



Research Article

ISSN : 2277-3657
CODEN(USA) : IJPRPM

Organizational Intangible Assets (human, social and psychological capitals) and Corporate Entrepreneurship - Case Study: Ministry of Sport and Youth of Islamic Republic of Iran

Loghman Keshvarz¹, Abolfazl Farahani², Mohammad Hadi Seyfi Saldehi^{3,*}

1Associate Professor of Sport Management, Payam noor University (PNU), Iran.

2Professor of Sport Management, Payam noor University (PNU), Iran.

3Ph.D. student in Sport Management, Payam noor University (PNU), Tehran, Iran.

**Corresponding Author: Mohammad Hadi Seyfi Saldehi, Email: hadi. Sayfi @ yahoo .com*

ABSTRACT

Introduction and purpose: Today's organizations need to pay attention to entrepreneurship due to growing environmental changes. A set of resources and tools are required for institutionalize entrepreneurship in organizations. Organizational intangible assets are the most important tools, and organizational assets are for distributing entrepreneurship. The aim of the current study is to explain the impacts of organizational intangible assets on corporate entrepreneurship and to provide appropriate model.

Methods: The study population consisted of all staff of the Ministry of Sports and youths and 275 of them were selected based on stratified random sampling method. For collecting data, four questionnaires of human capital, social capital, psychological capital and corporate entrepreneurship had been used. For determining organizational intangible assets and corporate entrepreneurship, the mean test for population had been used; and Pearson's correlation coefficient test and structural equation modeling had been used to determine the relationship between variables.

Results: Results showed that the average organizational intangible assets and its components were significantly higher than normal and the average entrepreneurship was at a moderate level; there was a significant correlation between organizational intangible assets and its aspects with corporate entrepreneurship and the study model had confirmed the impact of organizational intangible assets and its aspects on corporate entrepreneurship.

Conclusion: Based on the results, improvement of organizational intangible assets in the Ministry of Sports and Youth is effective in promoting corporate entrepreneurship.

Keywords: *organizational intangible assets, human capital, social capital, psychological capital, corporate entrepreneurship.*

INTRODUCTION

The importance of entrepreneurship in today's organizations is so increased that it became essential and necessary for survival and development of organizations [1], and many organizations rely on entrepreneurship for promoting and differentiating their products and services and also to gain business competitive advantages. Corporate entrepreneurship facilitates the efforts of an organization for exploiting its current competitive advantages and also

to explore new opportunities and capabilities that are required for successful follow ups [2, 3, 4]. Corporate entrepreneurship is defined as a desire of an organization to encourage and support creativity, flexibility, and risk appetite [5]. Corporate entrepreneurship can be used in private or public sectors of an organization. The most important distinction between entrepreneurship in private and public sectors is that entrepreneurship in the public sector does not necessarily targets financial benefits but it can fallow non-financial goals as well; and the goal of entrepreneurship in government agencies and public sectors goes beyond mere profitably [6: 76].

In the past decade, research on entrepreneurship has fallowed different paths, but what is obvious is that after the importance of entrepreneurship in today's organizations had been established, primary knowledge that facilitates entrepreneurship is also became especially important [7]. Hence, these questions always rise that what necessitates entrepreneurship and what kind of resources are needed for entrepreneurship. Perhaps the roots of this new approach of entrepreneurship can be found in a resource-based view. According to the resource-based approach, sustainable competitive advantage is possible through a unique resource control which cannot be imitated by others. So, for a corporate entrepreneurship to lead to a competitive advantage for the organization, it needs to rely on resources that are unique and inimitable. Intangible assets of an organization are among the most unique and inimitable assets of that organization. Therefore, it can be concluded that this process will lead to improved organizational performance and gain competitive advantage because of reliance of corporate entrepreneurship process on organizational intangible assets [8]. Human, social and psychological capitals are the most important components of organizational intangible assets and organizations can deal with other organizations and shall handle their duties through these capitals.

Human capital: theory of human capital suggests that individuals have different knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) that can be successfully implemented on tasks associated with their jobs [9, 10, 11]. Therefore, human capital theory had upgraded the attitude towards people from a traditional concept to a newer one. In the traditional sense, human capital had been used only for physical struggles, but in the new concept, human capital is viewed as a value that can and should be invested on in order to gain economic benefits for many individuals and for society [12, 13, 14]. Human resources are the only capitals that won't decrease with more usage, and increasingly spreads; and it seems that the most important difference between advanced industrial countries and low-income countries is due to human capital [15]. Also, in the field of organizations, today this fact has become solidify that injection of significant amounts of financial and physical capitals doesn't accelerated the pace of their success but organizations that have sufficient and skilled human capital are able to use their physical and financial capitals more effectively to accelerate their growth and development [16]. Basic human capital creates knowledge necessary for high quality innovation and entrepreneurial efforts [17]. In organizations, competent personnel that have higher human capital are a source of ideas for innovation and promotion of organizational productivity [14]. Many studies have shown a positive impact on the innovative performance and it has been clarified that more innovative organizations are managed by a team with higher education [17]. Scattered coordination among different individuals is a distinguished ability of entrepreneurs that is related to their previous learned skills and knowledge which they have gained during education and work experience. In addition, the perception of risks and opportunities is influenced by the ability to accumulating new knowledge which is in turn dependent on reserving accumulated explicit knowledge¹ that has been gained in higher education institutes and implicit knowledge² accumulated through experience in a given context [13]. Researchers of entrepreneurship field have studied the relationship between human capital and entrepreneurial outcomes in different levels and the results generally have supported the theory of human capital [18].

Social capital: Bourdieu have theorized his concept of social capital in 1988, but at the organizational level; people like have analyzed social capital. Organizational social capital is a combination of social and communicational links that allow employees to gain knowledge and resources in their organizations and professions [9]. According to experts, social capital as a source that is generated from infrastructure and communication networks of entrepreneurs and organizations is considered as a key factor in the process of entrepreneurship development and organizational infrastructure for innovation, creativity and dynamics [19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. The main question is that how could his

¹ Explicit knowledge is a knowledge that one receives in school and educational institutions.

² Implicit knowledge is the knowledge that a person gains in the workplace and when performing job responsibilities.

be achieved and what is the role of entrepreneurship in the development of social capital? Corporate entrepreneurship mainly refers to entrepreneurial activity of employees as a whole [7]. Therefore, corporate entrepreneurship activities require convergence of various sciences that belong to different members of the organization and require cooperation of all employees in an organization. In other words, corporate entrepreneurship is a group activity and it is the opposite of individual activity [24]; And also social capital, by facilitating collective action and information exchange which is followed by brainstorming and group synergy, provides new and innovative solutions as well as improving organizational performance and outcomes. In fact, it seems that continuous results from successive and frequent social interaction is necessary for creating an entrepreneurial organization [13: 353]. On the other hand, most of the previous studies on identifying opportunities have focus on the key role of information for identifying opportunities. If information has such a prominent role in identifying opportunities, what are the sources of such information for entrepreneurs? One of the hidden sources of such information is the links between entrepreneurs. Numerous empirical studies show the when entrepreneurial social network is broader, more opportunities can be identified. Therefore, one of the factors in identifying opportunities is social networks. These networks, provides more resources and opportunities for entrepreneurs and expand the circle of their choices [25].

psychological capital: A new concept that has been introduced recently by Luthans which was inspired by positive organizational behavior is psychological capital [26] that has been used as a key construct in the field of positive organizational behavior in the territory of a jobs [27: 1]. Luthans, [28] had introduced a well-known definition of Psychological capital as it follows: "psychological capital is a positive psychological stated of a person and it is defined by [1] having confidence (self-efficacy) to take responsibility and put required efforts to succeed in high challenging tasks; [2] making a positive attribution (optimism) about success at present moment and in future; [3] having the perseverance to achieve goals and when necessary changing paths for achieving goals (hope) so that success is gained; and [4] when surrounded by hardships and problems, employ endurance, rehabilitation and even beyond (resiliency) to achieve success "[28: 3]. Thus, psychological capital is considered a "higher order" construct that appears when the four constructs of hope, self-efficacy, optimism and resilience are combined [29, 30, 31]. Psychological capital seeks to create a positive approach to organizational performance among inevitable, stressful and fast changing demands in the work environment which is widely identified as an important predictive variable for attitudes, behaviors, and performances of employees and thus it is well-known in management research [29, 32, 33]. Previous research has found significant positive correlation between psychological capital with positive results related to work including psychological health and happiness, job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, attachment to work and organizational citizenship behaviors [34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40], as well as significant negative correlation between had been found psychological capital with negative attitudes and behaviors related to work such as stress, anxiety, abuse in the workplace, absenteeism and leaving job [41, 42, 43]. Psychological Capital has high potential and capacity in the organization [44] and previous studies regarding psychological capital emphasized on significance of this new capital and strengthening its four dimensions in order to maximize performances of different roles at work place [34, 45]. Psychological capital has a positive correlation with innovative behavior and beliefs of individuals in their abilities to perform a job successfully [46]. Psychological capital is an important factor for predicting entrepreneurship and those with higher psychological capital are looking for growth and progress and show more efforts [47]. Psychological capital as the newest organizational intangible assets is one of the most important sources for developing corporate entrepreneurship, and employees who have high psychological capitals, more likely will engage in challenging and risky activities. They hope that with determination and alternative routes, they will achieve goals; they are actually optimist about achieving positive outcomes; they believe in effectiveness, and they also believe that they can create a positive difference in their working environment and they can keep out hardships. All these positive factors help the creation of new and different ways of working and employment and organizational entrepreneurship [46]. Psychological capital has a promoting nature in one's recovery of failure and stagnation and entrepreneurs are generally those who have high tolerance for ambiguity and failure and by adapting an appropriate attributional style (optimism), they are hopeful for future and they try to change current situation and repeating previous successes self-confidently [48].

Based on the findings of research in this area, human, social and psychological capitals which are the fundamental components of organizational intangible assets plays vital roles in the promotion and development of entrepreneurship in today's organizations and the need for paying attention to theses for promoting entrepreneurship in these organizations is strongly felt. The ministry of Sports and Youth is also not an exception. The ministry of

Sports and Youth as a government agency, is responsible for sports in the Islamic Republic of Iran and has been a major influence in this exclusive area. So, the dynamics of this organization is growth and development of sports and ultimately followed by large-scale development of sports in the country. On this basis, and given the necessary attention to entrepreneurship for valorization in today's organizations and increase efficiency and effectiveness as well as the need for paying serious attention to the antecedents and resources needed for this developments of entrepreneurship, the corporate entrepreneurship and organizational intangible assets of the Ministry of Sports and Youths have been evaluated; and the effects of organizational intangible assets on corporate entrepreneurship of this ministry is analyzed. In fact, the current study seeks to answer this question that what efficiency status of using organizational intangible assets and entrepreneurship in the Ministry of sports and Youths look like and what is the role of organizational intangible assets and corporate entrepreneurship and their component as newest and most developed resources and organizational assets on promotion of corporate entrepreneurship in the ministry?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study regarding a philosophical basis is considered as positivist paradigm group. In terms of the direction of research, it is an applied research. From methodology data collection point of view, it is considered a descriptive study. In terms of research strategies, the current research uses correlation with the use of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). The population of this study included all employees of the Ministry of Sports and Youths of the Islamic Republic of Iran who consisted of a total number of about 750 individuals, and the sample size based on the table provided by Cohen, Morgan & Kerjcie had been estimated to be 254 individuals and by calculating the probability of failure to return a number of questionnaires, 300 questionnaires were distributed randomly among employees and 275 questionnaires were returned to the researcher. For data collection, four questionnaires of human capital [9] with 10 questions, social capital [9] with 12 items, psychological capital with 24 questions (these three questionnaires had been used together to measure organizational intangible assets) and corporate entrepreneurship scale [7] with 30 questions have been used [7, 9, 28]. Human capital, social capital and psychological capital questionnaires had been designed in the form of 6 point Likert scale and the corporate entrepreneurship scale was designed in the form of 7 point Likert scale. To evaluate content validity and reliability of the research instruments, the questionnaires had been distributed among a few professors and experts in this field and by considering their opinions, necessary modification had been applied. To assess reliability of existing constructs in questionnaires, confirmatory factor analysis had been used. First, in this analysis, the adequacy and appropriateness of factor analysis had been evaluated by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy index (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. After ensuring that the data can be used for factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis model had been used to evaluate construct validity of human capital, social capital, psychological capital and corporate entrepreneurship in LISREL software and relationships between markers had been molded. The results show that what the researcher intended to measure by subscales had been achieved through these questionnaires; therefore, the relationship between the constructs with hidden variables is invoked. To show how far the obtained values are matched with the realities of implementation model, fitness indices was evaluated. All fitness indices in this section displayed desirability levels. Therefore, the data for the current study had a good fit with the factor structure and underlying theories which shows that questions are aligned with theoretical constructs. Cronbach's alpha was used to evaluate the reliability of these questionnaires. Values that is greater than 0.7 indicate a desired reliability. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for human capital, social capital, psychological capital and corporate entrepreneurship had been evaluated as 0.88, 0.91, 0.86 and 0.95, respectively. For data analysis, SPSS and LISREL software packages were used. Statistical methods employed in this study include: descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics had been used for organizing, summarizing, and classifying raw scores and for describing sample sizes; And in inferential statistics normality of data distribution was determined by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov³; then parametric tests for mean of study population⁴ had been used to examine the status of variables, and Pearson's correlation coefficient and structural equation modeling had been used to explain the relationship between the variables.

³ One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

⁴ One-Sample T Test

RESULTS

39.27 percent of the respondents were female and 58.91 percent were male. 4.73 percent of them had a diploma degree, 6.18% had associates degree, 56.73 percent had bachelor's and 32.36 percent had master's and PhD degrees. 13.09 percent were up to 30 years old, 15.64 % were between 31 and 35 years old, 11.64 percent were 36 to 40 years old, 17.82 percent were 41 to 45 years old, 21.82 percent were 46 to 50 years old, and 14.18 percent were above 51 years old. 18.18 percent had up to 5 years of work experience, 20 percent had 6 to 10 years, 25.45 percent had 11 to 15 years, 17.82 had 16 to 20 years, 8.36 percent had 21 to 25 years, and 4.73 percent had 25 years and above work experiences. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results showed that all factors examined in the sample followed in a normal distribution. Therefore, to test the hypotheses, parametric statistical tests can be used.

To examine the status of organizational intangible assets of corporate entrepreneurship and each component of these variables, average test of study population had been used. In this test, the average value of organizational intangible assets of its three components meaning human, social and psychological capitals had been compared with number 3.5 (median of questionnaire responses) and corporate entrepreneurship average and its components had been compared with the number 4 (median of questionnaire responses).

According to the results of Table 1, we find that the testing "organizational intangible assets " and its three components has a significant level less than the critical value of 0.05, which indicates that the null hypothesis of the mean of this variable being equal to 3.5, is rejected and since upper and lower bounds on all the variables tested positive, therefore, we conclude that the average "organizational intangible assets" and its three components of "human capital", "social capital" and "psychological capital" are significantly more than average.

Table 1. Results of Average test of population for organizational intangible assets and its components

variables of the study	the test value = 3.5					
	Average	statistics	degree of freedom	level of significance	lower bound	higher bound
human capital	4.42	22.58	274	0.000	0.84	1.00
social capital	4.10	14.62	274	0.000	0.52	0.69
psychological capital	4.39	43.87	274	0.000	0.85	0.93
organizational intangible assets	4.30	27.75	274	0.000	0.75	0.86

Also according to table 2, we can see that the two variables of "corporate entrepreneurship" and "top management support" is significantly higher that the critical value of 0.05 which indicates that the null hypothesis that considers the mean of the two variable equals 4 will be accepted. This means that these two variables had no significant difference with the average value. The two variables of "work authorities" and "reward and reinforcements" are significantly lower that critical value of 0.05, which indicates that the null hypothesis that considers the mean of these two variables equals 4 is rejected, and with respect to the upper and lower bounds, which both are positive, we can conclude that the average "work authorities" and "reward and reinforcements" is significantly higher than the average. The two variables of "availability of time" and "organizational boundaries" also had been significantly lower that the critical value of 0.05, which indicates the null hypothesis which considers that these two variables equals 4 is also rejected; however, since the higher and lower limits are both negative, we can conclude that average "availability of time" and "organizational boundaries" are significantly lower than the average.

Table 2. The results of average test of population for corporate entrepreneurship and its components


variables of the study	the test value = 4					
	Average	statistics	degree of freedom	level of significance	lower bound	higher bound
top management support	4.02	0.28	274	0.783	-0.12	0.16
work authorities	4.22	3.37	274	0.001	0.09	0.35
reward and reinforcements	4.19	3.20	274	0.002	0.07	0.31
availability of time	3.46	-11.86	274	0.000	-0.63	-0.45
organizational boundaries	3.89	-2.80	274	0.006	-0.19	-0.03
corporate entrepreneurship	3.96	-0.88	274	0.381	-0.14	0.05

To examine the relationship between independent and dependent variables, Pearson's correlation coefficient test had been used. The results of this test (Table 3) showed that organizational intangible assets and its three components have a significant linear relationship with corporate entrepreneurship and to explore the matter further, we used structural equation.

Table 3. The results of the correlation between organizational intangible assets and its components with corporate entrepreneurship

Study variables	Pearson's correlation coefficient	level of significance
human capital and corporate entrepreneurship	0.306	0.000
social capital and corporate entrepreneurship	0.316	0.000
psychological capital and corporate entrepreneurship	0.325	0.000
organizational intangible assets and corporate entrepreneurship	0.695	0.000

Based on the results of figure 1, the standardized factor load of organizational intangible assets was 0.65 and t statistics for corporate entrepreneurship was 6.11. Since the obtained value for t was greater than 1.96, it indicates a significant direct effect of organizational intangible assets on corporate entrepreneurship. To show that how obtained values are matched the facts in the model, fitness indices should be studied. Desirable value for root mean square index (RMR) and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) is close to zero and obtained values are 0.021 and 0.036, respectively. Desirable value for goodness of fit index (GFI), normed fit index (NFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), incremental fit index (IFI) comparative fit index (CFI) are 0.9 which is higher than their values obtained values, these values had been calculated as 0.96, 0.98, 0.98, 0.99 and 0.99, respectively. Desirable value for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was 0.1 and lower and its value had been evaluated as 0.072. Also desirable value for Chi-Square index on degree of freedom was less than 3 which its value had been calculated as 2.42. Therefore, all fit indices show optimal limits.




Chi-Square=45.76, df=19, P-value=0.07154, RMSEA=0.072

Figure 1. Structural model of the effects of organizational intangible assets on corporate entrepreneurship

Upper numbers on the axis display standardized load factor (path coefficients) and the bottom numbers are t statistic.

According to Figure 2, standardized load factor of human capital variable on corporate entrepreneurship was 0.33 and its t statistic was 5.11. Standardized load factor of social capital variable on corporate entrepreneurship was 0.35 and its t statistic was 5.41; and the standardized load factor of psychological capital variable on corporate entrepreneurship was 0.38 and its t statistic was 5.71. Since t values for all three variables were greater than 1.96, it shows a significant and direct impact of all three components of the organizational intangible assets of human, social and psychological capitals on entrepreneurship. To show how obtained values match the realities of model, fit indices should be studied. Desirable value for root mean square index (RMR) and standardized root mean square index (SRMR) is close to zero and both values had been calculated as 0.000. Desirable value for goodness of fit index (GFI), normed fit index (NFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), indicators of fitness rising (IFI) and incremental fit index (CFI) was 0.9 and higher and all their values had been calculated as 1.00. Desirable value for the square root index had been estimated and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was 0.1 and lower which those value had been calculated as 0.000. Also desirable value for Chi-Square on degree of freedom was less than 3 which the value had been calculated as 0.000. Therefore, as fit indices show, the data had a good fit with factor structure and underlying theories of research.



Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.00000, RMSEA=0.000

Figure 2. Structural model of the effects of human, social and psychological capitals on corporate entrepreneurship

Upper numbers on the axis display standardized load factor (path coefficients) and the bottom numbers are t statistic.

Discussion and Conclusion

The organizational assets may had been tangible in the past, but today the majority of assets are intangible [49]. In the knowledge economy, organizational success depends on the ability to manage intangible assets. To be able to manage these assets, first they must be identified and measured and finally they can be managed [50]. Based on the results, the rating for organizational intangible assets of the Ministry of Sports and Youths is higher than average. Therefore, in terms of having newest and most advanced organizational assets, the Ministry of Sports and Youths is in a relative good condition, and the managers of this ministry need to properly use these valuable assets in order to achieve organizational goals. Although the beneficial conditions of organizational intangible assets had been evaluated to be relatively reasonable at the Ministry of Sport and Youth, there is still a distance to ideal situation and the managers of this ministry should strive to improve intangible assets of this organization. Therefore, in our world today, the largest value of an organization is based on intangible assets and these key resources are able to introduce the organization an ideal outcome regardless of industry [51, 52]. Human capital as one of the three main structural

components of organizational intangible assets has a relatively good state in the Ministry of Sports and Youths and its rating is higher than average.

Therefore, the Ministry of Sports and Youths should use employees that have acceptable knowledge, skills and abilities and using them appropriately and systematically in order to advance the goals of the ministry. The social capital rating was also higher than average in the Ministry of Sports and Youths. Therefore, the employees of the Ministry of Sports and youths in general have relatively effective social and communicational networks with each other and within the Ministry and with their colleagues outside the organization; moreover, these social and communicational networks are helpful in managing events and professional decisions. According to social capital provides links to explore opportunities and to identify collective and allocate scarce resources within the organization to facilitate organizational development [13: 350] which is a vital role. Consequently, not only social capital should be used in organizations but also according to Ellinger [53] organizations should invest on development and management of organizational social capital [53]. This is while the Ministry of Sport and Youth have a relatively good condition in having social capital, the managers of this ministry should focus their efforts to improve social capital and promote the effective use of this asset. Also, psychological capital rating in the Ministry of Sport and Youth was higher than average. Although the use of psychological capital in the Ministry of Sports and Youths is relatively good but it is still far from the ideal and managers of this ministry should strive to improve their employees' psychological capital; because quasi-state constructs of psychological capital component can be developed and improved further and it can improve under proper training and conditions [54]. Based on the results of the current study, the average corporate entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sports and Youths is moderate. These findings are not consistent with research results of Farzi [57] because the average corporate entrepreneurship that was obtained in their studies was lower than average [55, 56, 57]. The average condition of entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sports and Youth shows that managers have considered measures for development of entrepreneurship in this ministry, but these measures are not enough and must be completed. Therefore, a serious need for paying attention to the antecedents and tools that promote entrepreneurship in this organization is felt more than ever. Average "top management support" was also moderate and it seems that with little attention from top level managers the status of these components will be headed towards an ideal situation in order to support the employees and managers of the lower ranks to present creative ideas and conditions for innovation. Average of the variable "working authorities" and "reward and reinforcements" was higher than the average. Therefore, it seems delegation of authority to subordinates in the ministry is appropriately implemented and suitable rewards are considered for encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship by management for the staff, and these two components of corporate entrepreneurship have a relative desirable condition. The average variable of "availability time" and "organizational boundaries" was also lower than the average. Therefore, these two factors don't have a good position in the Ministry of Sport and Youths and there is a need for serious efforts of managers for freer and unstructured time for employees as well as a need for more flexibility in organizational boundaries and duty structures in this ministry.

Based on the results of the current study, organizational intangible assets have an effect on corporate entrepreneurship with a coefficient of 0.65. Therefore, organizational intangible assets as a vital resource for an organization in this era of knowledge economy has a great effect on the expansion of corporate entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sports and Youth; and through expansion and development, corporate entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sports and youths of the Republic Iran can be increased effectively. Also, according to the results of the current study, human capital effects corporate entrepreneurship with a coefficient of 0.33. Thus, by increasing attention to human capital as one of the antecedents and vital assets for corporate entrepreneurship and efforts to improve its level in the organization, the corporate entrepreneurship is also increases. The results of the current study is generally consistent with the results of [11, 13, 17, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75].

According to the results of the current study, social capital effects corporate entrepreneurship with a coefficient of 0.38. Thus, paying more attention to social capital as structural components of organizational intangible assets and one of the most important antecedents and sources of corporate entrepreneurship and efforts to improve it, the level of corporate entrepreneurship can increase in the Ministry of Sports and Youth. The results of the current study are consistent with the results of [22, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88].

Based on the results of the current study, psychological capital affects corporate entrepreneurship with a coefficient of 0.36. Thus, with increasing attention to psychological capital as one of the antecedents and leading drivers for corporate entrepreneurship and efforts to improve it, the level of corporate entrepreneurship will increase in the ministry of Sports and Youth. The results of the current study are consistent with the results of studies by [46, 48, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96].

In a general conclusion based on the results of the current study and similar researches in this area is suggested that managers in the Ministry of Sports and Youths are conscious regarding proper management of intangible assets of their organization through assessment, measurement and continuous improvement; and by paying more attention to organizational intangible assets and efforts to improve it, corporate entrepreneurs in this ministry will increase. New Age organizations are focused on people and just after putting the right people in right positions, they move in a direction so they can overtake their competitors [52]. Therefore, the director of the Ministry of Sports and Youths must have focus their efforts primarily to attract staff who have good intangible assets and they should put the evaluation of these assets at the priority of their employment program; and give organizational positions and responsibilities to employees based on utilization of organizational intangible assets so that employees' abilities match the responsibilities and their positions; then the next stage is to provide specialized trainings for staff so these assets will increase. Because, although part of these capitals is inherent in individuals, part of these features can also be acquired; and under useful trainings and experiences they can be increased. Therefore, it is suggested that director of the Ministry of Sports and Youths consider improvement two approaches for their organizational intangible assets. First, hiring employees should be selective based on having organizational intangible assets for the Ministry of Sports or delegate positions within an organization to the employees of this ministry. And second, provide necessary conditions for training these capabilities and assets of the staff. The solution of future problems is in the use of tools that they're used to, but less attention has been paid o the way of using these tools. Based on the results of this study, by increasing organizational intangible assets in the Ministry of Sports and Youth, the corporate entrepreneurship of this organization will also increase and necessary capabilities will be created in order to achieve and implement main objectives of this organization. The solution of future problems is not in the use of tools that we are used to, but it is in the use of tools that we paid less attention to.

REFERENCES

1. Nason, R, S. McKelvie, A. Lumpkin, G. T. (2015). The role of organizational size in the heterogeneous nature of corporate entrepreneurship. *Small Bus Econ.* No 45. Pp 279–304.
2. Turner, T. Pennington, W, W. (2015). Organizational networks and the process of corporate entrepreneurship: how the motivation, opportunity, and ability to act affect firm knowledge, learning, and innovation. *Small Bus Econ.* No 45. Pp 447–463.
3. Hornsby, J, S. Kuratko, D, F. Holt, D, T. Wales, W, J. (2013). Assessing a measurement of organizational preparedness for corporate entrepreneurship. *J PROD INNOV MANAG.* Vol 30. No 5. Pp 937–955.
4. Hayton, J, C. Hornsby, J, S. Bloodgood, J. (2013). Part II: The contribution of HRM to corporate entrepreneurship: A review and agenda for future research. *M@N@Gement*, Vol 16. No 4. Pp 381-409.
5. Hinz, V. Ingerfurth, S. (2013). Does ownership matter under challenging conditions? On the relationship between organizational entrepreneurship and performance in the healthcare sector. *Public Management Review.* Vol. 15, No. 7. Pp 969-991.
6. Yazdi Moghaddam, J. Khorakian, A. Maharati, Y. (2015). Organizational entrepreneurship and its impact on the performance of governmental organizations in the city of Mashhad. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* . 169. 75 – 87.
7. Lawson, M. (2014). Impact of risk propensity on corporate entrepreneurship. A Research Project Submitted to the Gordon Institute of Business Science, University of Pretoria, South Africa.
8. Hayton, C. J. (2005). The effect of intellectual capital on entrepreneurial orientation in high technology new ventures. *R & D Management.* Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 137-146.
9. Moses, A. R. (2012). Understanding the relationship of job embeddedness whit social and human Capital: The importance of organizational identification, Thesis for the degree of doctor of philosophy, university of Texas at Arlington, United States.
10. Buller, P, F. & McEvoy, G, M. (2012). Strategy, human resource management and performance: Sharpening line of sight. *Human Resource Management Review*, No 22, Pp 43–56.
11. Wei, Yu-Chen. (2014). The benefits of organizational citizenship behavior for job performance and the moderating role of human capital. *International Journal of Business and Management.* Vol 9. No 7. Pp 87-99.

12. Ployhart, R. E. Moliterno, T. P. (2011). Emergence of the human capital resource: a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol 36. No 1. Pp 127–150.
13. Felicio, J. A. Couto, E. Caiado, J. (2014). Human capital, social capital and organizational performance. *Management Decision*. Vol 52. No. 2. Pp. 350-364.
14. Kim, T. (2015). Impacts of learning interventions on organizational human capital and performance. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*. Vol 27. No 4. Pp 7-28.
15. Friebel, G. Leinyuy, J. Seabright, P. (2015). The Schubert effect: When flourishing businesses crowd out human capital. *World Development*. Vol 68. Pp. 124–135.
16. Milgrom, P. (2010). Complementarities and fit: Strategy, structure and organizational changes in manufacturing. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, No 19. Pp 179-208.
17. Alpkhan, L. Bulut, C. Gunday, G. Ulusoy, G. Kilic, K. (2010). Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management Decision*. Vol 48. Pp 5. Pp 732–755.
18. Martin, B. C. McNally, J. J. Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturin*. No 28. Pp 211-224.
19. Liu, X., Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., Dai, O., & Lu, J. (2010). Human mobility and international knowledge spillovers: Evidence from high-tech small and medium enterprises in an emerging market. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 4: 340–355.
20. Yang, H. L., & Cheng, H. H. (2010). Creativity of student information system projects: From the perspective of network embeddedness, *Computers & Education*, 54: 209-221.
21. Chen, M., Chang, Y., & Hung, S. (2008). Social capital and creativity in R&D project teams, *R&D Management*, 38: 21-34.
22. Kaasa, A. (2008). Effects of different dimensions of social capital on innovative activity: Evidence from Europe at the regional level, PHD dissertation, University of Tartu.
23. Goyal, A., & Ahkilesh, K. B. (2007). Interplay among innovativeness, cognitive intelligence, emotional intelligence and social capital of work teams, *Team Performance Management*, 13: 206-226.
24. De Villiers-Scheepers, M. J. (2012). Antecedents of strategic Corporate Entrepreneurship, *European Business Review*, 24: 400–424.
25. Bhagavatula, S., Elfring, T., Tilburg, A. V., & Gerhard G. V. B. (2010). How social and human capital influence opportunity recognition and resource mobilization in India's handloom industry, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25: 245-260.
26. Hodges TD. (2010). An Experimental study of the impact of psychological capital on performance, Engagement and the contagion Effect University Nebraska.
27. Reichard, Rebecca, J. Dollwet, Maren. Louw-Potgieter, Joha. (2013). Development of Cross-Cultural Psychological Capital and Its Relationship with Cultural Intelligence and Ethnocentrism. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 201X, Vol XX(X) 1–15.
28. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological Capital*. New York: Oxford University Press.
29. Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127-152.
30. Donaldson, S. I., & Dollwet, M. (2013). Taming the waves and wild horses of positive organizational psychology. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in positive psychology*, (pp. 1-21). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
31. Donaldson, S. I., & Ko, I. (2010). Positive organizational psychology, behavior, and scholarship: A review of the emerging literature and evidence base. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5, 171-199.
32. Newman, A., Ucbasaran, D., Zhu, F., & Hirst, G. (2014). Psychological capital: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S120-S138.
33. Quisenberry, David, M. (2015). Testing the Internal Validity of Psychological Capital: A Laboratory Experiment Utilizing Neurophysical and Psychological Measures. A dissertation For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Under the Supervision of Professor Fred Luthans. University of Nebraska.
34. Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., Smith, R. M., & Palmer, N. F. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 17-28.
35. Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44, 48-70.
36. Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 147-154.
37. Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2013). Organizational socialization and newcomers' psychological capital and well-being. *Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology*, 1, 211-236.

38. Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. L. (2008). Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2), 209-221.
39. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541-572.
40. Mathe-Soulek, K., Scott-Halsell, S., Kim, S., & Krawczyk, M. (2014). Psychological capital in the quick service restaurant industry: A Study of unit-level performance. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, doi:10.9634/8014550923
41. Abbas, M., Raja, U., Darr, W., & Bouckennooghe, D. (2014). Combined effects of perceived politics and psychological capital on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance. *Journal of Management*, 40(7), 1813-1830.
42. Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 677-693.
43. Karatepe, O. M., & Karadas, G. (2014). The effect of psychological capital on conflicts in the work-family interface, turnover and absence intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 43, 132-143.
44. Dawkins, S., Martin, A., Scott, J., & Sanderson, K. (2013). Building on the positives: A psychometric review and critical analysis of the construct of psychological capital. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(3), 348-370.
45. Harms P.D., Luthans, F. (2012). Measuring implicit psychological constructs in organizational behavior: An example using psychological capital, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 3(4), 589-594.
46. Avey, J.B., Luthans, F., & Youssef, C.M. (2012). The additive value of positive psychological capital in predicting work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 30 (2), 173-191.
47. Envick B, R. (2005). Beyond Human and social Capital: The Importance of Positive Psychological Capital for Entrepreneurial Success. *The Entrepreneurial Executive*. 2005, (10),41-52.
48. Silva, D & Roche, M. (2010). The Contribution of Psychological Capital to Entrepreneurs Success during Recessionary Times. Submitted to the nonrefereed stream - New Zealand Applied Business Educators Conference 27& 28 September 2010 Napier.
49. sullivan J, p, H. Sullivan s, p, H. (2000). valuing intangible companies : an intellectual capital approach, *journal of intellectual capital*, 1(4), 328-340.
50. Sanchez, P., chaminade, C. and Olea, M. (2000). Management of Intangibles: an Attempt to Build a theory, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 1(4), 312-327.
51. Oh, H. S., Chung, M. H., & Lbianca, G. (2004). group social capital and group effectiveness. *The academy of management journal*, 147(6), 860.
52. Brandt. E. & Kull. P. (2007). Talent Management: How firms in Sweden find and nurture value adding human resources, *Internationals Handelshogskolan* , Available at: www.essays.se/essay/47c110a845.
53. Ellinger, A. E., Elmadağ Baş, A. B., Ellinger, A. D., Wang, Y., & Bachrach, D. G. (2011). Measurement of organizational investments in social capital: The service employee perspective, *Journal of Business Research*, 64: 572-578.
54. Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior* (12 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
55. Seyfi Saldehi, M. H.; Seyfi Saldehi, M.; Koozeshian, H.; Ehsani, M (2014). The relationship between entrepreneurial structures and corporate entrepreneurship in Physical Education organization of the Islamic Republic of Iran, *sport management and motor behavior*, 10 (19):55-68.
56. Ferdowsi, M.H.; Farahani, A.; Keshavarz, L. (2015). Designing a corporate entrepreneurship model based on corporate systems at the Ministry of Sports and Youths, *Contemporary Research in Sport Management*. 5(10):47-59.
57. Farzi, H.; Abbasi, H.; Zartoshtian, S. (2015). Relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility with corporate entrepreneurship in the Ministry of Sports and Youths in Iran. *Sports Management*. 7 (5):713-729.
58. Abolhasani Ranjbar, A.; Anabestani, M.; Shariat-Jafari, I. (2012). The study of the relationship between intellectual capital and Inside Corporate Entrepreneurship (CASE STUDY: Employees of Economic and financial Affairs in Tehran). Collection of articles on the National Conference of knowledge based entrepreneurship and business management. Babolsar. Mazandaran University (Pardis). November 13th, 2012. pp. 18-1.
59. Kamalian, A.R; Salarzehi, H.; Asgharzadeh, F. (2012). The effects of intellectual capital on organizational innovation (Case study: Copper Complex of Sarcheshmeh in Rafsanjan). A collection of articles in the First International Conference on entrepreneurship and knowledge-based business management. Babolsar. Mazandaran University (Pardis). November 13th, 2012: 19-1.

60. Hosseinpour, d.; Ahoopay, M. (2013). The impact of serving leadership and intellectual capital on corporate entrepreneurship. *Quarterly Journal of Management Studies (recovery and transformation)*. 23 (70): 149-135.
61. Zarin-Sabab, M.; Salari, S. (2012). Intellectual capital management, a new approach in the development and improvement of organizational innovation. Report of a research project. Entrepreneurship Center of Sharif University of Technology.
62. Rezai, R. (2014). The effect of intellectual capital components on corporate entrepreneurship of advisory, Agricultural, and Engineering companies of Zanjan province. *Organizational Culture Management*. 12(1):147-125.
63. Anker, L.V. (2006). Absorptive capacity and innovative performance: A human capital approach. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. Vol 15. No 4-5. Pp 17-507.
64. Wu, S, H. Lin, L, Y. Hsu, M, Y. (2007). Intellectual capital, dynamic capabilities and innovative performance of organizations, *International Journal of Technology Management*, Vol. 39 No 3-4, pp. 279-96.
65. Marvel, M.R. and Lumpkin, G.T. (2007). Technology entrepreneurs' human capital and its effects on innovation radicalness, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 807-28.
66. Allen, S.D., Link, A.N. Rosenbaum, D.T. (2007), *Entrepreneurship and human capital: evidence of patenting activity from the academic sector*, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 937-51.
67. Mejia, D., St-Pierre, M.,(2008), Unequal opportunities and human capital formation, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 86, No.2, PP. 395-413.
68. Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., Wright, M., (2008). Opportunity identification and pursuit: Does an entrepreneur's human capital matter, *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 30, No. 2, PP. 153–173.
69. Michalski, M. Vazquez, F.J. (2008). The importance of intellectual capital for the entrepreneurial firm. Master Thesis in Business and Administration, Mälardalen University, 15 ECTS.
70. Erol, E. Ebru, B. (2009). Is intellectual capital antecedent of entrepreneurship orientation?. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, Vol 6 No 2, PP 121- 135.
71. Irena, M. Giedre, A. (2011). The evaluation of intellectual capital influence on entrepreneurship". *Journal of Economics and Management*, Vol 16 No 1, PP 558- 566.
72. Sadudin, I. & Gadaf, R. (2011). The link between intellectual capital, strategy and entrepreneurship. Research Report, Social Science Research Network.
73. Talebi, K. & Bahamir, A. (2012). "Identification of intellectual capital effects on promoting organizational entrepreneur (Charmahal- e-Bakhtiari Department of Cooperatives, Labors and Social Welfare)". *Journal of Business Economics & Management Research*, Vol 2 No 6, PP 131- 142.
74. Roca-Puig, V. Beltran-Martin, I. Cipres, M, S. (2012). Combined effect of human capital, temporary employment and organizational size on firm performance. *Personnel Review*. Vol. 41. No. 1. Pp. 4-22.
75. Kolstad, I & Wiig, A. (2013). Is it both what you know and who you know? Human capital, social capital and entrepreneurial success, *Journal of International Development*. No 25. Pp 626- 639.
76. Arabioun, A.; Dehghan Najmabadi, A.; Reza-zadeh, A.; Zarnegarian, Y. Saedi Tape Rasht, T. (2011). The effects of organizational structure on the entrepreneurial orientation of organizations (case study: Libraries of Tehran University), *Research and Information Research journal*. 45 (56):13-26.
77. Toghray, M. T. (2011). Mapping social capital in promoting innovation and entrepreneurial marketing activities, a master's thesis, Tehran University, Faculty of Management.
78. Piran, M.; Agha-Jani, T., Shoghi, B.; Reza-zadeh, A.; Dehghan Najm-Abadi, A. (2012). The effect of social capital on the creativity of employee in the casting industry of Iran (t case study: employees of Kaveh Industrial Zone), *initiative and creativity in humanities*, 1(2):163-182.
79. Rabiee, A.; Sarabi, S. (2013). The effect of social capital and its dimensions on Women's Entrepreneurship (Case study: Association of entrepreneur Women), *Quarterly Socio-Cultural Development Studies*, 1(4):33-68.
80. Karimi, F.; Ahmadi-dastjerdi, S.; Rajaepour, S. (2013). A model of relationships between social capital and organizational learning capability with innovation of the employees. *Efficiency Management*. 7(27):165-182.
81. Anderson, C., Leigh, L. L., & Rachel, N. (2001). Microcredit, social capital, and common pool resources, *World Development*, 30: 95-105.
82. Leana, C. R., & Pil, F. K. (2006). Social capital and organizational performance: Evidence from urban public schools, *Organization Science*, 17: 353-366.
83. Zheng, W. (2008). A social capital perspective of innovation from individuals to nations: where is empirical literature directing us?, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10: 1-39.
84. Wood, M., & Pearson, J. (2009). Taken on faith? The impact of uncertainty, knowledge relatedness, and richness of information on entrepreneurial opportunity exploitation, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16: 117- 130.

85. Wu, C. M., Ay, C. R., & Lien, B. Y. H. (2009). The role of social capital and organizational learning in promoting innovation performance, *Information Systems and Change Management*, 4: 171-186.
86. Chang, S. C., Tein, S. W., & Lee, H. M. (2010). Social capital, creativity, and new product advantage: An empirical study, *International Journal of Electronic Business Management* 8: 43-55.
87. Pishghadam, R., & Zabihi, R. (2011). Social and cultural capital in creativity, *Canadian Social Science*, 7: 32-38.
88. Cheng, H., H. (2012). The effect of social capital on creativity in information systems development projects: The mediating effect of knowledge integration, *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 64: 788-793.
89. Forouhar, M.; Hoveyda, R.; Jamshidian, A.R. (2011). Relationship between psychological capital and corporate entrepreneurship of faculty members. *Quarterly of Culture Counseling and Psychotherapy*, 2(8):100-83.
90. Marashian, F. S.; Naderi, F. (2013). The relationship between organizational culture, emotional intelligence and psychological capital with self-efficacy of employment and corporate entrepreneurship of the staff of Khuzestan Water and Electricity agencies. *Science and Research in Applied Psychology*, Vol. XIV; 3(53):121-112.
91. Dianat Nasab, M.; Javidi, H.; Baghooli, H. (2014). The Mediating role of work related stress in the relationship between psychological capital and job performance. *Psychological methods and models*, 4 (15):89-75.
92. House, Bessie. (2002). Confronting the Odds; *African American Entrepreneurship*, [http:// www.civilica.com/Papers-MIEAC Title-ASCAI.Html](http://www.civilica.com/Papers-MIEAC Title-ASCAI.Html).
93. Hmieleski, Keith M. (2007). The Relationship between Entrepreneur Psychological Capital and Well-Being, available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1064021>.
94. Valli,S, Niittykangas. H & Haapanen. M. (2009). Positive psychological capital and growth aspirations of Enetreneurs *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Available at: <http://digitalknowledge.babson.edu/>
95. Sweetman, David, Luthans, Fred, Avey, James B & Luthans, Brett C. (2010). Relationship between Positive Psychological Capital and Creative Performance, Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cjas.175/ful>.
96. Clarysse, B., Tartari,V. & Salter, A. (2011). The impact of entrepreneurial capacity, experience and organizational support on academic entrepreneurship, *Research Policy*, 40(8), 1084–1093.