



REVISTA AMBIENTE CONTÁBIL

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte

ISSN 2176-9036

Vol. 17, n. 2, Jul./Dez., 2025

Sítios: <https://periodicos.ufrn.br/index.php/ambiente>

<http://www.atena.org.br/revista/ojs-2.2.3-06/index.php/Ambiente>

Article received in: March, 21th, 2024. Reviewed by pairs in: July, 25th, 2024. Reformulated in: September, 09th, 2024. Evaluated by the system double blind review.

DOI: 10.21680/2176-9036.2025v17n2ID40750

Analysis of the disclosure of governance practices in brazilian olympic confederations

Análisis de la divulgación de prácticas de gobernanza en confederaciones olímpicas brasileñas

Análise da divulgação de práticas de governança em confederações olímpicas brasileiras

Authors

Izabela Maria de Azevedo

Master in Accounting in the Postgraduate Program (PPGC) of the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). Specialization in Tax Management and Finance from the University of Vale do Itajaí (2021). Bachelor in Accounting Sciences from the University of Vale do Itajaí (2017). Address: Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima, Trindade, Florianópolis – SC, Brasil. CEP: 88040-900. Identifiers (ID):

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7317-4413>

Research Gate: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Izabela-De-Azevedo>

Google Citations: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=ViIhXuQAAAAJ&hl=en>

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4931276689803013>

E-mail: izabelaazevedom@gmail.com

Fábio Minatto

PhD student in the Postgraduate Program in Accounting (PPGC) at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). Master's degree from the Postgraduate Program in Accounting at UFSC (2020). Bachelor's degree in Accounting from the Federal University of Santa Catarina (2017). Address: Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima, Trindade, Florianópolis – SC, Brasil. CEP: 88040-900. Identifiers (ID):

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4004-4086>

Research Gate: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fabio-Minatto>

Google Citations: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=8FFA2NAAAAAJ&hl=en>

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9720067599987952>

E-mail: fabio_minatto@hotmail.com

José Alonso Borba

Graduated in Accounting Sciences, Master in Management Accounting from FGV and PhD in Controllershship and Accounting from USP - University of São Paulo. He was a Visiting Scholar at UIUC - University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He did post-doctorate studies at HEC - Hautes Études Commerciales de Montréal and at Rutgers University. Full Professor at UFSC -

Federal University of Santa Catarina. Since 2004 he has been the leader of the Center for Studies in Accounting and Controllershship linked to CNPQ. Address: Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima, Trindade, Florianópolis – SC, Brasil. CEP: 88040-900. Identifiers (ID):
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6068-342X>
 Research Gate: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jose-Borba-3>
 Google Citations: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=eKA1upoAAAAJ&hl=en>
 Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3742827352808357>
 E-mail: jalonsoborba@hotmail.com

(The article was presented at the XVII Congress organized by the National Association of Postgraduate Programs in Accounting Sciences - ANPCont - at the Mackenzie Presbyterian University in São Paulo in December/2023)

Abstract

Purpose: The objective of this study is to analyze the level of compliance in the disclosure of governance practices in sports confederations, according to the of the Governance Indicator in Sports Entities (IGEE) check-list.

Methodology: The research is applied, quantitative, and descriptive. A documentary survey was conducted for the period from 2017 to 2022 using the check-list proposed for the IGEE on the official websites of the study sample, which includes 34 Brazilian Olympic confederations and the Brazilian Olympic Committee (COB). The construction of the IGEE combines elements from other similar indicators applied to sports organizations and related entities. It consists of 66 questions distributed across five dimensions: organizational transparency, financial-accounting reports, democracy, control and integrity, and solidarity.

Results: The organizations disclosed, on average, 64% of the items in the Sports Governance Indicator (IGEE). The findings indicate the need for improvements in the disclosure of strategic information and the publication and development of social projects. There was evidence of a predominance of men in management positions, and the long tenure of presidents in some confederations is a point that requires attention.

Contributions of the study: They are related to the development of empirical research on governance in sports entities in Brazil through an indicator applicable across different periods, the IGEE, allowing for a temporal analysis of governance practices within these entities. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of these organizations to the social environment, noting that many of them rely on public funding in Brazil. By providing a comparative assessment of governance practices, the IGEE also contributes to enhancing the transparency of these entities.

Keywords: Confederations; Governance in sport; Sports governance indicator.

Resumen

Objetivo: El objetivo de este trabajo es analizar el nivel de cumplimiento en la divulgación de las prácticas de gobernanza en confederaciones deportivas, de acuerdo con la lista de verificación del Indicador de Gobernanza en Entidades Deportivas (IGEE).

Metodología: La investigación es de tipo aplicada, cuantitativa y descriptiva. Se realizó un levantamiento documental del período de 2017 a 2022 utilizando la lista de verificación

propuesta para el IGEE en los sitios web oficiales de la muestra del estudio, que incluye 34 confederaciones olímpicas brasileñas y el Comité Olímpico Brasileño (COB). La construcción del IGEE combina elementos de otros indicadores similares aplicados a organizaciones deportivas y entidades relacionadas. Está compuesto por 66 cuestiones distribuidas en cinco dimensiones: transparencia organizacional, informes contables-financieros, democracia, control e integridad, y solidaridad.

Resultados: Las organizaciones divulgaron, en promedio, el 64% de los ítems del Indicador de Gobernanza en Entidades Deportivas (IGEE). Los hallazgos indican la necesidad de mejorar la divulgación de información estratégica y la publicación y desarrollo de proyectos sociales. Se evidenció la predominancia de hombres en cargos de gestión, y la larga permanencia de presidentes en algunas confederaciones es un punto que requiere atención.

Contribuciones del estudio: Están relacionadas con el desarrollo de investigaciones empíricas sobre la gobernanza en entidades deportivas en Brasil mediante un indicador aplicable en diferentes períodos, el IGEE, que permite un análisis temporal de las prácticas de gobernanza en estas entidades. Además, se enfatiza la importancia de estas organizaciones para el entorno social, y en Brasil, muchas de ellas sobreviven gracias a recursos públicos. Al proporcionar una evaluación comparativa de las prácticas de gobernanza, el IGEE también contribuye a mejorar la transparencia de estas entidades.

Palabras clave: Confederaciones; Gobernanza en el deporte; Indicador de gobernanza en el deporte.

Resumo

Objetivo: O objetivo deste trabalho é analisar o nível de conformidade na divulgação das práticas de governança em confederações esportivas, conforme *check-list* do Indicador de Governança em Entidades Esportivas (IGEE).

Metodologia: A pesquisa é do tipo aplicada, quantitativa, descritiva, e foi realizado um levantamento documental do período de 2017 a 2022, através do *check-list* proposto para o IGEE nos *websites* oficiais da amostra do estudo, composta por 34 confederações olímpicas brasileiras e do COB. A construção do IGEE é uma combinação de outros indicadores semelhantes aplicados a organizações esportivas e entidades afins, é composto por 66 questões, distribuídas em cinco dimensões: transparência organizacional, relatórios contábeis-financeiros, democracia, controle e integridade e solidariedade.

Resultados: As organizações divulgaram em média 64% dos itens do Indicador de Governança em Entidades Esportivas (IGEE), os achados indicam a necessidade de melhorias nas divulgações de informações estratégicas e publicação e desenvolvimento de projetos sociais. Evidenciou-se a predominância de homens em cargos de gestão, e a longa permanência de presidentes em algumas confederações é um ponto que requer atenção.

Contribuições do estudo: estão relacionadas ao desenvolvimento de pesquisas empíricas em torno do tema de governança em entidades esportivas no Brasil por meio de um indicador que é aplicável em diferentes períodos, o IGEE, permitindo uma análise temporal das práticas de governança nessas entidades. Além disso, enfatiza-se a importância dessas organizações para o meio social e, no Brasil, muitas delas sobrevivem por meio de recursos públicos. Ao fornecer uma avaliação comparativa das práticas de governança, o IGEE contribui também para aprimoramento da transparência dessas entidades.

Palavras-chave: Confederações; Governança no esporte; Indicador de governança no esporte.

1 Introduction

Governance in sports organizations has become an increasingly significant concern in academic literature. A series of governance failures in the sports sector has highlighted the need for further research. Illustrative examples include cases in Ireland and the United Kingdom, where questions have been raised regarding financial responsibility, such as the cost overruns and delays associated with Wembley Stadium in London and the expenses incurred during the construction of Aviva Stadium in Dublin (O’Boyle, 2012).

Governments in New Zealand and Australia, for instance, have recommended extensive reviews within their countries, with a central focus on this sector (Ferkins et al., 2010). One of the most pressing issues in achieving effective governance in sports relates to misconduct; even in environments where codes have been implemented, such issues persist (Geeraert & van Eekeren, 2021).

Brazil shares these global concerns regarding sports governance. The Brazilian sports landscape is represented by sports confederations, which are organizations that coordinate sports entities at the national level, with each confederation overseeing a specific sports modality. These organizations are linked to the Brazilian Olympic Committee (COB), and their primary funding comes from public resources, mostly derived from the Agnelo Piva Law (LAP), which allocates a portion of federal lottery proceeds to the COB and the Brazilian Paralympic Committee (CPB).

The allocation of resources via LAP to sports confederations is based on criteria determined by the COB and CPB. A portion of the funding is merit-based, considering the performance of each confederation in championships and competitions. In other words, the greater the number of medals and achievements, the higher the level of funding received (Parent et al., 2021; Seippel, 2019). Beyond merit, the confederations must also comply with the requirements established by Certifications 18 and 18A, which include detailed documents, fiscal and labor compliance, and accountability.

In recent years, Brazil hosted significant sporting events including the 2007 Pan American Games, the 2011 Military World Games, the 2013 Confederations Cup, the 2014 FIFA World Cup, and the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Mazzei & Rocco Júnior, 2017). However, following this sequence of major events between 2007 and 2016, significant instability and structural deficiencies were observed within sports governing bodies, such as confederations, particularly in their governance practices (Fender, 2022).

The organization of large-scale sporting events often creates expectations of improved infrastructure and enhanced organizational frameworks. In Brazil's case, however, these expectations were not fully realized. Challenges persist, including a lack of professional management in sports, insufficient ethical standards, a limited strategic vision, and inadequate accountability (Mazzei & Rocco Júnior, 2017).

Inefficient management and lack of transparency are recurring issues in sports entities. There are failures in government coordination and regulation, as well as deficiencies in control procedures, which are not applied transparently and efficiently (Henry & Lee, 2004). A study conducted by Sports Policy Factors Leading to International Sporting Success (SPLISS) highlights that Brazil's primary failure lies not in the volume of resources invested but in their misapplication. The study further indicates that Brazil presents the worst governance and

administrative structure indexes among sports organizations, warning that certain processes associated with the COB are perceived as undemocratic (Observatório do Esporte, 2019).

Within Brazilian sports organizations, multiple actors play pivotal roles in sports governance. These organizations operate within a network of interests and influences that shape how sports are practiced and managed. These actors are identified as stakeholders, with key players including athletes, administrators, sponsors, the media, government representatives, and others. In this context, stakeholder theory plays a pivotal role in addressing these governance challenges, as it emphasizes the importance of equitable management practices that treat all stakeholders fairly. In other words, it underscores the need to consider all involved parties – from athletes to sponsors – as a means of positively influencing sports governance. Studies such as Ribeiro and Costa (2017) highlight the positive impact of stakeholders on the management of sports governance.

Sports organizations should responsibly promote the practice of sports, aiming for balance and transparency in financial resource management. This is particularly relevant in Brazil, where most of these organizations rely on public funding. Such circumstances highlight the critical need for transparency and robust governance practices. Therefore, the analysis of governance quality in sports entities. Such circumstances highlight the critical need for transparency and robust governance practices.

Given this scenario, the research problem is defined as follows: **What is the level of compliance in the disclosure of governance practices in sports confederations?** Accordingly, the objective of this study is to analyze the level of compliance in the disclosure of governance practices in sports confederations, based on a checklist from the Sports Entity Governance Indicator (IGEE).

The IGEE was developed as a synthesis of other similar indicators applied to sports organizations and related entities, drawing on relevant national and international studies, including Chappelet & Mrkonjic (2013), Geeraert (2018), Henry & Lee (2004), Parent et al. (2021), and Thompson et al. (2022). It comprises sixty-six items distributed across five dimensions, namely: organizational transparency, financial accounting report transparency, representation and democracy, control and integrity, and solidarity.

Given the complexities and challenges of management in the sports sector, the development of IGEE offers a means to evaluate governance practices within these entities. The study contributes to advancing empirical research on the governance of Brazilian sports organizations by introducing an indicator that allows for longitudinal analysis of governance practices. Moreover, it underscores the societal significance of these organizations, many of which in Brazil depend on public funding. By providing a comparative evaluation of governance practices, IGEE also contributes to enhancing transparency within these entities. The results derived from the IGEE are measured and analyzed, with comparisons drawn against the studies that informed the development of the indicator.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Governance in Sports Entities

Sports governance pertains to the formulation of policies that guide the exercise of power and authority within these organizations, including eligibility criteria and regulatory

power, at local, national, or international levels (Hums & MacLean, 2017). Henry and Lee (2004) conceptualized sports governance across three interrelated dimensions: organizational, systemic, and political. Each dimension introduces unique challenges to sports management, requiring managers to exhibit flexibility and possess a diverse range of skills and competencies. Governance in sports organizations is characterized by its variability and peculiar features.

Dowling, Leopkey, and Smith (2018) conducted a scoping review of the literature on sports governance from 1980 to 2016. Their findings indicate a notable increase in research on the topic in recent years. However, despite these contributions, there remains a need for further empirical and theoretical studies in this area. This growing interest in sports governance can be attributed, in large part, to corruption scandals and misconduct within the management of sports organizations (Thompson et al., 2022). Nonetheless, these scandals and instances of misconduct have, paradoxically, had a positive effect by encouraging sports organizations to pursue greater professionalization to combat corruption and enhance management practices (Seippel, 2019).

Empirical governance literature is broadly supported by Agency Theory. The perspective of this theory is that there is a conflicting relationship between stakeholders who form a set of contracts. Specifically, it addresses the dynamic between the principal, who hires an agent to carry out decision-making processes, and the inherent conflicts of interest arising from their differing roles and objectives (Jensen & Meckling, 2009; Lacruz, 2020; Massicotte & Henri, 2021). Parent et al. (2021) note that studies on sports governance commonly adopt Stakeholder Theory and examine the organization, stakeholders, and the interaction between them. Stakeholder Theory, also known as the theory of interested parties, was initially presented in Freeman's work (1984) and has since undergone significant evolution. Originating from sociology, conflict management, and organizational behavior, the theory advocates for equitable treatment of all stakeholders (Boaventura et al., 2009; Harrison et al., 2015).

Stakeholders are defined as individuals, organizations, or groups with a vested interest in the processes and outcomes of the organization and upon whom the organization depends to achieve its goals. Stakeholder Theory is considered a practical framework, as all organizations must manage their stakeholders. It has become a critical tool for promoting corporate responsibility (Fassin, 2010; Freeman, 1984; Harrison et al., 2015). Fassin (2010) illustrated Freeman's stakeholder theory model (1984) through graphical representations, citing the case of the Olympic torch and the Beijing Olympic Games to demonstrate the dynamics of the torch's journey, the various stakeholders involved, and the political pressures as a potential risk factor.

Stakeholder Theory also presents an uncharted yet dynamic framework for management professionals, offering substantial opportunities to reassess and reinterpret existing concepts and models (Harrison et al., 2015; Ribeiro & Costa, 2017). Under stakeholder theory, all management decisions should consider the interests of these parties. It is inherently a management approach rooted in the moral and ethical treatment of stakeholders (Harrison et al., 2015). In the context of sports organizations, stakeholders encompass anyone with a vested interest in the organization's outcomes.

In sports organizations, stakeholder dynamics significantly influence the organizational structure, including board composition and strategic direction, as stakeholders may also be members of these bodies. In other words, managing a sports entity becomes even more complex due to the need to satisfy a wide range of interests (Parent et al., 2021). Governance in sports entities is essential to ensuring their integrity and long-term sustainability. In this regard, governance principles establish a framework of practices and guidelines designed to promote transparent and ethical management, which is essential for effective sports governance.

A systematic review of governance principles in sports across European countries, conducted by Thompson et al. (2022) identified 258 principles, most of which were derived from non-empirical sources, such as working groups and government bodies. These principles

predominantly focus on transparency, accountability, democracy, and board governance. The authors highlight the need for further development in this area and encourage researchers to seek more robust governance principles.

Table 1

Literature on governance indicators in sports entities

Authors	Observations	Dimensions/Principles	Description
Henry e Lee (2004)	The term "organizational governance" is used for sports organizations because, according to the authors, there is a broader set of responsibilities than traditional notions of corporate governance.	Transparency	Associated with clarity in procedures and decision-making
		Accountability	Relates to financial-accounting reports
		Democracy	Representation through boards, groups, managers
		Responsibility	Sustainable development of the organization
		Equity	Related to fairness with the organization's participants
		Efficiency	Establishment and monitoring of achievable goals
		Effectiveness	More efficient use of resources
Chappelet e Mrkonjic (2013)	A tool called Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport (BIGIS) was introduced, an assessment tool for international sport. The proposal is to measure governance levels through seven dimensions.	Organizational Transparency	Evaluates how key documents and official information are disclosed (statutes, rules, organizational chart, vision, mission, values, agendas, etc.)
		Financial Reports Transparency	Evaluates key annual reports, disclosed financial information, and audited reports
		Stakeholder Representation	Evaluates how stakeholders are represented in the organization (athletes, coaches, medical staff, suppliers, partners, volunteers, etc.)
		Democratic Process	Evaluates democratic processes (meetings, candidate regulations, voting, conflict of interest, term limits, age, gender balance, etc.)
		Control Mechanisms	Evaluates the controls and appropriate procedures for activities and decisions (governance principles, integrated management control system, committees, transparency)
		Sports Integrity	Ensures sports integrity (code of ethics and integrity, conflict of interest regulations, anti-doping, awareness programs, whistleblower channels, sustainable development, etc.)
		Solidarity	Evaluates if the organization invests its surpluses appropriately according to the objectives of a non-profit organization and if there are policies for this, community assistance programs, career programs for athletes, etc.
Geerart (2018)	An indicator was developed to evaluate governance in international sports federations.	Transparency	Regarding the internal functioning of the organization
		Democratic Process	Implies conducting fair, free, and competitive elections, with open and fair internal debates
		Internal Responsibility and Control	Refers to the separation of internal powers, governance structure, and compliance with rules and procedures
		Social Responsibility	The impact of the organization in having a positive effect on stakeholders and society in general

Source: Research data (2022).

Other relevant literature on governance indicators in sports organizations, as outlined in Table 1, includes the proposal by Henry and Lee (2004), which attributes seven dimensions, subsequently updated by Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013), who used three main sources: Henry and Lee (2004), Council of Europe (2005), and IOC (2008).

The proposal by Geeraert (2018) is based on four dimensions, developed for a sports governance project. Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013) emphasize that governance principles applied to sports are often overlapping and numerous, and their proposed tool is a condensed version based on studies from 2000 to 2012.

Parent et al. (2021) report that recurring indicators in relevant studies on sports governance typically include those associated with performance: accountability and responsibility, transparency, stakeholder participation with democracy (voting), and board composition. The proposals and studies on governance principles guiding sports are complex and numerous, highlighting the constant need for research and the consolidation of these principles given the complexity of organizational structures.

3. Method

3.1 Population, sample and period

For conducting this research, document sources were gathered from websites, including statutes, organizational charts, financial and accounting reports, statutory management documents, social projects, and other related materials. The time frame for the financial and accounting reports spanned a 5-year period, from 2017 to 2022, apart from budget publications, as the data collection period coincided with the requirement for the current year's publication. Additionally, information regarding the granting of benefits to board members was limited. Data collection occurred between January and March 2023.

The sample selection was based on accessibility, considering the 34 Olympic confederations, all of which are affiliates with voting rights in the assembly. Consequently, the entire population with available data was included in the study. This research will be applied to the 34 Brazilian Olympic Confederations, and the Brazilian Olympic Committee (COB), as the regulatory body for sports entities in Brazil, will also be assessed on the same level regarding its organizational demands.

Table 2

Sample

Acronym	Confederation
ABEE	Brazilian Association of Sport Climbing
CBAT	Brazilian Athletics Confederation
CBBd	Brazilian Badminton Confederation
CBB	Brazilian Basketball Confederation
CBBBoxe	Brazilian Boxing Confederation
CBCa	Brazilian Canoeing Confederation
CBC	Brazilian Cycling Confederation
CBDA	Brazilian Aquatic Sports Confederation
CBDN	Brazilian Snow Sports Confederation
CBDG	Brazilian Ice Sports Confederation
CBE	Brazilian Fencing Confederation
CBF	Brazilian Football Confederation
CBG	Brazilian Gymnastics Confederation

Acronym	Confederation
CBGolfe	Brazilian Golf Confederation
CBHb	Brazilian Handball Confederation
CBH	Brazilian Equestrian Confederation
CBHG	Brazilian Field Hockey Confederation
CBJ	Brazilian Judo Confederation
CBLP	Brazilian Weightlifting Confederation
CBPM	Brazilian Modern Pentathlon Confederation
CBR	Brazilian Rowing Confederation
CBRu	Brazilian Rugby Confederation
CBSK	Brazilian Skate Confederation
CBS	Brazilian Surf Confederation
CBTKD	Brazilian Taekwondo Confederation
CBT	Brazilian Tennis Confederation
CBTM	Brazilian Table Tennis Confederation
CBTARCO	Brazilian Archery Confederation
CBTE	Brazilian Shooting Sports Confederation
CBTri	Brazilian Triathlon Confederation
CBVela	Brazilian Sailing Confederation
CBV	Brazilian Volleyball Confederation
CBW	Brazilian Wrestling Confederation
CNDD	National Council of Dance Sport
COB	Brazilian Olympic Committee

Source: Research data (2023).

3.2 Governance Indicator

The Governance Indicator in Sports Entities (IGEE) was established with sixty-six items, distributed across five dimensions: organizational transparency, financial accounting report transparency, representation and democracy, control and integrity, and solidarity. The checklist questions related to IGEE are presented in the results analysis (J. Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013; Geeraert, 2018; Henry & Lee, 2004; Parent et al., 2021; Thompson et al., 2022).

The IGEE checklist was completed using a dichotomous variable approach (yes/no) to verify the presence or absence of the items on the websites of sports organizations. It is important to highlight that, in this context, the quality of the disclosed information was not assessed. Items answered with "yes" for IGEE were assigned a score of 1 (one), and negative responses "no" were assigned 0 (zero). Although some governance indicators use ordinal variables, which may introduce a degree of subjectivity, the use of dichotomous variables provides a more reliable measurement of governance (Geeraert, 2018).

The number of questions in each IGEE governance dimension is varied, meaning some dimensions have more items than others. Therefore, it is necessary to assign weights to each dimension to eliminate potential biases in dimensions with more items and to determine the IGEE ranking (Rezende et al., 2010). To determine the weight of each dimension, the following criterion was applied: the more questions a dimension contains, the lower its conversion rate to IGEE. This method ensures a more balanced evaluation of governance, as shown in the equation below (Rezende et al., 2010).

Equation 1

<i>Revista Ambiente Contábil</i> - UFRN – Natal-RN. v. 17, n. 2, p. 67 – 88, Jul./Dez., 2025, ISSN 2176.9036.

Weighting Criteria for IGEE

$$P = nq / tq$$

Note: P = dimension weight; nq = number of questions in the dimension; tq = total number of questions on the checklist.

Source: adapted from Rezende et al. (2010)

The proposed model is illustrated below for each dimension:

$$P \text{ (OT)} = 5 / 66 = 0.0757 \rightarrow 1 / 0.0757 = 13.2000$$

$$P \text{ (FR)} = 34 / 66 = 0.515 \rightarrow 1 / 0.515 = 1.9412$$

$$P \text{ (DR)} = 13 / 66 = 0.196 \rightarrow 1 / 0.196 = 5.0769$$

$$P \text{ (CI)} = 6 / 66 = 0.090 \rightarrow 1 / 0.090 = 11.0000$$

$$P \text{ (S)} = 8 / 66 = 0.121 \rightarrow 1 / 0.121 = 8.2500$$

Table 3 below illustrates the total weights for each dimension, i.e., their relevance to the final IGEE score, based on the criteria outlined above:

Table 3

IGEE Weighting Criteria

Dimension	Questions	Weight	Score (%)	Score
OT	5	13.2000	66	20%
FR	34	1.9412	66	20%
DR	13	5.0769	66	20%
CI	6	11.0000	66	20%
S	8	8.2500	66	20%
Total	66	39.4681	330	100%

Note: OT = organizational transparency; FR = financial-accounting reports transparency; DR = democratic representation; CI = control and integrity; S = solidarity

Source: Research data (2023).

4. Descriptive analysis

4.1.1 Organizational Transparency (OT)

The information disclosed pertains to the functioning of the organization, thus promoting accountability. This allows stakeholders to understand, monitor, and evaluate operations (S. G. Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2014). Dimension 1 – OT is evidenced by five items related to the topic. The results of the data collection for this dimension can be seen in Table 4:

Table 4

Organizational Transparency (OT)

Panel A: Disclosure by item		
Dimension 01	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Publishes the statute on the website	35	100%
Publishes the organizational chart on the website	34	97%
Publishes its vision/mission/values on the website	28	80%
Publishes updated strategic planning on the website	33	94%
The official website has a search function	34	97%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of the OT dimension		
Mean	33	94%
Median	34	97%
Minimum	28	80%

Maximum	35	100%
---------	----	------

Source: Research data (2023).

Among the organizations, 80% disclosed their mission, vision, and values, which are essential for organizing and achieving objectives, while also conveying clarity to stakeholders. Of the 35 organizations in the sample, 27 disclosed 100% of the items in this dimension, and 7 disclosed between 60% to 80%, lacking published information, mostly related to strategic planning. Except for the others, CBF did not provide an updated organizational chart or strategic plan on its official website. It had the lowest transparency index, disclosing only 45% of the items presented.

4.1.2 Financial-Accounting Reports Transparency (FR)

Dimension 2 – FR is evidenced by thirty-four items related to the topic. The results of the sample can be analyzed in Table 5.

Table 5

Financial-Accounting Reports Transparency (FR)

Panel A: Disclosure by item					
Dimension 02	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Published Balance Sheet (BS) on the website	91%	91%	97%	97%	94%
Published Income Statement (IS) on the website	89%	89%	97%	97%	91%
Published Cash Flow Statement (CFS) on the website	77%	83%	83%	91%	86%
Published financial-accounting reports audited by an independent firm	74%	80%	83%	91%	89%
Published budget	11%	11%	40%	31%	40%
Published employee salary table	23%	34%	31%	37%	43%
Published benefits granted to board members	-	-	6%	6%	6%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of the FR dimension by year					
Mean	69%	63%	63%	64%	63%
Median	77%	81%	83%	91%	86%
Minimum	11%	11%	6%	6%	6%
Maximum	91%	91%	97%	97%	94%

Source: Research data (2023).

In general, BS and IS statements were widely disclosed, with the following exceptions: CBCa did not disclose the IS for 2021; CBPM did not disclose the IS and BS for 2019, 2020, and 2021; CBTKD did not disclose the IS for 2017 and 2018; CBHb did not disclose the IS and BS for 2021; and CBB, CBtri, and CNDD did not disclose the IS and BS for 2017 and 2018. The years 2018 and 2019 had the highest disclosure rates, with a slight decline in 2021. The publication of the CFS followed a similar trend to BS and IS disclosures; however, ABEE and CNDD did not disclose the CFS in any of the analyzed years. The highest disclosure rate was in 2020.

On average, 83% of financial-accounting reports were audited by an independent firm. External audits serve as a good governance monitoring mechanism and are a strong indicator for this dimension. The confederations that did not publish audited statements in any of the years from 2017 to 2021 were CBPM, ABEE, and CNDD.

4.1.3 Democratic Representation (DR)

Dimension 3 – DR is evidenced by thirteen items related to the topic. The results of the study's sample can be analyzed in Table 6:

Tabela 6

Table 6: Democratic Representation (DR)

Panel A: Disclosure by item		
Dimension 03	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Has an athletes' committee	34	97%
Has a fiscal council	35	100%
At least one woman on the fiscal council	18	51%
Has an administrative council	25	71%
At least one woman on the administrative council	17	49%
The president's position is held by a man	33	94%
The current president has been in office for more than eight years	5	14%
Has an ethics and/or integrity committee	26	74%
Has an audit committee	0	0%
Has a governance and transparency committee	2	6%
Has a technical or similar committee	17	49%
Has another committee, different from those mentioned	17	49%
Councils and committees meet regularly and publish their minutes and agendas on the website	34	97%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of the DR dimension		
Mean	20	58%
Median	18	51%
Minimum	0	0%
Maximum	35	100%

Source: Research data (2023).

On average, 58% of the confederations met the governance-related items for this dimension. The board is one of the main components of governance. This group of individuals plays a strategic role by utilizing the organization's management information to protect stakeholders from opportunistic behavior by senior management, working towards improving organizational outcomes (Correia & Lucena, 2021; Ferkins et al., 2010; Massicotte & Henri, 2021). Regarding the composition of fiscal and administrative boards, the average size of a fiscal board is 5 members, while the average size of an administrative board is 7 members. Of the 35 organizations evaluated, 18 have at least one woman on their fiscal board. Among the 35 entities, 25 have an administrative board, and 18 of these have at least one woman serving on the board.

The CBE and CBJ confederations have predominantly female fiscal boards, with 67% women. CBtarco and CBtri, on average, have 60% female members on their administrative boards. According to Geeraert et al. (2014), boards with female representation implement better corporate governance practices. The inclusion of three or more women on boards leads to better outcomes in corporate strategies, conflict of interest resolution, and codes of conduct. Moreover, female voices have a distinctive impact on discussions and decision-making.

Additionally, the tenure of presidents was analyzed. Among the organizations, four had presidents serving for more than 8 years, including CBTM, CBTARCO, CBVela, and CBV. The first two have had their current presidents for more than 20 years, an abnormal situation compared to the others. Even with vacancy clauses in the statutes, these cases deviate from the standard norm. One way to improve governance in sports is by incorporating good practices and ethical behavior by the leaders of these institutions, not just within their structures. Ethical

leadership should be perceived as moral, trustworthy, and respectable, reinforcing ethical behavior (Geeraert & Drieskens, 2021).

4.1.4 Control and Integrity (CI)

Dimension 4 – CI is evidenced by six items related to the topic. The results of the sample can be analyzed in Table 7:

Table 7
Control and Integrity (CI)

Panel A: Disclosure by item		
Dimension 04	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Has a code or principles of ETHICS, CONDUCT, or similar (if similar, provide additional comment)	33	94%
Conducts open bidding for its main marketing and purchasing contracts	32	91%
Recognizes the sports tribunal (or similar) as an external channel for complaint and dispute resolution	32	91%
Has a whistleblowing mechanism (such as a whistleblowing channel and/or independent ombudsman) for managing comments and whistleblower allegations	31	89%
It is possible to track a filed complaint through the whistleblowing mechanism	23	66%
The whistleblowing mechanism is controlled by an independent firm (if not, provide additional comment)	24	69%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of the CI dimension		
Mean	29	83%
Median	32	90%
Minimum	23	66%
Maximum	33	94%

Source: Research data (2023).

Among the institutions, 34 published ethics and conduct codes, indicating a positive result. Ethics and conduct codes play a role in influencing individuals' decision-making (Lere & Gaumnitz, 2003). Additionally, 32 institutions provided specific documents and locations demonstrating that they conduct open bidding for their main purchases and services; CBF, ABEE, and CNDD did not disclose these aspects on their official websites.

The last three items analyzed address the whistleblowing mechanism and its functionalities. The whistleblowing channel is an important governance mechanism, essential for receiving and investigating reports of fraud and illicit acts (Henik, 2008; Silva & Sousa, 2017). CBLP, CBHb, CBDG, and CNDD did not have any whistleblowing mechanism on their websites. Of the 31 that did, in 23 of them it is possible to track a filed complaint, and 24 have a specific independent firm responsible for receiving and handling complaints. A whistleblowing system helps correct irregularities before scandals tarnish the institution's image. Whistleblowing practices have been adopted worldwide, such as in the UK with the PIDA Act/1998, Greece with Law No. 4254/2014, and France with the Sopin 2 Act/2016 (EU Sport Whistle Programme, 2018).

4.1.5 Solidarity (S)

Management is responsible for guiding and contributing to the sustainable development of sports through proper resource management. Sports should have a positive impact on the

external public (J. Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013; Geeraert, 2018). Dimension 5 – S is evidenced by eight items related to the topic. The sample results can be analyzed in Table 8:

Table 8
Solidarity

Panel A: Disclosure by item		
Dimension 05	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Has integrity awareness/education programs for its main stakeholders	14	40%
Has elite-level sports development programs	4	11%
Has grassroots-level sports development programs	1	3%
Has a published environmental responsibility policy and programs	2	6%
Has a published social responsibility policy and programs	5	14%
Has career and education programs to assist athletes during their transition to post-athletic careers	1	3%
Has programs or resources to assist the community hosting their events in planning	1	3%
Collaborates with governmental and non-governmental agencies on social responsibility issues	0	0%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of the S dimension		
Mean	4	10%
Median	2	4%
Minimum	0	0%
Maximum	14	40%

Source: Research data (2023).

The research results indicate that little to no information on the confederations' and COB's projects is published. In most cases, awareness programs and courses directed at the technical staff are available, but little on environmental, social policies, and athlete development is shared.

Of the 35 institutions analyzed, 17 did not publish any items related to this dimension on their websites. The CBE confederation performed best in this dimension, publishing the Engajar and Programa Esporte projects. Other confederations that published relevant projects include CBVela with the Grael project, CBV with VivaVolei, and CBGolf with its support for Hospital Pequeno Príncipe. The social return goes beyond a positive image and relates to the purpose of non-profit entities, such as sports organizations in Brazil. This is an item that should be highlighted in the research as an area for exploration and improvement, particularly in terms of disclosure.

4.1.6 Sports Entities Governance Indicator (IGEE)

The development of a specific indicator for Brazilian sports entities addresses the need to propose a governance framework tailored to this sector, accounting for its unique characteristics. While it does not serve as a definitive control mechanism, it represents a step toward broadening stakeholders' perspectives and evaluating the performance of these organizations. Similar studies conducted in international sports organizations, such as the study by Chappelet & Mrkonjic (2013), for the creation of BIGIS, applied the indicator to FIFA, the IOC, the International Equestrian Federation (FEI), the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA), and European Athletics (EAA). These studies compared governance levels among confederations and within the same confederation over time. The authors concluded that a longitudinal approach would be most appropriate, emphasizing the complexity and uncertainty of the environment. Nevertheless, they also stressed the need to apply, improve, and deliver labels to continuously measure sports governance (J. Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013).

Through the application of the IGEE, governance-related aspects of the sports entities studied can be assessed with a specific focus on the applied timeframe. However, subsequent applications and potential comparisons over time will offer a more comprehensive view. Table 9 presents the IGEE, correlating the confederation acronyms with the score of each dimension according to the research results and the application of pre-established weights. Based on the IGEE results, a ranking of sports entities is provided, measuring the level of compliance in governance practice disclosures, from best to worst.

Table 9
IGEE Ranking

Panel A: IGEE measurement								
Acronym	Ranking	OT (%)	RT (%)	DR (%)	CI (%)	S (%)	IGEE Total Score	IGEE Total Score (%)
CBAT	1	100,00%	88,24%	76,92%	100,00%	37,50%	265,76	80,53%
CBGolfe	2	100,00%	73,53%	69,23%	100,00%	37,50%	250,97	76,05%
CBV	3	100,00%	85,29%	53,85%	100,00%	37,50%	248,58	75,33%
CBTM	4	100,00%	61,76%	76,92%	100,00%	37,50%	248,28	75,24%
CBR	5	100,00%	100,00%	61,54%	100,00%	12,50%	246,87	74,81%
CBE	6	100,00%	64,71%	53,85%	100,00%	50,00%	243,24	73,71%
COB	7	100,00%	70,59%	69,23%	100,00%	25,00%	240,78	72,96%
CBW	8	100,00%	73,53%	76,92%	100,00%	12,50%	239,55	72,59%
CBTARCO	9	100,00%	70,59%	69,23%	100,00%	12,50%	232,53	70,46%
CBJ	10	100,00%	79,41%	53,85%	100,00%	12,50%	228,20	69,15%
CBVela	11	80,00%	58,82%	69,23%	100,00%	37,50%	228,07	69,11%
CBHG	12	100,00%	70,59%	61,54%	100,00%	12,50%	227,45	68,93%
CBCa	13	100,00%	67,65%	61,54%	100,00%	12,50%	225,51	68,34%
CBRu	14	100,00%	64,71%	84,62%	66,67%	25,00%	225,05	68,20%
CBG	15	100,00%	61,76%	53,85%	100,00%	25,00%	224,80	68,12%
CBC	16	80,00%	64,71%	61,54%	100,00%	25,00%	218,62	66,25%
CBDA	17	80,00%	67,65%	84,62%	83,33%	14,02%	217,54	65,92%
CBTE	18	100,00%	73,53%	30,77%	100,00%	25,00%	217,34	65,86%
CBH	19	100,00%	70,59%	53,85%	83,33%	12,50%	211,38	64,05%
CBTKD	20	100,00%	44,12%	46,15%	100,00%	25,00%	208,08	63,05%
CBB	21	100,00%	38,24%	61,54%	100,00%	12,50%	206,10	62,45%
CBDN	22	100,00%	67,65%	61,54%	66,67%	12,50%	203,51	61,67%
CBBd	23	100,00%	73,53%	53,85%	66,67%	12,50%	202,32	61,31%
CBBBoxe	24	100,00%	70,59%	53,85%	66,67%	12,50%	200,38	60,72%
CB SK	25	80,00%	50,00%	46,15%	100,00%	25,00%	198,76	60,23%
ABEE	26	100,00%	41,18%	61,54%	66,67%	25,00%	194,29	58,88%
CBHb	27	80,00%	70,59%	53,85%	50,00%	37,50%	192,68	58,39%
CBT	28	100,00%	61,76%	38,46%	66,67%	25,00%	192,65	58,38%
CBS	29	100,00%	47,06%	61,54%	66,67%	12,50%	189,92	57,55%
CBPM	30	100,00%	26,47%	30,77%	100,00%	25,00%	186,28	56,45%
CBTri	31	100,00%	32,35%	61,54%	66,67%	12,50%	180,22	54,61%
CBDG	32	80,00%	67,65%	53,85%	50,00%	12,50%	174,24	52,80%
CBLP	33	100,00%	61,76%	46,15%	33,33%	12,50%	167,48	50,75%
CBF	34	40,00%	58,82%	23,08%	66,67%	37,50%	149,20	45,21%
CNDD	35	60,00%	17,65%	46,15%	16,67%	12,50%	100,96	30,59%
Panel B: Descriptive statistics of Panel B								
Statistic	Ranking	OT (%)	FR (%)	DR (%)	CI (%)	S (%)	IGEE Total Score	IGEE Total Score (%)
Mean	18	93,71%	62,77%	57,80%	83,33%	22,19%	211,07	63,96%
Median	18	100,00%	67,65%	61,54%	100,00%	25,00%	217,34	65,86%
Minimum	1	40,00%	17,65%	23,08%	16,67%	12,50%	100,96	30,59%
Maximum	35	100,00%	100,00%	84,62%	100,00%	50,00%	265,76	80,53%

Note: OT = Organizational Transparency; RT = Financial-Accounting Reports Transparency; DR = Democratic Representation; CI = Control and Integrity; S = Solidarity.

Source: *Research data (2023).*

Based on the IGEE results, it is possible to identify the sports organizations at the top of the ranking, with high scores, indicating strong governance aspects, as well as those at the bottom, with lower scores. The top-ranking organizations are CBAT, CBGolf, and CBV, while the lowest scores are attributed to CBF and CNDD, highlighting the need for improvements across all dimensions. CBAT, which ranked first, scored 265 points, thus meeting 80% of the established items. The next nine organizations in the ranking received high scores, achieving between 69% and 76%. Of the 35 organizations studied, only two, CBF and CNDD, did not meet at least 50% of the items. In general, the others met at least half of the items established by the IGEE. When examining the information by dimension, it becomes evident that the Solidarity (S) dimension shows the lowest performance. This emphasizes the need for greater focus on the publication of social projects and the development of items related to education, awareness, and other similar initiatives.

A study conducted by Geeraert (2018) examined governance indicators for international sports organizations, applied to five confederations: FIFA, the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF), the International Swimming Federation (FINA), the International Handball Federation (IHF), and the International Tennis Federation (ITF). The study revealed that FIFA had the highest score compared to the other confederations. Geeraert's (2018) research compared indicators from 2015 and 2018, emphasizing that, despite the differences in the perspectives offered by the indicators, there was progress in terms of good governance within the studied organizations. However, they also pointed out common critical issues, such as: boards that are not adequately accountable to the assembly; strategic planning, lacking clear plans to guide objectives and actions; stakeholders, with no formal strategies for stakeholder involvement; governance elements, which are not yet mandatory in confederations, such as the proportion of independent board members, conflict of interest controls, and anti-corruption measures; disclosure, where reports are not considered long-term priorities; and standards, where the published items do not, in many situations, follow sufficiently high standards.

In collecting information for the confederations and COB, several issues similar to those highlighted in Geeraert's (2018) study were identified. The strategic planning item, examined in the Organizational Transparency (OT) dimension, revealed areas for improvement. In the Solidarity (S) dimension, the publication and participation of stakeholders were low and largely unmet by the IGEE. Additionally, the disclosure of information by the confederations and the COB does not consistently follow high standards and is not prioritized. This is evident in the absence of BS, IS, and CFS publications for 2021 and 2022, as noted in the Financial-Accounting Reports Transparency (FR) dimension. Furthermore, some websites were found to have missing and occasionally unclear information, as observed in the confederations CBSK, CBTri, ABEE, and CBHb.

Despite having published financial reports, its level of disclosure is relatively lower compared to other confederations. This is confirmed by its IGEE result, where it ranks 34th with one of the lowest scores. The measurement and analysis of the IGEE highlight the need for improvements in the disclosure of governance-related aspects by the confederations. According to Table 9, the dimension with the highest average disclosure was Organizational Transparency (OT) at 93.71%, followed by Control and Integrity (CI) at 83.33%, both reflecting very good results. Financial-Accounting Reports Transparency (FR) had a good result of 62.77%, while Democratic Representation (DR) showed a moderate result of 57.8%. Solidarity (S) had the lowest score at 22.19%, indicating a weak performance. However, even the confederations at the top of the ranking still need to make improvements in many areas.

Even confederations with high IGEE scores still require enhancement, as governance within sports entities continues to present challenges due to the diverse and evolving needs and expectations of stakeholders. Nevertheless, management practices, regulatory frameworks, and the professionalization of these organizations are consistently identified as critical areas for advancement. The studies referenced and compared to the IGEE indicate that the implementation of governance measures has led to some improvements. However, ongoing monitoring remains essential. Instruments such as the IGEE serve as valuable tools for assessing and comparing compliance levels in the disclosure of governance practices across sports entities, thereby supporting the long-term development and improvement of these organizations.

5. Conclusions

Sports organizations in Brazil are predominantly funded by public resources, which underscores the need for transparency and robust governance practices. The analysis of the compliance level in the disclosure of governance practices within sports confederations, based on the IGEE checklist, yielded the following key findings: Regarding organizational transparency (OT), most institutions publish their information on their websites, with an average of 94% of items being met. However, there remains room for improvement, particularly in disclosing information related to strategic planning. In terms of the dimension concerning the transparency of financial-accounting reports (FR), on average, 65% of the items for the years 2017 to 2021 were disclosed. The balance sheets (BS), income statements (IS), and cash flow statements (CFS) were widely disclosed, while other statements and reports, such as budgets and compensation/benefit reports, were published to a lesser extent. Reports audited by independent firms accounted for 83% of the disclosures.

In the democratic representation (DR) dimension, the predominance of men in board and presidential positions was evident. Additionally, the extended tenure of some confederation presidents is a matter that requires attention. Diversifying leadership roles and implementing statutory term limits are key factors in promoting good governance in these organizations. The control and integrity (CI) dimension revealed that, on average, 83% of the items were disclosed. Notably, 94% of confederations published their codes of ethics and conduct, and 89% had active whistleblower channels. Nevertheless, there is still room for improvement, particularly in monitoring complaints. The final dimension addresses solidarity (S), which requires attention, as a limited number of confederations offer and/or disclose projects aimed at stakeholders. These initiatives are crucial for the social contribution of these institutions.

The level of compliance in the disclosure of governance practices among the analyzed confederations, as evidenced by the IGEE, clearly highlights the need for improvements in governance disclosure and identifies key areas for attention. Even confederations with high IGEE scores face governance challenges. Studies and indicators like the IGEE play a fundamental role in measuring and comparing governance practices among Brazilian sports entities. Therefore, the pursuit of continuous improvement is necessary to ensure a transparent and sustainable environment in the long term.

The contributions of this study lie in advancing empirical research on governance in sports entities in Brazil, particularly through the development of the IGEE, which can be applied across multiple periods to allow for a temporal analysis of governance practices. Moreover, it emphasizes the societal importance of these organizations, as many of them rely on public funding. By providing a comparative evaluation of governance practices, the IGEE contributes to enhancing transparency within these entities.

In the realm of governance in sports institutions, to broaden and deepen knowledge on the topic, several research themes are suggested. One avenue of interest is conducting a

comparative analysis of Brazilian sports organizations with those of other countries, identifying best practices that could be applied in the Brazilian context. Another suggestion is to analyze the role of boards and committees, their actions, and outcomes as a means of improving governance and transparency. A third relevant theme is stakeholder participation in sports organizations and their effective involvement in the development of governance and transparency; as key actors, they can assist in identifying areas for improvement and gaps. Lastly, future research could examine the disclosure of strategic plans and roadmaps by the confederations, identifying the primary areas for improvement and actions required in the short and long term. This would provide valuable insights into the specific needs of these confederations and support a more comprehensive analysis.

One of the main limitations of this study concerns the data collection process, which relies on publicly available information from the official websites of the confederations and the COB. Any relevant information that is not disclosed is not reflected in the results. Additionally, the IGEE results are based on a dichotomous scale, indicating only the presence or absence of each aspect, without assessing the quality of the disclosed items. Another limitation is the temporal scope of the study, as it pertains specifically to information available between January and March 2023, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other periods.

References

- Boaventura, J. M. G., Cardoso, F. R., Silva, E. S. da, & Silva, R. S. da. (2009). Teoria dos Stakeholders e Teoria da Firma: Um estudo sobre a hierarquização das funções-objetivo em empresas brasileiras. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios - RBGN*, 45, 419–437.
- Chappelet, J., & Mrkonjic, M. (2013). Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport (BIBGIS): An assessment tool for international sport governing bodies. *Idheap*, 1(1), 9–14. Recuperado em 07 de julho, 2023, de https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB_7BDD210D3643.P001/REF
- Correia, T. de S., & Lucena, W. G. L. (2021). Corporate Governance and Global Management Accounting Principles in public companies in Brazil. *Advances in Scientific and Applied Accounting*, 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.14392/asaa.2021140107>
- Dowling, M., Leopkey, B., & Smith, L. (2018). Governance in Sport: *A Scoping Review*. *Journal of sport management*, 32(5), 438–451. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2018-0032>
- Eu Sport Whistle Programme. (2018). Implementation of whistleblowing policies by sport organizations in the EU An operational report with policy recommendations. *European Union through ERASMUS+ Sport*. Recuperado em 10 de julho, 2023, de <https://www.iris-france.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WHISTLE-report.pdf>

- Fassin, Y. (2010). A dynamic Perspective in Freeman's Stakeholder Model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(S1), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0942-6>
- Fender, R. V. D. (2022). Governança em Confederações Olímpicas Brasileiras: impactos do primeiro ciclo de implementação do Rating Integra. *Escola de Educação Física e Esporte Da Universidade de São Paulo*, 5(3), 248–253.
- Ferkins, L., Mcdonald, G., & Shilbury, D. (2010). A model for improving board performance: The case of a national sport organisation. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 16(4), 601–621. <https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.2010.16.4.601>
- Freeman, E. R. (1984). *Strategic Management: a stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Geeraert, A. (2018). Sports Governance Observer (Issue October). Recuperado em 5 de julho, 2023, de <https://www.playthegame.org/media/ygyf4r51/sports-governance-observer-2018-international.pdf>
- Geeraert, A., Alm, J., & Groll, M. (2014). Good governance in international sport organizations: an analysis of the 35 Olympic sport governing bodies. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6(3), 281–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2013.825874>
- Geeraert, A., & Drieskens, E. (2021). The dynamics of de-delegation: A principal–agent explanation of the reversal of private authority in international sport governance. *Public Administration*, 99(1), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12668>
- Geeraert, A., & van Eekeren, F. (2021). *Good Governance in Sport: Critical reflections*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003172833>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2012). Linking transparency, knowledge and citizen trust in government: An experiment. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852311429667>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G., & Meijer, A. J. (2014). Effects of transparency on the perceived trustworthiness of a government organization: Evidence from an online experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(1), 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus048>
- Harrison, J., Freeman, R. E., & Cavalcanti Sá de Abreu, M. (2015). Stakeholder Theory As an Ethical Approach to Effective Management: *applying the theory to multiple contexts*. *Review of Business Management*, 17(55), 858–869. <https://doi.org/10.7819/rbgn.v17i55.2647>
- Henik, E. (2008). Mad as hell or scared stiff? the effects of value conflict and emotions on potential whistle-blowers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9441-1>

Henry, I., & Lee, P. (2004). Chapter 2 : Governance and Ethics. *The Business of Sport Management*, January 2004, 1–22.

Hums, M. A., & MacLean, J. C. (2017). *Governance and Policy in Sport Organizations*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315213057>

Jensen, M., & Meckling, W. (2009). Theory of the firm: managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. In *The Economic Nature of the Firm* (pp. 283–303). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511817410.023>

Lacruz, A. J. (2020). Considerações teóricas sobre governança corporativa no terceiro setor à luz da teoria da agência. *Cadernos Ebape*, 18(3), 473–485. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395120190007>

Lere, J. C., & Gaumnitz, B. R. (2003). The impact of codes of ethics on decision making: Some insights from information economics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48(4), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000005747.37500.c8>

Massicotte, S., & Henri, J. F. (2021). The use of management accounting information by boards of directors to oversee strategy implementation. *The British Accounting Review*, 53(3), 100953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2020.100953>

Mazzei, L. C., & Rocco Júnior, A. J. (2017). Um ensaio sobre a Gestão do Esporte : Um momento para a sua afirmação no Brasil. *Revista de Gestão e Negócios Do Esporte*, 2(1), 96–109.

O’Boyle, I. (2012). Corporate governance applicability and theories within not-for-profit sport management. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 9(2–3), 335–342. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv9i2c3art3>

OAB/SP. (2007). Cartilha do Terceiro Setor. Recuperado em 6 de agosto, 2023, de <https://www.abong.org.br/final/download/cartilhaoab2007.pdf>

Observatório do Esporte. (2019). Consórcio de universidades compara políticas esportivas a sucesso e resultados no esporte. Recuperado em 22 de julho, 2023, de <https://observatoriodoesporte.mg.gov.br/consorcio-de-universidades-compara-politicas-esportivas-a-sucesso-e-resultados-no-esporte/>

Organização, D. A., & Justiça, D. A. (2009). *Código brasileiro de justiça desportiva resolução*. D, 1–73.

Parent, B. (2018). Social Responsibility in Sports: Current Landscape. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 28(2), 126–137. <https://doi.org/10.18060/22567>

Parent, M. M., Hoyer, R., Taks, M., Thompson, A., Naraine, M. L., Lachance, E. L., & Séguin, B. (2021). National sport organization governance design archetypes for the twenty-first century. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 23(4), 1115–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2021.1963801>

Rezende, A. J., Dalmacio, F. Z., & Facure, C. E. F. (2010). Practice of corporate governance in football clubs. *International Journal of Economics and Accounting*, 1(4), 410. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijea.2010.037579>

Ribeiro, H. C. M., & Costa, B. K. (2017). Stakeholders e sua influência na governança corporativa: um estudo de caso múltiplo em organizações esportivas. *Revista Ambiente Contábil*, 9(1), 246–267. <https://doi.org/10.21680/2176-9036.2017v9n1ID9029>

Seippel, Ø. (2019). Professionalization of voluntary sport organizations—a study of the Quality Club Programme of the Norwegian Football Association. *European Sport Management*

Quarterly, 19(5), 666–683. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2019.1579240>

Silva, G. R. da, & Sousa, R. G. de. (2017). A influência do canal de denúncia anônima na detecção de fraudes contábeis em organizações. *Revista de Contabilidade e Organizações*, 11(30), 46. <https://doi.org/10.11606/rco.v11i30.134372>

Thompson, A., Lachance, E. L., Parent, M. M., & Hoye, R. (2022). A systematic review of governance principles in sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, May, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2022.2077795>