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Abstract:
Nowadays China is in a transition from the planned economy to the market economy. During the transition all activities have rapidly developed, and so it is with China’s high-performance sports. However, due to the inadequate reformation of the sports system, the sports organization structure is still not clear enough. So, according to the current reality of high-performance sports in China, this paper proposes an organizational structure model which could be appropriate for development of high-performance sports in China and puts the model into precise sports terms to serve as a healthy and sustainable development of China’s high-performance sports. This paper is composed of two parts. In the first part by applying the methods of document collection and investigation, the authors state the changing process and the current problems of China’s high-performance sports events’ organizational structure and put forward a new model – that is “Joint-Decentralization” which includes three types: a) the government-oriented, b) the combined-oriented and c) the market-oriented decentralization. In the second part, on the basis of the investigation and analysis of the factors influencing the high-performance sports events, the authors classify different events into different organization structures.
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Introduction
China is a country in rapid development and there are profound changes in the political and economic system. This has caused a change in the organization structure of high-performance sports events. On the whole, the organization structure went through two stages of transformation: the first is a single governmental sports events organization structure based on the planned economy system from 1978 to 1992; the second is a multiplex sports event organization structure on the basis of the national system in transition from 1992 till now (Li-juan & Bo, 2002).

In 1978, at the third meeting of the 11th session of the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese government affirmed that the national task should be turned from a hierarchal struggle to an economic construction. The planned-economic system which was characterized by a high degree of planning and control took the dominant position. Under such a system, the Chinese government functioned in most administrative areas, including both the social and the economic areas. As a result, the government monopolized social material deployment, and had the ability to initiate any high-degree resource mobilization.

In this situation, a high-performance sports event was considered as purely a social and public affair. The government had absolute dominance over high-performance sports events, high-performance athletic training, high-performance sports team formation and high-performance sports event organization and participation (Xin-ping, 2007). The national sports conferences held in 1978, 1979 and 1980 by the State Sports Commission blueprint the Chinese sports development. After a three year adjustment, the “Whole national system of sports” was established (Hua, 1999). Under the conditions of an underdeveloped economy, the “Whole national system” made tremendous contributions to the development of China’s competitive sports and laid the foundation for sports system reform (Xiao-long, 2005).

In 1992, Xiaoping’s Southern Tour Speech affirmed a market economy system in a dominant
position. Along with the development of a market economy propelled by social needs, the government's "Whole national system" of sport failed to keep pace with the market interests, rights and distribution sectors. Therefore, the new kind of sports system based on a market economy was quite demanding.

In order to cope with the impact of the international sports market and meet the comprehensive connection of the economic system between China and the world, the Chinese government also began to seek a new way to develop high-performance sport.

Thus, in 1993, the State Sports Commission issued "Views on deepening the sports reform", and established some basic ideas on a sports reform in the 1990s. In this way they incited a sports system transition, from serving a planned economic system to serving the market economy system (Ming-xiao, 1997).

Then there came an unprecedented comprehensive sports reform. From 1993 to 1997, various departments of the State Sports Commission were divided into 20 programme management centres that were in charge of 41 associations and 56 individual sports programmes. Those centres, attached to the State Sports Commission, became self-governed institutions and provided the preconditions for substantiating individual sports associations.

In 1998, the State Council of the People's Republic of China announced the revocation of the State Sports Commission and the creation of the General Administration of Sport of China (Tao, 1998). The top body of state sports management changed from the previous department of the State Council to the current independent institution directly under the State Council. All other levels of governmental sports organization were also changed. Their functions converted from directly organizing to indirectly managing sports activities, from responsibility to macroeconomic regulations and control, such as formulating policies and regulations, supervising and coordinating. The original single form, in which there was only the national team, was replaced by a combined form in which the state, the provinces, the People's Liberation Army, the enterprises, the colleges and universities can all set-up high-performance sports teams. In this way different organizations in China have the possibility to participate in competitive sports. This 1990s reform, relating the market with sports, was a fundamental change and proved to achieve good economic and social benefits.

These reforms made it possible for China's high-performance sports events to get access to the market. Social capital then started entering into the sports market. After the government changed its model and degree of participation in the events, China's high-performance sports event organization structure also underwent a change and showed diverse characteristics. First, the Chinese government as the main actor in sports events has not been completely changed. Second, high-level sports events, organized by government and funded by enterprises, still are a large component of all sport events. Third, the variety of commercial competitions also spread all over the country. A diversified high-level sports organization structure was formed.

There is no doubt as to the great progress for the organization structure of sports events in China's sport system reform, changing from the single government-oriented to the multiple stakeholders-oriented. A new organization structure pattern, regulated by the government and operated by social sports organizations, such as the People's Liberation Army, enterprises, colleges and universities, will be eventually formed. However, China's regional economic imbalance and the large difference between various sports events mean that there will be a huge difference on the level of marketing and socialization among those diversified Chinese high-performance sports events. Besides, because of the impact from the traditional planned economy and the demand from the current market economy, there are still a lot of problems in the organization of participation in sports. The General Administration of Sport of China has made great efforts in the materialization of the Sports Association and the marketing of high-performance sports event organizations (Jian-hua, 2000). However, due to the dual role of the reformer and the reformed, the General Administration of the Sport of China cannot carry out the reform to the end and therefore some deep-rooted contradictions are exposed.

For example, the relationships between the administrative departments, the investors, the sponsors and the sports teams (including professional teams) have not been straightened out; individual sports associations exist in name only; the "semi-social" sports event organization model – "sponsored by an enterprise while operated by the government" – remains common in some sports programmes (Ming-xiao, 2000). When reforming the financing channel, the government retains control for high-performance sports events. So, the question of administrative power controlling the high-performance sports events is still a controversial topic.

Various kinds of problems caused by the incomplete reform leave the multiple sports event organization structure in disorder. In other words, the truly diversified high-performance sports event organization structure system has not yet been formed, and various types of organization structures are rather vague as to their use in suitable areas. Therefore, it is difficult to realize the comprehensive objective of China's high-performance sports event organizations.
This situation demands a clear and specific organization structure model for China’s high-performance sports events, and different events should clarify their appropriate organization structure type in order to cope with China’s socialist market economy. Which organization structure of Chinese high-performance sports events should be used? Which events can be marketed? Which ones cannot? Which ones need the government and other organizers to operate together? These questions will be dealt with in this paper.

Therefore, starting with the theoretical research of the differentiation of the government’s monopoly power in sports events, this paper establishes a high-performance sports event organization structure model suited for the development of the Chinese political and economic system. On this basis, with the empirical analysis of the various kinds of factors that influence the high-performance sports event market, this paper makes a classification judgment of the model.

Methods

Data-collection and analysis

By collecting and analysing the research material of sports events organization with the help of a modern index instrument, this paper makes the necessary classification of contents concerning the high-performance sports event organization structure and market. Three factors regarding a high-performance sports event organization structure is summarized as: participants, sports programmes and event activities.

Based on the organization theory, the integrity of the high-performance sports event structure should include contacts with the participants, the sports programmes and the event activities (Chao-lin & Xiao-sheng, 2005); meanwhile, from a market theory, the composition of a simple market must include the most basic elements: buyers, sellers and the goods used for sale (Yong, 2007), although the actual market is much more complex than a simple market. China’s high-performance sports event market also contains these three elements: participants (buyers, sellers and agents, etc.), sports programmes and events activities (products).

In this paper, the “participants” reflects the buyers, sellers, agents and other subjects involved in the sale. “Sports programmes” reflect the different sports programmes, such as basketball, football, gymnastics, etc. “Event activities” reflect the different ranks, types and stages of the events in the same sports programmes, using a football event as an example; it may be a world or a national event; a cup event or a tournament; a final event or an accumulating points event, and so on. The three indicators are important components of China’s high-performance sports event structure and have an effect on the organizational behaviour and the performance of the event market.

Investigation

Regarding the judgment of which events were appropriate for a market, because of the participants, the sports programmes and the event activities included many factors, and they had a strong relevance with each other. It is very difficult to access certain statistics software for quantified information. Therefore, investigation by experts, experienced managers, brokers and sponsors for the relevance of these factors to a market is more accessible. The aim of the investigation in this paper was to explain the application of the high-performance sports events organization structure, but not the foundation. Similarly, the aim of the investigation was to judge the reasonable types for every event in the structure, but not for building the structure.

Subjects of the investigation

The research was done with the sample of 18 experts from the field of sports events and sports management, 20 administrators, i.e. directors of all programme management centres under the General Administration of Sport of China (each from one programme management centre), and 18 directors from the brokers and sponsors.

Aims of the investigation

The aim of our investigation was to identify the relevance of sports events characteristics and the market through Expert Questionnaires and to identify the relevance of sports programmes characteristics and the market through Administrators, Brokers and Sponsors Questionnaires.

Steps of the investigation

The questionnaires were designed according to the needs of research, i.e. the authors designed 3 different kinds of questionnaires for experts, administrators, brokers and sponsors. 18 experts were asked to grade the 3 questionnaires according to their content and structure; 10 points were allocated for the perfect ones; 9 points for second and so on. The average values of the total points in terms of percentage were calculated. These values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Content validity</th>
<th>Structure validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts Questionnaire</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Questionnaire</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers and Sponsors Questionnaire</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 showed that the questionnaires had a high validity.

The three questionnaires were distributed to the experts, administrators, brokers and sponsors, respectively. After two weeks the first questionnaires were returned and the distribution was repeated. The situation with the distribution and responses is presented in Table 2.

The purpose of the repeated distribution of the questionnaires was to test the reliability of the answers. The reliability test followed the “test-retest” rule. The two responses of the investigating subjects towards the same questionnaire were analyzed by SPSS 11.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Science). The result (Table 3) showed a high similarity between both answers, which indicated that the results of the first answer were reliable and valid.

Through the validity and reliability test of the questionnaires, 56 valid questionnaires (18 from the experts, 20 from the administrators in programme management centres, 18 from the brokers and sponsors) were calculated from the first response package and were subsequently analysed. Data were processed by using the SPSS 11.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

### Table 2. Questionnaire distribution and response (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Distribution</th>
<th>First Response</th>
<th>First Valid</th>
<th>Second Distribution</th>
<th>Second Response</th>
<th>Second Valid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts Questionnaire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Questionnaire</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers and Sponsors Questionnaire</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Results of questionnaire reliability test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts Questionnaire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Questionnaire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers and Sponsors Questionnaire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Order of the various factors with the impact on high-performance sports events market (weight calculation according to the opinions of 18 experts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weight in own part</th>
<th>Weights in total</th>
<th>Place of order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>.6333</td>
<td>.5763</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Management Centre</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>.8444</td>
<td>.7684</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
<td>.8778</td>
<td>.7988</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors (79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home team</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.8889</td>
<td>.7778</td>
<td>.6144</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting team</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>.6222</td>
<td>.4916</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third competition site</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>.5778</td>
<td>.4564</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports star situation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.2778</td>
<td>.8556</td>
<td>.6759</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male event</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.6111</td>
<td>.7222</td>
<td>.5706</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female event</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>.4333</td>
<td>.3423</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperator</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.1480</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sponsor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.9444</td>
<td>.3889</td>
<td>.1439</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods provider</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.7778</td>
<td>.3556</td>
<td>.1316</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media TV (71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>.9111</td>
<td>.6469</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TV station</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.7222</td>
<td>.5444</td>
<td>.3866</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local satellites TV station</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.2778</td>
<td>.6556</td>
<td>.4654</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers (70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside broker</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.6667</td>
<td>.2467</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent broker</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>.8222</td>
<td>.3042</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized broker</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.7222</td>
<td>.3444</td>
<td>.1274</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ties, and some secondary elements of the high-performance sports events. The results are presented in Table 4.

Relations between sports programmes characteristics and the market

To investigate the impact of the factors on the sports event market and to keep the questionnaire clear and concise, the authors investigated the sports programmes following the Theory of Programmes Group (Mai-jiu, 2000). However, in the same group, the programmes varied greatly from each other. In order to further define the proper classification of organization structures, from the aspect of sports programmes, this paper made a further evaluation of the market location of sports programmes in China’s high-performance sports events.

First, through the investigation of the programme management centres, the authors considered the fact which sports programmes suited the market operations and which programmes failed to do so. Through the investigation of the brokers

Table 5. List of performance and market position of China’s high-performance sports programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent programmes</th>
<th>Preponderant market</th>
<th>Developing market</th>
<th>Weak market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pingpong, Wushu and other traditional programmes</td>
<td>Archery, gymnastics, swimming, judo (female), diving, volleyball (female), badminton, fencing</td>
<td>Weightlifting, shooting, football (female), basketball (female), handball (female), softball (women), hockey (female), wrestling (female)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse racing, water-skiing, motor boats, aerobics, billiards, basketball (male), beach volleyball, tennis, rock climbing</td>
<td>Yachting, track-and-field, trampoline, rugby, chess and cards, triathlon, marathon</td>
<td>Speed skating, figure skating, winter biathlon, ice hockey, curling, rowing, webbed swimming, taekwondo, water polo, handball (male)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (male), equestrianism, golf, bowling, motor and sports car racing, motorcycle racing</td>
<td>Modern pentathlon, judo (male) bicycle, sailing and sailboarding, artistic gymnastics, wrestling (male)</td>
<td>Boxing, hockey (men), baseball, alpine skiing, snowboarding, cross-country skiing, ski jumping, freestyle skiing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and sponsors, the authors made it clear which programmes they preferred to participate in. In this way, China’s high-performance sports event programmes are divided into three types: the preponderant-market programmes, the developing-market programmes and the weak-market programmes.

Second, through the comprehensive analysis of the performance of China’s high-performance athletic sports in the last four Olympic Games and the Theory of Programmes Group (Mai-ju, 2000), China’s high-performance sports event programmes were divided into three types: the excellent, the developing and the undeveloped.

Lastly, the authors drew a table (Table 5) of a comprehensive analysis of these investigations and documents.

Discussion and conclusions

Several remarks on the foundation of the “Joint-Decentralization” Model

Nowadays China is in a fast-developing stage in which the principal contradiction is the one between growing people’s material and cultural needs and the lagging social productive force. This contradiction runs through the entire primary stage of socialism and all aspects of social life in China (Xiao-ping, 1993). The development of sports is also faced with the contradiction between the people’s growing demands for sports and the relatively backward productive force of sports products and services. It will take a long time to gradually resolve this problem, which is the main task for the reform and development of China’s sports. Any deviation from this central task will obstruct the healthy development of China’s sports.

“Taking the socialist public ownership as the mainstay and keeping the common development of multi-economic sectors” (Ze-min, 2006) is a basic economic system in the primary stage of socialism. The diversification of the ownership structure of the economy decides that the investors in sports be certainly diversified. At the same time, since “the realization form of public ownership can be and should be diversified” (Ze-min, 2006), the sports system and operating mechanisms are naturally diversified. To this end, establishing the organization structure of China’s high-performance sports events should also be diversified. “Full-government-oriented” or “full-market-oriented” will go against the development of China’s high-performance sports events.

So the principal contradiction and the basic economic system in China show that high-performance sports events development needs large funds which not only come from the government but also from the market. But not all sports events can obtain the funds from the market. According to the needs of the public, some programmes are more popular and with higher commercial advertising value, so it is relatively easy for them to enter the market, whereas other programmes, which have less appreciation, and in which people cannot be directly involved, are very difficult to enter the market. For the latter, the government has the responsibility to help them survive and give impetus to their development. So, the “Joint-Decentralization” model is put forward. The specific reasons are as follows:

(1) The development of the sports event market indicates: the marketed operation of the sports events will be more standardized; the participants will further clarify their responsibilities, rights and obligations; sports events will enter the capital market and all types of sports events may make use of the social capital (Tie, 2002).

(2) The government finds a reason from the basic market law of “the one who invests, benefits” to participate in the market. But in the wide range of investment market, other investors are not given the deserved right to speak (Can-ming, 1997).

(3) Elaborating the association system and establishing the league competition system are the expectations of many experts and scholars of China’s sports reformation. Perfecting the association system is to realize the associations’ entities and the separation of government and enterprise; establishing the league competition system is to grant the club union the right to manage the sports market. However, currently, the problem of the state-owned assets disposal has not been well resolved and the functions of the government have not changed completely (Qing-wei, 2005).

(4) The changing process of China’s sports events market structure implies the gradual withdrawal of the country’s capital from the events and the entering of private capital (Xiong-fei, 2000).

(5) The Chinese government is the owner of the sports event resource. So the government’s direct involvement in the high-performance sports events operation is sensible and reasonable. At the same time, the governmental involvement is much easier than pure adjustment to some problems such as transportation and security. The Chinese sports market system has not developed completely. In this situation, the government’s replacement to the market is, to some extent, a kind of “compensation” to the market’s incomplete function. (Can-ming, 1997).

(6) To achieve a “soft landing” (Wei & Shan-lin, 2003) for China’s sports, the rational change of government’s functions plays an important role. For various forms of events, the government’s functions should be different.

(7) The reform of China’s state-owned enterprises can shed some light on the high-performance
sports event market. Establishing the modern enterprise system, represented by the joint-stock system, is the key to perfecting China’s economy structure (Xiong-fei, 2000). China’s market-oriented operation of the high-performance sports event organizations shares some similarities with the state-owned enterprises, and its assets also belong to the country. During the process of the separation of government and enterprises, the departments of marketing (some named “the department of programme development”) in the programme management centres play the role of “communicators” between the government function and the enterprises function of the high-performance sports events organizations, which is an effective form for the government’s participation in the market.

From what has been said previously, we know that currently China’s high-performance sports event market still needs nurturing. The funds that come from this market are the trends of the modern sports events development. At the same time, it is necessary for the government to support the high-performance sports events.

So, the different types of high-performance sports events organization structure should be chosen in the light of different events. The different organizers, including government and others coming from the market, organize, operate and manage different events, and make their own interests link to the benefit of events.

What is “Joint-Decentralization”?

“Joint-Decentralization” is a dynamic organizational structure model. The joint is the prerequisite and the decentralization is the theme. The degree of the decentralization authorized by the government is the key. The decentralization should develop according to the targets and tasks of sports events organizers and the market needs of the spectators: some programmes’ events occupy a weak position in the market, so the government-related participants should get more power to protect the development of the programmes, and support them, with both the finance and policy. On the contrary, some programmes’ events have a strong position in the market, so the governmental participants should get less power. Until the realization of the effective disposal of the state-owned assets, the programmes’ events should completely access through the markets, and the governmental participants withdraw from decentralization and turn to the macro regulation and control.

Decentralization means the separation of responsibility. The organization structure of China’s high-performance sports events should be manifested by the combination of the organization authorized by the government on behalf of the state’s interests and the organization acting on behalf of the benefits of other investors. The two parts should have distinct, yet equal responsibilities and rights, which will be essential for the development of the programmes.

The type of “Joint-Decentralization” organizational structure model

The “Joint-Decentralization” model of high-performance sports events is a choice which goal is to realize the organizational objectives. The difference in the characteristics of the various sports programmes allows for the demands of appreciating and participating in the programmes’ high-performance sports events. In addition, every participant of the sports event organization has its own objectives. Thus the difference in the demands and the diversity in the objectives allows the “Joint-Decentralization” model of the organizational structure. This means that it is inexorably a dynamic model, and that it necessarily has several different types of organization structures.

The ideal aim of the “Joint-Decentralization” organization structure model is to maximize not only the integral benefits of high-performance sports event organizations, but also that of each and every member. Obviously this is too difficult to achieve in real life. Thus, the realistic aim of the “Joint-Decentralization” model is to seek the maximum of the integral benefits through the Pareto Improvement. The “Pareto Improvement” is an economical term. In this current topic, it states, that with the dynamic decentralization of the members, at least one organization member can have better objective-benefits on the premise that the other members’ objective-benefits will not become worse when the ideal aim fails to be achieved.

Seen from the organizations and their member objectives, the integral objective of high-performance sports event organizations is to meet the people’s growing needs for the appreciation of and participation of in event. Their services’ objects are the audience and sports enthusiasts. The members in the sports event organizations have different objectives. The government values are gold medals, which can raise national status, expand international influence, underpin national spirit, enhance the cohesion and keep social stability (Yuan-zhen, 2000). The Sports Management Centres similarly serve the nation’s gold-medal objective and evaluation of the development of the programmes. This includes the popularity, the performance-raising and the guarantee for the interests of the organizations and the athletes. The sponsors, the television media and the intermediary stress, on the other hand, the importance of economic profits. The competitive teams value the victory and the gains of the participating teams and members. The spectators value the enjoyment of the sports programmes.
From the fondness of the targets of services, the sports programmes and events can be divided into three forms: (1) Popular programmes and events, which can integrate with the market well, can cover the expenses of training and competitions and even make profits. Independent from the governmental support, such sports programmes and events can ensure the achievements as well as incomes operating in a “marketed” way. (2) Less popular programmes and events, which are important integrants in the international events, have difficulty entering the market. Thus, with them it is necessary to follow the traditional form: the government monopolizes the training and competition parallel to the planned economic system, and fight for the succession of development. For example, reforming the competition system and publicizing to penetrate the market. (3) Programmes and events which are popular amongst a certain audience groups, i.e. those sports event organizations can make certain profits through the audience’s appreciation and participation; however, the limited income cannot make up for the actual expenses of the programmes’ development and arrangements. So the government should provide some resources to maintain the development of these programmes.

Based on the previous analysis, this paper divides the “Joint-Decentralization” model of China’s high-performance sports events organization structure into three types:

(1) Government-oriented: the objective is to win a gold medal and keep the programmes’ development, yet unpopular among the common people.

(2) Government- and market-oriented: the objective is to win a gold medal and to gain the programme’s development by combining both the goals of the government and the market. In this situation the spectators love it to a certain degree.

(3) Market-oriented: because of the popularity among the masses, the incomes from the audience surpass the expenses and ensure the survival and development of the programmes. Therefore, such sports events do not need governmental subsidies, and can ensure achievement as well as income from operating in a “marketed” way.

The significance of “Joint-Decentralization” organizational structure

The “Joint-Decentralization” model can use the internal and external resources of the members of high-performance sports event organizations more efficiently, so that the various sports programmes can develop in a more appropriate environment, thus enhancing the level of competition. This model also leads to maintaining a balanced development among the sports programmes.

The “Joint-Decentralization” model pays an important role in protecting the value of state-owned assets, promoting the participation of social forces, reducing the state’s financial burden, reducing the cost and risks of organizing sports events and even accelerating the process of them entering the market.

The “Joint-Decentralization” model pays great importance to the division of responsibility, the right and benefit of the members of high-performance sports event organizations, which ensures the interests of not only the state but also of the other members. It is an effective choice of means to realize the integral objectives of social and economy benefits.

The “Joint-Decentralization” provides a reference for a large number of countries in the world in which governmental support relies on the difference of the Olympic programmes and non-Olympic ones, and of their performance. It means according to their own country’s actual situation, the different events should be introduced to different types of “Joint-Decentralization”. Thus, some programmes can obtain more funds from the market and some can get better development with government subsidies.

**The application of the events-market relevance in the “Joint-Decentralization” model**

The result of the investigation (Table 4) shows: merely in terms of those inherent characteristics of the sports events, exclusive of the indefinite factors between the market and the local government, the sports management centre, the spectator, the sponsors, television and the brokers, the characteristics of some events are strongly related to the market, for example, the home team, sports star situation, male event, exhibiting accuracy type event, exhibiting difficulty and aesthetics event, confrontation in the same area, confrontation separated by a net, league match, exhibition event, final events; while the characteristics of some events are weakly related with the market, for example a female event, power sports, speed sports and endurance sports tournament, invitation match, two-side confrontation match, accumulating points events, promotion events, preliminary contest. Therefore, different events should adopt different organizational structure models: the market-oriented type, the government-market oriented type and government type and the government-oriented type.

Meanwhile, because these internal factors of the organization structure of China’s high-performance sports events have various associated forms, and because the organization structure is affected by external factors, such as the economic level, the people’s purchasing power and the regional cultures, it is impossible to classify all types of
events with a specific organization structure. So the high-performance sports event in a specific environment and time should be integrated with the actual situations, and a specific organization structure should be chosen.

The application of the programmes-market relations in the “Joint-Decentralization” model

From the analysis of the programmes of China’s high-performance sports events and of their market status (shown in Table 5), this paper shows that the programmes that have preponderant market status can try the road of the market-oriented development. Its high-performance sports event organization structure also turns to the market-oriented organizations structure. For the developing programmes and those that are undeveloped, both of which have preponderant market status, the government should adopt policies to support and to minimize direct intervention. Similarly, for the programmes that have developing market status, an organization structure model that combines government and market sources should be established. For the programmes that have weak market status, the government leadership should be insisted upon and the government-oriented organization structure should be retained and developed. For those developing programmes and those undeveloped, both of which have developing or weak market status, the government should make the necessary direct intervention to promote development.
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Danas je Kina u procesu tranzicije iz planske ekonomije prema tržišnoj ekonomiji. Tijekom tranzicijskog perioda sve aktivnosti se ubrzano mijenjaju i razvijaju, pa tako i kineski vrhunski sport. Ipak, zbog neadekvatne reforme sustava sporta u Kini, organizacijska struktura sportskih događaja još uvijek nije dovoljno jasna. Dakle, u skladu s trenutačnim stanjem vrhunskog sporta u Kini, ovaj članak predlaže model organizacijske strukture koji je primjeren za razvoj kineskog vrhunskog spora te stavlja taj model u okviru točno određenog sporta kako bi služila zdravom i održivom razvoju kineskog vrhunskog sporta. Članak je sastavljan od dva dijela. U prvom dijelu članka, primjenom metoda dokumentiranja i istraživanja, autori navode proces promjena i trenutna probleme organizacijske strukture vrhunskih sportskih događaja te predstavljaju novi model – "mješovita decentralizacija" koji uključuje tri tipa organizacijskih struktura: a) vladin, b) kombinirani i c) tržišno orijentirana decentralizacija. U drugom dijelu, na temelju istraživanja i analize čimbenika koji utječu na događaje vrhunskog sporta, autori klasificiraju različite događaje i različite organizacijske strukture.
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