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Abstract
The first 90 or 100 days of the top managers on duty; started to take its place in literature as important subjects of management science together with attractive and strategic qualities. Actually, there is only one target and summary of the things that should be done by the top manager in first 30 days, first 60 days and first 90 days : to start good. In this process, does a manager thinks to make a bad start! There is no example of this. This study, writes the extraordinary first 90 days of a sports manager as a case study; analysis and interpret it. The case is completely realistic. The sport manager in the case study is the president of TFF (Turkish Football Federation). In the case study, the chaotic situation faced by the president as soon as he starts his duty, deepening the chaos, attempts of managing the chaos, disappointment and regret occurs during first 90 days. The method of research, is the content analysis of a case study. As a result of content analysis, the special aspect of the case is exposed. The chaos faced by president, deepening of chaos and disappointment together with regret and confessing this are the subjects that we deal with. In the last section, the leading points as a result of content analysis and the performance of president managing the chaos, it was interpreted as taking the basic teachings of chaos theory.
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INTRODUCTION

The initial few days of a top manager who just assumed his duty form an important subject matter. In fact, some researchers consider this subject very delicate and strategic. Especially, “the first 90 days of a manager” is so important in management literature that it is considered a special subject of interest. The responsibilities that should be handled by a manager in business management are as important as those of a manager in politics or sports. In view of the importance of the first 90 or 100 days, many scientists evaluated it by taking manager as the research area. The importance can be gauged from the fact that Time, Financial Times, The Guardian, Le Monde, Le Figaro, Scientific American and many journals examined the first 100 days of Nicolas Sarkozy (Crumley, 2007), the first 90 days of Obama (Watkins, 2009), and the first 100 days of David Cameron (Groom, 2010). If anybody asks “who is the leader of this concept?”, it is Franklin D. Roosevelt (Walsh, 2009).

Gabarro (1987, p. 6) says that, when a manager assumes charge, the implications are many. Dealing with a new task is setting a process in motion. The process involves dealing with inner and outer environments, structural problems relating to society and organization, as well as performance in an effective manner. The process starts with assumption of charge by the manager and ends with activating the organization and resources. From this definition, one may infer that when the manager takes charge, it does not mean that he assumes charge fully.

Watkins (2003, p.1) says that the success or failure of a leader is determined by the things he does during the first 90 days; according to Daval (Mourlot, 2006), this period is 100 days for politics and 40 days for business management. The first 90 or 100 days of the manager in his new job is a delicate and critical period. This period can be subdivided, based on importance, say into 72 hours, 30 days, or 60 days. The first week of the manager, which gives the first impression, forms the important moment of 90-100 days period. Once the first impression forms, it is hard to change it (Plakhotnik, Rocco & Roberts, 2011); therefore, a good start is important from the manager’s view point. These thoughts are appropriate to the theory of “sensitive dependence on initial condition”, which is based on butterfly effect, an important teaching of chaos theory. According to this theory, the first 72 hours, the first 30 days, the first 60 days and the first 90 days, each by itself is an initial condition; in other words, they are evaluated as the factors reflecting the positive or negative performance of the manager. There are many initial conditions in a chaotic situation (Latif, 2005, p. 106).

Volvo Group CEO, Olof Persson (O’Sullivan, 2012), explains the things he did in the first days thus: One of the things I did in the first days was to familiarize myself with the corporation as a whole by carrying out visits around. From these visits, I learned things I did not know earlier about the corporation, and strengthened my understanding of the things I know. I saw the
energy, commitment and determination of my colleagues. That energy passed to me. This process, gave me the opportunity to test my thoughts about the corporation. I liked this very much.

Amado and Elsner (2007, p. 63) say that the initial days of the new job, particularly the transition period, will be full of tensions, and the leader will have to live with this tension throughout his tenure. This being normal and unavoidable, what needs to be done is to strike a balance between the opposite poles and reconcile to the situation (Collinson, 2005). For example, during decision-making stage, the leaders are often faced with situations wherein they have to take quick decisions under suspicious circumstances. Such situations expose the leaders to pressure and tension. Suspicion can be beneficial but when it turns to obsession, it can block the action. Amado and Elsner cite seven basic requirements for the managers in the initial days of their job: mission, relationship, reciprocity, decision-making, pace of change, faith, and loyalty. The new leader faces mission tension during the first transition period. What are the things that need to be changed and what are the things that need to be maintained? The leader vacillates between maintaining status quo and making fundamental changes. The leader, while building relationship with other managers, will have to choose between developing a bond and maintaining the distance. For the new leader, reciprocity means adopting an attitude of give and take, harmony and contribution towards his subordinates. According to reciprocity principle, manager will seek cooperation of his subordinates for pushing his values. The leader will have to impose his decision or facilitate a solution. The rhythm of the change should be to slow down to prepare for the change or to move fast for results. Faith will determine the decision for improving human relations, structures, and processes, or any of them. The new leader will show his loyalty by supporting the team and serving the hierarchy. All his intentions reflect a kind of balance, but this balance is not specific or precise. Rather, it is a situation preferred by the leader as rational, depending on the quality of the situation.

Greiner, Cummings and Bhambri (2003), emphasize the importance of inner and outer conditions when the new CEO takes office. One of the inner conditions is the support that the manager gets. If the people who choose the CEO do not support him, it is hard for the manager to make strategic transformation and important organizational changes.

Undoubtedly, mere full support to the manager is not enough for success. During the first days of taking charge, the manager may find the conditions balanced, but anything may happen any time, and it is uncertain when chaos can occur. The chaotic situation of inner and outer conditions and chaos level make it hard to overcome the problems that arise under such conditions. It is even harder for a manager to ignore these situations, as also the problems of these conditions, beyond chaos. The ability of forecasting or farsightedness, coincidence and
the ability of self possession and intervention are the important attributes needed for the manager in chaotic conditions. According to Herrmann (1996, pp. 171-174), chaotic periods are not the right periods for analysis or for taking traditional protective measures to develop different options; they are periods for creative thinking with a broad perspective.

Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001) emphasize the importance of being a leader in complex situations where there is too much of uncertainty and coincidence. A complex leader develops communication networks; exercising his authority, he plays the role of a catalyst and encourages interaction. He should have the ability to gather people around him, just like a flag, in contrast to other managers who focus on the ideals of the organization. Complex leaders build rituals and myths, including the ideals of the system and put them into the memory of workers and societies. Instead of exercising close control, they provide for disorder within order, think systemic, and benefit from the dynamics of interaction, rather than of control.

Choosing the right manager and a well planned transition period are the leading conditions for a manager’s success in his new job. Saporito and Winum (2012, p. 135) believe that, besides experience, technical expertise, strategic thinking, synthesis and execution abilities are necessary for the success of a CEO, although they are hard to measure. Entrusting the management to a wrong person can destroy the great results achieved through long years. The success of transition depends on the success of the voters’ decision.

In management literature, the transition period of the manager’s new job relates to the first 90 or 100 days of assuming charge, rather than the period after taking charge. Some people include the previous periods too. For example, when we try to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of providing a manager from inside or outside the organization, we can see the effect of the 90 days of critical period (Friel & Duboff, 2009; Neff & Citrin, 2005, p. 82; Charan, Drotter & Noel, 2011, p. 205; Ciampa & Watkins, 1999, p. 51). Transition period, adaptation process, things that should be done in first 90 or 100 days, and things that should be and should not be done in the first and second months form the general content of this literature. Another common point of this literature that merits attention is the assumption that transition period or the first 90 days will be quiet, far away from turmoil and full of surprises. No manager, doubtless, accepts a situation where he has to face chaos immediately after assuming duty, but should such a situation arise, both transition and harmonization periods are put aside. Such situations seem fantastic at first glance, just as earthquakes, but they occur only once or twice in 200 years. But the case study we present here is a very rare and good example.
This study analyzes the case study of a 3-month long real story of a sports manager, who was the president of TFF (Turkish Football Federation). TFF is a recognized, non-profit, autonomous organization, which falls under the purview of UEFA (The Union of European Football Associations) (TFF, n.d.).

Three key words are relevant to the present context. One of these is “Living 2 years as 2 months”, which has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph. Giving a brief explanation of this term, it has been compared with big earthquakes which can be lived only once or twice in a life time. The other two words, namely ‘chaos’ and ‘regret’, would be explained later at an appropriate place.

RESEARCH METHOD

Both theorists and practitioners often refer to case studies. Case studies are generally extraordinary and strange incidents, and therefore they should attract attention (Herreid, 1997/98; Veli, 1948, p. 19). A case study is a story with an educational message (Herreid, 2007, s.27), directed for understanding the complexity of a case. Although a single case study does not allow generalization, it spreads widely and provides important contributions to forming a new theory (Eisenhardt, 1989).

The first 90 days experience of a sports manager (TFF President) has been chosen as the theme for the present research. There are three important reasons for choosing this theme. First, the proposed case study falls within the area of management science, and therefore the outcome of this research would benefit that science. Second, the first 90 days experience of the present case study is altogether different from other experiences; for this reason, the outcome of this case study can be a guide for top managers in similar cases. Third, this case study is a management case which has educational value for training manager candidates.

The topics for applying the case study method arise from at least two situations. First and most important is when the research addresses a descriptive question (what happened?) or an explanatory question (how or why did something happen?). Second is when a particular situation needs to be illuminated for an in-depth and first-hand understanding (Yin, 2006).

Content analysis is a method of collecting text content and analyzing it. Content can be explicit or hidden (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 32). Explicit content relates to the things said and written, and hidden content to the things that were not said or written. The analyst’s job is to discover these. Comment has an important place in analysis.

Weber (1990, p. 42) and Mayring (2000) suggested some precautions in choosing document and sampling, and the same are taken into consideration for this research. For this case study, besides indirect observation, document researches were made. Content analysis is
a secure method for processes of a long time span. Written and visual communication
documents related with the case, right from the beginning, were collected. The documents that
constitute the main part of the research are in the form of press releases, video recordings,
observer notes and expert views. From these documents, press releases of national and
international popularity and high circulation were separated and a simple random sample drawn
from them. All the documents that constitute the case study were read and, starting from there,
the experience of the first 100 days of a sports manager was narrated in a chronological order.
The background of the case was explained and information about the organization given. After
identifying the problematic situation, the analysis of the problem was taken up. After determining
the words subject to analysis, based on the key word in context and its frequency, and relation
and proximity analysis techniques, the content of the case study was taken up for analysis.

THE STORY OF THE CASE

Before 29 June 2011, there was an agreement (Demirbilek, 2011) that there would be one
president nominee in ordinary general assembly of TFF on 29 June 2011.

On the scheduled day, out of 300 delegates who had the right to vote, 204 delegates
attended the general assembly and exercised their vote. As three blank votes became invalid,
the person who got all the remaining 201 valid votes was declared elected as the 39th president
of TFF (TFF, 2011a).

Soon after taking charge of the job, on 3 July, the President faced the scandal of match
fixing in Turkish football. Several managers, football players and many other people related with
football, notably Fenerbahçe Sports Club president (“Turkish police raid”, 2011; “Turkey roasted
by”, 2011; “Fenerbahce boss among”, 2011) were brought into the scope of this scam’s
investigation.

The comments of football writers on match fixing case were splashed all over the media,
like an explosion, in Turkish football on 4 July (“Yazarlar ne dedi?”, 2011). This is a very serious
case; it is an earthquake for Turkish football; it is shocking, weird, and worrisome in that it is
focused on Fenerbahçe. As justice is more important than championship and stay in league, it is
unlikely that Fenerbahçe Sports Club President interferes in such a case.

TFF President made this statement on 5 July (“Adliyeye sevk edilen”, 2011): The trial
can be long. We should act according to the proofs available.

On 9th July, Fenerbahçe Sports Club President was arrested as he happened to be the
head of the crime oriented organization that indulged in match fixing. (“Fenerbahce president
held”, 2011; “Turkey: Fenerbahce boss”, 2011). Fenerbahçe SC immediately reacted to this
Fenerbahçe Republic is not around, there is no Turkey, no football, no wealth, no people, and people will find it hard to breathe, and after a short time this country will no longer be a place worth living; it will become a cemetery. Extrajudicial execution and lynch campaign continues against Fenerbahçe. TFF should not decide in a hurry on a subject which can cause indignation. We don't believe in accusations.

TFF President made this statement on 11 July (Fenerbahçe Devler Ligi'ne", 2011): Since TFF has no proof or document, no process can be made. Disciplinary proceeding about this subject will start after Public Prosecution Office prepares its indictment and the same is accepted by the court. During this process, we will be constantly in contact with UEFA and FIFA. League will start on 5 August as planned. Super Cup Final will be between Fenerbahçe and Beşiktaş on 31 July. Details of the league matches are informed to the UEFA, as it is a registered body. On the same day, TFF President said that there is another club, which never stated anything in this regard ("O takım hangisi?", 2011).

On 12 July, Galatasaray SC, stating that “This fire cannot be doused by mere blowing; solution can not be spread in time” observed thus: Turkish Football is under heavy blemish and the decision delayed each day, will harm Turkish Sport; if necessary, the league should be delayed (“Bu ateş üfleyerek”, 2011). To this statement, Fenerbahçe SC reacted thus on the same day: The statement by Galatasaray SC causes deep disappointment and confidence crisis. UEFA also made the following statement on the same day (UEFA, 2011a): Undoubtedly, this is a very complicated case. We have full confidence in TFF. Within the limits of current information, there is nothing that justifies refusal to the entry of the mentioned clubs into the league. Every club entering UEFA competitions gives a written guarantee that it does not get involved in match-fixing. Besides this, if match-fixing is proved, the concerned team can be disqualified. TFF made a statement criticizing Galatasaray SC President on the same day (TFF, 2011b): “To be honest, the statement made today under the signature of Galatasaray SC President surprised and saddened us. It is not right for Galatasaray SC President to profiteer by this crisis, and it is not known where does this lead to. “This fire can not be doused by mere blowing” and any decision taken hastily without documentary or other proof would create law and order problems. We at TFF, condemn this statement, which brings people and institutions under suspicion. We, therefore, urge Galatasaray SC and Mr. President, who signed the statement, to behave discreetly. If the same attitude continues, we remind that the relevant provisions of Football Discipline Rules may have to be invoked. To this, on 12 July, Gençlerbirliği SC reacted thus (“Türk futboluna indirilmiş”, 2011): Despite the decision taken jointly by the Clubs Association and TFF, I find the statement made by Galatasaray SC President is rash and
I condemn it. In the evening, Beşiktaş JK made a statement in support of TFF and Gençlerbirliği SC and the retaliatory statement to Galatasaray SC. (“Beşiktaş’tan Kulüpler Birliği’nin”, 2011).

On 13 July, Galatasaray SC President answered the criticism (Galatasaray, 2011a) levelled against their club, a day before, by Gençlerbirliği SC. and Beşiktaş JK. Last week TFF President said “We will wait for the justice; we will take our own precautions.” This is a clear and precise message. After the meeting of Clubs Association, Federation President’s statement on Monday, which is not incompatible with the statements he made to the public, really surprised me. There is no opportunism. We have full confidence in Federation.

On 14th July, TFF President said that they would evaluate the match fixing investigation on 18 July, together with UEFA in Geneva. And after that, he made this statement (“Pazartesi UEFA’yla toplantısı”, 2011): The process works very quickly, and a different decision can be taken any time.

On 18 July, in Switzerland, Nyon city, UEFA met with TFF authorities and expressed its trust in TFF and emphasized that they would stick to zero tolerance rule in problems relating to match fixing (UEFA, 2011b; TFF, 2011c).

On 19 July, TFF delayed Super Cup 2011 Final, planned to be played between Fenerbahçe and Beşiktaş, to a later date. TFF President decided that UEFA would be informed of the teams going to European Cups on 31 of May and that no changes would be made in the list of players (TFF, 2011d).

On 20 July, the TFF received 26 folders of documents from İstanbul Chief Public Prosecutor’s Office relating to the football match fixing investigation. On receipt of the documents, the TFF President made these remarks (TFF, 2011e): These documents are classified and stored in the private room of encrypted records. They will be examined by TFF Ethical Committee, represented by five expert lawyers. We cannot say at this stage “whether there has been promotion or match fixing”. The Ethical Committee will decide on this, based on the available evidence. TFF President said that the starting date of the league matches will be decided latest by the next week. He added that “As long as we are on duty, Turkish league won’t start before the end of August” (“Türkiye'de ligler ne zaman”, 2011).

On 21 July, Fenerbahçe SC officially applied to TFF demanding a copy of the documents received by TFF and criticizing the attitude of TFF (“Fener şike belgelerini”, 2011). The contention of Fenerbahçe SC was that, as long as the documents and other information relating to the match fixing investigation are not shared by all concerned, it would not be possible to know as to who is accused of what crime and thus the accused does not get an opportunity to defend himself. In such a situation, the process of investigation can not be carried out in a legal manner. It is therefore necessary that the authorities carry out the investigation process in
accordance with the laws. On the same day, Gençlerbirliği SC President, recalled how, on 3 July, a “bomb” was dropped on Turkish football by raising the issue of match fixing. The same day, the private match between Fenerbahçe SC and Shakhtar Donetsk was abandoned midway at the 67th Minute when supporters descended on the field.

On 22nd July, TFF made a statement ("TSYD, Fenerbahçe maçında", 2011) bemoaning that Turkish football was passing through a very difficult period and that nobody who loves football can accept the manner in which the match between Fenerbahçe and Shakhtar Donetsk was abandoned and the press people forced to leave the stadium. Whatever be the reason behind this, the people who entered the field during the match should realize that what they did was harmful not to football alone, but to the country. Such disregard by the public at a time when the investigation process is being legally carried out is particularly unethical, because any kind of pressure and uncalled for statement can influence the ongoing process.

On 25 July, TFF announced that Spor Toto Super League 2011-2012 season would start on 9 September 2011 (TFF, 2011f; “Turkey match-fixing”, 2011). All football writers considered it appropriate to delay the starting date (“Önemli olan bu”, 2011).

On 15 August, the TFF announced that, after the prosecution delivered the documents to TFF, the scope of the investigation was enlarged to include more people, although no new information or document was made available. It was further observed that, under the circumstances, it would not be fair to give a verdict (TFF, 2011g). While answering the questions of press members, TFF President stated thus (“TFF kararını açıkladı”, 2011): TFF has imposed no sanction on clubs, and hence, UEFA also will not impose any sanction. Some people were sent to PFDC (Professional Football Discipline Committee), but a final decision on them will be taken only after giving them the right to defend. The decision of UEFA has to be honored by the teams, and those whose credentials are under scrutiny should not attend. On the same day, several comments were made on the statement of TFF: Beşiktaş JK termed the statement as “a decision which is expected and should be given” (Beşiktaş J.K., 2011); Trabzon SC President said to TFF, “You said that you don’t have any document, how can you send us to PFDC. If we have 4-5 people in the Federation, will it be like this?” (“Şener'den TFF'ye tepki”, 2011). Galatasaray SC commented thus (“Galatasaray'dan TFF'ye eleştiri”, 2011): Retracting on this decision can lead to adverse results. We hope that, this development will not put our clubs under a load that can not be carried. Gençlerbirliği SC felt that the decision of not trying to defend the case will put TFF under difficulty (“Cavcav'dan TFF'ye destek”, 2011), whereas Fenerbahçe coach felt that TFF’s decision was right (“Kocaman: Federasyon'un kararı”, 2011). Football writers were nearly divided into two opposing camps on TFF’s decision. Even so, some
among them evaluated TFF’s decision as “law and human rights lesson” and others as “craven”, and “disgraceful” (“Tarihi karara ilk”, 2011).

On 19 August, following the last decision of TFF, Galatasaray SC expressed that they were worried about the future of Turkish football (Galatasaray SC, 2011b). To this, TFF commented thus (TFF, 2011h): For a while, some of our clubs, some people—related or unrelated to the match-fixing case—and some uninformed people make statements which have no legal basis. In this context, mention should be made particularly of the Super League Club’s complaint to Europe, UEFA and FIFA about our Federation. We want to emphasize that TFF is a law-abiding institution and its operations are transparent. Turkish football will not forgive anybody who projects our Federation as an unlawful institution, and any complaint to outside countries in this regard will be a historic blunder.

On 22 August, UEFA Discipline Chief Inspector came to Istanbul on being informed by Istanbul Deputy Public Prosecutor about “Match fixing investigation in football” (“UEFA başmüfettişi “, 2011).

On 24 August, UEFA announced that Fenerbahçe SC was debarred from Champions League for this season and that Trabzon SC would directly participate in the matches (UEFA, 2011c; “Fenerbahce out of”, 2011; “Trabzonspor replace Fenerbahce”, 2011; “Fenerbahce appeal against”, 2011). UEFA General Secretary commented that, by debarring Fenerbahçe SC from Champions League this season, TFF saved football and this action is consistent with the UEFA’s zero tolerance attitude to match fixing (TFF, 2011i). On the same day, Fenerbahçe Deputy Chairman, targeting TFF President, said that “UEFA wants to maintain zero tolerance to match fixing. Alright, I am asking TFF President if UEFA implements zero tolerance only towards Fenerbahçe SC? TFF should immediately relegate us to Bank Asya First League. We will be the champions this season. Then, next season, we will compete in Super League. Relegate us to a sub league immediately, tomorrow” (“Bizi hemen Bank”, 2011). On the same day, TFF President, conveyed his feelings through a television program thus (“Bilseydim başkan olmazdım”, 2011): I would not have agreed to be president had I known that these things would happen. There was an election on 29 June. We made our first meeting on 1 July. When I opened my phone the next morning, messages started coming. From that day onwards, we felt as though the time has been moving on too fast. Decisions can change any moment. Two months passed but it looked as though we lived through a two-year process. Henceforth, I don’t want to be a sports club manager. The situation is still critical. If the managers of the clubs are arrested and prevented from going to Champions League, the situation would be volatile. Same would be the case if a lot of people are jailed, pending trial. At this juncture, it isn’t important if I am a fan of Fenerbahçe. But, what I want is that I should not get involved in such a process. It is
important to be fair and objective by maintaining equal distance to everyone. It is one of my important characteristics. On the same day, Fenerbahçe SC made the following statement with the title “Not able to manage” (Fenerbahçe SC, 2011a): TFF administration, which could not stand by their previous statement, has been consistently making grievous mistakes in representing our country. On the same day, TFF President made this statement (“Kararı UEFA istedi”, 2011): Following the demand of UEFA, we take the decision to debar Fenerbahçe SC from entering European Champions League.

On 25 August, TFF President stated that UEFA threatened them with eight years punishment if TFF fails in preventing Fenerbahçe SC from entering Champions League (TFF, 2011j). On the same day, TFF said that the decision to take Trabzon SC, and not Fenerbahçe, into Champions League was motivated purely by the incentive of UEFA (TFF, 2011k). Again, on the same day, Fenerbahçe SC Women’s volleyball team sponsor Acıbadem Health Group decided not to extend sponsorship agreement for the new season (“F.Bahçe Acıbadem'le ortaklığı “, 2011).

On 27 August, Fenerbahçe SC Deputy Chairman stated that “TFF cannot do this; government should confiscate” (“Bank Asya talebimiz”, 2011).

On 3rd of September, Fenerbahçe SC announced that, as of 1st September 2011, they filed a claim against UEFA and TFF in CAS (The Court of Arbitration for Sport) (Fenerbahçe SC, 2011b).

On 6 September, UEFA President said, “We know why Fenerbahçe did not take. When the investigation is completed, everybody will come to know.” (“UEFA Başkanı'ndan Fenerbahçe”, 2011).

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE CASE
At the center of this management case is the TFF President, as a sports manager. He is the leading actor of the case, and the location of the case is TFF. The case relates to the problems faced by TFF President during his first 90 days as the president, i.e. from 28 June to 10 September 2011.

This case is extraordinary and has many significant points. Extraordinary because, within 4-5 days of taking charge with full support, TFF President found himself in chaos, which was hard to manage. What is termed here chaos is the match fixing case that rattled Turkish football. This is not a seen case. Abandoning the plans of transition and adaptation to work, the President started fighting with match fixing case.
The term ‘chaos’ is used here to qualify the case faced by the President. But, the question here is whether the match fixing case really qualifies to be termed ‘chaos’? In that case, let’s get down to the definition of ‘chaos.’

Chaos is unpredictability (Poincaré, 1951, p.63). Chaos is the transformation of conditions into a different situation in a very short time. Under the new conditions, the manager finds himself, all the time, across the dynamics of the environment, abundance of connected aspects and different movements of these aspects. Chaos is a non-linear, dynamic process connected sensitively to initial conditions. Chaos is unmanageableness. Chaotic conditions remove command and control opportunity (Wheatley, 1997).

Once the case study is examined, it will not be hard to be convinced that the case is chaos or a chaotic case or even beyond chaos. According to Rosnay (2000, p. 29), the situation beyond chaos is medium anarchic, turbulent and dissociable. The situation faced by the President has certain expressions which prove that the case is chaos or chaotic. Table 1 shows the frequency of different expressions that appear in the content. In the first 90 days, the most used expression is match fixing (12 times). The expression that “This fire cannot be doused by mere blowing” was used only once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPRESSIONS POINTING THE CHAOS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match fixing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This fire cannot be doused by mere blowing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb is dropped on Turkish football</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An earthquake for Turkish football</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbelievable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrisome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very complicated case</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very big case</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two months passed, but we lived a two-year process.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation is still critical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to manage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chaos was not anticipated by TFF President. In the previous years, even though there have been instances of some football players and club managers intervening in match fixing or betting cases, those do not form enough of a proof to support the assumption of today. We can
add coincidence to chaos definition. The match fixing case is coincidental. This forewarns the manager that in chaotic conditions the unexpected can happen and anything can happen.

The TFF President is known for his entrepreneurial skills. Besides being the President, he is also the chairman of the board of directors of a health group (Acıbadem, n.d.). TFF President could successfully overcome a lot of problems earlier as an entrepreneur-manager, and it was expected that he could do so even now, although these problems were really hard to solve. The problems he faced now and the conditions he was under were not similar to those of the previous ones, because this was a situation beyond chaos.

Fenerbahçe SC was at the center of the match fixing investigation in football. As TFF President happened to be a member of the board of directors of Fenerbahçe SC, solution to the problem became more complicated. Fenerbahçe SC was the Super League Champion in 2010-11 season. Trabzon SC was the second in league with the same score as that of Fenerbahçe SC, but with a poorer average. This created a big pressure on the President during the problem solving process. Especially, Galatasaray SC, the main rival of Fenerbahçe SC affected this process by following it closely and making statements about the case of Beşiktaş JK, which was Turkish Cup champion on 11 May 2011. Super league ended on 22 May 2011. Even though Trabzon SC lost the championship by average, they did not object to or complain about this result. The President took charge on 29 June and match fixing allegation exploded on 3 July. By around this date, Trabzon SC also started raising objections and leveling accusations.

In Table 2, by separating TFF, it can be seen that, among the factors affecting the problem in the examined content, Fenerbahçe SC ranks the second by appearing 28 times, followed by the UEFA, which ranks third by appearing 22 times, and Galatasaray SC, which ranks fourth by appearing 14 times. We find it appropriate to separate TFF or TFF President from other variables as well shown in the Table, because they are responsible directly to solving the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFF (TFF including TFF President)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenerbahçe</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatasaray</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gençlerbirliği</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beşiktaş</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football writers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Match fixing case attracted so much attention that it became the most talked about subject. According to the survey by online research company, DORinsight, the match fixing case in Turkish football was the most discussed subject in the social media during July-August period ("Sosyal medyada", 2011).

The match fixing case was discussed most and hit the top on 12 July, and 15 and 24 August. It brought to the fore conflicts and mutual accusations. TFF (including TFF President), UEFA and sports clubs were engaged in intense mutual accusations. Table 3 shows that the conflict was between TFF, Fenerbahçe SC (FB), Galatasaray SC (GS) and UEFA. With the help of binary comparison matrix, it can be seen that FB, which is the focus of match fixing investigation, made four explanations targeting TFF, and GS, which was unrelated with match fixing, made four explanations targeting TFF. Summing up the columns and rows, it can be seen that TFF had 15 explanations, and GS and FB 11 each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>UEFA</th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>BJK</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football writers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conflicts of expressions and implementations of TFF President in the first 90 days are striking. Table 4 shows that the conflicting expressions of TFF President gained from content analysis. For example, on the subject of delaying the league, it can be seen how conflicting are the expressions used on four different dates.
### Table 4: Conflicting expressions of TFF President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABOUT</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>19 July</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League</td>
<td>League will start on 5 August.</td>
<td>Super Cup Final to be played</td>
<td>As long as we are on duty,</td>
<td>Super League will start on 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can not be delayed</td>
<td></td>
<td>between FB and BJK on 31 July</td>
<td>leagues won’t start before the end of August.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>24 August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European cups</td>
<td>League was notified to UEFA as required.</td>
<td>If they themselves are doubtful, then don’t go.</td>
<td>We have taken the decision to prohibit FB SC from participating in European Champions League in accordance with the direction of UEFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 July</td>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>14 July</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>15 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match fixing and corruption process</td>
<td>Trial can last long. We should act according to the proofs.</td>
<td>Since we have no proof or document in our hands, no process can be started.</td>
<td>The process goes so fast, that any decision can be taken any moment.</td>
<td>We have no chance to say “whether or not there is corruption or match fixing. According to our rules, the body which will decide on this is Ethical Committee. They will do the research.</td>
<td>There is no new information or document. It is not fair to give a judgment. Some people are sent to Professional Football Discipline Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*European cups*

- 11 July: League was notified to UEFA as required.
- 15 August: If they themselves are doubtful, then don’t go.
- 24 August: We have taken the decision to prohibit FB SC from participating in European Champions League in accordance with the direction of UEFA.
- 14 July: The process goes so fast, that any decision can be taken any moment.
- 20 July: We have no chance to say “whether or not there is corruption or match fixing. According to our rules, the body which will decide on this is Ethical Committee. They will do the research.
- 15 August: There is no new information or document. It is not fair to give a judgment. Some people are sent to Professional Football Discipline Committee.
Some words in TFF President’s statement, which we obtained from the content of the case, made us think that the case may have some hidden implications. These words, which can be seen in Table 5, give an idea of the President’s style of administering the process in chaotic level. Detailed comments in this regard will be presented in the last section. At this stage it is sufficient to focus on his words of 24 August. With the most remarkable, most surprising, self-criticisizing words of the process, president express his regret.

Table 5: The expressions which explain the implications of TFF President’s content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>There is a club in this process which has not been mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>If someone finds himself problematic, he should not participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 August</td>
<td>Had I known that these things would happen, I would not have accepted to be president. There was an election on 29 June. We made our first meeting on 1 July. The next morning, when I opened my phone, messages started pouring in. From that day on, we experienced a fast process. The decisions might have changed any moment. It has been two months but we lived as though it was like a two-year process. From now on, I don’t think I can be a sports club manager. The situation is still critical. If the presidents of the clubs are still in custody and prohibited from going to Champions League, the situation would continue to be critical. Arresting too many people shows that the situation is still critical. It is not important for me to be a supporter of Fenerbahçe in this process. I don’t want to interfere in such a process as the present one. It is important to be fair, objective, and to maintain equal distance to everyone. It is one of my important characteristics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Regret” is one of the key words of the article and a hidden part of the content; after emphasizing this concept, let us close this section. Regret is an emotional reaction that occurs as a result of misjudgments of people (Coricelli, Dolan & Sirigu, 2007). Even though regret is closely related to guilt, sadness and disappointment (Landman, 1987; Gilovich & Medvec, 1995), its behavioural results are clearer than those of others (Huang & Zeelenberg, 2012). The feeling of guilt is a negative mental intention sourced from a person’s wrong belief in himself and/or any subject. The person feeling guilty criticises and reprimands himself; the person feeling regret, sees his own mistake and accepts it.

Bell (1988) defines disappointment as a psychological reaction to inconsistency of expectations and results. When the difference between expectations and results gets bigger, disappointment also gets bigger. The state of reaction in the definition must be a state of
sadness; we can say that if the difference between expectations and results of the decision gets bigger, the sadness also gets bigger. Disappointment and regret are the functions of decision and result (Gerritsen, 1998, p. 87). Disappointment is similar to the feeling of regret; that is disappointment is a result sourced from others and conditions beyond one’s control (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004; Tzieropoulos, De Peralta, Bossaerts & Andino, 2011). For example, when a manager mentions that he puts more effort in extricating the firm and that he did everything, it implies that he is blaming others for failure. The feeling of the manager is not guilt; it is disappointment.

Decision, regret and disappointment are related to counterfactual thinking. People compare existing results and situations, known as counter facts, through mental simulations (Kahneman, 1995, pp. 375-396). Counterfactual thinking is the intention of thinking what will happen if the individual behaves differently or if the conditions develop differently in a significant situation (Kahneman & Miller, 1986, p. 136). Regret is the state through which a person looks to the past and says “if I did it in a different way in the past, it would have been much better”. To talk about regret, first a decision is required and then imagination. By this way, the person feeling regret gets back into initial condition and then starts imagining that he can make another choice. Regret is the judge of the decision; it feels uncomfortable about the past behaviours. Regret directs people to revise the decision process (Zeelenberg, 1999; Roese & Summerville, 2005).

Tversky and Kahneman (1974) think that a lot of decisions are heuristic and taken as shortcuts. This is generally beneficial but can lead, sometimes, to systematic errors. According to Aronson (2008), these types of decisions are opposite to systematic thinking which involves looking at the problem from different angles, collecting information relating to the problem, evaluating the information, and determining alternative solutions. Decisions should be rational, no doubt. If the information load is excessive or very little, if there is no time to think about the problem in detail, if the decision makers do not have the ability to think about the problem, and if there is uncertainty in conditions, then the tendency to go for heuristic decision increases.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Let us start this with a brief mention of what motivated the narration of this story. There are three sports clubs, next to each other, in Fenerbahçe peninsula: İstanbul Sailing Club, Fenerbahçe Sports Club and Galatasaray Sports Club. Sailing Club is where we go everyday for swimming and resting; it is in a unique location where we can watch Hagia Sophia and Topkapı against the backdrop of wonderful sunset. In Turkey, between Fenerbahçe and Galatasaray sports clubs, there has always been a severe competition in football, but they
always maintained good neighbourly relations. Football, which is the main topic of discussion here, has become the most discussed subject in Turkey, following the match fixing scandal exposed on 3 July 2011. TFF President has just been elected. We were in Sailing Club and the sports club, which is the focus of match fixing, is next to us. We were watching what is going on. We could imagine how unfortunate the President is, and how difficult the situation has become for him. These happenings motivated us to write this article sitting in the neighboring Sailing Club.

TFF President, by virtue of his being the chief boss of Turkish football, is responsible for solving the match fixing problem that rocked Turkish football. Four days after assuming the job, he faced this problem. The problem is so tough that it almost qualifies to be termed as one ‘beyond chaos’. No manager thinks of any negative coincidence when starting the job, and the President was no exception. Every manager realizes the importance of his first days in the job and wants to make a good start. No doubt, the President also started the job with the same emotions and feelings. The extent of the support of people who chose the manager is a subject that should be given due consideration. An election can make a manager come into power, but he can not come into power with support alone. But, the President was elected with the full support of the voters. Even though the President was in Fenerbahçe SC, the Board of Management, Galatasaray SC, the biggest rival of Fenerbahçe SC gave support to the President. The third biggest sport club Beşiktaş JK and other sports clubs also gave support to the President. This full support vouches for the management ability of the President, and that he would act in harmony with all sports clubs.

The dimension of the match fixing forced us to qualify the situation faced by the President as chaos, even beyond chaos. One week after the match fixing scam was exposed, all the sports club managers, namely the ones who gave full support to the President, got together to renew their support for his defence under chaos conditions. This support, which they believed would rescue football from this serious problem, was very well directed and made just in time.

As the days passed, more and more people started offering their suggestions about solving the problem, while some indulged in mutual accusations. All this led to increase the pressure forcing the President to take a decision and thus deepen the chaos. Being a chaos manager is something, but managing a chaotic situation is altogether different. Existing situation is the right opportunity for evaluating this aspect of the President. Mutual accusations and conflicts seemed to have weakened the authority of the President, but UEFA made him comfortable by extending their support. Chaos manager should gain control over the chaotic situation, exercise his powers and bring chaos down to a reasonable level. He should have
taken precautions against conflicts and mutual accusations which deepened the situation to the level of beyond chaos, but he did not do so. For example, he could have made a regulation restraining the sports club managers from making accusative statements in front of the press. Also, the President should understand that his position was in no risk, because he was elected with the full support of the sports club managers.

Most of the statements targeting the President came from Galatasaray and Fenerbahçe sports clubs. The leading sporting clubs of Turkey compete and cooperate with each other. When they nominate the president, it is possible that they extend cooperation. But, when a nominee was not confirmed by them, nominee’s election cannot be ensured. It would be so even when the president was a manager and a supporter of Fenerbahçe SC. Some time ago, his nomination to TFF presidency was supported by Galatasaray SC. This time, we see eternal confrontation between the sports clubs in the match fixing case. The accusations and arguments of these two sports clubs, and their statements targeting the President deepened the chaos. As mentioned above, the President could have intervened and prevented the situation, but he did not. The inaction of President in allowing the situation to come to this stage deserves condemnation. Under chaotic conditions, everything occurs fast. The President did not face these problems earlier, and that made management hard for him. The ability to intervene and remain calmness what is needed most for dealing with problems of this nature. In this turbulent period, he should be moderate and deliberate. If the President maintained his calm, the polemics between the two sports clubs would not have continued for long.

One of the important requirements for a chaos manager is to define the point called ‘edge of chaos’ and demonstrate his ability to stand at that point. The edge of chaos is a point where opposing forces, like order and chaos, become operative with diverse factors, some facilitating the solution, and some militating against the solution. The President should have stood between these two points, but he could not. To stay there, he should be balanced, consistent and decisive. The balance we are talking about is not a static balance; to provide this balance ability and effort are required. At the edge of chaos, the manager intends to shift into strange attractors of order and chaos. Surprises and coincidences occur at this point. Here, everything can be expected and realized. Strict control is not a valid strategy at this point. The President did not prefer this; neither did he intervene to mitigate the chaos which is deepening. He was nervous of making mistakes, and so he kept himself away from trying to find the solution. He forgot that there were mistakes in this process. Dragging the President into the ongoing polemics between the two sports clubs brought the whole issue under the effect of attractor factors. He did not even return from the edge of chaos.
The President started with a consensus based on collective thinking and action. Chaos destroys a lot of things, including the consensus. The President was not immune to intense pressure. We were wondering how he would cope with chaos. He was aware that everybody was watching him and his statements were being followed. Probably, all this contributed to increase the pressure on him. Inconsistent and incomprehensible explanations, targeting football media, and making contradictory statements eroded his trustworthiness. Besides, his ability to manage the problematic and chaotic situation came under suspicion. Also, the President was aware of the negative outcome of all these developments.

Whenever there is a problem, the gravity of that problem should be assessed and discussed rather than allowing it to remain stuck at the initial stage of the solution process. Similarly, people should focus directly on solutions, rather than indulging in repeated complaints. When the President expressed that they lived two years in two months, it amounted to accepting that he was nowhere near the solution and he felt so daunted that he wanted to be away from the process as well as duty. All this happened to the President within 54 days of his taking charge. By recalling the expressions of the President on the 54th day (24 August), it can be understood that he was full of negative emotions, such as disappointment, regret and sadness. The negative emotions of the President were the outcome of his accepting the duty of president. The President created an impression that he was intending to tender his resignation soon. Besides, a manager who expressed his disappointment together with regret can not stay longer in duty. It is obvious that he did not anticipate such a big problem. It is not right to to criticise the President on that account. The person who makes self-criticism, should be straightforward, honest and realistic. No doubt, the President, as a manager, had all these qualifications, but because of the pressure mounted on him, he could not cope with the match fixing problem and thus lost the support in a short time.

Summing up, let us emphasize one of the chaos teachings. Chaos theory in management science presents new opportunities to managers, based on not only thought but also practice. In making comments, one benefits from chaos teachings. It has been shown that during the first 90 days of process, chaotic systems are characterized by sensitivity to initial conditions or a metaphor called butterfly effect. Good start is important. President was unlucky; he had a bad start and continued with that.

*To those who wonder “what will happen next?”, the answer is “We wonder if we are coming to the last 90 days”*
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