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Abstract

The authors compare collegiate sports governance in Turkey and the United States using comparative analysis techniques. Using the U.S. National Collegiate Athletic Association as a model, the authors evaluate structural and political aspects of the Turkish University Sports Federation to identify new potentialities for its growth and for the support of collegiate sports within Turkey.
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The concept of sport has been around for thousands of years, and can be used to divide individuals among those same classes and backgrounds. Thus, this often results in economics determining what sports particular races and classes have access to. The divide can also be expanded depending on the individual's international background. For some cultures, sport is not available to all. In the United States, equality in sport is a common phenomenon, but equality in sport with regards to economics is a recent phenomenon in the country of Turkey (GSGM, 2009, Erturan, 2010). And if you specifically look at sport governance globally, the divide is even greater. In the United States, there is no government agency responsible for overseeing sports. In Turkey, however, sport governance and organizational autonomy is a fairly recent development.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comparative overview of sport governance on the collegiate athletic level in both Turkey and the United States. A review of the organizational structures and operations of both the Turkish University Sport Federation (TUSF) and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is provided. We then focus on similarities regarding organizational structure and policy and on differences between the two entities within their government structures with a specific emphasis on marketing efforts, programming, and talent identification practices. Based on our comparative analysis, we provide suggestions for areas in which TUSF can continue to grow and develop in order to provide opportunities for athletics at the university level in Turkey. The purpose of the paper is to discuss the structure of the TUSF and illustrate how the TUSF can leverage its status as a federation to help sport to grow in Turkey.

**Method**

Comparative studies have different approaches. Hantrais (1999) points out three major approaches in comparative research: (a) a universalist approach that looks at wide-range culture to develop context free theory, (b) a culturalist approach that develops from cross-cultural, ethnographic studies, and (c) a societal approach that seeks to identify the social aspects of the differences or similarities. According to Hantrais, the nation itself is a contextual frame or the reference because nations define the territorial borders and have their own legal structures. Moreover, the membership of international organizations such as the European Union, United Nations, and NATO can be a reference criterion to carry out a research (Hantarais, 1999).

Following the first stage of descriptive and survey method, generally in comparative studies, a juxtaposition approach is adopted and the obtained data are presented side by side (Hantarais, 1995). Providing the analyses of the comparison in a systematic way is essential in order to achieve rational conclusions in these studies.
Hantrais (1999) states some of the possible examples of interdisciplinary contexts for comparisons as the political institutions, administrative structures, economic systems, the legal framework, social institutions and structures and so on. Typically, studies in the sport management/policy area are mostly descriptive in character. This is due to a lack of comparable research data and the "complexity of comparing nations on a like-for-like basis" (Bosscher et al., 2009, p. 114).

Fortunately, comparative research (e.g., De Bosscher et al., 2009, Heinemann 1999, 2005, Houlihan, 1997, Houlihan & Green, 2008, Weinberg & McDermott, 2002) and the methodological studies of comparative research (e.g., De Bosscher et al., 2010; Henry, 2007; Henry et al., 2005) in the sports management field have accelerated in recent years. According to Henry et al. (2005), there are four types of comparative analyses of sports policy: approaches that seek similarities, approaches that seek differences, approaches that theorize the transnational, and approaches that define the discourse. Looking at the United States and Turkey, our study focuses on identifying similarities between each country's national sports organization. Consequently, the data we collected are generalized and nomothetic (Henry et al.). Here a descriptive analysis through statistical data is possible. However, a limitation of this approach that we would be unable to examine cultural specificities because of the universalizing character of the research (Henry et al.). Taking this concern into account, we tried to emphasize the findings in a microperspective as well.

Indeed, collecting and processing the data for this study was challenging in terms of available information, especially in Turkey. The data was obtained from secondary sources including annuals, press releases, websites, laws, regulations and other legal statutes. The documentary analyses of the collected data is examined and descriptively interpreted. Although some differences are also considered in this analysis, the overall similarity of the organizations is the predominant factor for the recommendations and conclusion of this study.

**Sport Governance in Turkey**

In Turkey, sports have been managed by governmental organizations for years. Since the beginning of the Republic, governance of sport has been one of the responsibilities of the state as it is mentioned in the Constitution (items no. 58 and 59).

Sports clubs were the earliest organizations of modern sport in Turkey. In 1920, 16 sport clubs came together and founded the Turkey Training Associations Alliance (TTAA), and this foundation was the first managerial organization of Turkish sport (Fişek, 1998).

At first, TTAA had a democratic, federative and autonomous character during its fulfillment. However, in 1936, with the idea of not allowing an au-
tonomous organization to manage a serious issue such as sports, the government abrogated this organization and founded the Turkish Sport Institute (TSI) to replace it. The TSI served as a transition organization between the regimes of the federative management to the governmental management in sports. Subsequently, prepared by the order of Atatürk, the founder of Turkish Republic, the Physical Education Law No. 3530 was enacted. In 1938, TSI was abolished, sportive events became one of the government responsibilities, and the newly founded General Directorate of Physical Education (GDPE) was the main institution to fulfill these duties (GSGM, 2001).

After being bound to several ministries and changing names, the GDPE was modified to become the General Directorate of Youth and Sport (GDYS) on March 2, 1989. Today, with the regulated law of No. 3530 (now, No. 3259), GDYS is the administrative governmental institute of sports in Turkey responsible for the management and driving of the Turkish sports.

Non-governmental organizations of the sports in Turkey serve as unofficial partners to GDYS, helping it achieve its goal. The Turkish National Olympic Committee (TMOK) and the Turkish Amateur Sports Clubs Confederation (TASKK) are the most important stakeholders of voluntary sport management in Turkey. In addition, sports federations and clubs are integral parts of the entire sports system as they are in other European countries. GDYS cooperates with these partners in various areas, including event organization, consultancy, and development of sports. These partnerships help the GDYS develop and improve sports in Turkey.

For over a decade, the autonomy of the sports federations has been a controversial issue in Turkey. Due to a decrease in the flow of work to state-oriented structures, GDYS had been required to enable the sports federations to be autonomous in various studies and platforms. In March 2004, a new vision that is often referred to as the “sport act,” arose through the regulation of several issues of sports including the legal statutes of the sports federations. As a result of the improvements on the laws related to sports, federations gained the right to become administratively and financially autonomous through Act 5105: Relating to Make Changes in the Institution and the Duties of the General Directorate of Youth and Sport and in Some Other Acts. Autonomous federations are described in this Act as the federations whose managerial units come in to force by the election of the general assembly. These units are required to adopt the changes indicated in Act 5105 within their structures, and the budgets of these federations must be approved by their general assemblies.

About the Turkish University Sport Federation

Before 2004, TUSF was a typical sports federation that was affiliated with GDYS. TUSF, that was founded in 1997, had been performing its duties under the rule of this governmental organization.
Following the "sport act" in 2004, bylaws of TUSF had been prepared according to the modified Act 3289 (GDYS) and the Frame Regulation of Autonomous Sport Federations of General Directorate of Youth and Sport. In June 2006, the prime ministry granted the federation the right to be autonomous in terms of administration and finance (Turkish University Sports Federation, 2010c).

According to the bylaws, the official name of the federation is “Turkey University Sports Federation,” and the head office is located in Ankara (Art. 5). As it is stated in Code of Competition Instructions Art. 1, the aim of TUSF is “to present sports well-rounded in every level in universities, to do background work to encourage sports, to carry out local and international events among universities and to coordinate these institutions.”

Duties and responsibilities of TUSF, which are described in its bylaws, can be summarized as follows (Main Bylaw of TUSF):

- To provide equal dissemination and development of sport branches in universities, to do necessary arrangements, take decisions and implement them.
- To represent Turkey in domestic and international platforms on issues related to university sports.
- To organize sports events, to set up regulations and to assign referees, presenters, observers, technicians and other staff for these events.
- To follow the developments related to university sports in the world, to program and control relationship, competition and working events.
- To contribute to the education and the improvement of managers, trainers and officers, to hold international seminars, panels and symposiums.
- To apply the international rules of international sports federations and FISU and EUSA.
- To solve the conflicts that may occur between universities and provincial directorates of GDYS.
- To designate the national athletes and teams that will participate international competitions.
- To track the elite athletes in universities and support them.
- To record statistics and archive related to university and cooperate with media.
- To do business to draw income for the federation.
- To register the athletes.

Organizational Structure

On the upper part of the pyramidal hierarchy, TUSF is first bounded to the European University Sports Association (EUSA) and then the Federation Internationale du Sport Universitaire (FISU). Founded in 1949, FISU supervises the Summer and Winter Universiades, the world-wide university games, and
the World University Championships. (Federation Internationale du Sport Universitaire, n.d). FISU's General Assembly consists of 153 national university sports federations, including TUSF.

TUSF comprises central and provincial organizations as the two main governance parts. The Board of the federation determines the assignments for provincial governance to support TUSF in local terms. Furthermore, the central governance of the federation consists of the following (Main Bylaw of TUSF):

- General Assembly
- The Board
- Control Committee
- Disciplinary Committee
- Honorary Committee
- Committees for Referees, Education, Law, Health, Foreign Affairs, Technical, Sponsorship and others
- Secretary General
- Administrative Units

The General Assembly is the top of the organization and cannot have less than 120 or more than 250 members (Main Bylaw of TUSF). The member universities must register with the federation every year. Once they meet the registration conditions declared by the Board of the federation, universities may conduct events.

The Board consists of the president of the federation and 14 members, chosen by the General Assembly. The term of the Board is 4 years. The Board fulfills executive duties such as choosing the member universities, programming the competitions, preparing the budget, constructing the provincial organization and regulating the legal procedures (Main Bylaw of TUSF). The Board also leads the general meeting once every four years. GDYS sends an observer to general meetings and the observer issues reports to the GDYS if there are any federation violations of the Frame Regulation of Autonomous Sport Federations of GDYS. If it is determined that the General Assembly was established against the legislation, a judicial process is initiated to ask for the cancellation of the assembly.

Financial Structure

Each year, the Board prepares a budget for TUSF that is then reviewed and approved by the General Assembly before being implemented. With the Board’s oversight, the president is empowered to conduct the business of the organization, an authority he or she can transfer to the vice-president when necessary. The federation’s primary sources of income are allocations from
the budget of GDYS; participation, application, and membership fees; registration fees; revenue from competitions and sponsorships; revenue from advertisements, publications, and other printed documents; revenue from penalties and protestations; donations and grants from supporters; and revenue from rents and administration (See Figure 1). All revenues of the federation are exempt from taxation.

![Figure 1: Revenues of TUSF from 2008 to 2010 (Turkish Liras).](image)


TUSF’s spending to operate its duties and expenditure of the federation (See Figure 2) may vary due to the annual budget (Art 38). The federation has the right to buy, sell and rent the movable and immovable properties according to its needs, or accept these properties as grants by the decision of the Board. Fundamentals of the expenditures are defined in the instruction prepared by the Board. (Bylaws of Budget and Accountancy of TUSF, Item no. 10)
Operations of TUSF

Participation in sport events among universities is becoming popular in Turkey each day. The number of licensed athletes participated in TUSF events almost doubled between 2000 and 2009.

Operation of the TUSF depends on the participation of member universities in sport events. In 2008, TUSF organized competitions in national level for 33 sports branches in 59 different facilities. The number of the universities that participate in the events of the TUSF have increased from 90 in 2006 to 102 in 2007 and 122 in 2008 (Turkish University Sports Federation, 2006, 2007, 2008).

TUSF as the main promoter of the sporting events among universities has various competitions in different branches not only on the national level but also internationally through its affiliation to FISU and EUSF. One of the biggest events of the TUSF was the 23th Universiad, which was held in Izmir in 2005. Thirty-one countries participated in this event, where 7,784 participants competed in 14 different areas of competition. (TUSF, 2008). The TUSF also was
the promoter of the Winter Universiad games with the cooperation of GSGM in 2011 in Erzurum, Turkey. In the games which were held in a total of 11 branches there were 2700 athletes participated (Universiad Erzurum, 2011).

The TUSF promotes university sports in different regions and cities. To achieve its goal, the federation assigns a provincial representative to the cities which have universities to provide a domestic contact. Also, TUSF can found a provincial organization where the number of the universities more than one and where it is necessary (Main Bylaw, 23).

**Sport Governance in the United States**

Sport governance is the United States differs substantially from the environment in Turkey. In the United States, sport is more of a concerted effort among multiple organizations rather than one governmental body. Although the President has The President's Council on Fitness, Sports and Nutrition, the organization is not a broad governing body for sport in the United States but rather an advisory committee of volunteers who seek to develop accessible, affordable and sustainable physical activity, fitness, sports and nutrition programs for all Americans regardless of age, background or ability (Fitness.gov, 2010).

Governance in the United States can be divided into two distinct missions: social and commercial. On the social level, sport is responsible for developing healthy, well-rounded citizens who are active participants in society. On the commercial level, sport is seen as a multibillion dollar industry with enormous opportunities for both public and private organizations to receive financial benefits. Sport governance in the United States occurs on the local, regional, national, and federal levels through youth and adult sports leagues, junior high school and high school athletic associations, collegiate athletic associations, and professional leagues. The NCAA is only one of several organizations which serve to regulate and enforce sport for intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA is bound by traditional corporate structure guidelines in the United States. As a not-for-profit entity, the organization is controlled by its members, who elect a Board of Directors. However, the organization is responsible for annual financial and organizational reporting requirements of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service to maintain its tax-exempt status. The organization and its Board are also responsible for ensuring that all activities are in furtherance if its mission and objectives.

**About the NCAA**

The National Collegiate Athletic Association is the principal regulatory and enforcement body for intercollegiate athletics for over 1,000 colleges and universities in the United States. Officially formed to initiate changes in the play-
ing rules in the game of football with a goal of making the game safer for its players, the NCAA, then called the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS), was created during a time when many institutions urged either the discontinuation/abolishment of the game of football or a need for strict reform.

With the support of President Theodore Roosevelt, 13 college athletics leaders from across the United States met to reform the rules of football. From those meetings emerged the IAAUS with 62 member institutions. The IAAUS was officially constituted March 31, 1906, and became the NCAA in 1910 (NCAA, 2010a). From inception, the NCAA was comprised solely of four-year, degree-granting institutions, and prior to 1979, the NCAA provided governance over only the men’s intercollegiate sports of its membership. In 1982, after the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, which governed women’s intercollegiate athletics, discontinued operation, most of the member institutions shifted their women's athletics programs to the governance of the NCAA.

Today the core purpose of the NCAA is “to govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner” (NCAA, 2010b). These core values also include providing the “highest levels of integrity and sportsmanship, diversity and inclusion, amateurism, competitive equity and excellence in the classroom”. In addition, the NCAA strives “to [espouse] a collegiate model of athletics in which student-athletes participate in varsity sports as an avocation, balancing their academic, social and athletics experiences” (NCAA, 2010c).

The purposes of the Association are:

(a) “To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, athletics excellence and athletics participation as a recreational pursuit;
(b) To uphold the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all intercollegiate sports in conformity with the constitution and bylaws of this Association;
(c) To encourage its members to adopt eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, sportsmanship and amateurism;
(d) To formulate, copyright and publish rules of play governing intercollegiate athletics;
(e) To preserve intercollegiate athletics records;
(f) To supervise the conduct of, and to establish eligibility standards for, regional and national athletics events under the auspices of this Association;
(g) To cooperate with other amateur athletics organizations in promoting and conducting national and international athletics events;
(h) To legislate, through bylaws or by resolutions of a Convention, upon any subject of general concern to the members related to the administration of intercollegiate athletics; and
(i) To study in general all phases of competitive intercollegiate athletics and establish standards whereby the colleges and universities of the United States can maintain their athletics programs on a high level" (NCAA Constitution and Bylaws Article 1.2).

The fundamental policy of the NCAA and the obligations of its member institutions apply to basic athletics issues related to admissions, financial aid, eligibility and recruiting. It is the role of all member institutions to apply and enforce the legislation of the Association; each institution further acknowledges that the “enforcement procedures of the Association [will be] applied to an institution when it fails to fulfill [its] obligation” (NCAA Constitution and Bylaws Article 1.3.2).

Organizational Structure

With the growth of its membership as well as the growth of athletics programs across the United States, in 1973 the NCAA felt a need to change its structure. In an effort the accommodate the legislative and competitive needs of each institution, the Association divided the membership into three distinct divisions which were identified as I, II, and III (NCAA, 2010d). Division I is led by the Board of Directors; members of the Board of Directors serve four-year terms. Divisions II and III are led by Presidents Councils; members of the Presidents Councils serve four-year terms. The Board of Directors and the two Presidents Councils consist of institutional presidents and chancellors who form the NCAA Executive Committee. The terms of service of members of the Executive Committee typically coincide with their service on the applicable divisional presidential governing body (NCAA Constitution and Bylaws Article 4.1.3.2). The role of the Executive Committee is to oversee the Association and ensure each Division operates according to “basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles of the Association” (NCAA, 2010d).

Each Division also maintains a council and committee/cabinet structure. For Division I, there is a Leadership Council and Legislative Council; members of these councils may serve a four-year term (NCAA, 2010e). For Divisions II and III, there is a Management Council; members of the Management Council may serve a four-year term. In the Division I and II councils members are Athletics administrators and Faculty athletics representatives (NCAA, 2010f; NCAA, 2010g). The Division III council members are Presidents or Chancellors, Athletics administrators, Faculty athletics representatives, and Student-athletes (NCAA, 2010g).

Below the councils are three types of committees. General committees “focus on topics such as academic requirements, financial aid, eligibility and rules infractions. Sports committees deal with the administration of NCAA championships. Playing Rules committees are responsible for determining intercollegiate rules of play in their particular sports” (NCAA, 2010d).
Financial Structure

The NCAA is a nonprofit association which has tax exempt status from federal income taxes through section 509 (c) (3) of the Federal Tax Code. The annual budget for the NCAA as of August 31, 2011 was US$757 million (NCAA, 2010h). Revenues for the association are derived from Television and Marketing Rights Fees, Championship Revenue, and Investments, Fees, and Services. More than 90% of the revenue that the NCAA receives from television/marketing rights fees and championships is returned to the membership in the form of direct payments and event services; much of which is dedicated to financing academic enhancement, basketball funds, conference grants, grants-in-aid, sports sponsorship, and a student assistance fund (NCAA, 2010i). March Madness, which involves 64 qualifiers vying for the national basketball championship, is one of the largest sources of television rights fees for the NCAA. The Bowl Championship Series is the corresponding football championship series for Division 1A teams; it also generates hundreds of millions of dollars in television revenues for the NCAA.

Expenses of the NCAA are comprised of:

- Distribution to Division I members
- Division I championships and programs
- Division I Expense & Allocation
- Division II Expense & Allocation
- Division III Expense & Allocation
- Division Specific Expenses & Allocations
- Association Wide Student-Athlete Welfare and Youth Programs and Services
- Association Wide Membership Programs and Services
- Administrative Services for Division II and III Championships and Program Support

Additional expenses include fees to Collegiate Sports, LLC which is the sole member of Collegiate Football Officiating, LLC. The NCAA formed this organization in 2007 to pursue the development and maintenance of a national Division I college football officiating program (NCAA, 2010j). There are also funds identified as Contingencies and Reserves.

Operations of NCAA

Participation levels in NCAA championship sports were at an all-time high in 2010-2011 for both male and female student-athletes. The total participation of student-athletes was 430,301 for all three divisions. This number increased by almost 10,000 from the previous year. In addition, the total number of sports teams was an all-time high of 17,990 (NCAA, 2010k). In addition to providing championship events for its member institutions, the
The NCAA was also a source for providing benefits to its student-athletes in the areas of education, finance, and health and safety. These programs include scholarships, medical benefits and injury/disability insurance, drug testing and substance abuse prevention, life skills programs, development grants, and education regarding careers in sport.

The NCAA has implemented a strong marketing program to enhance and promote its image to the public and to build a strong, well-recognized brand. Part of this effort involves identifying advertisers that the public will associate with the positive sport principles that guide the association. By affiliating with such sponsors, the NCAA associates itself with respectable sports values in the minds of consumers. As consequence of these marketing efforts, NCAA has become a recognized brand both nationally and internationally.

The logos and protection are part of the strength of the NCAA brand. According to the NCAA website by July 6, 2010 the NCAA had 75 registered trademarks. The NCAA must grant approval before any of these trademarks could be used. To protect the NCAA brand, “Only NCAA corporate champions and partners are authorized to use tickets in advertising, marketing or promotional activities (e.g., giveaways) (NCAA, 2010).” Limiting the use of the brand and logos to select organizations, allows the NCAA to control the image they desire to display to the public.

The programs offered by the NCAA to member student-athletes are a unique attribute that sets the organization apart from other organizations of similar function. The NCAA offers member benefits to student-athletes that include scholarships, medical benefits, insurance, leadership programs, substance abuse prevention programs, development grants, and education regarding careers in sport (NCAA, 2010). The NCAA also conducts youth sports clinics that target children ages 8-16. These programs are designed to benefit the student-athletes in various aspects of their lives, both on the field and off. The programs focus not only on teaching young athletes about playing sports but also on developing important life skills. These perks provided to student-athletes are important because they create added bonuses for athletes who choose to compete for NCAA member institutions. The promise of a good education and the added benefits of these programs may appeal to many athletes. Programming is an effective method that the NCAA uses to attract student-athletes to member institutions.

The NCAA uses talent identification programs to promote national success in the global athletic realm. Successful athletic performance on an international scale helps a country with global recognition. The United States is globally recognized in part because of the elite level of athletic competition it offers. The first step in talent identification by the NCAA is the use of youth sports camps. These sports camps are used to develop and recognize talented athletes at a young age. The skills of these children can be honed and developed through these camps. The NCAA spent $23,766,000 on student-ath-
lete welfare and youth programs and services from 2010-2011 (NCAA, 2010h). The portion of this money spent on youth programs and services is used to fund youth sports camps for the purpose of identifying young talented athletes. The NCAA identifies the potential athletic success of these athletes while they are young so that they can begin recruiting them. The recognition of these athletes makes it easy for the NCAA to develop a strong national athletic program. A strong national athletic program is important because it can compete on an international scale.

Evaluation

Similarities of the TUSF and the NCAA

The TUSF and the NCAA share many similarities. Each is a nonprofit organization aimed at regulating the athletics within its respective country. The TUSF and the NCAA are focused on promoting athletic participation and enhancing the level of participation in each country. With both organizations, membership of educational institutions is encouraged in order to help ensure that equality and uniformity are developed within athletics.

For the TUSF and the NCAA to promote the development of athletics, each organization created a list of guidelines and objectives for the organization. The TUSF’s bylaws and the NCAA’s constitution have similar structures and serve similar purposes. They both outline the duties and responsibilities of each organization in a list that starts with the primary mission of the organization and follows with the other major responsibilities. The bylaws and constitution state that both organizations are designed to supervise and regulate the athletics within each country.

The financial structures of the TUSF and the NCAA parallel one another. The two organizations have similar sources of revenue and similar types of expenditures. Sponsorship, advertisements, and membership fees are a few sources of income that the NCAA and the TUSF have in common. The revenue from these sources are used by both organizations to fund athletics; specifically, the funds are allocated to member institutions. The member institutions of these two organizations receive funds to help support their athletic programs. The TUSF and the NCAA encourage membership so that they can regulate the athletics within their country. To accept the funding from the TUSF or the NCAA, the member institutions must agree to follow the guidelines and criteria stated by the two organizations.

In addition to similar goals and finances, the organizational structure of these two entities is similar. The TUSF and NCAA have multiple divisions within each organization. The divisions are divided into a hierarchical structure. The smallest divisions are at the top of the organizational pyramid and the largest divisions are on the bottom. The members that serve on commit-
tees within each organization serve four-year terms. The TUSF has an Executive Board, which serves a role similar to the Executive Committee of the NCAA. The Executive Committees of both organizations oversee the member institutions, and they regulate the policies and procedures of the organizations.

Differences

While the TUSF and the NCAA are similar in many ways, they also possess distinct differences. The NCAA is many decades older than the TUSF, so it has had more time to grow and develop, to mature. The NCAA is much larger than the TUSF, given that the number of colleges and universities in the United States is substantially larger than the number of such institutions in Turkey. However, these numbers have enabled the TUSF to recruit a larger proportion of Turkish colleges and universities as members than the NCAA has recruited U.S. colleges and universities.

The amount of collegiate athletic participation in each country also creates a distinct level of difference between the TUSF and the NCAA. From 2010-2011, the United States total NCAA athletic participation level surpassed 430,000 student-athletes (NCAA, 2010k). In Turkey, the total number of athletic participants affiliated with the TUSF in 2009 was 16,311 (TUIK, 2009). This means that the number of the participation of the athletes in NCAA is significantly larger than the one in TUSF. The TUSF number was almost double the total from 2000, but it still does not compare to the scale of the participation levels that the NCAA records. This significant difference in the participation can be linked to the rooted past of the NCAA. Since the NCAA is 90 years older than the TUSF it had more time to construct the system and operate the sports and today the number of associated institutions and participants is much higher in the United States. However, more importantly, this difference might be related to the economic development of the countries. Promoting the idea of the sport among the society systematically needs money and programming. Although it is an OECD member, by all means, Turkey is a developing country. According to economic aspects, dissemination of the sport is a non-priority issue for the governments. Indeed, promoting the sport was not an issue of government until the 5th Development Plan, 1985-1989 (n.d.) in Turkey. After considering sports as a “social target” in 1989, it has been included in the later 5-years-development-plans. Therefore, it could be said that today the infrastructure of the society’s awareness about sports which was not considered to be developed for years, affects the athletic participation in sport institutes like the TUSF.

Furthermore, the total income for the two organizations can be considered as a major factor in their operational differences. The TUSF’s spends approximately $252.24 per student-athlete; while, the NCAA spends approximately $1,690.48 per student-athletes. Here, economic aspect of the higher partici-
pation of the athletes in the NCAA becomes clearer. The difference in the scale of revenue affects the budgeting and expenditures of the two organizations since the majority of the TUSF’s income is received from funding allocated by the GDYS. Unfortunately, this is causing a controversy with regards to the autonomy of the TUSF in Turkish sports management arenas (GSGM, 2009, Erturan, 2010). Since autonomy means to have financial and managerial liberty, like all the other sport federations in Turkey, the TUSF’s position can be defined as semi-autonomous according to the grants that shape the budget. For example, advertisement income, which is a good sign of financial strength, is less than 30% of the TUSF’s total income. Conversely, as an autonomous sport organization, the NCAA has the main source of budgeted revenue from television and marketing rights fees at 90%, according to the 2010-2011 budget, and typically it has almost no relation with the government in terms of making the budget. The NCAA’s $757 million made from this sector is dispersed to member institutions to fund their athletic programs.

The breakdown of the expenditures by both organizations is an important difference in how they operate. Because the TUSF has much less money to spend, their allocations are smaller. The majority of the TUSF’s income is used to fund domestic sporting events, followed by funding for international events. This is different from how the NCAA allocates their funds. The majority of the NCAA’s budget is distributed to the member universities and colleges in order to fund their athletic programs. Most of the NCAA’s income, 68%, is allocated to Division I athletic programs, while the Division II and III schools combined receive less than 10% of the total budget.

Data regarding TUSF’s marketing practices is not readily available. The effectiveness of TUSF’s marketing is a major difference in comparison to the NCAA. The NCAA’s marketing practices developed the organization’s strong, well-known brand. TUSF’s brand does not have the same level of recognition or strength, which may be a result of their marketing practices. If the TUSF made some modifications regarding its marketing practices, there might be opportunities to increase revenue generation by the organization. Facebook has been a strong marketing tool in the United States. The NCAA currently has 23,854 people following it on Facebook, and each sport and championship game has its own fans and friends. As of September 2010, Turkey has the 4th largest population of Facebook followers, but the TUSF has not established a presence Facebook. The current political environment in Turkey may be a deterrent for Facebook by this organization, as there have been legislative discussions regarding banning Facebook in Turkey. However, increasing marketing efforts will attract more supporters for the organization which ultimately will attract more advertisers and sponsors. Thus, if the TUSF implemented programs and applied more modern marketing methods, it could develop a financial strength that provides more liberal management as an autonomous federation.
Based upon the research, TUSF does not have any data about programs they offer to their athletes. If the TUSF is able to develop programming opportunities within Turkish communities such as sport clinics, the organization might be able to expand the growth of sport in Turkey by exposing more children to sport and increasing participation levels. TUSF also does not currently have any data on talent identification programs; therefore this area appears underdeveloped in comparison to the NCAA.

Conclusion

There undoubtedly are similarities between the two organizations, such as their purposes, sources of income and organizational structures. There are differences like their age (time of existence), number of members, participation of athletes and their budgets. Based on the analysis of each organization and their similarities and differences, we identified three areas that could encourage the growth of the TUSF and overall sport in Turkey. These areas were marketing, programming, and talent identification. Implemented effectively, these focus areas could provide (1) increased financial independence, (2) a network of programs that will encourage sport in Turkey and support athletes currently competing at the collegiate level, and (3) additional opportunities for athletes to compete on the collegiate level and to represent the country in international events such as the Olympic Games.
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