 때문이다. 그 결과, 소비자들은 그 조직이 질 낮은 서비스를 생산하고 전달하는 것이 아니라고 판단하게 될 것이다.

이러한 생각들은 서비스가 좋은지 나쁜지에 대한 또 다른 판단 문제를 야기한다. 또한 많은 연구자들이 이 문제에 대해 논쟁을 벌였지만, 그들은 비영리 스포츠키구 서비스 제공의 효과는 서비스를 이용하는 사람에 의해서만 판단할 수 있다는 것에 동의했다. 그러나 또 다른 관심사는 그들이 고객에게 양질의 서비스를 제공할 수 있도록 직원의 행복이 어떻게 유지될 것인가 하는 것이다. 이에 따라 거버넌스의 개념이 나타났다. 다른 학자들에 의해 묘사된 거버넌스는 비영리 스포츠단체의 일상적인 운영활동과 직접적으로 관련이 없는 조직의 계획 부분만을 다루는 것으로 묘사된다. 거버넌스의 유형들간에 분명한 구별이 나타났으며 이는 체계적인 거버넌스구조, 정치적(또는민주적) 구조, 기업(또는조직적) 구조 등이다. 첫째는 비즈니스 및 정책시스템에서 조직간의 경쟁, 협력 및 상호조정과 관련이 있다. 두번째 접근방식은 어떻게 직접적으로 조직의 행동을 통제하기보다는 스포츠 스타트에있는 정부나 정부기관이 어떻게 하는지에 관한 것이다. 마지막 하나는 경영행위의 규범적이고 윤리적으로 기준과 관련이 있으며 본 연구와 관련하여, 더 나은 스포츠 거버넌스에 초점을 맞추고 있다.

스포츠 정부의 이러한 개념은 민주적 거버넌스와 조직적 거버넌스 사이에 의존한다. 한 가지 제안은 그 용어가 더 나은 스포츠 거버넌스 구조로 바뀔 수 있다는 것이다. 이것은 스포츠단체에서

이해관계자들이 더 나은 거버넌스 관행을 위해 개선의 여지를 남길 것이다. 또 다른 제안은, 이 개념에서 이 사회가 전략적으로 스포츠 거버넌스 원칙을 비영리 스포츠 단체의 서비스 제공을 개선하기 위한 도구로 사용할 수 있다는 것이다. 이 사회가 단순히 스포츠 조직의 모든 사람들에게 좋은 근무조건을 계획하고 제공할 수 있고, 소비자(주주)가 만족하는 대가로 서비스제공(주주)의 행복을 촉진할 수 있으며, 그 결과 서비스 제공이 효과적이라고 판단 판단 고려한다는 것이다.

이것들은 비교 가능성의 개념을 설명한다. 서비스 제공자와 소비자를 분리할 수 있는 방법이 없다는 개념이다. 또한, 서비스 제공은 서비스를 제공하는 사람과 그것을 소비하는 사람에 따라 다르다는 것을 보여준다. 이러한 문제는 경영진과 조직이 사회 임원들에게 중요하다. 이 개념은 단순히 조직내의 모든 사람들이 고객으로 간주되고, 모든 사람들이 내부적으로 서로 서비스를 존중하기 때문에, 최고 정책입안자에서 외부소비자에게 서비스를 제공하는 직원까지 관리되어야 한다는 것이다.

본 연구의 목적은 이해당사자에게 비영리 조직서비스 제공의 효과를 검토하는 것이다. 본 연구의 맥락에 있는 이해관계자는 조직의 내부구성원(예: 직원및자원봉사자)과 외부구성원(예: 미디어 하우스, 스폰서)을 지칭한다.

본 연구에서는 확률 샘플링과 비확률 샘플링 방법이라는 두 가지 유형의 샘플링 방법을 사용했다. 인구는 150명으로 레소토 스포츠 앤 레크레이션 위원회에 직접 가입한 응답자이며, 성별, 그

룹에 따라 인구통계적으로 동일하게 나뉘었다. 내부 및 외부로 고려된 총 8 개의 그룹이 있으며, 외부 이해관계자는 36개 스포츠 연맹, 미디어하우스, 운동선수, 총괄관중, 비즈니스 커뮤니티의 대표자였으며 내부 이해관계자는 레소토 스포츠레크리에이션부 직원, 레소토 스포츠레크리에이션부 위원회, 레소토 올림픽 위원회 위원 및 직원, 공무원. 또한 모든 해당 담당자로부터 동일한 할당량을 가져왔다. 이메일, 소셜미디어 (whatsApp) 및 직접 전달을 통해 150명의 설문지를 배부하였다.

모든 변수의 유효성과 신뢰성은 Cronbach의 신뢰도 검정을 사용하여 얻었으며, 6개의 독립변수와 1개의 종속변수를 사용하였다. 보다 나은 스포츠 거버넌스 원칙은 스포츠 거버넌스와 효과적인 서비스 제공의 영향력 있는 요소로 두번 반복되었다.

분석결과, 더 나은 스포츠 거버넌스의 구현이 레소토 스포츠 및 레크리에이션부에서 서비스 제공의 효과에 직접 기여하고 영향을 미치는 것으로 결론지었다. 조사 결과에 따르면 조직의 서비스 제공이 상당히 우수했지만 이해관계자의 만족도는 효과서비스 제공에 영향을 미치지 않았다. 제언으로는 스포츠 고객의 만족에 정확히 영향을 미치는 요소에 대한 향후 연구를 수행하는 것이다.

---

중심단어 : 더 나은 거버넌스. 비영리단체. 서비스.

유효성. 이해관계자

학생번호 : 2018 - 29552

