Organisational culture in sport: A conceptual, definitional and methodological review

Article · September 2018

2 authors, including:

Christopher Robert David Wagstaff
University of Portsmouth
56 PUBLICATIONS **664** CITATIONS

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   The psychosocial factors affecting the development of overuse injuries in rhythmic gymnastics View project

Project   Stress and wellbeing in Sport View project

Organisational culture in sport: A conceptual, definitional and methodological review

Christopher R.D. Wagstaff & Suzanna Burton-Wylie

In this article we present a review of organisational culture relevant to sport psychology. In doing so, we outline the various ways scholars have conceptualised organisational culture, definitions of organisational culture and methods used to study this concept. In an attempt to stimulate reflection, discourse and action the review concludes with considerations for researchers and practitioners.

Keywords: *cultural; duty of care; characteristics; recommendations; organisational sport psychology*

Organisational culture in sport: Where have we been?

The title of this section of the paper is intended to have two purposes: First, it is intended to facilitate reflection on the historical emergence and progress on organisational culture in sport, to which we will shortly turn. Second, the title is intended to be provocative. Why have sport psychologists largely elided the study of organisational culture when there have been thousands of publications on this topic in other fields of psychology? To say we believe organisational culture as a concept has 'arrived' would be ignorant of many years of research on this concept outside of sport (and a small body of work within sport). Yet the field of sport psychology has been a bit-part player in the academic pursuit of organisational cultural and arguably should have played a more prominent role. Indeed, some scholars have already commented on 'the fall of organisational culture' and labelled the topic 'intellectually dead' (Alvesson et al., 2017, pp.105), in favour of concepts such as organisational identity, commitment, change, and sense-making. Perhaps sport psychology

has 'missed the boat' on organisational culture. Nevertheless, we believe that due to a confluence of research trends and applied needs, now is an important time for dedicating greater attention to organisational culture in sport psychology. That is, there has been a timely convergence of the substantial importance of organisational and cultural sport psychology research since the turn of the century and the changing landscape of elite sport environments. In order to fully explicate this convergence, we will provide a brief overview of the emergence of organisational sport psychology and cultural sport psychology, before turning to the current elite sport landscape.

Organisational culture has been identified as having a significant influence on performance outcomes at the Olympic Games (e.g. Gould et al., 2002; Greenleaf et al., 2001), as a source of strain for athletes (e.g. Arnold et al., 2013) talent development (e.g. Henriksen, 2015) and organisational functioning (e.g. Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). In 2009, Fletcher and Wagstaff concluded their review of the then nascent research on organisational psychology in elite sport by stating:

Those governing and managing elite sport have a duty of care to protect and support the mental wellbeing of its employees and members. In addition to these statutory requirements, NSOs also have an ethical obligation to create performance environments which facilitate individual and group flourishing... It appears that the 'global sporting arms race' has had both positive and negative consequences for those operating in elite sport. A convergence of evidence points to the organisational environment as having the potential to significantly impact on individuals' wellbeing and performance. It also indicates that the climate and culture in elite sport requires careful and informed management in order to optimise individuals' experiences and organisational flourishing. However, the body of knowledge is still in its early stages and restricted. (pp.432–433)

In the intervening years, sport psychology scholars have contributed to a burgeoning body of research examining organisational life in sport. Indeed, a growing body of literature (see, for reviews, Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff, 2017; Wagstaff et al., 2012; Wagstaff & Larner, 2015) has showcased the salience and utility of organisational psychology in sport as a field of research and practice. A forthcoming special issue of the *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* dedicated to organisational psychology in sport (see Wagstaff, 2019) provides further evidence of this currency. Moreover, in an attempt to better locate future research in this field, Wagstaff and colleagues (see Wagstaff & Larner, 2015; Wagstaff, 2017) have recently proposed an organising structure for the research within organisational sport psychology based on four complementary areas: emotions and attitudes (e.g. Hings et al., 2018; Wagstaff et al., 2012; Wagstaff et al., 2013; Wagstaff & Hanton, 2017); stress and wellbeing (Arnold & Fletcher, 2012; Arnold et al., 2013; Arnold et al., 2017; Larner et al., 2017); organisational behaviour (e.g. Aoyagi et al., 2008; Arthur et al., 2017; Fletcher & Arnold, 2011); and (high

performance) environments (Henriksen & Stambulova, 2017; Jones et al., 2009; Martin et al., 2017; Pain et al., 2012). Organisational culture as a line of research inquiry should best be located within the last of these areas of study; that is, the study of organisational environments.

In addition to the developments in organisational sport psychology in the last decade, this period has been characterised by a 'cultural turn' (see Ryba et al., 2010); specifically, a growing body of researchers have focused their attention on the topic of cultural sport psychology, with the aim of developing a more contextualised understanding of marginalised voices and identities (see McGannon & Smith, 2015; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009). According to McGannon and Smith, the central reason for the advocacy of cultural sport psychology is 'because culture shapes how we think, feel, and behave; we cannot step outside culture, thus to ignore it would be to miss a key matter that shapes people's self-identities and lives' (p.79). Grounded in social constructionism, research on cultural sport psychology promotes the use of narrative inquiry and discourse psychology to develop cultural praxis (McGannon & Smith, 2015). That is, cultural sport psychology researchers seek to be emancipative, with the goal of illuminating multiple forms of knowledge and understanding and to create opportunities for individuals as cultural beings in sport contexts. The topics aligned with cultural sport psychology include: race, gender, acculturation, disability, motherhood and sexual abuse. While each of these topics has an important place in the pursuit of inclusive and just sport, and will go some way to assisting the understanding of culture within sport organisations, the research conducted on cultural sport psychology does constitute or speak directly to organisational culture *per se*. Indeed, despite substantial research developments in organisational sport psychology and cultural sport psychology over the past decade, the research dedicated to organisational culture in sport remains comparatively

disjointed as a discipline and constrained by its almost exclusive examination within the field of sport management (see Maitland et al., 2015). Thus, research has often been restricted to illustrating generalised concepts of organisational culture supported by examples from sports rather than emerging from sport-specific contexts.

The second element of the confluence pointing to growth in organisational culture relates to the changing landscape of elite sport cultures (see Wagstaff, 2017). That is, recent media reports and anecdotal evidence from across a range of sports has led to questions about whether welfare, safety and duty of care are being given the priority they deserve. At a time of unprecedented success for British sport, in terms of medals, championships and profile, this raises challenging questions about whether the current balance between welfare and winning is right, and what we are prepared to accept as a nation, citizen and practitioner. In light of these questions, a recent report on and recommendations for improving the welfare and duty of care for all those engaged in sport in the UK was published (see Grey-Thompson, 2017). In March of 2017, UK Sport launched a cultural health check across all Olympic sports. The results of phase 1, which surveyed 1525 athletes, coaches, staff and stakeholders, showed that although the overwhelming majority of individuals felt positive about the UK's World Class pathway programme, with 90 per cent reporting feeling proud to be part of the system and 91 per cent believing those involved have good intentions. Some 30 per cent of athletes had either experienced or witnessed unacceptable behaviour and 24 per cent of athletes reported that they felt there were no consequences when people behave inappropriately. Those sports falling short of expected standards, as identified by the survey, have been given action plans following discussions with UK Sport to support change, with funding withdrawal a possible outcome. In sum, the elite sport landscape has changed and organisa-

tions face unparalleled pressure to ensure both welfare and winning, with undesirable consequences should they fail.

To fully illuminate organisational cultural, we must understand where organisational culture research 'has been', and we now provide a review of the sport research on this concept. We then use this research backdrop to take stock and consider definitional, conceptual and methodological approaches to organisational culture.

A review of organisational culture research in sport

While sport psychologists have called for the study organisational culture within sport psychology for some time (e.g. Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009), it has been the field of sport management that has hitherto led the way (see Girginov, 2006; Kaiser et al., 2009; Maitland et al., 2015; Schroeder, 2010a). Early culture research in the field of sport management adopted a leadership-centric approach to culture change and culture strength in American universities (Weese, 1995, 1996). Specifically, Weese aimed to understand the concepts of transformational leadership and organisational culture within the administrative departments of campus recreation programmes of Big Ten and Midwestern conference universities, using both quantitative (e.g. the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire) and qualitative (e.g. the Culture Strength Assessment and Culture Building Activities instruments) methods. Weese (1995) found the programmes led by high transformational leaders:

(i) possessed stronger organisational cultures, with staff members sharing stories of togetherness, tight-knit family atmosphere and leaders communicating and shaping stated values (e.g. honesty and mutual respect), increasing employee commitment; and

(ii) carry out culture-building activities (e.g. managing change, achieving goals, coordinated teamwork and customer orientation) with members, speaking to the need for customer service.

However, transformational leaders were not found to be more effective in penetrating the culture at the corporate level of their respective programmes. In the second of these studies, Weese's (1996), adopted quantitative measures with 19 directors from the American Athletic Conferences to determine if a significant relationship existed between either executive transformational leadership or organisational culture and campus recreation programme effectiveness. While the results of Weese's (1996) study did not show leadership to be significantly related to programme success, he did find a positive correlation between culture strength and organisational effectiveness, thereby producing some preliminary insights into the linkage between the concepts of leadership, culture and organisational effectiveness. These findings were supported in a review by Scott (1997), who also discussed the existence of a relationship between culture and transformational leadership, concluding that a strong positive culture in a corporate organisation, established through visions, collaboration and communication, generally results in overall success.

Doherty and Chelladurai (1999) took a unique approach by reviewing cultural diversity and its impact on organisations, and proposed a theoretical framework for managing cultural diversity as a function of the underlying organisational culture or shared values in an organisation. They argued that the potentially constructive or destructive influence of cultural diversity is a function of the management of that diversity, which is ultimately a reflection of organisational culture, or 'how things are done around here'. Doherty and Chelladurai described organisational culture along a continuum of valuing similarity and diversity in the organisation, and argued that the benefits of cultural diversity (e.g. creativity, challenge, constructive conflict) will be realised when an organisational culture of diversity underlies the management of that diversity. Moreover, the authors proposed that these benefits are heightened when the situation dictates a high degree of task interdependence and complexity, and that personal culture can manifest in organisations through symbolic (e.g. clothing, language) and substantive (e.g. values, perceptions) behaviours and while groups and organisations can benefit from multiple perspectives and perceptions of diversity.

Zevenbergen et al. (2002) adopted the Bourdieusian concept of 'habitus' (i.e. a system of embodied dispositions and tendencies that organise the ways in which individuals perceive the social world around them and react to it) to examine specific practices and rituals (e.g. appearance, language, interactions) at an Australian golf club. They found cadets assimilating and attempting to learn the cultural system of the golf club were essential if the junior golfer was to remain a member, with those that did not conform via acculturation marginalised or excluded.

In one of the first studies to explicitly refer to organisational culture in sport psychology, Cresswell and Eklund (2007) completed a longitudinal study with professional New Zealand Rugby players, interviewing nine players and three members of team management (i.e. fitness trainers or medical staff) over a 12-month period to identify the central factors (viz. influences, antecedents, symptoms and consequences), process and changes in the burnout syndrome. Reports from seven of the nine players were consistent with descriptions for burnout (e.g. heavy playing and training demands; injury and non-selection). Poor relationships with team and management were also noted by players as a factor in burnout, with poor communication, honesty and a lack of openness highlighted by the players.

Pfister and Radtke (2009) presented three studies focusing on gender differences in German sport organisations, aimed at:

(i) understanding women's perspectives on leadership and how women in leadership positions manage to combine their occupations, housework and family responsibilities;

(ii) surveying individuals in executive positions in sport organisations to examine differences between men and women's opinions and careers; and

(iii) a 'drop-out' study to identify the barriers faced by leaders who left their position earlier than planned.

The findings from this programme of research indicated that despite having similar qualifications and a similar commitment to sport, women did not have the same status as men at an executive level, while gender-specific barriers hindered women in their career advancement due to them not complying with the characteristics of an 'ideal leader' (e.g. high socio-economic status, freedom from family duties and a 'thick-skin' during conflict). Later, Frontiera (2010) explored leadership and organisational culture transformation in professional sport, in an attempt to understand how leaders in professional sport changed culture, and whether leaders were aware of different elements of organisational culture. After interviewing and observing six owners from the National Basketball Association (NBA), National Football League (NFL) and Major League Baseball (MLB), who all had experience of leading a sport organisation through successful culture change, five themes were developed, forming an initial model for organisational culture change in professional sport. These themes were:

(i) Symptoms of a negative culture (e.g. a new leader arrives and witnesses the damage from past leadership);

(ii) My way (e.g. a new leader implements a new way of doing things and sets out to communicate their values, vision and plan);

(iii) Walk the talk (e.g. through both daily and key organisational decisions, the leader repeatedly emphasises the new values);

(iv) Embedding the new culture (e.g. an organisation needs to experience success for members to embrace new values without reservation); and

(v) Our way (e.g. a new culture, complete with new values and improved decisions is completed).

These themes highlighted the salience of leaders developing a simple vision, along with a plan to see that vision realised. Recent work by Cruickshank and Collins (2012a) extended these culture change findings, with the authors conceiving culture in sport as day-to-day decisions based on management ideals and athletes' beliefs. Later, Cruickshank et al. (2014) argued that successful culture change in an Olympic setting requires support from the CEO, coaching staff, athletes, support staff and media, while leaders use 'dark' behaviours to shape relationships and establish control to determine performance outcomes. Although it should be noted that these authors were at pains to locate their work as focusing on the performance team (i.e. athletes and coaches) and delineate this from organisational culture and the organisational psychology in sport research agenda.

To further unpack the relevance of culture to the study of sport management, Girginov (2010) presented a review and argued for the interpretation of sport management as a specific cultural system of meaning and practice. In this review, it was proposed that 'seven aspects of culture' demonstrate the importance of culture–sport management research. The seven aspects, comparable to those in Table 1, help explain how culture and sport 'both strive to create order and to avoid uncertainty… and sport managers' beliefs, values and assumptions broadly constitute their 'ethos', which is often interpreted as national culture or 'collective programming of the mind' (p.411). Nevertheless, according to Girginov, individuals carry cultural imprints of our upbringing (e.g. family, religion, gender, ethnicity) which we do not abandon in a given sport environment; rather we aim to accommodate differences in cultural views. Such arguments point to the importance of leadership and the need to adopt a culturally-informed approach, with Girginov concluding 'sport managers thus

become mediators of meaning, while sport organisations become institutions for socialisation, acculturation and control' (p.413). In 2013, Mills and Hoeber interviewed and observed youth and adult figure skaters to explore organisational culture through artefacts of their Canadian skating club, and to enable reflections on institutionalised norms that may unintentionally influence the community. The authors interpreted their results to indicate that members took pride in the unique facility of the figure skating club, emphasising a sense of belonging. Yet contradiction was observed regarding achievement-orientated artefacts, such as plaques and the wall of fame, which inspired some members but not others, some of whom perceived these artefacts to reflect exclusivity.

Another key contribution to understanding organisational culture from the field of sport management comes from Maitland et al.'s (2015) systematic review of 33 studies published between 1995 and 2013. In doing so, Maitland and colleagues structured their review according to three 'building blocks' of organisational culture, as suggested by Martin (2002): research paradigm and methods; the perspective on, definition and operationalisation of culture; and the research interest of the study. Demographically, they found that research was heavily based in North America (almost half the studies) and Australia (four), while two thirds of the total studies collected their data from university sport organisations, six from professional sports, and the rest from local and national sport organisations. Further, all but one study collected data from a sample of management and employees, with the one exception to this including a sample of managers only. The authors concluded that researchers should consider the views and experiences of coaches and expand beyond North America and Australia samples. They found no pattern in the researcher paradigms, methodological approach or how organisational culture is conceptualised or defined. However, they did identify trends in:

(i) the methodological approach taken, with qualitative researchers exploring through interviews and quantitative researchers examining using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument; and

(ii) the perspective, with 70 per cent utilising an integration perspective (i.e. culture is consistent across the environment), and supported by the observation that half of the studies reviewed conceived culture as something shared, adopting Schein's (1985) definition of organisational culture.

A notable contribution to the examination of organisational culture in sport psychology has been made through a programme of research led by Henriksen (e.g. Henriksen et al., 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2015). Adopting a holistic ecological approach, Henriksen and colleagues took steps to redirect the focus in talent development from the individual athlete to the environment in which talented athletes develop. Over the course of several studies these researchers investigated successful athletic talent development environments (ATDEs) and paid considerable attention to the organisational context of the environment. For instance, Henriksen, Stambulova, and Roessler have examined factors influencing success in a sailing milieu (2010a), track and field team (2010b) and kayaking environment (2011). Collectively, this work has located organisational culture as an important component of the holistic talent development environment, viewing culture as a series of assumptions a person makes about their environment, which are grouped into three levels (viz. artefacts, values and assumptions), each level becoming more difficult to articulate and change. This work has shown that a hierarchal system which values open communication, promotes athlete autonomy, and supports athletes in their education and continuous development are more likely to experience sporting success. Henriksen and colleagues (see Henriksen et al., 2014) summarised

these findings and proposed that successful ATDEs are unique but also share a number of features, including:

(i) opportunities for inclusion in a supportive training community;
(ii) role models;
(iii) support of sporting goals by the wider environment;
(iv) focus on long-term development rather than short-term success;
(v) the integration of factors outside of sport, such as school, family and other components of the environment; and
(vi) a coherent organisational culture.

Building on his previous research, Henriksen (2015) used this ecological perspective to provide a sport psychology intervention to the Danish national orienteering team, aimed at optimising their organisational culture. An initial needs assessment with athletes and head coaches identified a team culture that was less-than-optimal, with athletes reporting unhealthy competition in the team (e.g. talking behind each other's back and not discussing strategies but keeping secrets) and a disloyal style of communication, both of which have a negative impact on performance. During a one-week training camp, members of the performance environment discussed their positive experiences and what characterised them when they were at their best, identifying their 'Top 5' espoused team values (viz. 'We make each other better', 'We act as a team', 'We train to win', 'We lead professional lives', 'We have clear agreements [about routines and procedures]'). Henriksen reported that the integration of the new values into the team's identity and performance environment was facilitated by several strategies:

(i) Ongoing evaluation (e.g. collectively evaluating one of the values each training session).
(ii) Positive story of the day (e.g. speaking to a teammate about something good they had done that day and how it reflected the values).

(iii) Values visible (e.g. value symbols hung on walls around the training areas).
(iv) Hug or High-Five (e.g. non-verbal communication based on whether a teammate looked happy or sad).
(v) State goals (e.g. each athlete stating their desired result and process goal in an open session at the start of a competition).

Evaluating the intervention, Henriksen (2015) noted that the problematic culture had disappeared, with athletes reporting feeling more at ease and a more supportive group culture in the national team. Moreover, the coach subsequently regularly engaged with the athletes and the wider performance team and the story of their successful culture change was told to new members, thus serving as a verbal artefact of the new team culture. The programme of work undertaken by Henriksen and colleagues has significantly extended the knowledge on high performance and talent development environments in sport. While Henriksen and colleagues view organisational culture as only one element of a broader holistic ecological approach, their work has perhaps made the greatest empirical steps in the exploration of this concept in sport psychology to date. Yet the researchers' focus on talent development environments rather than organisational culture *per se*, arguably limits the attention they have been able to dedicate to conceptual, definitional and methodological considerations for organisational culture as a standalone line of inquiry. Indeed, it is to a broader discussion of these considerations that we now turn our attention.

Approaches to conceptualising organisational culture

Although we have briefly summarised the literature on organisational culture in sport, we have resisted the urge to proceed directly onto definitional perspectives on this concept. We did so because a fuller understanding of such definitions requires

an appreciation of the ways researchers have conceptualised organisational culture, and in turn, how it has been studied. Hence, in this section we provide an overview of approaches to understanding organisational culture, and then move on to definitions of organisational culture and the methods for studying organisational culture.

One way to distinguish approaches to conceptualising culture is to contrast those that focus on culture as something that organisations have and those that conceive culture as something organisations are (cf. Smircich, 1983). The perspective allied with 'organisations have cultures' might also be referred to as an objectivist-functionalist view (see Alvesson, 1993). Researchers who adopt this approach typically conceive culture as an organisational variable or attribute that both is affected by and affects other organisational variables. The underpinning goal of researchers adopting this function-alist approach is to better understand the empirical relationship between culture and outcomes such as effectiveness, performance, efficiency and productivity. Not surpris-ingly, such approaches have their strongest currency in fields such as sports management and positivistic-oriented research in sport psychology (see, for sport examples, Choi & Scott, 2008; Weese, 1996). According to Alvesson (1993), the objective-functionalist approach to organisational culture can be characterised by a technical interest, with the goal being to develop understanding and knowledge of causal relationships before attempting to manipulate or control these variables to achieve a desired outcome. In research beyond sport (Alvesson, 2002), this approach to organisational culture has been praised for its utility for achieving high levels of employee commitment and articu-lation of vision in non-sport organisations (see, for a sport example, Choi et al., 2008).

An alternative conceptual approach is that of 'organisations are cultures', often referred to as the subjectivist-interpretivist view (see Alvesson, 1993). The focus of this approach is to understand what being part of an organisation means to those who operate within it, and the processes by which this meaning is understood and enacted. The underpinning goal of researchers adopting this interpretivist approach is to illuminate 'nonrational, taken-for-granted, underlying assumptions that drive organisational behav-iour and the shared interpretive schemas of organisational members' (Alvesson, 1993, pp.365–366). Accordingly, from this perspec-tive, culture is not a variable that can be meas-ured and managed, but a root metaphor for analysing and interpreting culture (Smircich, 1983), such that 'organisational culture is not just another piece of the puzzle, it *is* the puzzle' (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983, p.146). According to Alvesson (2002), the subjective-interpretivist approach to organisational culture can be characterised by a practical hermeneutic (i.e. describing and understanding how culture is created in organisations) or emancipatory (i.e. criti-cally analysing the aspects of organisations that control personal autonomy). In turn, symbolism has been a central tenet of this perspective, with researchers drawing from the narratives, myths, rituals and legends they encounter in organisational life. The concep-tualisation of organisational culture from this approach emphasises an interest in more implicit processes of meaning-making, covert power processes, and backstage politics, and provides a rich analysis of everyday organisa-tional life (see, for sport examples, Cresswell & Eklund, 2007; Henriksen et al., 2010a, 2010b, 2011; Larsen et al., 2013; Smith, 2009; Southall & Nagel, 2003). This approach does not necessarily propose that organisations lack culture, but that they are more akin to sites where different cultural elements are inte-grated (see Alvesson et al., 2017). To account for the complexity of this approach, inter-pretivist organisational culture researchers have explored *inter alia* cultural ambiguities (Young, 1989) and paradoxes (Koot et al., 1996), and the occurrence of subcultures (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985) and counter-cultures (Martin & Siehl, 1983). Such work has contributed to an increasing awareness

that organisational culture is complex, and that the objectivist-functionalist (i.e. that culture can be designed and engineered) is highly complicated, if not impractical.

Another way to distinguish between organisational culture approaches is to use Martin's (see Martin & Meyerson, 1988; Martin, 1992, 2002) three-perspective (viz. integration, differentiation and fragmentation) framework to explicate and decipher what has, and has not, been learned from a given study. Each perspective has a complementary view in relation to their orientation to consensus, relation among manifestations, and treatment of ambiguity. The boundaries of the three perspectives are viewed by Martin (1992) as permeable and indicative of the primary emphasis of a study rather than an oversimplification of the characteristics of a study. From an integration perspective, researchers emphasise definitions of culture that include an explicit focus on consensus, clarity and consistency on what is shared, and elides conflict and ambiguity within the organisation. This implies a singular organisation-wide notion of culture, whereby culture is that which is clear and uncontested. Martin (2002) observed that integration studies typically focus on senior leader or managerial views rather than lower-level employees, and prioritise generic consensus (e.g. assumptions) over superficial conflict (e.g. Frontiera, 2010; Schroeder, 2010b; Weese, 1995). From the differentiation perspective, inconsistent interpretations of cultural phenomena are emphasised because they represent the real world of organisations. As such, there may be no organisation-wide consensus on culture, rather inconsistency across occupational, functional or subcultural levels is often the focus (e.g. Colyer, 2000; Parent & MacIntosh, 2013; Schroeder, 2010a). Nevertheless, subcultures are viewed as having consensus within themselves, whereby conflict between subcultures is often the focus of differentiation studies, with ambiguity in this domain being 'relegated to the boundary' (Martin, 1992, p.83). In contrast, in fragmentation studies, researchers place ambiguity at the centre of culture, whereby ambiguity is embraced and viewed as a normal part of everyday organisational life. Researchers often present cultural irony, paradox and tension reflective of a loosely connected web of individuals who may change positions on a variety of issues for unknown reasons. As such, 'their involvement, their sub-cultural identities, and their individual self-definitions fluctuate, depending on which issues are activated at a given moment' (Martin, 1992, p.153).

In reflecting on the potential utility of Martin's categorical approach to conceptualising organisational culture, several considerations are worthy of mention. Martin (1992) argued that although researchers may state their conceptualisation of culture, it is the cultural manifestation that researchers study, and which reveals how the authors of a given study define culture. Further, Martin argued that three kinds of cultural manifestation are frequently studied: forms (e.g. jargon, rituals and stories), practices (e.g. tasks, or ways of communicating) and content themes (e.g. deeply held group assumptions, or more public espoused values of those in the organisation). Although useful, Martin's framework has been the focus of some critical debate. Specifically, some authors (e.g. Ehrhart et al., 2014) have questioned the extent to which the perspectives represent different lenses to view an organisation's culture or whether they are culture typologies. Additionally, scholars (e.g., Alvesson, 1993; Alvesson, 2002; Schein, 1991; Trice, 1991) have generally questioned whether 'the essence of any culture is pervasive ambiguity' (Martin et al., p.732). To elaborate, Schein (1991) questioned the extent to which an organisation can have a culture at all 'if there is no consensus… there is conflict or if things are ambiguous' (p.248). Others, such as Alvesson (2002) have been more accommodating, accepting that ambiguity is inherent in culture, but that it is 'not something about which most

Table 1: Metaphors for conceptualising organisational culture (Adapted from Alvesson, 2002)

Culture as *exchange-regulator*	Culture acts to indirectly control individual's behaviours through shared social knowledge of the relational exchange between individuals and their organization.
Culture as *compass*	Culture provides individuals and teams with a shared set of values that guide their goal-directed behaviour in the pursuit of effectiveness.
Culture as *social glue*	Culture as shared beliefs and norms that bring individuals and teams toward a harmonious and consensual existence.
Culture as *sacred cow*	Culture as core values that individuals emotionally identify with, are committed to, and ultimately view as sacred.
Culture as *affect regulator*	Culture as a means to communicate rules for appropriate emotional expressions and as a mechanism to manage the emotional expression of individuals.
Culture as *disorder*	Culture as a jungle of ambiguity, characterized by uncertainty, contradiction, irony and confusion.
Culture as *blinders*	Culture as an unconscious and largely inaccessible concept, with limited individual access or understanding of its effects.
Culture as a *world-closure*	Culture as a leader-created social reality that restricts individual's or team's autonomy and runs counter to their interests.

researchers are concerned on the level of the collective' (p.163). According to Ehrhart et al. (2014), part of the confusion may be due to Martin's (2002) examples of fragmentation studies, which illustrate consensus among employees regarding the presence of ambiguity in the organisation, thereby seemingly combining the integration and fragmentation perspectives. For Trice (1991), the paradoxes, contradictions and inconsistencies that are central to fragmentation perspectives are clearly visible in organisational life; yet for him, individuals and groups within organisations do tend to share some commonalities in their experiences, perceptions and assumptions, without which organisations would be unable to function in a sufficiently coordinated manner. Indeed, it should be noted that Martin (2002) advocated for a three-perspective theory of culture, in which integration, differentiation and fragmentation were simultaneously used to analyse organisations. Ehrhart et al. (2014)

characterised this approach as studying the macro general culture, the specific subcultures that might exist, and culture strength at the same time, and argued that such broad and multifaceted, multilevel thinking could lead to interesting advancements for the field. Indeed, several sport management researchers have conducted studies using all three of Martin's three perspectives, with relative success (e.g. for sport examples, Girginov, 2006; Girginov et al., 2006). Nevertheless, such pragmatic approaches might be critiqued by epistemological and ontological purists, adverse to mixed-methods designs.

So far in this article, we have referred frequently to Alvesson's (2002) work and believe readers might have interest in his eight metaphors for how culture has been conceptualised. These are outlined in Table 1. These metaphors offer both researchers and practitioners with accessible terms for the communication of organisational culture.

Table 2: Recommendations for conducting organizational culture research and practice
(adapted from Dennison, 2001)

1. Take the 'native's point of view' seriously by understanding their day-to-day concerns, even if they are instrumental- or results-focused.
2. Create a systems perspective by moving the primary focus away from the deepest levels of culture to how these levels are linked together, allowing for those seeking to understanding culture to start with the outer levels of culture that may be initially most accessible.
3. Provide a benchmark or frame of reference for data while also acknowledging uniqueness. Comparing organisations' values or behavioural norms may provide some insights that can be referenced in terms of an organisation's unique context and history.
4. Focus on performance implications to better make the argument that culture issues are important; otherwise it may be difficult to gain traction with sport organization gatekeepers.
5. Highlight symbols and contradictions to better understand how the organisation has dealt with problems of internal integration and external adaptation, and how different groups in the organisation may view those issues differently.

More recently, Alvesson et al. (2017), reflecting on several decades of research on organisational culture, pointed to the potential value of approaches to organisational culture research aligned with Swidler's (1986) cultural toolkit approach and organisational identity. Taking the first of these, Swindler proposed that there are not only different cultures, but also different ways to mobilise and use culture. In outlining this position, she used the metaphor of a 'toolkit' to describe a diverse repertoire of tacit (e.g. attitudes, styles) and explicit (e.g. rituals, beliefs) cultural resources. This toolkit represents the resources for action planning available to a given individual at a given time. From this simplistic perspective, culture is something that provides skills and competencies that may be exploited and utilised to engage with and solve problems through strategies for action. To elaborate, according to Alvesson et al. (2017) an individual's chosen strategy for action provides and sustains the strategies of action available for pursuit.

Organisational identity has been studied as a cultural resource in industrial and organisational psychology, and offers an exciting avenue for research. This approach relates to an interest in how identities are shaped and played out in organisations, with specific reference to how social actors deploy culture as a resource to develop, sustain or change an individual or collective identity. Perhaps the most valuable use of organisational identity in the study of organisational culture lies in its utility as a constructed, performative, linguistic practice (cf. Alvesson et al., 2017). That is, shared identity within a given sport organisation is developed, sustained or changed through accounts and interactions between members of that organisation. These processes might take the form of narratives, conversations and accounts of events. Over time, these (life) stories will be refined and repeated, such that they provide a rich cultural fabric that portrays the accounts of events in the organisation's past and present. In turn, these accounts may provide information to individuals (e.g. athletes) and those with whom they interact (e.g. coaches, support staff, stakeholders) with information about who the individuals within a given organisation are, and who they want to become. The potential value of organisational identity as a lens to study organisational culture is even more appealing when one reflects on the increasing portrayal of individual's existence in elite sport organisations as precarious (e.g. Gilmore et al., 2018; Wagstaff et al., 2015, 2016), and the need to enact emotional labour to be perceived as professional, often to the detriment

of the individual's wellbeing and performance (e.g. Hings et al., 2018; Wagstaff & Thelwell, 2016).

To conclude this section, there are numerous ways to conceive organisational culture, with scholars continuing to debate the value of respective approaches. Perhaps the biggest challenge allied with this conceptual debate is the assertion that too little organisational culture work has translated into practice and improved the organisational lives of individuals (see Ehrhart et al., 2014). This poor translation is something that sport psychologists must be cognisant of and take steps to avoid. In doing so, sport psychologists might reflect on Dennison's (2001) five recommendations for making culture work more relevant to change and which were intended to offer a compromise between the varying approaches to organisational culture (see Table 2).

Approaches to defining organisational culture

A cursory glance at just a few of the organisational culture studies published within and outwith sport will illustrate the variation in definitions proposed. The challenge facing scholars is, according to Pettigrew (1990), that culture is not just a concept, but the source of a family of concepts, and it is not just a family of concepts, but also a frame of reference or root metaphor for organisational analysis. This is perhaps reflective of the broad use 'culture'. Indeed, there is no global consensus on what culture means (see Borowsky, 1994; Ortner, 1984). In perhaps its most broad sense, organisational culture is an umbrella concept for a way of thinking that takes an interest in cultural and symbolic phenomena or aspects in organisations. Culture might be understood to be a system of common symbols and meanings, not the totality of a group's way of life (see Alvesson, 2000). Culture then, provides 'the shared rules governing cognitive and affective aspects of membership in an organisation, and the means whereby they are shaped and expressed' (Kunda, 1992,

p.8). Alvesson (2000) described culture according to this view, not as primarily inside people's heads, but somewhere between the heads of a group of people. Such definitions define culture in terms of communication and language use, but more than discourse, and inclusive of symbols and meanings that are publicly expressed during performances, social interactions, meetings, training, travel, perhaps even via electronic media. This perspective differs from culture research that emphasises values and norms. According to Alvesson (2000), the latter tends to be treated as measurable, easily-linked to behaviour and leader control, whereas meaning and symbolism are viewed as more complex and requiring of qualitative and interpretive research designs.

A key question facing researchers and practitioners interested in organisational culture is whether it can be influenced, and it is not surprising that there are a multitude of views this. Drawing from a variety of similar attempts at integrative definitional attributes (e.g. Alvesson, 2002; Martin, 2002; Schein, 1991), they provided a list of characteristics and functions of organisational culture, namely that it: is shared; is stable; has depth; is symbolic, expressive, and subjective; is grounded in history and tradition; is transmitted to new members; provides order and rules to organisational existence; has breadth; is a source of collective identity and commitment; and is unique. Despite these commonalities, given the numerous attributes listed here, it is not surprising that definitions of organisational culture are many and varied.

Most of the definitions – where they are provided – by those researching organisational culture in sport are drawn from general organisational culture literature (e.g. Colyer, 2000; Girginov, 2006; Zevenbergen et al., 2002), with only a small group of researchers adopting a sport-based definition (e.g. Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Scott, 1997). Nevertheless, the most commonly-proffered definition of organi-

sational culture in sport (see Cresswell & Eklund, 1997; Mills & Hoeber, 2013; Southall & Nagle, 2003) is the one originally outlined by Schein (1985). In a more recent revision of his text, Schein (2010) defined organisational culture as:

> *A pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.* (p.18)

Frequently, the term 'organisational culture' is used to describe a view of a sport organisation as a stable and unique amalgamation of meanings. From this perspective, organisations are viewed as microcultures, characterised by their meanings, values and symbols, which are shared by members of the organisation. As such, many of the definitions within sport-based research have been aligned with an integration perspective, as outlined in the preceding section. We now turn our attention from the various conceptualisations and definitions of organisational culture, toward the cultural manifestations or lenses through which it has been studied. In doing so, we focus on the level of analysis and the form that organisational culture takes.

Levels of organisational culture

A central debate within organisational culture research has been the depth or level of analysis. This consideration should not be confused with rigour and reflects the extent to which cultural content is objectively viewable or unobservable. In short, questions of level relate to how much 'digging' is required to unearth the cultural information that is taken for granted and ingrained within organisational life. The principal distinction for approaches adopted by researchers is between what can objectively be observed or espoused versus what is 'really' going on at a deeper level (Ehrhart et al., 2014). A widely-used categorisation of organi-

sational culture level is that outlined by Schein (1985; see, for a recent review, 2010), which includes three levels of organisational culture: artefacts, espoused values and beliefs, and underlying assumptions. Artefacts are readily-accessible by those outside the organisation, but the meaning of which may not be explicit without further insight. They include dress, the organisation of facilities and physical environments, brand, logos, stories, rituals, language and architecture. Importantly, while these artefacts may appear to be similar across organisations, the meaning they have for individuals and teams will vary. It is common for studies of organisational culture to begin with an investigation of the artefacts and follow this with an examination of their symbolic meaning to individuals.

The espoused values of an organisation are those that are articulated by leaders (e.g. performance directors), which may or may not reflect the values or beliefs of followers (e.g. athletes, coaches, support staff). In addition to these idealistic values, of equal importance are those that are communicated and shared through social interaction, and the behaviours of individuals have been labelled the values in use. The challenges of ascertaining what is 'really going on' in a given sport organisation, is arguably why qualitative researchers have had a long-held interest in organisational culture research. Indeed, penetrating the espoused values facade is immeasurably important, but difficult to achieve via questionnaire methods alone. According to Schein, basic underlying assumptions reflect the deepest level of organisational culture and are the core, or essence of the culture. These assumptions that influence the daily behaviours of individuals are often so taken for granted that individuals are unable to articulate and discern them. Indeed, these basics assumptions form around deeper dimensions of human existence. Rousseau (1990) proposed two additional levels to Schein's framework: patterns of behaviour (e.g. how members interact to solve problems) and behavioural norms (i.e. beliefs about acceptable and unacceptable behaviour).

Forms of organisational culture

In addition to considering the level at which they conduct their work, researchers must also consider what forms of culture they will focus on. Martin and Frost (1996) distinguished between generalist (i.e. holistic descriptions of culture with a variety of manifestation) and specialist (i.e. a singular focus on one cultural manifestation) studies. In line with the distinction, several cultural manifestation trends exist, and include, *inter alia*, jargon, myths, stories, legends, folklore, jokes, slogans, rituals, ties, ceremonies, celebrations, traditions, heroes, behavioural norms, rules, taboos, dress and physical arrangements. Trice and Beyer organised these manifestations into four categories (viz. symbols, language, narratives and practices). A symbol can be defined as an object – a word, material, behaviour or phenomenon – that stands ambiguously for something else and/or something more than the object itself (Cohen, 1974). Symbols condense complex meanings in an economic manner. Language may include slang, gestures, signals, songs, humour, jokes, gossip, rumours, metaphors, proverbs and slogans. Narratives, may include legends, stories, sagas and myths. Practices may include rituals, taboos, ceremonies, rites, and socialisation. Now we have considered the levels and forms for studying organisational culture, we will provide a review of the methods used to study and change this phenomenon.

Methodological approaches to studying organisational culture

As noted in the previous sections of this review, there is much contention regarding the conceptualisation and definition of organisational culture. Perhaps not surprisingly, this contention has an influence on debates regarding the most appropriate methods to be adopted for studying – and in turn influencing – organisational culture. Indeed, the methods employed are rightly intertwined with the conceptual and definitional foundations laid by researchers. For instance, those researchers that focus on culture as 'something that organisations *have*' are more likely to employ quantitative methods, and to a lesser degree qualitative, or mixed methods. Those that conceive culture as 'something organisations *are*' almost exclusively use qualitative methods.

In social science, there are two long-standing approaches to understanding the role of culture:

(i) the inside perspective of ethnographers, who strive to describe a culture from the 'native's' point of view; and

(ii) the outside perspective of comparativist researchers, who attempt to describe differences across cultures in terms of a general, external standard.

These approaches loosely reflect emic and etic research perspectives which are often seen as being at odds – as incommensurable paradigms. Indeed, in the large body of literature on organisational culture outside of sport, there has historically been a divide between researchers employing ethnographic methods (Gregory, 1983; Van Maanen, 1988) and those who favour comparative survey research (Schneider, 1990).

Emic accounts of organisational culture typically describe thoughts and actions primarily in terms of the actors' self-understanding – terms that are often culturally and historically bound. Such accounts are often inductively-oriented and conducted by researchers who adopt an insider's view to understand organisations as cultures. As such emic researchers have generally adopted qualitative methods to provide rich descriptions of what occurs in an organisation and such studies are more likely to involve sustained, wide-ranging interviews and observation of a single cultural group (e.g. Schroeder et al., 2010a). In contrast, etic models describe valuable phenomena that compare across cultures, with researchers more likely to adopt a deductive approach, attempt to isolate components of culture, or state hypotheses about their distinct antecedents and consequences, in line with the study of organisations having a culture. As such, etic

research is more likely to involve brief, structured measures or observations of multiple cultural groups across differing settings, and commonly use quantitative methods to examine whether such frameworks are valid in the context they are applied (e.g. Choi & Scott, 2008; Colyer, 2000). In sum, although the two perspectives are defined in terms of theory rather than method, the perspectives lend themselves to differing sets of methods.

To assist organisational culture researchers, Pettigrew (1990) noted seven issues pointing to why this area is so difficult to study:

(i) The levels issue (it is difficult to study deeply held beliefs and assumptions).

(ii) The pervasiveness issue (organisational culture encompasses a broad number of interlocking organisational elements).

(iii) The implicitness issue (organisational culture is taken for granted and rarely explicitly acknowledged and discussed).

(iv) The imprinting issue (culture has deep ties to the history of the organisation).

(v) The political issue (cultural issues are tied to differences in power or status in the organisation).

(vi) The plurality issue (organisations rarely have a single culture, but instead have multiple subcultures).

(vii) The interdependency issue (culture is interconnected with a broad number of other issues both internal and external to the organisation).

In the same year, Schein (1990) proposed five categories for characterising methodological approaches to studying organisational culture, with all but one being qualitative: (i) surveys; (ii) analytical descriptive; (iii) ethnography; (iv) historical; and (v) clinical descriptive. More recently, Davey & Symon (2001) recommended research on organisational culture be divided into two categories:

(i) psychological perspectives that are positivist (i.e. reliant on experiments) and functionalist (i.e. common values held essential for the integration and development of a culture) in their approach;

(ii) anthropological and sociological (i.e. the study of human society) perspectives that are more subjective and interpretive in their approach.

Elsewhere, Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) suggested separating qualitative studies into two categories: (i) holistic studies (i.e. field observations); and (ii) semiotic studies (i.e. studying communication via signs and symbols). Regardless of one's approach to researching organisational culture in sport, there is more nuance than a simple dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative methods and several researchers have noted strengths and weaknesses of each methodological approach depending on the research goal (see Ehrhart et al., 2014; Rousseau, 1990). To elaborate, both Rousseau and later Ehrhart et al., noted strengths and weaknesses of both qualitative and quantitative methods, and concluded that richer insights can be yielded when using multiple methods, given this coupling allows researchers to take advantage of the strengths of both approaches, while avoiding some of the weaknesses of using either approach exclusively.

Concluding thoughts

This review of conceptual, definitional and methodological approaches to the study of organisational culture showcases a very complex phenomenon. Indeed, organisational culture within and outwith the fields of sport management and sport psychology is not consistently approached or defined, and a multitude of methodological approaches have been employed. What is apparent from the preceding review, is that scholars researching organisational culture in sport have been heavily influenced by the field of organisational science, yet in that domain there is no 'gold standard' approach to understanding and studying organisational culture, despite many years of debate. We conclude by providing some recommendations for researchers and practitioners seeking to advise on organisational culture

change. These are certainly not intended to be exhaustive, and we merely hope to extend reader reflection.

Understanding organisational culture

The primary distinction observed within the extant literature on organisational culture has been between those that conceive culture as something organisations *have* or something organisations *are*. Research aligned with the former treats organisational culture as a variable that can be harnessed for competitive advantage in sport. The goal is to understand how to change or remove a culture to benefit leaders. Research aligned with the latter captures holistic individual experiences, meanings and symbols, and typically includes individuals at various levels of organisations. We see value in conceptual and methodological innovation, but also note the importance of researchers clearly locating their work in line with the existing categorisations of organisational culture work.

Conceptual congruence

One of the largest challenges in this literature is the conceptual ambiguity. In many cases, researchers fail to define or consistently define their conceptual perspective, leaving the reader unclear as to how the work 'fits' into existing organisational culture knowledge. While conceptual precision might facilitate the comparison of studies and potentially the sequential development of ideas within this field, it would be impractical to call for a one-size-fits-all approach to organisational culture, particularly with the common use of subjectivist–interpretive approaches and emic, insider accounts. As such, we recommend that researchers strive for conceptual congruence, whereby their work is presented with alignment of methodological choice with underlying epistemological assumptions (e.g. narrative inquiry with social constructionism), thus ensuring a 'golden thread' across the conceptual, definitional, methodological and interpretive elements of their work.

The unit of analysis

The appropriate unit of analysis is a crucial issue in organisational research, as in many cases the focal unit of interest is a team or organisation. In the case of organisational culture research, the dilemma is that the variable of interest, culture, is often measured at the individual level. In other words, individuals are asked for their perceptions of the culture of their sport organisation. This results in differing levels of data measurement and analysis, whereby data is collected at the individual level but analysis takes place at the group level, to reflect culture as a collective phenomenon. Although problematic, this approach is defensible if appropriate aggregation processes are used (i.e. multilevel analyses). In order to aggregate individual data to a group level, correspondence is needed among the cultural definition, the level of data collection (e.g. individual, team, organisation) and the data analysis to ensure methodological congruence.

Developing organisational culture

As sport psychology researchers attempt to decode organisational culture, a key consideration will be how and why the culture developed in the way it did. Schein (2010) argued that organisational founders, or significant forebears are likely to bring their assumptions and beliefs to the organisation and reinforce these through what they pay attention to, devote resource to, and how they react to crises. Schein went on to propose that these are reinforced through secondary mechanisms such as organisational procedures, rites and rituals, the design of space, stories and formal statements. Practitioners and leaders in sport organisations might reflect on how they reinforce beliefs, values and assumptions, or how they reinforce those of a previous leader. Additionally, monitoring subgroups and cliques might provide an insight into the development of organisational culture.

Maintaining organisational culture

Sport organisations are sites of substantial turnover and change, and the recruitment

of performance staff is a constant consideration. It follows that individuals within organisations should give consideration to the maintenance of culture when newcomers arrive, how newcomers are socialised to learn about the culture of the organisation. Indeed, scholars have increasingly acknowledged the need for organisations to invest resources in socialisation processes for new members (Wagstaff & Larner, 2015). Yet research is required to better understand these processes.

Organisational culture change

A key question facing researchers and practitioners interested in organisational culture is whether it can be influenced, and it is not surprising that there are a multitude of views this. Some researchers believe organisational culture to be relatively stable regardless of personnel or environmental change (e.g. Schein, 2010), whereas, others (e.g. Alvesson et al., 2017) have argued that individuals have relatively little effect on culture. Ehrhart et al. (2014) concluded that a contingency perspective is perhaps most appropriate, such that there are times when leadership can have a strong influence on organisational culture and other times when such efforts will likely fail. Clearly, intervention research is largely missing from sport organisational culture literature (cf. Henriksen, 2015), yet it is clear that such efforts are highly complex.

Leader-led or leader-informed

Many organisational culture in sport researchers have acknowledged the valuable role of leadership. Hence, researchers and scholars might avail themselves of the growing research on transformational leadership (see, for a review, Arthur et al., 2017) and transformational coaching (see, for a review, Turnnidge & Côté, 2018). Briefly, these approaches concern the management of meaning and emphasise culture more than conventional leadership and coaching approaches, which have typically focused on behavioural typologies, coach–athlete rela-

tionships and outcomes, and devoted less attention to values and emotions. As such, organisational leaders might actively cultivate the symbolic significance of shared meaning, a common history, a golden age, idiosyncratic leaders and dramatic results, which may distinguish the organisation and guide culture. Elsewhere, Cruickshank and Collins (2014) reported that sceptical, social dominance, Machiavellian/mischievous, and performance-focused ruthlessness behaviours were all employed during leaders' efforts to deliver change in their performance teams. It was notable that these leaders also felt that these behaviours, when appropriately engaged, were important and effective parts of their repertoire. Cruickshank and Collins noted that some of these behaviours might align with transformational approaches, but called for further examination to further illuminate these links given their development of themes that did not relate to transformational approaches. Conceptual and epistemological debates aside, clearly leadership has an important role to play within the study and influence of organisational culture in sport and we would advise readers to explore leadership theory as part of their upskilling. We do not believe that exclusively leader-led approaches to organisational culture are appropriate, but we do feel that researchers and practitioners should be leader-informed from a theoretical perspective.

The purpose and value of organisational culture work

Most of extant research on organisational culture in sport is focused on using this knowledge for competitive advantage reasons (e.g. talent development, asset maximisation). We are not naive to recommend that sport organisations forgo their performance pursuit, but call on researchers and scholars to encourage a balance between performance and wellbeing in their attempts to study or influence organisational culture. Here we see much value in incorporating the spirit, approaches and methods allied

with cultural sport psychology. That is, this field has generally focused on marginalised voices, and self-identity in a move away from the 'eliteness' of traditional sport psychology research. Unfortunately, the world of elite sport is volatile, complex and results-driven, and it is likely that some organisational leaders will have little patience for 'culture', if performance does not follow or even precede. Given the global sporting arms race which has begun to characterise elite sport (cf. Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009), what scholars, practitioners and organisations must ensure is that there is no domination of what Alvesson et al. (2017) have labelled 'the corporate beauty industry', whereby aesthetic and decorative surfaces (e.g. facilities, marquee athletes, corporate and socially-mediated brand) lead to a disconnect between impression management and cultural orientation to distort 'normal' or 'necessary'.

To conclude, sport psychologists have some catching up to do in terms of understanding organisational culture, and ought to be compelled to do so given the conflu-ence of research and applied themes. Nevertheless, organisational culture remains a contentious and complex phenomenon with regards to conceptual, definitional and methodological perspectives. We hope this review has brought to the attention of the readership some of the debates and challenges within the field of organisational culture and hope this stimulates discourse, reflection and action to progress this line of inquiry.

Authors

Christopher R.D. Wagstaff, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom; **Suzanna Burton-Wylie,** Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, UK

Correspondence

Christopher R.D. Wagstaff, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, Spinnaker Building, Cambridge Road, Portsmouth PO1 2ER; chris.wagstaff@port.ac.uk

References

Alvesson, M. (1993). Organizations as rhetoric: Knowledge-intensive firms and the struggle with ambiguity. *Journal of Management Studies, 30*(6), 997–1015.

Alvesson, M. (2000). Social identity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(8), 1101–1124.

Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organizational culture.* London: Sage.

Alvesson, M., Karreman, D. & Ybema, S. (2017). Studying culture in organizations: Not taking for granted the taken-for-granted. In A. Wilkinson, S.J. Armstrong & M. Lounsbury (Eds.) *The Oxford book of management* (pp.103–126). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aoyagi, M.W., Cox, R.H. & McGuire, R.T. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior in sport: Relationships with leadership, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 20*(1), 25–41.

Arnold, R. & Fletcher, D. (2012). A research synthesis and taxonomic classification of the organizational stressors encountered by sport performers. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 34*(3), 397–429.

Arnold, R., Fletcher, D. & Daniels, K. (2013). Development and validation of the organizational stressor indicator for sport performers (OSI-SP). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 35*(2), 180–196.

Arnold, R., Wagstaff, C.R.D., Steadman, L. & Pratt, Y. (2017). The organisational stressors encountered by athletes with a disability. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 35*(12), 1187–1196.

Arthur, C.A., Wagstaff, C.R.D. & Hardy, L. (2017). Leadership in sport organizations. In C.R.D. Wagstaff (Ed.) *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp.153–175). Abingdon: Routledge.

Borowsky, R. (Ed.) (1994). *Assessing cultural anthropology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Choi, Y.S. & Scott, D.K. (2008). Assessing organisational culture using the competing values framework within American Triple-A baseball. *International Journal of Sport Management, 4*(1), 33–48.

Cohen, A. (1974). *Two-dimensional man: An essay in the anthropology of power and symbolism in complex society.* London: Routledge.

Colyer, S. (2000). Organizational culture in selected Western Australian sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 14*(4), 321–341.

Cresswell, S.L. & Eklund, R.C. (2007). Athlete burnout and organizational culture: An English rugby replication. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 38*(4), 365–387.

Cruickshank, A. & Collins, D. (2014). Illuminating and applying 'The Dark Side': Insights from elite team leaders. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 27*(3), 249–267.

Cruickshank, A. & Collins, D. & Minten, S. (2013). Culture change in a professional sports team: Shaping environmental contexts and regulating power. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 8*(2), 271–290. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.8.2.271

Cruickshank, A., Collins, D. & Minten, S. (2014). Driving and sustaining culture change in Olympic sport performance teams: A first exploration and grounded theory. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 36*(1), 107–120. doi:10.1123/jsep.2013-0133

Davey, K.M. & Symon, G. (2001). Recent approaches to the qualitative analysis of organizational culture. C. Cooper, S. Cartwright, P. Earley (Eds.) *The international handbook of organisational culture and climate* (pp.123–142). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Doherty, A.J. & Chelladurai, P. (1999). Managing cultural diversity in sport organizations: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 13*(4), 280–297.

Ehrhart, M., Schneider, B., Macey, W. (2014). *Organizational climate and culture.* New York: Routledge.

Fletcher, D. & Arnold, R. (2011). A qualitative study of performance leadership and management in elite sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 23*(2), 223–242.

Fletcher, D. & Wagstaff, C.R.D. (2009). Organizational psychology in elite sport: Its emergence, application, and future. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*(4), 427–434. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.03.009.

Frontiera, J. (2010). Leadership and organizational culture transformation in professional sport. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17*(1), 71–86. doi:10.1177/1548051809345253

Gilmore, S., Wagstaff, C.R.D. & Smith, J. (2018). Sports psychology in the English Premier League: 'It feels precarious and is precarious'. *Work, Employment and Society, 32*(2), 426–435.

Girginov, V. (2006). Creating a corporate anti-doping culture: The role of Bulgarian sports governing bodies. *Sport in Society, 9*(2), 252–268.

Girginov, V. (2010). Culture and the study of sport management. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 10*(4), 397–417.

Gould, D., Greenleaf, C., Guinan, D. & Chung, Y. (2002). A survey of US Olympic coaches: Variables perceived to have influenced athlete performances and coach effectiveness. *The Sport Psychologist, 16*(3), 229–250.

Gregory, K.L. (1983). Native-view paradigms: Multiple cultures and culture conflicts in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 171–183.

Greenleaf, C., Gould, D. & Dieffenbach, K. (2001). Factors influencing Olympic performance: Interviews with Atlanta and Nagano US Olympians. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13*(2), 154–184.

Grey-Thompson, T. (2017). *Duty of care in sport review.* Independent report to government. Available at www.gov.uk/government/publications/duty-of-care-in-sport-review

Henriksen, K. & Stambulova, N. (2017). Creating optimal environments for talent development: A holistic ecological approach. In J. Baker, S. Cobley, J. Schorer and N. Wattie (Eds.) *Routledge handbook of talent identification and development in sport* (pp.271–284). Abingdon: Routledge.

Henriksen, K., Stambulova, N. & Roessler, K.K. (2010a). Holistic approach to athletic talent development environments: A successful sailing milieu. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 11*(3), 212–222.

Henriksen, K., Stambulova, N. & Roessler, K.K. (2010b). Successful talent development in track and field: Considering the role of environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 20*, 122–132.

Henriksen, K., Stambulova, N. & Roessler, K.K. (2011). Riding the wave of an expert: A successful talent development environment in kayaking. *Sport Psychologist, 25*(3), 341–362.

Henriksen, K. (2015). Developing a high-performance culture: A sport psychology intervention from and ecological perspective in elite orienteering. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 6*(3), 141–153.

Hings, R.F., Wagstaff, C.R., Anderson, V., Gilmore, S. & Thelwell, R.C. (2018). Professional challenges in elite sports medicine and science: Composite vignettes of practitioner emotional labor. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 35*, 66–73.

Jones, G., Gittins, M. & Hardy, L. (2009). Creating an environment where high performance is inevitable and sustainable: The high-performance environment model. *Annual Review of High Performance Coaching & Consulting, 10*, 139–149.

Kaiser, S., Engel, F. & Keiner, R. (2009). Structure-dimensional Analysis. An experimental approach to culture in sport organisations. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 9*(3), 295–310.

Kunda, Z. (1992). Can dissonance theory do it all? *Psychological Inquiry, 3*(4), 337–339.

Larner, R.J., Wagstaff, C.R.D., Thelwell, R.C, & Corbett, J. (2017). A multistudy examination of organizational stressors, emotional labor, burnout, and turnover in sport organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 27*(12), 2103-2115. doi:10.1111/sms.12833.

Larsen, C.H., Alfermann, D., Henriksen, K. & Christensen, M.K. (2013). Successful talent development in soccer: The characteristics of the environment. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 2*(3), 190–206.

Maitland, A., Hills, L.A. & Rhind, D. J. (2015). Organisational culture in sport: A systematic review. *Sport Management Review, 18*(4), 501–516. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.11.004

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain.* London: Sage.

Martin, J. & Meyerson, D. (1988). Organizational culture and the denial, channelling and acknowledgement of ambiguity. In L.R. Pondy, R. Boland & H. Thomas (Eds.) *Managing ambiguity and change* (pp.93–125). New York: Wiley.

Martin, J. & Frost, P. (1996). The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. Nord (Eds.) Handbook of organization studies (pp.599–621). London: Sage.

Martin, J. & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(2), 52–64.

Martin, L.J., Eys, M.A., & Spink, K.S. (2017). The social environment in sport organizations. In C.R.D. Wagstaff (Ed.) *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp.217–234). Abington: Routledge.

McGannon, K.R. & Smith, B. (2015). Centralizing culture in cultural sport psychology research: The potential of narrative inquiry and discursive psychology. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 17*, 79–87.

Mills, C. & Hoeber, L. (2013). Exploring organizational culture through artifacts in a community figure skating club. *Journal of Sport Management, 27*(6), 482–496.

Ouchi, W.G. & Wilkins, A.L. (1985). Organizational culture. *Annual Review of Sociology, 11*(1), 457–483.

Ortner, S. (1984). Theory in anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 26*, 126–166.

Pacanowsky, M.E. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. *Communications Monographs, 50*(2), 126–147.

Pain, M.A., Harwood, C. & Mullen, R. (2012). Improving the performance environment of a soccer team during a competitive season: An exploratory action research study. *The Sport Psychologist, 26*(3), 390–411.

Parent, M.M. & MacIntosh, E.W. (2013)schein. Organizational culture evolution in temporary organizations: The case of the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 30*(4), 223–237.

Pettigrew, A. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: Two constructs in search of a role. In B. Schneider (Ed.) *Organizational climate and culture* (pp.413–433). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rousseau, D.M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(5), 389–400.

Ryba, T.V., Schinke, R.J. & Tenenbaum, G. (2010). *The cultural turn in sport psychology.* Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E.H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E.H. (1991). *What is culture?* Newbury Park: Sage.

Schinke, R. & Hanrahan, S.J. (2009). *Cultural sport psychology.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Schroeder, P.J. (2010a). A model for assessing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 3*, 98–118.

Schroeder, P.J. (2010b). Changing team culture: The perspectives of ten successful head coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 33*(1), 63–88.

Scott, D. K. (1997). Managing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic organizations. *Quest, 49*(4), 403–415.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*(3), 339–358.

Southall, R.M. & Nagel, M.S. (2003). Content analysis of athlete handbooks from selected NCAA division I-A athletic departments. *International Journal of Sport Management, 4*(3), 179–191.

Swindler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review, 51*(2), 273–286.

Trice, H.M. (1991). Comments and discussion. In P. Frost et al. (Eds.) *Reframing organizational culture* (pp.298–308). Newbury Park: Sage.

Turnnidge, J. & Côté, J. (2018). Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 16*(3), 327–342.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Van Maanen, J,. & Barley, S.R. (1985). Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.) *Organizational culture* (pp.31–54). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Wagstaff, C.R.D. (2017). Organizational psychology in sport: An introduction. In C.R.D. Wagstaff (Ed.) *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp.1–8). Abingdon: Routledge.

Wagstaff, C.R.D. (2019). Taking stock of organizational psychology in sport: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 31.*

Wagstaff, C.R.D., Fletcher, D. & Hanton, S. (2012). Positive organizational psychology in sport. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 5*(2), 87–103. doi:10.1080/1750 984X.2011.634920.

Wagstaff, C.R.D., Gilmore, S. & Thelwell, R.C. (2015). Sport medicine and sport science practitioners' experiences of organizational change. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 25*(5), 685–698. doi:10.1111/sms.12340.

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. doi: 10.1080/14697017.2015.1062793.

Wagstaff, C.R.D. & Hanton, S. (2017). Emotions in sport organizations. In C.R.D. Wagstaff (Ed.) *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp.33–61). Abingdon: Routledge.

Wagstaff, C.R.D., Hanton, S. & Fletcher, D. (2013). Developing emotion abilities and regulation strategies in a sport organization: An action research intervention. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*(4), 476–487. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.01.006

Wagstaff, C.R.D. & Larner, R.J. (2015). Organisational psychology in sport: Recent developments and a research agenda. In S. Mellalieu & S. Hanton (Eds.) *Contemporary advances in sport psychology: A review* (pp.91–110). Abingdon: Routledge.

Wagstaff, C.R.D. & Thelwell, R.C. (2016). Athletes' responses to managerial change. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 38*, S267.

Weese, W.J. (1995). Leadership and organizational culture: An investigation of the Big Ten and American Conference campus recreation administrations. *Journal of Sport Management, 9*(2), 119–134.

Weese, W.J. (1996). Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Sport Management, 10*(2), 197–206.

Young, E. (1989). On the naming of the rose: Interests and multiple meanings as elements of organizational culture. *Organization Studies, 10*(2), 187–206.

Zevenbergen, R., Edwards, A. & Skinner, J. (2002). Junior golf club culture: A Bourdieuian analysis. *Sociology of Sport Online, 5*(1), 1–15.