



IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND BARRIERS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRACK AND FIELD IN IRAN

Mojtaba Jodi¹, Mahdi Naderi Nasab²

¹M.Sc, Physical Education and Sport Marketing,
Azad University, Ghazvin Branch, Iran

²Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sport Marketing,
Azad University, Ghazvin Branch, Iran

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to identify problems and barriers to the development of the track and field in Iran. The method used in this research is descriptive. The population of this research, current and former directors of track and field, heads of various committees track and field Federation and officials of the provinces, sports management and some pundits and prominent in track and field are estimated 260 to have formed. Due to the unavailability of certain population number was considered as a whole. In the end, 171 questionnaires were analyzed. Data were collected in this study included self-made questionnaire with 47 items was five components. In order to analyze the data, descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation, charting), and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to determine the normal distribution of data, Friedman test was used for ranking each factor. The results showed that the barriers are the most important to least important barriers are cultural barriers, social barriers, structural barriers, economic barriers and administrative and legal obstacles.

Keywords: privatization, development of track and field, administrative barriers, political barriers, legal barriers, cultural barriers, economic barriers

1. Introduction

Today, sport is a growing trend around the world and our country, like other developing countries, are entering the international areas. Areas that comply with a little bit, and when it comes to competition sharp differences of our country will be determined by countries with knowledge of sports science (Sajjadi, 2003). One of the

threads that progress in the sign of the development of sports in each country is, is track and field (Yazdanpanah, 2002). Among the medal, track& field, because of various materials, 24 among men and 23 among women matter, have a determining place in the Olympics. This field, with a variety of sprints, half strength, endurance, marathon, relief, throw, jump, hiking and multi- has a lot of modal in its place. Track and field with its field activities (walking, running, jumping and throwing) that are basic part of every human activity and its development can be an introduction to the development of other sports (Ramezanejad, 2000). But this field in our country so far had little success and few medals of the Olympic Games is not winning (just medal of Haddadi). This failure is rooted in several factors, some human, some administrative, some economic and some cultures have been considered. In most of the research that has been done in sport, economic factors and the absence of influential factors, the most important obstacles to the development of sports in the country (Deldar, 2011, Firozi et al., 2011, and Araghi and explorer, 2013).

Shabani et al (2010) affirms that the most important barrier to the development of track and field is the lack of funding and other resources that show the importance of economic factors. These facilities should be provided to the development of the sport to the development and improvement of results in competitions. Logo or show high credit institutions, the sports industry is another important issue by researchers as a vital factor for economic development and attract sponsors to the mentioned sports (Dahrty and Murray, 2007, J. Yang, 2004). Basically, the sponsors are seeking to make contact with the face of prestige sporting events to earn more money for their products or services. In this context, it is natural for companies to invest sponsors looking for parts that have better credibility and prestige among the public (Elahi, 2008). One of the most well-known researchers suggests ways to improve the club's logo or attract internationally recognized elite players and coaches know (Dabsn and Goddard, 2001).

Broment and colleagues (2006) argued that attract big-name players, simultaneously sporting success, enhance the image of the club and thus attract more funding from sponsors and television broadcasting to lead And ultimately increase the stock price will bring the club. Although the formulation of solutions to improve the logos of clubs and professional leagues requires a systematic and organized studies However, it is essential that clubs and federations to do the necessary steps in the development of the sports industry at the national and international and show their logo or not. Due to the high management costs sports clubs, especially in the beginning, paying grants or low-interest loans with long-term repayments to the private sector is essential and because there is in the private sector and there is also a fear of lack of return on investment, awarding grants or low-interest loans can be a good incentive to enter into the arena of sport. Is also possible like sports among service activities is the

interest rate as well as other parts of the manufacturing and service facilities are calculated. Sports experts believe that the rate is high and it should be reduced to the field. This means that if lending rate of investment in the housing sector as well as encouraging private sector investment can be in sports (Ali Dost, 2010). In general, given that the first factor in the development of processes, identify problems and challenges it is facing (Zolelm, 2003). So the main question is what are the problems and obstacles facing the development of track and field in Iran?

2. Method

The method used in this research is descriptive. The population of this research, current and former directors of track and field, heads of various committees track and field Federation and officials of the provinces, sports management and some pundits and prominent in track and field are estimated 260 to have formed. Due to the unavailability of certain population number was considered as a whole. In the end, 171 questionnaires were analyzed. Data were collected in this study included self-made questionnaire with 47 items was five components. In order to analyze the data, descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation, charting), and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to determine the normal distribution of data, Friedman test was used for ranking each factor.

3. Results

The results show that 14.6 percent of people under 30 years, 26.9% between 30 and 40 years, 30.4% between 41 and 50 and 28.1% over 51 years old. 10.5% of participants were club managers, 19.9 percent were university professors, 39.7 percent were pundits and officials of track and field Federation of and 29.9 were track and field athletes. Also 7.6% of the subject participating in the study was lower of experts, 45 percent were bachelor's, 25.1 percent are master's and 22.2 percent were PhD degree.

Table 1: Chi-square test prioritized economic barriers to equality in the development of track and field

Sample	Chi2	Df	P	Result
171	193.825	17	0/001	There is a significant difference between prioritizing of economic barriers.

The following are economic barriers to the development of track and field:

1. Lack of participation of foreign investors in the track and field club,

2. The reluctance to enter the private sector to invest in track and field have reason to believe the lack of guaranteed return of investment,
3. Lack of appropriate allocation of television rights to professional clubs of track and field.

Table 2: Chi-square test prioritized management barriers to equality in the development of track and field

Sample	Chi2	Df	P	Result
171	155.265	17	0/001	There is a significant difference between prioritizing of management barriers.

The following are management barriers to the development of track and field:

1. There are short-term, limited and results-oriented management in track and field Club of Iran,
2. The lack of economic thinking and attitudes in managers of track and field Federation and clubs in Iran,
3. Weaknesses in the management and administration of track and field Federations and clubs.

Table 3: Chi-square test prioritized structural barriers to equality in the development of track and field

Sample	Chi2	Df	P	Result
171	139.538	17	0/001	There is a significant difference between prioritizing of structural barriers.

Structural barriers to the development of track and field are as follows:

1. Lack of proper planning and economic strategy for the growth and development,
2. Appearance and lack of infrastructure activities to move to professional clubs,
3. Lack of attention to the talent and lack of basic teams and players rearing in most clubs.

Table 4: Chi-square test prioritized socio-cultural barriers to equality in the development of track and field

Sample	Chi2	Df	P	Result
171	139.538	17	0/001	There is a significant difference between prioritizing of sociocultural barriers.

Sociocultural barriers to the development of track and field are as follows:

1. Low of motivation in sponsors to work in the field of track and field,
2. Lack of appropriate ages based culture,
3. Lack of advertising in order to growth and development of track and field.

Table 5: Chi-square test prioritized legal barriers to equality in the development of track and field

Sample	Chi2	Df	P	Result
171	505.236	17	0/001	There is a significant difference between prioritizing of legal barriers.

Legal barriers to the development of track and field are as follows:

1. Lack of government support of athletics and sports clubs private,
2. The lack of a coherent legal framework to support and enforce of track and field,
3. Lack of executive talent identification process and focus on attracting players in track and field in Iran.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of the research in economic barriers were consistent with Deldar (2011), Elahi (2003) and Judio and Philip (2003), Alidoust Ghahfarokhi (2009), Gharekhani (2009). Most investors tend to invest in sectors that partly ensured the return of capital and less risk than other available alternatives experience. In other words, in economic terms, in any industry that is high risk to investment, investment movement, and in any industry where the yield is expected higher investment. It will be a faster movement of capital (Askarian Jafari, 2008). Despite the relatively high popularity of sports in Iran, due to structural reasons and different management, track & field athlete of industry economic development process runs slowly. Therefore, in such circumstances seems natural that the private sector the confidence to invest sponsors is not in an acceptable range. In this regard, if the sports industry is a major take steps in economic development and become an industry in itself There will be a secure environment for investment and the obstacle is economic in nature will be resolved (Elahi, 2007).

The results of the research in administrative barriers are consistent with Deldar (2011), Elahi (2003), Esfandiari (2008). The most important obstacle in the development of the sport of athletics in the country looked short-term, limited and results-oriented management in the track and field in Iran. As you are aware unfortunately, most managers when they are enter the sports just thinking immediate and short-term results and long-term results and the backing of not care. Other barriers to the development of the track and field in the Iran, the lack of economic thinking and attitudes of managers

and clubs and Federation can be noted. Since most clubs Athletics are government in Iran, are financed from the state budget, as a result, managers are not looking after money and the club fully funded by public and spend the club's affairs.

In the structural impediments, results with the results Deldar, (2011), Elahi (2003) and Ali doost (2009) were consistent. Authoritarian and top-down approach to privatization (bureaucratic structures) in the track and field from other administrative obstacles in the way of the development of track and field in Iran. Sport has social, cultural, economic and political wide (Davari, 2000). For this reason, some officials do not want the club to be removed from the scope of its authority in the private sector. In the socio-cultural barriers, the results of the research were consistent with Askarian (2008), Monavaryan (2004), Gorsya, Boodrigz (2002), Brands & Frank (2006) and Elahi (2003). The most important socio-cultural barriers that impede the development of track and field in Iran are the low motivation for sponsors for activities in the field of track and field. Because the track and field have a little fan than other sports and the lack of broadcast television IRIB sponsors have not strongly motivated to enter to this field and trying to invest in other disciplines which have more fans.

In the legal obstacles findings of this research is the line with the results of Deldar (2011), Ali doost (2009). Economic barriers that impede the development of the track and field in the Iran can be the lack of a coherent legal framework to support and enforce the sport of athletics noted, Basically, in many countries, the implementation of the privatization program is based on law that is approved specifically for that purpose, These laws cover a variety of topics that are widely differ from country to country and depends on factors such as legal regulations necessary to protect the ownership of the private sector, the need to form a body monitoring the implementation of privatization and so on. Unfortunately, implementation of this policy in the Iran without any specific legal framework has been developed and because of this aspect correlated with various problems from the multiplicity to decision-making; adopting appropriate implementation methods and enforcement need to be faced.

References

1. Barros .C.P (2006), The Financial crisis in Portuguese Football, *Journal of Sport Economics*, 7(1), 96-104.
2. Bloom, M., Grant, M. & Watt, D. (2005). *Strengthening Canada: The Socioeconomic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada*, the conference Board of Canada, pp: 36-38.

3. Brandes, L., Frank, E. (2006), How Fans improve competitive balance: an empirical analysis of the German Bundesliga. University of Zurich, Institute for Strategy and business economics, working paper no 41.
4. Doherty, A., Murray, M. (2007). The strategic sponsorship process in a non-profit sport organization. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16(1): 45-59.
5. Forrest, D., Simmons, R. (2002), Outcomes uncertainty and attendance demand in sport: the case of English Soccer, *the Statistician*, 51 (2): 229-241.
6. Garcia, J., Rodriguez, P. (2002). The determinants of football match attendance revisited: Empirical evidence from the Spanish football league, *Journal of sport economics*, 3(1): 18- 38.
7. Guidio Ascari, Philippe Gagnepain (2003). How Inefficient are Football Clubs? An Evaluation of the Spanish Arms Race. Department of Economics. University of Madrid. January (2003).
8. Hamil, S, Holt, M, Michie, J, Oughton, C and Shailer, L (2004). The Corporate Governance of Professional Football Clubs, *Corporate Governance: International Journal of Business in Society*, 4:2:44-51.
9. Hamil, S, Michie, J, Oughton, C and Shailer, L (2002) 'the State of the Game: the Corporate Governance of Football Clubs', *New Academy Review*, spring, pp 79-92.
10. Hamil, S, Michie, J, Oughton, C and Warby, S (2000) 'Recent Developments in Football Ownership', *Soccer and Society*, Vol 1 pp 1-10.
11. Herrmann, J.L., Kacha, M., Derbaix, Ch.(2016). "I support your team, support me in turn!" ☆: The driving role of consumers' affiliation with the sponsored entity in explaining behavioral effects of sport sponsorship leveraging activities. *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 69, Issue 2, February 2016, Pages 604–612.
12. Jensen, J.A., Cobbs, J.B., Turner, B.A.(2016). Evaluating sponsorship through the lens of the resource-based view: The potential for sustained competitive advantage. *Business Horizons*. Volume 59, Issue 2, March–April 2016, Pages 163–173
13. Keen, MP.A. (2009). English Football and its Governance. All Party Parliamentary Football Group. In: www.allpartyfootball.com
14. Kesene, S. (2007). Belgian Football: A Comment. *Journal of Sport Economics*, 8(6): 670- 674.
15. Keshock, C.M. (2004), The Effects of economic impact information on the attitudes of potential sports sponsors operating in mid-size and small college communities. Unpublished Doctoral degree Dissertation, The Florida State University, College of Education, department of sport Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education.

16. Lopez, L., Garate, R. (2007). The demand for sport: sport consumption and participation models. *Journal of sport Management*, 21(1): 103- 122.
17. Sport Industry Research Center. (2004). *The Impact of Achieving Sport England's Target for Making England an Active Nation by 2020*, Sheffield, England: Sport Industry Research Center, pp 2-3.
18. Sterlize, B. (2005). *Relationship in Sport Sponsorship: a marketing perspective*, unpublished doctoral degree dissertation, faculty of management, University of Johannesburg.
19. Tomasini, N. (2004). NCAA corporate sponsor objectives: Are there differences between divisions i-A, I-AA and I-AAA? , *Sport marketing Quarterly*, 13(4): 253-264.
20. Wakefield, K. L. (1995). The pervasive effects of social influence sporting event attendance. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 19(4): 335- 351.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).