



Comparison of sports training and services provided by local governments in Istanbul and Bursa provinces

Erdal BAL^{a *}

^a Department of Exercise and Sport Sciences, University of Health Science, İstanbul 34660, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of the study was to examine the differences between the sports training and services provided by local governments in Istanbul, a metropolitan city, and the city of Bursa. The sample of the study was chosen randomly among the residents of both provinces. There were a total of 519 participants, 288 (55.5%) selected in Istanbul and 231 (44.5%) selected from Bursa. The research used a questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part consists of 10 single-item demographic questions developed by the researcher (age, gender, marital status, chronic illness, education, occupation, economic status, participation in activities, weekly sports time, and city of residence). In the research, the "Opinion of Public about Sports Services of Local Authorities" scale developed by Tekin (2013) for his thesis on Keçiören Municipality in Ankara province was used. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are: Sports Services (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), Sports Management (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12), Sports Facility Operation (items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) and Sports Facility Usage (items 19, 20, 21, 22, 23). The SPSS (25.0) program was used for the analysis of the data. Frequency and percentage values were used in descriptive statistics. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare two independent groups for data that did not show normal distribution. A statistically significant difference was found between the scores for sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage provided by local governments in the cities of Bursa and Istanbul ($p < 0.05$). Participants in Istanbul were found to have higher scores in sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage compared to participants from Bursa, and the difference was found to be significant ($p < 0.05$).

Keywords: Local administrations, sports services, sports training, well-being, health

* Corresponding author name. Erdal Bal
E-mail address: erdalbal@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Among the most important national, regional and local responsibilities of states, securing the general well-being and health of all citizens is an important part. The numerous needs and demands of individuals living within the geographic boundaries for which they are responsible must be met every day. The mission and objectives of recreation, park and leisure services should be to improve the quality of life of all individuals in the society, not only in their working life but also during their leisure time activities. Due to this understanding, both the state and local governments bear the responsibility for improving the welfare of individuals. While providing this, various branches of science are also used.

As science is divided into disciplines and specialties, it has become a highly emphasized phenomenon (Mete, 2017). Especially management science, management, mastership and leadership phenomena are dealt with as complex with individual, organizational, urban, national and international aspects. If there is an institution, there is definitely a management there. Although financing, technology and human resources are very important in the functioning of local governments, there is only one fact that will ensure the coordination of these units, and that is the management (Akdemir et al., 2009). Each administration has an ideology within itself (Fişek, 1998).

Management is an absolute value for every institution because these institutions have goals determined together with many organizations. Local governments also constitute an important place in a country's public administration structure. Regardless of whether it has a federal or unitary structure, every country includes local governments within its administrative structure. However, local government units in each country are organized in different ways and structures (Akyıldız, 2012). There are units within local governments that can carry out sports activities. Sports management is the management and administration of the tasks undertaken if individuals or groups with the same purpose regarding sports activities fulfill these goals. People who carry out this task are called sports managers (Sunay, 2016).

Local governments gained legal status within the state towards the middle of the 19th century. The emergence of local governments during these periods was the result of the transfer of some of the central authority's powers to some local authorities for the first time, although they did not have their present characteristics, and besides, some local communities were given the opportunity to benefit from these rights (Nadaroğlu, 1994). Local governments are established with the aim of producing services for the needs of people living in a certain geographical area due to living together, and are public legal entities, whose decision-making bodies are elected by the residents of the region, who have duties, powers, budget and personnel determined by law, and who benefit from administrative autonomy in their relations with the central government for the services

they undertake (Parlak and Özgür, 2002). Unlike centralized management, local government is the execution of some administrative services to be provided to the society not from the state center and from a single source, but by public legal entities that are not included in the central administration organization and are not included in the central administration hierarchy (Günday, 2003).

Local governments are seen as indispensable institutions in terms of fulfilling the needs and expectations of the public in all developed and developing countries. The power and efficiency of local governments in a country are closely related to the development and democratic level of that country (Arslan, 2005). A good local administration provides not only service delivery but also democratic participation, civil dialogue, local development and quality life (Shah and Shah, 2006). The service requirement of local governments is also in line with the democratic political ideology in which the citizen has excessive power (Self, 2000).

While explaining the reasons for the existence of local governments, the state allows all public services to be carried out by some autonomous organizations for the benefit of the country and citizens. Some services do not concern a whole country, but a region or some groups of citizens. The state cannot be expected to remain indifferent to such services. For this reason, it can give some services to autonomous organizations with separate budgets, legal personality and income under its own control, which has caused the issue to gain a different dimension (Keleş and Yavuz, 1983). Local governments in Turkey have a tripartite structure consisting of special provincial administrations, municipalities and neighborhoods (Akyıldız, 2012). Local governments, whose importance is increasing day by day, are obliged to provide new public services while performing existing services more effectively and widely. Local governments are increasingly obliged to increase citizens' options in local services and to encourage their participation. For this reason, they have to fulfill their increasing and diverse public service demand with decreasing resources (Görmez and Ökmen, 2009; Zengin and Öztaş, 2010). Considering the sports management systems of European countries, it can be clearly seen that the municipalities are highly focused on mass sports and recreation activities (Akdenk, 1989).

As Bozlağan and Yaş (2007) stated, factors such as social mobility caused by scientific and technological developments, emergence of social, cultural and sporting occupational areas, population increase in urban areas, socio-economic division of labor and increase in stratification lead to the diversification of the needs and expectations of the public, and thus to the expansion of the duties and service areas of local governments.

Municipalities in Turkey have been obliged to fulfill their duties and responsibilities by carrying out domestic and foreign organizations and activities in the social, health, cultural, science and education fields that serve the integrity of the metropolis (Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216, Article 7 subparagraph (m)). At the same time,

municipalities have undertaken important responsibilities in meeting the sports needs of the public. In the "Metropolitan Municipality Law" numbered 5216 and accepted on 10.07.2004, in the 7th article and subparagraph (m) that determines the duties and responsibilities of the municipalities, the statement "To construct, build, operate or have someone operate social, sports, recreation, entertainment facilities and similar places that serve the integrity of the Metropolis, providing equipment and support to amateur sports clubs when necessary" is included, and in article 15 of the same law, the statements "The Metropolitan Municipal Council may establish specialized commissions consisting of at least five and at most nine members to be elected at each term meeting" and "It is obligatory to establish an education, culture, youth and sports commission and a transport commission" are included (<https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5216.pdf>).

Local governments have more opportunity to present and implement recreational activities as common, continuous and cheap options. Provision of these services by local governments is a requirement of democracy and a legal obligation at the same time. These services are too extensive to be provided only by the private sector.

Although the new public management emphasizes the concept of the citizen as a customer, it should not be neglected that the concepts of customer and citizen have different meanings. As an equal individual under the law, the citizen is a stakeholder of political and social rights and responsibilities (Yıldırım, 2009). Municipalities act in the direction of being more customer- / citizen-centered with the idea of providing a better quality service to the local population. The first task of producers / service providers, namely local governments, is to distribute services in a way to achieve customer / citizen gratification and satisfaction (Aberbach and Christensen, 2005). Especially strong political pressures and commitments on public services force public administrations to be more "customer / citizen-centered" (Kaul, 1997). Therefore, citizens are not only customers but also owners of the government (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2006).

2. Method

2.1. Population and Sample

The sample of this study consisted of 288 (55.5%) randomly selected individuals residing in Istanbul and 231 (44.5%) randomly selected individuals residing in Bursa. 568 people participated in the study, but 49 participants were not included in the study due to incorrect filling of the questionnaire, and so the sample group was limited to 519 people in total.

2.2. Data Analysis

The SPSS (25.0) program was used for the analysis of the data. Frequency and percentage values were used in descriptive statistics. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare two independent groups for data that did not show normal distribution.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The research used a questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part consists of 10 single-item demographic questions developed by the researcher (age, gender, marital status, chronic illness, education, occupation, economic status, participation in activities, weekly sports time, and city of residence). In the research, the "Opinion Of Public about Sports Services of Local Authorities" scale developed by Tekin (2013) for his thesis on Keçiören Municipality in Ankara province was used. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are: Sports Services (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), Sports Management (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12), Sports Facility Operation (items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) and Sports Facility Usage (items 19, 20, 21, 22, 23).

Table 1. Scale Sub-dimension

Sub-Dimension	Items
Sports Service Dimension	1,2,3,4,5,6
Sports Management Dimension	7,8,9,10,11,12
Sports Facility Business Dimension	13,14,15,16,17,18
Sports Facility Usage Dimension	19,20,21,22,23

The scale was created in a 5-point Likert type and scale item responses was created as below; Totally Disagree (1), Slightly Agree (2), Moderate Agree (3), Agree (4), Strongly Agree (5).

Reliability was calculated by calculating the Cronbach-Alpha coefficient in the original of the scale. This coefficient was found to be ,758 (Tekin, 2013).

3. Results

The results obtained are given via tables as in the following.

Table 2. Demographic information of the participants

	<i>Responses</i>	<i>Frequency(n)</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>	<i>Total</i>
Age	0-18	60	11,6	519
	18-30	372	71,7	
	30 and above	87	16,8	
Gender	Male	297	57,2	
	Female	222	42,8	
Marital Status	Married	74	14,3	
	Single	445	85,7	
Chronic Diseases	Yes	31	4	
	No	488	96	
Educational Status	Just can read and write	7	1,3	
	Primary school	6	1,2	
	Secondary school	18	6,4	
	High school or equivalent	202	38,9	
	University	253	48,7	
	Postgraduate	33	3,5	
Occupation	Doesn't work	64	12,3	
	Retired	8	1,5	
	Laborer	50	9,6	
	Civil Servant	66	12,7	
	Student	291	56,1	
	Self-employment	40	7,7	
Economic Status	Very good	18	3,5	
	Good	206	39,7	
	Average	221	42,6	
	Poor	60	11,6	
	Very poor	14	2,7	

Leisure Time	Yes	413	79,6	519
	No	106	20,4	
Weekly Sports Time	1 hour a week	60	11,6	
	1-3 hours a week	120	23,1	
	3-5 hours a week	103	19,8	
	5 hours a week	147	28,3	
	Never	89	17,1	
City	İstanbul	288	44,5	
	Bursa	231	55,5	

Among the individuals participating in the study, 60 were between the ages of 0-18 (11.6%), 372 were between the ages of 18-30 (71.7%), and 87 were aged 30 and over (16.8%). 297 of the individuals were male (57.2%), while 222 (42.8%) of them were female. 74 (14.3%) of the participants were married and 445 (85.7%) were single. 31 (4%) of the participants had a chronic disease, while the remaining 488 (96%) did not have a chronic disease. 7 (13%) of the participants were only literate, 6 (1.2%) were primary school graduates, 18 (6.4%) were secondary school graduates, 202 (38.9%) were graduates of high school or equivalent, and the rest of the participants consisted of 253 (48.7%) university graduates and 33 (3.5%) postgraduates. 64 (12.3%) of the participants were unemployed, 8 (1.5%) were retired, 50 (9.6%) were workers, 66 (12.7%) were civil servants, 291 (56.1%) were students and 40 (7.7%) were self-employed people. In terms of economic status, 18 (3.5%) people had a very good economic status, 206 (39.7%) were in good condition, 221 (42.6%) were normal, there were 60 (11.6%) people with a bad financial situation and there were 14 (2.7%) people in a very bad financial condition. 413 of the participants (79.6) were individuals who did sports in their leisure time, while the remaining 106 (20.4%) people were individuals who did not do any sports activities in their leisure time. 60 (1.6%) people did sports for 1 hour a week, 120 (23.1%) people did sports for 1-3 hours a week, 103 (19.8%) people did sports for 3-5 hours a week. There were 147 (28.3%) people who did sports for 5 hours a week and 89 (17.1%) participants who did not do any sports.

Table 3. Score Comparison of Istanbul and Bursa Province According to Scale Sub-Dimensions

	Mean	N	Mann-whitney U	Z	P
Sports Service Dimension					
İstanbul	268,95	288	29576,000	-1,879	0,060
Bursa	244,22	231			
Sports Management Dimension					
İstanbul	274,29	288	29148,500	-2,432	0,015
Bursa	242,18	231			
Sports Facility Business Dimension					
İstanbul	293,56	288	23598,500	-5,703	<0,001
Bursa	218,16	231			
Sports Facility Usage Dimension					
İstanbul	283,06	288	26621,500	-3,927	<0,001
Bursa	231,24	231			

p <0.05*

As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between Istanbul and Bursa in terms of the sports service dimension, according to the scores given by the participants ($U=29576,000$, $p=.060$; $p>0.05$). When the sports management sub-dimension was examined, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in favor of Istanbul in terms of the scores given by the participants. It was determined that the participants gave higher scores in the sub-dimension of sports management in Istanbul ($U=29148,500$, $p=.015$; $p<0.05$). In the sports facility operation sub-dimension, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores given by the residents of Istanbul and the scores given by the individuals residing in Bursa ($U=23598,500$, $p=.00$; $p<0.05$). This difference was in favor of Istanbul. The scores given by the participants in the sports facility operation sub-dimension in Istanbul province were higher. A statistically significant difference was found in favor of the city of Istanbul in terms of the scores given in the sports facility usage sub-dimension ($U=26621,500$, $p=.00$; $p<0.05$). Individuals residing in Istanbul province gave higher scores in this sub-dimension than individuals residing in Bursa.

4. Discussion

A comparison was made for the sports services provided by the local governments of Istanbul and Bursa. Findings regarding the use of sports services, sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage, which are the sub-dimensions of the scale used, were obtained. Differences between Istanbul and Bursa have been evaluated.

In the evaluation of the scale sub-dimensions, it was determined that there was no difference between Istanbul and Bursa in terms of sports services. In Turkey, according to the existing laws and governmental policies of local governments, municipalities are obliged to prepare areas and opportunities for the public to do sports (Doğu et al., 2002). The centralized management approach emphasizes the importance of sports with legal regulations and obliges the local administrations of each region to make certain regulations for the provision of sports services to the public. For this reason, local administrations are obliged to carry out their sports services and provide sports services to people in the local area (Zengin and Öztaş, 2008). Therefore, such a result is likely to be achieved, as Bursa and Istanbul metropolitan cities serve in the same direction in sports services and activities within the framework determined by the central government and laws.

In the local administrations, higher scores were obtained in the province of Istanbul in sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage compared to Bursa. This situation is considered as an expected result. Istanbul is a metropolitan city. It is the most populous city in Turkey. It has hosted World and European championships and is a city where many international organizations are constantly held (Spor Istanbul, 2019). For this reason, Istanbul is a long way ahead of Bursa in terms of establishment and trained personnel. Qualified personnel working especially in the field of sports are increasingly employed. Those who have graduated in physical education and sports management are more included in sports services in Istanbul compared to Bursa. In Istanbul, where competition is more common, the stakeholders involved in sports management have effective knowledge and equipment. The fact that these people are employed in important places has prepared the ground for the formation of these differences. It can be said that Istanbul acts with a more professional service understanding with the participation of its trained personnel in meeting the sporting expectations and demands of the public.

Esenkaya (2010), in his work *Expectations of the Public from Local Governments about Sports Services*, concluded that the sports facilities in the municipal districts are not used sufficiently, sports services are not fully used by the public due to inefficient operation of facilities; lack of equipment, materials and expert personnel in the facilities; the fact that the hours when the facilities are open are not sufficient or appropriate; problems with access to facilities and efficient use; lack of incentive activities; and

insufficient information. This situation explains the reasons for the differences in sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage in our study. It can be concluded that compared to Bursa province, Istanbul is more effective and more efficient in sports facility operation, sports management and sports facility usage.

In another study, in which the level of public utilization of sports facilities was investigated by Okçi et al. (2009), the result was obtained to the effect that they found sports facilities to be few in number, their level of utilization was 50%, and the reason for this was that people could not do sports whenever they wanted, facilities were far from districts, and the cleanliness of the employees was not sufficient. In our study, the ease of access to sports areas for individuals in Istanbul, the greater number of areas where individuals can do any sport they want, and the opportunities and possibilities are higher than in Bursa. At the same time, Istanbul is a university city. There are many academics working as consultants within local governments. Collaborating with universities creates more efficient management and operation. This situation seems likely to be different for individuals residing in Istanbul than those residing in Bursa.

In Göküş and Alptürker's (2011) study related to citizen satisfaction in the services provided by municipalities, it was determined that the expectations of the public were in line with the social facilities, parks, green areas, the abundance of sports areas and the service quality provided by the experts working in these areas. Due to the fact that Istanbul is a megacity and because of the higher level of income than in all other provinces in Turkey, it has been possible to carry out many projects in the field of sports education and sports services. Its response in the public has yielded more positive results than in Bursa.

According to the findings of a study performed by Çoban (2002), in which the expectations of the public from municipalities regarding sports services were revealed, the municipalities should bear a great deal of responsibility for the sports activities of the public. The sports services provided by the municipality greatly increase its reputation. This opinion is prevalent in all age and occupational groups. According to the individuals in the sample, "sports services" have an important place in the development of the relationship between the municipality and the public. The necessity for the municipality to take into account the expectations and needs of the public while running sports services has been put forward. The municipality's running of sports services has emerged as a factor that increases its reputation at medium and higher levels (90.8%). However, it was observed that the rate of informing local people about the sports services offered by the municipalities was low (28.1%) for all occupational groups. In our study, the people of Istanbul have information about all kinds of sports events because Istanbul hosts many national and international tournaments. In general terms, sports events are constantly covered in the written and visual media. This affects people's perspectives, wishes and

desires regarding sports. For this reason, it can be said that Istanbul's sports services, management and operation are in a better situation than those of Bursa.

According to a study by Guthold et al. (2008), women are more inactive than men. Municipalities should take this situation into consideration, develop sports practices in this context and fulfill their social missions and constitutional duties by reaching specific groups in the society.

Among the results of many studies, sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage should be designed by local governments, especially considering the needs, expectations and opinions of the public. If the people to be assigned are composed of people who are graduates of sports management, physical education and sports and recreation, this will increase the functionality of local governments.

5. Conclusions

It has been concluded that there is no difference between the sports services provided by the local governments of Istanbul and Bursa.

A statistical difference was found between the sports management, sport facility operation and sport facility usage scores of the local governments of Istanbul and Bursa in favor of Istanbul ($p < 0,05$). It has been determined that individuals living in Istanbul have higher scores in sports management, sports facility operation and sports facility usage compared to Bursa.

Sports services and activities should be provided with the same quality and equal opportunities in every region. Sports management should be carried out by taking into account the expectations, opinions and needs of the public. Importance should be attached to the employment of people who have graduated from sports management, recreation, physical education and sports fields who can also perform management functions in local administrations.

References

- Aberbach, J.D. & Christenson, T. (2005), "Citizens and Consumers: An NPM Dilemma", *Public Management Review*, 7(2): 225-245.
- Akdemir, A. Leçiner, S. Gümüş, M. ve Uğur, S. (2009) *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Pozitif Matbaacılık, Ankara, Cilt 7, Sayı 1, 1-338
- Akdenk M. (1989) Türk Sporunun Gelişmesinde Spor Federasyonlarının Rolü, Güreş Federasyonu Örneği. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Akyıldız, F. (2012). Belediye Hizmetleri ve Vatandaş Memnuniyeti: Uşak belediyesi Örneği. *Journal of Yasar University*, 26(7): 4415-4436.
- Arslan, N.T. (2005). İdari ve Mal Paylaşım Açısından Merkezi Yönetim Yerel Yönetim İlişkileri. I.Ü. *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, No: 33, s.189-208.
- Bozlağan, R., & Yaş, H. (2007). Belediyelerde Hizmet İçi Eğitim. *edt. Bilal Eryılmaz, Musa Eken ve Mustafa Lütfi Şen*, *Kamu Yönetimi Yazıları*, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 123-144.
- Çoban B. (2002) Spor Hizmetlerine İlişkin Halkın Belediyelerden Beklentileri (Elazığ İl Örneği), Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Ankara
- Denhardt, J.V. & Denhardt, R.B. (2006), *The New Public Service*, USA: Sharpe Inc.
- Doğu, G., Kardaş, N. T. V& Atalı, L. (2013). Büyükşehir belediyesi spor politikalarına yönelik hizmetlerin incelenmesi (Kocaeli Büyükşehir Belediyesi Örneği). *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 25: 97-111.
- Doğu, G., Kesim, Ü., & Sivrikaya, Ö. (2002). Belediyelerin sporla ilgili işlevleri: Düzce belediyesi örneği. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi*, 11(2), 89-106.
- Esenkaya, A. (2010). Halkın yerel Yönetimlerden Spor Hizmetleri Konusunda Beklentileri (Konya Örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Konya
- Fişek, K. (1998), *Devlet Politikası ve Toplumsal Yapıyla ilişkileri Açısından Dünyada ve Türkiye de Spor Yönetimi*, Ankara: Bağrgan Yayınevi,
- Görmez K, Ökmen M (2009). Yerel Yönetimlerin Güncel Sorunları. Küresel, Yerel ve Bölgesel Perspektifler. Edt: Görmez K. Ökmen M. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları
- Guthold R, Ono T, Strong KI, Chatteerji S, Morabia AM (2008): Worldwide Variability In Physical Inactivity: A 51- Country Survey. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34 (6), 486–494.
- Günday, M. (2003), *İdare Hukuku*, İmaj Yayınevi, 7. Basım, Ankara.
- Göküş, M., & Alptürker, H. (2011). Belediyelerin sunduğu hizmetlerde vatandaş memnuniyeti: Silifke Belediyesi örneği. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (25), 121-133.
- <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5216.pdf>) ifadeleri yer almaktadır. Erişim:01.07.2020
- Kaul, Mohan. (1997), "The New Public Administration: Management Innovation in Government", *Public Administration and Development*, 17(1): 13-26.
- Keleş, R., & Yavuz, F. (1983). *Yerel yönetimler*. Ankara: Turhan Kitap Evi, s.20.
- Mete, E., S., & Parlıtı, N., (2017). *İş Modeli ve İş Modeli İnovasyonu*, Detay Yayıncılık, 1. Baskı, Ankara, s. 7

- Nadaroğlu, H. (1994). Mahalli İdareler Teorisi, Ekonomisi-Uygulaması. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş. s.213
- Okçi A., Çetinaslan A., Başaran, Z. &Erdal R. (2009). Kocaeli İlinde Halkın Spor Tesislerinden Yararlanma Düzeyi, Uluslararası Herkes İçin Spor Turizmi, Ankara, Nehir Matbaacılık
- Parlak, B., & Özgür, H. (2002). Avrupa Birliği ve bütünleşme sürecinde Türkiye’de yerel yönetimler. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, s.101-102
- Self, Peter. (2000), Rolling Back the Market: Economic Dogma and Political Choice, New York, USA: St Martins Press.
- Shah A, Shah S (2006): The New Vision of Local Governance and The Evolving Roles of Local Governments. Edt: Shah A. Local Governance in Developing Countries. Herndon: World Bank Publications.
- Sunay, H. (2016). Spor Yönetimi, Gazi Kitap Evi, Ankara.
- Spor İstanbul (2020). Kısa tanıtım ve tarihçe,.<http://www.spor.istanbul/kurumsal/kisatanitim-ve-tarih%C3%A7e.aspx> [Erişim tarihi: 11.17.2020]
- Tekin, Y. (2013). Yerel Yönetimlerin Spor Hizmetlerine İlişkin Halkın Görüşleri (Keşiören Belediyesi Örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Spor Yönetim Bilimleri Programı, Ankara
- Yıldırım, M. (2009), “Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Bir İkilem: Yurttaş Odaklılık ya da Müşteri Odaklılık”, C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 10(1): 99-115.
- Zengin, E., & Öztaş, C. (2008). Yerel yönetimler ve spor. Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi, (55), 49-78.American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).