

Implementation of Good Sport Governance in Selected Ethiopian Olympic Sports Federations

Mengistu Galcho Garmamo¹, Tesfaye Asgedom Haddera²,
Zeru Bekele Tola³, Matiwos Ensermu Jaleta⁴

1. Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Sport Science, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
2. Associate professor, Department of Sport Science, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
3. Assistant professor, Department of Sport Science, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
4. Associate professor, School of Commerce, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Corresponding Author: **Mengistu Galcho Garmamo**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent of good sport governance implementation in selected Ethiopian Olympic sports federations (Football Federation, Athletics Federation, Handball Federation, Volleyball Federation, Basketball Federation, & Cycling Federation). In doing so, the quantitative cross-sectional survey was used. 265 respondents from the sampled federations were selected by stratified random sampling. The data were quantitatively analyzed by Descriptives (frequency and means & standard deviations) & One-way ANOVA. The quantitative findings revealed that the surveyed Olympic sport federations have scored below the expected average level of implementation with a mean score ($M=2.40$, $SD=.38$), and also a statistically significant difference between the sampled Olympic sport federations ($F 5, 232 =8.18$, $P<0.001$). The findings suggested that the surveyed Olympic sport federations were found to have low scores in good sport governance practice with sever weakness in implementing transparency and solidarity. On this basis, this study has implications for sport managers as it, theoretically, was a significant endeavour in empirically testing the implementation of good sport governance in national sport governing bodies, and has practical implication for policy issues as it investigated the extent of implementation of good sport governance especially it calls for 'walk the talk' of transparency & public communication and solidarity.

Key words: Ethiopia, Implementation, Good sport governance, Olympic sports federations

1. Introduction

Organizational hybridity seems to be a feature that has become more common in many sport federations as a result of processes of commercialization and new public management since the last decades (Brandsen, van de Donk & Putters, 2005; Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013; Lucassen & Bakker, 2016; Lucassen & Heijden, 2013), and it is due to this hybrid nature that the sport federations behave like corporations and tend to be under “the scope of prescriptive approaches of democratic governance and corporate governance” (Chappelet, 2013, as cited in Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013).

Despite this unique requirement of good governance by sport sectors, they have lagged in inculcating it into organizational management (Pielke Jr., 2016). However, in the last few years, the issue of good sport governance has moved towards the top of the agenda by non-governmental organizations and sports organizations (Geeraert, 2022).

This advocacy on good sport governance is due to factors such as (1) the commercialization and professionalization of sports events and competitions (Geeraert, 2016; Hoye et al., 2015; O'Boyle, 2012); (2) a wide range of governance catastrophes being experienced by sport governing organizations under the authority of the Olympic movement which have brought the autonomy of sport to cross-way recently (Chappelet, 2008, O'Boyle, 2012, Pielke et al., 2019), etc.

Hence, its significance has been agreed by scholars and organizations except being conceptualized differently by different scholars, practitioners, and sport organizations. For instance, from the perspectives of scholars, Ferkins, Shilbury & McDonald (2009) conceptualized sport governance as it is the responsibility for the functioning and overall direction of the governing bodies so that it is an indispensable and long-standing component of all sports codes of the organizations around the world. In the same vein, Hoye & Cuskelly (2007) defined sport governance as it refers to the structure and process the sport governing bodies use to develop their strategic goals and direction, monitor performance, and ensure the boards activity to the best interests of their members. In near recent, Blanco (2016) defined sports governance as "an act of orchestrating, manoeuvring, facilitating, and mobilizing the pool of talents, resources, approaches, and processes in a much broader, fuller, and wider continuum of sports actors, agents, and stakeholders across various sectors of society".

From the perspective of sports organizations, the Australian sports commission (ASC) is the one with mandatory governance principles and has defined sport governance as the system by which organizations are directed and managed (ASC, 2015).

In spite of all the scholarly arguments and the global advocacy on the critical importance of good sport governance, Geeraert (2018) posits that "there is a gap between discourse and practice and between expectations and reality". In this regard, previous studies on good sport governance practice are found handful in number and, are all found focusing on specific issues i.e. governing board dynamics as to Dowling, Leopkey & Smith (2018) such as board size, roles and involvement (Ferkins, Shilbury & McDonald, 2009; Ferkins & Shilbury, 2012 & 2015; Ferkins, Shilbury & O'Boyle, 2018; Yeh & Taylor, 2008), board structure (Ingram & Boyle, 2017), gender quotas and gender equality (Adriaanse & Schofield, 2014; Sisjord, Fasting & Sand, 2017) etc. hence, lacks wide-ranging nature of good sport governance.

Besides, when we see sport and sport governance in Ethiopia, it has been given a key place starting from the reign of the emperor (Bezabih & Gaudin, 2007; Bromber, 2013; Chappell & Seifu, 2000) through the Marxist (Derg) regime (Chappell & Seifu, 2000) and the era of EPRDF (FDRE, 1995) to these days despite their difference in political ideologies.

Currently, it is in line with the federated system that Ethiopian sport has been governed centrally by the jurisdiction of ministerial office called Ministry of Culture and Sport (MSC) and Ethiopian sports commission established in accordance to councils of ministers regulation No.446/2019 (FDRE, 2019), and Ethiopian national Olympic committee and National federations or associations (non-governmental) and regionally by the sports commissions or the like and regional sports federations.

Yet, despite the sports' instrumental role in societal development regardless of the nature of government (Getahun, 2009) and the presence of respective national and regional governing bodies of each Olympic sport (Ministry of youth, sport and culture (MYSC), 1998), nowadays, there is the disparity between rhetoric and the current status of good sport governance in Ethiopia. In this vein, MYSC (1998) underlined that the growth (inclusive of good governance) of modern sport in Ethiopia is still at a lower level because of organizational and attitudinal factors. Besides, sport seems to front a lack of genuineness as youth projects are deprived of any coaching staff, sports facilities, and adequate support for athletes (Wolde & Gaudin, 2017), and athletics clubs are in governance challenges (undetermined organizational structure and club strategy, environment, resource, decision making, and line of communication) (Gebremeskel et al., 2019).

Moreover, the newly reframed national reform document has boldly underscored the public questions on the representativeness of general councils, and the electoral processes of executive bodies being dominated by government, politicians, and ethnic influences (ESC, 2020).

Despite all the aforesaid empirical gaps in global sport governance and all the drawbacks that call for its investigation in Ethiopian context, the implementation of good sport governance has not been studied in Ethiopian Olympic sports federations.

Hence, the purpose of this study was to investigate the extent of implementation of good sport governance in selected Ethiopian Olympic sport federations. In doing so, the study examined the basic question “To what extent is good sport governance implemented in some selected Ethiopian Olympic sport Federations?” through the quantitative hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The level of good sport governance practice in Ethiopian Olympic sports federations is below the expected average.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a statistically significant difference in good sport governance implementation between sampled Olympic sports federations.

2. Theoretical framework of the study

Though, the governance of nonprofit organizations is relatively under-theorized when compared with the governance of corporate organizations (Cornforth (2003c) as cited in Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007, p.11), some of the major theories proposed to shed light on how the governance function is enacted within sport, corporate and nonprofit organizations include: agency theory, stewardship theory, institutional theory, resource dependence theory, network theory, stakeholder theory & etc. (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007; Hoye et al., 2009, 2015).

Each of these theories was examined to identify their relevance in understanding the governance of sport organizations and found to offer perspectives on illuminating something of the governance assumptions, processes, structures and outcomes for sport organizations despite they were not basically in the context of sport governance.

In this regard, both agency theory and stewardship theory focus on the internal monitoring issues of governance whereas institutional theory, resource dependence theory and network theory each seek to explain how organizations relate to their external environments and acquire scarce resources (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007 ; Hoye et al., 2009, 2015). The stakeholder theory also proposes organizations as they are a series of interactions and responsibilities for which the governance structure must account (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007; Hoye et al., 2009, 2015). Moreover, Ferkins and Shilbury (2019) as cited in Iordanakis (2020) have categorized sport governance theories in to organizational governance theories (agency theory, stewardship theory, leader-membership theory, and managerial hegemony theory), and systemic governance theories (stakeholder theory, network theory, resource dependency theory, and institutional theory) (pp.7-9).

However, as to some scholars (eg. Miller-Millesen, 2003; O’Boyle, 2012), these theories have been used independently within the existing sport management literature and as such, have provided “a narrow view of sport governance”. Hence, it deemed important to combine multiple theories as sport organizations and their governance frameworks have diverse elements that prevent the development of an overarching theory of sport governance (Hoye et al, 2009, 2015).

Hence, with these theoretical arguments in consideration, and to understandingly assess the extent of good sport governance implementation in national federations, the theoretical lens in this study was the integration of agency theory, institutional theory, resource dependency theory and stakeholder theory.

2.1. Agency theory

Agency theory focuses on internal monitoring issues of governance, hence suggests hierarchical accountability of employees of the sport federations including chief executive officer (for instance, CEO

should be accountable to the board) that it (agency theory) ensures that management decisions and activities are directly aligned with the established directions of the board (Fama & Jensen, 1983; Miller-Millesen, 2003; O'Boyle, 2012; Rhoades et al., 2000). So, with this theoretical arguments, agency theory in this study tends to underline the importance of checks and balance (internal accountability and control) dimension of good sport governance.

2.2. Institutional theory

Institutional theory also has a key place in this study as it seeks to explain how sport organizations relate external organizations for acquiring scarce resources and hence suggests the establishment of clear statutes, bye-laws, rules and regulations, and the structures that results in effective and efficient operation to withstand external pressures(Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007; Hoye et al., 2009, 2015, & O'Boyle, 2012). So, with these theoretical arguments, institutional theory in this study tends to underline (though not limited to) the importance of democratic processes and the checks and balance (internal accountability and control) dimensions of good sport governance.

2.3. Resource dependence theory

Resource dependency theory proposes that sport organizations (national federations) are open systems and dependent on other organizations for survival(to get resources and information) that the role of the board is to minimize the external pressure, gather knowledge that is key to the organizations' activities, attract resources, and present positive public image(Hillman et al.,2000; Miller-Millesen, 2003, & O'Boyle, 2012) . Hence, this theory in the study tends to underline (though not limited to) the necessity of transparency and public communication and checks and balances dimensions of good sport governance.

2.4. The stakeholder theory

The stakeholder theory yet has important implications for corporations acting as good corporate citizens, and particularly sport organizations(hybrid national sport federations) that need to manage a myriad of relation with sponsors, funding agencies, members, general public, affiliated organizations, staffs, board members, government agencies, and suppliers (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007; Hoye et al., 2009 & 2015, & O'Boyle, 2012), hence, refers to the corporate responsibility's view related to numerous categories of stakeholders(Iordanakis, 2020). So, this theory signals (though not limited to) for the fulfillment of democratic processes and solidarity dimensions of the sport governance.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Research Design

Descriptive cross-sectional survey was used in conducting this research as a survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population(Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Specifically, the cross-sectional survey design was best suited for this study as (Skinner et al., 2015) argue, it is a design to identify the study population, select a sample and contact the respondents to find out the required information from representatives of a given population at one point in time that the results can be generalized.

3.2. Sampling

From the total of 16 Olympic sport federations, 6 federations i.e. Ethiopian Football Federation (EFF), Ethiopian Athletics Federation (EAF), Ethiopian Basketball Federation (EBF), Ethiopian Volleyball Federation

(EVBF), Ethiopian Handball Federation (EHF), and Ethiopian Cycling Federation (ECF) were purposively selected for their being dominant throughout the country as they have a long history (more than half a century) of establishment, have a number of member clubs, are with the most popular sport events, and have the highest public focus on them. Then, 265 respondents from the sampled Olympic sport federations (based on Soper's (2021) a-priori sample size calculator for SEM to determine minimum sample size and in consideration of 20 % attrition rates for the main thesis) were selected by proportionate stratified random sampling.

3.3. Instrument

Good sport governance was assessed by using the slightly modified and contextualized version of the Action for Good Governance of International Sport Organizations (AGGIS) sport governance observer tool (Geeraert, 2015). The original 36 indicators were extended to 38 indicators as the four dimensions are kept the same i.e. transparency and public communication (12 items), democratic processes (10 items), checks and balances (7 items), and solidarity (9 items). Besides, the initial five-point Likert scale ranging from 'not fulfilled at all' (1) to 'state-of-the-art' (5) were modified in range from 'not fulfilled at all' (1) to 'fulfilled at all' (5) on the assumption that it should reflect measures of perceived level of implementation of good sport governance with some meaning and value to all stakeholders participating in the study. The interpretation of the perceived level of implementation of items in terms of their mean values and their ranks is based on five levels: (1) very low (1.00-1.80); (2) Low (1.81-2.60); (3) Moderate (2.61-3.40); (4) High (3.41-4.20), and (5) Very high (4.21-5.00) for Descriptives.

The internal consistency was checked, hence the coefficients alpha of the scales were found as transparency and public communication (.92), democratic processes (.95), checks and balances (.85), and solidarity (.92), hence, were all above .70 which indicate desirable internal consistency attributes of the subscales (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2014).

3.4. Methods of Data Analysis

Data was analyzed by IBM SPSS 26.0 software and the level of statistical significance was set at an alpha value less than .05. Descriptive statistics i.e. frequency & percentage for background information, and means and standard deviations for good sport governance and each dimension of good sport governance across the sampled sport federations were computed. Inferentially, the group difference in the implementation of good sport governance between the sampled Olympic sports federations was computed by using One-Way ANOVA with post-hoc test for the level of significance of the mean difference.

Preliminary checks were performed to assess normality and homogeneity of variances so that the data was found normally distributed (the normal curve retained the bell-shaped curve, and the Shapiro-Wilk test was found non-significant ($P=.116$). But the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not assumed as Levene's statistic was found to be statistically significant ($P=0.046$) (Ntoumanis, 2001, p.73)

4. Results

A survey was conducted by distributing questionnaires to 265 respondents from February to June 2022 and upon the serious follow-ups, 238 completed questionnaires were collected with an 89.8% response rate. When respondents were seen in their stakes, officials were nearly half (50.4%) of the respondents followed by coaches covering 35.7% of the respondents. The remaining 2.9% and 10.9% portions were covered by executive committee members and paid staff respectively.

Regarding the sex and age composition of the study respondents, the vast majorities (87.4%) were male and the remaining 12.6% were female. The age category above 30 comprised the large majority together (83.6%). When the academic level and years of work experiences are seen, holders of BA/BSc degree and MA/MSc degrees in together took the highest share (68.5%) of the respondents, and, almost half of the

respondents (52.1%) were found to have the work experience of 1-10, and 37.4% lie in the experience category of 11-20 which together form 89.5%.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of good sport governance implementation in the sampled federations

Names of the federation	Mean	Std. Dev.
Ethiopian Football Federation	2.50	.31
Ethiopian Athletics Federation	2.54	.40
Ethiopian Handball Federation	2.29	.40
Ethiopian Basketball Federation	2.23	.32
Ethiopian Volleyball Federation	2.24	.50
Ethiopian Cycling Federation	2.16	.28
Total	2.40	.38

Descriptive statistics in table 1 above revealed that the surveyed Olympic sport federations have a mean score below the expected average (moderate level) with the actual average score (M =2.40, SD=.38) with the lowest mean score in the Ethiopian Cycling Federation and the relatively higher mean score in Ethiopian Athletics Federation. These indicate that all the surveyed federations were found to be at low level of implementing good sport governance.

In descriptive statistics for each dimensions of good sport governance, democratic processes was found to be the only dimension moderately implemented whereas transparency and public communication was relatively the least implemented dimension. Checks and balances and solidarity dimensions were all found to be implemented low (see Table 2.).

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of factors/ dimensions of good sport governance in the sampled federations

	Mean	Std. Dev.
Transparency and Public communication	2.08	.48
Democratic processes	2.81	.62
Check and Balances	2.53	.44
Solidarity	2.15	.56
Valid N (listwise)		

A One-Way ANOVA was also conducted to examine the mean difference in the implementation of good sport governance among the surveyed Olympic sport federations (see Table.3.). There was a significant difference in implementation of good sport governance between the sampled Olympic sport federations (F 5, 232 =8.18, $P < 0.001$) and, Tamhane’s T2 post hoc test, as the homogeneity variances was not assumed (Hair et al., 2014), revealed that the mean score of implementing good sport governance in Ethiopian Football Federation was significantly higher than in Ethiopian Basketball Federation ($P = .010$) and Ethiopian Cycling Federation ($P < .001$). The post hoc test also revealed that the mean score of implementing good sport governance in the Ethiopian Athletics Federation was significantly higher than Ethiopian Basketball Federation ($P = .004$), and Ethiopian Cycling Federation ($P < .001$) whereas, statistically significant differences were not found between other Olympic sport federations.

Table 3: ANOVA table for mean comparison among the sampled federations

ANOVA					
Good Sport Governance					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.397	5	1.079	8.180	.000
Within Groups	30.615	232	.132		
Total	36.011	237			

5. Discussion of the Results

This study intended to investigate the extent of good sport governance implementation in selected Ethiopian Olympic sport federations. In this regard, the finding for the first hypothesis revealed that the implementation of good sport governance was below the expected average (M=2.40, SD=.39), hence, supported the hypothesis. This finding is in congruence with the findings of Geeraert's (2015) study where all the surveyed 35 Olympic international federations generally achieved modest to weak scores (P.76), and Rustiadi et al.'s(2018) findings that the level of good governance of sports organizations in Central Java(Indonesia) is only weak.

For explicitness, this study also attempted to analyze the extent of implementation of each dimension. Hence, the findings revealed that the surveyed Olympic sport federations were found relatively better in implementing democratic processes and weaker in implementing transparency and public communication, and solidarity.

The findings were in congruence with the findings of Pielke et al.(2019) where national governing bodies of sports in the USA were found to be better in implementing democratic processes and checks and balances whereas less well in transparency and solidarity(P.9). Except the contextual difference, the least score findings in both transparency and solidarity were also in correspondence with Geeraert's (2018) findings where transparency and societal responsibility were the least implemented dimensions of good sport governance by the five surveyed international federations(P.25). The low score in transparency and public communication was also consistent with the findings of Rustiadi et al.(2018) of sport organizations in central Java (Indonesia) where they underscored the lack of a website or social media in the studied organizations.

The group comparison among the surveyed Olympic sport federations (hypothesis 2) also revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in scores of implementing good sport governance among the surveyed federations(hypothesis supported) where the mean scores of implementing good sport governance in EAF and EFF similarly were significantly higher than the mean scores in EBF and ECF. The findings here slightly indicate that large-sized Olympic sport federations were relatively better at implementing good sport governance. But, the difference in implementation between large-sized and small-sized federations seeks further statistical scrutiny.

In sum, the weak score in good sport governance signifies the critical need for implementing transparency and public communication, solidarity, and to some extent, checks and balances to better adapt to the changing environment and not to lose their legitimacy as Freeburn (2010) warns that the severity of poor sport governance is accompanied by the obvious possibility of catastrophic collapse for mismanaged national sport organizations besides the more relevant consequences such as the riddance of sponsorship, weakening in association numbers and participation, and defenselessness of organizations to possible interventions from government funding agencies against autonomy (p. 48).

Specifically, the severe weakness of the federations in transparency and public communication (weakness in publishing the statutes and rules and regulations in their hands on their websites, etc.) is just like 'lighting a candle and putting it under a bushel". However, Lam(2014) underscores the critical need for informing

stakeholders as “members should be regularly informed of the governing bodies activities, financial condition, policy decision, elections, approach to governance, and other business”(P.26). Scholars, in this regard, also argue that sport organizations should keep their door open to stakeholders as “the inner workings should as far as possible be open to public scrutiny” (Henry & Lee, 2004, p.31), and “it is no longer possible for sport organizations to be run as a ‘closed book’” (Robinson cited in Alm, 2013) as openness enhances the organizations’ ability to gain the public’s trust (BoardSource, 2010, p. 319).

Furthermore, the weakness in solidarity implementation weakens the organizations capacity to have social capital. However, national governing bodies of sport are expected to widen their services into the wider community(King, 2017), and or they are highly demanded by a community for social, ethical, and environmental actions (Babiak, 2010, cited in Alm, 2013) that enhance their social capital.

6. Management Implications

The current study has several theoretical and practical implications for sport managers. In terms of theory, it was a significant endeavour in empirically testing the implementation of good sport governance in Ethiopian national sport governing bodies. From the practical perspective, this study implies policy issues as it investigated the extent of implementation of good sport governance i.e.it calls for ‘walk the talk’ of transparency & public communication and solidarity in national sport governing bodies.

7. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

As with any research investigation, this study is not without limitations. First, despite the effort made to achieve the desirable internal consistency attributes for all of the subscales, the lack of universally agreed up on indicators of good governance in general, and inconsistency of Sport Governance Observer (SGO) indicators and the limited application of it in national contexts specifically may shadow the findings of this study. Hence, the future studies using this tool should further engage in national contexts to validate the instrument.

Secondly, the current investigation focused only on Olympic sport federations which are the most popular sports federations in Ethiopia. However, future investigations should better examine all national sport federations to enhance the generalizability of these findings and also take further statistical scrutiny on the difference in implementation between large-sized and small-sized federations.

Finally, as this study only focused on quantitative survey for the extent of implementation of good sport governance, it provides a partial view as it fails to incorporate the in-depth perceptions of stakeholders or doesn’t capture the richness of the real world (Skinner et al., 2015). Hence, the future study should better employ a mixed-methods approach.

8. Conclusion

This study used Cross-sectional survey design to investigate the extent of implementing good sport governance in selected Ethiopian Olympic sport federations in the lens of integrated sport governance theories. Hence, four conclusions emerged from this study. First, this study unveils that the surveyed sport federations scored below the average in good sport governance. Second, they were relatively better at implementing Democratic processes whereas severely weak at implementing transparency and solidarity. Third, a significant difference in implementation of good sport governance was revealed among the surveyed federations. Finally, the study advances the operationalization of the AGGIS Sport Governance Observer tool in the context of national sport governing bodies.

9. Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all who contributed a lot during the data collection process and in language translation. Deep gratitude also goes to the study participants from all the selected six Olympic sports federations.

10. Authors' Contributions

1. Concept development, design of the research methods, data collection and analysis, manuscript development
2. Concept review, review of the research methods, and review & approval of the manuscript.
3. Concept review, review of the research methods, and review & approval of the manuscript
4. Concept review, review of the research methods, and review & approval of the manuscript

11. Consent for Publication

All authors have agreed to publish the manuscript.

12. Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

13. References

1. *Adriaanse, J., & Schofield, T. (2014). The impact of gender quotas on gender equality in sport governance. Journal of Sport Management, 28(5), 485–497.*
2. *Blanco, D. V. (2016). Sports governance stakeholders, actors and policies in the philippines: Current issues, challenges and future directions. Asia Pacific Journal of Sport and Social Science, 5(3), 165–186.*
3. *Brandsen, T., van de Donk, W., & Putters, K. (2005). Griffins or chameleons? Hybridity as a permanent and inevitable characteristic of the third sector. International Journal of Public Administration, 28(9–10), 749–765.*
4. *Bromber, K. (2013). Improving the Physical Self: Sport , Body Politics , and Ethiopian Modernity,ca.1920-1974. Northeast African Studies, 13(1), 71–100.*
5. *Chappelet, Jean-Loup; Kübler-Mabbott, B. (2008). The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System: The governance of world sport (T. G. Weiss & R. Wilkinson (eds.); 1st ed.). Routledge.*
6. *Chappelet, J., & Mrkonjic, M. (2013). Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport(BIBGIS): An Assessment tool for international governing bodies (No. 1; January). www.idheap.ch %3EPublications %3EWorking Papers*
7. *Chappell, R., & Seifu, E. (2000). Sport, culture and politics in Ethiopia, Culture, Sport, Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics. Sport in Society, 3(1), 35–47.*
8. *Cleak, B. A. (2019). Good Governanse for National Sport Federations in South Africa From A Systems Perspective: A Case Study. University of Johannesburg.*
9. *Creswell, J. ., & Creswell, J. . (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.*
10. *Dowling, M., Leopkey, B., & Smith, L. (2018). Governance in sport: A scoping review. Journal of Sport Management, 1–15.*
11. *Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of Ownership and Control. The Journal of Law & Economics, 26(2), 301–325.*
12. *FDRE. (1995). A Proclamation to provide for the Establishment of the Sports Commission: a proclamation No.12/1995. Fedral Negarit Gazeta, 81–84.*
13. *FDRE. (2019). Council of Ministers Regulation to provide for the powers,duties,and organization of Sport Commission and the National Sport Council. Federal Negarit Gazeta, Regulation No. 446/2019, 10901–10907.*

14. Ferkins, L., & Shilbury, D. (2012). *Good boards are strategic: What does that mean for sport governance?* *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(1), 67–80.
15. Ferkins, L., Shilbury, D., & McDonald, G. (2005). *The Role of the Board in Building Strategic Capability: Towards an Integrated Model of Sport Governance Research.* *Sport Management Review*, 8(3), 195–225.
16. Ferkins, L., Shilbury, D., & McDonald, G. (2009). *Board involvement in strategy: Advancing the governance of sport organizations.* *Journal of Sport Management*, 23(3), 245–277.
17. Freeburn, L. (2010). *National Sporting Organisations and the Good Governance Principles of the Australian Sports Commission.* *Australian & New Zealand Sports Law Journal*, 5(1), 43–80.
18. Gebremeskel, T., Shivappa, H., Ibrahim, Y., Mathivanan, & Dhamodharan. (2019). *Organizational structure and management challenges of athletics clubs in Ethiopia : Policy perspective.* *International Journal of Physiology, Nutrition and Physical Education*, 4(1), 344–349.
19. Geeraert, Arnout. (2015). *Sport Governance Observer 2015: The legitimacy crisis in international sports governance.*
20. Geeraert, Arnout. (2016). *The EU in international sports governance: A principal-agent perspective on EU control of FIFA and UEFA.* In S. Oberthür, K. E. Jørgensen, A. Warleigh-Lack, S. Lavenex, & P. Murray (Eds.), *The European Union in International Affairs Series (1st ed.)*. Palgrave MacMillan.
21. Geeraert, Arnout. (2017). *National sports governance observer. Indicators for good governance in national federations.*
22. Geeraert, Arnout. (2022). *Introduction: The Need for Critical reflection on Good Governance in Sport.* In A. Geeraet & F. Van Eekeren (Eds.), *Good Governance in Sport: Critical reflections (First, pp. 1–12)*. Routledge.
23. Getahun, S. A. (2009). *A history of sport in Ethiopia.* *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, 409–418.
24. Hair, J. ., Black, W. ., Babin, B. ., & Anderson, R. . (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis (7th ed.)*. Pearson new International edition.
25. Henry, I., & Lee, P. (2004). *Governance and Ethics in Sport.* In S. Chadwick & J. Beech (Eds.), *The business of sport management (pp. 25–41)*. Pearson Education Limited.
26. Hillman, A. J., Cannella, A. A., & Paetzold, R. L. (2000). *The resource dependence role of corporate directors: Strategic adaptation of board composition in response to environmental change.* *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(2), 235–256.
27. Hoye, R., Smith, A. C. T., Nicholson, M., & Stewart, B. (2015). *Sport Management: Principles and applications (4th ed.)*. Routledge.
28. Ingram, K., & Boyle, I. O. (2017). *Sport governance in Australia : questions of board structure and performance* *Sport governance in Australia : questions of board structure and performance.* *World Leisure Journal*, 1–18.
29. Iordanakis, E. (2020). *Measuring governance: A case of Greek National Sport Federations.* Molde University College.
30. Lucassen, J., & Heijden, A. von. (2013). *Hybrid professions in the sport sector.* 21th EASM Conference, 1–3.
31. Lucassen, J. M. H., & Bakker, S. de. (2016). *Variety in hybridity in sport organizations and their coping strategies.* *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 13(1), 75–94.
32. Miller-Millesen, J. L. (2003). *Understanding the Behavior of Nonprofit Boards of Directors: A Theory-Based Approach.* *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 521–547.
33. O’Boyle, I. (2012). *Corporate governance applicability and theories within not-for-profit sport management.* *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 9(2–3), 335–342.
34. Pielke Jr., R. (2016). *Obstacles to accountability in international sports governance.* In G. Sweeney & K. McCarthy (Eds.), *Global Corruption Report: Sport (1st ed., pp. 1–372)*. Transparency International.

35. Pielke, R., Harris, S., Adler, J., Sutherland, S., Houser, R., & McCabe, J. (2019). *An evaluation of good governance in US Olympic sport National Governing Bodies*. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1–22.
36. Rhoades, D. L. ., Rechner, P. L. ., & Sundaramurthy, C. (2000). *Board Composition And Financial Performance : A Meta-Analysis Of The Influence Of Outside Directors*. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 12(1), 76–91.
37. Rustiadi, T., Castyana, B., Gansar, D., & Wijayanti, S. (2018). *The Good Governance Level's Profile of Sport Organization in Central Java*. *Journal of Physical Education , Sport , Health and Recreations*, 7(1), 1–4.
38. Sisjord, M. K., Fasting, K., & Sand, T. S. (2017). *The impact of gender quotas in leadership in Norwegian organised sport*. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 9(3), 505–519.
39. Wolde, B., & Gaudin, B. (2007). *The Institutional Organization of Ethiopian athletics*. *Annales d’Ethiopie*, 23(1), 471–493.
40. Wolfgang, M. (2017). *Governance in Sport organizations*. In *Hamburg Contemporary Economic Discussions*, No. 60.