

Hoye, R., Parent, M. M., Taks, M., Naraine, M. L., Seguin, B., & Thompson, A. (2020). **Design Archetype Utility for Understanding and Analyzing the Governance of Contemporary National Sport Organizations.** *Sport Management Review*, 23(4), 576-587. DOI:10.1016/j.smr.2019.10.002.

Title: Design Archetype Utility for Understanding and Analyzing the Governance of Contemporary National Sport Organizations

Abstract

More than 30 years has passed since the seminal works of the late Trevor Slack and his colleagues first appeared using design archetypes to explore change dynamics amongst National Sport Organizations. The scale and nature of change that has continued to occur in the operating environment for these organizations over the last three decades has resulted in NSOs increasingly being required to be more professional, to manage more complex sport delivery systems, and strategically adapt and change to be effective. In that context, we explore the contemporary nature of NSO design archetypes in order to better understand the current and emerging dynamics of change for these organizations. This conceptual paper reviews the theory and utility of design archetypes in helping to understand organizational change dynamics in relation to NSOs, revisits the work of Slack and others in order to identify ways to improve the representation of design archetypes for contemporary NSOs, and presents an argument for a renewed emphasis on design archetypes as a fundamental driver for future research efforts to help understand change within NSOs, and indeed, other sport organizations.

Keywords: Organizational Theory, Organizational Change, Sport Policy, Structures

Introduction

The importance of design archetypes in understanding organizational change has been a central tenet of organizational theorists for more than three decades, especially following the work of Greenwood and Hinings (1988, 1993). The concept of an archetype “derives from the idea that organizations operate with a limited number of configurations of structure, strategy and environment” (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988, p. 294) and that coherence or the emergence of a pattern amongst these variables is the foundation for the identification of a particular design archetype and ability to analyze seemingly different organizations. Archetypes and their utility have, since then, become a core part of organization theory.

There are several core concepts associated with design archetypes: the identification of tracks, the notions of momentum and inertia in relation to movement within or between archetypes, and the beliefs and values associated with an organization’s domain, its principles for organizing, and its criteria for performance evaluation. Greenwood and Hinings (1988) described tracks as “maps of the extent to which organizations move from the constraining assumptions of a given archetype and assume the characteristics of an alternative archetype” (p. 294). Organizations can exhibit momentum in relation to their existing archetype, but may also exhibit inertia because they are fixed within an archetype and unable to move between archetypes. Beliefs and values can drive the establishment of an archetype that reflects ideas of “what an organization should be doing, of how it should be doing it and how it should be judged” (p. 295).

Identifying design archetypes amongst National Sporting Organizations (NSOs) and the associated relevance of these archetypes in explaining the dynamics of change amongst these organizations was the focus of a long term project in the late 1980s and early 1990s led by the late Trevor Slack and his colleagues then at the University of Alberta. The many publications (cf. Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Hinings, Thibault, Slack, &

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Kikulis, 1996; Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c; Slack & Hinings, 1992, 1994; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1991, 1993) from this project highlighted the nature and extent of change that occurred amongst Canadian NSOs in the late 1980s and early 1990s in terms of structure, strategy, values, and operating environment. These collective works are among the most highly cited in the field of sport management and are the foundation of the widely accepted notion that NSOs fall into three archetypes (i.e., Kitchen Table, Boardroom, and Executive Office), an idea that has framed discussions and influenced analyses of organizational structures and change ever since, not only in Canada (e.g., Kikulis, 2000; Parent, 2016a; Stevens, 2006), but in other jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom (Bayle & Robinson, 2007), and Norway (Steen-Johnson & Hanstad, 2008), and a review of research into professionalization of sport organizations around the world (Nagel, Schlesinger, Bayle, & Giaouque, 2015).

More than 27 years after the first publication from this project – a contribution which drew much of its data from archival material documented more than 30 years ago – it is timely to revisit the important concept of design archetypes in relation to NSOs given the scale and nature of change that has continued to occur in the operating environment for these organizations over the last three decades. Parent, Naraine, and Hoye (2018) posited that contemporary NSOs operate in an environment replete with digital hardware such as smartphones and tablets, and software including mobile applications and social media that “would be unrecognizable to managers from the previous century” (p. 555). In the first two decades of the 21st century, NSOs have had to deal with increased influences of globalization, a global economic recession, increased instances of reporting and monitoring corruption in sport (e.g., doping scandals, match fixing, money laundering; Parent et al., 2018), and more recently, public reporting of sexual misconduct and assaults stimulated by the MeToo movement (Ewing, 2018). In Canada specifically, NSOs are also having to respond to the

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

increased governance requirements associated with the Canada Not-For-Profit Corporations Act (2009) such as mandatory publication of key documents on organizational websites, formalization of policies, increased privacy protection measures, adoption of formal strategic plans, and an overall increased focus on demonstrating transparency in decision-making. They have also had to respond to numerous shifts in Canadian national sport policy, especially in relation to the provision of financial support for high performance programs and the hosting of the Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games (Dowling & Smith, 2016). There are likely similar, and perhaps different pressures in other countries on the operating environments that have also affected their respective NSOs over this timeframe and thus how NSO design archetypes manifest in those countries.

In an era where NSOs are increasingly required to be more professional, to manage more complex sport delivery systems that involve commercial partners for venue and service delivery, sophisticated data storage and privacy protection requirements, and partnerships with governments to support sport participation pathways and other health-focused outcomes, as well as strategically adapting and changing to be effective, it is useful to explore the contemporary nature of NSO design archetypes so that we can better understand the current and emerging dynamics of change for these organizations. To that end, the purpose of our paper is threefold. First, we seek to review the theory and utility of design archetypes in helping to understand organizational change dynamics in relation to NSOs. Second, we revisit the work of Slack and others in order to identify ways to improve the representation of design archetypes for contemporary (Canadian) NSOs. Finally, we present an argument for a renewed emphasis on design archetypes as a fundamental driver for future research efforts to help understand change within NSOs and, indeed, other sport organizations.

Literature Review

Design Archetypes

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

In this section, we review the theory of design archetypes and their value in helping to understand organizational change dynamics in relation to NSOs. As we noted in the introduction to this paper, there are core concepts associated with design archetypes (definition, values and beliefs, movement within archetypes, and movement between archetypes or tracks). We now provide a brief review of each of these in turn.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, organizational theorists sought new ways to explain the drivers of organizational design and the impact internal and external forces had on shaping the structure of an organization and how an organization's structure might move and adapt in relation to those forces. Prominent authors of the time, such as Miles and Snow (1978), Mintzberg (1979), and Miller and Friesen (1980), provided variations to the theme of a design archetype that would enable organizations to be categorized according to patterns amongst variables like structure, strategy, or the environment (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988).

Greenwood and Hinings (1988) argued that the design archetype concept “based upon the combination of structural coherence and underpinning interpretive schemes is, in fact, the basis of typologies and classification in organizational theory” (p. 297). They made the important point that typologies are important building blocks of organizational theory, as they help us identify different categories of organizations which have implications for how core management and organizational theory concepts such as performance, power, decision-making, attitudes, behavior and change manifest themselves in these different types of organizations.

The importance of the interpretive scheme, or the set of values and beliefs that shape what might be an ideal organizational design, is fundamental to the concept of a design archetype and follows the work of Child (1977, p. 16), who argued for the greater acknowledgment of the “strategic decisions of those who have the power of structural initiation – the dominant coalition” in their influence over organizational design. Values help define the

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

purpose of an organization, its reason for existence, the principles for organizing, and guide how an organization should go about its business and be evaluated. For example, organizations that value meeting government policy objectives, such as NSOs who are somewhat beholden to national sport funding agencies, would value alignment with government policy and adherence to delivery standards and requirements imposed by government funding programs. These values would influence the organizational design of the group of NSOs subject to the same funding regime, as they create job roles, programs, and processes to deliver organizational outcomes. Greenwood and Hinings (1988) posited that “the starting point for identification and classification of design archetypes is, we suggest, identification of the interpretive scheme and of how that relates to structural attributes and processes” (p. 299). Greenwood and Hinings (1993) also highlighted that identifying specific categories of design archetypes is dependent on understanding that, although there may be an interpretive scheme for a cohort of organizations, there will be differences in the “extent to which some or all organizational actors are, at a given time, committed to those ideas and values” (p. 1057).

As noted in the introduction to this paper, archetypes can exhibit momentum and inertia. Greenwood and Hinings (1988) defined momentum as “the process whereby an organization exhibits change which is an extension of its current archetype” (p. 295) – in other words, it changes but within an archetype rather than between archetypes. This might manifest as a gradual transfer of decision making control from volunteers to professional staff over a period of time, as an NSO might be able to employ more professional staff, but other values or structural elements that define a design archetype remain relatively static. In this case, there is some change evident within the NSO, but it remains categorized in the same overall design archetype. Conversely, they posited that organizations can also exhibit inertia (a lack of change between archetypes) precisely because they fall within an archetype. The duo labelled these as tracks because they wanted to map and explain the “incidence, nature and cause of movements

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

and the absence of movement between archetypes” (p. 303). They make the important distinction that there may be a complex array of tracks and that “the language of tracks has to provide for the study of organizations over time, allowing for the possibilities not only of radical transformations but of abortive shifts between design archetypes and of the absence of change” (p. 303).

The utility in studying the change dynamics of NSOs through the lens of design archetypes is that it allows researchers to identify both the values and beliefs influencing organizational form and the influence of the environment on a set of organizations at any one time. A theme we revisit later in our paper is that, once researchers understand the current dynamics between (NSO) structure and environmental pressures, they can assist managers and directors with identifying potential strategies and practices to help achieve organizational goals. NSOs are a set of institutionally-specific organizations in that they have been subject to a similar set of “pressures from government agencies to adopt new policies, programs and structures [and] have responded by changing in a similar manner” (Kikulis et al., 1992, p. 343). These pressures to change have continued over the last three decades, but what is not known is how NSOs have responded to those changes over that time and the implications for contemporary NSO design archetypes. The concept of a design archetype is that it allows us to discern patterns of organizational forms amongst a group of organizations and thus to determine the drivers of any changes in both the pattern (i.e., the number and attributes of the groups that make up the pattern) and any changes of the attributes used to discern the pattern. We now turn to our review of the work of Slack and his colleagues in determining NSO design archetypes.

NSO Design Archetypes

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

The pivotal paper that first¹ identified common design archetypes within Canadian NSOs by Kikulis, Slack, and Hinings (1992) followed the earlier contribution of Slack and Hinings (1987, 1992) recommending work to explore differences amongst organizational structures of NSOs must be based on identifying levels of professionalization and bureaucratization. It also built on the work of Cunningham, Slack, and Hinings (1987), Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmerman (1989), and Macintosh and Whitson (1990), who “made an initial contribution to our understanding of the kinds of design archetypes and changes occurring in Canadian amateur sport organizations” (Kikulis et al., 1992, p. 345). Cunningham et al.’s (1987) work pointed to the existence of not only a kitchen table archetype but also what they termed a corporate professional design archetype focused on (a) high performance sport, (b) higher levels of standardization and specialization, (c) measuring its performance objectively, and (d) a more professional approach to management compared to other, more volunteer-oriented organizations. Three years later, Macintosh and Whitson (1990) argued the existence of two archetypes: a traditional form that eschewed professionalism and valued a broad range of sport activities, not just high performance sport; and a corporate volunteer archetype that supported professional management and governance. These advances were an important catalyst that spurred the aforementioned long-term project by Slack and his colleagues.

First, Slack and Hinings (1992) set the context for exploring change within Canadian NSOs by providing an integrated review of different theoretical perspectives that could be applied to the study of this change phenomenon. Their work was the foundation for developing measures for the various structural elements associated with NSO organizational design (i.e., specialization, standardization and centralization). Importantly, this paper also illustrated that

¹ Earlier work by Slack and colleagues (i.e., Cunningham, Slack, & Hingings, 1987; Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, & Zimmerman, 1989) developed two to eight archetypes for provincial sport organizations (PSOs), not NSOs.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

employing different theoretical perspectives (e.g., resource dependence theory, institutional theory, organizational culture, transformational leadership) allowed them to “explain different aspects of the change process and to produce a more complete picture of the phenomenon” (p. 129). While this paper did not employ design archetypes explicitly, it did utilize the principles of tracking changes in structural elements over multiple time periods (1984, 1986, and 1988) to show shifts in the organizational design of NSOs collectively as they were subject to a range of change pressures.

The aim of the supplemental paper by Kikulis et al. (1992) was to develop a theoretical framework to “assist our understanding of the variety of organizational design types and the nature of change between these design types for a set of NSOs” (p. 345). They sought to identify the range of “design archetypes that most significantly represent NSOs by describing the patterns of the structure-value coherence that are most often identified in this sector of organizations” (p. 345). The structural dimensions that were used were specialization (the differentiation of roles and tasks), standardization (reflected in the extent of written and unwritten rules, policies or procedures), and centralization (where final decision making authority resides). As noted earlier, the idea of a design archetype also incorporates other variables such as values or beliefs that, together with these structural attributes, form an overall archetype. To that end, Kikulis et al (1992) used four interpretive schemes or value areas: domain (the products and services provided to clients, customers or members), principles of organizing (values relate to roles, responsibilities and rules), criteria of effectiveness (how will an organization’s performance be judged), and orientation (sources of legitimation and support for an organization).

Kikulis et al. (1992) also employed a four-step method to identify design archetypes amongst (Canadian) NSOs. Following the work of McKinney (1966), they first outlined their problem situation, defining it empirically as “identifying the variety in organizational design

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

for these organizations” (Kikulis et al., 1992, p. 353). Second, they undertook a detailed literature review of material associated with NSOs to “assess the organization and administration of their programs, activities, traditions, and events” (p. 353). Then, via what can at best be described as an ontological process, that is, a process of identifying, articulating, and simplifying the data into the “constructed type on the basis of some idea of the social scientist’s as to the nature of social reality and on the basis of the purposes of inquiry” (McKinney, 1966, p. 203), they used the data from this literature review and assessed it against the seven concepts for structural dimensions and values. On this basis, they determined three design archetypes – the Kitchen Table, Boardroom, and Executive Office – that described the range of organizational designs for Canadian NSOs. It should be noted here that Kikulis et al. (1992) pointed out this method was “not a matter of placing empirical observations in *a priori* categories, rather it was a matter of identifying categories as exemplified by the activities and structures of these observations” (p. 354).

Their final methodological step was to reveal the characteristics of each design archetype: “with the kinds of design archetypes having been roughly identified as constituting the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office, the attributes were chosen based on their criticality in defining the design archetypes in the context of NSOs” (Kikulis et al., 1992, p. 354). The authors noted that these design archetypes each constituted a hypothesized relation of the seven attributes making them an idealized set of design archetypes and, as such, “no single NSO may mirror exactly the structure and values of the archetype to which they aspire or belong” (p. 363). An adapted version of the original table outlining these design archetypes is presented in Table 1.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Aspects of these design archetypes and the criteria used to develop them were subsequently used to explore a number of different research avenues. Slack and Hinings (1994)

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

explored the impact of institutional pressures from Sport Canada to adopt more professional and bureaucratic structures on 36 Canadian NSOs between 1984 and 1986 and employed cluster analysis to group the NSOs based on the structural dimensions of specialization, standardization and centralization at each time period. They found that “while there has been a general shift towards a more homogenous design type and the direction of this shift was to a more professional bureaucratic form, decision making has not changed substantially” (p. 821).

Expanding the time period for the analysis of change amongst this same cohort of 36 Canadian NSOs, Kikulis et al. (1995c) again used the structural dimensions to trace the change in organizational structures of Canadian NSOs (between 1984 to 1988) that were subject to increased requirements from Sport Canada in return for funding support. The authors concluded that NSOs did resist the pressures from Sport Canada and that those “pressures from the Canadian government for a professional bureaucratic form of organization were not strong enough to destabilize the structural inertia that had built up around the traditions of volunteer control of NSOs” (p. 150).

Kikulis et al. (1995b) sought to test three propositions in relation to the nature of change within Canadian NSOs: (1) organizations will exhibit a range of archetypal coherence at the start of a change period; (2) throughout a change period, organizations will follow a variety of tracks; and (3) organizations that move toward a new design archetype will demonstrate the greatest change in the high impact system of decision-making. This study was the first to operationalize the measures of the structural elements of the design archetypes: specialization, standardization, and centralization. Specialization was measured via the number of professional roles in an organization, number of paid support staff in an organization, the number of different roles for volunteers and the number of different committee functions. Standardization was measured in terms of the existence of a range of organizational procedures [ranging from (0) no procedures, (1) a few, (2) some, (3) considerable to (4) extensive formal

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

procedures] in five areas: administration, athlete services, athlete support systems, decision making, and evaluations. Centralization was measured in relation to the locus of final decision making, the number of levels involved in decisions, and the degree to which decision making was concentrated amongst volunteers.

With these measures, Kikulis et al. (1995b) found only two NSOs to be kitchen tables, whereas 18 were boardrooms, and 12 were executive offices. The study illustrated the value of using design archetypes to study change over time and confirmed the first two of the three propositions tested in the study, illustrating that NSOs react in different ways despite experiencing the same environmental pressures. In relation to the third proposition, Kikulis et al. (1995b) showed that

the volunteer governance orientation of NSOs is the fundamental core value of these organizations and it is the decision-making structural elements that are tightly coupled to ‘who governs’ ... and ... it is the reorientation to the Executive Office, the prescribed design archetype [by Sport Canada] for the change period examined in this study, that exhibits the most radical shift in the amount and direction of change.
(p. 95)

Their focus was on determining if that same cohort of 36 Canadian NSOs had “shifted away from the dominant paradigm of volunteer-led decision making in favor of professional staff authority and autonomy over strategic decisions” (Kikulis et al., 1995a, p. 273). They used the design archetypes advanced by Kikulis et al. (1992) and developed a series of measures, slightly modified from Kikulis et al. (1995b) in order to operationalize the structural elements of specialization, standardization and centralization. Specialization and standardization were measured using the same criteria as for Kikulis et al. (1995b), but with the omission of the existence of decision making procedures for standardization. Centralization was determined

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

via the same criteria as Kikulis et al. (1995b) but with the addition of a measure of the standardization of decision making using a five-point scale.

The extent of change in each of these structural dimensions was then measured at three time points for each NSO: in 1984 at the start of the Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP), at the midpoint in 1986, and at the conclusion of the QPP in 1988. Through an analysis of the change of each NSO between different design archetypes across these three time points, Kikulis et al. (1995a) were able to identify an overall shift of NSOs from the Kitchen Table archetype along a track to various iterations of either the Boardroom or Executive Office archetype but that, importantly, most NSOs had “maintained the tradition of a volunteer-controlled and professionally supported decision making structure” (p. 296). The utility of undertaking this study with design archetypes over several distinct time periods “enabled the identification of structural elements that are tightly coupled to the core values of this sector of organizations and that are most resistant to change” (p. 297).

The emphasis of the paper by Hinings et al. (1996) was the identification of the second half of the design archetype attributes – the values and beliefs – that were ingrained in the Canadian sport system that were shaping the way NSOs operated. Through a process of content analysis, interviews with key Canadian sport leaders and a review of research on the development of Canadian sport similar to that outlined in our summary of the methodology used by Kikulis et al. (1992), Hinings et al. (1996, p. 897) summarized these values and beliefs to be:

1. *High performance emphasis* – a commitment to identifying and developing elite athletes who could successfully compete at the international level, shifting away from mass participation;
2. *Government involvement* – a commitment to government as a partner, supplying resources and ideas to develop expertise in NSOs;

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

3. *Organizational rationalization* – a commitment to organizational development in the direction of specifying and codifying activities;
4. *Professionalism* – a commitment to developing full-time professional staff to assist volunteers;
5. *Planning* – a commitment to long-term planning of the organization’s objectives and activities;
6. *Corporate involvement* – a commitment to the involvement of corporate sponsors in the support of high performance sport;
7. *Quadrennial plans* – a commitment to the outcomes and objectives of the quadrennial plans (which are coterminous with the Olympic cycle).

The generic profile of the design archetypes was outlined as with each of these seven values varying from low (Kitchen Table), to medium (Boardroom), to high (Executive Office); coupled with the three structural elements varying from low (Kitchen Table) to medium/high (Boardroom) to high (Executive Office) for both specialization and standardization and in the opposite direction for centralization (see Table 2).

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Using data from 35 Canadian NSOs in 1986, the midway point of the 1984 to 1988 QPP, Hinings et al. (1996) found those organizations fit the pattern of these proposed design archetypes in terms of the seven values. They also found that, amongst the 35 NSOs, there were variations in the congruence between values and the structural variables, indicating that some NSOs were best described as being in an indeterminate form (described as indeterminate Kitchen Table, indeterminate Boardroom, and indeterminate Executive Office), highlighting the mixed pattern of NSOs in relation to these idealized set of design archetypes. This finding is consistent with the argument noted by us earlier in the present paper that no specific NSO is likely to exactly match the structure elements and values of any particular design archetype (cf.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Kikulis et al., 1992). Hinings et al. (1996) also highlighted the role of values in shaping organizational design, especially in the context of these NSOs that were so heavily influenced by the ideas and beliefs being perpetuated by Sport Canada's funding schemes, and thus the importance for studies of organizational change to include an examination of values. They concluded that:

... change is often about the struggle, both within the sector and within an individual organization, between alternative archetypes. It is only by being clear about what these archetypes are, and the relationship between values and structural forms that we can adequately understand the process of change. (pp. 911-912)

The collective works of Slack and his colleagues reviewed in this section highlight two important ideas for the organizational design of NSOs. First, both structural dimensions and organizational values are equally important in determining design archetypes and understanding why a particular NSO might be categorized within a specific design archetype. Second, determining design archetypes is an important enabling step to understand the nature and direction of change within these organizations, especially organizations subject to powerful environmental forces such as interventionist public policy, as these organizations have significant impacts on their sport in the country. Before we turn our attention to how we could improve the way in which we identify contemporary NSO design archetypes, we briefly review the application of design archetypes in sport management research since the works of Slack and his colleagues were published.

Application of Design Archetypes in Sport Management Research

Design archetypes have been utilized to varying degrees by other sport management scholars to explore issues of change in different types of sport organizations (i.e., Cousens, 1997; Stevens, 2006), change amongst NSOs (Steen-Johnsen & Hanstad, 2008;) and the drivers

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

and processes of professionalization in sport organizations, including NSOs (i.e., Dowling, Edwards, & Washington, 2014; Nagel et al., 2015; Lang et al., 2018).

Cousens (1997, p. 332) applied the concept of design archetypes to examine change in AAA professional baseball franchises, identifying both sport and business centered organizational design configurations that, in turn, “facilitated the comparison and classification of these organizations.” Stevens (2006) explored large-scale change in NSOs through an in-depth case study of the merger of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association and Hockey Canada in 1994, and posited a new archetype – the Amateur Sport Enterprise. Stevens (2006) explained this merger “according to archetypes, archetype transition, and sedimentation [the process of an organization exploring various tracks in order to arrive at a final design]” (p. 97).

Steen-Johnsen and Hanstad (2008) drew on the work of Slack and colleagues on issues of change in NSOs to explore change in the Norwegian Olympic Committee and Confederation of Sport (NOC) from 2004 to 2006, focusing on the use of power in decision making and its influence over organizational change. They explored how “the issue of elite sport evoked interest, tensions and power struggles within the NOC” (Steen-Johnsen & Hanstad, 2008, p. 124). Via an understanding of these change dynamics, they were able to explain the changes in organizational design over that time.

Dowling et al. (2014) reviewed the study of professionalization in sport, arguing that, in relation to sport organizations, this had manifested in three main ways: governance improvements, changes in policy-making processes and professionalization of the organizational structures used by sports. In relation to the last of these, the work of Slack and colleagues on design archetypes was deemed central to enhancing our understanding of “how the structures of sport organizations change as they have become more professionalized” (Dowling, et al., 2014, p. 523). A similar conclusion was made by Nagel et al. (2015) in their proposed multi-level framework for the study of professionalization of sport federations. A

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

study by Lang and colleagues (2018) of professionalization amongst Swiss national sport federations drew on the work of Slack and colleagues, highlighting the utility of design archetypes to understand “organizational designs and professionalization in NSFs” (p. 299).

It is also important to note that, while Slack et al.’s archetypes appear to have dominated the sport management archetype research landscape, other archetypes and approaches have been presented, which demonstrates the changing nature of the sport landscape as well as the applicability of the archetype approach in different sport contexts. For example, Thibault and Babiak (2005) examined the impact of the Canadian sport system’s shift towards an athlete-centered approach, using Pettigrew’s (see Pettigrew, Ferlie, & McKee, 1992) contextualist approach to do so. According to Thibault and Babiak, the context’s external pressures towards an athlete-centered approach affected structural and bureaucratic aspects, and possibly organizational values by, for instance, reorienting priorities, including athletes on NSO decision-making committees, and increasing athlete funding. This is further proof that components of Slack and colleagues’ NSO archetypes may need to be revisited.

The sport event context has also become ripe for structure-based organization theory and archetype-related studies. For example, Theodoraki (2001, 2007) argued Olympic Games organizing committees’ structures could be analyzed longitudinally using Mintzberg’s (1979) configurations, especially the simple structure, professional bureaucracy, divisionalized structure, adhocracy, and missionary organization configurations. In turn, Parent and Séguin (2010; Parent, 2015) highlighted major sport event organizing committees’ move from a traditional hierarchical organizational structure during the planning mode to a venue team (VTeam)-based or simili-matrix-like structure during Games-time due to the multiplication of reporting lines and cross-cutting interactions; organizing committees also move from normative to performative managerial routines. By the end of their lifecycles, organizing committees continue with their performative routines while returning to a headquarter-centered

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

structure, though one that is much flatter than pre-Games (Parent & Séguin, 2010). Parent (2016b) also noted sport event organizing committees can be described as network administration structures (cf. Provan & Kenis, 2007) due to their event stakeholder network coordination function.

The above examples highlight both the foundational work of Slack and colleagues in advancing our understanding of change in NSOs and other types of sport organizations, but also the utility of a robust framework such as design archetypes and related theories/approaches (e.g., the contextualist approach, the lifecycle approach, and the network approach) that enable the categorization of sport organizations in order to identify the nature and extent of change occurring. These examples also highlight the relatively small number of studies that have utilized such a rigorous framework as design archetypes to assist in identifying the nature and extent of change in sport organizations and to subsequently support the underlying analysis of why and how change may be occurring in different organizational contexts. Given the development of the sport management field since Slack and colleagues' seminal work was published and the changes that have occurred in the operating environment of NSOs, we now turn our attention to identifying how we might improve the way in which we identify design archetypes for contemporary NSOs.

Operationalizing NSO Design Archetypes

When we look back at the central values identified by Hinings et al. (1996) listed earlier as representing the core values driving design archetypes of Canadian NSOs in the 1980s, some could argue that little has changed and that all of these values remain central in the discourse on NSOs and the expectations placed on them by government agencies such as Sport Canada. Kikulis (2013) concluded that high performance outcomes and success were central tenets of the Canadian national policy, stating that the policy elements “point to an effort to strengthen in [both] quality and quantity the key stakeholders [i.e., NSOs] that play an important role in

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

the governance of high performance sport programs and policy and ensure their co-ordination with government policy priority” (p. 103).

We would argue that, alongside this continued emphasis on high performance outcomes, there also remains the value of government seeking to partner with NSOs to assist them in delivering sport policy outcomes in both elite sport outcomes and increased participation in sport. In addition, corporate involvement in high performance sport has perhaps evolved into a more nuanced and sophisticated set of values and beliefs around partnership development by NSOs with a multitude of organizations with whom they collaborate to support their operations (e.g., live streaming services, event delivery agencies, sports apparel and merchandise providers, social media platforms).

We would, however, contend that the values of organizational rationalization, a commitment to professionalize the workforce, engage in planning and the commitment to the quadrennial planning cycle imposed by Sport Canada have become so pervasive over the last 30 years that organizational designs have evolved to such an extent that these values no longer have as much influence over *future* changes in NSO organizational design or driving potential differences between organizations. In other words, while these values may still influence business as usual operations within NSOs, there are now various contemporary values and beliefs that are more influential on NSO structures or design archetypes and that allow for distinctions to be made between organizations.

So what might these new values be? As we noted earlier, Parent et al. (2018) argued contemporary NSOs operate in an environment replete with technology and social media accessibility and have to deal with the influences of globalization and increased instances of reporting and monitoring ethical issues in sport (e.g., doping scandals, match fixing, money laundering, sexual misconduct and assaults). It seems that managing a range of content via social media channels and using social media platforms as vehicles for member, community,

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

or customer engagement is an increasingly important activity for NSOs, and that having a commitment to values focused on managing risk, access, privacy and brand perceptions associated with social media platforms would influence the staffing profile, governance practices and overall organizational design of an NSO (Naraine & Parent, 2016, 2017a, 2017b).

NSOs are also under increased pressure from more varied stakeholders who demand more from them in terms of services and programs, transparency in decision making and the ability to effectively service a more diverse populace with specific needs such as indigenous groups, refugees and migrants, people with disabilities, and an ageing population. Having a commitment to the values of servicing diverse communities, ensuring equitable access to services and programs by diverse groups, and investing in staff training and development to ensure NSOs can service these diverse groups would also have a direct impact on the organizational design of NSOs.

The regulatory regime for NSOs has also changed over time, with greater demands and expectations placed on NSOs to ensure their athletes, staff and volunteers adhere to such things as legislative requirements for child safety, food handling and safety requirements, privacy protection, codes of behavior, drug testing for illicit and performance enhancing drugs, or wagering and sports betting controls for sport (Stewart, 2017). These demands require the development, dissemination, monitoring, and implementation of a range of policies and procedures by NSOs and ultimately the investment in dedicated staff or volunteer time to manage them.

NSOs also, arguably, have to manage a much more complex brand for their operations compared to 30 years ago. They may deal with many more sponsors and partners who seek to leverage the value and reach of an NSO brand or specific sub-brands owned by an NSO such as a national championship event, national league, national team, or other brand property. The mechanics of developing and protecting a brand involve complex licensing arrangements,

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

intellectual property issues, naming rights, brand activation with partner organizations and individual athlete or player endorsements (Cornwell, 2017), all of which require staff or volunteer time to be managed.

NSOs today also operate a much more complex business model compared to the mid-1980s: they can be involved with substantial and complex media rights deals with a variety of media partners (e.g., radio, broadcast and pay per view television or streaming services), manage diverse revenue streams (e.g., from government, sponsors, events, media rights, and/or members), a potentially unionized player or athlete cohort with the growth of player unions, and a more diverse program including professional leagues. These changes in the operating context for NSOs, and potentially others not listed here, suggest the need for more detailed research to determine the full range of current values and beliefs impacting NSOs and the extent to which they resonate with NSO decision makers, both voluntary and professional. We have identified that values in relation to risk management, equity and access for service provision, adherence to regulatory requirements and integrity matters, and greater accountability to a more complex stakeholder network may be areas that now have a greater influence over NSO organizational design than 30 years ago. More detailed research would help identify a more contemporary set of values and beliefs impacting structural choices being made by NSOs and therefore the criteria for identifying design archetypes that might now exist and that have evolved from the time period that informed the work of Slack and his colleagues.

The way in which we might operationalize the measurement of the structural elements of the design archetypes might also differ from that used by Slack and his team. For example, in relation to specialization, Slack and colleagues used measures such as numbers of staff, volunteers or committees – essentially measures of horizontal differentiation, and did not utilize any assessment of vertical or spatial differentiation. Given that the scale and complexity of NSOs operations has evolved significantly over the last decades, it would be worth exploring

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

the feasibility of employing a broader set of criteria for this structural dimension to fully capture the range of specialization that exists across NSOs.

The measurement of the standardization dimension was also based on what would now be considered a very narrow set of criteria. Kikulis et al. (1995b) included three criteria in relation to high performance programs (extent of high performance programs, existence of athlete support services, and formalization of decisions about high performance programs) in their five criteria to assess standardization (the other two being extent of formal job roles, policies and procedures and existence of formal staff evaluations). Not only has the delivery system for high performance programs evolved considerably since the mid-1980s (Kikulis, 2013), the range of activities undertaken by NSOs in addition to managing a high performance program has greatly increased. NSOs may be involved in major national event delivery, significant broadcast programming and marketing, national league management, sponsorship and engagement activities, and other activities that suggest a revision of the measures used to assess the degree of standardization that might exist within an NSO. In addition, given the international calls for good governance and various laws being enacted in this respect (cf. Parent et al., 2018), standardization is no longer enough – the formalization of key documents (e.g., strategic plans, codes of conduct, and harassment policies) is now expected on top of other standardized activities.

The assessment of the centralization dimension may also benefit from a refreshing of the criteria used. For example, Kikulis et al. (1995b) used the level of decisions, number of levels involved in decisions and the extent of volunteer involvement in decisions to assess centralization. Arguably, the application of more comprehensive measures of centralization as argued by Pennings (1973) that are contextually relevant for contemporary NSOs will provide a more meaningful assessment of this structural element and its relationship to different design archetypes. This could include the assessment of social media's role in influencing decision

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

makers, the extent of diversity amongst decision making levels of an organization, or other indicators that illustrate the nature of the decision making process amongst NSO stakeholders.

In summary, future efforts to determine the nature of design archetypes for NSOs should attempt to identify the contemporary set of values and beliefs that are influencing organizational design amongst these organizations as well as utilize robust measures of structural elements that reflect meaningful interpretations of centralization, standardization, and specialization. We now turn to the last foci of our paper, identifying a proposed research agenda associated with design archetypes for NSOs.

Proposed Research Agenda

The work of Slack and his colleagues in relation to NSO design archetypes covered four major research themes beyond establishing the rationale for the use of design archetypes in the study of structures and the dynamics of change for NSOs. First, documenting the shift within NSOs from volunteer to professional decision making (e.g., Kikulis et al., 1995a); second, identifying the shift in structural form toward a dominant design archetype, the Executive Office (e.g., Kikulis et al., 1995b; Slack & Hinings, 1994); and third, the importance of understanding the role of values and beliefs in shaping decisions over organizational structure and change processes (e.g. Amis et al., 2002; Hinings et al., 1996). The fourth theme was the examination of tracks of change amongst NSOs (e.g. Amis et al., 2004a, 2004b; Kikulis, 2000) which we will revisit later.

We argue the starting point for a research agenda that builds on this foundational work by Slack and his colleagues should be, somewhat unsurprisingly, the refinement of the operational measures for the structural elements as discussed in the previous section. The development of robust measures of structural elements that reflect meaningful interpretations of centralization, standardization/formalization and specialization for contemporary NSOs would enable a more accurate determination of contemporary design archetypes and the

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

categorization of individual NSOs within a particular design archetype. To this end, we offer some suggestions in Table 3 based on our above discussion. In regard to specialization, we argue there is merit in using more specific measures of the sub-dimensions of horizontal, vertical, and spatial differentiation. Similarly, we recommend more nuanced measures for standardization, formalization, and centralization that reflect the contemporary nature of NSO operations as documented earlier in this paper.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Concomitantly, there needs to be a re-assessment of the values and beliefs that are central to contemporary NSOs that reflects the changes in the operating environment and range of operational elements that have occurred since the mid-1980s, and have been noted in the previous section of this paper and also presented in Table 3. These suggested values and beliefs require more detailed research in order to confirm and clarify their impact on organizational design; this would drive the identification of the range of design archetypes that exist amongst contemporary NSOs that, in turn, would facilitate the examination of a number of research themes, each with specific research questions as outlined in Table 4.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

The first research theme we propose is the continuation of the work of Kikulis (2000) (in part) and Amis, Slack and Hinings (2004a, 2004b) in documenting the tracks of change of either individual NSOs moving between design archetypes or the shift in the nature of design archetypes overall for NSOs. Kikulis (2000), while not utilizing design archetypes explicitly, did highlight the need to move beyond simplistic determinations that NSOs may have moved from volunteer to professionally-controlled decision making, and “pay closer attention to the stages of institutionalization (e.g., pre, semi, full, and deinstitutionalization), the levels of institutionalization (e.g., low, moderate, and high), and the process of institutionalization (habitualized, objectified, sedimented, and eroded)” (p. 315). Having the ability to identify

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

when an NSO exhibits different attributes that categorize it as aligning to a particular design archetype at a single point in time would facilitate the investigation of why and how change has occurred, including processes around institutionalization.

Amis et al. (2004a) used six case studies of NSOs over a 12-year period to document the individual tracks followed by NSOs as they changed between various design archetypes. Their results showed that those NSOs which achieved the change to the Executive Office archetype desired by the national sport agency “possessed leadership with the technical and behavioral capacity for change, had an organizational structure in which volunteers were willing to share power with professional staff, and engaged in an all-encompassing transformation process that embraced the entire organization” (p. 158). Conversely, those NSOs which failed to achieve change had ineffective leadership, volunteers who retained decision making power and were beset with self-interest. These insights, made possible by tracking shifts between design archetypes, are the sort of valuable, nuanced views of successful change that continue to be needed in the sport management field, particularly in relation to NSOs. The accompanying paper (Amis et al., 2004b) focused on the pace and sequence of change amongst 36 NSOs between 1984 and 1996. Importantly, they concluded that “rapid change throughout organizations is not only insufficient to bring about radical change, but may even be detrimental” (p. 35) and that the sequence in which organizational elements were changed is more important, specifically changing high-impact elements, such as decision-making, early in the change process. Again, the use of design archetypes was fundamental to being able to undertake the research and develop this more nuanced view of the dynamics of change within NSOs. At the same time, we cannot assume that all NSOs change archetypes in a linear manner; the change tracks patterns (e.g., linear, oscillating, delayed, or other, cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988) NSOs exhibit today as they change archetypes should be

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

investigated to better understand what change patterns are possible and how to help NSOs successfully complete their change processes.

It is worth noting that the bulk of these studies were undertaken when studies of organizational change in sport organizations were few and far between, and with the advancement of institutional theory and approaches such as institutional work as well as others (e.g., contextualist, lifecycle, and network approaches), the application of these and other conceptual or theoretical frameworks to change within NSOs can assist in developing a more detailed understanding of the dynamics of change within these organizations. Future research using a more contemporary view of design archetypes for NSOs could illustrate how NSOs effectively (or not) manage to change in response to emerging and current issues and provide insights for funding agencies and organizational leaders for how to navigate change.

The second research theme would be the use of design archetypes to assist in understanding the dynamics of change within NSOs and NSOs' interactions with their stakeholders that are subject to important, formal institutional forces or environmental forces. Parent et al. (2018) noted that many of the changes in the structure and governance processes of Canadian NSOs in recent times were in response to the legislative requirements under the new Canada Not-For-Profit Corporations Act (2009) and the changing nature of contemporary sport governance which demands greater transparency for stakeholders and effective use of social media. In this regard, the scope of this research theme is potentially very large given the number of issues impacting NSO governance and operations.

We believe there is a clear need for a new empirical study to create a contemporary analysis of design archetypes for NSOs, not just in Canada but in other nations, and address the fundamental measurement issues raised in this paper in relation to values and beliefs and various structural dimensions and how they are reflected in a potentially new set of contemporary NSO design archetypes. Such a study would provide the impetus for the use of

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

a contemporary design archetypes to help understand current changes in this important category of sport organizations. It could also lead to the development of design archetypes for other types of sport organizations, namely sport leagues, player or athlete unions, professional sport clubs, local/regional organizations, Olympic and non-Olympic sport organizations, or international sport federations which would, in turn, facilitate a new wave of research into the dynamics of change across the broader sport industry. If researchers understand the current dynamics between (NSO) structure and environmental pressures they could then assist managers and directors with identifying potential strategies and practices to help achieve organizational goals.

The third research theme would be to focus on understanding how organization designs may influence the achievement of organizational outcomes; essentially the “so what” question of what difference does structure make to organizational performance. Within this theme, questions such as what size is optimal or even critical for an NSO to maintain in order to provide an effective level of service to its members and stakeholders, and what structural choices are made by new, emergent sports (e.g., eSports, extreme sports) as they seek to secure NSO status and recognition from federal agencies, or indeed how much freedom do they have about their choice of design archetype? This theme would also explore the tracks these new sport organizations follow as they evolve between design archetypes and the implications for overall organizational performance.

Conclusion

In this paper, we reviewed the theory and utility of design archetypes in helping to understand organizational change dynamics in relation to NSOs. By revisiting the work of Slack and others, we propose to no longer consider organizational rationalization, professionalism, planning and quadrennial plans as major influencers of structural change, but instead consider contemporary issues such as commitment to good governance, stakeholder

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

involvement and engagement (particularly through social media) and brand governance. We further propose more robust measures of the structural elements of specialization, standardization, formalization, and centralization. These recommended changes should improve future research efforts to identify design archetypes for contemporary (Canadian) NSOs. Finally, we presented an argument for a renewed emphasis on design archetypes as a fundamental driver for future research efforts to help understand change within NSOs, and potentially, other sport organizations. Such understandings would better position researchers to help sport managers make their organizations more efficient and effective.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the thoughtful insights and suggestions of the two anonymous reviewers that have helped shape this manuscript.

References

- Amis, J., & Slack, T. (1996). The size-structure relationship in voluntary sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 76-86.
- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Values and organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 38*, 436-465.
- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004a). Strategic change and the role of interests, power and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*, 158-198.
- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004b). The pace, sequence, and linearity of radical change. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 15-39.
- Bayle, E., & Robinson, L. (2007). A framework for understanding the performance of national governing bodies of sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 7*, 249-268.
- Child, J. (1977). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology, 6*, 1-22.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 1281-1303.
- Cornwell, T. B. (2017). Sport sponsorship and endorsements. In R. Hoye and M. M. Parent (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Sport Management* (pp. 368-382). London, England: SAGE.
- Cousens, L. (1997). From diamonds to dollars: The dynamics of change in AAA baseball franchises. *Journal of Sport Management, 11*, 316-334.
- Cunningham, D., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1987). Changing design archetypes in amateur sport organizations. In T. Slack and C. R. Hinings (Eds.), *The Organization and Administration of Sport* (pp. 59-81). London, Canada: Sports Dynamics.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

- Dowling, M., & Smith, J. (2016). The institutional work of Own The Podium in developing high-performance sport in Canada. *Journal of Sport Management, 30*, 396-410.
- Dowling, M., Edwards, J. & Washington, M. (2014). Understanding the concept of professionalization in sport management research. *Sport Management Review, 17*, 520-529.
- Ewing, L. (2018, November 7). Canada losing ground on abuse, harassment reporting in sports: Study. *The Canadian Press*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/canada-sport-abuse-1.4895423>
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and dynamics of strategic change. *Organization Studies, 9*, 293-316.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Understanding strategic change: The contribution of archetypes. *The Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 1052-1081.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 1022-1054.
- Hinings, C. R. & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of Quadrennial Plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack and C.R. Hinings (Eds.), *The organization and administration of sport* (pp. 127-152). London, Canada: Sports Dynamics.
- Hinings, C. R., Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Kikulis, L. M. (1996). Values and organizational structure. *Human Relations, 49*, 885-916.
- Kikulis, L. M. (2000). Continuity and change in governance and decision making in national sport organizations: Institutional explanations. *Journal of Sport Management, 14*, 293-320.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sport organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 27, 343-367.
- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1995a). Does decision making make a difference? Patterns of change within Canadian national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 273-299.
- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1995b). Sector-specific patterns of organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 67-100.
- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1995c). Toward an understanding of the role of agency and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 135-152.
- Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., Hinings, B., & Zimmermann, A. (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 129-150.
- Lang, G., Schlesinger, T., Lamprecht, M., Ruoranen, K., Klenk, C., Bayle, E., Clausen, J., Giauque, D., & Nagel, S. (2018). Types of professionalization: Understanding contemporary organizational designs of Swiss national sport federations. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 8, 469-491.
- Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). *The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McKinney, J. C. (1966). *Constructive typology and social theory*. New York, NY: Meredith Publishing Company.
- Miles, R., & Snow, C. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure and process*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1980). Archetypes of organizational transition. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 269-299.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nagel, S., Schlesinger, T., Bayle, E., & Giauque, D. (2015). Professionalisation of sport federations: A multi-level framework for analysing forms, causes and consequences. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *15*, 407-433.
- Naraine, M. L., & Parent, M. M. (2016). Illuminating centralized users in the social media ego network of two national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, *30*, 689-701.
- Naraine, M. L., & Parent, M. M. (2017a). Examining social media adoption and change to the stakeholder communication paradigm in not-for-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Amateur Sport*, *3*, 55-81.
- Naraine, M. L., & Parent, M. M. (2017b). This is how we do it: A qualitative approach to national sport organizations' social-media implementation. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, *10*, 196-217.
- Parent, M. M. (2015). The organizing committee's perspective. In M. M. Parent & J.-L. Chappelet (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sports event management* (pp. 43-64). London, England: Routledge.
- Parent, M. M. (2016a). Stakeholder perceptions on the democratic governance of major sports events. *Sport Management Review*, *19*, 402-416.
- Parent, M. M. (2016b). The governance of the Olympic Games in Canada. *Sport in Society*, *19*, 796-816.
- Parent, M. M., Naraine, M. L., & Hoye, R. (2018). A new era for governance structures and processes in Canadian national sport organizations, *Journal of Sport Management*, *32*, 555-566.
- Parent, M. M., & Séguin, B. (2010). Change as routine? Understanding organisational change in Canadian major sporting events. In A. Ferrand, C. Legrand, and B. Séguin (Eds.),

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management, Paris, France:

IFSAM

Pennings, J. (1973). Measures of organizational structure: A methodological note. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79, 686-704.

Pettigrew, A. M., Ferlie, E., & McKee, L. (1992). *Shaping strategic change. Making change in large organizations. The case of the National Health Service*. London, England: SAGE.

Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2007). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 229–252.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences*, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 114-132.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1994). Institutional pressures and isomorphic change: An empirical test. *Organization Studies*, 15, 803-827.

Steen-Johnson, K., & Hanstad, D. V. (2008). Change and power in complex democratic organizations: The case of Norwegian elite sports. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8, 123-143.

Stevens, J. A. (2006). The Canadian hockey association merger and the emergence of the amateur sports enterprise. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 74–100.

Stevens, J. A., & Slack, T. (1998). Integrating social action and structural constraints. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 33, 143-154.

Stewart, B. (2017). Regulating sport. In R. Hoye and M.M. Parent (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of sport management* (pp. 201-226). London, England: SAGE.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

- Theodoraki, E. (2001). A conceptual framework for the study of structural configurations of organizing committees for the Olympic Games. *European Sport Management Journal*, 8, 106-124.
- Theodoraki, E. (2007). *Olympic event organization*. London, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Thibault, L., & Babiak, K. (2005). Organizational changes in Canada's sport system: Toward an athlete-centered approach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5, 105-132.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1991). Professionalism, structures and systems: The impact of professional staff on voluntary sport organizations, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 26, 83-97.
- Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). A framework for the analysis of strategy in non-profit sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 7, 25-43.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Table 1

Institutionally specific design archetypes for NSOs

	Kitchen Table	Boardroom	Executive Office
Organizational Values			
Orientation	Private, volunteer non-profit (membership and fundraising)	Private, volunteer non-profit (public and private funds)	Private, volunteer non-profit (government and corporate funds)
Domain	Broad: mass-high performance sport	Competitive sport opportunities	Narrow: high performance sport
Principles of Organizing	Minimal coordination; Decision making by volunteer executives	Volunteer hierarchy; Professionally assisted	Formal planning; Professionally led and volunteer assisted
Criteria of Effectiveness	Membership preferences: Quality service	Administrative efficiency and effectiveness	International success
Organizational Structure			
Specialization	Roles based on interest and loyalty	Specialized roles and committees	Professional technical and administrative expertise
Standardization	Few rules and little planning	Formal roles, rules, and programs	Formal roles, rules, and programs
Centralization	Decisions are made by a few volunteers	Decisions are made by the volunteer board	Decisions are decentralized to the professional staff

Adapted from Kikulis, Slack & Hinings (1992, p. 355).

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Table 2

Design archetype profiles

	Kitchen Table	Boardroom	Executive Office
Values			
<i>High performance</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Government involvement</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Rationalization</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Professionalism</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Planning</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Corporate involvement</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Quadrennial plans</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
Structure			
<i>Specialization</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Standardization</i>	Low	Medium/High	High
<i>Centralization</i>	High	Medium/High	Low

Adapted from Hinings, Thibault, Slack & Kikulis (1996, p. 898).

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Table 3

Suggested revisions to design dimensions for NSOs

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Suggested measures/description
Specialization	Horizontal differentiation	Number of departments/divisions, committees, paid staff, and volunteers
	Vertical differentiation	Number of hierarchical levels
	Spatial differentiation	Number of offices in different locations
Standardization		Involvement in major national event delivery; broadcast programming, national league management; and marketing, sponsorship, social media and other engagement activities
Formalization		Number of different strategic documents, policies and procedures written down
Centralization		The level of where decisions are made; the number of levels involved in decisions
Values and beliefs*	High performance	A commitment to identifying and developing elite athletes who could successfully compete at the international level
	Growth of sport	A commitment to the growth of the sport and long term athlete development
	Financial sustainability	A commitment to diversifying revenue sources for financial sustainability
	Good governance	A commitment to the principles of good governance (performance, accountability, transparency, and stakeholder participation in decision-making), as well as monitoring and reporting on corruption
	Stakeholder involvement	A commitment to partners, supplying resources, capacity and ideas to develop expertise in NSOs

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Stakeholder engagement	A commitment to communicating with stakeholders through various means, notably through social media
Diversity	A commitment to diversity (gender, race, etc.)
Brand governance	A commitment to building, managing and governing the organization's brand, image and reputation

*The basic definitions of the institutional values (i.e., orientation, domain, principles of organizing, and criteria of effectiveness) remain the same.

DESIGN ARCHETYPE UTILITY

Table 4

Proposed research agenda

Theme 1 Identifying change tracks	Theme 2 Understanding the dynamics of change	Theme 3 Organizational design impacts on performance
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the most relevant indicators of the stages (e.g., pre, semi, full, or deinstitutionalization) of institutionalization for NSOs? 2. What are the most relevant indicators of the levels (e.g., low, moderate, or high) of institutionalization for NSOs? 3. What are the most relevant indicators of the processes (habitualized, objectified, sedimented, or eroded) of institutionalization for NSOs? 4. What leadership capabilities are required for NSOs to move between archetypes? 5. What change tracks patterns (e.g., linear, oscillating, delayed, or other) do NSOs exhibit today as they move between archetypes? 6. What support do NSOs need from government funding agencies to help them move between design archetypes? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do specific external factors such as new governance guidelines, legislative requirements for governance, or market forces drive the need for change in NSO design archetypes? 2. What organizational values and beliefs influence change in NSOs design archetypes? 3. How does change in design archetypes manifest itself(?) in different types of sport organizations? 4. What strategies do leaders need to employ to effectively manage the transition between design archetypes? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What difference does the adoption of any specific design archetype make to overall organizational performance? 2. What organizational size or scale of operation is required for an NSO to adopt a particular design archetype? 3. What choices do new or emerging NSOs make in regard to their design archetype and why? 4. Are new or emerging NSOs free to choose their design archetype or does the reality of the context of NSO funding, operations or stakeholder engagement limit their choice? If so, how? 5. Does organizational performance improve as NSOs move between design archetypes? Why or why not?