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Stand Up Paddling (SUP) . . . commonly referred to as ‘the world’s fastest growing water sport’
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Stand-Up Paddleboards. Are even longer boards coming to win us?

Mid-Length Board Guide. Imagine one or two of these babies in your quiver...

Kaikoura, New Zealand. One of the most scenic surfspots in the world.

John Witzig Photos. More great images from the halcyon days.
Stand Up Paddling came along for me around 2011 and really got me thinking about what this sport looks like now and what it might look like in the future.
Peak governing bodies for sport are cognisant the changing sport landscape

Sport New Zealand’s (2015) ‘Future of Sport in New Zealand’ document highlights a number of themes and trends currently influencing sport.

• Individualising sports participation.
  • Commercial sector has created many new opportunities for consumers to ‘pay for play’ with no links to the traditional ‘not for profit’ sport ‘supply system’.

Similarly, the Australian Sports Commission’s (2013) ‘Future of Australian Sport’ report also highlights a number of ‘mega trends’.

• Rise of lifestyle and alternative sports.
  • They assert that such sports are likely to attract participants and build communities via online social media platforms such as YouTube, Facebook and Twitter.

Sport New Zealand (2015) suggests that sport organisations will need to explore new structural forms.
Traditional sport federations

From a historical perspective traditional sports in Britain were faced decisions on how to structure their sport and the relationships between organisations, manage competitions and generally develop their sport (Symanski & Ross, 2007.)

The federated model was established as the preferred design. All organisations in the system, ultimately share the responsibility for the growth and development of the sport.

Therefore, interorganisational relationships are important and a spirit of cooperation is required within and between levels, for the sport to operate effectively and efficiently.

An ongoing challenge for many sport federations is to achieve sport wide cohesion and cooperation over individual self interest.

1. Structure for sport

Different sporting organisations operate under different governance structures. While not requiring the adoption of any single model, the ASC will consider closely whether sports' governance models are likely to enable them to achieve their core participation and high performance objectives in the most cost-effective fashion.

Each structure should be clearly documented, with a clear delineation of the roles, responsibilities and powers of the board, management and each body involved. There should be no overlap in the powers of any two bodies or individuals in a governance structure.

1.1 A single national entity for all forms of the sport – from juniors through to high performance – with horizontal integration of sport disciplines.

Each element of a sport needs to be incorporated into governance arrangements on the same basis. Only a sport that is fully integrated in this fashion can plan strategically for the benefit of the whole sport and operate with optimal efficiency.

Effective integration is critical to achieve the scale and whole-of-sport management that enables a sport to grow and compete in the marketplace.

1.2 Where sports have a federated structure, all parts of the federation must demonstrate they are working in cohesion and adhere to a strategic direction set by the national entity to maximise the interests of the sport.

It is essential that NSOs and their member bodies have aligned objectives and purpose to ensure achievement of sport outcomes. The sport should have a single participation and high performance strategic plan that drives the overarching objectives, which are delivered consistently and effectively by the member bodies.

A sport's strategic plan will form the basis of all local implementation outcomes and be developed with input and agreement from all stakeholders.
Where there are multiple parties involved in the achievement of strategic outcomes, formal agreement is required. This applies to any structure or grouping of interests but particularly where organisations are a federation of member bodies – generally National Sports Organisations (NSOs) are federations.

Each body will have a specific focus and role. Mutual understanding and how co-operation is to occur can be documented in a number of ways; constitutional alignment, plans, memoranda of understanding, service level agreements or through joint ventures. Each group needs the other to deliver effective outcomes for members and participants as a whole. Cross sport agreements are not strictly core governance but nonetheless strategically important.
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This paper presents the outcomes of an 18-month developmental action research study to enhance the governance capability of a national sport organization. Bowls Australia, the national governing body for lawn bowls in Australia, includes nine independent state and territory member-associations. An intervention was designed and implemented with the Bowls Australia Board. The purpose of the intervention was to enact collaborative governance to overcome a perceived cultural malaise in the governance of the sport. This study is one of the first to examine collaborative governance in a federal sport structure. Results demonstrate the utility of collaborative governance to overcome adversarial national, member-state relations for the purpose of establishing a common and unifying vision for bowls, while also enhancing governance capability. This study identified the importance of collective board leadership in governance decision-making throughout the sport. It also highlights future research directions in relation to collective board leadership in federal governance structures.
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The sport of skateboarding is fragmented, lacking in formal structures and contains overlapping roles of suppliers, participants and program developers (Kellet & Russell, 2009).

Triathlon contains TPOs such as event managers taking on roles normally assumed by the NSO (Phillips and Newland, 2014).

Kellet and Russell (2009) assert there is a dearth of understanding as to how new and emerging sports are structured and governed and that this lack of knowledge compared to mainstream sports seems remiss given the growth of the action sport sector.
The changing environment

Cornforth (2012) asserts that the once fixed and linear boundaries between private, public and not for profit sectors are becoming increasingly blurred. States that governance research “has not adequately kept up with the changing context in which many non-profit organisations operate…” (p. 2).
Overarching research question:
How can governance design options be developed for new and emerging sports?

The concept of design aligns well with a new and emerging sport.
A conceptual framework for governance design
(VANGEN, HAYES AND CORNFORTH, 2015)

The governance of a collaborative entity entails the design and use of a structure and processes that enable actors to direct, coordinate and allocate resources for the collaboration as a whole and to account for its activities.

The structure is the totality of partners (individuals, organizations and other collaborations) involved in the collaboration and the formal interconnections between them for the purpose of the collaboration.

The actors are anyone with enough power and know-how to influence and enact the collaboration’s agenda.

Processes include ways of communicating, sharing responsibility and taking decisions via instruments such as plans, committees and workshops.

Figure 1: Governing collaborations – key design elements
Adapted conceptual framework for design for this research

Governance design elements of new and emerging sports

- Stakeholders involved in the new and emerging sport. Roles and responsibilities, power and influence and participation in governance activities. Legitimate authority to govern. Potential stakeholders.

- Structure
  - Issues and tensions
  - Cooperation
  - Processes

- Issues and tensions

- Levels of cooperation in the new and emerging sport and associated constructs such as trust, inclusion and legitimising cooperation.

- Governance processes and approaches including but not limited to facilitation and coordination, decision making, communication, special initiatives and events, planning and committees.

- The totality of the new and emerging sport. The overall shape of the sport portrayed by the interconnections and patterns between stakeholders. Levels, categories, platforms and sectors of stakeholders.

Adapted from Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth (2015)
Overarching research question and sub questions:

How can governance design options be developed for new and emerging sports?

1. What is the current context with regards to the design of Stand Up paddling in New Zealand?

2. What are the key issues and tensions regarding the design of the sport of Stand Up Paddling in New Zealand. More specifically, what governance structure, processes, stakeholder and cooperation issues and tensions influence the governance of this sport.

3. What design options, actions or interventions pertaining to stakeholders, structure, processes and cooperation can the governing body consider and/or implement to enhance the governance of this sport.

4. What are the implications of the design actions or interventions implemented/considered for implementation by the governing body of this sport?

The nature of these questions have been designed to reflect the stages and the processes involved in the qualitative, developmental action research methodology this research has adopted.
This research seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice in participation with the board of the case study organisation, New Zealand Stand Up Paddling (est. 2013) to develop practical solutions to issues of pressing concern (Reason & Bradbury, 2001), namely those pertaining to the governance design of new and emerging sports.
SURFING NEW ZEALAND ORGANISATION STRUCTURE

International Surfing Association (IDC Recognised)
Surfing New Zealand Incorporated (NZOC Recognised)

SNZ Board (Six members)
Chief Executive Officer (FTE)

Event and Communications Manager (FTE)
Development Manager (FTE)

Stand Up Paddleboard Assoc
Bodyboard Assoc
Kneeboard Assoc
Adaptive Surfing Assoc

Boardrider Associations and Clubs
Approved Surf Schools

Volunteers
Event Officials
Regional Scholastic Coordinators
Approved Surf Instructors

Surfing Community

Olympic Tug of War: International Canoe Federation Challenges ISA’s Role as Stand Up Paddling’s Official Governing Body

posted April 17th, 2017 by Christopher Parker, Boss Man

Is stand up paddling considered surfing or canoeing? The debate is currently raging in the Olympic world. (photo: ISA)
Multi-theoretical frameworks/Theoretical pluralism (Roberts, McNulty & Stiles, 2005).

Interorganisational relationships and network theory (Babiak, 2007; Dickson, Arnold & Chalip, 2005; Provan & Kenis, 2008).

• The interorganisational relationships and the dynamics that underpin them are of significant importance to this study.

Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984)

• This study has the potential to unveil new stakeholders not present in traditional sports which has potential to provide additional challenges and shed new light from a stakeholder perspective relating to sport governance.

Institutional theory (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983).

• How much pressure will be exerted on this new and emerging sport to follow the path most travelled re governance design? Particularly with reference to potential with Olympic games inclusion.
Action research phases (Adapted from Ferkins & Shilbury, 2009)

Data Collection - initiated
Semi-structured Interviews

NZSUP workshop(s)
NZSUP board meeting attendance, participation
Participant observation
Reflective journaling

Secondary data
Document analysis
Media analysis

E.g. NZSUP Workshop # 1 lead to an early action/intervention.

Establish digital community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation type</th>
<th>Number of participants (36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZSUP board members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZSUP Stakeholders</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surfing NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP event managers - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP retailers - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP distributors - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For profit SUP operators - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP clubs - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP training groups - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUP Facebook groups - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted established water sports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surf lifesaving NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canoe racing NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waka Ama NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted NZ sports that have included newer sports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Snow Sports NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycling NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yachting NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation type</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted other new and emerging sports/lifestyle sports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parkour - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skateboarding - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted relatively new sport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Triathlon New Zealand - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted traditional sports that are relatively new to New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baseball NZ - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old new sport configurations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics- Tramp., Aerobics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak governing bodies for sport in NZ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sport New Zealand - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Zealand Olympic Committee - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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