

# Decentralization of Sports Services Opinions of Youth Services and Provincial Directors of Sports

Hayri AYDOĞAN

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Rize, Turkey

The purpose of this paper is to make a study on opinions of Youth Services and Provincial Directors of Sports related to decentralization of sports services according to demographical variables like educational background, age, total professional working period, and working period as a director. While the population of the study consists of 81 Youth Services and Provincial Directors of Sports from all over Turkey, the sample of the study consists of 49 Youth Services and Provincial Directors. While assessing research data of the scale that was used as data collection tool in research, Kruskal Wallis analysis was used in order to determine the relationship between sub-dimensions and variables and Mann Whitney *U* test was used in order to determine the source of significance as a result of analysis. As a result of the study, it was determined that the provincial directors who are 40 or above have a stronger belief than those who are between 35-39 years old in that decentralization is necessary and that it is more beneficiary. It was also determined that provincial directors who have Bachelor's degree have a stronger belief than those who have Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Philosophy of Doctorate (Ph.D.) degrees in that decentralization and anticipated services dimension in decentralization are necessary.

*Keywords:* Youth Services and Provincial Directors of Sports, sports services, decentralization

## Introduction

Humankind and especially nations need to take a step to keep up with changes in the changing world. The missions of nations who need to keep up with these changes increase by spreading over economical, social, and cultural fields as well as their classical functions. On the one hand, these increases in the missions of nations bring along new organizations. On the other hand, they widen and change the content of organizations which have existed so far (Eskicioğlu & Mirzeoğlu, 2009).

In the rapidly developing and changing world, the thought of "managements exist for public" have begun to shape management philosophies. Especially after the years of 1980's, public administration understanding changed in the world and Turkey, and the pursuit and struggle of reconstructing were affected by conceptions like subsidiarity, governance, and decentralization (Çukurçayır & Eroğlu, 2010). While one of the inheritances of 21st century from the previous centuries is globalization and its processes, the other one is decentralization (Ekenci, Arıkan, & Yerel Yönetimler ve Spor, 2009).

The existence of such a thought brings forward a new radical construction in classic bureaucratic organizations and in central administration understandings. As a result of these arguments, while some public services are handed over to local governments, the principle of subsidiarity is becoming dominated instead of

central constructions. Handing over some authorities to rurals, in our day there have been arguments about handing over some authorities from central administration to provincial administrations and handing over public services or half-public services to local administration, so arguing these subjects is also inevitable for sports management (Çukurçayır & Eroğlu, 2010).

Local governments have been assigned as an effective foundation in increasing welfare of citizens in their own units (Keleş, 2011). Nations lay a burden and mission on local governments by fulfilling sports services as a result of a tendency to fulfilling the services from the center through regulations and laws besides the General Directorate of Sports depended on the Ministry of Youth and Sports (Ekenci et al., 2009).

Provincial organizations play an important role for the General Directorate of Sports in fulfilling these missions and responsibilities. It can be suggested that administrators assigned for discharging the responsibilities in the name of directory in provincial organizations which were given to the General Directorate of Sports with No. 3,289 law article play an important role in decentralization and increasing of productivity (Eskicioğlu & Mirzeoğlu, 2004). At this point, which of sports services will be discharged by the General Directorate of Sports, which of them will be discharged by provincial organizations or non-governmental organizations and how these missions and authorities will be shared still pose a problem.

### **Decentralization**

“The conception of decentralization in public administration” (Demir, 2014) emerged as an effective means for reorganizing new necessities of the rapidly changing world where classical public administration understanding is not effective has led public administration to another dimension by inserting human factor in the center of administration.

Decentralization is “the administration of functions belonging to public and making decision, handing over or transferring existing legal and political authority from central government or its foundations to organizations in provinces, sub-units of government, semi-autonomous public unions, regional development authorities, functional authorities, autonomous local governments, or non-governmental organizations” (Litvack, 1999).

Decentralization in the dictionary of public administration has been defined as “a state of taking administrative decisions and fulfilling duties, undertaking authority and responsibility by organizations where services are supplied out of central government” (Bozkurt, 2008).

While decentralization was expressed as, making local administrations stronger against the central administration, due to the mission and source transferring and the authority from central to local administrations in the first years when it was tried to bring a new sight against classical public administration, nowadays it is accepted as transferring some administrative authorities, such as decision-making, creating resources, and planning to provincial foundations, local administrations, semi-autonomous foundations, professional foundations, voluntary foundations (foundation, association, and non-governmental organizations), and companies (Bilgiç & Gül, 2009).

Decentralization has many causes like historical, cultural, political, economical, organizational, resource, psychological, administrative, and functional. It is obvious that the type and degree of decentralization will be determined by these causes (Özmüş, 2005; Balcı, 2000) and central administrations wish:

1. To lighten his load, paperwork, time, and get rid of functions that lead to losses, such as labor;
2. To relieve bureaucratic delays and routine functions, and provide more stable plans and policy-making center;

3. To enhance capacities of administrations through coordination of non-governmental organizations and central governments, regional development organizations, semi-autonomous public unions, and sub-unions of government;
4. To supply the central services for the individuals who need service, thus providing national investments' activation;
5. To secure the justice by increasing political, administrative, and socio-economical interaction;
6. To create a behavioral change supporting semi-autonomous organizations, local administrations, professional foundations;
7. To determine local necessities and problems faster and access resources easier, and become decentralized.

### **Types of Decentralization**

It can be seen that there have been some classifications about decentralization types. The most used classifications are organizational decentralization and political decentralization. Organizational decentralization is analyzed in two separate ways: decentralization in terms of services and decentralization in terms of region. In decentralization in terms of services, an organization fulfills some services belonging to public, and in decentralization in terms of region, the services for the people in a certain region are fulfilled. Political decentralization is an administration type which has an autonomous or semi-autonomous status for regional communities who do not have a national identity especially in federal governments (Keleş, 2011).

Other classifications of decentralization are handing over goods and services supplied centrally to units under the authority of government and functional decentralization handing over central responsibilities to foundations which government administrates completely or partially or to non-governmental units<sup>1</sup>. In another classification, there are four types of decentralization:

#### **Political Decentralization**

Giving authority to groups at different stages of administration according to the situation which they are influenced and responsibility areas.

#### **Administrative Decentralization**

Redistributing fiscal resources, responsibilities, authorities in order to serve public in different stages in government (Litvack & Seddon, 1999). Decentralization as a period of change is divided as subsidiarity, decentralization and size of deconcentration according to transfer of responsibilities<sup>2</sup>.

**Deconcentration.** In general, transferring administrative responsibility within the frame of certain functions without any authority transfer among the stages of administration within local administration bureaucracy related to region (Yuliani, 2004).

**Delegation.** A type of administrative decentralization transferring authority and responsibilities to semi-autonomous foundations which are not completely controlled by central government (Yuliani, 2004). It predicts the transfer of some authorities to the organizations who are technically and administratively capable (Rondinelli, 1980).

**Devolution.** Transferring administration, responsibilities, and functions which are owned officially or

---

<sup>1</sup> Retrieved from [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/decentralization\\_working\\_report.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/decentralization_working_report.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/publicsector/decentralization/admindecen.htm>.

privately to the sub-national stage out of central government's control and mobilising local foundations (Yuliani, 2004). Creating and empowering local administrations are independent from national level in terms of a certain function.

In general, this type of administration has a lawful authority about spending and generating income, many functions to be fulfilled, geographical limits, and a clear legal position. This type of administrations has a right to have a complete administration, besides being quite independent foundations in their own responsibility areas (Mills, Vaughan, Smith, & Tabibzadeh, 1990).

### **Fiscal Decentralization**

In this decentralization type, in order to tax and generate an income, powers which were gathered previously are distributed to other stages of government to let local governments use fiscal resources to discharge their responsibilities<sup>3</sup>.

### **Decentralization in Terms of Economy and Market**

The most common forms which show what decentralization means are privatization and deregulation (Litvack & Seddon, 1999).

**Privatization.** Privatization can be defined as sales of service to individuals or private sector through regulations in order to protect public benefits under the control of government agencies<sup>4</sup>. Briefly, it expresses transfer of total responsibility of government to private foundations and individuals (Guzman, 2007).

**Deregulation.** Deregulation is to decrease restrictions of participations of private organizations and enable organizations to compete with each other (Litvack & Seddon, 1999).

This classification may vary according to political preferences, geopolitical location, substructure possibilities, cultural conditions, history of country, application type and the way they will be applied. In addition, the type and level of decentralization depend on composition of complex effects including cooperation in organizations, monitoring and controlling methods, substructure and fiscal resources, and mechanisms providing the participation of community.

## **Decentralization in Sports Services**

Sports, which is a focus of interest with many attractive aspects, is a means of health population, an activity including great economical inputs and also sports has characteristics which affect international relationships positively and introduce countries in international platforms (Sunay, 2009). In this regard, technological, socio-economical, cultural changes, and demand for sportive services have created great changes in the service structure. On the other side, developments in welfare, education levels of people, and the increasing of recreative and sportive activities made sports a piece of our lives and this makes sports services more attractive for audiences and participant (Ministry of Development, 2014).

Sports organization and reaching services to people have been carried out as a public service in many countries. Education, health, security services which government must supply have always been in a change and this change forms in parallel with new needs that time brings. Government, which is the inspirer for sports, plays a role in supervision and support. In Turkey, popularizing sports became a subject with lawful regulations and basic documents determining the purposes and aims of Turkish Sports Politics which were included in

---

<sup>3</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/publicsector/decentralization/admindecen.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> Retrieved from [http://www.iccs-isac.org/en/pubs/asd\\_on.pdf](http://www.iccs-isac.org/en/pubs/asd_on.pdf).

constitutions, progress plans, and government plans (Ministry of Development, 2014). The government tries to encourage sports by private sector, professional foundations, communities, and local administrations (Ekenci & Arkan, 2009). Encouraging individuals' active participation in sports, adopting sports as a life style, and popularizing sports among people have been adopted as basic principles in the 58th and 59th articles of Turkish constitution, but there have not been any precautions for putting it into practice. Both politics in development plans, and decisions taken in sports councils have not been able to stop maintaining the importance of sports in Turkey, and sports have not been able to be adopted by communities (Kalkınma, 2014). As in the other countries, carrying out sports activities is emerged by the inspirer, supporter, and controller (Kalkınma, 2014). As a result of the rapid developments in international sports, decentralizing sports idea became the main topic of conversation in sports management (Anderson, 2006).

In this context, it is understood that transferring some missions and responsibilities, such as planning, decision-making, generating resources, and carrying out all of them from the central government to the local administrations, semi-autonomous foundations, professional foundations, and voluntary foundations would be the most effective method in the management of sports services (Ekenci & Arkan, 2009). In this way, sportive developments in regions will take actions from short period to longer periods by enabling them to administrate themselves and giving them authority by supplying the required materials (Anderson, 2006). Sports services in Turkey gave responsibility to the provincial organizations towards fulfilling sports services through regulations and laws. These services are supplied by the General Directorate of Sports depended on the Ministry of Youth and Sports (Ekenci & Arkan, 2009). With the duty, responsibility, and authority imposed, it can be suggested that managers play a significant role in increasing productivity and decentralization in sports services that are Olympic and non-Olympic (Eskicioğlu & Mirzeoğlu, 2004).

In Turkey, the sports branches accepted by the International Olympic Committee express the Olympic sports branches and the branches accepted by the General Directorate of Sports express the non-Olympic sports branches<sup>5</sup>.

Sports branches of current summer Olympics consist of Archery, Athletics, Badminton, Basketball, Beach Volleyball, Boxing, Canoe Slalom, Canoe Sprint, Bicycle Moto Cross, Cycling Mountain Bike, Cycling Road, Cycling Track, Diving, Equestrian/Dressage, Equestrian/Eventing, Equestrian/Jumping, Fencing, Football, Golf, Gymnastics Artistic, Gymnastics Rhythmic, Handball, Hockey, Judo, Modern Pentathlon, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Shooting, Swimming, Synchronized Swimming, Table Tennis, Taekwondo, Tennis, Trampoline, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, Weightlifting, Wrestling Freestyle, and Wrestling Greco-Roman.

Sports branches of current winter Olympics consist of Alpine Skiing, Biathlon, Bobsleigh, Cross Country Skiing, Curling, Figure Skating, Freestyle Skiing, Ice Hockey, Luge, Nordic Combined, Short Track Speed Skating, Skeleton, Ski Jumping, Snowboard, and Speed Skating<sup>6</sup>.

Non-Olympic sports branches are Air Sports, Bandy, Baseball, Billiards, Boules, Bowling, Bridge, Chess, Cricket, Dance Sports, Floorball, Karate, Korfbal, Lifesaving, Motorcycle Racing, Mountaineering, Netball, Orienteering, Basquepelot The Polo, Motorboat Racing, Racquetball, Roller Sports, Softball, Climbing, Squash Sumo, Surfing, Rope Pulling, Underwater Sports, Water Skiing, and Wushu (Kılınç, 2005).

---

<sup>5</sup> Retrieved from [http://tr.yenisehir.wikia.com/wiki/olimpik\\_olmayan\\_spor\\_dallar%c4%b1](http://tr.yenisehir.wikia.com/wiki/olimpik_olmayan_spor_dallar%c4%b1).

<sup>6</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.olympic.org/sports>.

Adding new sports branches to the sports world and increasing services depending on them is a problem because which of sports services will be discharged by the General Directorate of Sports and which of them will be discharged by the provincial organizations or non-governmental organizations and how these missions and authorities will be shared will cause the uncertainty.

### Method

While the population of the study consists of 81 Youth Services and Provincial Directors of Sports from all over Turkey, the sample of the study consists of 49 Youth Services and Provincial Directors. Decentralization in Sports Services Scale developed by Albayrak (2012) was used in the study. Data collection consists of two stages: At the first stage, five questions were asked to the administrators to determine the region where the participants work, work experience, educational status, duty, gender, and individual characteristics; and At the second stage, there were 24 closed-ended and two open-ended questions related to decentralization of sports services. For the questions in the questionnaire, five-Likert type rating scale was used.

As a result of exploratory factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample appropriateness value of the scale was found as 0.951 and the value of Globularness Test of Bartlett was found as 0.000 ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). These values show that data are appropriate for factor analysis. Besides, as a result of Cronbach Alpha Test, data were found as 0.80 ( $p > 0.05$ ) and this indicates that the reliability of the obtained data is high. Data obtained from the research were used in International Business Machine (IBM) Statistic Package for Social Science (SPSS) programme. Besides descriptive statistical method, Kruscal Wallis analysis was used in order to determine the relationship between sub-dimensions and variables and Mann Whitney  $U$  test was used in order to determine the source of significance as a result of analysis.

### Findings

As a result of analysis, there was a significant difference between sub-dimension of the necessity of decentralization (Chi-Square = 11.375,  $p < 0.05$ ), the benefits of decentralization (Chi-Square = 14.041,  $p < 0.05$ ) and age variables. Mann Whitney  $U$  test was used in order to determine the source of this significance. Hereunder, the necessity for decentralization scores of individuals ( $X = 25.24$ ) who are 40 or above are significantly higher ( $X = 12.63$ ) than those who are 35-39 years old. Similarly, benefits of decentralization scores ( $X = 26.19$ ) of the participants at 40 years old or above are significantly higher ( $X = 8.25$ ) than those at 35-39 years old (see Table 1).

As a result of analysis, it was determined that there was a significant difference among the necessity (Chi-Square = 6.723,  $p < 0.05$ ) of decentralization from sub-dimension of decentralization levels, anticipated services in decentralization sub-dimension (Chi-Square = 13.544,  $p < 0.05$ ), and educational status. Mann Whitney  $U$  test was used in order to determine the source of this significance. Accordingly, the necessity of decentralization scores ( $X = 27.14$ ) of individuals who have bachelor's degree, were significantly higher ( $X = 16.58$ ) than the scores of individuals who have Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Philosophy of Doctorate (Ph.D.) degrees. Similarly, in the dimension of services anticipated in decentralization, the scores ( $X = 28.71$ ) of individuals who have Bachelor's degree were significantly higher ( $X = 11.88$ ) than the scores of individuals who have M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees (see Table 2).

Table 1

*Kruskal Wallis Analysis Results According to the Relationship Between Decentralization Levels and Age Variables of Participant*

	Age	N	Queue average	Chi-Square	p
Necessity of decentralization	20-24	0	0.00	11.375	0.010*
	25-29	1	6.00		
	30-34	3	11.00		
	35-39	8	15.13		
	40 or above	37	28.78		
Benefits of decentralization	20-24	0	0.00	14.041	0.003*
	25-29	1	16.50		
	30-34	3	20.17		
	35-39	8	9.00		
	40 or above	37	29.08		
Inconveniency of decentralization	20-24	0	0	2.029	0.566
	25-29	1	40.00		
	30-34	3	32.00		
	35-39	8	25.25		
	40 or above	37	23.97		
Anticipated services in decentralization	20-24	0	0.00	7.794	0.050
	25-29	1	4.00		
	30-34	3	7.00		
	35-39	8	28.38		
	40 or above	37	26.30		
Context of decentralization	20-24	0	0.00	1.207	0.751
	25-29	1	29.00		
	30-34	3	29.00		
	35-39	8	28.00		
	40 or above	37	23.92		
Services wished to be handed over	20-24	0	0.00	3.384	0.336
	25-29	1	35.00		
	30-34	3	18.67		
	35-39	8	19.38		
	40 or above	37	26.46		
Services not wished to be handed over	20-24	0	0.00	0.369	0.947
	25-29	1	31.50		
	30-34	3	23.67		
	35-39	8	25.63		
	40 or above	37	24.80		
Administration style which supplies productivity	20-24	0	0.00	0.522	0.914
	25-29	1	32.00		
	30-34	3	24.17		
	35-39	8	26.13		
	40 or above	37	24.64		

Note. \*  $p < 0.05$ .

Table 2  
*Kruskal Wallis Analysis Results According to the Relationship Between Decentralization Levels and Educational Status Variables of Participants*

	Educational status	N	Queue average	Chi-Square	p
Necessity of decentralization	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	6.723	0.035*
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	42.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	27.33		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	16.58		
Benefits of decentralization	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	5.389	0.068
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	37.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	27.29		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	17.13		
Inconveniency of decentralization	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	3.226	0.091
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	23.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	22.92		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	31.42		
Anticipated services in decentralization	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	13.544	0.001*
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	23.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	22.92		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	31.42		
Context of decentralization	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	5.264	0.072
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	29.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	27.22		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	18.00		
Services wished to be handed over	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	2.567	0.277
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	10.50		
	Bachelor's degree	36	24.11		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	28.88		
Services not wished to be handed over	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	2.093	0.371
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	8.00		
	Bachelor's degree	36	25.26		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	25.63		
Administration style which supplies productivity	Primary and secondary school	0	0.00	4.977	0.083
	High school	0	0.00		
	Associate degree	1	8.50		
	Bachelor's degree	36	23.78		
	M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees	12	30.04		

Note. \* $p < 0.05$



Table 3

*Kruskal Wallis Analysis Results According to the Relationship Between Decentralization Levels and Total Working Period Variables of Participants*

	Total working period	N	Queue average	Chi-Square	p
Necessity of decentralization	1-5	3	11.00	11.829	0.008*
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	20.00		
	16-20	13	17.35		
	21 or above	29	30.57		
Benefits of decentralization	1-5	3	20.17	4.976	0.174
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	14.50		
	16-20	13	21.69		
	21 or above	29	28.43		
Inconveniency of decentralization	1-5	3	32.00	8.821	0.032*
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	40.25		
	16-20	13	28.46		
	21 or above	29	20.62		
Anticipated services in decentralization	1-5	3	7.00	7.254	0.064
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	28.00		
	16-20	13	21.35		
	21 or above	29	28.09		
Context of decentralization	1-5	3	29.00	1.902	0.593
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	18.00		
	16-20	13	26.69		
	21 or above	29	24.79		
Services wished to be handed over	1-5	3	26.83	0.198	0.978
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	22.75		
	16-20	13	25.38		
	21 or above	29	24.95		
Services not wished to be handed over	1-5	3	23.67	1.655	0.647
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	31.50		
	16-20	13	26.08		
	21 or above	29	23.76		
Administration style which supplies productivity	1-5	3	24.17	4.050	0.256
	5-9	0	0.00		
	10-15	4	32.00		
	16-20	13	28.38		
	21 or above	29	22.60		

Note. \*  $p < 0.05$

Table 4

*Kruskal Wallis Analysis Results According to the Relationship between Decentralization Levels and Working Periods as a Director*

	Working as a director	<i>N</i>	Queue average	Chi-Square	<i>P</i>
Necessity of decentralization	1-5	37	23.93	5.257	0.262
	6-10	4	34.00		
	11-15	3	34.33		
	16-20	1	35.50		
	21 or above	4	16.25		
Benefits of decentralization	1-5	37	24.61	2.057	0.725
	6-10	4	25.13		
	11-15	3	32.33		
	16-20	1	37.00		
	21 or above	4	20.00		
Inconveniency of decentralization	1-5	37	24.36	7.822	0.098
	6-10	4	41.88		
	11-15	3	15.67		
	16-20	1	12.00		
	21 or above	4	24.25		
Anticipated services in decentralization	1-5	37	23.20	6.132	0.190
	6-10	4	20.50		
	11-15	3	39.50		
	16-20	1	26.00		
	21 or above	4	35.00		
Context of decentralization	1-5	37	22.73	7.426	0.115
	6-10	4	29.00		
	11-15	3	41.00		
	16-20	1	29.00		
	21 or above	4	29.00		
Services wished to be handed over	1-5	37	25.00	2.890	0.576
	6-10	4	28.88		
	11-15	3	18.67		
	16-20	1	10.50		
	21 or above	4	29.50		
Services not wished to be handed over	1-5	37	25.43	4.103	0.392
	6-10	4	31.50		
	11-15	3	15.83		
	16-20	1	31.50		
	21 or above	4	19.75		
Administration style which supplies productivity	1-5	37	22.73	6.141	0.189
	6-10	4	32.00		
	11-15	3	32.00		
	16-20	1	32.00		
	21 or above	4	32.00		

Note. \* $p < 0.05$

As a result of analysis, it was determined that there was a significant difference between the necessity of decentralization (Chi-Square = 11.829,  $p < 0.05$ ) from the sub-dimensions of decentralization levels, inconveniencies in decentralization (Chi-Square = 8.821,  $p < 0.05$ ) and total working period. Mann Whitney *U* test was used in order to determine the source of this significance. Accordingly, when working period is taken as basis, the scores ( $X = 25.02$ ) of individuals who have worked for 21 years or above were found to be significantly higher ( $X = 13.65$ ) than the individuals who have 16-20 years of working experience. Inconveniencies of decentralization dimension scores ( $X = 28.00$ ) of individuals who have 10-15 years of working period were found to be significantly higher ( $X = 15.48$ ) than the individuals who have 21 years of working experience or above (see Table 3).

As a result of analysis, there were not any significant differences between the variable of working period as a director and decentralization levels ( $p > 0.05$ ) (see Table 4).

### Discussion and Conclusion

When examining the opinions of Provincial Directors of Sports related to decentralization of sports services, there were significant differences between the sub-dimensions of the necessity of decentralization and benefits of decentralization and age variables. It was determined that the provincial directors who are 40 or above more strictly believe in the necessity of decentralization than those with 35-39 years of age. Similarly, it was determined that the provincial directors who are 40 or above more strictly believe in benefits of decentralization than those with 35-39 years of age.

It was determined that there was a significant difference among educational status variable and sub-dimensions of services planned in decentralization (Chi-Square = 13,544,  $p < 0.05$ ) and necessity of decentralization (Chi-Square = 6,723,  $p < 0.05$ ) of Provincial Directors of Youth Services and Sports. Provincial directors who have Bachelor's degree believe in the necessity of decentralization more than the provincial directors who have M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees. Similarly, in planned services for decentralization sub-dimension, provincial directors who have Bachelor's degree believe more than provincial directors who have M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees.

On the contrary to this research, in Albayrak's study (2012) related to analyzing opinions of central and local administrators for decentralization, it was determined that scores of provincial directors who have M.Sc. degree were more positive than provincial directors who have Bachelor's degree related to necessity of decentralization and planned services in decentralization. In the same study, similar to our research, provincial directors who have Bachelor's degree have more positive ideas about handing over a part of sports services than other undergraduates (Albayrak, 2012).

In the study of Işıkgöz and Taşkıran (2015) related to decentralization in Turkish sports management in the process of membership to the European Union, there were not any significant differences in the dimension of decentralization about educational status. However, in the politics related to decentralization, administrators who have Bachelor's degree have more positive attitudes towards decentralization than those who have high school and M.Sc. degree.

In planning dimension, it was determined that administrators who have Bachelor's degree have more positive attitudes towards decentralization than administrators who have graduate degrees. In finance dimension, attitudes of administrators who have Bachelor's degree were more positive than administrators who have primary school degree (Işıkgöz & Taşkıran, 2015).

Accordingly, when working period is based, individuals who have 21 or more years of working experience have more positive attitudes than those who have 16-21 years of working experience. In dimension of inconveniency, it was seen that provincial directors who have 10-15 years of working experience believe in decentralization more than provincial directors who have 21 years of working experience or above.

On the contrary to this research, in Albayrak's study (2012) related to analyzing opinions of central and local administrators for decentralization, it was determined that individuals who have 6-10 years of working experience are more positive towards the necessity of decentralization and planned services in decentralization than the provincial directors who have 21 years of working experience or above .

Similarly, in Işıkgöz and Taşkiran's study (2015) related to decentralization in Turkish sports management in the process of membership to the European Union, there were not any significant differences among the administrators opinions according to their ranks related to decentralization in finance, politics and decentralization dimensions in Turkish sports management. However, in the planning dimension, administrators who have 6-10 years of working experience have more positive attitudes towards sports management than the other administrators (Işıkgöz & Taşkiran, 2015).

In addition, in Kılınç's M.Sc. dissertation related to determining administrative issues of sports experts who work at the General Directorate of Youth and Sports (2005), there were issues (Kılınç, 2005) about leadership characteristics of administrators related to interdivisional non-communication, proficiency of administrator, non-communication, and communication theme that are very important for decentralization. On the other hand, in our study, there were not any significant differences among decentralization levels of administrators in terms of years worked as a director and this seems to contribute a different point of view to literature.

In our day, there are many arguments about opinions related to decentralization, and it can be seen that provincial directors and local administrators who are assigned to sports services have common opinions, and they are in a consensus about decentralizing sports services. The administrators' opinion that decentralization of sports services is necessary and by this way, the decision making process could be faster and there could be productivity about justice, equality, performance management, accountability subjects, coinciding with principles of serving people from the nearest region (Işıkgöz & Taşkiran, 2015).

Consequently, in Turkey, where rapid changes happen, there should be a change in Turkish sports management and our government should support, supervise, encourage, and direct people to participate in sports for these changes to fulfill sports services (Kalkınma, 2014). The government itself is a barrier to reaching the targets of fulfilling sports services in governments' development plans (Yetim, 2005). As a result of the rapid changes in International Sports, the idea of decentralizing services and responsibilities became the main topic for conversation in sports management (Anderson, 2006).

In this context, it was understood that transferring some responsibilities like planning, decision-making, generating resources in sportive area and carrying them out from central administrations to provincial organizations, semi-autonomous foundations, professional foundations, and voluntary organizations would be the most effective method for managing sports services (Ekenci & Arıkan, 2009). In this way, providing the required materials, which the region needs, and enabling them to be an organization to administrate themselves will let them act faster for the development of sports in their own regions from short period to longer periods.

## References

- Albayrak, A. Y. (2012). Sports services in the decentralization: sports general directorate of the central and provincial organization evaluation of pinion leaders (Ph.D. thesis, Gazi University, 2012).
- Anderson, C. (2006, July). Centralisation or decentralisation—what is the best way forward for sports organisations? *Olympic Capital Quarterly*, 1(2).
- Balcı, B. E. (2000). *The decentralization in education*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Bilgiç, K.V., & Gül, K. S. VII. (2009). *Public Administration Forum Globalization in the Face of Public Administration Congress Proceedings* (pp. 613-626). Kahramanmaraş: Turkey.
- Bozkurt, Ö., & Ergun, T. (2008). *Glossary of public administration*. (S. Sezen, Ed.). Ankara: Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East (PAITME).
- Çukurçayır, A. M., Eroğlu, T. H., & Uğuz, E. H. (2010). *Governance-theory, size and practices*. Konya/TURKEY: Çizgi Bookstore.
- Demir, A. K. (2014). Transition to decentralization classical government building: Scope governance assessment. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2).
- Ekenci, G., Arıkan, Y., & Karaoğlu, E. (2009). Localization of different direction. In K. B. Veysel (Ed.), *Local government and sports*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Eskicioğlu, Y., Mirzeoğlu, N., & Çelebi, N. (2004). Youth and Sports Provincial Director of analysis of factors affecting the efficiency. In *Tenth International Sports Science Congress Abstract Book* (S96).
- Guzman, A. B. (2007). Chronicling decentralization initiatives in the philippine basic education sector. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(6), 613-624.
- Işıkgöz, E., & Taşkiran, Y. (2015). EU's membership in the process of decentralization on turkish sport management. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 7.
- Keleş, R. (2011). *Decentralization and politics*. İstanbul: Cem Publishing House.
- Kılınç, Z. (2005). Determination of youth and sports experts mangment of employees in the directorate of sports (Master's thesis, Social Sciences Institute, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu).
- Litvack, J., & Seddon, J. (1999). Decentralization briefing notes. In *World Bank Institute (WBI) Working Papers in Collaboration with Prem Network* (S3).
- Mills, A., Vaughan, J. P., Smith, D. L., & Tabibzadeh, I. (1990). *Health system decentralization*. England: World Health Organization.
- Ministry of Development. (2014). *Tenth Development Plan: Sports Special Commission Report*. Ankara/TURKEY.
- Özmüş, L. (2005). Decentralization and the new public management approach. In *Tenth Turkey Scientific and Technical Conference*. Ankara: Tmmob Map Room and Kadostr Engineers.
- Rondinelli, A. D. (1980). Government decentralisation in comparative perspective: Theory and practice in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 47, 133.
- Sunay, H. (2009). *Sports management*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Yetim, A. A. (2005). *Sociology and sports*. İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları Ltd..
- Yuliani, E. L. (2004). Decentralization, deconcentration and devolution: What do they mean? (pp. 1-5). In *Interlaken Workshop on Decentralization*, 27-30 April, Interlaken, Switzerland.