



Strategic Map for the Balanced Performance as a Tool for Managing the Strategic Performance at the Egyptian Olympic Bodies in the Light of Thirty-First Session Results of Rio De Janeiro, Brazil, 2016 (Comparative Study)

Hussein Mohamed Abdel-haleem¹, Mohamed Fathy Abdel-hafez²

¹ Assistant professor at sport administration, Faculty of physical education, Minia University, Egypt

² Instructor at sport administration dep., Faculty of physical education, Minia University, Egypt

Abstract

The research aims to measure the strategic performance of the Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Committee Paralympics), depending on the Balanced Scorecard, including the proposed conception for the strategic map of the balanced performance as a tool to manage the strategic performance of those Olympic committees. The researchers used the descriptive approach by "surveys," "analytical Comparative method"

The research community included the beneficiaries from the Olympic committees" Olympic Committee and Paralympics, represented in (ICRC staff, technical and administrative organs of the teams, players) and participation in the Olympic Games in the period (from 5 to August 21, 2016) and participation in Paralympic Games in the period (from 7 to 18 September 2016) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, with a sample of (260) two hundred and sixty players. The sample of Olympic Committee was (192) one hundred ninety-two individuals as a percentage of (60.18%), while the sample Paralympic Committee amounted to (68) eight and sixty members with a percentage of (60%).

The researchers used a questionnaire based on the dimensions of the Balanced Scorecard aims to identify the level of performance of strategic Olympic committees (IOC / Paralympic Committee).

One of the most important results is the weakness of the strategic performance level in general Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Committee Paralympics). Also that there are no statistically significant differences between the Olympic committees in the total degree of the questionnaire in the direction of (Paralympic Committee). Reaching to the proposed conception for the strategic map of the balanced performance at the Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Paralympic Committee) under discussion.

The most important recommendations to activate the proposed concept of strategic map of the balanced performance within the Olympic committees "under consideration" as a tool for managing the strategic performance, and try to circulate the idea to all the other sports bodies.

Introduction & Research problem:

Balanced Scorecard is considered an important indicator of performance evaluation within the bodies. It is also one of the most important tools that can help in facing issues that relate to the process of the implementation of their strategic plans, where many research studies have shown that approximately between (70% to 90%) from bodies and institutions fail to implement their own strategic plans because of the problems associated with the low level of commitment and the strategic crowd, so the implementers apply the

Balanced Scorecard as a measurement system guiding the strategy as to contribute in solving the problem of connecting, managing and applying the strategy (Malkawi 2009: 57), (El Maher 26, 2007).

Through the interviews conducted by the researchers with some officials within the Olympic bodies, they found that there is an absence of indicators of the strategic performance measurement and weakness in the strategic orientation for its administration, as it is always being planning for a sports event or participation for short term without considering the returns that can be gained with the strategic planning for those sporting events, as evidenced

by what happened in the recent Olympic Games in Brazil cycle during the period from (5 to 12 August, 2016), which Egypt participated in with (122) athletes with the biggest mission in its history and has spent the amount of 130 million pounds of equivalent to 13 million dollars to reap medals, which Egypt got just (3) bronzes as well also in the Paralympic Games (Olympics with special needs) during the period from (7 to 18 September, 2016) in

Brazil, which Egypt participated in with (44) athletes, and earned (12) medal and has spent 61 million pounds.

The two researchers analyzed the results of Egypt through its participation in Olympic and Paralympic Games and preparing a documentary study for the results of Egypt during the historical period from (1988 to 2016), the results of Egypt were as follows:

Table (1)
Results of Egypt in the Olympic and Paralympic Games during the historical period from (1988 to 2016)

Game	year	Committee	Participated countries	Number of medals Egypt have obtained& its type				The general arrange of Egypt
				Gold	silver	bronze	total	
SEOUL, Korea	1988	Paralympic	60	1	2	5	8	35
		Olympic	159	-	-	-	-	0
Barcelona, Spain	1992	Paralympic	83	7	6	7	20	19
		Olympic	169	-	-	-	-	0
Atlanta American	1996	Paralympic	104	8	11	11	30	21
		Olympic	197	-	-	-	-	0
Sydney, Australia	2000	Paralympic	122	6	12	10	28	23
		Olympic	199	-	-	-	-	0
Athens Greece	2004	Paralympic	135	6	9	8	23	24
		Olympic	202	1	1	3	5	46
BEIJING China	2008	Paralympic	140	4	4	12	20	29
		Olympic	204	-	-	1	1	80
London England	2012	Paralympic	164	4	4	6	14	36
		Olympic	204	-	2	-	2	58
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	2016	Paralympic	161	3	5	4	12	30
		Olympic	205	-	-	3	3	75

Through studying these results and processed them statistically, it was found that Egypt is always stable in the upper quartile in terms of arrangement, that means, it is one of the developed nations in sports with special needs. Also it is clear that Egypt is always also stable in the lower quartile in terms of arrangement, which means, it is one of the latest countries in the Olympic sports. Through analyzing the previous table, it became clear that Egypt during the last eight Olympic circle won a (11) medals, while the Paralympic Committee won (155) medals, so these Olympic bodies should be taken care with to promote Egypt in this international sporting events.

Through access to many of the previous studies such as studying, "Abu al-Wafa 0.2014", "Mahmoud 0.2014", "Omar 2014", "hamid 2010", "Angham 2010", "Salem 2009", "ching 2009", "Zaghloul, 2008, "" Beauty 0.2007", " Fouda 0.2005", "Banker & Pizzini, 2004", "Abdul Mohsen .2015", "Khouly .2011", "Arif 2009", "Moroccan, 2009", "Salama, 2005", " Kaplan & Norton,1996, 2004,2005" .

The goal of research:

The research aims to develop a perception of a proposed strategic map for the balanced performance of Olympic committee (IOC / Paralympic Committee) at the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Research questions

- 1- What is the level of the strategic performance of the Olympic committees (IOC / Paralympic Committee), depending on the Balanced Scorecard?
- 2- Are there significant differences between the Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Paralympic Committee) in the level of strategic performance depending on the Balanced Scorecard?
- 3-What is the perception of the proposed strategic map of the balanced performance at the Olympic committee (IOC / Paralympic Committee)?

Keywords:

Strategic Map for balanced performance, strategic performance, Olympic committees.

Research tools:

Survey strategic performance evaluation depending on the Balanced Scorecard (prepare researchers) (Appendix 6)

Research procedures:

Research Methodology:

The researchers used the descriptive approach using "surveys"

Timetable for the search:

The researchers conducted a prospective study in the period from 09/28/2016 to 10/10/2016 on a sample of (55) Fifty-five people, and then the researchers applied it on all the sample individuals "under discussion". The application period was from 15/10/2016 to 13 / 11/2016 on a sample of (260) two hundred and sixty people.

Society and the research sample:

The research community in the beneficiaries of the Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Paralympics committee) through participating in of the Olympic Games in the period from (5 to August 21, 2016 m) and in Paralympic Games in the period from (7 to September 18, 2016 m) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, consisted of (260) two hundred and sixty members as following and the table (2.3) clarify the research sample distribution (Appendix 5).

Discussion and interpretation of the results:

The answer to the first question : What is the level of the strategic performance at the Olympic committees (IOC / Paralympic Committee), depending on the Balanced Scorecard?

Table (2)
The relative weight and the response average for the questionnaire of the strategic performance level of the Olympic Committee depending on the Balanced Scorecard (n= 192)

N	response			Relative weight	Response Average
	High	medium	low		
First dimension					
1	48	49	95	337	0,59
2	6	20	166	224	0,39
3	5	32	155	234	0,41
4	57	36	99	342	0,59
5	129	51	12	501	0,87
6	8	32	152	240	0,42
7	16	118	58	342	0,59
8	36	71	85	335	0,58
9	37	71	84	337	0,59
10	39	59	94	329	0,57
11	49	42	101	332	0,58
12	129	54	9	504	0,88
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				4057	0,59
second dimension					
13	137	46	9	512	0,89
14	3	139	50	337	0,59
15	3	130	59	328	0,57
16	3	124	65	322	0,56
17	5	139	48	341	0,59
18	46	28	118	312	0,54
19	11	31	150	245	0,43
20	140	52	0	524	0,91
21	3	128	61	326	0,57

N	response			Relative weight	Response Average
	High	medium	low		
First dimension					
22	3	142	47	340	0,59
23	3	137	52	335	0,58
24	16	36	140	260	0,45
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				4182	0,61
third dimension					
25	20	75	97	307	0,53
26	36	47	109	311	0,54
27	33	48	111	306	0,53
28	35	52	105	314	0,55
29	92	49	51	425	0,74
30	33	70	89	328	0,57
31	39	55	98	325	0,56
32	90	46	56	418	0,73
33	20	67	105	299	0,52
34	34	75	83	335	0,58
35	37	62	93	328	0,57
36	13	45	134	263	0,46
37	29	54	109	304	0,53
38	5	40	147	242	0,42
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				4505	0,56
fourth dimension					
39	6	50	136	254	0,44
40	10	15	167	227	0,39
41	4	12	176	212	0,37
42	12	48	132	264	0,46
43	23	43	126	281	0,49
44	116	53	23	477	0,83
45	38	22	132	290	0,50
46	27	44	121	290	0,50
47	36	32	124	296	0,51
48	20	38	134	270	0,47
49	132	37	23	493	0,86
50	16	64	112	288	0,50
51	23	69	100	307	0,53
Relative weight average& response average for the dimension as all				3949	0,53
Relative weight average& response average for the questionnaire as all				16693	0,57
The minimum limit for trust= 0,60 the maximum limit for trust=0,74					

Table(2) shows that the response averages of the opinions of beneficiaries sample of the Olympic Committee in a questionnaire strategic performance phrases ranged between (0.37: 0.91), as the response average of the first dimension "financial dimension" was (0.59), for the second dimension "customers (beneficiaries)." was (0.61), the third dimension " internal processes" was (0.56), and the fourth dimension " learning and growth" was (0.53); while the average response to the questionnaire as a whole

was (0.57). This shows the lack of all the responding averages to the dimensions of the questionnaire and the total degree as an indicator of the strategic performance of the Olympic Committee, except the second dimension "customers" as it came between the minimum and maximum trust. It means that it achieved moderately as an indicator of the strategic performance of the Olympic Committee.

Table (3)
The relative weight and the response average for the questionnaire of the strategic performance level of the Paralympic Committee depending on the Balanced Scorecard(n= 68)

N	response			Relative weight	Response Average
	High	medium	low		
First dimension					
1	28	35	5	159	0,78
2	0	22	46	90	0,44
3	5	7	56	85	0,42
4	33	29	6	163	0,80
5	5	21	42	99	0,49
6	6	21	41	101	0,50
7	9	18	41	104	0,51
8	0	28	40	96	0,47
9	16	0	52	100	0,49
10	0	41	27	109	0,53
11	3	30	35	104	0,51
12	10	19	39	107	0,52
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				1317	0,54
second dimension					
13	24	44	0	160	0,78
14	22	11	35	123	0,60
15	32	29	7	161	0,79
16	27	39	2	161	0,79
17	43	24	1	178	0,87
18	33	29	6	163	0,80
19	46	5	17	165	0,81
20	60	3	5	191	0,94
21	34	29	5	165	0,81
22	17	24	27	126	0,62
23	28	39	1	163	0,80
24	20	23	25	131	0,64
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				1887	0,77
third dimension					
25	4	43	21	119	0,58
26	11	17	40	107	0,52
27	29	39	0	165	0,81
28	11	9	48	99	0,49
29	6	44	18	124	0,61
30	2	40	26	112	0,55
31	0	49	19	117	0,57
32	18	20	30	124	0,61
33	2	50	16	122	0,60
34	11	40	17	130	0,64
35	35	32	1	170	0,83
36	13	24	31	118	0,58
37	8	40	20	124	0,61
38	5	32	31	110	0,54
Relative weight average & response average for the dimension as all				1741	0,61

N	response			Relative weight	Response Average
	High	medium	low		
First dimension					
fourth dimension					
39	6	15	47	95	0,47
40	0	11	57	79	0,39
41	40	14	14	162	0,79
42	0	32	36	100	0,49
43	7	23	38	105	0,51
44	1	31	36	101	0,50
45	6	17	45	97	0,48
46	11	4	53	94	0,46
47	13	11	44	105	0,51
48	5	27	36	105	0,51
49	38	22	8	166	0,81
50	11	9	48	99	0,49
51	8	13	47	97	0,48
Relative weight average& response average for the dimension as all				1405	0,53
Relative weight average& response average for the questionnaire as all				6350	0,61
The minimum limit for trust= 0,56			the maximum limit for trust=0,78		

Table (3) shows that the Response averages of the opinions of beneficiaries sample of the Paralympic Committee in a questionnaire strategic performance phrases ranged between (0.39: 0.94), as the response average of the first dimension "financial dimension" was (0.54), for the second dimension "customers (beneficiaries)." was (0.77), the third dimension " internal processes" was (0.61), and the fourth dimension " learning and growth" was (0.53); while the average response to the questionnaire as a whole was (0.61). This shows the lack of all the responding averages to the dimensions of the questionnaire and the total degree as an indicator of the strategic performance of the Olympic Committee, except the second dimension "customers" as it came between the minimum and maximum trust. It means that it achieved moderately as an indicator of the strategic performance of the Olympic Committee

the researchers attribute that result to the weakness of the efforts made by those in charge of Olympic Committee

management in which it achieves its goals and makes them able to carry out its duties and functions associated with the Olympic and international competitions in order to achieve the achievements in international affairs globally, Olympia , continental and regional levels, as well as the failure of the administration of the Olympic Committee to develop a strategy own and implement it. As well as the evaluation and measurement process were based on subjective and lacks the scientific and substantive criteria, as seen results only as an indicator or criterion for success. It means that the assessment is done by focusing on only one side and the omission of many important aspects; this is consistent with (Abu al-Wafa et al., 2014) and (elgamal, 2007) studies.

Answering the second question which states: Are there significant differences between the Olympic committees (Olympic Committee / Paralympic Committee) in the level of strategic performance depending on the Balanced Scorecard?

Table (4)
 Statistical significance differences between Olympic bodies (Olympic Committee, Paralympic Committee) in the level of strategic performance depending on the Balanced Scorecard (n = 260)

dimensions	Olympic Committee N= 192		Paralympic Committee N=68		T value	Direction
	M	A	M	A		
First dimension: financial	21,13	4,36	19,37	1,44	4,89	Olympic
Second dimension: customers	21,78	1,62	27,75	2,41	18,97	Paralympic
Third dimension: Internal Processes	24,09	5,71	25,60	2,19	3,08	Paralympic
Fourth dimension: Learning& Growth	20,57	4,91	20,66	2,26	0,21	No differences
Strategic performance as whole	87,57	13,21	93,38	5,62	4,96	Paralympic

The value of tabled (T) at free degree (258) and the level of significance (0.05) = 1,960

Table (4) show that there are significant differences between the (Olympic Committee, Paralympic Committee) in the first dimension of the questionnaire for the strategic performance level, depending on the Balanced Scorecard in the direction of (IOC), and there are significant differences between the (Olympic Committee, Paralympic Committee) in each of the (the second dimension, the third and the total degree) of the questionnaire for the strategic performance level, depending on the balanced Scorecard in the direction of (Paralympic Committee). While there is non-significant differences between the (Olympic Committee, Paralympic Committee) in the fourth dimension of the questionnaire for the strategic performance level, depending on the balanced Scorecard.

The researchers attributed the outcomes relating to the first dimension (financial dimension) to the lack of Paralympic Committee for a financial strategy about how to provide sources of funding Resume and financial resources for the implementation of public policies relating to the conduct of work to induce the development of competitive sport away from government support. It leads to the disposal of the risks of relying on source support which is the state. Thus its independence in making decisions and achieve the principle of self-management in their affairs will only be achieved by providing the means for self-development resources.

The researchers attributed the outcome of the second dimension (customers) to weakness of the Olympic Committee to determine the beneficiaries accurately, and thus unable to find out their needs and try to satisfy them by providing activities and services consistent with the size and nature of their desires achieving a degree of balance between the activities and the available services. It is lack the ability to deal with the beneficiaries as the first pivot point from which they develop its performance. As well as the weakness of attention to the provided services

and activities. So the total does not rise to the level of the required performance to compete in sporting circles. This result is considered actually an indication of lower-level competitive both on local or international level. This refers to the inability of people at the institution to create a competitive environment suitable with the level and size of the needs of the beneficiaries within the Olympic Committee

The researchers attribute the outcome relating to the third dimension (internal operations) to the weakness of the factors related to work procedures, and the weakness of the efforts made by those who work on the Olympic Committee by the way that achieves its goals and makes them able to carry out its duties and functions associated with the competitions for achieving the accomplishments in the international affairs globally, Olympia, continentally and regionally, as well to the failure of those in charge of administration in developing its strategy and implementing it. As well as the methods used in the measurement and evaluation are traditional and rely on self-criteria lacking the objectivity scientific standards.

The researchers attribute the result of the fourth dimension (learning and growth) to the limited attempts by the Olympic and Paralympics committee to improve the performance of human resources through providing some training programs and courses but they does not meet the needs of the beneficiaries of the human resources in size and species, which requires managing and training of the available human resources that may contribute to improve the strategic performance.

Answering the third question which states on: What is the perception of the proposed strategic map of the balanced performance at the Olympic committee (IOC / Paralympic Committee)? (Appendix 7)

Conclusions:

- 1- Weakness of strategic performance in general at the level of the Olympic committees
- 2- There are statistically significant differences between the Olympic committees in total degree of the questionnaire in the direction of (the Paralympic Committee).
- 3- Use strategy maps based on the Balanced Scorecard model may contribute in developing the strategic performance management of the Olympic committees " under consideration".

Recommendations:

- 1- Activate the proposed conception of the strategic map for the balanced performance within the Olympic committees" under consideration" as a tool for the management of strategic performance, and try to circulate the idea to all the other sports bodies.
- 2- Spread the culture of the Balanced Scorecard and strategy maps as a mechanism for the managing the strategic performance within the various sports bodies.
- 3- Prepare, qualify and train those who work on how to use the Balanced Scorecard and strategic maps in the work.

References:

First, Arabic References:

- 1- Malkawi, Ibrahim Alkhlof (2009): Strategic Performance Management using Balanced Scorecard, Warraq for Publishing and Distribution, Amman..
- 2- Almaher, Ahmed (2007): The scientific evidence for managers in Strategic Management, University House, Alexandria..
- 3- Abdul Mohsen, Mohammed Tawfiq (2015): Recent trends in the evaluation and distinction in management "Six Sigma and Balanced Scorecard", Dar Arab Thought, Cairo.
- 4- Abu al-Wafa, Jamal Mohammed et al. (2014): evaluating the Egyptian universities performance using the Balanced Scorecard, published research, Journal of the College of Education, the number (99) July c (2).
- 5- Zaghoul, Gouda Abdel Raouf (2008): Using the Balanced Scorecard scale in the construction of a system to measure the strategic performance in the Egyptian

business environment, trade and finance magazine, Faculty of Commerce, Tanta University, n.1.

6- Omar, Ahmed Ceyhan (2014): the study of the impact of using the strategic map to model balanced performance on the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan of the Organization and competitive advantage (a field study on the joint banking sector), PhD Thesis, Sadat Academy for Management Sciences.

7- Mahmoud, Zainab Khairy (2014): Balanced performance measurement as a system for evaluating the performance of some service to youth and sports bodies, PhD Thesis, Faculty of Physical Education for Girls, Helwan University.

8- Fouda, Mr. Shawky (2005): A Proposed Framework to assess the strategic performance in modern production environment through the Balanced Scorecard scale, published research, the scientific journal (trade and finance), Faculty of Commerce, Tanta University.

9- Almaghraby, Abdel-Hamid Abdel Fattah (2009): Strategic Management measuring the Balanced Scorecard, Faculty of Commerce, Ain Shams University.

10- Salem, Imad Mosbah (2009): Evaluation of some Olympic sports federations using the Balanced Scorecard B.S.C system in the Arab Republic of Egypt, unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Helwan University.

11- Algamal, Amr Ahmed (2007): a proposed model for the management of the national Olympic federations using the Balanced Scorecard, published research, the scientific journal of Physical Education and Sports, No. (46), Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Helwan University, Cairo.

12- Salama, Mohamed Mahmoud (2005): the strategic dimension to evaluate the Balanced Scorecard, the Arab Organization for Administrative Development, Cairo.

13- Alarif, Nadia (2009): Strategic Management "Third Millennium Management", University House, Alexandria..

14- Khouly, Hala Abdullah (2011): Using a balanced performance measurement model in the strategic performance measurement for businesses, Accounting and Management magazine, Faculty of Commerce, Cairo University.

Second: English references:

15- Banker, R. ,Change, H. &Pizzini, M. (2004) : The Balanced Scorecard Judgment Effwctcs of Performance Measures Linked To Strategy , The Accounting Review .

- 16- B Rameshm, (2010) : Importance of Balanced scorecard for Growth of sme,Management accountant,vol.45,Iss.5.
- 17- Bieker,T,(2009) : Towards A sustainability Balanced scorecard Linking Environmental and social sustainability to Business strategy .
- 18- Ching, L. (2009): How Strategy Map Works For Ontario, s Health System, International Journal of Public Sector Management .Vol 22.Issue. 4.
- 19- Hamid,Tohidi,et,al,(2010) : using Balanced scorecard in educational organization , procedia – social and behavioral scien. Issue 2 .
- 20- Ingham, J. (2010) : Using A human Capital Scorecard As Framework For Discovery, Stratigic HR Review .vol.10, Issue 2 .
- 21- Kaplan, R. & Norton, D. (1996) : The Balanced Score Card: Translating strategy intoaction, Harvard Businen School Press, Boston .
- 22- Kaplan, R. & Norton, D. (2001) : The strategy focused organization : how Balanced scorecard companies Thrive in The new Business Enviroment, Harvard Businen School Press, Boston .
- 23- Kaplan, R. & Norton, D. (2004) : Strategy Maps, Converting Intangible Assets Into, Tangiple Outcomes, Harvard Business Press.
- 24- Kaplan, R. & Norton, D. (2005) : The Office of Strategy Management, Strategic Finance Montvale, .vol.87, Iss 4
- 25- Oliver,P (2008) : Drauing up a Balanced scorecard for an integrated Quality,safety and environment cars system,Business globe Automotive manufacturing,vol3,Issue 4 .