

## 9 Brazil

*Gonzalo Bravo*

### Topics

- The role of government and the enactment of public policies to organise and fund sport
- The constitutional rank given to sport in Brazil
- The perceived importance of high-performance sport and its influence over public policies and funding
- Business management practices and their role in shaping effective governance in sport organisations.

### Objectives

- To explain the evolution of organised sport in Brazil and its impact over the governance of sport organisations
- To discuss governmental role and the struggle to achieve consensus for a national sport policy in Brazil
- To discuss how different sport laws, enacted since 1940, have influenced the Brazilian sport system
- To explain the role of sport leaders in shaping the governance of sport organisations
- To examine the organisational features of the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation and the reasons behind its success
- To examine the alignment of sport polices' goals with sport policies' interventions of public and private sport governing bodies.

### Key terms

**Mass sport** Form of sport participation that is practiced on a voluntary basis. It contributes to promote social integration, health promotion and care for the environment.

**Educational sport** Form of sport participation that primarily takes place in school settings. It contributes to the overall individual's wellbeing by promoting civic values. This type of sport discourages early selectivity based on skills and excessive competitiveness among its participants.

**High-performance sport** Form of sport participation that is in compliance to national and international rules. Its participation is reaching the highest level of performance. It is categorised as professional or non-professional.

**Sport confederation** A national governing body that groups a number of sport federations. In Brazil, there is only one sport confederation for each sport.

**Law Agnelo–Piva** Federal law that assigns two per cent of the lottery to fund Olympic and Paralympic programmes.

## Overview

The chapter examines the evolution of sport policies in Brazil by looking at the role played by public and private structures in the process and struggle to achieve national sport policies. It also discusses the role of the federal constitution in shaping these policies and the perceived importance of high-performance sport in influencing them. Among the factors that have influenced priorities for funding and governance of sport in Brazil are: the Constitution of 1988 and the subsequent laws enacted since then, the political context with the return to democracy, and the economic growth of the country during the last decade.

The Brazilian Volleyball Confederation (Confederação Brasileira do Voleibol – CBV) serves as a case study to illustrate the growth and success of a national governing body (NGB) in the current setting of sport policies in Brazil that, for years, had minimal impact. To understand the context in which the CBV operates, a description of the main issues related to the governance of sport in Brazil is also presented.

## Sport governance in Brazil and the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation

Brazil, in terms of size and population, is not only the largest country in Latin America, but is also the largest economy too. In 2011, Brazil's gross domestic product (GDP) ranked sixth in the world (World Bank, 2012). Nevertheless, while some indicators related to human development like education, index of inequality, and life expectancy, still fall behind when compared to other developed nations, the last decade had seen Brazil, along with China, India and Russia, as a part of the new bloc of emerging economies of the world (Zakaria, 2009).

Across the Latin American region, Brazil's status and leadership is not only seen in terms of its economic power, but also in terms of its politics, culture and sport. Due to its geographical location, Brazilian national sport governing bodies fall under the jurisdiction of South American governance agencies like CONMEBOL in football, CONSUDATLE in track and field, and ODESUR or PASO for major regional competitions.

Considering the historical success achieved by Brazilian athletes, the entire Brazilian sport system represents a model to follow for most countries across

Latin America. Over the years, Brazilian athletes have reached a level of success which few other Latin American athletes and teams have. For example, since the second half of the twentieth century, the men's football team has dominated not only in South America, but also throughout the world. Brazilian athletes have also reached world and Olympic success in men's and women's volleyball, sailing, swimming, formula one, track and field, and judo. Overall, these athletes have obtained 108 medals at the summer Olympic Games, thus ranking them second in Latin America after Cuba.

Complementing the success of Brazilian sports has been the significant growth of the sport industry over the past three decades. DaCosta (2006a) estimated that in the early 2000s there were 85 million sport participants, of which 700,000 were categorised as very active. The sport market in Brazil represents the fifth largest market in the world with an estimated size of US\$10.4 billion annually (DeMelo, Neto & Feitosa, 2006). Today, the gross domestic product for the industry is estimated at 1.7 per cent of Brazil's GDP, but during the late 1990s it grew 5.4 times more than the country's GDP (Kasznar & Graça, 2002). These statistics reflect not only the trend of sport participation and sport consumption, but also the product of government involvement and the sport policies created over the last decades. The impact of sport on Brazilian society, the size of the sport market, and the performance achieved by Brazilian athletes in world and Olympic competitions are three main factors that have influenced the current state in which sport is organised and governed in Brazil.

The next section discusses government involvement and the influence of sport policies. It follows a discussion of the Brazilian Olympic Committee (BOC) and a description of the role played by its leaders in forging some of the successes in today's sport.

### **Issues related to the governance of sport in Brazil**

Modern sport in Brazil has its roots from the mid-nineteenth century as swimming, rowing, and fencing became common in military schools. During this time, a few public initiatives took place to promote the value of physical education in schools. However, it is the arrival of immigrants and the further establishment of sport clubs what would create the momentum for the future growth of sport in Brazil. Gymnastics clubs came to flourish in the southern part of the country (Tesché & Rambo, 2001). A few years later, rowing clubs emerged in Rio de Janeiro and football clubs spread all over, but mostly in the southern region (Melo, 2006). This trend of club expansion not only influenced how modern sport evolved, but it also set the need to organise, fund and legislate sport policies. The establishment of sport clubs were much more than the foundation block of the entire sport system. These clubs had a vast impact on the Brazilian culture, as immigrants and their descendants from Germany, Italy and Japan founded a large number of them. Consequently, many sport clubs served not only as a venue to exercise or play, but also to reinforce the customs and identity of these different ethnic groups (DaCosta, 2006b).

By the 1970s, sport associations had grown significantly and had expanded throughout the country. A high concentration of these organisations was found in the southern, more industrial and prosperous states. It is estimated that during the 2000s, there were more than 10,000 organised sport and recreation clubs throughout the country. Estimates also suggest that these clubs have contributed to creating 100,000 jobs (DaCosta, 2006b). Therefore, as in many other countries, sport clubs in Brazil become the fundamental, and perhaps the most critical, organisational unit in which governance exerts its influence. It is at the club level where sport is practised and where rules and policies clearly reflect its effect.

The first legislation related to sport dates back to 1941 when President Getulio Vargas passed Law 3199. This law established the basis for organising the sport system in Brazil. An outcome of this legislation was the creation of the National Sport Council (Conselho Nacional do Desporto) which became the institution that ruled sport for the next five decades. Bueno (2008) noted that Brazilian leaders decided to legislate and intervene in the sport sector because there was a need to control an important area of social life that was poorly, or not regulated, at all. In addition, Law 3199 of 1941 recognised the hierarchical model of governance employed by Olympic organisations in which at the bottom lay sport clubs and at the top the Brazilian Olympic Committee (BOC). Although an Olympic structure has existed in Brazil since 1913, this Law provided governmental legitimacy and full recognition to the BOC. Furthermore, it implicitly recognised the importance of high performance sport within the Brazilian sport system.

Scholars who have examined the evolution of sport policies in Brazil agree that the intervention of government in sport has been a positive step aimed at better organising and fostering this area. Nevertheless, they noted that during the first 35 years since the enactment of Law 3199, governmental intervention provided minimal flexibility for sport organisations to manage and control their own destiny. Instead, this intervention was seen as obstructive and bureaucratic (Tubino, 2001). Government not only inhibited growth but also failed to satisfy the need of most sport organisations. As a result, during this period, the overall level of participation, growth and performance of most national governing bodies significantly suffered. The exception to this trend was football. Since the mid-1920s, the interest and popularity of football showed consistent growth among Brazilians of all spheres of life, particularly during the 1950s to 1970s when the men's national team won the FIFA World Cup three times. It was not until the mid-1970s that a new law was passed, and while mostly overlooked, the significance of Law 6251/1975 was that for the first time it called for the need to address a national sport policy. However, it was not until the late 1980s that significant changes occurred. In 1985, the Ministry of Education created a commission with the task to reformulate existing sport policies. This commission delivered 80 specific recommendations of what government and sport organisations should do in order to strengthen the sport system in the country. The most significant outcome of these recommendations was that in 1988 sport achieved constitutional status (Tubino, 2001). Furthermore, Article 217 of the Federal Constitution of 1988, included the following clause:

It established the autonomy of sport organisations; it established the system of public funding related to sport; and established a clear distinction in governance between professional and non-professional sport organisations. (Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil, 1988.)

Because the passage of the Federal Constitution of 1988 the National Sports Council disbanded in the early 1990s, thus, ending five decades of bureaucratic, and perhaps ineffective, control over sport. During the next two decades, the way sport was organised and governed began to shift.

Although the Federal Constitution of 1988 stated that government must promote opportunities to participate in organised and unorganised sport with the priority to allocate public resources for educational sport, most bills and policies discussed throughout the 1990s and 2000s focused on matters related to professional football and funding for high-performance sport. Perhaps the most contingent issues were those that affected football. It seemed natural that football took most of the attention, particularly considering the impact football historically has had in Brazil. Most of the discussions related to sport policies prior to the Federal Constitution of 1988 emphasised the need to make sport more democratic and accessible to people (Tubino, 2001). Nevertheless, while governmental policies in the early 1990s focused on establishing a coherent structure for the Brazilian sport system, some of the most visible and contentious issues involved matters related to professional football.

During the short presidency of Fernando Collor (1990–1992), the newly appointed secretary of sport was a well-known football player from the 1970s, Arthur Antunes Coimbra, better known as Zico, and during the two terms of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1994–2004), his first Minister of Sport was also a former football player, Edson Arantes do Nascimento or Pele. Both, Zico and Pele worked on bills that would become laws bearing their names.

In 1993, Law 8672, or Zico Law, brought important reforms to the way sport was organised. However, the most ambitious part of this bill, which looked to transform the structure and organisation of professional football, did not pass. The bill aimed to transform professional football clubs into private enterprises and remove the transfer fees of players. Club presidents, who opposed many of the clauses of this bill, fiercely lobbied for its removal. In spite of this unsuccessful attempt, the Zico Law provided a new structure for governance and established principles and guidelines for the functioning of sport organisations. It also provided a more precise definition of the different categories and types of sport (Presidência da República, 1993).

Five years later in 1998, Law 9651, known as Pele Law, was passed. This law included many of the aspects related to football that were crafted but never approved in the Zico Law. The Pele Law also included a reorganisation of the Brazilian sport system with the replacement of SEDES (Secretary for Sport) by INDESP (National Institute for the Development of Sport), and the CSD (Higher Council of Sports) for the CDDD (Council for the Development of Sport) (Bueno, 2008). The most controversial aspect of the Pele Law was the end of

the transfer fees for football players. Consequently, in 2000 several laws were introduced to this law. Some of the most relevant involved establishing specific terms in regard to players' contracts, particularly after a player's contract with a club (Aidar, Bueno de Almeida & Miralla, 2004).

During the 2000s, more laws were passed. Among these were Law 10264/2002 known as Agnelo–Piva; Law 10671/2003 or Statute of the Fan (estatuto do torcedor); Law 16672/2003 or Club Moralising Law (lei de moralização dos clubes); Law 10891/2004 or Athlete Subsidy Law; and Law 11438/2006 known as Incentive Fiscal Law (Queiroz, 2006). Two of these laws were directly related to football (Laws 16671 and 16672), two were aimed to provide funding for high-performance sport (Laws 10264 and 10891), and the Incentive Fiscal Law aimed to attract resources for any of the three categories of sport as stated in the Zico Law of 1993.

The Agnelo–Piva Law assigns two per cent of the federal lottery to fund Olympics and Paralympic programmes hosted by the Brazilian Olympic Committee. Of the total amount, 85 per cent goes to support national governing bodies (NGBs) that are part of the Olympic programme. The remaining 15 per cent goes to NGBs that are part of the Paralympic programme. For the Olympic programme, funds are distributed with a performance criterion. Thus, the BOC categorised all NGBs into four groups based on the most recent level of sporting success. This means athletes and teams from NGBs that have achieved medals or won championships at the (a) Olympic level; (b) Pan-American level; (c) South American level; or (d), those that have not achieved any major title, yet but have the potential to do so. In 2009, NGBs grouped at the Olympic level obtained 4.2 per cent (e.g., basketball) to 6.2 per cent (e.g., track and field, swimming, judo, sailing and volleyball) of the total amount transferred to all NGBs. Those grouped at the Pan-American level received 3 per cent (e.g., triathlon) to 4.5 per cent (e.g., equestrianism); and those grouped at the South American or lower level received 1.5 per cent (e.g., skiing) to 2.5 per cent (e.g., taekwondo) (Almeida & Marchi Júnior, 2011).

The Athlete Subsidy Law provides a yearly stipend to support the athlete's career. Amounts are categorised based on the athlete's level of performance ranging from junior, national, and international. Priorities are given to athletes that are part of the Olympic and Paralympic programmes (Presidência da República, 2004). The Incentive Fiscal Law provides 1–6 per cent tax deduction for organisations and individuals that invest in programmes related to mass sport, educational sport or high-performance sport (Presidência da República, 2006).

In terms of laws that affected professional football, the Statute of the Fan aimed to raise the standards at sporting events by treating fans as consumers. This law looked to influence not only safety at stadiums, but also the entire service provided during sporting events. In a study conducted in six states, Mezzadri *et al.* (2011) noted that 61 per cent of fans attending football matches during 2006 and 2007 showed minimal or no knowledge at all on the existence of this law. They also found that most fans feel safe at the stadiums. They concluded that while this law had a positive effect in raising the safety standards of sporting events, it

failed to reach its main purpose, as fans could not exercise their rights as consumers due to lack of knowledge they have on this law. Finally, the Club Law imposes administrative responsibilities on professional football clubs and establishes penalties for club directors in cases of mismanagement.

When discussing the role of sport in Brazilian society, politicians, scholars, and sport leaders have repeatedly struggled to reach balance, and provide fair treatment, for the different categories of sport. According to the Federal Constitution of 1988, sport constitutes a right for every Brazilian citizen. Moreover, Law 8672 from 2003 (Zico Law) establishes three categories of sport: mass sport, educational sport, and high-performance sport.

A number of factors have influenced the priorities for funding and governing sport in Brazil. First, the legal context for sport as established in the Constitution of 1988 and the subsequent laws enacted since then. Second, the new political scenario that emerged during the 1980s. Finally, the economic growth the country has shown during the last decade has also influenced the priorities to fund and govern sport. Although in the last two decades, several public programmes were implemented to attend to the need of these three categories of sport. High-performance sport has received, and continues to receive, the highest attention and funding not only from the Ministry of Sport but also from several public offices as well (Almeida & Marchi Júnior, 2010; Bastos, 2011; Bueno, 2008).

While obtaining greater autonomy for sport organisations should have resulted in less financial dependency from government, Almeida and Marchi Júnior (2010) noted that over the past decade most NGBs remain heavily dependent on public funding. Moreover, in spite of the constitutional mandate that favours educational sport over high-performance sport, what has occurred is exactly the opposite, as more money has been allocated for the funding of high-performance programmes. Most notably, the Pan-American Games of Rio in 2007, along with the bidding process for the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Summer Olympic Games. Over the last decade, Brazil has emerged not only as the most important player within Latin America, but also as a strong economic power worldwide. Therefore, the justification to support high-performance sport is almost natural.

In this context, also noteworthy is the role played by the Brazilian Olympic Committee. While the BOC has been legally recognised since 1935, it has been in existence since 1913 (Abreu, Hecksher, Franceschi & Rajman, 2006). In addition, since the 1920s, several Brazilians have filled positions within the IOC executive committee. The IOC has also kept two members from Brazil, which is a privilege that few countries have. The role played by current BOC president, Carlos Arthur Nuzman, is equally important. For many, Nuzman is credited with not only successfully winning the bid for the 2016 Summer Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, but also with taking Brazilian sport to the highest visible level since the reigning days of Brazilian football at the World Cup. Nuzman, a former volleyball player who played for the Brazilian national team, is considered the architect for the success of the 2007 Pan-American Games and the rise of Brazilian volleyball. During his tenure as president of the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation, Brazilian national teams not only achieved numerous world titles, but also contributed to

the overall growth and popularity of volleyball in Brazil. The rise of the CBV serves as a case study to illustrate the organisational changes in a NGB that, for many years, had minimal impact until it became the most powerful NGB in Brazil after football. Key factors in this transformation were the influence of their leaders, the application of sound business principles and being the recipient of public subsidies that rewarded achievement in high performance sport.

### **Case study: The Brazilian Volleyball Confederation**

Volleyball first arrived in Brazil at the YMCA of São Paulo in 1916. Until the 1960s, the sport was practised primarily as a recreational pastime, mostly at the elite clubs in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Belo Horizonte. Although throughout this time it became highly accepted in schools, the absence of an effective mechanism that allowed continuing practice at schools and the clubs impeded its growth at a faster pace (Marchi Júnior, 2004). It was not until the 1980s that Brazilian volleyball reached world-class status. Marchi Junior (2004) noted that innovative coaching methods, introduced during the 1960s and 1970s, and the arrival of Carlos Nuzman as president of the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation, are plausible explanations about the change and subsequent growth of volleyball in Brazil. The occurrence of these two events acted in a symbiotic manner and influenced not only the structure of the CBV, but also the popularity of volleyball in Brazil.

The Brazilian Volleyball Confederation was created in 1954. Its purpose was to group, under one governing body, all the state federations that existed at that time. Prior to this date, volleyball was under the jurisdiction of the Brazilian Sport Confederation (CBD). Nuzman is credited as the trailblazer that revolutionised not only volleyball, but also as the man who changed the way sport was administered in Brazil. In fact, one of his most visible accomplishments was to bring private sponsors to sport. To accomplish this he was able to influence important changes in the Brazilian sport legislation, which until 1980 restricted the use of sponsorship in certain sports (Vlaustuin, Almeida & Marchi Júnior, 2008). The need to bring in sponsors was driven by the need to provide more resources to improve and raise the overall standards of volleyball including its tournaments. It was also a call to alert politicians and sport bureaucrats that professionalisation was the only way to retain top Brazilian talent in Brazil. As a result, the first professional sport clubs fully sponsored by private companies were born.

Today, the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation follows the same goals as the ones established in 1954. However, its structure, style of management, type and numbers of programmes offered and level of success achieved, is significantly different. According to the CBV statute of 2006, the CBV is a private not-for-profit sport organisation with the aim to rule, administer, control, promote and foster the practice of volleyball at all levels of performance all over Brazil. The CBV is affiliated with the International Volleyball Federation (FIVB) and the Brazilian Olympic Committee, and according to Article 217 of the Federal Constitution of

1988, the CBV is an autonomous entity free to administer and organise without government interference. Membership in the CBV is represented by 27 state federations that acts as a branch of the CBV at the state level. Although each state federation acts autonomously, its membership and continuity is dependent on their adherence to the statutes of the CBV. Currently, there are 27 volleyball federations in Brazil, so each of the 26 state and the capital of Brasilia are all represented in the CBV.

In terms of governance, there are four main powers in the CBV: the general assembly, office of the presidency, the board of directors, and the audit board. The general assembly is the ultimate power in the CBV and is represented by each of the 27 federation members. The office of the presidency is represented by the president and the vice president. They both act as administrators of the decisions and resolutions approved by the general assembly under the advice of the board of directors. Among the main responsibilities of the president are: to adhere to the rules and policies as established in the statute of the CBV; preside over the general assembly; be responsible for personnel of the CBV; approve marketing and media contracts to commercialise events sanctioned by the CBV; nominate members to the board of directors; and, represent the interests of the CBV to the BOC. The board of directors assist the president by working in seven key areas including: administration, finance, volleyball, international relations, public relations, development, social affairs, and administrative support. The audit board has the responsibility to audit the financial state of the CBV (CBV, 2006).

Ary Graça led the CBV from 1997 to 2012. Prior to his presidential tenure in the CBV, he was president of the South American Volleyball Confederation, vice president of the International Volleyball Federation (FIVB) executive committee, vice president of the Pan-American Union of Volleyball; and a member of the BOC executive committee. Currently, he serves as the FIVB president. From 1975 to 1983, he served as vice president of the CBV during Nuzman's presidency (Graça, 2012). Once he took office in 1997 he not only continued with Nuzman's work, but he also took it to a whole new level. Graça's main innovation within the CBV was to implement a managerial model that treated each department as a business unit. This model has been praised both inside and outside the world of sport. For example, in 2003, the CBV became the first sport governing body worldwide to receive an ISO-9001: 2000 certification from the International Organisation for Standardisation (Ministério do Esporte, 2012a). This credential recognises not only the CBV's unique business model, but also its reputation as a credible and effective organisation (Ministério do Esporte, 2012a).

The current structure of the CBV includes a three-level model of management: strategic, tactical and operational. At the strategic level is the president followed by two main units, chief of staff and technical staff. The chief of staff unit oversees three departments all acting at the operational level: institutional relations; special projects; and media relations. The technical unit deals exclusively with technical matters related to volleyball. Below these strategic units are two executive superintendents acting at the tactical level. The first superintendent oversees six departments: general administration, sponsorships, purchasing, legal

affairs, management of the Arysão high-performance centre, and the development of a management programme. The second superintendent also oversees six departments responsible for issues on matters directly related to volleyball: referees, coaches, management of national teams (indoor and beach volleyball) and management of tournaments (indoor and beach volleyball). Each of these departments acts at the operational level (CBV, 2010). As a result, long-term and strategic planning at the CBV is carefully managed by the apex structure in coordination with each superintendent and each department.

The outcome of the managerial model implemented by the CBV has resulted in many world and Olympic titles for Brazil. It has also shown that a sport governing body can be managed no differently than any other business. According to the 2012 FIVB ranking of indoor volleyball, Brazil led the group in men's and was second in women's and the same applies for the men's and women's beach volleyball teams. In the last decade, the men's national team has achieved eight first places in the indoor world league. At the indoor World Cup, the men's team won in 2003 and 2007, and the women's team achieved second place during the same years. At the Summer Olympics, the men's indoor teams have achieved one gold (2004) and two silvers (2008 and 2012) since 1996; while the women's indoor teams obtained two golds (2008 and 2012) and two bronzes (1996 and 2000). Men's beach volleyball teams won one gold (2004), three silvers (2000, 2008 and 2012) and one bronze (2008) while women's teams achieved one gold (1996), three silvers (1996, 2000, and 2008) and one bronze (2012).

Capitalising on the sporting results of the last 15 years has allowed the CBV to increase its brand equity inside and outside Brazil. In terms of marketing, it has allowed the CBV to position the sport of volleyball in the Brazilian market as a high value commodity. According to Global Sports Network (GSN, 2011), Brazilian volleyball and its many sub-products (e.g., indoor volleyball, beach volleyball, club teams, national teams, the super league, etc.) have permitted companies not only to reach specific target groups and multiply their exposure, but also has allowed them to be associated with concepts like excellence, youth, success and leadership. In 2010, Nestlé and its product Sollys (based on soy) sponsored the Osasco women's team of São Paulo. This partnership was established as a way to position the brand Sollys with the female audience. Similarly, Banana Boat and its sunscreen products also decided to sponsor women's volleyball as a way to reach that particular market.

Companies have also decided to invest in volleyball in order to strengthen its corporate image with a specific community or region. That was the case of the Italian carmaker Fiat in 2007 and 2008 when they sponsored the team Minas Tênis Clube, in the state of Minas Gerais. (Fiat has a plant in the same state). However, the most iconic case between a corporate brand and volleyball is the association that Banco do Brasil (BB) established with the CBV in 1991. A main goal in this partnership was to reach a new and younger clientele for the bank. The bank not only succeeded in expanding its base of clients but also it reached its target group effectively. Once the teams achieved world status and players became well-known all over Brazil, the bank also was able to reconnect with the

more mature audience. In past years, marketing studies conducted in Brazil ranked BB as the most remembered brand among the top 15 brands in the market (Vlaustuin, Almeida & Marchi Júnior, 2008). In 2012, BB renewed its partnership with the CBV until 2017. Because its status as a credible, effective and successful NGB, the CBV has not only been extremely successful in securing resources from the private sector, but also it has been the recipient of important public subsidies as well. Thus, between 2005 and 2008, it received the highest percentage of subsidies among all the national governing bodies that received funding derived from the Law Agnelo–Piva of 2001 (Almeida & Marchi Júnior, 2011).

The growth and success achieved over the past two decades has made the CBV the shining star of not only all the NGBs of the BOC, but perhaps of the entire Brazilian sport system. Certainly, the application of sound managerial principles, effective leadership, and government subsidies has made it possible for the CBV to achieve world status as one of the most successful NGBs in the world.

## Summary

Sport clubs in Brazil represent the keystone of its entire sport system. Although most sport clubs are private organisations, their development and growth have been highly dependent on sport policies enacted at the federal level. The first legislation related to sport dates back to 1941 with Law 3199. This law established the basis for organising the sport system in Brazil. However, it was not until the late 1980s that significant changes occurred with the most significant being that in 1988 sport achieved constitutional status. The Federal Constitution of 1988 stated that government must give priority to allocating public resources to educational sport, yet most policies discussed throughout the 1990s and 2000s have focused on professional football and funding for high-performance sport. Considering the significant economic growth of the country over the last decade, the justification to support high performance sport was a good one.

The Constitution of 1988 and further sport policies enacted during the 1990s provided greater autonomy for sport organisations. While this should have resulted in less financial dependency from government, the past decade has witnessed that most NGBs remain heavily dependent on public funding. Perhaps an exception to this trend is the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation (CBV) which for over two decades has applied business principles to its administration. Today, the CBV follows the same goals as the ones established in 1954, however, its structure, style of management, type and numbers of programmes offered and level of success achieved, is significantly different. The current structure of the CBV includes a three-level model of management. The outcome of this model has resulted in several world and Olympic titles. It has also shown that a sport governing body can be managed no differently than any other business. The application of sound managerial principles, effective leadership, and government subsidies has made it possible for the CBV to achieve world status as one of the most successful NGBs in the world. This has allowed the CBV not only to increase its brand equity as a NGB but also to position volleyball as a valuable commodity within the Brazilian market.

## Review questions

- 1 In what capacity has the Federal Constitution of 1988 influenced sport policies?
- 2 What factors have influenced the priorities to provide public funding for sport?
- 3 What managerial and business mechanisms have been adopted by the Brazilian Volleyball Confederation to achieve success?

## Further reading

- Bramante, A.C., Valente, E. F., Santos, J. N., DaCosta, L. P., Dias, M. L. & Matsudo, V. (2002). Brazil: Developing sport for all from public recreation (1920s) to leisure (1970s) and health promotions (1990s). In L.P. DaCosta & A. Miragaya (eds), *World experiences and trends of sport for all* (pp.675–704). Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport.
- Bravo, G., Orejan, J., Vélez, L. & López de D'Amico, R. (2012). Sport in Latin America. In M. Li, E. Macintosh & G. Bravo (eds), *International sport management* (pp.99–133). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- DaCosta, L. P. (1996). The state versus free enterprise in sports policy: The case of Brazil. In L. Chalip, A. Johnson & L. Stachura, *National sports policies* (pp.23–38). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Graça, A. S. (2012) *Institutional strategy of sports in Brazil. Strategic thoughts to consolidate a democratic and responsible sports policy* (preliminary version). Confederação Brasileira de Voleibol. São Paulo: Mbooks. Available online at: <http://www.cbv.com.br/v1/institucional/publicacoes/institucional/index.html>

## Websites

- Brazilian Volleyball Confederation: <http://www.cbv.com.br>  
 Ministry of Sport of Brazil: <http://www.esporte.gov.br>

## References

- Abreu, N., Hecksher, R., Franceschi, M. & Rajman, B. (2006). Comitê Olímpico Brasileiro – COB. In L. DaCosta (ed.). *Atlas do esporte no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro: CONFEF.
- Aidar, A. C., Bueno de Almeida, C. & Miralla, R. G. (2004). Recent history of Brazilian soccer. In R. Fort & J. Fizel (eds). *International sports economics comparison* (pp.245–261). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Almeida, B. S., & Marchi Júnior, W. (2010). O financiamento dos programas federais de esporte e lazer no Brasil (2004 a 2008). *Movimento*, 16(4), 73–92.
- Almeida, B. S., & Marchi Júnior, W. (2011). Comitê Olímpico Brasileiro e o financiamento das confederações brasileiras. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, 33(1), 163–179.
- Bastos, F.C. (2011). Apontamentos sobre a participação da sociedade no desenvolvimento de políticas de esporte no Brasil. *Revista Intercontinental de Gestão Desportiva*, 1(1), 44–59.
- Bravo, G., Orejan, J., Vélez, L. & López de D'Amico, R. (2012). Sport in Latin America. In M. Li, E. Macintosh & G. Bravo (eds). *International sport management* (pp.99–133), Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Bueno, L. (2008). Políticas públicas do esporte no Brasil: Razões para o desempenho (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Escola de Administração de São Paulo da Getúlio Vargas, Brazil.
- CBV (2006). *Estatuto*. Confederação Brasileira do Voleibol. Available online at [www.cbv.com.br/v1/institucional/Estatuto\\_CBV.pdf](http://www.cbv.com.br/v1/institucional/Estatuto_CBV.pdf)
- CBV (2010). *Balanco social 2009–2010*. Confederação Brasileira do Voleibol. Available online at <http://www.cbv.com.br/v1/institucional/balancos/BalancoSocial-2010.pdf>
- Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil (1988). Brasília: Senado Federal. Available online at [http://www.senado.gov.br/legislacao/const/con1988/CON1988\\_05.10.1988/CON1988.pdf](http://www.senado.gov.br/legislacao/const/con1988/CON1988_05.10.1988/CON1988.pdf).
- DaCosta, L. (2006a). Cenário de tendências gerais dos esportes e atividades físicas no Brasil. In L. DaCosta (ed). *Atlas do esporte no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: CONFEF.
- DaCosta, L. (2006b). Clubes esportivos e recreativos. In L. DaCosta (ed). *Atlas do esporte no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: CONFEF.
- DeMelo Neto, F. P., & Feitosa, M. (2006). Marketing esportivo. In L. DaCosta (ed). *Atlas do esporte no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: CONFEF.
- Graça, A. (2012). Um gestor de ouro para o esporte. Available online at [http://arygraca.com/queme\\_carreira.php](http://arygraca.com/queme_carreira.php)
- GSN (2011). Estratégia de marketing esportivo no voleibol brasileiro. Rio de Janeiro: Global Sports Network. Available online at <http://www.slideshare.net/GSNsports/gsn-marketing-no-voleibol-brasileiro-7742081>
- Kasznar, I. & Graça, A. S. (2002). *O esporte como indústria: Solução para criação de riqueza e emprego*. Rio de Janeiro: Confederação Brasileira de Voleibol.
- Marchi Júnior, W. (2004). *Sacando o voleibol*. São Paulo: HUCITEC.
- Melo, V. A. de (2006). Remo, modernidade e Pereira Passos: Primórdios das políticas públicas de esporte no Brasil. *Esporte e Sociedade*, 1(3), 1–21.
- Mezzadri, F. M., DeCamargo Preste, S. E., Capraro, A. M., Cavichioli, F. R. & Marchi Júnior, W. (2011). As interferências do Estado brasileiro no futebol e o estatuto de defesa do torcedor. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte*, 25(3), 407–16.
- Ministério do Esporte (2012a). Confederação Brasileira do Voleibol. Available online at <http://www.esporte.gov.br/cen/detalhesEntidades.do?jsessionid=C1EE0A4B3CE0876AFB23306815EBA78E?idEntidade=2>
- Ministério do Esporte (2012b). *Programas e projetos*. Available online at <http://www.esporte.gov.br/institucional/secretariaExecutiva/programasSecretaria.jsp>
- Presidência da República (1993). Lei nº 8672 de 6 de julho de 1993. Institui normas gerais sobre desporto e dá outras providências. Brasília: Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Available online at [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/leis/L8672impressao.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L8672impressao.htm)
- Presidência da República (2004). Lei nº 10891 de 9 de julho de 2004. Institui a bolsa-atleta. Brasília: Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Available online at [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_Ato2004-2006/2004/Lei/L10.891compilado.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2004-2006/2004/Lei/L10.891compilado.htm)
- Presidência da República (2006). Lei nº 11438 de 29 dezembro de 2006. Dispõe sobre incentivos e benefícios para fomentar as atividades de caráter desportivo e dá outras providências. Brasília: Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Available online at [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_Ato2004-2006/2006/Lei/L11438.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2004-2006/2006/Lei/L11438.htm)
- Queiroz, A. (2006). Ministério do esporte. In L. DaCosta (ed.) *Atlas do esporte no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro: CONFEF.
- Tesche, L. & Rambo, A. B. (2001). Reconstructing the fatherland: German turnen in southern Brazil. In J.A. Mangan (ed.). *Europe, sport world. Shaping global societies*, (pp.5–22). London: Frank Cass.

- Tubino, M. (2001). *Política nacional do esporte. Análise da proposta apresentada pela Câmara Setorial do Esporte*. Available online at <http://www.PoliticaNacionalEsporte.pdf>
- Vlastuin, J., Almeida, B. S. & Marchi Júnior, W. (2008). O marketing esportivo no voleibol brasileiro: Fragmentos teóricos referentes ao processo de espetacularização da modalidade. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, 29(3), 9–24.
- World Bank (2012). *World development indicators database*. World Bank, 18 September 2012. Available online at [http://databank.worldbank.org/databank/download/GDP\\_PPP.pdf](http://databank.worldbank.org/databank/download/GDP_PPP.pdf)
- Zakaria, F. (2009). *The post-American world*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.