

## **Comparison of manager's attitudes about the role of privatization in the development of sport**

**<sup>1</sup>Mehdi Rostami, <sup>1</sup>Farrokh Legha Najafzadeh, <sup>2</sup>Mohammad Rahim Najafzadeh, <sup>3</sup>Mir Nabi Salari**

*<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical Education, Ahar branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahar, Iran*

*<sup>2</sup>Department of Physical Education, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

*<sup>3</sup>Department of Physical Education, Khosro Shahr branch, Islamic Azad University, Khosro Shahr, Iran*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*The aim of this study was to compare the manager's perspective about of privatization principles in sport development of East Azerbaijan province. 27 office managers and physical education offices and 85 managers of active and official sports clubs in the East Azerbaijan province were selected randomly. A standard questionnaire of the principles of sport privatization was used to get the result. The results showed that: there is no significant between physical education office managers and administrators sports club perspective in the components of necessary and possible in the sport privatization, coordinated with the development of the principles of the sport privatization, the effect of privatization sport efficiency, privatization impact on sports reform, privatization and increasing productivity and optimizing and focus on sports out of public and private sector. But there is no significant difference between physical education office managers and administrators sports clubs perspective in component of reform rules and regulations of sport privatization.*

**Key word:** privatization, efficiency, structure, managers, clubs

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

One of the most crucial and dynamic features of the economy as well as the advanced countries well-established factor of economical development refers to "privatization". Privatization is considered as continua maintenance of priorities towards market mechanism and market-based strategies. This process includes a vast attributes evolving a complete privatization in one hand, and secondly, it is based on renovation of government-based agencies structures [11]. According to the new-emerged events in the world and based on the recent years distribution of governmental section, the increase of public expenditures, economical issue make all governmental organization to upgrade their efficiencies in this regard as an essential ideology. One of the most important ways to overcome these problems refers to privatization interested problems-solving cases. We can consider privatization as an effective struggle into the market just in front of government decisions as an economical agent [9]. In fact, the perception of privatization is more comprehensive than productivity of the agencies. The main ideology in the field of privatization related to the market mechanism on economical decisions resulting a competitive atmosphere for all private agencies; in addition, this kind of attribute can increase the efficiency of these agencies towards public [4]. Although privatization is different from country to country, but it can stable based on these reason: financial pressures, maximization of all economical activities, overcoming problems and weaknesses of public organizations, developing private section, selection successful samples, determining realism targets and designing a scientific approach. In their words, any

privatization activity can provoke a lot of productivity sections. It exchanges a reluctant governmental section in the economy into a dynamic and conducting navigator where it can decide on its strategies in high-potential approaches. All governmental section can make a great setting through their regular basis on investments, the decrease of source saving based on economical motivations, not political, that this leads them to team-based profits as well. Making a suitable atmosphere leads to appear all talents and aptitudes, the release of resources for investments with a reasonable efficiency, decrease of budget shortage and inflation that these factors are the results of individuals abilities turnover with arranging the growth way of all organizations. Privatization is one of the most important topics into all organizations. Besides, all governmental organizations are including into this process such as the department of physical education and country sport. There are many research done for this regard; moreover, these researches and evaluations mostly focused on the study of privatization in organizations, managers attitudes, specialist ideas, the relationship of privatization with other includes such as the high-potential performance and efficiency have been achieved in the field of privatization. Schwarz et al (2010) stated that the income from privatization, government and private cooperation and its influence on voluntary part has a direct effect on providing budget source for sport facilities. As the real placement of economy has been done in early 21<sup>st</sup> century, its effects on sport facilities investment is an important case and it must be paid attention by manages to earn their favorite sport fasciitis as well [15]. Bi and his colloques (2009) conclude that: the privatization established in chins government has a little effect on the job shifts but it gradually leads to increase the rate of sale and efficiency of the job force as well. At the same time the decrease of managerial expenses helps to increased level of selling in a company. Ultimately, the effect of privatization can be appeared in a long time along with its surrounded setting and the level of minority was opposed against to decrease the responsibility of the government [6]. Tomorrow (2007) stated that privatization decreases the penetration of foreigner companies and recovers the level of productivity efficiency potentially but again it mitigates the level of internal public welfare. Also it is presented that, the privatization process of public organizations decreases domestic productivity worsening social welfare, too [14]. Ghare Khani et al (2009) concluded that the average degree of structural obstacles, economical and managerial is not equal together and some of these are prior against each other. So, it can be said that, the economical obstacles are placed as an important legal barriers in the second rate, structural stands in the third and managerial obstacles put into the last category [7]. Ghanbari et al (2009) studied these following factors during a research by the name of "privatization of sport communities in Iran" opportunities and threats, determined changes with their priorities, government decisions about decreasing its responsibility and private section for sharing the related risk, welcoming increasingly in sport atmosphere and new requirements in the field and finally the existences of investors interested in the construction of sport complexes and facilities. Also, determined threats were: the recent unfavorable laws for privatization of sport fields, unsuitable courage for absorbing internal/external investment sections, insufficient support of local/ state officials for private investors, the lack of stable political conditions in the country, opposition against privatization by managers and officials, extra supervision and intervention of governmental officials in the sports issue, the complexity of bureaucracy for allowing any certificates, the lack of economical stability and inflection as well as selling governmental sport complexes with high-price to private sections [10]. Kashef et al (2008) conducted these following results according to a study of the present problems related to article 44 in sport from private owner's opinions in Isfahan: in sufficient bank loan, equal and simultaneous intervention of physical training department, the state of job law, insurance and tax regulations, serious laws of different governmental organizations about sport complexes, high prices in the construction process of sport complexes [18]. Due to this new topic, the study of discrepancies between official managers of sport and private sport managers has been a little paid attention; hence, a researcher is seeking any answers to these questions: 1- how is the physical training manageress's point of view and East-Azerbaijan sport manager's ideology about privatization process?

2- Are there any differences between these two categories about privatization?

Therefore, the analysis of this ideological view and reasoning the recent obstacles in privatization can be effective.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The present research is descriptive that has been carried out as measuring case; statistically it covers 27 individuals of physical training officials and managers and formal sport club manager of East-Azerbaijan (117 ones). Form 117 formal club managers with high-potential activities, about 89 ones were taken up randomly as top-ones using "Morgan table". In order to gather background information, a questionnaire has been applied to evaluate the subject as well; in this regard, a researcher can distribute or share his/her information through participating in sport department according to the latest information governed from that organization. There are, of course, there following-up steps to gather and send this information. From 89 sport club managers, 4 individuals were abandoned but the rest (85 ones) were studied given that questionnaire. In this research, standard questionnaire has been used in privatization of sport that its static/ dynamic has been also confirmed by Razavi (2009). This questionnaire is consisted of 50 questions and answers are based on Likert scale like this:

-I completely agree (5) - I agree (4) - I don't have any idea (3) - I disagree (2) - I completely disagree (1)

The researcher distributed this questionnaire among 30 individuals, from physical training officials to active sport club managers of south-Azerbaijan state, to be able to gather information about the static of the research and indicated  $\alpha=0.876$  for this evaluation.

Data were analyzed by independent T-test using SPSS software version 18.

❖According to descriptive and individual features (age, education and background), these results have been governed:

❖From total of 24 physical training managers, 13 ones (48.14%) were 31-40 years old (high percentage) and 2 one (7.4%) were 30 and 50 years old but from 85 ones sport club managers, 33 one (38.9%) were between 31-40 (high percentage) and 11 one (12.9%) were older than 50 years old (lower percentage).

❖From total of 24 physical training managers, 20 ones (74.1%) with M.S degree (high percentage) and one (3.7%) had diploma (lower percentage) and from 85 one sport club managers, 34 one (40.23%) had M.A but 6 one (7.15%) were A.D (lower percentage).

**Table 1. The attitudes of physical training Managers and sport club managers about Small-scale methods of sport privatization**

privatization	physical training Managers				sport club managers	
	I disagree & completely disagree	I don't have any idea	I agree & completely agree	I disagree & completely disagree	I don't have any idea	I agree & completely agree
The necessary possibility of sport privatization	1.11%	25.9%	63%	9.4%	23.5%	67.1%
Coherence development of sport with privatization methods	7.3%	29.6%	66.7%	8.2%	23.6%	68.2%
The effects of privatization on sport efficiency	8.14%	18.5%	66.7%	9.4%	21.2%	69.4%
The effects of privatization on sport structures	0.00%	48.1%	51.9%	17.6%	27.1%	55.3%
Privatization and upgrade the efficiency and optimize sport	0.00%	33.3%	66.7%	1.2%	31.7%	67.1%

❖From physical training managers, 18 (66.66%) were up to 10 years (high) and two (7.4%) up to 21 years old with lowest managerial background; from sport club managers, 52 (61.17%) were more than 10 years and 3 (3.52%) were more than 21 (the lowest managerial background).

Based on governed information from table1, it is considered that 63% of East-Azerbaijan were "agree" for the necessity of privatization of sport but 66.7% and 68.2% of both mentioned categories were "agree" or "completely agree" in sport development with privatization; 66.7% and 69.4% were "agree" or "completely agree" with the effects of privatization on sport deficiency, 51.9% and 55.3% "were agree"/ "completely agree" completely agree" with the effects of privatization on sport structure amendment; 66.7% and 67.1% were agree/completely agree with the high-efficiency of sport optimization; 70.4% and 85.9% were agree/completely agree with sport privatization laws and regulations and finally, 81.5 and 74.1% were agree/ completely agree for the focus on sport privatization out of governmental section.

In this section, it is considered the governed data and analysis.

**Table 2. Kolmogrov- Smirnov test for the determination of normalized distribution of privatization components**

Variables statistical indices	Kolmogrov Smirnov k-z	P	Result
The necessary possibility of sport privatization	1.266	0.081	Normal
Coherence development of sport with privatization methods	1.309	0.065	Normal
The effects of privatization on sport efficiency	1.239	0.093	Normal
The effects of privatization on sport structures	1.166	0.132	Normal
Privatization and upgrade the efficiency and optimize sport	0.951	0.326	Normal
The amendment of laws and regulations in sport privatization	1.256	0.085	Normal
Trends toward private sport from governmental I port	0.142	0.142	Normal

According to Table 2 and the related test, it is considered that, the numerical distribution of privatization components based on K-Z test with a significant level "P". Have normalized distribute and therefore, parametric tests have been used to answer the questions.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the evaluation of the first hypothesis, there is no any significant difference between physical training managers and sport clubs managers: these results have been come along with researches like "Razavi" (2004), Djudaki (2005), Arefian (2005), Ghanbari, Abadi (2009), Pahlaran Hashemi and his colleague and Hosseini Darvishian (2010) and also other achieved researches abroad like Burki and Harris (2006), Tumoro (2007), Bai and colleague (2009) and Tisameni and colleague (2010). Although none of these researches but Razavi paid attention to the difference between all managerial levels and sport different parts, but the lack of difference between physical training managers and sport club manager can originate from the agreement between managers for the necessary achievement of privatization; the struggle for fulfilling this process is appearing increasingly. It must be noted that, the support of companies for sport events and construction of new stands, contract with players in every field of sport make a great deal of economical activities for this regard. So, the necessity of privatization is a vital step in sport issues. In the second study of the hypothesis, there is no a significant difference in physical training managers and sport club managers based on organizing privatization of sport development. This result is not come along Razavi (2004), Arefian (2005) but it is in one side with Dianco, Mc Leash, Romalho (2006) and no equal with Tumoro (2007) and Bie and colleagues (2010). The competition in the field of sport industry needs skilled and experienced specialists to get any opportunities and facilities to upgrade and develop the present works in sport. Now, according these conditions we observer that, covering all these activities are out of governmental hands; in the other hand, the optimization of these global chances need individuals' participation and especially private section. In the third hypothesis study, the same topic has no any significant difference. Since the efficiency refer to method and purpose of privatization, the literature review of our research shows that Razavi (2009) Arjunj (1382), Backtiari (2009), Arefian (2005) and Dianko, McLeish and Romalho (2006) and Bie (2009) consider Privatization as high-potential background of efficiency, while Shahband Zade (1993), Abdolah Pour (2004) doesn't address privatization effective in this regard. They believe that there is a gap of executive planning and designing between managers as well as the lack of economical, culture and social subjects in management made all these reasons. In this regard, however making and creating cultural and thinking foundation in a society to regular/ arrange these information system plays a key role for being well-established case. The study and review of fourth hypothesis showed that there is no any significant difference between two groups on sport structure amendment and privatization. The governed results from Razavi (2004), Razavi (2005), Arefiasn (2005), Razavanfar (2009), Kashef (2008), Gharekhani (2009), Kiani and Fazelian (2009) and also Tisameni (2010) were at the same and equal like together. They all point to the equality of organization structure amendment, balanced structure and more cohesion into organizational structures in the field of privatization executive process. The agreement between East-Azerbaijan sport managers also confirms this reason; hence, the lack of a significant difference in all ideals present this balanced way of sport structures. The first step in this way is expanding our thoughts, concepts and culturizing the field of privatization. The study of fifth hypothesis shows no any signification difference between physical training managers in the related province. This comes from all manager agreement to boost the efficiency of sport privatization. All results governed from Arefian (2005), Pahlaran Hashemi (2009) and Soltan Hesseini (2009) and also Tumoro (2007) Bie and colleague (2009) and Schuwartch (2010) are going well at the same direction. In a detailed study of above-mentioned subject, most of them refer to the positive effects of privatization and its high-potential efficiency. Hence, the necessity of cooperation must be done between organization and responsible offices for privatization process. The sixth study of hypothesis shows that, there is a significant different between physical training manager and sport club managers. However, in some achieved researches all regulations run for navigating an optimized privatization but other's go along with removing obstacles against privatization, but there is a different between these both managers yet. This may come from the lack of awareness of managers or other law obstacles on the country's sport organization. Therefore, it is necessary for all managers to review and study the importance of these regulations firstly. However, more than 70% managers agree/ completely agree with these mentioned regulations. But it is crucial to remove any rumors or gossips in this regard. In the study of seventh hypothesis, between two levels of managers about focusing a private section out of governmental section, there is no any significant difference showing equal attitudes of these managers in the province. This result is accordance with Arefian (2005) and Razavis' (2006). The process of privatization refers to moving any governmental activity into private section. In other words, transforming any details to general subjects is to produce all productions/services that called "privatization". This agreement is based on article 44 that says; focusing on private section out of government bands. It can be said that, privatization or moving all details from non-governmental and non-profit organization into private plays a key role in the less appearance of the government; hence, one of the most crucial tasks of privatization is focusing on a hirechial activities that they cannot be run without government help and support at all.

Therefore, in the end:

1. According to organized comments of physical training managers and sport clubs managers about privatization, it is recommended that all top-managers of the county sport must make easy ways to run this process as soon as possible.
2. The arrangements towards sport development along with privatization comes shared ideas of managers, so it is suggested that development of sports practices and methods must be done in a suitable way and well-established approaches.
3. Privatization in sport increases the efficiency, this idea is focused by managers, therefore, it is suggested that the struggles happening into the state sport activities should be up-to-date.
4. It's recommended, though sport structure changes in the country, the execution of privatization should be optimized as well.
5. Due to delivering sport into private section, it is suggested that, there must be essential steps towards an optimized efficiency of sport right now.
6. It's suggested that, the amendment of sport regulations and laws about privatization must be on top of governmental issue at once.
7. It is recommended that the necessary themes must be executed to get the focus on governmental section out of that and follow up into private sections.

It is hoped that governed results can be great and giant towards optimization the present state and conditions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Abdollah pour A, MA Thesis, Teacher training University, (Tehran, Iran, **2004**).
- [2] Arefian Y, MA Thesis, physical training of Mazandaran, (Mazandaran, Iran, **2005**).
- [3] Arjang A, MA thesis, institute of research and education in management, (Tehran, Iran, **2003**).
- [4] Bakhtiari MR, M.A Thesis, Iranian Medicine University, (Tehran, Iran, **2004**).
- [5] Behkish MM, *Iranian economy under globalization*, Tehran, **2002**.
- [6] Djudki H, MA Thesis, Iranian Medicine University, (Tehran, Iran, **2005**).
- [7] Ghare Khani H, Ehsani M, Kuze Chian H, Khabiri M, Seventh international conference of Physical Training, Tehran, **2004**.
- [8] Ghanbari F, Abadi A, Amirtash AM, Hadavy AM, Seventh international conference of physical training, Tehran, **2009**.
- [9] Kashef MM, Djafari AM, Ahmadi A, Sixth international conference of physical training, Kish, **2008**.
- [10] Kiani F, Fazelian SM, Seventh international conference of physical training, Tehran, **2009**.
- [11] Hosseini DM, MA Thesis, teacher training University, (Tehran, Iran, **2010**).
- [12] Reznafar AZ, Sepherian N, The seasonal magazine for natural resources and agriculture sciences, **2007**, 57, 119.
- [13] Razavi SMH, *Harakat*, **2004**, 23, 5-22.
- [14] Razavi SMH, *Harakat*, **2005**, 27, 19-31.
- [15] Razavi SMH, Privatization, decomposition and movement championship takes into Olympic natural committee, Fourteenth years, **2006**, 1, 33.
- [16] Soltan HM, Nazari R, Hashemi M, Seventh international conference of physical training, Tehran, **2009**.
- [17] Shahbandzade H, MA Thesis, Teacher Training University, (Tehran, Iran, **1993**).
- [18] Mazljoo M, Research and scientific seasonal magazine for individuals' welfare, second year, **2006**, 6, 12-27.
- [19] Pahlavan Hashemi SA, Razavi MH, Seventh international conference of physical training, Tehran, **2009**.
- [20] PourHosseein, M., MA Thesis, institute of research and management training, (Tehran, Iran, **2004**).