

УДК 351:796(4)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6246-2023-6-14-20>

Блащак Ігор,
Завідувач кафедри фізичного виховання
та спорту Львівського торговельно-
економічного університету

Blashchak Ihor,
Head of Department chair of sport and physical
education of Lviv University of Trade and
Economics

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2785-9048>✉ ihorblashchak@gmail.com

ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ДОСВІД ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ СФЕРОЮ СПОРТУ: СТРУКТУРНО-ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНІ АСПЕКТИ

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT IN THE SPHERE OF SPORTS: STRUCTURAL AND FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS

Анотація. Розвиток фізичної культури і спорту як найменш витратний і найбільш ефективний засіб фізичного й морального оздоровлення нації, покликаний забезпечити формування фізичних, естетичних і моральних якостей людської особистості, профілактику захворювань, фізичної та психоемоційної рекреації і реабілітації людини, об'єднання сім'ї, організацію дозвілля. Фізкультурно-спортивні громадські рухи зближують особисті і громадські інтереси, формують здоровий морально-психологічний клімат у різних соціально-демографічних групах населення, особливо в молодіжному середовищі. Фізична культура, будучи частиною загальної культури людини, її здорового способу життя, багато в чому визначає її поведінку під час навчання, на виробництві, в побуті, у спілкуванні.

Механізми публічного управління у сфері спорту спрямовані на реалізацію основних управлінських функцій: планування, організаційні заходи, бюджетування, моніторинг, контроль. Реалізація функцій відбувається в системі суб'єктно-об'єктного управління шляхом реалізації нормативно-правових механізмів як основи законодавчого забезпечення процесів розвитку фізичної культури та спорту в ЄС. Важливим елементом публічного управління фізичною культурою та спортом є стейкхолдери та їх співпраця із органами публічної влади та місцевого самоврядування. Європейський досвід публічного управління реалізовується на рівні загальноєвропейської системи управління, незважаючи на схожу орієнтацію та стратегічні пріоритети національних моделей публічного управління кожної країни, існують суттєві відмінності та специфіка їх побудови.

В Україні відсутня функціональна орієнтація на розвиток сфери фізичної культури та спорту. Тому систематизація та узагальнення європейського досвіду публічного управління сферою спорту, зокрема щодо структурних та функціональних аспектів є важливим та актуальним предметом дослідження даної статті.

Ключові слова: сфера спорту, публічне управління, досвід ЄС, структурно-функціональний аспект.

Abstract. The development of physical culture and sports as the least expensive and most effective means of accelerated physical and moral improvement of the nation, designed to ensure the formation of physical, aesthetic and moral qualities of

the human personality, disease prevention, physical and psycho-emotional recreation and rehabilitation of a person, family unification, and organization of leisure. Physical education and sports public movements bring together personal and public interests, form a healthy moral and psychological climate in different socio-demographic groups of the population, especially among young people. Physical culture, being part of a person's general culture, his healthy lifestyle, largely determines her behavior during training, at work, at home, and in communication.

Public management mechanisms in the institutional model are focused on the implementation of the main management functions: planning, organizational activities, budgeting, monitoring, control. The implementation of functions occurs in the system of subject-object management through the implementation of regulatory mechanisms as the basis for legislative support for the development of physical culture and sports in the EU. An important element of public management of physical culture and sports are stakeholders and their cooperation with public authorities and local governments. The European experience of public administration is implemented at the level of the European management system; despite the similar orientation and strategic priorities of the national models of public administration of each country, there are differences and specifics of their construction.

We lack an economic orientation towards the development of the sphere of physical culture and sports. Therefore, systematization and generalization of the European experience of public management of the sports sector, in particular, in structural and functional aspects, is an important and relevant subject of research in this article.

Keywords: sports sector, public administration, EU experience, structural and functional aspect.

Introduction. The institutional structure of the public administration system in the field of physical culture and sports has a wide range of functions and specificity in accordance with the tasks that society sets for it in a specific area or sector of the economy. The sphere of physical culture and sports has a high humanitarian and social value, therefore, the specifics of public administration should be based on its priority for the state and society. The public administration system in the European Union has a two-level structure:

- representation of the EU as an associative collective body,
- national public administration systems of EU member states.

Considering this structure of regulatory and organizational support for public administration of the EU member states, it is advisable to determine the elements of both a general management model and to analyze national models of public administration in order to determine priority and relevant mechanisms that can be applied in the domestic system of public administration of physical culture and sports, taking into account the European integration vector of development of Ukraine, the World Organization of the United Nations determines the basic priorities of public administration in the field of physical culture and sports [1].

Literature review. Global trends in the development of processes influencing the formation of mechanisms for public management of physical culture and sports were analyzed by isolating information through an analysis of the resources of the World Health Organization [2], the World Bank Country and Lending Groups [3], the United Nations [4] and other international organizations. The works of a number of foreign authors define priorities, public demands and models for the implementation of

effective public management mechanisms in the field of physical culture and sports, in particular the works of D. Killing [5], Mary P. Follett [6], D. Boakaert [7], R. Lickert [8].

Formulation of the objectives of the article (statement of the problem). The purpose of the article is to systematize and generalize the European experience of public management of the sports sector, in particular structural and functional aspects.

Results. When analyzing public management models, it is advisable to note that the European model considers the sphere of physical culture and sports as a person-oriented category of public management, defining such a concept as «sports services». The share of sports services in the GDP of EU member states is 43 billion Euros, or 0.33% of the total EU GDP.

The high level of entrepreneurial and investment activity in the field of sports in the European Union is determined from the point of view of the formation of the basic concept of physical culture and sports, which includes elements of business structures, business processes aimed at attracting investments to finance the industry and ensure its competitiveness in international markets.

Among the subjects of the European model of public management of physical culture and sports, it is advisable to highlight [9]:

- national coordinating bodies whose activities are aimed at organizing sports events, competitions, tournaments at the European and national levels, conducting communication campaigns;
- specialized agencies whose activities are aimed at planning physical culture and sports management processes and the application of management mechanisms through the implementation of organizational support;
- partner organizations providing financial and organizational support for events, in particular, international and European foundations, public organizations, foundations and organizations at the national level, international partners, specialized associations, municipalities, etc.;
- ambassadors carrying out activities aimed at developing, positioning, ensuring investment attractiveness of the sphere of physical culture and sports at the national level, are conductors of the country's image by popularizing its sporting achievements, carry out communication and organizational work aimed at the development and dissemination of physical culture and mass sports;
- private companies whose activities are aimed at making a profit through the development of the field of physical culture and sports in cooperation with public authorities and local governments.

Modeling the system of public management of physical culture and sports should be based on defining the goals of public management, in particular:

- fight for health,
- economic efficiency associated with increasing working capacity and ensuring the normal physical condition of people of working age,
- social efficiency, determined by reducing the burden on the healthcare system due to the lack of treatment of people, since their healthy lifestyle, the use of physical education and sports ensured their health,
- strengthening health and physical activity,
- expanding the population's interest in physical culture and sports,
- availability of sports,
- cooperation as an element of the development of physical culture and sports.

So, the modeling of public management in the field of physical culture and sports determines coordination processes through cooperation at the level of executive

bodies of the EU, national and local authorities through integrated cooperation. Considering the division of the public administration system of the European Union at the pan-European and national levels, it is advisable to analyze the European model of European management and analyze individual national models in order to determine the best public management practices for their implementation in the national system of public management of physical culture and sports.

The EU's institutional arrangements consist of seven main governing bodies. To understand the model of public administration, it is important to consider the executive and legislative bodies of the EU: the Council of the EU, the European Parliament, the European Commission. Each institute has its own special functions. For the executive branch, they are somewhat duplicated, but it is advisable to determine the main mechanisms of public management of the EU [10]: administrative, legal, socio-economic, informational, political, regulatory.

It is advisable to consider the classical models of public management in the field of physical culture and sports, inherent in European countries, which have deep historical traditions. Great Britain, as part of the EU, showed some of the leading results in the development of physical culture and sports, which is expressed in high results in sports, achievements of the peaks in the development of physical culture and mass sports. Despite the UK's exit from the EU, we will analyze the model of public management of physical culture and sports in the UK, since this state was part of the EU for some time. The specificity of the British national model of public management in the field of physical culture and sports is the focus on the person as an individual, his needs, requests, which was a national priority back in the period of the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

The German national model of public management of physical culture and sports is aimed at a clear structural and functional system of organizing power, ensuring the implementation of management functions. It should be noted that the basic priority of the German national model of public management of physical culture and sports is the economic component. Germany is developing an open market, a competitive economic system, but the basis of such a system is the social economy. The main task of social economics is to distribute limited resources among the entire population on the basis of equality and justice. This is the economics of social protection and social security. The bureaucratic apparatus of the national model of public administration, due to its structural and functional features, is focused not directly on performing bureaucratic functions, but on meeting the needs and demands of the population. A clear structural hierarchy of public management bodies for physical culture and sports, the distribution of management functions, powers and responsibilities allows the German national model of public administration to be one of the most effective systems, capable of ensuring the effectiveness of both domestic and foreign policies within the country itself, and consolidating efforts to ensuring development within the framework of Associated Europe [11].

It is advisable to define the French national model of public administration as the most pluralistic. After the events of the Great French Revolution, French society began to move towards equality and justice. The basis of the government of the French Republic was equal access to political, economic and social freedoms and guarantees. French society is one of the most tolerant and democratic, open to interethnic, interfaith dialogue, and interaction between different political and social groups. The dominant feature of the national model of public administration is the provision of regulatory policies that promote the creation of opportunities for harmonious coexistence of representatives of different public and social groups, the development

of the state by accumulating the best practices of socio-economic development developing within each group. France is an open and tolerant country, which was the result of the formation of humanistic philosophical movements and scientific substantiation of approaches to the development of a national model of public administration. It was the French humanistic concept, its research and development among a society of philosophers, scientists in the field of social development, and political scientists that became the basis for the formation of the modern representative structure of public power. The scientific justification of socio-political processes and the processes of state creation is another feature of the national model of public administration. One of the basic tasks of the state is the development of technology, because the use of scientific approaches cannot but be accompanied by the introduction of innovations in all spheres of social development. Innovation ensures a high level of technical and technological development of the country, and the technocratic system is the basis for the formation of effective mechanisms for socio-economic development. The development of pluralistic institutions of public administration is possible only in conditions of freedom at both the state and local levels. So, the basis for local democratic development in France is a system of decentralization. Decentralization is the basic power of the national model of local self-government, which interacts in a balanced manner with public authorities thanks to a clear distribution of rights, responsibilities and powers, which creates a dual effect and ensures high efficiency of public administration institutions at the national and regional levels.

The Scandinavian national model of public administration is focused on the social needs of the population. This is an example of a social democratic society, where regulatory mechanisms on the part of public authorities on the processes of transformation of social and economic systems are minimal, and the influence of the state on the private life of an individual is practically absent. At the same time, the state guarantees the provision of high social norms and living standards, distributing resources as balanced as possible among the entire population in order to reduce social inequality within society.

Accordingly, the Scandinavian national model of public administration defines support for the development of physical culture and sports as one of its priorities as a basic social task public authorities are aware of the limitations of their powers, delegating them through establishing effective cooperation with the private sector, the public and other stakeholders. Limiting government intervention in socio-economic processes is the result of the theory of public choice implemented in practice. It should be noted that representatives of this theory understand and perceive the need for limited influence of the state through the implementation of public management mechanisms in social development in order to ensure the most effective development of social processes. This is an important element of the public administration system of the Scandinavian countries, which is associated with such unique factors for these territories as limited resources, which necessitates their rational use and fair distribution in order to ensure the effectiveness of the state's social policy, and the limited number of people who live in conditions limited transport mobility due to climatic conditions. The development of a national model of public administration should focus not only on the social priorities of the Scandinavian states, but also take into account their specific features [12].

Conclusions. So, as a result of the study, the main priorities were identified that determine the models for ensuring the functioning of public administration processes in the leading economically developed democratic countries of Europe - Great Britain,

Germany, Scandinavian countries and France. Having determined the features of the formation and development of leading national models of public administration, it is advisable to analyze the impact of their specifics on the development of physical culture and sports in these countries. It should be noted that the analyzed countries are not only the world's leading democracies and recognized leaders in socio-economic development, but also countries with high sports results.

Public management mechanisms in the institutional model are focused on the implementation of the main management functions: planning, organizational activities, budgeting, monitoring, control. The implementation of functions occurs in the system of subject-object management through the implementation of regulatory mechanisms as the basis for legislative support for the development of physical culture and sports in the EU. An important element of the European model of public management of physical culture and sports is stakeholders and their cooperation with public authorities and local governments. The European model of public administration is implemented at the level of the European management system; despite the similar orientation and strategic priorities of national models of public administration, there are differences and specifics of their construction.

We lack an economic orientation towards the development of the sphere of physical culture and sports. According to outdated Soviet approaches, the Ukrainian system of public management of physical culture and sports is trying to look for forms of financing the industry only through the residual principles of budgets at different levels, while mechanisms for attracting investments from the private sector, grant financing and the formation of business systems for sporting events are generally absent or are not used effectively enough.

References

1. Andreff, W. (2009). Public and private sport financing in Europe: the impact of financial crisis: 84th Western Economic Association International Conference. Vancouver.
2. Waşık, J., Ortenburger, D., & Mosler, D. (2021). Perception of Self-Efficacy and Health-Related Behavior in Context of Taekwon-Do Sport Camps. *Sustainability*, 13(9), 4645. DOI: 10.3390/su13094645.
3. Xing, X., Church, A.G., O'Reilly, N., Pegoraro, A., Nadeau, J., Heslop, L., & Séguin, B. (2008). Olympic Games host and bid city marketing: exploring issue management in the relationships among event stakeholder groups. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 9, 4, 77-91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-09-04-2008-B009>.
4. 17 Goals to Transform Our World. *www.un.org*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>
5. Keeling, D. (1972). *Management in Government*. London: Allen & Unwin.
6. Follett, M. (2013). *Creating Democracy, Transforming Management*. Tonn, Joan C., New Haven: Yale University Press.
7. Bouckaert, G. (2012). *Modernizing the Rechtsstaat: Paradoxes of the Management Agenda*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
8. Likert, R. *Management System Theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.learnmanagement2.com/likert.htm>.
9. Lu, H.-F., & Lin, H.-W. (2021). Does the legacy governance of major sporting events affect urban development? The stakeholder's perspectives on the Taipei 2017 Universiade. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 22, 1, 87-106. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-02-2020-0022>.
10. Lera-López, F., & Rapún-Gárate, M. (2011). Determinants of sports participation and attendance: differences and similarities. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 12, 2, 66-89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-02-2011-B007>.

11. Oh, T., Oh, J., Kim, J., & Kwon, K.D. (2019). Differences of perception between private and public officers in an organizing committee concerning stakeholders of an international sporting event. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 20, 1, 127-142. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-08-2017-0067>.
12. Šerić, N., & Ljubic, J. (2018). Motives for Market Research in the Sports Industry. *Market Research Methods in the Sports Industry*. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley, 7-49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78754-191-720181002/>.
13. Blashchak, I., Karpa, M., & Akimova, L. (2022). Organizational and management support of the sphere of sport tourism in Ukraine: legal aspect. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (3), 54-60. <https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2022-3-54>.

Подано до редакції 7.11.2023 р.

Прийнято до друку 11.12.2023 р.