

## Organisational Management Peculiarities of the Public Sector Referring to Sports as a Public Sector Example

Akville Gedvilaite-Moan<sup>1</sup>, Skaiste Laskiene<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vytautas Magnus University  
Daukanto str. 28, LT-44246 Kaunas, Lithuania  
e-mail: a.gedvilaite@evf.vdu.lt

<sup>2</sup> Lithuanian Academy of Physical Education  
Sporto str. 6, LT-44221 Kaunas, Lithuania  
e-mail: s.laskiene@lkka.lt

The article analyzes organisational management peculiarities of the public sector organizations, paying a special attention to sports as a public sector. The development of Lithuanian, as well as of the other post-Soviet countries has caused sport system to go through the immense multimeaningful change. Structural changes inside the system, inside and outside judicial environment, the expansion of the market relations are an everyday success guarantee for every sport organisation. Dynamic development of sports requires timely and qualified decisions in a constantly changing environment of opportunities. The top sport manager plays an ideological role in the post-Soviet system. Top manager plays a crucial role in the modern sports world by putting his/her knowledge and capabilities to have the organisational goals met by striving for quality and meeting the needs of the members and market.

The quest for higher performance by public organizations is a central and recurring theme in government policies and academic research (Boyne, Farrell, Law, Powell, Walker, 2003; Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2000). For complex and permanent modernization of public sector, a complex strategy of modernization is required (vision, mission, provisions, and concepts of modernization) (Skietrys, Raipa, Bartkus, 2008). An effective strategy formation capability is a complex organizational resource – a dynamic capability that should lead to superior performance (Slater, Olson, Hult, 2006). Although the notion of strategy has its origins in the military arena, strategic planning in recent years has been primarily focused on private sector organizations and much of the theory assumes that those in executive control of an organization have the freedom to determine its direction. Strategic planning is a means to an end, a method used to position an organization, through prioritizing its use of resources according to identified goals, in an effort to guide its direction and development over a period of time (Wilkinson, Monkhouse, 1994).

Research on the general topic of organizational performance in the public sector is limited in quantity and quality (Boyne, 2003), so it is hardly surprising that the reversal of organizational decline has received little serious academic attention. Interest in the subject has come largely from practitioners rather than researchers

(Borins, 1998; Moore, 1995). It is important to stress at the outset that public and private management are significantly different in several respects. For example, public organizations are generally more bureaucratic, public managers have less discretion over organizational missions and personnel, and the staff in public organizations is less likely to be motivated by financial incentives (Nutt, Backoff, 1993).

Keywords: organisational management, public sector, sport public sector, private sector, strategic planning, strategy.

### Introduction

Organizational change is a comprehensive and interrelated process involving planning, goal setting, training and developing employees and stakeholders, obtaining sufficient resources, selecting intervention strategies, and monitoring and communicating outcomes. In the public sector frequent political agenda changes, legislative rather than market-driven goals, and insufficient allocations of financial and human resources often hinder change (Rusaw, 2007). In their efforts to provide increased value for money and to genuinely improve their outputs, public sector organizations have been increasingly turning to strategic planning systems and models (Wilkinson, Monkhouse, 1994).

According to Eskildsen, Kristensen and Juhl (2004), private and public organisations do not achieve excellent results in the same way. Private companies put higher emphasis on the systems dimension whereas public organisations put higher emphasis on the people dimension. In traditional political science literature it is emphasised that there are distinct differences between private and public organisations. Most public organisations do not have the same strategic freedom as private companies have since some of their strategic goals are decided by politicians. This puts constraints on public organisations ability to operate and may, in some instances, force public organisations to make decisions that are not sound for the society at large (Lane, 1993).

This also affects the resources available to public organisations. They do not always have the resources needed in order to meet demand – making it necessary for

public organisations to prioritise which customers/ users to serve. This is a situation unfamiliar to private companies. Most public organisations also have a very limited operating room in some aspects of human resource management. Many public employees are covered by collective bargaining agreements that limit the public organisations' use of incentives in relation to employees (Eskildsen, Kristensen, Juhl, 2004).

Role of human resources is also very important in creating and sustaining a functional strategy for an organisation. Human resources, replacing the former terms of labor force or staff, is the main factor determining the success of activity (Sakalas, 2008). Therefore, according to Kazlauskaite and Buciuviene (2008), human resource management should be viewed as a strategic activity and thus carried out consistently with the overall business/corporate strategy. Ciarniene, Sakalas, Vienazindiene (2007) note that the system of human resources in the public sector is closely related with the creation of a new quality.

**Research problem:** to identify which organisational management peculiarities in public sector should be addressed in order to have a positive affect on public sport sector management.

**Research goal:** to analyze the organizational management peculiarities in the public sport sector.

**Research objectives:** to analyze the concepts of organizational management in the public sector, to discuss the sport sector as an example of public sector and to investigate management peculiarities of a public sport sector following the examples of foreign countries.

**The following study methods were applied:** comparative analysis of academic literature, review of published researches and formulation of conclusions.

### **Organizational Management Peculiarities of the Public Sector**

The beginning of the reforms in the public sector was the eight-decade of the XX century. When the quality improvement in the private sector was compared with the unchanging public sector the claims for the public sector occurred at that time and the total discontent with the state management increased (Vienazindiene, Ciarniene, 2008).

Nowadays it is not attempted to create one absolute formulation, but it is more perspective to understand what enterprise strategy is and how the major enterprise strategy should be crafted and developed. Therefore, it is necessary to realize what imperatives influence strategy development in an enterprise. Moreover, it is important to discuss the nature of strategic decisions that are reflected in the formed strategy (Gudonavicius, Bartoseviciene, Saparnis, 2009).

Research efforts addressing the planning-performance relationship have been numerous and provided varying conclusions. The implications from the subset of seminal and current articles linking performance to the characteristics or type of strategy process indicate that there is a consensus that strategic planning is positively related to organizational performance across a wide range of sectors (Gunby, 2009).

For many years, according to Ciegis and Gineitiene (2008), strategic development plans have been prepared in the way when a planner has understood it without really

giving attention to the quality or purpose of planning. Vaitkevicius (2007) in his findings of the study suggests that strategic management in Lithuanian organisations is to a little extent based on formal analysis. It is characterised by intuitive application of strategic management tools accompanied by especially sophistic strategic analysis (not based on hard data). Valentinavicius (2009) states that the organisation's business strategy could be successfully implemented, if an investment strategy is prepared, combined and evaluated along.

According to Streimikiene and Girdzijauskas (2008), seeking to achieve sustainable growth in an organisation, new technology resources and using renewable resources are necessary. Gatautis (2008) states that digital technologies (remote network systems, internet and mobile technologies) should be used to facilitate the process of decision-making for public institutions, improve public policy in local communities and transform relations with citizens, business and other public institutions.

Conflicting evidence that the effect of strategic planning was minimal, non-significant or positive but moderated by a significant environmental or contextual variables were also extensively prevalent in special literature. The majority of these studies included operationalizations of the strategy process that were one-dimensional. The individual strategy processes that make up the current multidimensional configurations began with the field's early developmental models (Andrews, 1971; Ansoff, 1965; Hofer, Schendel, 1979; Allison, 1971) which are based on the principles of rational decision making and assume that purpose and integration are essential for a firm's long term success (Fredrickson, 1983).

A group of "incremental" models (Lindblom, 1959; Quinn, 1980; Mintzberg, 1973) presented other depictions of how firms actually make strategic decisions and they have become the foundation of strategy development processes. The richness provided by these and other integrative frameworks endeavoured to provide an enhanced representation of organizations compared to what could be produced by single or binary theoretical frameworks. These enhanced views showed promise in identifying more specific managerial and operational implications. From these views, strategic managers could possibly derive prescriptive strategy development processes deemed more effective and efficient within given organizational contexts. From these initial characterizations of the strategy process, multidimensional strategy process archetypes and many unique typologies have been developed endeavouring to contribute to the understanding of how individual or combination strategy processes affect outcomes in an interactive or synergistic manner (Gunby Jr., 2009).

A review of the strategic management literature identified six dimensions of strategy development processes (see Table 1, adapted by Gunby Jr. (2009) from Bailey et al. (2000)). Each "type" of strategy development process listed has a description that characterizes who, where or what is the primary catalyst for the strategy initiation. Table 1 also includes the seminal conceptual and key supplementary citations that established and/or support each strategy development process.

Table 1

**Six dimensions of strategy development processes (adapted by N. W. Gunby Jr. (2009) from Bailey et al. (2000))**

Strategy development process type	Description	Seminal reference(s)	Key supplementary references
Command	Strategy driven by top executives	Bourgeois and Brodwin (1984)	Drucker (1970); Kotter (1990); Westley (1989)
Planning	Strategy driven by intentional and deliberate procedural methods	Ansoff (1965)	Ansoff (1965); Argenti (1980); Mintzberg (1978); Steiner (1969)
Cultural	Strategy driven by organisational mission, vision and values	Johnson (1987)	Chrisman et al. (1988); Deal and Kennedy (1982); Gioia and Poole (1984); Johnson (1987); Schon (1983); Trice and Beyer (1985); Weick (1979)
Political	Strategy driven by coalition and stakeholder objectives	Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), resource dependence	Cyert and March (1963); Feldman (1986); Pettigrew (1973); Pfeffer et al. (1978); Wilson (1982)
Incremental	Strategy driven by bargaining, negotiation and compromise	Lindblom (1959), incrementalism – “muddling through”	Johnson (1988); Lindblom (1959); Quinn (1980, 1982)
Enforced choice	Strategy driven by environmental constraints	Hannan and Freeman (1989), population ecology	Deepphouse (1996); Hannan et al. (1989)

During the past two decades, many observers have detected shift in values from traditional public administration to new public management (Dunleavy, 1991; Dunleavy, Hood, 1994)

Many models of organizational change are designed for private sector organizations, which are primarily based on profit purposes, enterprise goals, frameworks that can adapt more easily to changing customer needs and interests, shareholder interests, and market niches. Government organizations have legally-based purposes, operate by vast systems of rules and regulations, and serve clientele having rights and privileges set by legislation rather than by market-driven interests. Goliembiewski (1985) pointed out five structural constraints that distinguish public sector change:

1) Public organizations have an “iron quadrangle” of inputs into the legislative decision making process: the executive branch, legislative sub-groups, and mass media.

2) Public organizations have a variety of interests and reward structures, making it difficult to identify precise needs for change and to satisfy all relevant stakeholders.

3) Government bureaucracies lack centralized power, being responsive to state and local pressures in decision making.

4) In addition, overseeing each level of government are beives of short tenured political appointees of varying skills, interests, and goals, and having weak relationships with long-term career professionals. This complicates communications and coordinating policies, but also greatly limits decentralized decisional flexibility.

5) Lastly, the legalistic foundation of public administration produces a narrowly - focused span of control, emphasizes procedural regularity rather than openness in solving problems, and intermixes politics and management.

In addition to the constraints in decision making power, public organizations suffer from chronic legislative underfunding (Ferris, 1987). Change in public organizations is possible, however, provided organizational change agents recognize the key constraints and adapt models to particular organizational characteristics (Rusaw, 2007).

In a meta-analytic study of organizational change in the public and private organizations, Robertson and Sneviratne (1995) determined that change was effective in both cases. However, the authors noted that in the public sector, change strategies aimed at improving individual performance and organizational productivity fared better than those in the private sector. In the private sector, they noted, organizational change often brought about individual development, but was not aligned with overall organizational performance. Moreover, the study indicated that organizational change comes about differently in the two sectors. In private companies, top level executives can order change among lower echelons; in the public sector, however, this is more difficult because of more numerous social arrangements (such as constituent groups) that affect the course and extent of change. The authors pointed out that because of the different goals of the constituents as well as the frequent changes in political leadership in public organizations, to develop sustained change programs is quite difficult (Rusaw, 2007).

### Sport Sector as an Example of Public Sector

Sports sector is often treated not only as a tool for improving the physical and emotional well-being of the society, but also as a tool in the international area for promoting investment, developing international business linkages and socio-cultural relations between different cultures, as well as enhancing the political role of the nation (Karpavicius, Jucevicius, 2009). International sport development initiatives have become part and parcel of the foreign policy and aid programmes of super powers since the First World War. The break-up of colonial empires left a void for world forces to use sport as a vehicle to support political and ideological change (Burnett, 2001). The political concept of development found expression in providing socioeconomic support and worldwide cooperation to developing countries. This was often instigated through heterogenous sport development projects and with regard to the interests of the relevant stakeholders (Bloss, 1977).

A growing trend, which shows sport is being used increasingly by a variety of institutions as a vehicle to enhance existing development initiatives and/or reach areas that traditional development finds difficult to access, has been clearly discernable. This is occasionally recognized by key policy makers (Levermore, 2008). Recognition of the role of sport as a potential engine of development is, however, largely absent from the social sciences literature. According to Roger Levermore's article in 2008, at the time of writing, it was found that from over 70,000 entries in the last 15 years of *International Development Abstracts*, only 12 mentioned sport. Even contemporary texts on development (such as Hettne, 1995; Desai, Potter, 2002; Kingsbury, 2004), where one might expect some discussion of the recent intensification of sport to development, fail to highlight or comment on the relationship. However, development-through-sport is rarely the centre of their analysis, with some being highly descriptive, noting simply that sport does play a role in promoting development around the world without embellishing further.

Sports – understood in its broadest sense to include simple physical education as well as the more recognizable competitive definition – has long been used in an attempt to foster development, particularly in unifying often disparate groups of people. The Netherlands, Switzerland, Canada, Norway and Australia are examples of developed countries which attempt to harness some sports attributes to assist with objectives linked to international development/relations (Levermore, 2008). Sport has the potential to generate substantial economic and social returns to local and regional government investment in the sports industry (Gratton, Shibli, Coleman, 2005).

Many governments around the world have adopted national sports policies that specify that hosting major sports events is a major objective. A broad range of benefits has been suggested for both the country and the host city including: urban regeneration legacy benefits, sporting legacy benefits, tourism and image benefits, social and cultural benefits and the direct economic impact benefits. It is well known that cities and countries compete fiercely to host the Olympic Games or the soccer World Cup. However, over recent years there has been increasing competition to host less globally recognized sports events in a wide range of other sports where spectator interest is less certain and where the economic benefits are not so clear cut (Gratton, Shibli, Coleman, 2005).

The literature on the economics of major sports events is relatively recent. It is not a straightforward job, however, to establish a profit and loss account for a specific event. Major sports events require investment in new sports facilities and often this is paid for in part by central government or even international sports bodies. Thus some of this investment expenditure represents a net addition to the local economy since the money comes in from outside. Also, such facilities remain after the event has finished acting as a platform for future activities that can generate additional tourist expenditure (Mules, Faulkner, 1996).

In theory, there is a wide diversity in the range of economic benefits that sports events can generate. Kasimati (2003) summarized the potential long-term benefits to a city of hosting major sports events such as the

summer Olympics: newly constructed event facilities and infrastructure, urban revival, enhanced international reputation, increased tourism, improved public welfare, additional employment and increased inward investment. In practice, however, there is also a possible downside to hosting such events including: high construction costs of sporting venues and related other investments in particular in transport infrastructure, temporary congestion problems, displacement of other tourists due to the event and underutilized elite sporting facilities after the events which are of little use to the local population (Gratton, Shibli, Coleman, 2005).

For some events, other benefits can be greater than economic impact. Some of the events generate relatively small economic impacts. Just because the event is a world or European championship does not guarantee that it will be important in economic terms. The difficulty for cities trying to follow an event strategy for regeneration purposes is that it is difficult to forecast the economic impact of any event prior to staging it – it should be taken into consideration while arranging European Basketball Championship for men in 2011 in Lithuania.

Physical education and sport are becoming a more important part of Lithuania's economy and culture. Strategic management principals and methods are used to model the activity development of the country's economy, separate companies and organizations. Therefore, in order to analyze the situation of physical education and sport in the country and to foresee the possible development scenarios, it is necessary to be guided by general rules of strategic management. Sport is widely accepted as a powerful contributor to social and personal development. Sport is an essential tool for building strong individuals and vibrant communities and for enhancing the collective pride and identity, and sense of belonging. It is essential to have a clear strategy of how to make the sport system more effective and inclusive in Lithuania (Gedvilaite-Moan, Liesionis, 2009). This kind of goal might be reached by following the good example of foreign countries' sport sector management, strategy formation patterns and formation of sport politics.

### **Public Sport Sector Management Peculiarities Following Foreign Countries' Example**

Sport is a social phenomenon, closely related to society culture – an important part of the preparation for sport competitions and participation in them, while striving for the best results. Every citizen should have a possibility to participate in sports. There have been many changes in European sport sector during past couple of years – sector management, personnel hiring and advancement in technology among them. Principal European sport sector development factors are the growth of the participation in sports in all Europe, globalization, the effect of the technology and aging of residents. The significance of sport has grown, when European governments invested more into this sector and recognized its positive role. During the last 10 years the employment in sports sector has grown by 60% due to the increasing participation in sports activities (Beleckiene, Murphy, Dienys, 2008).

The public benefit of better health and well-being, education, social integration and democracy are the rationale for public support to the sports sector. Equal opportunities and open access to sporting activities can only be guaranteed through public involvement. While some sports organizations are economically self-sufficient, most of them remain dependent on public funding. Public sector support can take many different forms. Typically, central government expenditure on sport is lower than the amounts coming from regional and local governments, most of which goes to finance local sports facilities. Lottery income is an important source of public support in many Member States and is distributed either through umbrella sport organizations or directly to sports clubs and associations (European Commission on Public Sector Support, 2009).

Sport is a growing social and economic phenomenon which makes an important contribution to the European Union's strategic objectives of solidarity and prosperity. The Olympic ideal of developing sport to promote peace and understanding among nations and cultures as well as the education of young people were born in Europe and have been fostered by the International Olympic Committee and the European Olympic Committees (White Paper on Sport, 2009).

Pescante – the most famous sport law expert, has described law regulated sport models used in EU countries, in 1993 as liberal, intervention and decentralized. Other authority for sport law Chaker (2004) divides sport regulating models into interventive and non interventive, and models, influenced by government – into centralized and decentralized. All the models have several principles in common – the role of volunteers in organizing sports, autonomy of sports organizations and the need of government intervention in evaluating social, health, educational and cultural impact of sports. It is noted that almost all the new EU member countries' (except Czech Republic) sport models have evolutionized towards interventive and centralized, and most of the countries have adopted a sports law. Sports law adoption is more characteristic to Western European countries with interventive regulating models. Some countries (e.g. Austria, Finland) have Sports Law, though their sport models are not interventive.

In liberal model sport is understood as a volunteer and autonomic person's activity. Sports organizations are responsible for its stimulation and development. Government's input is reflected by inducing sports movement and not by passing laws and regulations. The governmental input could be direct financial, building of infrastructure objects and research and/or tax privileges. As an example - UK, Sweden, Netherlands and Norway do not have a separate Sports Law. Principal sports movements (usually federations) rely on the internal and international regulations - in addition to that, all the aforementioned countries have additional adjacent regulating laws regarding safety during sporting events, doping control, etc.

Interventive model treats sport as a public service. Government takes on the responsibility to induce, develop and sometimes supervise the provision of service. For example, Sport Laws which regulate activity of the sports

federations and their relation with the government, are passed in France, Spain and Portugal.

Decentralized model is responsible only for the highest level sports activity and sometimes for organizing sports for handicapped people. This type of a sports model works in such federal countries like – Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

According to the research made by European Non-governmental Sports Organisation (ENGSO) in 2001, there are 3 types of occupation in sports models:

- bureaucratic, where government plays an essential role in defining and bringing out sports politics (typical example is France);
- business-like, where rationalization and need for adapting are stipulated by government supply (typical example is the United Kingdom);
- missionary, where sports movements are tightly connected to local life (typical example is Germany) (European Network Sport & Employment in the Third Sector, 2001).

The outline of the principles of reglamenting sport models in Lithuania, Latvia, UK, Germany and France are described below.

More comprehensive opportunities for the strategic management of economic development in Lithuania appeared only in 2002, with the preparation of the first long-term development strategy for economic development (Diskiene, Galiniene, Marcinskas, 2008). But long-term country sport strategy has not been presented after gaining Independence at all; therefore work group has provided a sport strategy project during the summer 2007. Authors of the physical education and sport development strategy (2008-2020) draw special attention to the social mission of sports and the aim to include all social groups into physical education and sport activities (Gedvilaite-Moan, Liesionis, 2009). Most of the Lithuanian strategic planning documents outline the importance of promoting healthy living for citizens, where sports and physical activity are an essential background.

Since regaining its Independence in 1990, Lithuania has been undergoing social and economic changes that have had a direct influence on the development of physical education and sport. New sports organizations have been set up and more attention is now being paid to the physical education of youth and school children as well as to the social integration of the disabled. Sport for all events, intended for all age groups, is being promoted, too. Special attention to these matters was given at the Lithuanian Sports Congress 2000, which adopted the Strategy for Physical Education and Sports of the Republic of Lithuania for the years 2002-2012 as well as the Physical Education and Sports Development Programme for 2000-2004. There are 124 national sports bodies, 1299 sports clubs and 103 sports educational institutions along with other sports organizations in Lithuania at present. At a national level, the legal basis of sport is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Physical Education and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Education and the Law on Social Integration of the Disabled. While planning and implementing activities in the field of sport, Lithuania, as a member of the Council of Europe, follows the provisions of the European Sports

Charter, the European Sport for All Charter: disabled persons, the European Anti-doping Convention and the European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports Events and in Particular at Football Matches (Report on the Advisory Visit on the Implementation of the European Sports Charter in the Field of Physical Education and "Sport for All" in Lithuania, 2002). While special programmes, laws and strategies are being presented, the questions of how to induce physical activity through sports are still open. Strategic goal that has been set by the third Sports Congress of Lithuania in 2000 to create an efficient system of physical education that would encourage the need for physical fitness, health improvement, and secure, healthy and productive lifestyle is still unaccomplished.

The purpose of Latvia's Sports Law is to determine general and legal basis of sports organization and development, mutual relations of sports organizations and the State and local government institutions, and main tasks for development of sport and basics of funding of sport as well as principles to comply with betimes involvement in international sports movement (Latvia's Sports Law, 2002). Latvia's sports model is considered to be interventive. The Ministry of Education and Science is responsible for sports politics implementation. Funds of the State budget are assigned to sport according to annual law of the State budget, where half of this budget comes from lottery and sponsors. Sport strategy for the period of 2006-2012 was presented in 2006, where principal development goals were formulated in these 5 segments: in children and youth sport, top level sport, sport for all, handicapped people sport and sport infrastructure development.

Separate regions in the United Kingdom have total autonomy in sports. Sport England has published its new strategy for 2008 to 2011. This strategy will focus specifically on sport, rather than sport and active recreation, which was at the heart of the previous strategy. Sport England's role will be to focus exclusively on sport – the responsibility for delivering the wider physical activity agenda now lying with the Department of Health and the Department of Transport. The new strategy focuses on a new "world leading community sport system" to maximize English sporting success in all forms, which is of particular importance in the lead up to 2012. The Youth Sport Trust has clear responsibility for school sport. Sport England will focus on ensuring quality opportunities and links between school and community sport. Sport England recognizes that there is a need for new thinking in this area. For National Governing Bodies developing the girls' and women's game, disability sport, and reaching out to diverse communities, will not be an optional extra but a vital part of what they will be required to do. If any sport does not wish to accept this challenge, funding will be switched to those that do. At a local level, there will be opportunities to assist and work with clubs especially in developing infrastructure and embedding community sport amongst excluded and hard to reach groups. By identifying links with existing groups to promote, develop and deliver sport in non-traditional settings (McKenzie, 2008).

There is no federal sports law in Germany. Sports and physical activity are regulated by the separate lands'

competence. Different lands have accepted different sports laws. Federal funds are used for the international sport events and participation on international level by German athletes. Federal government is also responsible for the handicapped sports. Land and federal performance are coordinated by the lands' sport minister conference. 9 ministries, subordinated by Internal Affairs ministry are related to sport in federal level. There is "Sport aid fund" that supports outstanding athletes financially as well as subsidizes non profitable sports, provides scholarships, supports athletes whose carriers are over, provides requalification. Fund is directly dependent on government, which provides finance from private donations, marketing, and the biggest input comes from national TV lottery. According to German Tax law, section "Tax privileges", tax benefits are granted to those associations or companies that have exceptional unselfish, directly beneficial to society, compassionate and religious goals – sport is among them (Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe).

A new Sports law has been accepted in year 2000 in France, which replaced the old law of 1984. The law declares government's responsibility to provide the society with sport services; therefore French sport model is considered interventive. Government delegates its organizational sports role to federations. On 18 May 2007, the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Voluntary sector fell under the remit of the Ministry of Health, where it took on the official name of "Ministry of Health, Youth and Sport". The Ministry of Health, Youth and Sports draws up and implements government policy partly with regard to initiatives targeting young people that concern physical and sports activities as well as participation in sports and community development. Sport activity is sponsored in two ways – from federal budget and 90% of the funding comes from national lottery. Sport ministry divides funding to federations, which sponsor elite and mass sport. Sport ministry pays sport organization employees and managers (Ministry of health, Youth and Sports, Missions "youth, sports and voluntary sector", 2007).

Most sport strategies and policies note the importance of sport as a uniting, integrity inducing power that has impact on society. Therefore a good sports strategy is becoming more and more important part of every country's strategic goals.

## Conclusions

1. Change in public sector organisations is difficult, though possible. Many models of organisational change are designed for private organisations. Having in mind that frequent political agenda changes, legislative rather than market-driven goals, and insufficient allocations of financial and human resources often hinder change in public organisations, specific, related to context, strategies should be formed.
2. Recognition of the role of sport as a potential engine of development is, however, absent from the social sciences literature. Sport has the potential to generate substantial economic and social returns to local regional government investment in the sports industry.
3. Analysis of sport as a public sector example proves, that sport is a growing social and economic phenomenon

which makes an important contribution to every country's strategic objectives of solidarity and prosperity. Therefore it is essential to have a clear and functional sport strategy, based on the principal peculiarities of

public sector management, paying special attention to the context, political influence, staff qualities and the top level managers.

## References

- Allison, G. (1971). *Essence of Decision*. New York: Little, Brown & Co.
- Andrews, K. (1971). *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*. R.D. Irwin, Homewood, IL.
- Ansoff, H.I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bailey, A., Johnson, G., & Daniels, K. (2000). Validation of a multi-dimensional measure of strategy development processes. *British Journal of Management*, 11, 151-62.
- Beleckiene, G., Murphy, C., & Dienys, V. (2008). *Sporto sektorius studija. Darbuotojų ir jų kvalifikacijos kaitos prognozių tyrimo ataskaita*. Profesinio mokymo metodikos centras, Kaunas: Judex.
- Bloss, H. (1977). Sport Development Assistance under Educational and Political Aspects. *International Journal of Physical Education*, Fall, 21-27.
- Boyne, G. A., Farrell, C., Law, J., Powell, M., & Walker, R. (2003). *Evaluating public management reforms: Principles and practice*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Boyne, G. A. (2003). Sources of public service improvement: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13, 367-394.
- Borins, S. (1998). *Innovating with integrity*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Burnett, C. (2001). Social Impact Assessment and Sport Development. *International Review for the sociology of Sport*, 36 (1), 41-57.
- Chaker, A. N. (2004). *Good Governance in Sport: A European Survey*. Council of Europe Publishing, 7-13.
- Ciarniene, R., Sakalas, A., & Vienazindiene, M. (2007). Strategic Human Resources Management: Changes in the Context of New Public Management. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 2(12), 144-165.
- Ciegis, R., & Gineitienė, D. (2008). Participatory Aspects of Strategic Sustainable Development Planning in Local Communities: Experience of Lithuania. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 14 (2), 107-117.
- Desai, V., & Potter, R. B. (2002). *The companion to development studies*. Arnold: London.
- Diskiėnė, D., Galiniėnė, B., & Marcinskis, A. (2008). A Strategic Management Model for Economic Development. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 14 (3), 375-387.
- Dunleavy, P. (1991). *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice*. Harvester Wheatsheaf: London.
- Dunleavy, P., & Hood, C. (1991). From Old Public Administration to New Public Management. *Public Money and Management*, 14, 3, 9-16.
- Eskildsen, J. K., Kristensen, K., & Juhl, H. J. (2004). Private versus public sector excellence. *The TQM magazine*, 16 (1), 50-56.
- European Commission on Public Sector Support, last updated 11 March 2009. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/doc41\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/doc41_en.htm)
- European Network Sport & Employment in the Third Sector (2001). Final Report.
- Ferris, J. M. (1987). Local Government Pensions and Their Funding: Policy Issues and Options. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 7(3), 29-44.
- Fredrickson, J. W. (1983). Strategic process research: questions and recommendations. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 565.
- Gatautis, R. (2008). The Impact of ICT on Public and Private Sectors in Lithuania. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(4), 18-28.
- Gedvilaite-Moan, A., & Liesionis, V. (2009). Strateginės profesionalaus ir mėgėjiško sporto plėtros užsienio šalyse analizė. *Mokslas ir edukaciniai procesai*, 2(8), 24-35.
- Goliembiewski, R.T. (1985). *Humanizing Public Organizations*. Lomond: Mount Airy, MD.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and Economic Regeneration in Cities. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 42, 5/6, May, 985-999.
- Gudonavicius, L., Bartoseviciene, V., & Saparnis, G. (2009). Imperatives for Enterprise Strategists. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 75-82.
- Gunby Jr., N. W. (2009). Firm Performance and Complementary Strategy Development Processes. *Management Decision*, 47 (5), 7-14.
- Hettne, B. (1995). *Development theory and the three worlds: Towards an International Political Economy of Development*. Essex: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hofer, C. W., & Schendel, D. (1979). *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning*. Little Brown: Boston, MA.
- Karpavicius, T., & Jucevicius, G. (2009). The Application of the Business System Concept to the Analysis of Football Business. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(3), 86-95.

- Kasimati, E. (2003). Economic aspects and the Summer Olympics: a review of related research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5, 433-444.
- Kazlauskaitė, R., & Buciniene, I. (2008). The Role of Human Resources and Their Management in the Establishment of Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(5), 78-84.
- Kingsbury, D., Remenyi, J., McKay, J. & Hunt, J. (2004). *Key Issues in Development*. Palgrave: New York.
- Lane, J. (1993). *The Public Sector*. London: Sage.
- Latvia's Sports Law, adopted by Saeima 24 October 2002. Available at: <http://izm.izm.gov.lv/laws-regulations/2293.html>
- Levermore, R. (2008). Sport: a New Engine of Development? *Progress in Development Studies*, 8, 2, 183-190.
- Lindblom, C.E. (1959). The science of 'muddling through'. *Public Administration Review*, 19, 79-88.
- McKenzie, C. (2008). *World-leading ambition of Sport England*. National Association for Voluntary and Community Action, August/September.
- Ministry of health, Youth and Sports, Missions "youth, sports and voluntary sector". (2007). Available at: [http://www.jeunesse-sports.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/plaquette\\_anglais.pdf](http://www.jeunesse-sports.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/plaquette_anglais.pdf)
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). Strategy-making in three modes. *California Management Review*, 16, 44-53.
- Moore, M. (1995). *Creating public value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mules, T., & Faulkner, B. (1996). An economic perspective on major events. *Tourism Economics*, 12(2), 107-117.
- Nutt, P., & Backoff, R. (1993). Organizational publicness and its implications for strategic management. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3, 209-231.
- Pescante, M. (1993). *Les différents modèles européens de législation sportive*. La législation sportive en Europe, ACNOE/AENOC, Rome.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public management reform*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Quinn, J. (1980). *Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism*. R.D. Irwin: Georgetown.
- Report on the Advisory Visit on the Implementation of the European Sports Charter in the Field of Physical Education and "Sport for All" in Lithuania, 2002.
- Robertson, P. J., & Sneviratne, S. J. (1995). Outcomes of Planned Organizational Change in the Public Sector: A Meta-Analytic Comparison to the Private Sector. *Public Administration Review*, 55(6), 547-558.
- Rusaw, A. C. (2007). Changing Public Organizations: Four Approaches. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 347-361.
- Sakalas, A. (2008). Human resources management as Science and Studies at KTU Economics and Management Faculty. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(4), 46-52.
- Skietrys, E., Raipa, A., & Bartkus, E. V. (2008). Dimensions of the Efficiency of Public – Private Partnership. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(3), 45-50.
- Slater, S. F., Olson, R. M, & Hult, G. T. M. (2006). The Moderating Influence of Strategic Orientation on the Strategy Formation Capability-Performance Relationship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 1221-1231.
- Stiftung Deutsche Sporthilfe. Available at: <https://www.sporthilfe.de/sporthilfe.de>
- Streimikiene, D., & Girdzijauskas, S. A. (2008). Logistic Growth Models for Analysis of Sustainable Growth. *Transformations in Business & Economics*(15), 218-236.
- Valentinavicius, S. (2009). Verslo strategijos formavimo įmonėje teoriniai aspektai. *Verslas: teorija ir praktika*(2), 130-141.
- Vaitkevicius, S. (2007). Application of Strategic Management Tools in Lithuania: Managers' Knowledge and Experience. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(4), 70-77.
- Vienazindiene, M., & Ciarniene, R. (2008). Human Resource Management Trends Conditioned by New Public Management. *Economics & Management*, 13, 368-373.
- White Paper on Sport. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/white-paper/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/white-paper/index_en.htm)
- Wilkinson, G. & Monkhouse, E. (1994). Strategic Planning in Public Sector Organizations. *Executive Development*, 7(6), 16-19.

Akvilė Gedvilaitė-Moan, Skaistė Laskienė

#### Viešojo sektoriaus organizacinio valdymo ypatumai sporto kaip viešojo sektoriaus pavyzdžiu

Santrauka

Straipsnyje atliekamas metatyrimas, t. y. mokslinės literatūros analizė: aptariami sporto kaip viešojo sektoriaus ypatumai bei viešojo ir privačiojo sektoriaus skirtumai. Formuluojama prielaida, jog remiantis kai kuriais viešojo ir privačiojo sektorių strateginiais valdymo modeliais ir atsižvelgiant į kontekstą bei politinę, ekonominę padėtį, galima sukurti sporto strategiją, kuri padėtų gerinti šalies ekonomiką ir žmonių gyvenimą.

Geresnio valdymo paieškos tema yra pagrindinė ir nuolat pasikartoja vyriausybinių organizacijų politikoje, taip pat akademiškuose tyrimuose. Viešajame sektoriuje valdymo pagerinimo išorinis katalizatorius gali būti tiek politika, tiek ekonomika. Veiklos vykdymo apibrėžimas ir į jo įvertinimas viešajame sektoriuje yra labai sudėtingas. Viešųjų įstaigų daugybė tikslų sudaryti politiškai bei konkuruoja tarpusavyje. Gebėti sudaryti efektyvia strategiją yra labai svarbu organizacijos plėtojimo procese.

**Tyrimo problema:** nustatyti, į kuriuos viešojo sektoriaus organizacinio valdymo ypatumus turi būti atkreiptas ypatingas dėmesys, kad tai turėtų teigiamą poveikį viešojo sporto sektoriaus valdymui.

**Tyrimo tikslas:** išanalizuoti organizacinius sporto kaip viešojo sektoriaus valdymo ypatumus.

**Tyrimo uždaviniai:** ištirti viešojo sektoriaus organizacinio valdymo aspektus, aptarti sporto kaip viešojo sektoriaus pavyzdį ir nustatyti sporto sektoriaus valdymo ypatumus, remiantis užsienio šalių pavyzdžiu.

**Tyrimo metodai:** šalies ir užsienio autorių mokslinės literatūros lyginamoji analizė ir straipsnio autorių loginė išvalgos.

Straipsnyje autorės analizuoja pasaulio ir Lietuvos mokslininkų išvalgas apie viešojo sektoriaus valdymą, šio sektoriaus panašumus ir skirtumus su privačiuoju sektoriu. Apžvelgus mokslinę literatūrą, galima konstatuoti, kad viešojo sektoriaus mokslinis ištyrimas yra fragmentiškas ir atliekamas

pačių mokslininkų, o ne sektoriaus iniciatyva. Tuo pat metu pažymėtina, jog tokio pobūdžio tyrimai itin reikšmingi praktikams, nes tiek vyriausybės institucijos, tiek viešųjų organizacijų vadovai pasigenda mokslininkų išvalgų, siekiant nustatyti, kokios strategijos pagerintų viešųjų įstaigų ir organizacijų veiklą.

Šiame straipsnyje autorės, remdamosi užsienio šalių sporto strategijų ypatumais, analizuoja organizacinio valdymo ypatumus viešajame sektoriuje sporto, kaip viešojo sektoriaus pavyzdžiu.

Mokslininkai pripažįsta, kad viešajame sektoriuje veiklos vykdymo apibrėžimas ir jo įvertinimas itin sudėtingas procesas. Strateginių procesų valdymo modeliai, grindžiami klasikine paradigma, pateikiami kaip vienadimensiniai, grįsti racionalių sprendimų priėmimu, o tikslas ir integracija yra svarbiausios organizacijos ilgalaikės sėkmės veiksniai (Fredrickson, 1983). Strateginį valdymą analizuojančioje mokslinėje literatūroje galima išskirti 6 strateginio plėtojimo procesų dimensijas:

1. Įsakyminė – tai strategija, kurią įgyvendina aukščiausio lygmens vadovai.
2. Planavimo – tai strategija, įgyvendinama taikant tikslingus bei iš anksto numatytus procedūrinius metodus.
3. Kultūrinė – tai strategija, įgyvendinama vadovaujantis organizacijos misija, vizija bei vertybėmis.
4. Politinė – tai strategija, įgyvendinama naudojant koalicijos ir pagrindinių iniciatorių tikslus.
5. Augimo – tai strategija, kurios varomoji jėga yra derybos ir kompromisai.
6. Priverstinio pasirinkimo – tai strategija, veikiama išorinių suvaržymų (Gunby Jr., 2009).

Dauguma organizacinės kaitos modelių yra sukurti privačiojo sektoriaus organizacijoms, kurios siekia pelno, o organizacijos tikslai ir profilis gali lengvai kisti pagal rinkos poreikius ir segmentus. Viešojo sektoriaus organizacijos yra suvaržytos įvairių įstatyminių nurodymų ir nefunkcionuoja pagal rinkos interesus. A. C. Rusaw (2007) teigia, jog dėl skirtingų politinių jėgų tikslų ir dažnos kaitos viešojo sektoriaus valdymo procese, sudaryti kaitai palankią organizacijos plėtojimo programą yra sunku.

Jau nuo I pasaulinio karo laikų didžiųjų valstybių užsienio politikos dalimi buvo sporto kaip valstybės atstovavimo tarptautiniu mastu skatinimas. Tačiau sporto kaip viešojo sektoriaus potencialios plėtojimo varomosios jėgos vaidmuo nepelnytai nebuvo tiriama socialinių mokslų tyrėjų (Levermore, 2008). Pastaruoju metu mokslininkai vis dažniau akcentuoja, jog sporto sektorius potencialiai gali sukurti reikšmingą ekonominę ir socialinę grąžą vietinės ir regioninės valdžios investicijoms į sporto industriją (Gratton, Shibli, Coleman, 2005). Daugelio šalių vyriausybės sukūrė ir priėmė sporto strategijas, kurios yra reikalingos ne tik pasauliniams sporto renginiams organizuoti, bet ir vietos ekonomikai, darbo vietų kūrimui, turizmo verslui, suteikiančiam socialinę bei kultūrinę naudą, skatinti.

Atlikus mokslinius tyrimus, galima teigti, jog sporto sektorius pastaruoju metu gali būti pripažintas kaip socialinis ir ekonominis veiksnys, reikšmingai darantis įtaką Europos Sąjungos plėtojimo strateginiams tikslams, solidarumui ir klestėjimui. Daugelis Europos valstybių turi priėmusios sporto įstatymą arba strategiją. Vienas labiausiai pripažintų sporto teisės ekspertų M. Pescante (1993) teigia, jog ES valstybėse dominuoja du ryškūs alternatyvūs ir vienas mišrus sporto teisiniai reglamentavimo modeliai: liberalusis, intervencinis ir decentralizuotas. Kitas sporto teisės autoritetas A. N. Chaker (2004) sporto reguliavimo modelius skirsto į intervencinius ir neintervencinius, o vyriausybės vaidmens modelius - į centralizuotą ir decentralizuotą. Tačiau visiems jiems būdingas tam tikrų bendrų principų pripažinimas: nemokamų savanorių vaidmuo sporte, sporto organizacijų autonomiškumas ir vyriausybės politika, įvertinant sporto socialinę, sveikatingumą, švietėjišką ir kultūrinę reikšmę.

Straipsnyje pateikti Lietuvos, Latvijos, Didžiosios Britanijos (liberalusis modelis), Vokietijos (decentralizuotas modelis) ir Prancūzijos (intervencinis modelis) sportą reglamentuojantys modeliai.

Sveika piliečių gyvenama daugelyje Lietuvos valstybės strateginio planavimo dokumentų yra įvardijama kaip vienas iš prioritetinių uždavinių, o kūno kultūra ir sportas yra esminis tokios gyvenamosios pamatas. Ilgalaikės valstybinės strategijos kūno kultūros ir sporto srityje nebuvo parengtos per visą Lietuvos nepriklausomybės laikotarpį, todėl 2007 metų vasarą darbo grupė supažindino su siūlomu strategijos projektu (Gedvilaitė-Moan, Liesionis, 2009).

Latvijoje už valstybės sporto politikos įgyvendinimą atsakinga Švietimo ir mokslo ministerija, prie kurios įkurta Sporto valdyba. Ministrų kabinetas 2006 m. spalį patvirtino Latvijos 2006 - 2012 m. sporto plėtros programą. Programoje suformuluoti pagrindiniai tikslai ir konkretūs uždaviniai šių 5 sričių:

- 1) vaikų ir jaunimo sporto;
- 2) aukštųjų laimėjimų sporto;
- 3) sporto visiems;
- 4) žmonių su negalia sporto;
- 5) sporto bazių plėtros (Latvia's Sports Law, 2002).

Jungtinėje Karalystėje regionai nuo seno yra visiškai autonomiški sporto srityje. 2002 m. pabaigoje paskelbta vyriausybės strategija sporto ir fizinio aktyvumo srityje. Strategijoje pabrėžiama, kad vyriausybė turi siekti gerokai didinti sporto ir fizinio aktyvumo lygį, ypač ekonomiškai silpniausiose grupėse, taip pat sėkmingai pasirodyti tarptautinėse varžybose. Dėl to svarbus tikslas - propaguoti masinio dalyvavimo kultūrą, labiau pabrėžiant fizinį aktyvumą negu didelius pasiekimus. Strategija numato, kad plėtojant sporto ir fizinio aktyvumo reikia keisti žmonių elgesį, šalinti kliūtis, trukdančias žmonėms būti fiziškai aktyviems, užtikrinti būtinas sąlygas (įranga, treneriai ir kt.), įvairių žmonių grupių atžvilgiu vykdyti skirtingą politiką.

Vokietijoje nėra federalinio sporto įstatymo. Teisinis sporto veiklos reglamentavimas yra tik regionų, kurie priima sporto įstatymus, kompetencija. Tarptautinių sporto renginių organizavimas ar sportininkų dalyvavimas juose finansuojami iš federalinių lėšų. Federaliniu lygmeniu su sporto veikla yra susijusios 9 ministerijos, o jų veiklą koordinuoja Vidaus reikalų ministerija. Nusipelnčius ir daug metų sportui atsidavusius sportininkus finansiškai remia „Paramos sportui fondas“, kuris veikia nepriklausomai nuo vyriausybės iš privačių aukų, reklaminės veiklos ir nacionalinės TV loterijos.

Prancūzijoje valstybė savo organizacinį vaidmenį priskiria sporto federacijoms. Sporto veikla finansuojama iš valstybės biudžeto ir Nacionalinio sporto plėtros fondo, kuris apie 90 % pajamų gauna iš nacionalinės loterijos.

Viešojo sporto sektoriaus valdymas yra sudėtingas procesas, kurį lemia ne tik ekonominės, bet ir politinės jėgos. Viešojo sporto sektoriaus organizacijos, kurdamos strateginius veiklos modelius, turi atsižvelgti į rinkos kaitą, taip pat į įstatyminius nurodymus, būdingus būtent joms.

Raktažodžiai: *organizacinis valdymas, viešasis sektorius, sporto viešasis sektorius, privatusis sektorius, strateginis planavimas, strategija.*

The article has been reviewed.

Received in December, 2009; accepted in February, 2010.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.ee.66.1.11656