
INTELLIGENT SPORT ORGANIZATION

Submitting author: Dr Inga Staskeviciute-Butiene
Lithuanian sports university, Sport management, economics and sociology
Kaunas, 44221
Lithuania

All authors: Inga Staskeviciute-Butiene (corresp), Irena Valantine

Type: Scientific

Category: M: Information, Knowledge Creation and Innovation
Management in Sport

Abstract

A very interesting case of global function system in world society is the global system of sports which only arises late in 19th century society. The global sports system involves the mechanisms of production, experience and consumption. Achievement sport involves the identification and development of talent; its production on a global stage, in a single or multi-sport event and its consumption by direct spectators or, through the media complex, a global mass audience. Over time there is a tendency towards the emergence of a global achievement sport monoculture - a culture where administrators, coaches and teachers promote and foster achievement sport values and ideologies and where competitions and tournaments are structured along highly co modified and rationalised lines (Maguire, 2009). Within the global sports system there is not only an international rank order of nations, but these nations can be grouped, more or less, along political, economic and cultural lines, into core, semi-peripheral and peripheral blocs.

Sport organisations exist to provide sport products and services in the sport industry (Chelladurai, 2005). One critical difference between sport organisations and business organisations is the way they measure performance (Smith & Stewort, 1999). The main purpose of business organisations is to make a profit. Sport governing bodies are sport organisations whose primary goal is to promote and develop sports at all levels in a given territory and sport discipline. This entails control and supervision of a sport, guaranteeing periodic competition at national and international levels, amateur and Professional, and from grassroots to senior categories. Another type of sport organisation is the one whose main activity is associated to the production of sport spectacles. The operations and activities of these organisations are subordinated to the venue and rules of sport governing bodies, as well also f Professional teams. The main activity of these sport organisations is to design a competition system articulating the interests of all the actors in order to

create an attractive sport event. The third type of sport organisation in the classification is the one we call the sport providing entity, whose main activity is to design and deliver sport programs for a given community such as clubs, local sport programs, fitness centres, and university sport programs (Gomez, Opazo, Marti, 2008). These are private, non-profit associations, dedicated to the provision of recreational sport activities at a local level.

Sport organizations exist to perform tasks that can only be executed through cooperative effort, and sport management is responsible for the performance and success of these organizations. With so many options now available to the sport consumer, it is no longer enough for a sport organization to be simply managed well. To compete and succeed in today's environment, the challenge for every sport organization is to be better. Achieving new standards (to increase the quality of the products and services, speed and flexibility in responding to customers, to innovate to constantly provide new products and services) is important for different type of sport organizations.

The analysis of factors influencing success of the sport organizations let us claim that those factors affected the transformations and analysis of organizational activities allowing effective adaptation to the rapidly changing environment implementing strategic aims. The changes in the environment encourage sport organizations to review their management methods and modernize them if they want to remain or compete in the global market and to create its long-term advantage. The main problem concerning the sport organizations and making them implement modern management paradigms is the duality of functions which divides the organization into units increasing the internal competition and reducing the possibilities to create new knowledge. This undoubtedly affects the insufficiently productive functioning of the sport organization under modern conditions of globalization. According to the approach of constant development, when the architecture of the sport organization is purposefully transformed, it becomes possible to develop the internal dimensions of the organization expediently, aiming to create an intelligent sport organization. When we speak about an intelligent sport organization, we have in mind some characteristics which allow classing it to the group of intelligent organizations. An intelligent sport organization should act as a system where collaborative decisions are made, the co-workers show initiative and the ability to make teams unreservedly; organization should allow a degree of decentralization which promotes organizational learning and integrating processes; sport organization should also be able to generate knowledge and use it when it adapts to the environment. The profound analysis of the research literature let us conclude that organizational intelligence can be perceived as a certain way of organizing organizational activities which emerges organizational culture and becomes an inseparable part of it. Sport organization can become intelligent only because of significantly altered internal dimensions.

Knowledge and skills become valuable only when they are used in

certain purposeful activities. In the society of science there is an increase of interest in the recognition, mobilization and formalization of employees' knowledge in order to promote innovations and competitive ability. Organizational intelligence (further – OI) could be a way to promote innovations, create and share knowledge. At the beginning most authors (McMaster, 1998; March, 1999) compared organizational intelligence to information / data management by means of informational technologies, but lately (Farrel, 2007; Ahmadinejad et.al., 2014) view this management paradigm as an absolutely new means of organizational management which involves all the processes (organizational openness; formality; knowledge creation and management; group work; organizational learning; leadership expression; systemic thinking) on the plane of internal dimensions.

We can conclude that OI refers to its created value – the improvement of the effectiveness of its activities. Activities of any organization are directed towards the achievement of results, which are expressed as aims, vision and mission. Modern management applies various indices of the evaluation of organizational effectiveness. Effectiveness of business organizations is directly linked to its profits – material output. The effectiveness of activities of sport organizations cannot be linked with the increase of profit because the aims of sport organizations deal with meeting the needs of the community. Thus, the notion of intelligence of sport organizations is different because they are conditioned by the social needs and attitudes despite their effort to compare to business organizations.

OI is a phenomenon which manifests in the organization's relationship with its main competencies; mission and aims; market in which organization operates and where it disseminates its skills and knowledge; external environment which evaluates its effectiveness. Thus, OI could be viewed only in its relationship with economy, market and cultural environment where the organization operates; also OI manifests in organizational activities and the interaction of its subsystems, which enables the organization to adapt to the changing environment.

The formation of OI directly depends on the number of creative, innovative and initiative employees in the organization and their ability to communicate among themselves; the heads of the organization must be discontent with the present situation and constantly look for ways to act more effectively; OI is more common to those organizations which exist in the turbulent environment; organizational culture must reflect in the values of each employee: orientation to the problems and changes, initiatively, taking risk.

In an intelligent organization the culture should be more oriented to the relations than to the outcomes because only with sufficient communication (both formal and informal) it is possible to create values inherent to OI; structure; internal economy (distribution of resources is linked to strategic aims and their implementation, involving the organization's employees who are interested in the dimension of final

outcomes); the methods used in the intelligent organization should match the strategic aims and employees' skills, and also condition creation of new knowledge and organization's openness both in internal and external communication; evaluation and reward is nothing else but feedback which enables the evaluation of employees results in accordance with their abilities to adapt their behavior.

OI is a synergetic effect – the result of the activities of the whole system, not only its separate parts. Each component includes the processes of organizational activities and organizational systems. But only the synergetic effect of those components enables the development of an intelligent organization. In other words, an intelligent organization should develop its internal dimensions through the components of OI:

1) Formal vs. informal organization. An intelligent organization cannot avoid a certain level of bureaucracy because of the state regulation and the legal basis which demands to maintain a certain form. So an intelligent organization pays more attention to the development of an informal organization which manifests through the intensification of communication network among the departments and employees carrying out different functions. A formal organization becomes a "framework" of the intensive internal communication.

2) Individual vs. group work. Speaking about an intelligent organization we must be aware that group work is more linked not only to the fulfilment of one's functions but also to the involvement of employees in the creation of new knowledge, strategies, decision making, implementation of innovations, etc.

3) Individual vs. organizational intelligence. For individual intelligence to become organizational intelligence we need such dimensions as awareness what is going on, communication, learning, solving problems, decision, making, creativity, ability to act and feedback. Organizational intelligence becomes possible only when the members of the organization start working together for the mutual aim.

4) Analytical vs. systemic thinking. In an intelligent organization the ratio between analytical and systemic thinking should benefit systemic thinking, i.e. every employee in an intelligent organization must be aware of their role in the common system of the organization, and the organization must perceive its role in the relationship with the external environment and meeting the needs of consumers and the society.

5) Closed vs. open organization. Constructing an intelligent organization it is necessary to ensure that the organization was open both internally and in its relation with the external environment, so that more effective activities and timely adaptation to the changing environment were possible.

6) Management vs. leadership. In the organization which looks for new activities enabling transformations and new ways of management, the most appropriate management would be that which is based on values and which ensures continuous dialogue between the managers and the employees - the most important owners of organizational competencies - and which allows creating culture oriented towards relationships.

7) Individual vs. organizational learning. In an intelligent organization the main attention should be paid to organizational learning because only there “good experience” can be shared and new knowledge can be created. It also ensures a free flow of information.

Thus, the research problem in this study would be as follows: in what extent the sport organization should develop its’ internal dimensions if it seeks to become an intelligent organization?

The research methodology was diagnostic instrument (questionnaire survey) to evaluate the level of organizational intelligence in sport organizations’ (Staskeviciute, 2009). It was created an original research methodology, which was compounded from 146 rank scale questions. The diagnostic instrument was formed on the basis of the components of organizational intelligence mentioned above (formal organization vs. informal organization; individual work vs. group work; individual intelligence vs. organizational intelligence; analytical thinking vs. systemic thinking; closed organization vs. opened organization; management vs. leadership; individual learning vs. organizational learning). Each of these organizational intelligence processes dimensions is created from factors, which were distinguished in factorial analysis. These factors reflect the main features of organizational intelligence processes’ dimensions. In summary, it can be stated that these factors include all levels of organization – individual, group and organizational, which secure the entrenchment of organizational intelligence in organizational culture.

The internal reliability of diagnostic instrument was computed by using Cronbach alpha rate. The rate of prepared questionnaire was 0,987. Because it is near 1, it can be stated, that the internal reliability of this questionnaire is high – the questions are interrelated and they measure the same phenomenon.

The devised diagnostic instrument for the evaluation of the development of the organization in the context of an intelligent organization allows evaluating the degree of internal organizational dimensions and foreseeing the direction of its development.

Nearly one hundred various Lithuanian sport organizations took part in the survey.

At the time of abstract submission, the data obtained in the research is analyzed, so results are not yet available, but at the conference they will be presented.

References

1. Chelladurai, P. (2005) Managing organisations for sport and physical activity. Scottsdale, Arizona, Holcomb Hothowoy.
2. Farrell A. (2007) An Organizational Intelligence Framework for the Agile Corporation. White Paper, Woodlawn Marketing Services.
3. Gomez, S., Opazo, M., Marti, C. (2007). Structural characteristics of sport organizations: main trends in the academic discussion. IESE Business School, Working paper.

-
4. Masoomah A. M., Farsijani, H., Taghi Amin, M. (2014) Organizational Intelligence and Examination of Its Relationship with Employees' Performance (Case study: Supreme Audit Court), *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1), pp. 277-289.
 5. March, J. G. (1999) Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2, pp. 71 – 87.
 6. Maguire, J. (2009). *Sport and Globalization*.
 7. McMaster, M.D. (1998) *Organizational Intelligence. Knowledge Based Development. The Industrial Society*.
 8. Smith, A., & Stewart, B. (1999) *Sports Management: A Guide to Professional Practice*. St Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
 9. Staskeviciute, I. (2009) *Development of intelligent organization in the context of internal organizational dimensions transformations*. Doctoral dissertation, Kaunas.