Understanding the impact of radical change on the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations: A multi-stakeholder perspective

Ashley Thompson & Milena M. Parent

Understanding the impact of radical change on the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations: A multi-stakeholder perspective

Ashley Thompson and Milena M. Parent

School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, 125 University Private, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to understand how radical organizational change impacts the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations from the perspectives of internal and external stakeholders. A single case study methodology of U SPORTS – the national governing body of university sport in Canada – was employed. Data sources included 32 semi-structured interviews with internal (*n* = 16) and external stakeholders (*n* = 16), as well as documentation (e.g., annual reports, financial statements). Results indicated the effectiveness of organizations can be impacted by radical change but can vary in the degree of impact, depending on the organizational effectiveness approach and stakeholder perspective used. Using both internal and external stakeholders contributes to our understanding of radical organizational change, as it demonstrates the outward impact of change on not only the focal sport organization but also its external stakeholders, which are critical for organizational survival.

Introduction

The importance and influence of organizations' external environments has been well documented in the sport and management literatures (e.g., Legg, Snelgrove, & Wood, 2016; Parent, Naraine, & Hoye, 2018; Pedersen & Thibault, 2019; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). To survive, sport organizations must cope with economic, sociocultural, geopolitical, and technological changes in their respective environments by engaging in organizational change (Amis & Aïssaoui, 2013; Burnes, 2017; Hoye et al., in press; Parent et al., 2018; Woiceshyn, Huq, Blades, & Pendharkar, 2020). As such, organizational change in general – and radical change in particular – has become a core feature of organizational life (Burnes, 2017; Poole & Van de Ven, 2004). Radical change also referred to as "frame-breaking" change, is a change in an organization's existing orientation, configuration, or pattern (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996).

Despite the prevalence of change in organizations, both within and outside of sport (e.g., Burnes, 2017; Parent et al., 2018), organizational members tasked with implementing and managing radical change are faced with challenges which can impact the success of the transition process and the survival of the organization (Amis & Aïssaoui, 2013; Burnes, 2017).

CONTACT Ashley Thompson ✉ athom156@uottawa.ca; Milena M. Parent ✉ milena.parent@uottawa.ca

These challenges can include resistance to change (Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1995b; Riehl, Snelgrove, & Edwards, 2019) and dealing with a lack of capacity for change – the latter referring to the ability for an organization and its members to transition or change the organization (cf. Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004a; Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Legg et al., 2016).

In addition to dealing with these implementation challenges, organizations undergoing radical change cannot simply close their doors; they must continue to operate and deliver services to their stakeholders (i.e., groups, individuals, and organizations influencing or affected by the organization's actions; Freeman, 1984). In other words, organizations, while engaging in radical change, must continue to be *effective* during the change process.

Effectiveness is defined as an organization's ability to meet its goals (Daft, 2021). For national-level not-for-profit sport organizations – including national (single) sport organizations (NSOs) and national multi-sport organizations (MSOs) – given their purpose as service organizations (cf. Government of Canada, 2018), effectiveness involves the successful delivery of core services to members and clients. Thus, their ability to deliver these services and satisfy member needs is important for survival (cf. Scott & Davis, 2007), as external stakeholders possess key resources required by the focal organization to successfully operate (Esteve, Di Lorenzo, Inglés, & Puig, 2011; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). In addition, internal stakeholders are equally critical as they are the ones tasked with implementing and managing radical change (Burnes, 2017; Wagstaff, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2016). As such, remaining effective – as it relates to satisfying both internal and external stakeholder needs (i.e., the purpose of national-level sport organizations as service organizations) – during the turbulent times of radical change is arguably a key determinant for sport organizations' long-term survival. Thus, the challenge for national-level sport organizations is to balance the implementation of change initiatives, which have been said to fail more often than they succeed (Burnes, 2011), while continuing to effectively implement day-to-day operations – thus, satisfying stakeholder needs and continuing to obtain valued resources for the survival of the organization.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to understand how radical organizational change impacts the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations from the perspectives of internal and external stakeholders. Two research questions were examined to address the purpose:

Research Question 1: How do internal and external stakeholders perceive the impact of radical organizational change on the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations?

Research Question 2: How do external stakeholders perceive the impact of radical organizational change in a national-level sport organization on the effectiveness of their organization?

Review of the literature

Radical organizational change in sport organizations: research

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, radical change received considerable attention by sport management scholars who documented the extensive changes then occurring in Canadian NSOs (e.g., Kikulis, Slack, & Hinings, 1992, 1995a). Through a 12-year study, these works shed light on a variety of areas of organizational change as well as the process of change itself. Slack and Hinings (1992) and Kikulis et al. (1992) found that as a result of pressures from the

Federal Government, NSOs changed from volunteer-led organizations to those led by professional staff. With these findings, Kikulis et al. (1992) developed three archetypes specific to NSOs: the kitchen table (low professionalization and bureaucratization), board-room (the presence of bureaucratic procedures and formal structures), and executive office (the presence of bureaucratic structures and the professionalization of roles).

Additional aspects of change included the importance of strategic choices made by NSOs regarding how they implemented the changes prescribed by the Federal Government (Kikulis et al., 1995b) and the impact of decision-making processes on NSO governance structures (Kikulis et al., 1995a). Amis, Slack, and Hinings (2004b) sought to understand the relationship between the pace, sequence, and linearity of the change process on radical change outcomes. They found rapid and wide transformations were not determinants of successful radical change outcomes; rather, successful transformations were linked to the change sequence, where changes first made to high-impact elements (e.g., decision-making authority) resulted in more successful outcomes.

These aforementioned studies were foundational in our understanding of various aspects of change in national-level, not-for-profit sport organizations while also shedding light on the challenges and "messiness" of the change process (Amis et al., 2004a). Through the archetype analysis, this research provided an understanding of how sport organizations changed and uncovered the similarities and differences in the change process among a group of organizations in a single population (Kikulis et al. 1992, 1995a). However, despite the importance of "mapping" the change process, research has neglected to understand the impact of these types of changes on the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations in delivering services to their stakeholders. This is important as stakeholders are critical for the survival of these organizations as they bring key resources required to continuously operate (cf. Esteve et al., 2011; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Scott & Davis, 2007). Thus, a lack of organizational effectiveness could negatively influence stakeholder satisfaction, thereby challenging the survival of the focal organization.

Several studies exist examining change and effectiveness in sport organizations. For example, Besters, van Ours, and van Tuijl (2016) examined mid-season managerial changes in the English Premier League and found that managerial changes did not improve a club's performance. Soebbing and Washington (2011) examined leadership changes and performance in the NCAA and found organizational performance decreased following leadership changes but increased over time as the coach's tenure increased. While these studies help explain a specific area of change and effectiveness (i.e., leadership change/changes in personnel), change can occur in different areas, including products and services, structures and systems[1], and technology (Slack & Parent, 2006). Therefore, it is important to examine different types of change, and in particular radical change, given its disruptive nature and potential impact on organizational survival (Amis et al., 2004a; Burnes, 2011, 2017).

Stakeholder theory and (radical) organizational change research

To address the purpose, stakeholder theory was used as the overarching approach as it examines the relationship between an organization and its stakeholders (Parent, 2008;

---

[1]In this article, 'system' refers to the organizational-level systems such as management information and control systems, reward systems, and financial systems (Daft, 2021).

Slack & Parent, 2006). It posits that an organization's performance is linked to the successful interaction with its stakeholders (Friedman, Parent, & Mason, 2004). As such, stakeholder theory not only accounts for stakeholders' interests but also for how the focal organization will manage those interests. Wagstaff et al. (2016) and Welty Peachey and Bruening (2011) highlighted stakeholder theory's usefulness in examining organizational change. Wagstaff et al. (2016) examined stakeholder responses to repeated episodes of change, finding stakeholders responded to change both positively and negatively. In turn, Welty Peachey and Bruening (2011) examined the driving forces and responses to organizational change, finding different responses to change between stakeholders (e.g., acceptance, resistance, and ambivalence).

Although these studies laid the groundwork for future research by demonstrating the value of examining change through a stakeholder perspective, these works were limited to either the perspective of internal stakeholders (i.e., employees; e.g., Wagstaff et al., 2016) or internal stakeholders and one external stakeholder group (i.e., student-athletes; e.g., Welty Peachey & Bruening, 2011). Organizations are complex entities with a plethora of stakeholders, both internal and external to the organization (Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000; Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). Internal stakeholders are those individuals who are part of the operating team (e.g., paid staff, volunteers) or responsible for the strategic direction of the organization (e.g., Board of Directors, senior management); external stakeholders are individuals, groups, and/or organizations not part of the operating team or responsible for the strategic direction of the organization, such as the government, sponsors, media, members, athletes, coaches, other sport organizations, and the community (cf. Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013).

Given the diverse range of internal and external stakeholders, and the importance of external stakeholders on an organization's ability to acquire resources (Esteve et al., 2011), it is critical to understand change and its impacts on, not only its internal stakeholders, but also on the organization's external stakeholders. As sport organizations – especially service organizations such as NSOs and MSOs – undergo radical change, they must continue to effectively satisfy and deliver their services to external stakeholders in order to keep obtaining the resources needed to survive. Thus, understanding how radical change impacts external stakeholders from their perspective is important for national-level sport organizations so they can better manage the change process and increase their chances of organizational survival.

Organizational effectiveness: integrating approaches

One issue scholars face when examining organizational effectiveness is the complexity associated with measuring this construct (Liket & Maas, 2013). Scholars have attempted to measure and understand organizational effectiveness using a variety of perspectives such as the goal attainment approach, internal process approach, systems resource approach, and the multiple constituency approach (Chelladurai, 1987).

In the goal attainment approach, organizations are deemed effective when the goals of the organization are achieved (Chelladurai, 1987; Slack & Parent, 2006). Within sport, these goals can include measuring a team's on-field performance (Frisby, 1986; Slack & Parent, 2006) like the number of medals won (Chelladurai, Szyszlo, & Haggerty, 1987, as cited in Slack & Parent, 2006). While simple to implement and objective to measure, this approach

neglects to account for the differences between various types of organizations (i.e., for-profit, non-profit, and public organizations) and the multiple goals an organization can have (Slack & Parent, 2006). It also assumes these goals do not conflict with each other (Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000).

In the internal process approach, effective organizations are those which have little internal strain and have a strong flow of information throughout the organization (Cameron, 1980). Here, organizational effectiveness is focused on the throughputs or internal processes – such as decision-making and staffing – and how the organization effectively converts inputs to outputs (Chelladurai, 1987; Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000). Although this approach is helpful when comparing different organizations, it provides a narrow perspective as it does not consider the inputs (i.e., environment) or outputs of the organization (Slack & Parent, 2006).

In the systems resource approach, organizational effectiveness is achieved when an organization acquires valuable resources from its external environment (Chelladurai, 1987). Frisby (1986) examined the relationship between the goal attainment approach and systems resource approach in NSOs, finding a positive and significant correlation between a goal model indicator – the effectiveness ranking – and the total operating budget (i.e., a systems model indicator). The strength of the systems resource approach is that it accounts for the relationship between the organization and its external environment (Slack & Parent, 2006); however, using this theory in the NSO context can be impractical given they can have guaranteed basic funding from government agencies (Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000).

The multiple constituency approach considers the variety of perspectives held by an organization's constituents or stakeholders. Accordingly, effectiveness is achieved when an organization satisfies the needs of one or many of its key stakeholders (Tsui, 1990). For example, Papadimitriou and Taylor (2000) used this approach to examine effectiveness in Hellenic NSOs. Results indicated differences between stakeholders when rating effectiveness: athletes, coaches, and staff produced the least favorable effectiveness rating, while international officials and Board members produced the highest. Though it can be challenging to measure the different perspectives/preferences of stakeholders (Tsui, 1990), the multiple constituency approach is useful for the NSO context, as these organizations have a variety of stakeholders (athletes, coaches, Board of Directors, employees etc.), who define effectiveness uniquely and who work together to meet the overall effectiveness of the organization (Papadimitriou & Taylor, 2000).

These four theories have been used independently within the existing sport management literature and, as such, have provided a narrow view of effectiveness limited to either the organization's goal acquisition, its internal processes, its resource acquisition, or its multiple constituents. Therefore, these four theories, along with stakeholder theory, were integrated in this paper to provide a more complete understanding of change and effectiveness. Trail and James (2016) discussed the importance of using multiple theories when conducting research as a means of dealing with human complexities and complex situations. As Van de Ven and Poole (1995, p. 510–511) argued, "it is the interplay between different perspectives that helps one gain a more comprehensive understanding of organizational life, because any one theoretical perspective invariably offers only a partial account of a complex phenomenon."

Methods

A single case study methodology was used to provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2018) – in this case, radical change and effectiveness in national-level sport organizations. Case studies allow researchers to focus on specific people, groups, organizations, and/or contexts and can be used when researchers have no control over the participants under investigation or to examine relationships between organizations and their stakeholders (Andrew, Pedersen, & McEvoy, 2011; Gray, 2004). As this study – through the stakeholder approach – seeks to obtain the personal accounts or experiences of participants which can provide a detailed understanding of a phenomenon while attempting to explain causal relationships, the case study methodology was appropriate (Gray, 2004). The case was chosen using purposeful and convenience sampling (Marshall, 1996) according to the following criteria: the organization must (a) be a not-for-profit sport organization at the national level; and (b) have undergone radical change at the time of data collection. In other words, as the change process can occur over a long period of time, the organization must have also experienced some initial changes before the start of data collection for the changes to have some impact on stakeholders – thus, answering the research questions. Assuming multiple organizations satisfied these criteria, national-level sport organizations (e.g., MSOs or NSOs) were approached based on a convenience sample (i.e., location of the organization, ease of access).

Case context: U SPORTS

U SPORTS is the governing body of university sport in Canada (Government of Canada, 2019; U SPORTS, n.d.). As an MSO, U SPORTS oversees national championships in a variety of sports such as, but not limited to, basketball, soccer, rugby, and hockey. At the time of the study, the organization consisted of 56-member universities from across the country. In addition to these members, U SPORTS also collaborates with four independent regional associations who oversee the regular season play in their respective geographical areas. Unlike the 56-member universities, these four regional associations are not members of U SPORTS; rather, they work in partnership with the focal organization as the results from the regular season determine who will compete in the U SPORTS national championships. At the time of the study, U SPORTS received most of its funding from membership fees and government (public) funding.

In 2014, U SPORTS embarked on its most radical change to date. Initially known as CIS (Canadian Interuniversity Sport)[2], the organization adopted a new name, U SPORTS, and went through a radical transformation impacting nearly every facet of its business. In addition to a relocation of its head office from Ottawa, Ontario, Canada to Toronto, Ontario, Canada, U SPORTS' changes can be further divided into five main areas: changes in people, technology, structures and systems, products and services, and strategic direction. As a result of its relocation, U SPORTS experienced a dramatic shift in human resource personnel with only four of approximately 10 staff members moving to Toronto,

---

[2]Prior to the turn of the 21st century, CIS was known as CIAU (Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union).

bringing in a new U SPORTS staff and, in particular, a new senior leadership team composed of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Operating Officer (COO), and Chief Sport Officer (CSO). Furthermore, as a result of its increase in professionalization and formalization (e.g., increase in the formalization of work plans, work timelines, etc.), U SPORTS also experienced technological changes with the addition of an online portal and new project management tools to help increase efficiencies. Another major change related to U SPORTS' governance structure. In its old structure, the Board of Directors consisted of 16 athletic directors from the various member universities from across the country; in the new structure, the Board of Directors consisted of four athletic directors, four university presidents, and one director at large. Moreover, the Board's purpose also changed, shifting from an operationally driven Board to one which was governance-based and policy-focused – leaving operational matters in the hands of its senior leadership team. Finally, while U SPORTS continued to deliver its core business areas to its members (e.g., national championships, rules and regulations around eligibility), the organization shifted its strategic direction focusing, not only on organizing and delivering national championships but also on marketing efforts to better promote student-athletes.

Data collection

Prior to the start of data collection, we obtained ethical approval from our university's Research Ethics Board. Data were collected from September 2017 to February 2018 via two main sources: interviews and documents. First, 32 semi-structured interviews (henceforth referred to as "interviews"; Edwards & Skinner, 2009) were conducted in three phases – Phase 1: Benchmark interviews, Phase 2: Internal stakeholder interviews, and Phase 3: External stakeholder interviews. Each interview phase informed the next and is presented below. Interviews were conducted either in person or over the phone, depending on the location and preference of the participant. Akin to Legg et al. (2016), interviews were conducted until theoretical saturation occurred (i.e., when no new information or insights were found; Corbin & Strauss, 2014). Second, as a means of supporting or corroborating the interview findings (Yin, 2018), archival records and documents were used (Edwards & Skinner, 2009). Sixty-one documents were obtained from U SPORTS, its website, and other pertinent websites (e.g., Sport Canada). Documents were available as of 2009 and consisted of annual reports; Annual General Meeting (AGM) minutes; governance, membership, program, and committee policies; by-laws; organizational charts; strategic plans; and the Government of Canada's Not-for-profit Corporations (NFP) Act. In addition, based on the initial interview results and document analysis, social media data (i.e., number of followers on Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram) were obtained to help corroborate information (see Results section).

Phase 1: benchmark interviews

Given the dramatic shift in internal stakeholders throughout U SPORTS' transition, three benchmark interviews were conducted with former internal stakeholders. The purpose of these interviews was to (a) establish an understanding of the early stages of U SPORTS' radical changes (e.g., "Why did CIS/U SPORTS engage in organizational change?"), (b) inform the interview guide for Phase 2, and (c) develop the researcher's understanding of the organization, a key aspect for researchers seeking to examine radical change.

Participants were selected using a convenience sample (Marshall, 1996) as well as a snowball sample (Edwards & Skinner, 2009). Interviews ranged from 22–44 min.

Phase 2: internal stakeholder interviews

The second phase consisted of 13 interviews with internal stakeholders (e.g., full-time and part-time employees/contractors, Board members, volunteers) and ranged from 26–62 min in length. A purposeful sample (Marshall, 1996) was used, resulting in two members of the Board of Directors and 11 paid staff at each levels of the organization being interviewed (i.e., higher-level/senior managers to lower-level employees; see Parent & Deephouse, 2007 for an example of interviewing various levels of an organization). These interviews sought to understand the successes and challenges faced by U SPORTS during the radical change process, as well as the impact on internal stakeholders' effectiveness in completing their day-to-day tasks (e.g., "In your opinion, how well does U SPORTS function or operate on a daily basis?"). During these interviews, internal stakeholders were also asked to identify their primary stakeholders (e.g., "As an organization, who are U SPORTS' most important or critical stakeholders?"). From these responses, we categorized each external stakeholder into four subgroups: member universities, regional associations, sponsors/partners (e.g., media partners, Sport Canada, corporate sponsors, merchandising partners; national sport organizations), and student-athletes. Though sponsors and partners can be viewed as separate, participants tended to talk about them as one. As such, these two categories were combined into one stakeholder subgroup.

Phase 3: external stakeholder interviews

The last phase of the interview process consisted of 16 interviews with four primary external stakeholders identified by the focal organization as the most important or critical to its survival. These included member universities, regional associations, national sport organizations, and student-athletes. Interviews were conducted with a *minimum* of two respondents per stakeholder group as well as the stratification of member universities by regional sector (i.e., two representatives per regional sector; see Parent, 2005). Interviews ranged from 10–60 min in length and discussed the impact of U SPORTS' changes on external stakeholders as well as how the changes impacted the effectiveness of the stakeholders themselves or their organization (e.g., "Have the changes undergone by U SPORTS affected your organization? If so, how? If not, why not? Have the changes at U SPORTS changed the way your organization operates?").

Data analysis

Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Prior to analyzing the data, interview transcripts were sent back to participants for member checking (Burke, 2016). All data were uploaded into the data analysis software NVivo 11 Plus (QSR International Pty Ltd., Doncaster, Australia) and analyzed following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six steps to a thematic analysis (see Table 1 for an example of the development of the "internal process" theme): familiarization with the data, which involved reading the data and taking notes of initial ideas; generating initial codes through deductive and inductive coding; searching for themes, which consisted of consolidating initial codes into higher-level clusters; reviewing themes, which required refining candidate themes by returning to the raw data; defining

Table 1. Example of the Development of the "Internal Process" Theme.

Stage 1: Deductive codes	Stage 2: Inductive codes[a]	Stage 3: Consolidation of codes	Stage 4: Theme
• Internal processes	• Had few formal documents	• Internal processes (internal stakeholders)[b]	• Internal processes (internal stakeholders)
	• Was heavily driven by policy	○ Had few formal documents[c]	○ Was a policy-driven organization
	• Had negative office culture	○ Was heavily driven by policy	○ New leadership team brought new processes and formalization
	• New leadership team brought new processes and formalization	○ New leadership team brought new processes and formalization	○ Had negative office culture
	• Staff worked in silos	○ Had negative office culture	○ CEO transformed the office culture
	• Little collaboration between departments	○ Staff worked in silos	○ Gained a sense of togetherness
	• CEO transformed the office culture	○ Little collaboration between departments	• Internal processes (external stakeholders)
	• Gained sense of "togetherness" in the change process	○ The awkwardness between outgoing staff and existing staff	○ Increased workload
	• Increased responsibilities/ workload	○ CEO transformed the office culture	
	• Increased short-term frustrations	○ Gained sense of "togetherness" in the change process	○ Increased short-term frustrations
		• Internal processes (External stakeholders)[b]	
		○ Increased responsibilities/ workload	
		○ Increased short-term frustrations	

[a]Codes provided in this column are not the entire list of inductive codes.
[b]Denotes overarching code.
[c]Denotes sub-code.

and naming themes; and producing the report. Several measures were used to increase the results' trustworthiness: member checking, data source triangulation, independent peer debriefing where feedback was noted and changes made to the research process, and using direct quotations in order to ensure the findings represent the data (Burke, 2016).

Results

We present the study's findings based on each area of effectiveness: goal attainment, internal process, systems resource, and multiple constituency. Each section presents the internal stakeholder perspective followed by the external stakeholder perspective.

Goal attainment

Understanding how the changes impacted U SPORTS' goals as an organization is a multi-faceted and complex question. As U SPORTS moved through the transition process and

underwent radical change, the goals originally outlined in the 2013–2018 strategic plan became obsolete as they preceded these changes. The addition of a new Board and senior leadership team, as well as the changes in governance, caused a shift in organizational goals. This is illustrated in the following quotation:

> We [U SPORTS] have a vision document, a strategic plan, and it articulates goals... Now, the strategic plan was developed prior to a lot of this big change. It's clear to us that we have to refresh the strategic plan so that the goals that [the CEO] and [his/her] staff have articulated and that the Board has now begun to articulate, line up well with the goals articulated in the strategic plan. That's going to unfold over this coming year. (Devin[3], internal stakeholder)

As U SPORTS was concurrently undertaking a new strategic planning cycle, it became difficult to identify its organizational goals, because new goals had, and were, in the process of being developed. Given this, it became important to first identify U SPORTS' organizational goals through this change process to be able to examine the organization's effectiveness in meeting those goals. As stakeholder theory guided this research, U SPORTS' goals were identified through the interviews with internal stakeholders and included: (a) increasing visibility and relevancy of university sport and U SPORTS, (b) promoting student-athletes and creating a positive student-athlete experience, (c) servicing member universities, and (d) professionalizing U SPORTS by formalizing work/operational plans and timelines. Table 2 provides supporting quotations for each of these aforementioned goals.

Table 2. Supporting Quotations for Each of U SPORTS' Identified Goals.

Goal	Quotation
Increasing visibility and relevancy of university sport and U SPORTS	"...relevancy in the marketplace, profile. We're understated. We've got an amazing property - if you want to call it that - like our student-athletes. We need to tell their stories better... I think it's just not known by the Canadian public or the media or Corporate Canada. It's really trying to elevate our relevancy." (Ryan, internal stakeholder)
	"I think we're trying to shine a brighter spotlight on student-athletes. It's to grow university sports in Canada. I think it's pretty widely accepted that we have a fantastic product and that it's not as well known or well regarded as it should be. So that's a primary goal." (Mackenzie, internal stakeholder)
Promoting student-athletes and creating a positive student athlete experience	"It's trying to create an experience and an environment that is like a professional environment for our student-athletes." (Quinn, internal stakeholder)
	"I think the main goal is obviously to make student-athletes and their experience while they're in university a priority... At the end of the day, realizing that we only exist because of the student-athletes and if they're not getting everything that they can out of it, then they're obviously doing something wrong." (Avery, internal stakeholder)
Servicing member universities	"Provide better services to our members at a higher level." (Reagan, internal stakeholder)
	"It's also providing a service to the members who are the important part of what composes us." (Quinn, internal stakeholder)
Professionalizing U SPORTS	"I think we are all working to professionalize our organization." (Reagan, internal stakeholder)
	"[We want] to be run at a professional level." (Mackenzie, internal stakeholder)

From the internal stakeholders' perspective, the change process both positively and negatively affected U SPORTS' ability to achieve its goals as an organization. Specifically,

---

[3]Following our ethics certificate, participant names were replaced with pseudonyms.

results showed how the changes had positively affected U SPORTS' ability to reach specific goals such as increasing the visibility and relevance of university sport and better promoting student-athletes. As Andy discussed, some changes – specifically those related to technology – have allowed U SPORTS to better promote university sport and its student-athletes:

> It actually helped. So, all of these changes, everything that we are doing, has helped us to be better in promoting university sport in Canada, to be better [at] being identified outside of the community, to be better at telling our stories, and to be better in promoting our international programs. (Andy, internal stakeholder)

This quotation is also supported by examining U SPORTS' brand-related documents presented at the 2017 AGM where social media presence was compared pre-brand launch (September 2016) to post-brand launch (May 2017) and showed an increase in social media presence (followers & average post likes) across three social media platforms: Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. The data presented in this document are illustrated in Table 3 with the addition of social media data found in the 2015 AGM package as well as those obtained by the researchers (data obtained on May 27th, 2018). Comparing 2014/2015 (pre-change) and 2018, U SPORTS increased its social media followers across all platforms, including an increase of more than, 5,000 followers on Facebook, 16,000 on Twitter, and 12,000 on Instagram.

Despite U SPORTS' perceived success in increasing its visibility and relevancy through the implementation of various technological changes, internal stakeholders also recognized the work still required to effectively meet this goal, as illustrated by Leonard (internal stakeholder):

> I think, yes, we've been effective to an extent, but there's still a long way to go... We need to continue with marketing and brand[ing] and get some bigger sponsors on board. That can help start to meet some of our higher goals.

In addition, results highlighted how the changes allowed U SPORTS to better meet its goal of professionalization, while also negatively impacting the organization's ability to service members in the initial stages of the change – two points further discussed in the Internal process and System resource section below (Table 3).

Table 3. Comparative Data of U SPORTS Social Media Presence.

Platform	April 1, 2014-March 31, 2015	September, 2016	May, 2017	May 27, 2018
Facebook				
Followers	4,587[a]	5,700[b]	8,040[b]	9,695[b]
Twitter				
Followers	17,402	21,000	27,800	34,200
Average likes per post	N/A	6+	23+	N/A
Instagram				
Followers	1,867	4,000	8,287	14,200
Average likes per post	N/A	35+	120	N/A

[a]Indicates number of "members" in a Facebook group.
[b]Indicates the number of "followers" in a Facebook page.

Next, although several external stakeholders indicated the changes undergone at U SPORTS had some negative impact on their own organizational goals – particularly related to finances and processes (see Systems resource section below) – overall, the majority of external stakeholders felt the changes had no significant negative or positive impact on their ability to achieve their own organizational goals. For example, Addison (external stakeholder) explained how, while there were changes to the U SPORTS governance structure and a one-time increase in fees assessed to the member universities, the changes had little impact on his/her athletic department's goals:

> No. I don't think so... Our departmental goals remain the same and really un-impacted by U SPORTS. There's been a change in the governance model. There was a one-time blip in the fees, but outside of that, there's been no real impact... The change in business has not been so remarkable that it's caused us to re-examine our goals.

This sentiment was also consistent with other external stakeholders, such as student-athletes, where the goal is to always compete and win a national championship, as Riley (external stakeholder) indicated: "it's always the goal to get to nationals and compete for a national championship, regardless of what league you're in or what the branding is."

Internal process

Prior to the changes, U SPORTS was best described as a "policy-driven" organization. In other words, the organization and its staff relied heavily on policies to guide their operations. There were few formal documents related to operations which staff could use to guide their day-to-day work. As such, with the addition of the new senior leadership team, U SPORTS focused on addressing these processual issues by developing and implementing work processes, project management tools, and systems, such as operational plans, work plans, and timelines – thereby increasing its professionalization – as described in the following quotation:

> CIS [was] very policy-driven. There [were] no planning documents, which I found to be a challenge, no concept plans... no critical paths, no timelines. ... Even though you got institutional knowledge in people, you still need plans and business plans and concept plans to know what you're doing and how you're doing it. (Jamie, internal stakeholder)

In addition to the lack of formal documents, the change process also exposed issues surrounding the office culture, where collaboration was weak among staff: "There [were] lots of internal issues that weren't [made] aware publicly. The office was not running well at all... as much as it was a small staff, they were very siloed. They didn't work together.... It wasn't a healthy climate" (Ryan, internal stakeholder). These changes also created an "awkward" and tense office culture, as some staff members were staying on with the organization and others were not: "there was a lot of tension [and] it was still very awkward, because they [were] a part of planning things, but they [were] planning for something they [were] not going to be there for. I think that was quite difficult" (Leonard, internal stakeholder). The hiring of new senior leadership transformed the siloed office culture into a more inclusive and collaborative one among staff: the CEO has "done a great job in opening that [office culture] up and making it more inclusive and working together" (Jamie, internal stakeholder).

Although the results highlighted challenges experienced within the office culture, it is worth noting how – while U SPORTS progressed through the transition process – the changes positively affected staff who gained a sense of "togetherness" as they experienced the challenging aspects of the transition as a group. This togetherness was explained by Neil (internal stakeholder): "Because we've been through so much together, we really developed a good bond and we have to depend on each other and ask for support a lot and ask a lot of questions, so we work really well together."

For external stakeholders, the changes impacted their own organizations, specifically in the case of member universities and regional associations. The changes in the internal processes and the increase in stakeholder responsibilities had an impact on external stakeholders' overall workload. As explained by Jules (external stakeholder), the time spent fulfilling their responsibilities at the national level resulted in less time spent in their own organization:

> The time and energy spent at the national level is not time and energy spent at the conference level, right? Time is an absolute value. There's 24 h for you and 24 h for me… If you make time for one thing, then you don't make time for another.

For member universities, in the short-term, adding a new online portal also resulted in an increase in workload and frustrations due to the learning curve associated with a new software system. However, overall, members agreed these challenges were short-term in nature and they expected to see long-term benefits to using the portal in terms of streamlining processes and aiding inefficiencies and effectiveness, a sentiment best explained by Addison (external stakeholder):

> Do I think that the portal is ultimately going to be a benefit to U SPORTS as the organization and to us as a member? Yes. Prior to the introduction of the portal, all of our processes were basically submission of paper. Managing that eligibility and recording the data, from the national office perspective, it was a mountain of paper and it was a nightmare. Now, where every athlete is going to be recorded in a database and tracked from their entry into the [university sport] system until they exhaust their eligibility, it's a change that needed to occur…. There's been some learning curves at both ends, both as a user and also for U SPORTS as – if you want to call it – the owner of the platform…. I expect that it's going to streamline operations at both ends.

Lastly, for student-athletes, with the exception of a new registration process, U SPORTS' changes did not have a significant impact on their internal processes.

Systems resource

The changes undergone at U SPORTS impacted the organization's effectiveness in acquiring two types of resources: financial and human. First, U SPORTS primarily acquired its funding from the Government of Canada, with membership fees as another main source of funding. As Leonard (internal stakeholder) explained, this was one area where it continued to remain effective despite the change process: "Government funding, we have been receiving the same level of funding. That hasn't changed at all after the transition." In contrast, results showed how U SPORTS was less effective over the years (i.e., not only during the change) in its ability to acquire sponsorship revenue. This is illustrated best in the following quotation: "Securing some major corporate dollars and

new revenue streams is the biggest challenge" (Ryan, internal stakeholder). Despite this lack of effectiveness, however, the change in strategic direction, which focused more on securing corporate dollars, and the relocation change to Toronto, which allowed the organization to be closer to and build stronger relationships with the corporate community, allowed U SPORTS to capitalize on this change process as an opportunity to respond to this particular area of ineffectiveness:

> We've seen [before the change] a drop in the amount of sponsorship and the scope of sponsorship. This was part of the reason that there was a sense that moving to Toronto would be an important direction because we had certainly seen a decline. (Devin, internal stakeholder)

Participants also described how U SPORTS addressed this ineffectiveness in acquiring external funding through hiring a new CEO with a strong focus on commercial and sponsorship acquisition: "Certainly, we have a talented CEO in that area and [his/her] connections with corporate Canada are significant because he came from [another NSO] where he grew that organization exponentially" (Ryan, internal stakeholder).

Given the length of time it takes to develop relationships with sponsors and partners, at the time of data collection, it was still early in the transition process to fully understand the impact of the changes on U SPORTS' ability to increase its sponsorship revenue. This sentiment was expressed by Quinn (internal stakeholder), who highlighted the increase in conversations and relationships with potential sponsors and partners, but how it had not yet translated into additional sponsorship revenue:

> In terms of partnerships and sponsorship, we're definitely having more conversations than we have in the past. We're trying to build and develop that portfolio. That's not to say that it has directly translated into more revenue generation, but I think it's in the right direction in that respect.

Second, the changes also impacted U SPORTS' ability to acquire human resources. Specifically, participants noted that the governance and operational changes benefited U SPORTS as it gave them the flexibility to hire more consultants and contractors when needed to help with specific projects:

> . . .the way we allocate our operational funds is different and it's different in a way that allows us to be more functional and effective. We have the ability to hire contractors when we need to. . . We have a development company who built [our Member Services Portal] for us. . . [T]hat's a function of the governance change. . . (Reagan, internal stakeholder)

From the perspective of external stakeholders, such as member universities, the changes undergone at U SPORTS have had little impact on the members' ability to acquire external resources as explained in the following quotation: "I would say no. That's a totally internal process for us" (Bonnie, external stakeholders). However, given the length of the change process and the time it takes to fully implement change, at the time of data collection, some members hoped the success of U SPORTS in acquiring external resources could have a positive impact on their (i.e., member universities) own organizations. External stakeholders believed that, as U SPORTS becomes more effective in gaining sponsorship revenue, this will trickle-down to its members through the sharing of these

resources and thus increasing their own external resources: "I think we're waiting for that moment where maybe it could be more [impactful]" (Ivan, external stakeholder).

As a result of some financial deficits, U SPORTS also assessed its members a one-time fee which had a small financial impact on member universities, as explained in the following quotation:

> It was a one-time increase. There were some challenges in the U SPORT office in terms of balancing the budget, so the Board came and assessed the members a one-time increase in membership fees to account for the budget shortfall. (Addison, external stakeholder)

However, as noted by several member universities, the ramifications on their overall budget did not significantly impact their programs and services: "We didn't drop any programs. We didn't drop any services as a result of the one-time fee assessment" (Addison, external stakeholder). In contrast, for other partners such as regional associations, given they share members with U SPORTS, the increase in membership fees and assessment by U SPORTS could have a potentially negative financial impact on the regional associations:

> …again, in many ways, because [we] share members, it's the same pot of money that we try and get fees for the members. If they [U SPORTS] were to raise their fees, would that impact our ability to go to our members and increase fees? I think it would. Sometimes, we are competing for the same resources, for sure. You could say that with sponsorship and you could say that with membership fees. (Liam, external stakeholder)

Lastly, for student-athletes, the changes had some impact financially with the addition of a one-time registration fee assessed to new student-athletes: "I had to pay $50.00 [CAD] fee of some sort. …The fee was for, I want to say first time U SPORTS athletes if you were a first-year or something" (Riley, external stakeholder).

In summary, the changes did not impact member universities' own abilities to acquire external resources; however, for regional associations who share members with U SPORTS, it could have a financial impact in terms of membership fees. For some student-athletes, the U SPORTS' registration fee also impacted them financially.

Multiple constituency

Participants discussed how the change process impacted U SPORTS' ability to deliver services to external stakeholders to the same level of quality compared to before the changes: "inevitably, with the lack of resources we were working with, there were going to be some challenges in meeting all of the needs of the members" (Mark, internal stakeholder). This was supported by Quinn (internal stakeholder), who explained how U SPORTS experienced a "blip" in services; but Quinn also explained how the organization's ability to meet the needs of its stakeholders improved once staff became accustomed to their new positions:

> I wouldn't say it was to the exact level as what it was [before the change]. Because, with any change, I think there's an onboarding [learning] process where new people are in roles where they weren't before… I think there was probably a bit of a blip in terms of being able to service members and clients in the same way. That being said, I think as we get over that learning curve and coordinating processes, it'll start to even itself out.

Similar to the results presented above, as the changes in the strategic direction took place, the nature of the services provided to members and the roles of staff also changed. As such, staff members were not only servicing member universities in their traditional capacity, but they also began servicing them in new ways that were better aligned with the (new) goals of the organization. This finding was explained by Charlie (internal stakeholder):

> I think a lot of the members want to be serviced in certain key areas that I would consider to be our core business. But we're moving in a direction that we want to promote and market, where, as it used to be, we were providing more services in more rules, regulations, policies, and administrating that. So, it changed. I think at the beginning, in the eyes of our members, we weren't hitting the objectives and we were not doing what they wanted. But...like I said, the most recent AGM, they're starting to see, 'Okay, they're doing cool things in marketing... they're building their brand.' I think that they started to see 'Well okay, maybe we're being serviced in a different way now.'

External stakeholders' perspectives also indicated the change process had an initial negative impact on U SPORTS' effectiveness related to meeting external stakeholders' needs. This ineffectiveness occurred due to the large staff turnover and the "newness" of incoming staff. The large staff turnover in certain periods of the change process meant existing staff were required to take on additional roles. The turnover in staff also resulted in new incoming staff members in various positions which came with a steep learning curve. New staff were less able to respond quickly to external stakeholder needs compared to previous staff members with long organizational tenures. This idea is illustrated by Bonnie (external stakeholder):

> I deal with a lot of coaches. Many times, when I'm dealing with other universities, or U SPORTS, or coaches, I need answers when I need the answers. I really can't operate in a world where it takes somebody [at the national office] three or four days to get back to me. I have to be responsive.

Discussion and conclusions

Our findings demonstrate that (a) organizational effectiveness can be impacted by a radical change process; (b) effectiveness is a complex concept with varying degrees of achievement depending on the perspective used; and (c) effectiveness can change over time during a radical change process. We discuss the results using each area of effectiveness (i.e., goal attainment, internal processes, systems resource, and multiple constituency) to answer the first research question, followed by a discussion of the impact of the radical organizational change process on external stakeholders' effectiveness to address the second research question. We then offer contributions before describing limitations and future research suggestions.

Focal organizational effectiveness during a radical change process

Results from this study echo Trail and James' (2016) argument regarding the usefulness of integrating multiple theories when conducting research in sport management. Each effectiveness approach – the goal attainment, internal process, systems resource, and

multiple constituency – provided a unique perspective on the effectiveness of national-level sport organizations undergoing radical change. Before addressing the integration of these theories further, it is important to understand how these theories apply (or not) to the phenomenon under study – in this case, change and effectiveness.

From a goal attainment perspective, when examining goal achievement during radical change, effectiveness varied positively or negatively, depending on the goal articulated by internal stakeholders. These findings highlight important realities regarding the use of the goal attainment approach as a single perspective during a radical change. In the traditional sense (i.e., the way it is used in the existing literature; e.g., Chelladurai et al., 1987), the goal attainment approach may not be an appropriate standalone approach to use when examining radical change, as organizational goals may shift during the change process, prompting questions about which set of goals to measure and when. However, integrating the goal attainment approach with a stakeholder perspective (i.e., stakeholder theory) can help mitigate some of these challenges by focusing on the goals from the perspective of the organization and the stakeholders who develop these goals. As such, identifying goals becomes contextual or specific to the organization during radical change – paralleling Pettigrew (1985) who illustrated the importance of accounting for specific contexts when examining change as it can unveil key aspects of the change process.

From an internal process perspective, the results highlighted the negative impact of radical change on organizational culture. As Amis et al. (2004a) illustrated, radical change can cause conflict between groups due to their diverging interests (i.e., culture). However, as we illustrated earlier, through the staff's sense of "togetherness," radical transitions can bring about positive cultural changes in organizations where the norms and values from the "old" organization are no longer shared by its members. This emulates Slack and Hinings (1992) who also found that radical change can bring about positive cultural changes in sport organizations.

Radical change can also reveal, and result in, inefficiencies in internal processes and procedures (e.g., Legg et al., 2016), such as those related to financial systems and human resource practices found in the present study. However, as our findings show, radical change can positively impact organizations' internal processes by introducing new processes and procedures which increase efficiencies and professionalization in the organization. The internal processes approach is, therefore, appropriate to examine effectiveness during radical change, as it seeks to understand the strains (or lack of) experienced in an organization (cf. Cameron, 1980). We contribute to the literature by demonstrating how these strains, and thus ineffectiveness, are equally experienced during the change process. Thus, researchers should consider examining how processes and procedures (e.g., technological changes) impact organizational effectiveness by using the internal process approach. As we showed, examining these other internal processes can help better understand the various facets of radical change and its impact on effectiveness, as well as help inform the other effectiveness approaches, specifically the multiple constituency approach. In addition, this approach also fits with the goal attainment approach, especially if the goals are related to aspects of the internal process (e.g., organizational culture and procedures).

From the systems resource perspective, radical organizational change can negatively impact organizations' effectiveness in terms of their ability to acquire financial resources. While the organization in this study remained effective in acquiring external funding from federal grants, over the years, it was seen as less effective in acquiring sponsorship revenue. In addition, through the restructuring of the organization and its processes, radical change can positively impact an organization's ability to acquire human resources, such as consultants and contractors to address specific gaps in knowledge or increase capacity. While the systems resource approach is an appropriate approach to use when examining radical change given the importance placed on financial resource acquisition for the survival of organizations, this approach is limited in its ability to capture resource acquisition that takes a significant length of time (e.g., the time needed to develop and sign sponsorship or partnership agreements). Thus, we caution researchers wishing to use this approach when examining radical change in real-time (i.e., data collection timing), as it can be difficult to determine the extent to which the changes affect the focal organization's ability to effectively gain financial resources.

From the multiple constituency perspective, radical organizational change can negatively impact an organization's ability to meet stakeholders' needs to the same extent as before the changes due to the challenges (e.g., new staff members entering the organization and learning about their new roles) faced during the radical change process. However, stakeholders noted that, as the organization moved through the change process and staff members gained experience in their new roles, the organization's ability to deliver services effectively to external stakeholders increased. We argue the multiple constituency approach was the best approach as it accounted for the different stakeholder perspectives and needs (cf. Tsui, 1990).

Although this study highlights how each approach used can be appropriate to examine change and effectiveness in national-level sport organizations, this discussion illustrates the value of integrating multiple theories as it provides a more comprehensive understanding of a complex phenomenon. For instance, had the study only used the systems resource approach, the results would have identified that radical change negatively impacts organizational effectiveness, at least in the context of the case. However, as the integration of theories showed, radical change can both positively and negatively impact effectiveness in national-level sport organizations.

External stakeholders' effectiveness during an organization radical change process

Overall, our findings indicate external stakeholders did not believe the radical organizational change had a significant impact on their organizations' own effectiveness in terms of goal attainment or resource acquisition. However, radical change did have a negative impact on external stakeholders' effectiveness in terms of internal processes (e.g., the increase in responsibility of staff members and the changes to internal processes and procedures) because the changes resulted in an increased workload both short-term (related to the internal processes and procedures) and long-term (related to increase responsibility). Thus, our results highlight the potential outward impact (or lack thereof) of radical change on external stakeholders and how this outward impact can vary, that is,

how radical change can impact external stakeholder effectiveness positively and/or negatively, depending on the approach used.

Although Welty Peachey and Bruening (2011) found change impacts external stakeholders to some degree – in their case in relation to feelings of either acceptance, resistance, or ambivalence towards change – these results were limited to student-athletes as the external stakeholder group. The study did discuss some responses from parents, fans, and alumni, but it was limited to internal stakeholders' interpretations, not the external stakeholders themselves. As our results highlighted, internal and external stakeholder perspectives can differ greatly. This is an important finding for organizations managing change; managers undergoing change should actively seek the input and feedback from external stakeholders regarding their experiences during the change process. Likewise, future research examining change should include the perspective of internal as well as external stakeholders.

Theoretical contributions

Our integrative framework provided a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of radical change and its impact on organizational effectiveness (cf. Trail & James, 2016; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995) given the complex and multi-faceted nature of change (Poole & Van de Ven, 2004). Each theory or approach we used (i.e., stakeholder theory, goal attainment approach, internal process approach, system resources approach, and multiple constituency approach) helped answer the overall purpose. The four major effectiveness approaches were useful in helping define and more holistically examine the effectiveness component of the study. Despite their usefulness, there were also challenges that unfolded when using these approaches in the context of radical change. These challenges prompted us to suggest ways to redefine each approach in order to better align them with the context of radical change (see Table 4). These proposed definition changes are small but significant when employed in the context of radical change research. For the goal attainment approach, organizational goals become specific to the research context (i.e., organization) and the achievement of those goals are based on the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders. For the internal process approach, the proposed definition includes examining the impact of internal processes and procedures on external stakeholders, as these processes can influence an organization's effectiveness. The systems resources approach should account for the progress made towards achieving external resources given the time it takes to acquire certain types of financial resources (e.g., sponsorships and partnerships). Finally, the multiple constituency approach should not only be concerned with satisfying stakeholder needs but also ensuring changes do not negatively impact stakeholders.

Further, each approach can be appropriate for analyzing the effectiveness of (national-level sport) organizations in the context of radical change if two conditions are met: (a) if the newly proposed definitions are used which better suit the context of radical change, and (b) if these approaches are integrated together as presented in this study. Although the goal attainment approach presents limitations if used alone when examining effectiveness in the context of radical change, the internal processes approach, the systems resource approach, and the multiple constituency approach could be used as standalone approaches. However, the use of a single approach is cautioned as it can provide a limited

(and misleading) understanding of effectiveness given our findings of varying effectiveness over time and depending on the perspective.

Practical contributions

This study illustrates the importance of maintaining institutional knowledge for organizational effectiveness when undergoing radical change by having stakeholders who hold this knowledge active in the transition process to help ensure the organization continues to function. Further, this study also highlights the importance of communications and consultation with both internal and external stakeholders during the radical change process to generate support through, for example, weekly or monthly meetings with (Table 4) stakeholders, sending out updates to members on progress, and meeting stakeholders face-to-face whenever possible.

Table 4. Proposed Revised Definitions for Each Effectiveness Approach for Radical Change Research.

Approach	Non-change research definition	Proposed radical change research definition	Good for examining internal and/or external stakeholder effectiveness
Goal attainment	Achieving goals (Chelladurai, 1987)	Achieving goals as determined by the organization	Internal & External
Internal process	Lack of internal strain Good flow of communication (Cameron, 1980)	Lack of internal strain (i.e., culture) Good flow of communication Internal processes and procedures and their impact on internal and external stakeholders	Internal & External
Systems resource	Acquiring external resources (Chelladurai, 1987)	Acquiring or making progress towards acquiring external resources (e.g., financial, human, etc.)	Internal & External
Multiple constituency	Satisfying the needs of one or more stakeholders (Tsui, 1990)	Satisfying the needs of stakeholders, such as delivering services and ensuring stakeholder satisfaction with the change process	Internal[a]

[a]External stakeholders not applicable as they were not examined in this study (it would mean asking the perceptions of the external stakeholders of the focal organization's external stakeholders, i.e., twice removed from the focal organization).

Limitations and future directions

First, this research was delimited to a national-level sport organization. Future research should consider examining radical change in other contexts, including provincial and community-level sport organization, given the differences which exist between these organizations (e.g., governance structures, amount of resources available, capacity, and size). In addition, future research should also consider conducting a multiple case study to compare between different sport organizations at the national level – for example, an organization with low capacity for change compared to one with high capacity for change – in order to understand the potential similarities and differences between these organizations and the impact of radical organizational change on their effectiveness.

Second, although this study found little impact on external stakeholders' own effectiveness, this was a single case; the extent to which radical change does not impact the effectiveness of external stakeholders' own organizations may differ in other contexts or situations. Therefore, future research should consider examining radical change in other

contexts, including provincial and community-level sport organizations, given the differ-ences which exist between these organizations. The number of resources available to or accessible by these organizations (e.g., fewer key stakeholders with capacity-related resources) and the size of these organizations could result in different or more prevalent issues (i.e., lack of capacity due to limited (if any) staff and stakeholder resources) and, thus, potential areas of (in)effectiveness. In addition, future research should consider examining the impact of radical change on external stakeholder subgroups. In particular, analyzing U SPORTS through the perspective of a federated network (Meiklejohn, Dickson, & Ferkins, 2016) and comparing the differences between external stakeholder subgroups such as affiliated members (i.e., member universities) and non-member (e.g., sponsors/partners, regional associations, and student-athletes) could provide an opportunity for additional insights by comparing and contrasting this information with more traditional NSOs who operate in a federated network (Meiklejohn et al., 2016).

In sum, this study highlighted the potential use of each approach to effectiveness in the context of organizational change and the benefits of integrating these perspectives by helping mitigate the limitations of each individual perspective. The use of both internal and external stakeholders contributes to our understanding of radical organizational change as it demonstrates the outward impact of change on – not only sport organiza-tions – but their external stakeholders that are critical for organizational survival (cf. Esteve et al., 2011).

Declaration of conflicting interests

There are no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

References

Amis, J., & Aïssaoui, R. (2013). Readiness for change: An institutional perspective. *Journal of Change Management, 13*(1), 69–95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2013.768435 .

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004a). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*(2), 158–198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.18.2.158 .

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004b). The pace, sequence, and linearity of radical change. *The Academy of Management Journal, 47*(1), 15–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159558 .

Andrew, D. P. S., Pedersen, P. M., & McEvoy, C. D. (2011). *Research methods and design in sport management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Besters, L. M., van Ours, J. C., & van Tuijl, M. A. (2016). Effectiveness of in-season manager changes in English premier league football. *De Economist, 164*(3), 335–356. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10645-016-9277-0 .

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa .

Burke, S. (2016). Rethinking 'validity' and 'trustworthiness' in qualitative inquiry: How might we judge the quality of qualitative research in sport and exercise sciences? In B. Smith, & A. C. Sparkes

(Eds.), *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 484–497). London, UK: Routledge.

Burnes, B. (2011). Introduction: Why does change fail, and what can we do about it? *Journal of Change Management, 11*(4), 445–450. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2011.630507 .

Burnes, B. (2017). *Managing change*, (7th ed.) Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Cameron, K. (1980). Critical questions in assessing organizational effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(2), 66–80.

Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and multiple perspectives of organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management, 1*(1), 37–47.

Chelladurai, P., Szyszlo, M., & Haggerty, T. R. (1987). Systems-based dimensions of effectiveness-the case of national sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences*, 12(2), 111–119.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Daft, R. (2021). *Organization theory & design*, (13th ed.) Boston, MA: Cengage.

Edwards, A., & Skinner, J. (2009). *Qualitative research in sport management*. London, UK: Routledge.

Esteve, M., Di Lorenzo, F., Inglés, E., & Puig, N. (2011). Empirical evidence of stakeholder management in sports clubs: The impact of the board of directors. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(4), 423–440. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2011.599210 .

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Melbourne, AU: Pitman.

Friedman, M. T., Parent, M. M., & Mason, D. S. (2004). Building a framework for issues management in sport through stakeholder theory. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4(3), 170–190.

Frisby, W. (1986). Measuring the organizational effectiveness of national sport governing bodies. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences Journal Canadien Des Sciences Appliquees Au Sport*, 11 (2), 94–99.

Government of Canada. (2018, August 30). Sport organizations. Retrieved September 26, 2019, from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/sport-organizations.html .

Government of Canada. (2019, June 18). National multisport service organizations. Retrieved September 26, 2019, from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/sportorganizations/national-multisport-service.html .

Gray, D. E. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022–1054. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/259163 .

Hoye, R., Parent, M. M., Taks, M., Naraine, M. L., Seguin, B., & Thompson, A. (in press). Design archetype utility for understanding and analyzing the governance of contemporary national sport organizations. Sport Management Review. doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2019.10.002.

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sport organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 27(4), 343–368. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/101269029202700405 .

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995a). Does decision making make a difference? Patterns of change within Canadian national sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9(3), 273–299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.9.3.273 .

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995b). 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(2), 135–152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.9.2.135 .

Legg, J., Snelgrove, R., & Wood, L. (2016). Modifying tradition: Examining organizational change in youth sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(4), 369–381. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2015-0075 .

Liket, K. C., & Maas, K. (2013). Nonprofit organizational effectiveness: Analysis of best practices *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44 (2),268–296.

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13(6), 522–526.

Meiklejohn, T., Dickson, G., & Ferkins, L. (2016). The formation of interorganisational cliques in New Zealand rugby. *Sport Management Review*, 19(3), 266– 278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.08.002 .

Papadimitriou, D., & Taylor, P. (2000). Organisational effectiveness of Hellenic national sports organisations: A multiple constituency approach. *Sport Management Review*, *3*(1), 23–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(00)70078-7 .

Parent, M. M. (2005). *Large-scale sporting events: Organizing committees and stakeholders (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. University of Alberta, Canada.

Parent, M. M. (2008). Evolution and issue patterns for major-sport-event organizing committees and their stakeholders. *Journal of Sport Management*, *22*(2), 135–164.

Parent, M. M., & Deephouse, D. (2007). A case study of stakeholder identification and prioritization by managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *75*(1), 1–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9533-y.

Parent, M. M., & Smith-Swan, S. (2013). *Managing major sports events: Theory and practice*. London, UK: Routledge.

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*(6), 555–566. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2018-0037 .

Pedersen, P., & Thibault, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Contemporary sport management*. (6th ed.) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1985). *The awakening giant: Continuity and change in Imperial Chemical Industries*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *External control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of organizational change and innovation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Riehl, S., Snelgrove, R., & Edwards, J. (2019). Mechanisms of institutional maintenance in minor hockey. *Journal of Sport Management*, *33*(2), 93–105. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2018-0041 .

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*, *6*(2), 114–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.6.2.114 .

Slack, T., & Parent, M. M. (2006). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organization theory*, (2nd ed.) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Soebbing, B. P., & Washington, M. (2011). Leadership succession and organizational performance: Football coaches and organizational issues. *Journal of Sport Management*, *25*(6), 550–561. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.25.6.550 .

Trail, G. T., & James, J. D. (2016). Seven deadly sins of manuscript writing: Reflections of two experienced reviewers. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, *1*(3–4), 142–156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2016.1231927 .

Tsui, A. S. (1990). A multiple-constituency model of effectiveness: An empirical examination at the human resource subunit level. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *35*(3), 458–483. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393313 .

U SPORTS. (n.d.). U SPORTS history. Retrieved January 26, 2018, from https://usports.ca/en/about/history .

Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 510–540. http://dx. doi.org/10.2307/258786 .

Wagstaff, C. R. D., Gilmore, S., & Thelwell, R. C. (2016). When the show must go on: Investigating repeated organizational change in elite sport. *Journal of Change Management*, *16*(1), 38–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2015.1062793 .

Welty Peachey, J., & Bruening, J. (2011). An examination of environmental forces driving change and stakeholder responses in a football championship subdivision athletic department. *Sport Management Review*, *14*(2), 202–219. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2010.09.002 .

Woiceshyn, J., Huq, J.-L., Blades, K., & Pendharkar, S. R. (2020). Microdynamics of implementing planned change on organizations' front line. *Journal of Change Management*, *20*(1), 59–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2019.1602553 .

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. London, UK: SAGE.