

IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF OBSTACLES TO ORGANIZATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE MINISTRY OF SPORT AND YOUTH

Farzad Ziviar*¹, Abolfazli Farahani², Loghman Keshavarzi³

¹Ph.D. in sport management, Virtual branch, Azad Islamic university, Tehran, Iran.

^{2,3}Department of Sport management of in Payaam Noor University, P.O.BOX 19395-3697, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The present paper was conducted with the aim of identifying and prioritizing the obstacles to organizational entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sport and Youth (MSY). In terms of method, the paper uses the mixed methodology (qualitative and quantitative). The population consists of the present and former managers of the MSY and academic experts. In the qualitative section, the purposeful sampling method was considered. Accordingly, following interviews with 13 individuals from the population, a theoretical saturation level was achieved. In order to identify the barriers to organizational entrepreneurship, in the qualitative section, the qualitative content analysis and open and axial coding interviews were used. Additionally, in the quantitative section, AHP was used for prioritizing the identified obstacles. An analysis of the qualitative data revealed the three main behavioral, structural and environmental obstacles to organizational entrepreneurship in MSY. Furthermore, prioritization of the obstacles in the quantitative section showed, in an order of importance, the behavioral (0.526), structural (0.289) and environmental (0.185) obstacles to organizational entrepreneurship in MSY.

Keywords: organizational entrepreneurship, barriers to entrepreneurship, the Ministry of Sport and Youth.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is the main driving force of economic development and one of the characteristics of a healthy economy (Druker, 2014). It occurs when an individual or a group of individuals initiate an economic activity or when it occurs within an operating organization in which case it is called organizational entrepreneurship (Moghimi, 2005- Mobaraki,2013).

* Corresponding author: fziviar@ut.ac.ir

Organizational entrepreneurship (OE) is the nurturing of entrepreneurial behavior in an organization that has been already established. It is a process through which new goods (or services) or innovative processes are produced via the development of an entrepreneurial culture. In this type of entrepreneurship, the firm creates an environment where the members could take part in entrepreneurial activities through which goods, services or innovative processes emerge via entrepreneurial culture development (Omid et al., 2016-).

Many scholars stress the fact that entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial behavior can be essentially pursued in any context (Thompson, 2000- Thai, 2014). In this regard, the research by Ratten (2010) which particularly deals with entrepreneurial behaviors and areas in sport firms, shows that innovation and change are key elements in such firms, so the process of entrepreneurship is an integral part of sport management .

When entrepreneurial, a sport firm can create conditions where managers, policy-makers, decision-makers and employees could better perceive opportunities and exploit the existing resources and opportunities to make innovations and hence contribute to higher and more rapid growth and survive in the regional, national and global domains. In recent years, interest in entrepreneurial organizations by government organizations has increased due to various reasons. There are barriers and obstacles to becoming entrepreneurial organizations. Like any other organization, these barriers exist also in the MSY (MohammadKazemi et al., 2011).

Therefore, due to the importance of OE and identification of its barriers and development of necessary solutions to meet them and also in light of the status of the MSY as the responsible actor for sport activities in Iran, the authors attempted to identify and prioritize the barriers to OE in the MSY.

METHODOLOGY

This research is applied in terms of purpose and utilizes a descriptive survey approach of data collection. Moreover, it is a mixed method research (qualitative and quantitative) in terms of methodology. The research population consists of the present and former managers of the MSY and also the experienced faculty of the Management School, Entrepreneurship School and Physical Education School in the University of Tehran. Considering that the aim of the research in the qualitative section was to obtain a rich and informed population, the purposeful sampling method was chosen. Accordingly, following interviews with 13 individuals from the population, a theoretical saturation level was achieved. As the purpose of sampling was to choose the best individuals for research and meeting the research objectives, the paper used a non-random purposeful sampling method for data collection. Therefore, the individuals with the highest command and expertise were selected. In the qualitative section, the qualitative content analysis and axial and open coding techniques were used for identification of the barriers to OE. The

Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) technique was used in the quantitative section to prioritize the identified barriers.

Research findings

The paper uses the mixed method (qualitative-quantitative). In this line, the analyses were carried out in two qualitative and quantitative stages. In the qualitative stage, the data was collected through interviews with 9 present and former top managers at the MSY and also academic experts in the fields of management, entrepreneurship and physical education. For this purpose, the authors surveyed the interviewees about structural barriers to OE in the MSY and then coded and categorized them.

Using the AHP technique in the quantitative section, the identified barriers were prioritized. For this goal, pairwise comparison questionnaires were prepared and distributed among the sample members. Later, the questionnaires were analyzed.

Qualitative section

In this section, the conducted interviews about barriers to OE with the sample members were coded.

Coding the interviews

The conducted interviews with the sample members were coded and categorized in Table 1.

Table 1: Coding of the interviews

No.	Interview's code	Verbal statements	Coding	
			Open	Axial
1	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₀ , I ₁₂	Maintaining the status quo instead of pursuing new opportunities	Strategy	Structural barriers
2	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₁ , I ₁₃	Lack of attention to the root causes of problems in solving social problems		
3	I ₁ , I ₂ , I ₆ , I ₁₀ , I ₁₂	Insufficient attention to the creation and implementation of new ideas in organizations by creating an R&D unit and defining and developing rules, procedures and policies		
4	I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Inability to search the internal and external environments in order to explore and transform, adapt to and implement new opportunities		

5	I ₄ , I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₁ , I ₁₃	Inability to accomplish new achievements through cooperation, consultation and contracting with other organizations	Decision making
6	I ₆ , I ₁₀	Lack of semi-independent units to think, initiate and strengthen	
7	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₉ , I ₁₂	Organizational innovation being limited to imitating other organizations by making small changes	
8	I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₀	Lack of an evaluation system in the organization	Evaluation system
9	I ₄ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₁ , I ₁₃	Lack of attention to the performance of business associates and partners	
10	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₂	Lack of a detailed examination of the business associates and partners' performance history	
11	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₁₀	Lack of care in choosing suitable partners	
12	I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₉ , I ₁₁	Existence of a formal hierarchy	Structure
13	I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₉	Coordination of activities via formal regulations	
14	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₁₃	Failure to run activities through independent self-management teams	
15	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Existence of detailed job descriptions	
16	I ₁ , I ₁₂	Disproportionate payment to employees in relation to their performance	Rewarding system
17	I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₈	Attention to monetary rather than internal incentives	
18	I ₄ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₃	Inflexibility in payments	
19	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₀	Mismatch between payment and risk-taking propensity and creativity	
20	I ₂ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Lack of attention to R&D activities by various units of the organization	R&D system
21	I ₁ , I ₅ , I ₉ , I ₁₃	Incorrect selection of research projects in the organization	

22	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₆	Lack of simultaneous attention to fundamental (theoretical) and practical research	Financial system	
23	I ₂ , I ₇	Considering tangible and short-term results rather than long-term research efforts		
24	I ₂ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₀ , I ₁₁	Considering general criteria in performance evaluation		
25	I ₄ , I ₅ , I ₁₁	Lingering over the past moves than focusing on future moves for performance evaluation		
26	I ₃ , I ₁₀	Budget planning based on traditional methods rather than focusing on programs and projects		
27	I ₄ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Slowness and complexity of the budget allocation process		
28	I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₃	Inability to attract financial resources from various channels (public, governmental, sales, international, etc.)		
29	I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₉ , I ₁₁ , I ₁₃	Lack of variety in revenues in the organization		
30	I ₂ , I ₄ , I ₈ , I ₁₀	Absence of cultural traits such as morality, honesty, trust, and credibility	Organizational culture	Behavioral barriers
31	I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₁₂	Mismatch between an individual's level of knowledge and the organization's needs		
32	I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Lack of commitment and loyalty among the members of the organization		
33	I ₂ , I ₅ , I ₁₃	Rigid and dull working environment		
34	I ₂	Low value of the organization's activities for its individual or organization clients		
35	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₁₁	Lack of attention to individuals, structures and processes		
36	I ₃ , I ₄ , I ₁₀	Lack of attention to creative and innovative individuals		
37	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₉	Limitations and failure to give freedom of		

	I ₁₃	action to employees at different organizational levels	Managerial-personal factors	
38	I ₁ , I ₆ , I ₁₀	Inability of employees and units to work long hours		
39	I ₉	Poor organizational levels of innovation and creativity		
40	I ₅ , I ₁₂	Lack of forward thinking and proactiveness in identification of new organizational and environmental areas		
41	I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₃	Reluctance toward challenges within the organization and lack of interest in team-working		
42	I ₁ , I ₂ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₁₀	Lack of appropriate and balanced organizational skills		
43	I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Lack of ability to negotiate between the units of the organization		
44	I ₄ , I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₀	Lack of persistence and need for achievement in the organization		
45	I ₂ , I ₁₁ , I ₁₂	Lack of employee participation in decision makings	Leadership style	
46	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Failure to delegate tasks to more creative and innovative individuals by the managers		
47	I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₀	Inadequate circulation among organization members for enrolling into management jobs or the executive board		
48	I ₄ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Problems arising from conflicts and differences among employees and between employees and the management	Organizational conflict	
49	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₈ , I ₁₃	Reluctance of the management toward conflicts and differences		
50	I ₁ , I ₈ , I ₉	Incorrect use of conflicts and differences for achievement of organizational goals		
51	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₇	Lack of an integrated evaluation and monitoring system in the area of physical	Legal-political	Environmental barriers

	I ₈ , I ₁₁	education		
52	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₁₀	Poor legislative processes for employment and employee support services		
53	I ₂ , I ₄ , I ₁₁	Employment of managers and policy-makers who are not familiar with sport management		
54	I ₁ , I ₅ , I ₁₂	Lack of attention to development of sport cooperatives and failure to support them to promote sport		
55	I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Lack of a balanced supply and distribution of sport facilities and establishments		
56	I ₄ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Lack of the necessary supportive laws to support women entrepreneurship at the national level		
57	I ₃ , I ₉ , I ₁₁	Lack of laws that result in reduced sport costs and increased public access to sports		
58	I ₅ , I ₈ , I ₁₀	Instability of management in the sport sector of the country due to political changes		
59	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₀	Failure to properly observe the laws of private ownership for making new investments		
60	I ₁ , I ₁₁	Complexities of trade laws (e.g. import and export of sporting products)		
61	I ₁ , I ₁₂	Lack of commitment to observe intellectual property laws (licenses, exclusive rights of sporting goods)		
62	I ₆ , I ₉ , I ₁₃	Interference of informal groups from outside the MSY in organizational affairs and in its affiliated units		
63	I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₉	Inadequate involvement of non-governmental institutions in sport management and provision of goods and services		

64	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₁₁	Failure to pass and allocate appropriate funding in sport	Economic factors	
65	I ₁ , I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Reduced per capita income		
66	I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₁₂	Decline in the value of the national currency versus the currencies of other countries		
67	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₁₃	Inappropriate distribution of funds for the development of different sport segments (educational, public, championship, professional, etc.)		
68	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₈	Lack of the economic security infrastructure in order to attract domestic and foreign investment		
69	I ₆ , I ₁₁	Increased interest rates and higher funding costs for investment		
70	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₁₃	Increased population of the unemployed in relation to the active people in the sport community		
71	I ₂ , I ₄ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₂	Insufficient government investment in sport infrastructure		
72	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₁₁	The organization's insufficient description of appropriate business opportunities for involvement in the private sector		
73	I ₄ , I ₇ , I ₁₀	Scant funding for the sport sector in comparison to the total national funds		
74	I ₄ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₉ , I ₁₂	Lack of financing facilities for sport entrepreneurship		
75	I ₆ , I ₁₀	Failure to expedite the implementation of Article 44 of the Constitution		
76	I ₂ , I ₆ , I ₉ , I ₁₂	High dependence of the Physical Education sector on government funding		
77	I ₅ , I ₈ , I ₁₁	Lack of proper entrepreneurial training programs at the Faculty of Physical Education		

78	I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Lack of effective programs for promoting entrepreneurship in the media		
79	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₉ , I ₁₀	Failure to identify or give recognition to successful sport entrepreneurs		
80	I ₂ , I ₄ , I ₅ , I ₁₁	Lack of practice to build an entrepreneurial culture in Iranian families		
81	I ₃ , I ₅ , I ₉	Lack of appropriate models for identifying sport demands		
82	I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₁₀	lack of a voluntary social participation culture and orientation in sporting activities		
83	I ₂ , I ₅ , I ₆	Employment of individuals with unrelated education and expertise		
84	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Lack of attention to the role of women and their participation in sporting activities		
85	I ₈	Limitations for women in entering sport management areas		
86	I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₈	Absence of a comprehensive system guiding the technology-based research in the MSY		Technological
87	I ₆ , I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₃	Negligence in transferring and exploiting the latest sport knowledge and technologies		
88	I ₂ , I ₃ , I ₅	Failure to properly utilize the advances in technology and other industrial sectors		
89	I ₂ , I ₉	Lack of equal access to modern sports technologies among the provinces		
90	I ₁ , I ₅ , I ₆ , I ₁₂	Poor information systems in sport management and the national system of sport information collection, processing, and distribution		
91	I ₁ , I ₃ , I ₆	Lack of international relations due to political sanctions	International environment	
92	I ₃ , I ₇ , I ₁₁	Failure to encourage joint activities at the regional and international levels		
93	I ₂ , I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₈	Failure to benefit from the knowledge and		

	I ₁₃	experience of other countries in the area of sports		
94	I ₄ , I ₆	Lack of necessary conditions for hosting major international events		
95	I ₃	The effect of international economic sanctions that prevent the entry of modern sport knowledge and equipment		
96	I ₅ , I ₇ , I ₁₂	Lack of infrastructure for improving the status of management and membership in the international organizations and federations		
97	I ₇ , I ₈ , I ₉ , I ₁₁	International laws that are the result of religious differences (such as a ban on hijab)		

In the following, a summary and analytical comparison of OE barriers in the MSY has been presented.

Table 2: Analytical comparison of OE barriers

Axial coding	Open coding	Interviewee code	Frequency
Structural barriers	Strategy	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	25
	Decision making	I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₆ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₂	6
	Evaluation system	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	18
	Structure	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	15
	Rewarding system	I ₁ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	15
	R&D system	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₃	12
	Financial system	I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	24
Behavioral barriers	Organizational culture	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	22
	Personal-managerial factors	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	29
	Leadership style	I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂	12
	Organizational	I ₁ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₃	11

	conflict		
Environmental barriers	Legal-political	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	43
	Economic	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	44
	Socio-cultural	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₀ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂	31
	Technological	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	17
	International environment	I ₁ ,I ₂ ,I ₃ ,I ₄ ,I ₅ ,I ₆ ,I ₇ ,I ₈ ,I ₉ ,I ₁₁ ,I ₁₂ ,I ₁₃	21

As can be seen from the table above, the coding of the interviews indicate three main barriers: structural (including strategy, decision-making, evaluation system, structure, rewarding system, R&D system, and financial system), behavioral (including organizational culture, managerial-personal factors, leadership styles, organizational conflict), and environmental (including legal-political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, and international).

Prioritization of the variables

In this section, the data are analyzed using the AHP technique.

Preferential judgment (pairwise comparisons)

Tables 3 through 6 present pairwise comparisons of OE barriers based on expert opinions.

Table 3: A pairwise comparison of OE barriers after aggregation of expert opinions

Main barrier	Behavioral	Structural	Environmental
Behavioral	1	2.06	2.54
Structural	0.485	1	1.77
Environmental	0.394	0.565	1
Sum	1.880	3.625	5.310

Table 4: A pairwise comparison of OE structural barriers after aggregation of expert opinions

Structural barriers	R&D system	Performance evaluation system	Rewarding system	Decision-making	Structure	Financial system	Strategy
R&D system	1	3.176	3.293	1.297	3.105	1.622	1.414
Performance evaluation system	0.315	1	2.330	2.450	1.770	1.860	1.297
Rewarding system	0.304	0.429	1	4.162	1.770	1.297	1.190
Decision-making	0.771	0.408	0.240	1	1.930	2.213	1.414
Structure	0.322	0.565	0.565	0.518	1	1.297	1.09
Financial system	0.616	0.537	0.771	0.452	0.771	1	1.190
Strategy	0.707	0.771	0.840	0.707	0.917	0.840	1
Sum	4.035	6.887	9.40	10.586	11.263	10.130	8.595

Table 5: A pairwise comparison of behavioral barriers after aggregation of expert opinions

Behavioral barriers	Organizational culture	Managerial-personal	Leadership style	Organizational conflict
Organizational culture	1	1.166	1.361	1.660
Managerial-personal	0.858	1	1.587	2.706
Leadership style	0.735	0.630	1	1.08
Organizational conflict	0.602	0.369	0.926	1
Sum	3.195	3.166	4.874	6.446

Table 6: A pairwise comparison of environmental barriers after aggregation of expert opinions

Environmental barriers	Socio-cultural	Technological	Economic	Legal-political	International environment
Socio-cultural	1	3.156	3.260	1.470	3.057
Technological	0.317	1	2.395	1.166	2.586
Economic	0.306	0.417	1	1.876	1.793
Legal-political	0.680	0.857	0.533	1	1.361
International environment	0.327	0.386	0.558	0.735	1
Sum	2.63	5.818	7.746	6.247	9.797

Normalizing, weighting and ranking the identified barriers

Normalization and weighted average are used in order to determine the weight of the criteria. In this line, the sum of the values from each column in the pairwise comparisons matrix was first calculated. Then, each value in a column is divided by the sum of that column. This new matrix is called the ‘normalized comparison matrix’. The normalized values and the weight of each identified barrier in the tables above are as follows:

Table 7: The normalized matrix of the main barriers to OE

Main barriers	Behavioral	Structural	Environmental	Weight	Rank
Behavioral	0.248	0.197	0.286	0.526	1
Structural	0.345	0.274	0.243	0.289	2
Environmental	0.407	0.528	0.469	0.185	3

In light of the results in Table (7), the main barriers to OE in the MSY include in order of importance: behavioral (0.526), structural (0.289), and environmental (0.185).

Table 8: The normalized matrix for the structural barriers

Structural barrier	R&D system	Performance evaluation system	Rewarding system	Decision-making	Structure	Financial system	Strategy	Weight	Rank
R&D system	0.248	0.461	0.364	0.122	0.276	0.160	0.164	0.256	1
Performance evaluation system	0.078	0.145	0.258	0.231	0.157	0.184	0.151	0.172	2
Rewarding system	0.075	0.062	0.111	0.393	0.157	0.128	0.138	0.152	3
Decision-making	0.191	0.059	0.026	0.094	0.171	0.218	0.164	0.132	4
Structure	0.080	0.082	0.062	0.049	0.089	0.128	0.127	0.088	7
Financial system	0.153	0.078	0.085	0.043	0.068	0.099	0.138	0.095	6
Strategy	0.175	0.112	0.092	0.067	0.081	0.083	0.116	0.104	5

Considering the results in Table (8), the main structural barriers to entrepreneurship in the MSY include in order of importance: the R&D system (0.256), the performance evaluation system (0.172), the rewarding system (0.152), decision-making (0.132), strategy (0.104), the financial system (0.095), and structure (0.088).

Table 9: The normalized matrix for the behavioral barriers

Behavioral barrier	Organizational culture	Managerial-personal factors	Leadership style	Organizational conflict	Weight	Rank
Organizational culture	0.313	0.368	0.279	0.257	0.304	2
Managerial-personal	0.268	0.316	0.326	0.420	0.332	1
Leadership style	0.23	0.199	0.205	0.167	0.200	3
Organizational conflict	0.188	0.1167	0.19	0.155	0.163	4

In light of the results in Table (9), the main behavioral barriers to entrepreneurship in the MSY include in order of importance: managerial-personal factors (0.332), organizational culture (0.304), leadership style (0.200), and organizational conflict (0.163).

Table 10: The normalized matrix for the environmental barriers

Environmental barriers	Socio-cultural	Technological	Economic	Legal-political	International environment	Weight	Rank
Socio-cultural	0.380	0.542	0.421	0.235	0.312	0.378	1
Technological	0.120	0.172	0.310	0.187	0.264	0.210	2
Economic	0.116	0.072	0.129	0.300	0.183	0.160	3
Legal-political	0.258	0.147	0.069	0.161	0.139	0.155	4
International environment	0.124	0.066	0.072	0.117	0.102	0.096	5

Considering the results in Table (10), the main environmental barriers to entrepreneurship in the MSY include in order of importance: socio-cultural (0.378), technological (0.210), economic (0.160), legal-political (0.155), and the international environment (0.096).

Consistency ratio of the judgments

Inconsistency Ratio (I.R) shows the amount of consistency and indicates the extent to which one could trust the obtained priorities resulted from the comparisons. Ratios smaller than 0.1 reflect the acceptable consistency of comparisons. Otherwise, the comparisons should be reconsidered. The results of I.R calculations are presented in Table (11).

Table 11: Consistency ratios of the judgments

Barriers to OE	λ_{max}	CI	CR
Main barriers	3.01	0.0073	0.012
structural	7.77	0.128	0.097
Behavioral	4.046	0.015	0.017
Environmental	5.315	0.079	0.070

As can be seen, CR values are smaller than 0.1. Therefore, the pairwise comparison matrix for the barriers to OE is thoroughly consistent in relation to the aggregation of the expert opinions matrix.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Organizational entrepreneurship (OE), one of the main branches of entrepreneurship, significantly contributes to organizational success and excellence. OE is described as the development of competencies and opportunities within the organization through a combination of new resources. It can foster growth and innovation in a traditional organization. Today, many larger organizations utilize entrepreneurship as a way to achieve competitive advantage in the long run. So, due to its importance, the present paper attempted to identify the barriers to OE in the context of the MSY. An analysis of the data from the interviews and questionnaires led to the identification of three major barriers namely, behavioral, structural and environmental. In the following, each barrier will be discussed in detail.

Behavioral barriers

The environmental barriers to OE in the MSY include organizational culture, managerial-personal factors, leadership styles, and organizational conflict.

- A) The present research results indicate that behavioral barriers to OE in the organization under study include managerial-personal factors: reluctance of managers to meet challenges, lack of essential organizational skills among some managers, lack of innovative individuals among the managers. As regards manager qualities, the studies by Moghimi (2005) and Markoska (2008) also support the present research. Moreover, employees' personality traits are one of the behavioral barriers and include lack of creativity and innovation, lack of accountability, and unwillingness to take risks. This finding is consistent with Mirazie Ahranjani and Moghimi (2003).
- B) Organizational culture: the present research is consistent with Kuratko and Goldsby (2004) and Fox (2005) in light of organizational culture. In their research, they highlight the meaningful effect of organizational culture on OE. Furthermore, Haghshenas et al., (2007) investigated the main factors affecting OE; their findings are also consistent with the present paper.
- C) Leadership style: the results show that factors such as meritocracy, delegation of tasks to creative and innovative employees, and employee participation in decision-makings are among the important managerial components required for OE which are lacking in the MSY and do not meet its needs. In his research, Moghimi (2005) studied entrepreneurship in governmental organizations. He particularly considers the manager's reluctance toward employee participation in decision-makings and lack of a suggestions system as important components that conduce to an unentrepreneurial leadership style. Additionally, Shah-Hosseini et al., (2009) found a meaningful relationship between task delegation and

organizational innovation and entrepreneurship which supports the findings of the present study.

- D) Organizational conflict: existence of organizational conflict between employees and the management, acknowledgment of the differences by the management, and existence of differences at the service of organizational goals are introduced as functional conflicts that have been investigated in this paper. In his comprehensive model of organizational entrepreneurship in Iranian non-governmental public organizations, Moghimi (2004) devotes a significant part of entrepreneurial behavior factors to investigating organizational conflict and tension. The obtained results in this study shows that many non-governmental organizations utilize conflict and differences of opinion in the service of their organizational goals. That being the case, there is an inconsistency with relation to the present study findings, since organizational conflict in the MSY not only hampers the achievement of goals but also is seen as one of the barriers to OE.

Structural barriers

The structural barriers to OE in the MSY include barriers related to strategies, decision-makings, the evaluation system, structures, the rewarding system, the R&D system, and the financial system.

- a) The R&D system: the criteria for the R&D system in this study include decentralized and integrated R&D activities, implementation of research projects based on research results, simultaneous implementation of applied and theoretical projects, long-term goals for research projects rather than short-term tangible results. The authors found that the experts and managers in the MSY view these factors as barriers to OE in the area of R&D. This finding is consistent with Moghimi (2004) who describes the structural barriers of his study as including limited ability of managers in monitoring the simultaneous implementation of applied and theoretical projects, lack of an R&D system, lack of an information management system as the identified structural sub-components.
- b) The performance evaluation system: based on the present study results, in the MSY, too, the management needs to foster entrepreneurial behavior as one of its priorities in order to overcome the structural barriers in the field of performance so as to improve organizational performance.
- c) The rewarding system: an appropriate rewarding system is one of the most important factors that affect OE. The results of this study indicate that the rewarding system in this ministry resides lower than the entrepreneurial state average and is far from entrepreneurial. Therefore, it can be said that the rewarding system in the MSY is lacking entrepreneurial characteristics.

- d) Decision-making: the structural barriers to OE in the area of decision-making include semi-independent thinking units, and making small changes. According to the present study results, these factors are not met in the context of the MSY. Entrepreneurs' analytical thinking is the main reason that their judgments and decisions are unaffected by cognitive biases used by others under uncertainty situations. Therefore, the MSY and the management by the same token need to foster entrepreneurial behavior in order to overcome the structural barriers in the area of decision-making and thus improve organizational performance.
- e) Strategy: results of this study indicate that factors such as considering new business opportunities, solving the root causes of the problems, creating new ideas, searching the external and internal environments, making new accomplishments, and collaborating with non-governmental organizations are among the major and required strategic components of entrepreneurship in the MSY. These factors have been seriously and systematically overlooked in the MSY. This reflects that the MSY is far from having a favorable entrepreneurial state.
- f) Financial system: many studies have introduced access to resources as one of the important factors influencing OE. Therefore, several factors are considered in the assessment of the financial system in connection with OE. In entrepreneurial organizations, the funding allocations process takes place easily and fast and entrepreneurial projects receive diverse sources of financial support. In the present study, the criteria for the financial system have been examined from the viewpoint of experts and those involved in the MSY. These criteria include the relation between direct and indirect bonuses and creativity, decentralized financial system, forward-thinking, traditional financial system, and allocation of funds speed. The low value which is smaller than the required average, suggest that the financial system is very far from having an entrepreneurial state.
- g) Structure: based on the study findings, designing an entrepreneurial structure for the Physical Education Organization will prove effective in improving the effectiveness of this organization. Such a structure is not appropriate for an entrepreneurial organization and provided the management is willing to foster entrepreneurship in their organization they should reconsider the structural patterns of their organization. These results suggest the dominance of a bureaucratic and mechanic structure in the MSY, consistent with the results by Moghimi (2004). Based on his study results, the public sector units are often depicted as exclusive, conservative and bureaucratic units which may result in the inability of the public sector to be entrepreneurial.

Environmental barriers

The environmental barriers to OE in the MSY include legal-political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, and international environment barriers.

- a) Socio-cultural: employment of individuals with unrelated education and expertise, lack of a voluntary social participation culture and orientation in sporting activities are among the barriers in this area that hamper OE in the MSY.
- b) Technological: negligence in transferring and exploiting the latest sports knowledge and technologies, lack of equal access to modern sports technologies among the provinces, absence of a comprehensive system guiding the technology-based research in the MSY, and poor information systems in sports management and the national system of sports information collection, processing, and distribution are among the technological barriers in this area that hamper OE in the MSY.
- c) Economic: increased population of the unemployed in relation to the active people in the sport community and lack of the economic security infrastructure in order to attract domestic and foreign investment are among the technological barriers in this area that hamper OE in the MSY.
- d) Legal-political: lack of attention to development of sport cooperatives and failure to support them in order to promote sport, poor legislative processes for employment and employee support services, lack of a balanced supply and distribution of sport facilities and establishments, and employment of managers and policy-makers who are not familiar with sport management are among the technological barriers in this area that hamper OE in the MSY.
- e) International environment: lack of necessary conditions for hosting major international events and lack of international relations due to political sanctions are among the technological barriers in this area that hamper OE in the MSY.

In a schematic look at the barriers to OE in the MSY, we find that this context is affected by a combination of limitations related to the legal, political, economic, cultural and technological issues between Iranian sport organizations and institutions and international sport organizations. If entrepreneurship is fostered in organizations with an approach to performance development and development of new trends, it is only reasonable that overcoming international barriers that affect the external environment of the MSY and given its close relationship with the political, legal, economic, cultural and technological dimensions, the implementation of entrepreneurship could be facilitated. Therefore, it seems that more studies need to be done using different approaches to obtain more comparative information.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) It is suggested that managers consider the development of new and more efficient ways of working for the organization in their agenda (to improve the structures and work processes). In this line, a team can be created to examine the ways work is done by the employees and choose the best and fastest work method to be provided to others as proposed programs.
- 2) It is suggest that managers allocate the necessary funding for the implementation of the projects based on innovative ideas. In this light, it is essential that the management allocate a specific and meaningful part of the organization's annual budget to innovative activities.
- 3) It is suggested that managers encourage individuals to generate ideas for improving organizational performance. For this purpose, the management could change fixed annual rewarding to rewarding based on innovative ideas. In this line, those employees who are able to voice their innovative ideas for performance improvement, would be rewarded financially and also in terms of their organizational positions.
- 4) It is suggested that managers support creative employees in bypassing inflexible rules and processes. Therefore, creative employees should have the management's word to be able to work independently of working hours and existing rules.
- 5) It is suggested that managers allow free hours for employees to develop their innovative ideas. In this line, the management could reduce the workload of innovative and creative employees, to find the free time to work on their ideas.
- 6) It is suggested that managers allow the employees the liberty to make their own decisions about what they are doing. In this regard, the managers should only set goals for employees and allow them to choose their own way of meeting those goals.
- 7) It is suggested that managers base rewarding on creativity and innovativeness. In this line, the fixed annual rewards to all employees is replaced by division of the total reward between employees based on their creativity and innovativeness.
- 8) It is suggested that managers make a reasonable balance between the time and the right volume of doing works properly. Therefore, managers need to use time and work measurement techniques to determine the time needed to accomplish tasks successfully.
- 9) It is suggested that manager strive constantly to offer new services within the scope of their organization's mission description. To do this, the management could form idea generating teams to offer new and innovative services within the scope of the organization's mission description.

- 10) It is suggested that managers strive constantly to tackle obstacles and problems in doing their jobs. In this line, the management needs to regularly survey the employees to identify and solve work-related problems and obstacles.
- 11) Among other suggestions of this study include delegation of tasks to creative and innovative employees; employee participation in decision-makings; establishment of ethics, honesty, trust, and credibility; attempts to increase commitment and loyalty among members of the organization; encouraging managers to accept change and seek opportunities; enhancing organizational skills in managers, delegation of more authority to employees; encouraging individuals to voice their novel and innovative ideas; creation of a competitive environment coupled with a feeling of trust and announcement of results; allowing individuals to express their different viewpoints and tolerating constructive conflicts, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Drucker. P.F. (1995), *Entrepreneurial Strategies*, Calif. Manage. Rev., 27: 9- 25
2. Fox ,Julie M., (2005) *Organizational entrepreneurship and the Organizational performance linkage in university extension*
3. Haghshenas, A. (2007). *A Model of Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector of Iran. Management Sciences of Iran Quarterly. 2(8).*
4. Mohammad Kazemi, R., Ghasemi, H., Rostambakhsh, M.R. (2011). *Identification and Analysis of Behavioral Barriers to Organizational Entrepreneurship in the Sports Organization (the Ministry of Sport and Youth). Scientific Journal of Contemporary Research in Sport Management, 1 (2).*
5. Moghimi, M. (2005). *Entrepreneurship in Public Organizations. Fara Andish Publications*
6. Mirzaie Ahranjani, H., Moghimi, M. (2003). *An Optimal Model for NGOs: An Entrepreneurial Approach. Knowledge Management Journal. Vol 62.*
7. Moghimi, M. (2004). *Entrepreneurship in Civil Society Organizations: A research into NGOs. University of Tehran Publications, 2nd Ed.*
8. . Omid, Y., Mohammad Kazemi, R. Azmoudeh, S. (2016). *Identification and Analysis of Environmental Barriers to Organizational Entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sport and Youth. Sport Management, 8(5).*
9. Thai, M. T. T., & Turkina, E. (2014) *Macro-level determinants of formal entrepreneurship versus informal entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(4) 490– 510*
10. Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S Covin, J. G. (2014). "Diagnosing a., firm 's internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship". Elsevier, *Business Horizons*,

11. Markoska, Monika (2008)." Interpreneurship- Way of work in organizations for improvement of working quality" 5th International Scientific Conference Business and management .
12. Mobaraki, Mohammad Hassan; Moghimi Esfandabad, Hossein; safavinejhad Sharzad, Mohammad Kazemi, Reza.(2013).Entrepreneurial team formation the success of the companies
13. Ratten, V, (2010). "Sport-based entrepreneurship: towards a new theory, of entrepreneurship and sport management". Int Entrep Manag J. DOI 10.1007/s11365-010-0138-z. 7(1): 57-69
14. Shahhosseni, Ali, et al. (2009)." Studing the Relation of Organization Entrepreneurship & Financial Funtions at Tehran Customs", European Journal of Social Science-Volume 12, Number 1.
15. Thompson, J., Geoff, A., Lees, A., (2000), "Social entrepreneurship: 'a new look at the people and the potential'", management decision, vol.38, no.5, p.5.