

THE THEORY OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES FOR ATHLETES AND COHESION IN SPORTS TEAMS

Dr. Mohammad Javad Naeiji¹, Mahsa Mahmoodi Mehrizi²

¹Assistant Professor,

*Department of Entrepreneurship Management, Faculty of Management and Accounting,
Shahid Beheshti*

University, Tehran, Iran

²Department of

*Entrepreneurship Management, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Shahid Beheshti University,
Tehran, Iran*

Abstract

In traditional approaches to build team cohesion, it is focused on the short-term methods including providing Motivational incentives and applying conflict management techniques where such approaches in the cases the teams provided with high diversity and distinction did not show essential efficiency in nature. This study aims to study the role of emotional and cultural intelligence of athletes in cohesion in sports teams as a new approach in this scope. Research data has been collected of 137 athletes from Major national teams as well as athletics league teams across Tehran where two teammates' views asked in addition to an athlete's view in order to assess the cultural and emotional intelligence. The findings of research showed that a positive significant relationship exists between emotional intelligence and cohesion in sports teams ($r = 0.283$, $p < 0.01$). Further, the cultural intelligence of team members found with a high correlation with cohesion in sports teams ($r = 0.355$, $p < 0.01$). The results from regression analysis of the sub-indices associated to cultural and emotional intelligence indicated that three components of Behavioral cultural intelligence, The use of Emotions and cultural and cognitive intelligence had the highest correlation level with cohesion in sports teams where found as the only components of emotional and cultural intelligence with a casual relationship with dependant research variable. A survey on demographic variables indicates that the more membership experience of the team members, cohesion and education status of team members increase, the team cohesion decreases. Nevertheless, a correlation did not observe between gender and age of sports teams members and team cohesion. To sum up, the results of this study expand the operating approaches, scope of theoretical and applied studies on the personal factors affecting sports teams' cohesion.

Keywords: Team cohesion, Cultural diversity, Emotional intelligence, Cultural intelligence, Sports

Introduction

From the very beginning, Intelligent Quotient recognized as the most important factor affecting athletes' personal performance where its role has been confirmed in Sporting success in many studies. Nevertheless, in sports teams provided with more Communication networks and

dynamics, just Intelligent Quotient cannot result in success of team (Crowne, 2013; Rapisarda, 2002). The results of a variety of studies indicate, the teams provided with massive ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity would be severely suspected to conflicts emergence facing their inherent cohesion with threats (Du Plessis, 2011). Several reasons exist for such conflicts in the teams with high cultural diversity: the first, due to lack of common cultural system, team members look upon with different perspectives so as the way they interpret or understand them can be totally different (Joshi & Roh, 2009). The second, various cultures use different styles of decision making, communications and knowledge exchange. For instance, individuals in the Individualist cultures compared to collectivist cultures less tend towards participatory decision making and knowledge exchange. While the individuals with such cultural differences put in a team, they would ask different expectations whereby this would make difficult access to a common solution (Gibson & McDaniel, 2010; Groves & Feyerherm, 2011). The third, the more cultural diversity increases, the individuals in groups tend to stereotyping, attempting to build sub-teams in their main team in order to reveal cohesion in team, whereby stereotyping would lead to intragroup conflicts affecting the team performance. The fourth, there is not the same meaning on emotions, feelings, verbal and non-verbal behaviors for the all in a team whereby a different interpretation can be found in accordance with the context of each culture or subculture.

The factors resulting in conflict emergence found with cultural and emotional nature inherently causing the Intelligent Quotient, although necessary for the team members, not seem sufficient so that most of scholars have drawn their attention to the position of other types of intelligence (Lee, 2010; Ahn & Ettner, 2013). This is of importance particularly in Iran mentioned replete with massive cultural diversity at which so many subcultures exist (Naeiji & Abbasalizadeh, 2010). Notable, neglect of such diversity can lead to emergence of intragroup conflicts reducing the *cohesion* accounted as the fundamental components of success in sports teams. The studies conducted to date indicate at those teams with high level of potential social and cultural conflicts and distinctions, IQ supports only 20% of success so as the left relies on other factors.

Further, teams provided with higher social and cultural intelligences have shown better performance indicators, e.g. role of cultural intelligence as a predictive factor to trust, performance and cohesion has been confirmed (Moynihan et al., 2006) where the emotional intelligence found effective in increasing individuals' desire to sustain in team and enhance common values (Quoidbach & Hansenne, 2009). Although such evidences exist on the job teams, several studies on the position of emotional and cultural intelligence in sports area and its effect on sports teams have not conducted. These few studies found with contradictory results. Several studies have reported the negative relationship between team diversity and cohesion (Harrison et al., 1998), while other studies have not reported any relationship between these two (Smith et al., 1994).

This is in a way that if the conflict existing in teams not to be controlled in proper then a decrease in intragroup cohesion would be resulted whereby the effectiveness in teams would be faced with a big challenge. The heterogeneous team members might have different views, values, attitudes and/or knowledge getting specified in interactions or resulting in intergroup conflicts (Pamela, 2006).

Such conflicts reduce the intragroup cohesion level causing the members leave the team, at this time team members' beliefs on the teams potential to succeed in access to their goal can be deterministic in leaving their job or duty. The members who believe their team provided with the critical factors of success in doing their tasks would tend to sustain in team more. Within the importance of members sustained in Heterogeneous group, managing such groups would not simple ever since observed no common point exists on how to build the intention to sustain in heterogeneous group so that this point has been examined in different points of views (Seymen, 2006).

Indeed, intentions to leave the job in various teams left unknown (Lawrence, 1997) where each view indicates a part of the general approach. In this regards, the present paper investigates the role of cultural and emotional intelligence in cohesion *in* sports teams. The major goals of this study in response to three questions can come to realize:

- To what extent emotional intelligence affects cohesion in sports teams?
- Does the cultural intelligence affect those groups of sports teams provided with high cultural diversity?
- Do the indicators including gender, age, and membership in team and education status have a significant relationship with team cohesion?

Literature review

Emotional intelligence: The terms emotional intelligence and emotional quotient found as the new concepts and terms used the most in the 1995s in American Dialectic society, later the studies on the emotional intelligence kept increasing (Mayer et al. 2008). Emotional intelligence found effective to recognize the individual's feelings and emotions to control the emotions in real relationships properly. The individuals conveyed intelligence emotionally use their emotions to control their relationships, decisions and programs whereon undesired realities and conflicts are not ignored. They are more skilled to measure others' emotions, indicating understanding and sympathy, reacting better towards the social environment and providing a proper framework for social support to themselves (Lam & O'Higgins, 2012). Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2008) have defined emotional intelligence as an emotional information processing which includes accurate evaluation of emotions and feelings in the individual and others, accurate expression of feelings and adaptive adjust of feelings such that the life quality can increase In the pattern provided by Mayer et al. used as a framework to measure emotional intelligence whereon four scopes of emotional intelligence abilities have been proposed:

1-perceiving and understanding self emotions: Degree of awareness of self emotions as well as the extent to which verbal and non-verbal expression of such emotions differs in different individuals. The individuals who express their emotions more accurate would be understood by others better coping better in their social interactions.

2-perceiving and understanding others emotions: the individuals who skilled better in evaluating others emotions and found perfect at understanding and sympathy would understand the social environment better, so as could provide better social(Ciarrochi & Rosete, 2005).

3-controlling emotions: individuals' ability in controlling their emotions and ability to change effective reactions to others found different (Mayer et al. 2000). Adjusting the individual's emotions and behaviors results in negative and positive effective situations. The individuals found more intelligent in their emotion, are skilled in being in the positive conditions where can tolerate the negative conditions with less destructive consequences.

Using emotions: individuals differ in the methods of using emotions. The most important uses of emotions include the improvement in decision making process with regard to better understanding the individual's emotional reactions, facilitate the thinking processes including creativity and increasing endurance with the use of arousing emotions (Zmpetakis et al. 2008)

Cultural intelligence

Cultural intelligence is the individual's ability makes the individual to act in different cultural situations effectively (Earley & Ang, 2003). These causes the individuals resolve the cultural barriers easier and manage to resolve the intercultural issues. Cultural intelligence makes us able to recognize the cultural differences by means of knowledge and awareness let to behave in a different way in different cultures (Triandis, 2006). The person conveyed intelligent in cultural

perspective, can emerge the same behavior by his experiences fitted with the existing situation. Studies show cultural intelligence affects individuals' performance through two factors. The first is the very notion of cultural sensitivity, i.e. it lets the individuals draw attention to cultural differences existing among them and others (Janssens & Brett, 2006).

This means drawing into attention the cultural differences not judging about their advantage or disadvantage. The second factor lies in accepting cultural differences called in term the process of Cultural Compatibility (House, et al., 2002). The individuals with higher cultural intelligence show more cultural compatibility, attempting cope with the cultural distinctions and diversities placed in the environment. One of the features which double the importance of cultural intelligence turns back to the capability of acquisition. Hence, cultural intelligence can be reared in the individuals. In this regard, it has to draw into attention two points, the first: this can be managed and undertaken by qualified individuals like professional psychologists, the second: improving cultural intelligence has to be assigned along with Comprehensive program to foster strategic human resource together with other facets of this program (Alon & Higgins, 2005).

Most studies grounded on cultural intelligence provided based on a four-factor model where such intelligence is evaluated in form of strategy, knowledge, motivation and behavior (Ang et al, 2004). Due to comprehensive four-factor model, a set of factors engaged in this model has been used to assess cultural intelligence in this study where its components are reviewed in the following:

Metacognitive CQ: this means how the individual perceives the intercultural experiences. This cognition indicates the processes assigned by individuals to acquire cultural knowledge. This occurs while the individuals judge about their and others thinking processes.

Metacognitive CQ consists of metacognitive strategy of cross-cultural encounters, review and modifies assumptions when dealing with mental maps in the light of difference in the actual experiences of the previous expectations.

Cognitive CQ: this indicates understanding cultural differences and similarities showing the general knowledge and cognitive or mental maps of individuals from other cultures Moynihan et al, 2004). Cognitive facet of cultural intelligence consists of legal and economic systems recognized, Norms of social interaction, religious beliefs, aesthetic values of other cultures and languages.

Motivational CQ: this indicates individual's tendency to test other cultures and interact with the individuals from different cultures. This motivation consists of individuals' internal values for multicultural interactions and the self-confidence which let the individual acts effectively in different cultural situations.

Behavioral CQ: this consists of the individual's ability to adapt with verbal or non-verbal behaviors accounted proper in different cultures. Behavioral CQ consists of a set of logical behavioral responses using in different situations accounted relevant with a specific interaction or situation with the capability to adapt or modify.

Team cohesion

Team cohesion or group cohesion conveyed to individuals' tendency to sustain in a team (Schermerhorn. et al.2002). Individuals in cohesive teams value their membership in a team who desire to sustain on their relationship with team members. In viewpoint of Carron et al. (1998), cohesion is a dynamic process which indicates members loyalty to the group and sustain in a group to access their goals or meet their needs. This definition of cohesion provided as multidimensional and dynamic structure with social property in nature where this definition rather than other ones can define the concept of cohesion better. The results of studies focused on the impact of cohesion on other concepts and variables of team performance. High team cohesion affects decreasing unconstructive conflicts (Nibler & Harris, 2003; Andrews, et al.,

2008), improving personal performance(Chang & Bordia, 2001), improving group performance(Dion, 2000), innovation in teams and organizations(Mumford & Hunter, 2005). In the sports arena, higher levels of cohesion result in more proper attitudes towards exercises (Courneya, 1995), better performance (Carron et al, 2002), more concentration and stability (Spink, 1995). The studies by Williams and Widmeyer (1991) indicate higher levels of functional cohesion among national college women's golf teams in America can predict the success motivation in golfers. The recent study on Basketball Players indicates that team cohesion affects members understanding towards the extent to which their fundamental needs met so that this understanding affects their satisfaction in direct (Blanchard et al. 2009).

Emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence and cohesion in sports teams

An investigation into the challenges the teams faced with it in the multicultural environments as a multidisciplinary topic, this found with a long history in literature review of Management, cultural sciences and physical education so that a large body of research on the role of diversity of emotional, emotional, cultural and gender on team performance has been conducted. Studies by Chang & Bordia (2001) indicate that the groups with the common understanding, there would emerge low level of success. Further, the possibility of leaving team by athletes who do not see the team Uniform and consistent, would increase (Coumeya, 1995). Bayazit & Mannix(2003) in a study grounded on the reasons the individuals sustained in sports teams, concluded that Heterogeneity of individuals in sports teams oblige them to conflict with other team members whereby the interaction and in the end the team cohesion would be reduced. Therefore, the possibility to leave the team by members has been increased. The studies conducted to date grounded on increasing team cohesion in different groups in terms of emotional and cultural scope, have focused more on the techniques to resolve conflicts, build motivational factors and adjust coaching style where an investigation into the role of emotional and cultural intelligence in improving sports teams cohesion seen less in the studies. However, it seems if looked at team functions in emotional perspective, the better outcomes would be acquired because the cultural and emotional intelligence can be improved substantially in teams due to the property of acquisition of such types of intelligence (Crowne, 2008).

The result of a study on The Pupil/Student Services teams with high cultural diversity indicates cultural intelligence helps team members to develop intragroup values among themselves (Brislin et al, 2006). Behavioral Cultural Intelligence and Metacognitive cultural intelligence have played the most in developing intragroup values in heterogeneous teams. Each of team members might suppose difference presuppositions about teamwork (Ang, & Inkpen, 2008; Naeiji & Safikhani, 2014).

They have entered to a team with a totally different understanding from how to interact with each other and how to do the tasks whereby they found a set of behavioral norms and standards with regard to their cultural experiences in the past. Team members with the same or participatory cultures at which social coordination is a value do not share those views which affect sustained far from the team(Adair et al., 2013; Pescosolido & Saavedra, 2012). Further, team members with Hierarchical cultures at which distance prioritizes power, would tend to disagree with the ideas proposed by leader and/or members with the most power (Earley & Gibson, 2002).

Research Methodology

The present paper in terms of aim is an applied type of research where descriptive statistics have been used to collect data so that this study conveyed as such a survey type of research. The main

tools to collect data mentioned the questionnaire used to measure cultural intelligence so as the questionnaire with 20 questions of Cultural Intelligence Center has been used. This questionnaire has been designed in four dimensions of cognitive cultural intelligence, metacognitive cultural intelligence, behavioral cultural intelligence and motivational cultural intelligence. The questionnaire of Wong and Law(2002), consisting of four dimensions of recognizing self emotions, recognizing others emotions, controlling emotions and using emotions has been used to measure emotional intelligence. Team cohesion has been measured by means of Physical Activity Group Environment Questionnaire (PAGE-Q). To measure validity of questionnaire, content validity has been examined and Cronbach's alpha method has been used to measure reliability of questionnaire where software-SPSS21 has been used to calculate the value of reliability. Team cohesion has been measured by means of physical activity group environment questionnaire. This scale includes four questions to measure sports team's members' perceptions to the extent of cohesion existing in their team. Cohesion questionnaire based upon five-option Likret spectrum from totally agree to totally disagree has been designed. This questionnaire found with high validity and reliability in the previous studies (Estabrooks & Carron, 2000; Shapcott et al., 2006).

The value of Alpha Chronbach for the cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence, team cohesion questionnaires acquired 0.82, 0.87 and 0.92, respectively. Alpha Chronbach value changed from 0.72 for cultural intelligence to 0.93 for emotional intelligence in order to adjust self emotions. To sum up, the entire main and secondary variables provided with the least Alpha Chronbach for non-experimental studies.

Statistical population and sampling method

Statistical population consists of athletes from Major national teams as well as athletics league teams from three handball, basketball and volleyball fields across Tehran. As aimed to investigate the impact of cultural emotion within multicultural environments, two limitations in statistical population have been taken into account. The first the teams accounted in statistical population at which there exist athletes from three provinces. The second, those team members put in statistical population with at least two years membership in team. On the whole, 134 individuals examined as the sample. Since the self-assertion intelligence questionnaires consist of bias, questionnaires of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence were given to the individual and two others among his teammates or coaches where the mean of three questionnaires

To select samples, the stratified random sampling method has been applied. It has been acted in this way that the number of statistical population members in each sports field determined, and then based on sample size of statistical population, the research questionnaires distributed. After the questionnaires distributed, 361, 346 and 137 questionnaires of emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence and team cohesion returned. The results of demographic status in the research samples have been indicated in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of samples based on their gender, age and education status

Gender			
Males		Females	
Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
76	55.5%	44.5	61%

Age

Younger than 20 years old		20-25 years old		25-30 years old		Elder than years old	
Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
18	13.1	38	27.7	59	43.1	22	16.1

Team membership experience							
2-4 years		4-6 years		6-8 years		Over 8 years	
Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
35	25.4	49	35.8	34	24.9	19	13.9

Education status							
Diploma and under diploma		Associate degree		Bachelor degree		Master degree	
Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
60	43.8	25	18.2	47	34.3	5	3.7

Research findings

According to the relationship existing between research hypotheses and normality of factors distribution, Pearson correlation coefficient has been used to evaluate the relationship between indicators of cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence and team cohesion where the results have been shown in table 2. As indicated in table 2, the relationship between cultural intelligence and team cohesion is confirmed at 0.01 level($r=0.355$), such a relationship observed between emotional intelligence and team cohesion observed as well, however, the correlation coefficient assigned to emotional intelligence compared to cultural intelligence reported very low.

Table 2. Pearson correlation coefficient between emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence and team cohesion

Independent variable	Pearson correlation coefficient	p-value
Emotional intelligence	0.283	0.006
Cultural intelligence	0.355	0.000

The results associated to the correlative relationship between cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence, demographic variables and team cohesion have been reported. As shown in table 2, all the dimensions of cultural intelligence found with a correlative relationship with team cohesion at 5% level. Yet, the relationship between emotional intelligence dimensions and cohesion approved, reporting there this not a significant relationship between recognition of self emotions and team cohesion. The relationship between demographic variables and cohesion found with a massive difference in a way that no relationship between gender and age and cohesion observed. Further, a positive relationship between membership experience and cohesion but negative one between education status and cohesion seen.

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients between research sub-hypotheses and team cohesion

Main variables	Sub-variables	Pearson correlation coefficient	p-value
Cultural intelligence	Cognitive cultural intelligence	0/401	** 0/000
	Metacognitive cultural intelligence	0/211	* 0/035
	Behavioral cultural intelligence	0/318	** 0/002
	Motivational cultural intelligence	0/387	** 0/000
Emotional intelligence	Recognize self emotions	0/126	0/058

	Recognize others emotions	0/207	** 0/041
	Control emotions	0/265	** 0/008
	Use emotions	0/314	** 0/000
Demography	Gender	0/105	0/217
	Age	0/064	0/454
	Membership experience	0/319	** 0/000
	Education status	-0/237	** -0/002

To define the research results better, Hierarchical regression test has been used to analyze the casual relationships existing among research variables. For this, each of four-typed dimensions of emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence as predictive variables and team cohesion as criterion variable entered to the equation where the results from regression has been indicated in table 4. As indicated in table above, behavioral and cognitive dimensions at 0.01 level from four dimensions of cultural intelligence and use of emotions from four dimensions of emotional intelligence found with a casual relationship with team cohesion. Therefore, enhancing behavioral and cognitive cultural intelligence and increasing the ability to use emotions can affect increasing team cohesion.

Table 4. Results of Hierarchical regression test to find the impact of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on team cohesion

Model	Non-standard coefficients	Standard coefficients	t	Error level
	Beta	Beta		
Behavioral cultural intelligence	-0/087 0/343	0/523	-0/119 9/826	0/834 0/000
Behavioral cultural intelligence in using emotions	-0/758 0/241 0/286	0/337 0/301	-4/225 5/311 4/776	0/000 0/000 0/004
Behavioral cultural intelligence in using cognitive cultural intelligence emotions	-0/844 0/266 0/291 0/277	0/360 0/319 0/294	-4/018 6/559 4/921 5/139	0/000 0/000 0/001 0/013

Conclusion

The theory of Multiple Intelligences for athletes and cohesion in sports teams has been examined in present paper. The findings of this paper introduced both emotional and cultural emotions as the fundamental factors in building cohesion. However, previous studies have taken the role of cognitive intelligence in sports teams' success, this study accounted as one of the early studies defined position of other types of intelligence in sports teams particularly team cohesion. The results of this study indicate at the teams with high diversity, conflict might occur more.

Being provided with cultural and emotional intelligence can come useful in building group correlation and increasing commitment to team. While team members provide with higher emotional intelligence, cognitive complexity and ambiguity increase whereby the team members sensitize to their teammates internal characteristics showing more adaptive behavior. Further, the teams with more cultural diversity and complexity, cultural intelligence helps team members to cope better with various cultural characteristics (Crowne, 2013; Du Plessis, 2011). The importance of these research findings can be examined in two perspectives: the first, selecting, training and evaluating players have not limited to their technical and tactical abilities in team

sports where emotions, feelings and communications besides other technical skills assure the success of team. The players with high level of sport abilities would not optimize the team performance. So many instances of sports teams can be found with disappointing outcomes however having a selection of the best players, turning back to lack of ability in building team cohesion feeling and access to a common understanding(Pescosolido, Saavedra, 2012).

In this regards, emotional and cultural intelligence provide the sport teams practitioners with a criterion which can give the best outcome in building cohesion. The second point stemmed from this study lies in the fact that emotional and cultural intelligence can be acquired. In traditional approaches to build team cohesion like providing motivational incentives and conflict management techniques, it is mainly focused on short-term methods, attempting to assign strategies to cope with them by recognizing threatening factors of cohesion. The weak point lies in such strategies is that by any change in conditions or replace practitioners within organization, no longer effectiveness in cohesion would last. In contrary, emotional and cultural intelligence conveyed as long-tem strategies which can be improved by means of different methods so that several programs can be applied to develop such types of intelligence (Alon & Higgins, 2005). Reading books and articles about different cultures, playing techniques, building laboratory space (virtual), and putting people in teams in both emotional and cultural perspectives are those strategies can be assigned to empower emotional and cultural intelligence(Lee et al., 2013).

Drawing attention to casual effects of different emotional and cultural intelligence aspects on team cohesion, several points can be deduced. In this study, a significant relationship reported between “behavioral cultural intelligence and cognitive cultural intelligence” and cohesion. In other words, if these aspects enhanced, team cohesion can be expected with a large increase. Cultural Intelligence relies on recognizing economic and legal systems, the norms existing in social interactions, religious beliefs, aesthetic values of other cultures and languages where a better understanding can be acquired when going through these factors coming them to realize. Nevertheless, if cognitive abilities found higher than other cultures, but not emerge in verbal and non-verbal behaviors, then it won’t help to make an effective relationship. Among all the aspects of emotional intelligence, only use of emotions found with a direct impact on cohesion. This can be defined in a way that recognizing self and others emotions is fundamental to use emotions in behaving with other teammates, this has been reported by participants. Yet, it has to pay a particular attention to the point that other secondary factors like metacognitive cultural intelligence, motivational cultural intelligence, recognizing self and other emotions which found with a correlative relationship with cohesion affect cohesion in a indirect way where only recognizing others emotions has not found with a direct/indirect relationship with cohesion.

Research findings oriented on the difference among the demographic classes in perspective of team cohesion consists of several points. The first demographic variable was the gender, not shown a significant relationship with cohesion. In other words, there does not exist a difference among cohesion level in males and females sports teams. Another demographic variable mentioned the age of team members put in the range from 17 to 35 years old in the samples studied. No difference among different age group exists in cohesion perspective where this is totally relevant with the results of research by Wendt et al. (2009).

The third demographic variable in present paper was the membership experience in the team showed a strong relationship with team cohesion. In other words, team cohesion increases by increasing membership experience. The most conflicts in teams emerge at the early while the membership forms and then cohesion appears after trajectory to cohesion. Education status despite what expected affects team cohesion negatively where team preparation to build cohesion reduces whatever education status increases. The participants with the degree of diploma or lower degrees had substantially more cohesion rather than the ones with master degree or higher degrees. This can be associated to increasing trend in cognitive and behavioral complexities as well as a massive increase in educated individuals’ expectations by which the possibility to

emerge conflict in teams can be seen. Present paper indicates a survey field of study whereby the multiple types of intelligence can act as a predictive factor among most of the behavioral variables in the team or among individuals. It has to pay a particular attention to the point lies in the fact that cultural and emotional intelligence needs at first to comprehensive scales taken into account in Iran. Further, it is believed that CQ is not limited to international an interaction which includes communications with national subcultures and organizational culture. In cultural perspectives, some countries and organizations are taken as a small world where on cultural intelligence strategy can help for a more effective performance.

References

1. Adair, W.L., Hideg, I., & Spence, J.R. (2013). The Culturally Intelligent Team: The Impact of Team Cultural Intelligence and Cultural Heterogeneity on Team Shared Values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(6), pp. 941-962.
2. Ahn, M.J. & Ettner, L. (2013). Cultural intelligence (CQ) in MBA curricula. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 7 (1), pp. 4-16.
3. Alon, I., & Higgins, J.M. (2005). Global leadership success through emotional and cultural intelligences. *Business Horizons*, 48, pp. 501-512.
4. Andrews, M.C., Kacmar, K.M., Blakely, G. L., & Bucklew, N.S. (2008). Group cohesion as an enhancement to the justice affective commitment relationship. *Group & Organization Management*, 33, pp. 736-755.
5. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.Y., (2004). The Measurement of cultural intelligence. Paper presented at the August 2004 Academy of Management Meetings Symposium on Cultural Intelligence in the 21st Century, New Orleans, LA.
6. Ang, S. & Inkpen, A.C. (2008). Cultural intelligence and offshore outsourcing success: a framework of firm-level intercultural capability. *Decision Sciences*, 39(3), pp. 337-358.
7. Bayazit, M., & Mannix, E.A. (2003). Should I Stay or Should I Go?: Predicting Team Members' Intent to Remain in the Team. *Small Group Research*, 34, 290-321.
8. Blanchard, C.M., Amiot, C.E., Perreault, S., Vallerand, R.J., & Provencher, P. (2009). Cohesiveness, coach's interpersonal style and psychological needs: Their effects on self-determination and athletes' subjective well-being. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, pp. 1-7.
9. Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & Macnab, B. (2006). Cultural Intelligence: Understanding Behaviors that Serve People's Goals. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, pp. 40-55.
10. Carron, A.V., Colman, M.M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport: a Meta analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24, pp. 168-188.
11. Carron, A.V., Brawley, L.R., & Widmeyer, W.N. (1998). The measurement of cohesiveness in sport groups. In J.L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 213-226). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
12. Chang, A., & Bordia, P. (2001). A multidimensional approach to the group cohesion-group performance relationship. *Small Group Research*, 32(4), pp.379-405.
13. Courneya, K.S. (1995). Cohesion correlates with affect in structured exercise classes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 81, pp.1021-1022.
14. Crowne, K.A. (2008). What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizons*, 51, pp.391-399.
15. Crowne K.A. (2013). Cultural exposure, emotional intelligence, and cultural intelligence: An exploratory. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 13(1), pp. 5-22.
16. Dion, K.L. (2000). Group cohesion: From field of forces to multidimensional construct. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 4, pp.7-26.

17. Du Plessis, Y. (2011). Exploring teamwork paradoxes challenging 21st-century cross-cultural conflict management in a multicultural organizational context. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 12(1). pp. 49-71.
18. Earley, P.C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford: CA7 Stanford Business Books.
19. Earley, P.C., & Gibson, C.B. (2002). *Multinational work teams: A new perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
20. Estabrooks, P.A., & Carron, A.V. (2000). The Physical Activity Group Environment Questionnaire: An instrument for the assessment of cohesion in exercise classes. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 4, pp. 230-243.
21. Gibson, C.B., & McDaniel, D.M. (2010). Moving Beyond Conventional Wisdom: Advancements in Cross-Cultural Theories of Leadership, Conflict, and Teams. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), pp. 450-462.
22. Groves, K.S., & Feyerherm, A.E. (2011). Leader Cultural Intelligence in Context: Testing the Moderating Effects of Team Cultural Diversity on Leader and Team Performance. *Group & Organization Management*. 36(5), pp. 535-566.
23. Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H., & Bell, M.P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, pp. 96-107.
24. House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1), pp. 3-10.
25. Janssens, M., & Brett, J.M. (2006). Cultural Intelligence in Global Teams: A Fusion Model of Collaboration. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, pp. 124-153.
26. Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: a meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), pp. 599-627.
27. Lam, C.S., & O'Higgins, E.R.E. (2012). Enhancing employee outcomes: The interrelated influences of managers' emotional intelligence and leadership style. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33 (2), pp. 149-174.
28. Lawrence, B.S. (1997). The black box of organizational demography. *Organizational Science*, 8, pp. 1-22.
29. Lee, L-Y. (2010). Multiple intelligences and the success of expatriation: the roles of contingency variables. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(17), pp. 3793-3804.
30. Lee, L-Y., Veasna, S., & Wu, W-Y. (2013). The effects of social support and transformational leadership on expatriate adjustment and performance The moderating roles of socialization experience and cultural intelligence. *Career Development International*, 18(4), pp. 377-415.
31. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63, pp. 503-517.
32. Mayer, J., Salovey, P. & Caruso, D. (2000). Emotional Intelligence as Zeitgeist, as Personality, and as a Mental Ability, in Bar-on and Parker (eds), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, Jossey- Bass: New York.
33. Moynihan, L.M., & Peterson R.S., & Earley P.C. (2006). Cultural Intelligence and the Multinational Team Experience: Does the Experience of Working in a Multinational Team Improve Cultural Intelligence? *Research on Managing Groups and Teams* , 9, pp. 299-323.
34. Mumford, M.D., & Hunter, S.T. (2005). Innovation in organizations: A multi-level perspective on creativity. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Multi-level issues in strategy and methods* (pp. 11-174). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

35. Naeiji, M.J., and Abbasalizadeh, M. (2010). Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Affectivity and Entrepreneurial Behaviors: Evidence from Iran SMEs. First International Conference on Entrepreneurship (ICE-2010): Iran.
36. Naeiji, M.J., and Safikhani, S. (2014). Emotional and Cultural Intelligence: A response to Entrepreneurial Leadership challenges in Multi-Cultural Organizations. *Applied Mathematics in Engineering, Management and Technology*, In press.
37. Nibler, R., & Harris, K.L. (2003). The effects of culture cohesiveness on intragroup conflict effectiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, pp. 613-631.
38. Pescosolido, A.T. & Saavedra, R. (2012). Cohesion and Sports Teams: A Review. *Small Group Research*, 43(6), pp. 744-758.
39. Quoidbach, J., & Hansenne, M. (2009). The Impact of Trait Emotional Intelligence on Nursing Team Performance and Cohesiveness. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 25(1), pp. 23-29.
40. Rapisarda, B.A. (2002). The impact of emotional intelligence on work team cohesiveness and performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10(4), pp. 363-379.
41. Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(5), pp. 388-99.
42. Rossen, E., & Kranzler, J.H. (2009). Incremental validity of the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test Version 2.0 (MSCEIT) after controlling for personality and intelligence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, pp. 60-65.
43. Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.N. (2002). *Organizational behavior*. New York: Wiley.
44. Seymen, O.A. (2006). The cultural diversity phenomenon in organizations and different approaches for effective cultural diversity management: a literary review. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 13 (4), pp. 296-315.
45. Shapcott, K.M., Carron, A.V., Burke, S.M., Bradshaw, M.H., & Estabrooks, P.A. (2006). Groups Member Diversity and Cohesion and Performance in Walking. *Small Group Research*, 37, pp. 701-720.
46. Smith, K.G., Smith, K.A., Olian, J.D., Sims, H.P., O'Bannon, D.P., & Scully, J.A. (1994). Top management team demography and process: The role of social integration and communication. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 412-438.
47. Spink, K.S. (1995). Cohesion and intentions to participate of female sport team athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, pp. 416-427.
48. Triandis, H.C. (2006). Cultural Intelligence in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 32(1), pp 20-26.
49. Wendt, H., Martin, C., Euwema, I.J. & van Emmerik, Hetty. (2009). Leadership and team cohesiveness across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, pp. 358-370.
50. Williams, J.M., & Widmeyer, W.N. (1991). The cohesion-performance outcome relationship in a coaching sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 13, pp. 364-371.
51. Wong, C. & Law, K.S. (2002.) The effect of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, pp. 243-274.
52. Zampetakis, L.A., Panagiotis, B., & Moustakis, V.S. (2008). "Day-to-day" entrepreneurship within organisations: The role of trait Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Organisational Support. *European Management Journal*, 13, pp. 87-105.