



DOI:10.28925/2664-2069.2021.16

UDK: 796.062:351.72

## STRATEGIC ISSUES OF PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN SPORTS DEVELOPMENT IN UKRAINE

**Prykhodko Volodymyr**<sup>1(ABCD)</sup>, **Tomenko Oleksandr**<sup>2(CEF)</sup>,  
**Matrosov Serhii**<sup>2(EF)</sup>, **Chernihivska Svitlana**<sup>1(ABCD)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National University of Technology “Dnipro Polytechnic”, Dnipro, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup>Sumy State Pedagogical University n.a. A. Makarenko, Sumy, Ukraine

### Author contribution:

A – study concept and design; B – data collection;  
C – data analysis and interpretation; D – paper writing;  
E – paper editing; F – paper final adoption

### Abstract

*Relevance.* The deeds resolved by Verkhovna Rada and Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine have an absolutely weak impact not only on sport for everyone but also on high performance sport. The article is devoted to studying the content of legislative and normative acts regulating the development of the sphere of sport in Ukraine. The objective reason for utterly dissatisfying accomplishment of the resolved legislative and normative acts consists in the state institutions' unpreparedness for taking considerable efforts to provide real growing of indicators in the sphere of sport.

The *aim of the research* is to determine the existing issues of public governance causing insufficient rates of improving the state not only of sport for everyone but also of high performance sport aimed not to let it happen further.

*Material and methods:* theoretical analysis of literary sources, analysis of documental materials, synthesis, abstraction. The research was conducted during April-August, 2020.

*Results.* The conducted analysis shows that the resolved legislative and normative acts aimed at development of the sphere of sport are not realized considerably and efficiently. This occurs as for a great part of their content declarativity and absence of established norms are inherent not allowing control of their accomplishment. Such negative will be marked also at the activity of the public governance body which will be delegated the patronizing of developing the sphere of sport further.

*Conclusions.* The current state of public governance of the sphere of sport is critical today and does not promote conducting positive changes in humanitarian sphere. It is important to create new more consummate legislative, organizational and financial levers of influence aimed to improve the state of the sphere of sport.

**Key words:** legislative and normative acts, development of sport, public governance in development of the sphere of sport, control.



**Introduction.** Physical education and sport have a leading position in humanitarian policy of any state. That is exactly why during the years of state independence a number of Laws of Ukraine, Decrees of the President of Ukraine, and Resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (*hereinafter referred to as* – CMU) aimed at development of the sphere of sport were resolved. Thus, CMU made the Resolution «On approving State targeted social program of development of physical education and sport for the period up to the year 2020» [9]. The declared aim that is determining a prominent role of physical education and sport as an important factor of healthy lifestyle, preventive care from illnesses, developing humanistic values, creating conditions for comprehensive harmonious development, promoting reaching physical and mental perfection, defining reserve capabilities of the body, developing patriotic feelings among citizens and a positive image of the state. It was denoted that further development of physical education and sport can go on the three options.

The first one includes preserving traditional practice of influence «manually» for which absence of systemic approach to solving the current problems is inherent. This will only promote aggravation of the current crisis situation.

The second option (exemplified by the USA) includes creating «autonomous» system of governing the sphere where there is no coordinative function of the state and governance is executed by the bodies responsible for providing development of the Olympic

movement involving financial resources of the private sector. It is worth noting that this will lead to reducing the financial resources of the budgets of all levels, which can be directed at the development of the sphere of physical education and sport.

The third one, optimal for Ukraine is combining the efforts of all the bodies of the executive government, local self-government and institutes of civic society to reform the sphere of physical education and sport in order to regulate it in accordance with European practice.

It was assumed that competing the program will notably give an opportunity to: yearly improve the level of population coverage with motion activity by 1-2%; create the conditions for social adaptation and rehabilitation for people with physical disabilities; increase the level of the youth's eagerness to serve the Armed Forces and other army units formed in accordance with the laws to protect sovereignty and independence; improve children's and youth's interest in social and preventive care actions aimed at motivation for conscious attitude to their own health; involve up to 13% of children and youth to sessions in children's and youth's sports schools, create conditions for development of reserve sport and quality replenishment of national teams; provide prominent positions of Ukrainian athletes in international competitions to enhance the state's authority in world sporting community; provide preserving and creating a network of modern sporting equipment complying with international standards with engaging the investors' costs.



Since such legislative and normative acts having already been resolved by Verkhovna Rada, the President and CMU are completed partially, it is worth studying the reasons, as the Program mentioned above is likely to have a similar fate due to the analysis of the current facts.

A number of publications are devoted to the topic of public governance in sport of other countries where development of the sphere is determined [3; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18]. National specialists also have not neglected it [1]. Works along the lines of what analyze the role of local self-government in development the sphere are known [2]. The authors have also analyzed these issues not resolved yet [5; 6; 7].

Low efficiency of governing development of sport in Ukraine requires studies since the reasons for weak accomplishment of the laws of Ukraine and other deeds concerning the sphere of sport are not defined. The hypothesis of the research consists in the assumption that the reason for weak accomplishment of the resolved legislative and normative acts was the state institutions' unpreparedness to taking real efforts for providing growth in indicators of development the sphere of sport.

The **aim of the research** is to

determine the existing issues of public governance causing insufficient rates of improving the state not only of sport for everyone but also of high performance sport aimed not to let it happen further.

**Material and methods.** The following methods of theoretical research were used: generalizing of literature and Internet-materials, abstraction, analysis and synthesis. The research was conducted during April-August, 2020.

**Results of the research and discussion.** The prediction of the amount of funding physical education and sport was determined by the State program (table 1).

We note that it is important not to analyze absolute growth of funding from state budget but to emphasize the role of local budgets already exceeding 50% of composite budget. So, in 2015, the income of local budgets accounted for 98.2 billion hryvnias, in 2016 – 146.6 billion hryvnias, in 2017 – 192.7 billion hryvnias, and in 2018 – 233.9 billion hryvnias (revenue increase for the year 2017 compared to the year 2016 under comparable conditions and regardless of the territories beyond Ukrainian government's control accounted for 21.9% or 41 976.8 million hryvnias) [9].

*Table 1*

**Predicted amounts of funding physical education and sport**

Sources of funding	Amount of funding, thousand hryvnias	Notably, by the years			
		2017	2018	2019	2020
State budget	8 806 282.1	2 182 625	2 004 450.3	2 061 014.1	2 558 192.7
Local budget	13 651 515.3	2 983 585.1	3 277 919.4	3 565 381.6	3 824 629.2
Other sources	2 867 035.3	533 276.3	743 852	694 236.7	895 670.2
Total	25 324 832.6	5 699 486.4	6 026 221.7	6 320 632.4	7 278 492.1



As the table 1 data show 1 [9, p. 4], there is a less relative growth of local budgets' costs on physical education and sport development intended which can be interpreted with insufficient focus of the public government bodies and weak lobbying of this source of funding from the Ministry of Youth and Sport of Ukraine (*hereinafter referred to as – MinYouthSport*). Thus, in 2018, compared to 2017, the growth should have accounted for 259.2 million hryvnias, namely the increase in funding only by 7.3 %. As it is possible to monitor, already at the moment of approving the State Targeted Program the reduction of funding physical education and sport at the local level was budgeted beforehand in relative numbers.

The costs belonging to the section “Other sources” of funding are not revealed and explained in the Resolution so it is impossible to evaluate their growth, and the given absolute numbers do not make it possible to make a conclusion on their impact on the field of sport. Then, what concerns the results of accomplishing the State program of physical education and sport development for the period up to the year 2020 [9], and they are related to funding, there are no reasons to expect that the Program will push the development of sport since increase of finance is not intended. Moreover, building modern sporting objects (being of an urgent necessity both in the regions and in the center) to train athletes in priority sports is not intended in the Program. This statement approves, for example, the following fact: in March 2019, the

CMU resolved a decision to assign the MinYouthSport 200 million hryvnias on building, reconstruction and maintenance of palaces of sports. It is important to note that these buildings do not perform the function of venues for training athletes since they are intended for holding competitions and show-like events (gigs, etc.). The main question: “Is it possible to create a modern sports training center as a place for comprehensive and quality training of athletes based on one object or another?”

This is Hungary being possible to serve an example of what the base for training the Olympians should be (at the Olympic Games in Rio-de-Janeiro, 2016, the athletes from Hungary gained 8 gold medals and the ones from Ukraine – only 2). In the town of Tiszaújváros located in 2 hours' ride from Budapest, there is a modern sports complex where athletes train in 20 kinds of sport. By virtue of infrastructure, it also performs the function of the center of training the Olympians [10].

Accordingly, the analysis of content and focus of the Resolution on approving the State Targeted Program of development of physical education and sport shows:

- the government does not focus the local government bodies on the fact that the costs on the development of sport grew in proportion to growing the amounts of the local budgets;
- increasing of funding the building of sports objects (for example, assigning 200 million hryvnias in 2019) occurs rather as of places for people's rest regardless of the need of creating conditions for development of



priority Olympic sports in specific oblasts of Ukraine;

– central government bodies have an utterly weak impact on development of high performance sport in Olympic kinds via specific instruments.

This is common practice, which can be seen in all similar documents, for example, in the ‘Concept of reforming the sphere of physical education and sport’ [4]. In the part devoted to high performance sport, it is only denoted: ‘Supporting high performance sport should be provided via aerating the system of equal availability of state funding for all sports federations. Such equal availability should be provided via rating system.

Realization of the rating system should occur with establishing transparent, measurable, and balanced criteria. The mechanism of establishing these criteria should include all the data making it possible to compare game and non-game sports. The state should provide the participation of all sports federations, whose national teams and athletes perform on international arena in state funding founded on the rating system’ [4, c. 4].

Similar declarative instructions are written in the Concept on functioning of also sports equipment, sports federations, sports clubs, etc.

In the same way (as a wish) the role of local self-government is also written: “The local self-government bodies have to accomplish support and promotion to the development of the sphere of physical education and sport; <...> promote and support the development of physical education and sport via executing financial,

organizational, logistical, investing support (but there should be legislative mechanisms of the corresponding support as well as degree of liability for their non-compliance – *the author’s note*); they have to provide equal availability of all the subjects of the sphere of physical education and sport to the local self-development bodies’ support” (and what about those Olympic sports defined in the oblasts for priority development without priority creation of those priority conditions for them? – *the author’s note*) [4, p. 6].

Consequently, organizational and financial preconditions of development not only of sport for everyone but also of priority Olympic sports are still not embedded that does not stimulate to the government bodies’ or the specialists’ the sphere of sport participation at the local level in any way.

It is noteworthy that the government ‘manually’ from the center is going on. Thus, the biggest support from MinYouthSport in 2019 was received by the sports like biathlon (64.1 million hryvnias) and athletics (59.7 million hryvnias) that made sense considering international success, and basketball (61.2 million hryvnias) [11]. Why it was the latter sport, it is not understood since among summer sports the mentioned discipline is the leader in funding regardless of the fact that our athletes do not have any obvious success. Moreover, the national basketball team of Ukraine was not qualified to the final stage of the World Championship and the local Super League by its level is not included even in twenty best national European championships. Instead, the success of



biathlon and athletics is obvious.

Powerlifting is the most funded non-Olympic sport (15.2 million UAH), notably, even more than an Olympic one – weightlifting (13.1 million hryvnias).

It is hard to execute a small kind of quality analysis of the given data and make conclusions on substantiation of MinYouthSport's funding of sports since the logics present here is not persuasive. At the same time, the Ministry that should lobby solving this problem has not influenced on supporting the funding of the Olympic sports in premises at legislative level in any way.

The processes of decentralization made Verkhovna Rada resolve the Resolution «On providing sustainable development the sphere of physical education and sport under government decentralization» [8]. It is worth noting that a considerable part of the clauses of this utterly important Resolution is also declarative.

Let us analyze at least the recommendations for the local self-government bodies: “To provide yearly increase of the amount of expenditures from the local budgets for development of physical education and sport in due course” [8, p. 3]. It would be advisable to add just the following clause: “In the budgets of towns and united territorial communities the funding of physical education and sport cannot be less than 3% and in the oblast budgets – less than 2% from yearly total amount of the budget as well as 3% and 2% from their overfulfillment, respectively”, it would enhance the sphere of sport profoundly.

Consequently, the conducted

analysis shows that the resolved legislative and normative acts do not belong to those promoting the development of the sphere of sport. This occurs, notably, since the declarativity and absence of firmly established norm is inherent for them.

### **Conclusions**

1. Government decentralization creates more powerful organizational and financial preconditions for reforming the sphere of physical education and sport by the European model. In case of providing the necessary, higher level of public governance there is a chance to create the new reality for modern sphere of sport. This model makes it possible to unite the resources and capabilities of the state, local government bodies and all the privy civic organizations.

2. Instead, the analysis of the principle documents in regulating the sphere shows that this model currently cannot be realized. Moreover, there is still no legislative basis created which would report on and objectively use the present capabilities of the center, oblasts, cities, towns and united territorial communities to develop the sport for everyone and high performance sport.

3. Then, the present state of public governance in the sphere of sport is critical and holds back the conducting of positive changes in this important humanitarian sphere. Such negative, obviously, will affect further activity of the public governance body that will be delegated to patronize the development of sport.

4. Based on the conducted theoretical studies it is possible to determine the algorithm of actions important for



providing organizational steps and financial instruments to promote the development of the sphere of sport:

- determining the key priorities in development of sports for everyone and high performance sport, establishment of firm qualitative and quantitative indicators of development;
- firm determination of the present weaknesses as well as the role of central and local state government bodies in the further development of the sphere of sport;
- development and imprinting in really efficient, controlled instruments

of impact on the sphere of sport in future legislative and normative acts;  
 — elaborate, quality and total training of the planned innovations' executives in the center and oblasts for activities upon these new conditions of development of the sphere of sport.

**The object for further explorations** is studying the other objectively present problems of strategy governance in development of the sphere of sport except the legislative ones as well as their impact on holding back the reforming of the sphere of sport.

#### References:

1. Hasiuk IL. State management of physical culture and sports: state and prospects of development: monograph. Kharkiv: 2011. 432 p. *Ukrainian*
2. Yevsieieva OO. Improving state regulation of the development of the system of physical culture and sports in the region. *Biznes-inform*. 2013;1:46-51. *Ukrainian*
3. Zhurba MA. Foreign experience of state regulation of physical culture and sports.. *Aktualni problemy derzhavy i prava*; 2017:51-57. *Ukrainian*
4. The concept of reforming the field of physical education and sports (basic provisions). [Internet]. Kyiv; 2014: 13 s. [cited 2018 Nov26]. Available from: [dsmsu.gov.ua/media/2014/10/20/8/Koncepciya\\_.pdf](https://dsmsu.gov.ua/media/2014/10/20/8/Koncepciya_.pdf). *Ukrainian*
5. Prykhodko V, Akhmetov R, Tomenko O, Tabinska S. Use of sports rating as a tool of state management of sports development in Ukraine. *Sportyvnyi visnyk Prydniprovia*. 2019;1:53-63. *Ukrainian*
6. Prykhodko VV. The concept of managing a modern system of training athletes: monograph. Dnipro: 2018. 464 p. *Ukrainian*
7. Prikhodko VV. The direction, content and principles of the reform of high-achievement sports in Ukraine. *Sportyvnyi visnyk Prydniprovia*. 2017;1:308-313. *Russian*
8. On ensuring sustainable development of physical culture and sports in the context of decentralization of power. Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady*, 2016; 47:804. *Ukrainian*
9. On approval of the State target social program for the development of physical culture and sports for the period up to 2020. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine № 115, vid 1.03.2017.[Internet]. [cited 2020 July 5]. Available from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/115-2017-%D0%BF>. *Ukrainian*
10. Tiszaújváros Sports Center.[Internet]. [updated 2019 June 1; cited 2020 March 26]. Available from: <http://sport-sbor.ru/hotel/sportivnyj-centr-tisaujvarosh/> *Russian*
11. TOP-10 sports for which Ukraine will allocate the most money in 2019: unexpected figures.[Internet]. [cited 2020 May 26]. Available from: [https://24tv.ua/sport/top\\_10\\_vidiv\\_sportu\\_na\\_yaki\\_v\\_ukrayinividilyat\\_naybilshe\\_groshey\\_u\\_2019\\_rotsi\\_nespodivani\\_tsifri\\_n118673](https://24tv.ua/sport/top_10_vidiv_sportu_na_yaki_v_ukrayinividilyat_naybilshe_groshey_u_2019_rotsi_nespodivani_tsifri_n118673). *Ukrainian*



12. Chappelet JL. Autonomy and governance: Necessary bedfellows in the fight against corruption in sport. *In Transparency International (Ed.), Global Corruption Report*. 2016: 16–28.
13. De Dycker S. Good governance in Sport: comparative law aspects. *The International Sports Law Journal*. 2019;19:116–128.
14. European Commission, EU Expert group on good governance, Principles of good governance in sport, p. 5, 2013. [Internet]. [updated 2013 June 15; cited 2018 Dec 15]. Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/sport/library/policy\\_documents/xg-gg-201307-dlvrbl2-sept2013.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/sport/library/policy_documents/xg-gg-201307-dlvrbl2-sept2013.pdf)
15. Geeraert A. Indicators and benchmarking tools for sport governance. *In Transparency International (Ed.), Global Corruption Report*. 2016:56–61.
16. Horne J. The planning and hosting of sports mega-events: Sources, forms and the prevention of corruption. *In Transparency International (Ed.), Global Corruption Report*. 2016:163–168.
17. Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Resolution 2199 (2018) ‘Towards a framework for modern sports governance’, 24 January 2018. [Internet]. [cited 2018 Dec 15]. Available from: <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=24443&lang=en>.
18. Kirkeby M. Challenges and approaches to ensuring good governance in grassroots sport. *In Transparency International (Ed.), Global Corruption Report*. 2016:88–93.

*The authors claim no conflict of interests.*

#### **Authors’ information:**

##### **Volodymyr PRYKHODKO**

*candidate of sciences in physical education and sport, assistant professor of the department of physical education and sport,*

National University of Technology

“Dnipro Polytechnic”,

Dnipro, Ukraine

ORCID:0000-0001-6980-1402

E-mail: komandaODI@ukr.net

##### **Serhii MATROSOV**

*research student of the department of theory and methodology of physical education,*

Sumy State Pedagogical University

n.a. A. Makarenko,

Sumy, Ukraine

ORCID:0000-0001-6980-1402

E-mail: ser.matrosov95@ukr.net

##### **Oleksandr TOMENKO**

*doctor of sciences in physical education and sport, professor*

the chief of the department of theory and methodology of physical education,

Sumy State Pedagogical University

n.a. A. Makarenko,

Sumy, Ukraine

ORCID: 0000-0002-1097-965X

E-mail: rehabsc.tt@gmail.com

##### **Svitlana CHERNIHIVSKA**

*candidate of sciences in physical education and sport, assistant professor of the department of physical education and sport,*

National University of Technology

“Dnipro Polytechnic”,

Dnipro, Ukraine

ORCID: 0000-0001-7342-438X

E-mail: kandidat2208@ukr.net

*The article received December 7, 2020*

Prykhodko V, Tomenko O, Matrosov S, Chernihivska S. Strategic issues of public governance in sports development in Ukraine. *Sports Science and Human Health*. 2021; 1(5):58-65. DOI:10.28925/2664-2069.2021.16