

UDC 354.1

DOI: 10.53068/25792997-2024.2.12-99

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ARMENIAN SPORTS: CURRENT STATUS

A. A. Kyureghyan¹, A.V. Avetisyan²,

¹*Instituto Superior de Derecho y Economía (ISDE), Madrid, Spain,*

²*Armenian State Institute of Physical Culture
and Sport, Yerevan, Armenia*

Keywords: good governance, Council of Europe, sport federation, NOC, IOC, stakeholder, sports industry, sports management.

Research relevance: This research is objectively required as Armenia is a member of the Council of Europe, and the recommendations of the latter are applicable thereof including but not limited to sports industry. This is crucial as these recommendations have aim at achieving uniformity within the framework of the Council of Europe for proper functioning of the same fields (objects) of recommendations. Nevertheless, there is *prima facie* evidence, that the sports industry in Armenia has flows in following the principles of good governance (PGG), which will be laid down below.

Moreover, the local legal framework is outdated for fulfilling such good governance. There are no any legal binding tools obliging the parties for social dialogue nor there is enough jurisprudence on this matter, which might at least direct the stakeholders of the sports industry to speak it. This slows down the development of

professional sports in Armenia, which derives from the amateur sports. There is no enough link of transition between amateur sports and professional sports, apart from football industry, where the Football Federation of Armenia is a member of UEFA, which in turn is a sanctioning body of professional football competition within the European domain.

This research is dedicated to draw up the focal points, on which the modernization of the sports industry governance in Armenia may be achieved. It is addressed to national federations governing different sports as well as to National Olympic Committee of Armenia (ARMNOC) as the sole authority in charge for Olympic Movement, in turn affiliated with International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Research aim: The goal of the research is to identify current problems and propose a technique for measuring Principles of Good Governance (PGG) to find solutions.

Research methods and organization: The methods being used are analysis of best practices of the application of the PGG;

partial synthesis of the facts of the current issues available in Armenia with the compliance of the PGG; deductive reasoning in the sense of decompiling the PGG; inductive reasoning in the sense of compiling the current issues in Armenia and compliance with the PGG. It should be noted that the research is related to sports management, nevertheless it involves legal matters as law is fundamental for any governance, therefore, the legal part should be covered in 'Layman's terms' in order to be reader friendly without dwelling into many legal complexities unless required for proper assessment of facts.

Introduction: The PGG is not an empty declarative concept, it is an exact set of principles, consisting of 12 principles, established by the Council of Europe. In particular, according to the good governance it includes the following principles:

Fair Conduct of Elections – Representation and Participation, to ensure real possibilities for all citizens to have their say in local public affairs;

Responsiveness - to ensure that the local authority meets the legitimate expectations and needs of citizens;

Efficiency and Effectiveness - to ensure that objectives are met while making the best use of resources;

Openness and Transparency - to ensure public access to information and facilitate understanding of how local public affairs are conducted;

Rule of Law - to ensure fairness, impartiality and predictability;

Ethical Conduct - to ensure that the public interest is put before private ones;

Competence and Capacity - to ensure that local representatives and officials are well able to carry out their duties;

Innovation and Openness to Change - to ensure that benefit is derived from new solutions and good practices;

Sustainability and Long-term Orientation - to take the interests of future generations into account;

Sound Financial Management - to ensure prudent and productive use of public funds;

Human rights, Cultural Diversity and Social Cohesion - to ensure that all citizens are protected and respected and that no one is either discriminated against or excluded;

Accountability - to ensure that local representatives and officials take responsibility and are held responsible for their actions [3].

These principles are adopted to ensure the development in particular industry, they were present even before the Valencia Declaration. Assumably, it was just a consequence of consolidation of scholars work and best practices. Also, they are to be applied together instead of being applied selectively. As to sports, they are more than relevant and inherent due to the public nature of amateur sports. Most of the sports governing bodies (SGB) have non-

commercial legal organizational form and group structure, such as ARMNOC, Armenian Chess Federation, Boxing Federation of the Republic of Armenia, Wrestling Federation of the Republic of Armenia, Football Federation of Armenia, etc. These SGBs are responsible for Sports Movement within the country. Thus, considering the public orientation of those organizations, these principles are more than needed to serve as grounds for their activity.

The governance functionality (ends) must lead thinking about governance forms (means). In other words, one ought to think about what governments *should do* before one thinks about what governments *should look like* [12].

The conduct of Sport Governance is categorized into *Macro-sense* – the correlation between the state authorities and SGBs; and *Micro-sense* – the way and the manner, in which the SGBs operate internally. From the comparative law perspective there is no unified typology of sports governance model. Therefore, in Europe, these typologies are identified on the grounds of 4 criteria, as underlined by Stéphanie De Dycker. These 4 criteria are: 1) level of intervention of the State; 2) the organizational structure of the sports system and the distribution of responsibilities within the sports system; political responsibility for sports policy; organisational structure of the national Sports Movement [15].

www.sportedu.am

The question is how the performance of the criteria and the PGG is to be measured. Dr. Michaël Mrkonjic proposed 6 criteria for the measurement, taking into account the reports of international SGBs, the legal framework adopted by the latter, programmes and other data related to the performance: 1) enforcement - the result of the PGG adopted by the organization and the type of document in which PGG is referenced (programme, Statutes, code of ethics, declaration of intention, voluntary code, etc.), 2) conceptual scope of PGG, 3) degree of the operationalism of PGG, 4) structured manner of PGG, 5) outreach of the set to the targeted group of stakeholders, 6) PGG implementation related to the recommendations of specific mechanisms that would guarantee that the principles and the indicators are effectively and successfully implemented by the target group [13].

In order to efficiently underline the minimum issues at hand, we will group the PGG into 4 subgroups, a.k.a. the four dimensions of good governance according to Jean-Loup Chappelet & Michaël Mrkonjic:

- 1) Transparency and public communication;
- 2) Democratic process;
- 3) Checks and balances;
- 4) Solidarity [8].

Transparency and public communication in Armenian sports.

At first it is required to break down the term ‘transparency and public communication’. Transparency in sports is defined as *‘clarity in procedures and decision-making, particularly in resource allocation. Organisations charged with care of a public good such as sport have a particular obligation not simply to act in a fair and consistent manner but also to be seen to do so. Thus, their inner workings should as far as possible be open to public scrutiny’* [7]. This important as this definition sets the framework beyond the minimum legal requirements, i.e., the term *‘but also to be seen to do so’* means that the transparency criterion does not mean that the SGBs must just comply with the minimum requirements set forth by the law, but also must conduct their activities in a way that the unbiased onlooker could easily and unimpededly witness the resource allocation, decision-making and the procedures thereof. For instance, some countries have ‘law on transparency’, for instance Spain has ‘Act 19/2013, of 9 December, on Transparency, Access to Public Information, and Good Governance’, which sets the required framework for operation within the landscape of the PGG. It even constitutes independent appeal body - the Council on Transparency and Good Governance, the deployment of special tools for exercising the right of access to information –

Transparency Portal, and many other principles to ensure the smooth flow of information from the decision-making process to the end addressee or a stakeholder. The same law enshrines the principles of good governance in the Article 26. More importantly the law categorizes the violations of the rules into 3 categories: minor, serious, very serious with the corresponding sanctions arising therefrom (Articles 27-30).

In Armenian, there is no any incorporated ‘law on transparency’, these relations are governed by different laws, such as the law HO-11-N [HHPT 2003.11.05/55(290) Hod.1016] of the Republic of Armenia ‘On freedom of information’ adopted on 23 September 2003, which does not speak a single word about PGG, and in terms of liability – directs to the legislation of the Republic of Armenia. Thus, the violation of this law derives from different laws and codes, such as Code of Administrative Offences of the Republic of Armenia [HSSHGST 1985/23] adopted on 06 December 1985, or the Criminal Code of Republic of Armenia [HO-199-N] adopted on 05 May 2021. Another law governing the matters of transparency is the law HO-22-N [HHPT 2017.01.25/5(1280) Hod.58] of the Republic of Armenia ‘On Non-Governmental Organizations’ adopted on 16 December 2016, where Chapter 5 obliges non-governmental organizations to comply with a certain level of transparency, however the

aforementioned law doesn't stipulate any sanctions for violations of its provisions.

The problem with the current legal framework is the shifted delivery of the information. Put differently, the interested stakeholder or a party must make a formal request to acquire the information, which is under the possession of the pertinent SGB under Article 6(1) of the law 'On freedom of information' mentioned above, which obviously puts an additional layer of obstacle in front of the stakeholders. Therefore, the compilation of the factual circumstances at hand triggers the following unquestionable reality:

A. Most of the SGBs do not have an official website;

B. Most of the SGBs do not publish any report on activity apart from news from time-to-time published utmost on social media platforms, if any;

C. The constituting documents of the most of SGBs, such as statutes, rules and regulations are not publicly available;

This situation leads to countless issues in terms of good governance, starting from the legal certainty of the stakeholders concerned ending up with the lack of any social dialogue at public level.

It should be noted that even there are some SGBs, apart from the football federation of Armenia, Basketball Federation of Armenia, the activity of the most of them can doubtfully pass the transparency

threshold of 'seen to be so' by unbiased onlooker as told above.

It should be noted that this omission must not necessarily constitute the intention of the SGBs, it can be connected to objective factors being beyond their control. However, this is an issue to be concerned about and to bring to the table for discussion by the stakeholders and SGBs to find solutions. At the final stage, the establishment of social dialogue can lead to the development of the particular sports.

It should be also highlighted that Armenia is not alone in this sense. The lack of transparency and communication is a common issue in many regions. Low transparency is a typical feature of governance in Central Eastern Europe countries, Latin American and Middle Eastern countries. Moreover, it should be noted that transparency has a similar meaning to two other terms commonly used in governance literature– disclosure and accountability. While the terms transparency, disclosure, and accountability overlap, distinctions can be drawn among them based on their common usage and definitions. Disclosure is broadly understood as making available information about an organization, whether on the basis of legal requirements or voluntarily [14].

For insuring, the proper compliance with the PGG a corresponding transition is required from the 'disclosure' principle to 'transparency' principle.

Democratic process in Armenian sports

In addition to the requirements of legal compliance of their own statutes the SGBs are recommended to comply with the PGG by ensuring the democratic process in their governance. It should also be noted that most of the domestic SGBs are affiliated with the international bodies forming the pyramid structure. Armenia is signatory party of the Council of Europe therefore the European Sports Model is applicable. In this sense it should be mentioned that there are cases where the obligation to comply with the democratic election process derives directly from the obligations undertaken before its pertinent international SGB. For instance, Articles 14(1)(e) and 15(j) FIFA statutes, adopted on 31 March 2022 by the FIFA Congress oblige the affiliated member association, *inter alia*, to call a general assembly of its legislative body at least once in 2 years and the obligation to form its legislative bodies in accordance with the principles of representative democracy.

Democracy is typically associated with countries' form of government where people hold the power and exercise this power by selecting their representatives in free and open elections [11]. The issue of democracy in sports is the confusion of it with traditional democracy known at the constitutional level. In sports, the democratic process uses deliberative democracy. The deliberative part of this

democracy includes decision making by means of arguments offered *by* and *to* participants who are committed to the values of rationality and impartiality. Deliberative 'conversations' fall somewhere between two extremes: bargaining, which involves exchanging threats and promises, and arguing, which concerns either matters of principle or matters of fact and causality [10].

In other words, deliberative democracy reminds more of a bargaining for personal (stakeholder's) interest in exchange of vote, which has nothing to do with classical democracy, where the participants vote for the agenda provided by the candidate. This is not subject to be good or bad, it is what it is. Bernard Enjolras and Ragnhild Holmen Waldahl provide excellent overview when covering this concept on the Norwegian Olympic Committee and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF), according to them: *'Democratic politics generally and politics within voluntary organizations span a plurality of interests, making it difficult to build a platform which is supported by a majority and benefits the community. NIF is a plurality of organized interests which at all organizational levels seek to maximize resources, positions, influence and power. One way to deal with such interests is to aggregate them through voting procedures which are in place at the AGMs [annual*

general meetings]. Another is to seek consensus through deliberation'[1].

Therefore, to evaluate if the democratic process compliances with the PGG requirement, it should be overviewed through the scope of the benefits of the community of particular sports. For this measurement the 6 criteria proposed by Dr. Michaël Mrkonjic should be applied. This requires strong consolidation of the community of the particular sports, including but not limited to the athletes, coaches, spectators and supporters, the State authorities. After this consolidation and collective feedback, the 4 criteria proposed by Stéphanie De Dycker mentioned above should be applied. In our view this will provide the best reflection of the current state if there is a democratic process in Armenian sports or not within the sense of PGG. Once again, it should be noted, that legal compliance with the statute requirements for election in particular SGB is not enough, it shall only verify the formal legal compliance, but not the compliance with PGG. For clear reflection of the citation in Armenia, a separate study is required to be conducted in accordance with the methodology provided above.

Checks and balances

Checks and balances, also known as principles of separation of powers developed by MONTESQUE is one of the essential cornerstones of the democratic political regime. According to him, in each state

www.sportedu.am

there are three sorts of powers: legislative power, executive power over the things depending on the right of nations, and executive power over the things depending on civil right [2]. It is applicable to any system relying on the democratic governance model.

How is this applicable to sports? The principle is about the structuring of power within the SGB by diving it into legislative, executive and judicial bodies whilst taking into consideration the system checks and balances.

In reality, the concept of separation of powers in sports governance is underdeveloped and usually implies separating the disciplinary bodies from the political and executive arms of a sports body [9].

Many of the modern international SGBs as well as the Armenian national federations attempt to use this principle in different configurations. For instance, FIFA stipulates in its statutes that FIFA Congress is the supreme and legislative body, general secretariat is the executive, operational and administrative body and judicial bodies, which are equalized to the independent committees by their status being granted institutional independence, and consists of disciplinary committee, ethics committee and appeal committee. FIFA also has a body called Council, which is defined as strategic and oversight body, which issues [6]. In other words, FIFA declares the Congress to be the legislative body, but delegates the

adoption of its regulations to the Council. Undoubtedly, the adoption of rules and regulations of FIFA are part of its legislative activities, therefore we can assume that the Council is also a legislative body in that sense.

However, the situation differs in Football Federation of Armenia (FFA). According to its statutes, FFA's legislative body is the assembly, the executive body is the executive committee, and the general secretariat is the operational and administrative body. Now the problem is that the executive body, the executive committee, holds the power to adopt most of its rules and regulations. Even the president has power to adopt regulations governing the Internal Organization Regulations, which also includes in its scope the judicial bodies. The judicial bodies consist of disciplinary and ethics committee, appeal committee and national dispute resolution centre [5]. It is highly questionable that this model, where the body holding the executive power is entitled to adopt so many regulations, can be assumed in compliance with the check and balances criterion of PGG. Nevertheless, this requires deeper research and not only applicable to FFA, but to other federations as well, taking into account the regulations they embedded in their statutes.

This criterion is related to the simple limitation and accumulation of power in one body entitling the latter to influence on the

other bodies, eventually undermining the 12 criteria of PGG.

Solidarity

David Miller distinguishes four main components of solidarity: 1) distinguishing features that bind members together; 2) mutual concern and mutual aid within the group; 3) acknowledgement of collective responsibility; 4) limits on inequality among members [4]. When speaking about solidarity in sports, the first thing that generally comes to mind is the Olympic solidarity, which enshrines the complex of action plans, principles and methodology to achieve the solidarity. It is achieved throughout the three programmes: 1) World Programmes, 2) Continental Programmes, 3) IOC Subsidies for Participation in Olympic Games. World Programme in turn covers the development of five areas: 1) athletes, 2) coaches, 3) National Olympic Committees (NOC) Management and Knowledge Sharing, 4) Promotion of the Olympic Values, 5) Forums and Special Projects [17].

Solidarity principle is strictly connected with the other principles of PGG. In case of Armenia, the one that is to be underlined is the accountability. How can we speak about any compliance with the principles of solidarity, when the publicity doesn't have enough information publicly available about the activities of the SGBs? For this requirement, an observation is to be made about the level of publicity of the industry. Moreover, this observation will help to

evaluate the compliance with PGG in general, i.e., do the SGBs comply with the requirements of ‘Fair Conduct of Elections, Responsiveness’, ‘Efficiency and Effectiveness’, ‘Openness and Transparency’, ‘Rule of Law’, ‘Ethical Conduct’, ‘Competence and Capacity’, ‘Innovation and Openness to Change’, ‘Sustainability and Long-term Orientation’, ‘Sound Financial Management’, ‘Human rights’, ‘Cultural Diversity and Social Cohesion’, ‘Accountability’?

Research Results Analysis: While using the ‘observation’ method the situation

of the publicizing of the activity of sports governing bodies listed by ARMNOC [16] are shown in Table.

The observation has been done based on the principles as if the unbiased onlooker would attempt to access information based on consumer-like, stakeholder-like behaviour by using meta search engines and using comparative quantity of actions aimed at acquiring the same information related to PGG of SGB in other countries like Spain and England.

Table. The situation of the publicizing of the activity of sports governing bodies listed by ARMNOC

Name of SGB	Official website	Social Media	Activity
Athletic Federation of Armenia	https://www.armathletics.com/ Status - inactive	N/A	N/A
Sailing Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Last post in 2022
Basketball Federation of the Republic of Armenia	https://bfa.am/ Status - active	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Armwrestling Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Boxing Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Figure Skating Federation of Armenia	https://www.armfs.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Last post in March 2024
Golf Association of Armenia	https://www.armfs.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active

Armenian Ski Federation	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Wrestling Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Taekwondo Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Active
Swimming Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Active
Karate Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Weightlifting Federation of Armenia	https://awf.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook	Active
Armenian national Federation of canoeing	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	No recent post
Handball Federation of Armenia	https://armhandball.am/ Status - active	N/A	Active
Cycling Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Active
Shooting Federation of Armenia	http://asf.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Armenian Judo Federation	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Gymnastics Federation of Armenia	http://armgymfed.com/ Status -inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Archery Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Last post in 2023
Armenian Chess Federation	https://www.chessfed.am/am Status - active	Facebook and Instagram	Active

Armenian Water Polo Federation	https://armeniawpf.com/ Status – active, significantly outdated (last updated in 2016)	Facebook and Instagram	Last post in 2023
Diving Federation of Armenia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sambo Federation of Armenia	https://www.sambo.am/hy/ Status – active, significantly outdated (last news in 2022)	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Table Tennis Federation of Armenia	N/A	Instagram	Not systematically active
Fencing Federation of Armenia	https://ffa.do.am/ Status – active, significantly outdated (last news from 2018)	Facebook	Last post in March 2024
Volleyball Federation of Armenia	http://www.armvolley.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Synchronized Swimming Federation of Armenia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Badminton Federation of Armenia	https://www.badminton.am/ Status – active, significantly outdated (last news from 2019)	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Armenian Hockey Federation	http://www.armhockey.org/ Status - inactive	Facebook	Active
Traditional Wushu Federation of Armenia	http://wushu.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Football Federation of Armenia	https://www.ffa.am/hy Status - active	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Tennis Federation of Armenia	https://www.tennisarmenia.org/ Status - inactive	Facebook	Active
Rugby Federation of Armenia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biathlon federation of Armenia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equestrian Federation of Armenia	N/A	Facebook and Instagram	Active

Modern Pentathlon Armenia	N/A	Facebook	Last post in 2022
Armenian Powerlifting Federation	https://www.apf.am/ Status - inactive	Facebook and Instagram	Active
Triathlon Federation of Armenia	N/A	N/A	N/A

Conclusion

Based on the research results, it is evident that there is no legal framework binding SGBs to comply with transparency requirements as defined by PGG. This lack of regulation leads to insufficient public information, making it difficult for researchers to assess SGBs' compliance with PGG principles. To address this, a new tailored law is needed to ensure that SGBs maintain a required level of transparency and accountability, backed by sanctions for non-compliance. Such a law would provide a focal point for evaluating and improving the governance of SGBs, initiating a cycle of

action and feedback within the sports industry.

The lack of publicized information prevents stakeholders from assessing compliance with key criteria such as accountability, ethical conduct, and sound financial management. Transparency fosters public interest, which is crucial for monetizing sports and developing professional sports in Armenia. By enhancing transparency and accountability, the sports industry can engage more effectively with stakeholders and promote the growth of professional sports through increased public and financial support.

REFERENCES

1. Bernard Enjolras & Ragnhild Holmen Waldahl, Democratic Governance and Oligarchy in Voluntary Sport Organizations: The Case of the Norwegian Olympic Committee and Confederation of Sports, 10 Eur. Sport Mgmt. Q. at 215, 234 (2010).
2. Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, The Spirit of the Laws 156 (Anne M. Cohler, Basia C. Miller & Harold Samuel Stone eds. & trans., Cambridge Univ. Press 1989).
3. Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, CM (2008)14-add, 15th Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Local and Regional Government, Valencia Declaration, at Annex 1, Para. III (2007) (adopted Feb. 1, 2008).

4. David Miller, Solidarity and Its Sources, in Keith Banting & Will Kymlicka (Eds.), *The Strains of Commitment: The Political Sources of Solidarity in Diverse Societies* at 61, 64 (Oxford Univ. Press 2017) <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198795452.003.0002>.
5. FFA statutes, arts. 39(D), (H), 51(1), 55, 61(4), 60, 63(2), 74(3), 75, 76(2), adopted on of 28 Jun. 2022, adopted by the FFA Assembly and FFA Internal Organization Regulations, art. 51, adopted on 28 Jul. 2023 by the Executive Committee
6. FIFA statutes, arts. 24, 48, 50 et seq. adopted on 18 Sep. 2020 by FIFA Congress; FIFA FIFA Governance Regulations, art.8.2(s) adopted 16 Dec. 2022 by FIFA Council.
7. Ian Henry & Ping-Chao Lee, "Chapter 2: Governance and Ethics" in *The Business of Sport Management*, eds. Simon Chadwick & John Beech, 9-10 (Pearson 2004).
8. Jean-Loup Chappelet & Michaël Mrkonjic, Existing Governance Principles in Sport: A Review of Published Literature, in Alm J. (Ed.), *Action for Good Governance in International Sports Organisations Final Report (Play the Game/Danish Inst. for Sports Stud. 2013)* 13-17.
9. Jean-Loup Chappelet, n. 4 *supra*, 16
10. Jon Elster, ed., *Deliberative Democracy* 8 (Cambridge Univ. Press 1998) 8, 19.
11. Lucie Thibault, Sport Governance, Democracy and Globalization, in *The Palgrave Handbook of Globalization and Sport* 627, 633-634 (Joseph Maguire, Katie Liston & Mark Falcous eds., 2021).
12. Matt Andrews, Stuart Russell & Douglas Barrios, *Governance and the Challenge of Development through Sports: A Framework for Action*, CID Working Paper No. 323, at 2, 7 (Harvard Univ., Ctr. for Int'l Dev. 2016).
13. Michaël Mrkonjic, A Review of Good Governance Principles and Indicators in Sport, INT'L CTR. FOR SPORTS STUD. (CIES), at 5-6 (2016).
14. Pavel Král & Graham Cuskelly, A Model of Transparency: Determinants and Implications of Transparency for National Sport Organizations, 17 *Eur. Sport Mgmt. Q.* 3-4 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1376340>.
15. Stéphanie De Dycker, Good Governance in Sport: Comparative Law Aspects, 19 *Int'l Sports L.J.* 116, 116-117 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40318-019-00153-8>.
16. <http://www.armnoc.am/eng/anoc/federations/> accessed 29 May 2024
17. <https://worldathletics.org/development/community/solidarity> accessed 29 May 2024

**ԱՐԴՅՈՒՆԱՎԵՏ ԿԱՌԱՎԱՐՄԱՆ ՍԿԶՐՈՒՆՔՆԵՐԸ ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՍՊՈՐՏՈՒՄ.
ՆԵՐԿԱՅԻՍ ՎԻՃԱԿ**

*Ա.Ա. Կյուրեղյան¹, Ա.Վ. Ավետիսյան²,
¹Իրավունքի և բիզնեսի բարձրագույն ինստիտուտ
(ISDE), Մադրիդ, Իսպանիա,
²Հայաստանի ֆիզիկական կուլտուրայի և սպորտի
պերական ինստիտուտ, Երևան, Հայաստան*

ԱՄՓՈՓԱԳԻՐ

Առանցքային բառեր: Արդյունավետ կառավարում, Եվրոպայի խորհուրդ, ԱՕԿ, ՄՕԿ, շահառու, մարզական ֆեդերացիա, սպորտի արդյունաբերություն, սպորտի կառավարում:

Հետազոտության արդիականություն: Այս հետազոտությունն օբյեկտիվորեն անհրաժեշտ է, քանի որ Հայաստանը Եվրոպայի խորհրդի անդամ է, և վերջինիս առաջարկությունները կիրառելի են դրա համար, ներառյալ, բայց չսահմանափակվելով սպորտի ոլորտով: Այն ունի առանցքային կարևորություն, քանի որ այս առաջարկությունները նպատակ ունեն հասնել միատեսակության Եվրոպայի խորհրդի շրջանակներում՝ առաջարկությունների միևնույն ոլորտների (օբյեկտների) պատշաճ գործունեության համար: Այնուամենայնիվ, կան առերևույթ ապացույցներ, որ Հայաստանում սպորտի ոլորտը արդյունավետ կառավարման սկզբունքների (ԱԿՍ) տեսանկյունից ունի բացթողումներ:

Հետազոտության նպատակն է՝ բացահայտել ընթացիկ խնդիրները և առաջարկել արդյունավետ կառավարման սկզբունքների չափման տեխնիկա՝ լուծումներ գտնելու համար: Այս հարցերը կներկայացվեն շահագրգիռ կողմերին՝ արդյունավետ կառավարումը զարգացնելու սկզբունքները սահմանելու համար:

Հետազոտության մեթոդները և կազմակերպումը: Ուսումնասիրվել է ԱԿՍ-ի կիրառման լավագույն փորձի վերլուծություն, ԱՍԿ-ին համապատասխանելիության մասով Հայաստանում առկա խնդիրներին վերաբերող փաստերի մասնակի սինթեզ, ԱՍԿ-ի վերլուծության մասով դեդուկտիվ մեթոդ, ինդուկտիվ մեթոդի կիրառում՝ կապված Հայաստանում առկա խնդիրների ամբողջականացման հետ, որոնք չեն համապատասխանում ԱԿՍ-ին:

Հետազոտության արդյունքների վերլուծություն: Հայաստանի դեպքում պետք է ընդգծել հաշվետվողականության և համերաշխության սկզբունքները, որոնց սկզբունքը սերտորեն կապված է ԱԿՍ-ի մնացած սկզբունքների հետ: Հրապարակված տեղեկատվության բացակայությունը խոչընդոտում է շահագրգիռ կողմերին՝

գնահատելու հիմնական չափանիշերին համապատասխանությունը, ինչպիսիք են՝ հաշվետվողականությունը, էթիկական վարքագիծը և ռացիոնալ ֆինանսական կառավարումը: Թափանցիկությունը խթանում է հանրային հետաքրքրությունը, ինչը շատ կարևոր է Հայաստանում սպորտը դրամայնացնելու և պրոֆեսիոնալ սպորտը զարգացնելու համար: Բարձրացնելով թափանցիկությունն ու հաշվետվողականությունը՝ սպորտի ոլորտը կարող է ավելի արդյունավետ համագործակցել շահագրգիռ կողմերի հետ և նպաստել պրոֆեսիոնալ սպորտի աճին հանրային և ֆինանսական աջակցության ավելացման միջոցով:

Համառոտ եզրակացություն: Հրապարակային տեղեկատվության բացակայությունը խոչընդոտում է շահագրգիռ կողմերին՝ գնահատելու հաշվետվողականության, էթիկական վարքագծի, առողջ ֆինանսական կառավարման և այլ չափանիշերի համապատասխանելիությունը: Հարկ է նշել, որ ԱԿՍ-ն ունի երկու պատճառահետևանքային կապ. թափանցիկությունը կրեթի հրապարակային հետաքրքրությանը, որն իր հերթին առանցքային սկզբունք է սպորտի դրամայնացման համար: Նշվածը որպես հետևանք՝ հնարավորություն կստեղծի Հայաստանում պրոֆեսիոնալ սպորտի զարգացման համար:

ПРИНЦИПЫ ЭФФЕКТИВНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В АРМЯНСКОМ СПОРТЕ: СОВРЕМЕННОЕ СОСТОЯНИЕ

А.А. Кюрегян¹, А.В. Аветисян²,

*¹Высший институт права и бизнеса
(ISDE), Мадрид, Испания,*

*²Государственный институт физической культуры
и спорта Армении, Ереван, Армения*

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова: эффективное управление, Совет Европы, НОК, МОК, участник, спортивная федерация, спортивный менеджмент, спортивная индустрия.

Актуальность исследования. Данное исследование объективно необходимо, поскольку Армения является членом Совета Европы и его рекомендации применимы к ней, в том числе и в сфере спорта. Это имеет ключевое значение, поскольку данные рекомендации направлены на достижение единообразия внутри Совета Европы для надлежащего функционирования одних и тех же областей (объектов) рекомендаций. Однако, есть очевидные свидетельства того, что спортивная индустрия Армении имеет упущения с точки зрения принципов эффективного управления (ПЭУ).

Цель исследования. Цель состоит в том, чтобы выявить текущие проблемы и предложить метод измерения принципов эффективного управления для поиска решений. Эти вопросы будут представлены заинтересованным сторонам для установления принципов развития надлежащего управления.

Методы и организация исследования. Был изучен опыт наилучших практик применения ПЭУ, частичный синтез фактов, связанных с существующими проблемами в Армении по части соблюдения ПЭУ, дедуктивный метод в отношении анализа ПЭУ, применение индуктивного метода, связанное с обобщением существующих в Армении проблем не соответствия ПЭУ.

Анализ полученных результатов. В случае Армении следует подчеркнуть принципы подотчетности и солидарности, которые тесно взаимосвязаны с остальными принципами ПЭУ. Невозможно говорить о соответствии принципов солидарности и подотчетности при отсутствии общедоступной информации о деятельности органов управления спортом. В связи с этим требованием в качестве отправной точки необходимо принять меры по повышению уровня публичности отрасли. Более того, это наблюдение поможет оценить общее соответствие с ПЭУ.

Краткие выводы. Отсутствие публичной информации не позволяет заинтересованным сторонам оценить соблюдение подотчетности, этического поведения, рационального финансового управления и других стандартов. Следует отметить, что ПЭУ имеет две причинно-следственные связи - прозрачность приведет к общественному интересу, что, в свою очередь, является ключевым принципом монетизации спорта. Как следствие, это создаст возможность для развития профессионального спорта в Армении.

Information about the authors

Ashot Ashot Kyureghyan – Master of International Sports Law, Madrid, Spain, ‘A.K.A. Lex Sportiva Law Office’ LLC, Vagharshapat, Armenia, E.mail: aka@lexsport.org, ORCID: 0000-0003-022403471

Arman Vachagan Avetisyan, PhD, Lecturer of the Chair of Sport Management and Sport Journalism, Armenian State Institute of Physical Culture and Sport, Yerevan, Armenia, E.mail: arman.avetisyan@sportedu.am, ORCID: 0000-0002-0303-3612

Տեղեկություններ հեղինակների մասին

Աշոտ Աշոտի Կյուրեղյան՝ Միջազգային սպորտային իրավունքի մագիստրոս, Մադրիդ, Իսպանիա, 'A.K.A. Լեքս Սպորտիվա իրավաբանական գրասենյակ ՍՊԸ, Վաղարշապատ, Հայաստան, E.mail: aka@lexsport.org, ORCID: 0000-0003-022403471

Արման Վաչագանի Ավետիսյան՝ ՖԴՏ, մեթոդիկայի և ադապտիվ ֆիզիկական կուլտուրայի ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ, Հայաստանի ֆիզիկական կուլտուրայի և սպորտի պետական ինստիտուտ, Երևան, Հայաստան, E.mail: arman.avetisyan@sportedu.am, ORCID 0000-0002-0303-3612

Հոդվածն ընդունվել է 23.06.2024–ին:

Ուղարկվել է գրախոսման՝ 24.06.2024–ին:

Գրախոս՝ մ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր Ա. Չատինյան