

Igor Ivašković, PhD

School of Business and Economics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

igor.ivaskovic@ef.uni-lj.si

THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING »PERFORMANCE« IN NON-PROFIT SPORT ORGANIZATIONS: THE CASE OF BASKETBALL CLUBS FROM SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Received: November 30, 2019

Accepted: December 23, 2020

<https://doi.org/10.46458/27121097.2020.26.70>

Preliminary communication

Abstract

The article examines the problem of ambiguities in the process of measuring the performance in non-profit sports clubs which is one of the main causes for disputes between various stakeholders in the process of determining organizational strategies and strategic objectives. The first objective is to use the non-profit basketball clubs as an example, to describe their specifics from the aspect of organizational performance and to reveal what exactly, beside the financial and sports results, is necessary to take into account for the performance evaluation in these organizations. The second objective is to disclose non-profit sport clubs' actual strategic orientations.

The explorative factor analysis performed on performance estimations of 15 organizational goals was obtained on a sample of 73 non-profit basketball clubs from four South-Eastern European countries. The results indicate two basic strategic orientations of non-profit basketball clubs, namely financial-competitive and non-financial-recreational orientation. The findings may be helpful to clubs' managements in the process of defining missions and hierarchy of strategic goals for their organizations.

Keywords: *performance, strategy, non-profit organizations, basketball clubs, South-Eastern Europe;*

JEL: L31

1. INTRODUCTION

According to some estimates (Arnaut, 2006, 19) in 2006 around 10 million volunteers experienced work within approximately 700,000 sports clubs, and today this figure is for sure much higher. Assessing the performance of these organizations seems quite simple to a considerable part of people. After the season every fan of a particular club will easily assess whether “his/her” team fulfilled the expectations or whether a certain percentage of wins, the position in the league or the number of trophies were such that the season should be considered as successful. At the same time, the club’s management will relatively easily assess financial performance indicators, e.g. how much the revenues grew or decreased, how much expenditure did the club have, and to what extent the organization has already provided funding for the upcoming season. A financial investor will have somewhat more difficult task in assessing the efficiency of the investment, but he/she will also be able to determine whether his business has improved since he/she sponsored a particular sports team. Finally, the potential owner will be able to determine the club’s value, especially if it is listed on the stock exchange. Otherwise, he/she will at least be able to assess the organization’s accounting value. The difficulty in assessing the overall performance of the organization arises when we have to decide to which performance indicator should be given higher priority, and this process gets even more complicated if a non-profit sports club is to be assessed. The fact is that European sport clubs are closer to the non-profit sector than their US counterparts, which is in line with EU Commission’s statement that sport clubs should offer sport opportunities at a local level and thus promote the “sport for all” idea (Petry, Steinbach and Tokarski, 2004). In this context, in some former centrally-planned states as well as in some Nordic countries even highly professional top sport clubs preserved non-profit legal forms (Ibsen, 2006; Škorić, Bartoluci, and Čustonja, 2012). In the latter relationships between stakeholders and, consequently, the hierarchy of the club’s objectives are not entirely clear.

The ambition of this article is to explore what should be taken into account when assessing the performance of non-profit sports organizations. We were primarily interested in the goals pursued by club managements and whether there are other goals, in addition to already mentioned financial and sports results, that are important for non-profit sport organizations. In this context the article aims to evaluate the importance of organizational goals, and to discuss different strategic orientations of non-profit sports clubs.

2. SPECIFICS OF NON-PROFIT SPORT CLUBS IN SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

The majority of European sport competitions have preserved the traditional system, where the best clubs in the end of the season advance in a higher ranked competition, while clubs with the worst sport result drop into a lower level league. This differentiates the so-called European “open” system from the “closed” one which is used in the majority of professional sport leagues in United States. The latter enables sport clubs to have a greater degree of certainty, while European sport clubs have to preserve organizational flexibility. At the same time, unlike in the USA, Europe does not have the system of athletes’ development incorporated into the educational system. Consequently, European sport clubs have to develop young athletes, who will eventually participate in the top sport competitions. Therefore, most of European sport clubs have mixed organizational structures consisted of professional and amateur parts. This dual nature also results in mixed teams’ structures, composed of professionals and amateurs (Boxall and Purcell, 2000; Auld and Godbey, 1998). In addition, a large percent of European sport clubs still operate as non-profit organizations regardless of the collapse of communist regimes Eastern Europe. The positive aspect of non-profit legal form is that it enables easier access to public funds, but at the same time it often enables hiding the organizational ownership structure and consequently allows a non-transparent distribution of business risk in “bad times”. However, mixed organizational structures and involvement of public institutions into clubs operations bring up a new perspective on their performance evaluation.

As mentioned, the majority of sport clubs from South-East Europe still operate as non-profit organizations regardless of the fact that the current legislation in some countries offers various legal possibilities. For instance, Slovenian legislation from 1995 and 2006 allowed the transformation from a non-profit to a for-profit status form (Ilešič, 2004), but in practice this was usually prevented by national federations. This is also the case in the field of basketball where clubs, in order to compete in national leagues, have to be members of the basketball federation whose statute explicitly excludes all for-profit organizations. Thus, sport managers in those clubs are not in the position to choose the legal structure, which has been confirmed to significantly affect sponsorship income (Dietl and Weingärtner, 2011; Wicker et al., 2012). Croatia has somewhat more sophisticated sport legislation, but paradoxically cases from practice have shown that the transformation into a for-profit legal form only takes place when a sport club is on the edge of bankruptcy, while clubs with a healthy financial background retain their non-profit status. Similar situations are seen in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Serbia. Thus, the budgets of those sport clubs, unlike the budgets of their counterparts from Western Europe, still consist of a significantly higher proportion of funds from public institutions, as well as from funds from companies that are partly or fully owned by the state or municipality (Škorić, Bartoluci, and Čustonja,

2012). On one hand, the easier access to public funds enables clubs' managers to conduct a wider spectrum of activities, but at the same time it could sow seeds of conflict between public and private investors regarding what the clubs' objectives and strategies should be. It is therefore understandable why the 'evergreen' discussion of whether sport clubs should be entitled to non-profit status and public funding is still very relevant.

Critics of non-profit sport clubs support the idea of transforming clubs into profit legal forms and advocate the full transparency of ownership (Bergant-Rakočević, 2008). They claim that those clubs are in fact not established with a view to helping vulnerable segments of the population so they should not be allowed to compete for funds, which should be spent for charitable purposes. Those critics also support Daft's (1998) warning that the ambition of sport clubs' managers to satisfy some stakeholders may lead to the alienation of others who should in fact be in the focus of the organizational mission. On the other hand, the main argument for preserving sport clubs' non-profit legal forms are the positive externalities, mostly the proliferation of sport values among youth, which is one of the keys to the development of a healthy and prosperous society. In accordance with the principles of economic logic, sport activities should be financed by those who benefit from it. If positive returns are both private and public, then the funding should come from both sources. This group also denies the claim that stakeholder groups, which behave like suppliers of capital and are only interested in returns on their investments, have a significant influence on non-profit sport clubs' strategies. At first sight, the arguments of both sides are well grounded, but obviously they have different starting points, which stimulated us to conduct empirical research on the different perspectives of non-profit sport clubs' performance.

Basketball might be only one branch of the sport industry, but according to the size of the organizations and their financial budgets, basketball clubs from South-Eastern Europe can be considered representatives of other non-profit sport clubs. Basketball for sure has a long tradition and glorious history in ex-Yugoslav countries. National teams and clubs have won numerous trophies in top competitions both before and after the break-up of Yugoslavia. These achievements are even more admirable if we know that basketball clubs are relatively small organizations, usually with fewer than 50 club members (without members of youth basketball schools the average club in this research had 22.1 members) and an average budget of EUR 0.4 million (Ivašković, 2018). Despite the disintegration of Yugoslavia, cooperation among basketball clubs in the area covered in the present study remained strong. Clubs' managers realized they shared the same problems, primarily too small markets and thus poor competition within the national basketball leagues; therefore, they formed the regional Adriatic Basketball League (ABL). However, there is a significant difference between basketball clubs that compete at the highest level of competition and others. The most recent studies revealed the following (Ivašković, 2018).

1. The scope of financial resources increases and a quality of infrastructure improves with the quality of competition in which a club participates.
2. The share of public funds in the clubs' budgets decreases at higher levels of quality.
3. First division clubs are predominantly professional organizations, while second and lower division clubs operate as amateur organizations.
4. Clubs at higher quality levels compared to their counterparts in lower divisions have a larger administrative part, which includes significantly higher proportion of highly educated personnel.
5. Personnel on managerial and administrative functions are mostly people from the local environment in all segments; however, there is a significant inclination of top clubs to find these people on the wider national and international markets.
6. Head coaches, athletes, and clubs' presidents bear the largest share of responsibility for the club's performance.
7. At higher quality levels the influence of the sports director on HRM field increases, and the influence of the club's president decreases.
8. With the quality level the influence of non-club stakeholders increases, namely sponsors' representatives and athletes' agents; this indicates the process of decentralization and higher share of outsourced services in clubs with higher degree of professionalization.

3. HYPOTHESIS

Development of clear hierarchy of organizational goals is one of the key desired outcomes of the strategy process (Gurkov, 2009; Gurkov 2010). The latter is under strong impact of the stakeholder's structure and their hierarchy within the club (Berman et al. 1999; Barringer and Bluedorn 1999; Selvin and Covin 1997). The fact is that in non-profit sport clubs a large number of interest groups may see their interests, which consequently leads to ambiguity in the organizational objectives' hierarchy. This, however, might negatively affect organizational productivity (Mulhare, 1999). Due to the facts that managements of non-profit sport clubs have to adapt to key stakeholders (Ivašković, Čater, and Čater, 2017), and that organizations, which finance sport organizations, are mostly profit-oriented (Škorić, Bartoluci, and Čustonja 2012), we may assume those clubs will emphasize more commercial objectives (Meenaghan, 1983). This basically means that sponsored club will try to attach its goals directly to the commercial goals of sponsors, which should be placed higher in the club's hierarchy of objectives. Thus, we expect that clubs at the highest level of competition place financial and sport results higher on their hierarchy of objectives. On the contrary, lower

quality level clubs emphasize more non-financial and local community based objectives. Therefore, we suggest the hypothesis as it follows.

Hypothesis: The clubs at the highest level of competition place financial and sport results higher on their hierarchy of objectives, while clubs in lower divisions emphasize more non-financial and local community based objectives.

The process budgeting is the crucial moment which discloses all the conflicting objectives, because that process reflects the actual club's priorities. Therefore the budgeting is usually under strong pressures stakeholders (Baroncelli and Lago 2006; Kern, Schwarzmann and Wiedenegger 2012). The final hierarchy of objectives discloses actual strategic orientation of a sport club. From this aspect Keller (2008) divided them into clubs that pursue sustainable strategy and clubs which try to achieve top sports results. While first invest their financial surplus in the development of local sport infrastructure, local community, young athletes etc., other invest in the acquisition of top skilled athletes. This shows that determining the strategic orientation of sport clubs is not always in line with the differentiation/low cost/niche focus division. In line with that and with the fact that non-profit sport clubs are expected to have a wider spectrum of potential purposes (Cuskelly 2004), for the purpose of this study we followed the Paauwe and Boselie's (2008) advice that sometimes is necessary to explore and modify the strategy classification.

4. METHODOLOGY

This research was performed among men's basketball clubs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia and Slovenia. Although only one branch of the sport industry according to the size of the organizations and their financial budgets, basketball clubs can be considered representatives of other non-profit sport clubs from this part of Europe. Basketball has a long tradition and glorious history in ex-Yugoslav countries. Regardless of the somewhat different development of the legal environment in the studied countries, all basketball clubs have retained their non-profit status.

We used the clubs' presidents (i.e. president of the management board or president of the board of directors) as our main source of information, because they usually have the best overview of their clubs' strategic behavior. We contacted 249 of them and invited them to participate in the research. Participation was completely voluntary. The data collection took place through the whole 2013/2014 season, never immediately after a competition in order to avoid competition-specific biases. 73 presidents were willing to cooperate, resulting in the response rate of 29.3%. The sample consisted of 27 first-division clubs (the highest national competition level), 31 second-division clubs and 15 clubs from the third level of

national competitions in selected countries. Of the 27 first-division clubs, 9 also participated in international competitions (ABL, EuroChallenge cup, Eurocup, or Euroleague) (see Table 1). The participants had on average 4.87 (SD = 3.70) years of management experience in the current club and on average had held their presidential position for 2.53 (SD = 1.36) years.

Table 1. Sample

Country	First division		Second division		Third division		Return rate by country
	All clubs (ABL)	In sample (ABL)	All clubs	In sample	All clubs	In sample	
BiH	14 (2)	5(1)	12	3	21	2	21.3
Croatia	13 (3)	7(3)	34	14	19	3	36.4
Slovenia	12 (2)	9(2)	13	8	24	5	44.9
Serbia	17 (4)	6(3)	14	6	56	5	19.5
Sum	56 (11)	27 (9)	73	31	120	15	29.3
Return rate by divisions	48.2 (81.8)		42.5		12.5		

Note. All clubs are non-profit organizations.

The list of sport clubs' objectives which might influence the perception of organizational performance was obtained by the group of 12 managers, each with at least five years of work experience in non-profit basketball clubs. Every manager wrote down five most important organizational goals, and had to identify five more additional objectives that are actually pursued in basketball clubs. Therefore, each of them identified 10 sport club goals. We combined similar objectives and obtained the final list of 15 goals: (1) promotion of state/municipality; (2) development of infrastructure in local environment; (3) private sponsor promotion; (4) attracting spectators to the matches; (5) development of athletes for national selections; (6) surplus of revenues over expenses; (7) development of top basketball players; (8) sport results of the first team; (9) budget growth; (10) increasing athletes' market value; (11) reducing the costs; (12) increasing the number of club members; (13) involvement of local population in the club's activities; (14) encouraging local population to do sports; and (15) sport results of junior teams.

Our respondents, clubs' presidents, had to assess the importance of each of these 15 organizational goals for their club on a 7-point Likert scale, where (1) stands for "not important at all", (2) denotes "very low importance", (3) "relatively less important goal", (4) "moderately important", (5) "relatively important goal", (6) "very important goal", and (7) "the most important of all listed goals."

5. RESULTS

Table 1 shows that the “increasing the number of club members” was the most important objective for observed clubs. It was followed by “encouraging local people to do sports” and “the involvement of local population in the club’s activities.” The least important organizational goal was “generation of surplus revenues,” followed by “increasing the athletes’ market value” and “reducing the costs.” An analysis of differences between clubs on different quality levels reveals that the hierarchy of objectives in third division clubs was similar to overall results. Among the second division clubs the objective of “the local population involvement in the club’s activities” was replaced by the objective of “attracting spectators” among top three most important aims. We can see that as a desire of second division managements’ to involve local population passively rather than actively, which seems to be the consequence of higher degree of clubs’ professionalization. At the same time, first division clubs were more focused on “attracting spectators,” “the top athletes’ development” and “private sponsor promotion”. The organizational goals hierarchy among the top sub-segment was slightly different. “Sport results of first team” were on the first place, “private sponsor promotion” on second and “generation of profit” on third.

The ANOVA results showed that the importance of “promoting private sponsors” increased with the level of competition. The clubs from first and second divisions in contrast to the clubs in third division gave higher priority to “attracting spectators,” “development of athletes for national selections,” “development of top basketball players,” “sport results of first team,” “growth of athletes’ market value,” “generation of profit,” “reducing the costs” and “budget growth”, while no statistically significant differences were found regarding the importance of the “state/municipality promotion” and “the development of sports infrastructure in local environment.” On the other hand, the largest difference was noticed regarding the importance of “budget growth.” In addition to that, the clubs from the second divisions showed the highest interest in “increasing the number of club members”, while the top clubs seemed to be relatively less interested in “local population involvement in the club’s activities.” T-test results show that top clubs emphasized “promotion of private sponsors,” “development of top basketball players,” “sport results of first team,” “growth of athletes’ market value,” “generation of profit,” “reducing the costs” and “budget growth,” and paid less attention to “the development of sports infrastructure in local environment,” “increasing the number of club members,” “promotion of state/municipality,” “encouragement of locals to do sports” and “the involvement of local population in the club’s activities.”

Table 2. Hierarchy of organizational objectives

Objective	M	SD	Level of competition			ANOVA (significantly different groups)
			1st (ABL)	2nd	3rd	
Increasing the number of club members	5.41	1.38	4.89 (2.78)	6.06	5.00	F = 7.07; p = 0.00 (1st and 2nd; 2nd and 3rd)
Encouraging local population to do sports	5.37	1.61	4.70 (2.78)	5.90	5.47	F = 4.41; p = 0.02 (1st and 2nd)
Involvement of local population in the club's activities	5.18	1.60	4.30 (2.56)	5.52	6.07	F = 8.59; p = 0.00 (1st and 2nd; 1st and 3rd)
Attracting spectators to the matches	5.16	1.43	5.63 (5.33)	5.63	3.33	F = 26.30; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Sport results of junior teams	4.85	1.27	4.85 (4.44)	5.23	4.07	F = 4.67; p = 0.01 (2nd and 3rd)
Development of top basketball players	4.71	1.75	5.26 (5.44)	5.29	2.53	F = 23.90; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Development of infrastructure in local environment	4.63	1.60	4.19 (2.44)	4.90	4.87	F = 1.69; p = 0.19 (no significant differences)
Promotion of state/municipality	4.42	1.50	4.07 (2.44)	4.52	4.87	F = 1.47; p = 0.24 (no significant differences)
Development of athletes for national selections	4.36	1.74	4.48 (4.00)	5.13	2.53	F = 16.271; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Sport results of the first team	4.34	1.91	5.00 (6.78)	4.74	2.33	F = 14.58; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Budget growth	4.21	1.86	4.85 (5.67)	4.94	1.53	F = 41.05; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Private sponsor promotion	4.07	1.95	5.22 (6.44)	3.94	2.27	F = 15.74; p = 0.00 (all differences are significant)
Reducing the costs	4.03	1.89	4.70 (5.33)	4.35	2.13	F = 13.04; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Surplus of revenues over expenses	3.60	2.01	4.19 (5.78)	4.10	1.53	F = 13.59; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)
Increasing athletes' market value	3.75	2.04	4.70 (6.00)	3.77	2.00	F = 10.78; p = 0.00 (1st and 3rd.; 2nd and 3rd)

Note: M – mean; SD – standard deviation; ABL - Adriatic Basketball League.

Source: own work

In the next phase we conducted the explorative factor analysis for the hierarchy of organizational objectives. Already in the first iteration it resulted with two relatively clear factors (Bartlett test: $\chi^2(105) = 861.875$, $p = .000$, $KMO = .861$; all variables $MSA > .5$; both factors explained 68.67% of variance) (Table 3). In first factor mostly financial and top sport results aims were included; whereas the other factor consisted of mostly non-profit and local community based objectives.

Table 3. Results of factor analysis for importance of organizational aims

Component	Factor	
	1	2
Involvement of local population in the club's activities	-,700	,568
Encouraging local population to do sports	-,548	,688
Promotion of state/municipality	-,524	,568
Increasing the number of club members		,823
Development of infrastructure in local environment		,740
Sport results of junior teams	,504	,522
Attracting spectators to the matches	,596	,561
Development of athletes for national selections	,616	,524
Reducing the costs	,707	
Private sponsor promotion	,750	
Budget growth	,806	
Development of top basketball players	,818	
Sport results of the first team	,842	
Surplus of revenues over expenses	,864	
Increasing athletes' market value	,869	

Source: own work

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to provide answers to question which objectives are pursued in non-profit sport clubs and then how the clubs on different quality levels differentiate regarding their strategic focus. The study once again confirmed a whole spectrum of different organizational aims within non-profit sport organizations, even within so narrow group as are non-profit basketball clubs. The fact that in these organizations numerous stakeholders see their interests (Ivašković, Čater, and Čater, 2017), results with ambiguity of organizational primary goals. This study also confirmed a huge difference among examined non-profit sports clubs regarding their priorities. At the highest level of quality clubs' managements usually place financial and sport results higher on their hierarchy of objectives. On the contrary, lower quality level clubs emphasize more non-financial and local community based objectives. Evidently, higher ranked clubs place the goal of

“promoting private sponsors” higher due to larger investments of the latter in these organizations. The third division clubs, on the other hand, don’t cherish great ambitions for “attracting spectators,” “development of athletes for national selections,” “development of top basketball players,” “sport results of first team,” “growth of athletes’ market value,” “generation of profit,” “reducing the costs” and “budget growth”, since these are mostly amateur organizations with athletes who don’t have top sport capacities. Moreover, the fact that second division clubs show higher interest in “increasing the number of club members”, implicates that third division clubs are mostly oriented on satisfying the needs of current club members. Interestingly, no statistically significant differences were found regarding the importance of the “state/municipality promotion” and “the development of sports infrastructure in local environment” which indicates that even top sport clubs see these achievements more as collaterals rather than organizational intentions. As expected, the largest difference was noticed regarding the importance of “budget growth” as that is the key leverage for top clubs to maintain their high ranking.

Obviously, higher quality clubs attract more money and are thus forced to seek sponsors among profit-oriented enterprises (Ivašković, Čater, and Čater 2017). At the same time this reduces management’s interest in local community objectives. This is in line with some previous claims (e.g. Ivašković and Čater, 2018) that in those organizations, where the role of public institutions is larger, managements usually pursue established routines and follow less financially aggressive strategies. In line with our hypothesis, the findings show that higher quality clubs give more importance not only to financial goals, but also to sports results as well. At the same time, sport lower quality clubs tend to be more oriented to contributing to the social welfare at the expense of maximizing pure financial gains. This objective also includes the aim of engaging more people from local environment into the clubs’ activities.

We can conclude that defining purpose and consequent mission statement for non-profit sport organization is a complex process, as those organizations are usually influenced by the specific business process (that is under the impact of historical development of sport organizations in particular country), the system of national and transnational competitions and, of course, it is also influenced by the level of competition in which particular club participates. In this study we tried to justify the need for a special, multi-dimensional treatment of the performance measurement in non-profit sports clubs. This issue cannot be easily reduced on financial and sports results measures. The factorization of 15 organizational goals developed for the context of non-profit basketball clubs, which can be adapted to other clubs analogously, show that we can distinguish between at least two basic strategic orientations; namely financially-competitive

and non-financial-recreational. For the literature in the field of non-profit sports organizations management the development of these two performance indicators enables an upgrade of the existing attempts to conceptualize success in similar organizations (Papadimitriou, 2007) and facilitates understanding of their purpose. The development of two aspects of the performance for non-profit sports clubs can also help the managers in similar organizations at identifying and resolving the key dilemmas which they face in the process of formulating club missions. The results of this analysis may also serve as guidelines for determining club goals, which is necessary not only for measuring performance, but also for assessing the direct impact of various environmental and (internal) organizational factors on the non-profit sports clubs' performance. Hopefully this will be from now a bit easier.

In conclusion, it is fair to mention the limitation of the particular research in order to help all future scholars who will have the ambition to deal with the problem of performance in non-profit organizations. We used subjective survey-based data, which were collected only from non-profit sport clubs in four countries with similar historical background. This might influence the ambition to generalize the results. Moreover, the response rate among the third division clubs was relatively low, which implicates somewhat lower reliability of the results for this segment. In line with the mentioned, we suggest additional empirical verification on sport organizations and non-profits from different environments and from other sport branches.

REFERENCES

1. Arnaut, J. L. (2006). Independent European Sport Review: Najdeno 15. maja 2012 na spletnem naslovu: www.independentfootballreview.com/doc/Full_Report_EN.pdf.
2. Auld, C. J. and Godbey, G. (1998). Influence in Canadian national sport organizations: perceptions of professionals and volunteers. *Journal of sport management*, 12(1), 20-38.
3. Baroncelli, A., and Lago, U. (2006). Italian Football. *Journal of Sport Economics*, February: 13–28.
4. Barringer, B. R., and Bluedorn, A. C. (1999). The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal* 20, 421–444.
5. Becker, B. E., and Huselid, M. A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Journal*, 16(1), 53–101.

6. Bergant-Rakočević, V. (ed.) (2008). *Šport & pravo*. Ljubljana: Gospodarski vestnik.
7. Berman, S. L., Wicks, A. C., Kotha, S., and T. M. Jones. (1999). Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 42 (5), 488–506.
8. Boxall, P. and Purcell, J. (2000). Strategic human resource management: where have we come from and where should we be going? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(2), 183–203.
9. Cuskelly, G. (2004). Volunteer retention in community sport organisations. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 4(2), 59–76.
10. Daft, R. L. (1998). *Organization theory and design* (6th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
11. Dietl, H. and Weingärtner, C. (2011). The effect of professional football clubs' legal structure on sponsoring revenue. *Journal of Sponsorship*, 4(4), 377 – 390.
12. Gurkov, I. (2009). Strategy process as formulation and realization of corporate goals: the synthesis of surveys in Russian firms. *Journal for East European Management Studies* 14(1), 48–64.
13. Gurkov, I. (2010). Strategy techniques for the times of high uncertainty. *Journal for East European Management Studies* 15(2), 177–186.
14. Ibsen, B. (2006). Sport and welfare policy in Denmark. Paper presented at the Workshop 'Sport, Politics and Public Policy'. ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25–30 April 2006.
15. Ilešič, M. (2004). Pravni status športnih organizacij. *Podjetje in delo*, 30(6–7), 1639–1644.
16. Ivašković, I. (2018) The specifics of HRM systems in Southeastern European basketball clubs. The paper presented at 3rd Business & entrepreneurial economics conference, 30th May - 2nd June, Šibenik, Croatia 2018.
17. Ivašković, I. and Čater, T. (2018). The influence of public funding on the strategies and performance of non-profit basketball clubs from South-Eastern Europe. *Ekonomska istraživanja* 31(1), 796–810.
18. Ivašković, I., Čater, T., and Čater, B. (2017). The strategic influence of stakeholders in non-profit organisations: the role of municipality in basketball clubs from South-East Europe. *Journal for East European management studies* 22(4), 596–620.
19. Kaplan, R. S. (2001). Strategic performance measurement and management in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 11(3), 353–370.

20. Keller, K. L. (2008). *Strategic brand management. Building, measuring, and managing brand equity* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River (NJ): Pearson.
21. Kern, A., Schwarzmann, M., and Wiedenegger, A. (2012). Measuring the efficiency of English Premier League football: A two-stage data envelopment analysis approach. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* 2(3), 177 – 195.
22. Meenaghan, J. A. (1983). Commercial sponsorship. *European Journal of Marketing* 7(7), 5-73.
23. Mulhare, E. M. (1999). Mindful of the future: Strategic planning ideology and the culture of nonprofit management. *Human Organizations* 58(3), 323-330.
24. Paauwe, J., and Boselie, P. (2008). *HRM and performance: What's next?* Working paper. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies.
25. Papadimitriou, D. (2007). Conceptualizing effectiveness in a non-profit organizational environment. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 20(7), 571–587.
26. Petry, K., Steinbach, D., and Tokarski, W. (2004). Sport systems in the countries of the European Union: similarities and differences. *European Journal for Sport and Society* 1(1), 15-21.
27. Pološki-Vokić, N. (2004). Menadžament ljudskih potencijala u velikim hrvatskim poduzećima. *Ekonomski pregled*, 55(5–6), 455–478.
28. Selvin, D., and Covin, J. (1997). Strategy formation patterns, performance, and the significance of context. *Journal of Management* 23(2), 189-209.
29. Škorić, S., Bartoluci, M., and Čustonja, Z. (2012). Public financing in Croatian sport. *Financial Theory & Practice* 36(2), 109-227.
30. Wicker, P., Weingärtner, C., Breuer, C., and Dietl, H. (2012). The effect of a sport institution's legal structure on sponsorship income: The case of amateur equestrian sports in Germany. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 7(4), 340-357. Retrieved from: http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/49522/82057_1.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 26 September 2015)

dr. sc. Igor Ivašković

Ekonomski fakultet, Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Slovenija

igor.ivaskovic@ef.uni-lj.si

PROBLEM DEFINIRANJA »USPJEŠNOSTI« U NEPROFITNIM SPORTSKIM ORGANIZACIJAMA: PRIMJER KOŠARKAŠKIH KLUBOVA IZ JUGOISTOČNE EUROPE

Primljen: 11. studenog 2019.

Prihvaćen: 23. prosinac 2020.

<https://doi.org/10.46458/27121097.2020.26.70>

Prethodno priopćenje

Sažetak

Članak istražuje problem nejasnoća u procesu mjerenja uspješnosti u neprofitnim sportskim klubovima što je jedan od glavnih uzroka sporova između različitih dionika u procesu utvrđivanja organizacijskih strategija i strateških ciljeva u tim organizacijama. Prvi je cilj na primjeru neprofitnih košarkaških klubova opisati specifičnosti s aspekta organizacijske uspješnosti i otkriti što je točno, osim financijskih i sportskih rezultata, potrebno uzeti u obzir kod ocjenjivanja uspješnosti u tim organizacijama. Drugi je cilj otkriti stvarne strateške orijentacije neprofitnih sportskih klubova. Provedena je faktorska analiza ocjena uspješnosti na području 15 organizacijskih ciljeva na uzorku od 73 neprofitna košarkaška kluba iz četiri zemlje jugoistočne Europe. Rezultati ukazuju na dvije osnovne strateške orijentacije, a to su financijsko-takmičarska i nefinancijsko-rekreacijska. Rezultati mogu biti od pomoći klupskim upravama kod definiranja organizacijskih poslanstava i opredjeljivanja hijerarhije strateških ciljeva svojih klubova.

Ključne riječi: *uspješnost, strategija, neprofitne organizacije, košarkaški klubovi, jugoistočna Europa;*

JEL: L31