

Relationship between cultural intelligence of coaches and effectiveness of the Iranian men's national team members

Hossein Peiymani Zad^{1*}, Somayyeh Poornazarpoor², Hasan Fahim Dovein¹

¹. Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

² Senior Expert, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Hamedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Hamedan, Iran
Peymanzad128@Gmail.com

Abstract: Introduction and aims: Mass effectiveness of players and high cultural intelligence of the coaches have an important role in the success of a team. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between cultural intelligence and competence of trainers in men's national team members of football, volleyball, basketball, and handball. **Materials and methods:** The research was based on the application and the recommended method of data collection was descriptor-correlation. The statistic population of this study includes the coaches and players of the national teams in four fields of futsal, volleyball, basketball and handball, with the total number of 35 for futsal, 31 for basketball, 31 for handball, 30 volleyball players and 36 coaches were chosen as sample group. Questionnaires for cultural intelligence and mass effectiveness were used to measure the variables. In this study, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to prove the normality assumption of data, and Pearson-Spearman correlation coefficient test and analysis of variance was used to test the research hypotheses. **Results:** In the variable of mass efficacy, the highest score was in handball sport players (387.38) and the lowest score was for basketball (351.48). In cultural Intelligence, the highest score was for the national basketball team coaches (83.10) and the lowest score was for the sport of futsal (75.62). At the cognitive and meta-cognitive components the basketball coaches, in motivational factors and behavioral components the handball coaches and in behavioral components the volleyball coaches gained the highest score. Between the cultural intelligence of coaches and mass efficiency of players ($p \leq 0.042$), and meta-cognition intelligence of trainers with mass efficacy of national team players there is a statistically significant relationship ($p \leq 0.05$). **Conclusions:** According to the study's findings it can be cautiously concluded that to gain more impact of coaches on the performance of players, in addition to considering other effective factors on the mass efficiency of players, consolidation and improvement of the cultural intelligence of the instructors must be taken into consideration and necessary trainings in this field should be given.

[Hossein Peiymani Zad, Somayyeh Poornazarpoor, Hasan Fahim Dovein. **Relationship between cultural intelligence of coaches and effectiveness of the Iranian men's national team members.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(5s):405-409] (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 73

Keywords: cultural intelligence, mass efficiency, national players, coaches

1. Introduction

Culture is the lifestyle of the society and is affected by several factors which are not identical and uniform in all communities. Accordingly, from a sociologist point of view, culture includes all behaviors that are learned in social life and transferred in various ways between different generations or people of the same generation (Fayyazi, 1384).

It surely can be claimed that the era of individual work has come to an end and today the management is more about management of working groups than management of individuals. Creating effective teams and their ability to coordinate effectively by playing the role of coordinator, is necessary for the group leader and group members (Faghihi Farahmand, 1381).

Cultural intelligence is the ability to communicate with a new culture that is often unfamiliar with the own culture (Early & Ang, 2003). What further reveals the importance of cultural intelligence is that cultural

intelligence is the most important reason for managers to try to avoid intercultural relations and the most important reason for the interactions failure (Green and Hill 2005).

Alon and Higgins (2005) began a study of global leadership success through emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. The results showed that for foreign leaders' successful respond to different environmental conditions and interpersonal relationships it is necessary to have high emotional and cultural intelligence.

Shane and Chen (2011) studied the role of cultural intelligence (CQ) and its impact on the performance of foreign workers. Also, the relationship between (CQ) and performance, and the impact of culture shock was studied. The results showed that (CQ) has a positive relationship to Filipino workers' performance and has a negative relationship with culture shock. Furthermore, it was found that the

relationship between (CQ) and performance, the cultural shock is somewhat an interface. These findings indicate that (CQ) can be a predictor of intercultural relations.

Mc Nobb and Worthly (2012) studied the individual characteristics as a predictive factor for the development of cultural intelligence and its relation to self-efficacy. The cultural intelligence is a hopeful development of the intercultural managing field.

Also a sports team is an organization that contains players, technical staff, administrative and support staff, all of which have the same aim as a team and players have different national cultures. With a total team effort and abilities of team members are in agreement that contains a series of complex reactions between individual agents and the team (Karen, 2005).

Thomas in 2005 studied the dominant variables in cultural intelligence, including cultural knowledge, cultural skill and cultural care. Cultural knowledge includes knowledge about this issue, which is a collection of what is culture? How cultures become different? How does culture affect behavior?

Elite athletes in team sports success at the national level where there are a lot of factors that depend on the efficiency of collective intelligence and knowledge of the coaches of cultural intelligence, the behavior and the extent of the coach play an important role in the success of a team. (Mokhtari, 1389).

In the past two decades, research on coaches' mass efficacy mainly considered characteristics of the mentor, the leadership styles and behavioral patterns are also important components of cultural intelligence. Success of an organization depends on the work of human resources and appropriate material. In this regard, teachers, administrators and technical staff have an important role and need to have skills that can help them in carrying out his mission (Aghaz 1385).

Edmund And colleagues (2009) studied mass efficacy, effort and performance level of players in 17 teams in various sports and found that with higher levels of collective efficacy, players attempt to achieve greater success in the show were also had better performance. Marcus and colleagues (2010), in their research on 76 semi-professional football players and basketball players as well as self-assessed level of team cohesion and collective efficacy paid players. His results showed that feelings of self-efficacy levels of players and coaches, teams, task cohesion and social cohesion of the team have a significant direct relationship.

Certainly people with similar values and attitudes are more likely to work in a team, but as members of a team have different cultural values, only through a strong cultural management can achieve the collective integrity and efficiency that it time which depends on the manager's ability.

Induction of lateral thinking and effective relationship with the players is too difficult and it will not be possible unless teachers are of high cultural intelligence. Communication and motivational skills, which are components of cultural intelligence, will require a more subtle analysis. In this study, the researcher attempted considering the success of the national team in the international arena, and the relationship between cultural intelligence plays an important role in guiding the athletes and coaches who play in the national team, considering the success of public sport.

2. Materials and methods

This study naturally analyzes the application, but in terms of data collection is a field survey. The coaches and players of the national teams are in the four major sports of futsal, volleyball, basketball and handball. The sample characteristics of the population has tried all the players in the national team sports camp in each order for 35 members of futsal, 31 basketball members, 31 handball members and 30 volleyball 30 members. Also from all the coaches of teams mentioned, 8 people of futsal, 9 people of volleyball, 9 people of handball and 10 from basketball were studied.

Variables to measure cultural intelligence scale was developed by the Center for American Cultural Intelligence Assessment, and is native in Iran research by Ramooz (1385). The players community for measuring the effectiveness of collective efficacy questionnaire (Fletz and Lirgue, 1998) with 49 questions, the athletes' perceptions of their team's ability to achieve desired conditions and objectives was evaluated. The person who achieved the national team camps can be used to collect data.

3. Statistical methods

To analysis the data, methods of descriptive statistics including frequency tables and percentages, averages, standard deviations was used and to inferential statistical test to determine normality of variables the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Pearson-Spearman correlation coefficient test to analysis of variance was used to test the research hypotheses.

4. Results

According to statistical data of Table 1, we can get that the highest score in mass efficacy variables is related to the handball players and lowest is assigned to basketball sports.

The highest score ranging cultural intelligence related to the national team coaches of basketball, and futsal coaches have the lowest cultural intelligence. In cognitive and meta-cognitive aspects the top scores are for basketball coaches and in motivational aspect the handball coaches, and in behavioral aspect the volleyball coaches had the highest score.

Table (1): variable indices of players and coaches of national teams

Statistics Variable	The score range	Futsal	Volleyball	Handball	Basketball	The total
Mass efficacy	441-49	381.45	380.06	387.38	351.48	375.25
Cultural Intelligence	100-20	75.62	78.22	77.11	83.10	78.72
Meta-cognitive aspect	20-4	15.57	14.88	15.77	17.50	16.02
Cognitive aspect	30-6	22.25	23.77	22.44	25.80	23.66
Motivational aspect	25-5	18.75	19.55	20.77	20.40	19.91
Behavioral aspect	25-5	18.87	20	18.11	19.4	19.11

In the statistical analysis of the study hypothesis, the correlation test results showed that between the mass efficiency of national team players and cultural intelligence of coaches there is a significant statistical relationship ($p \leq 0.04$). Also

relation between mass efficacy and meta-cognitive components of intelligence ($p \leq 0.05$) is significant in this respect and the other components of cultural intelligence and education level of the players association was not significant.

Table 2: Correlation between players' self-efficacy and cultural intelligence of coaches and its components (number of players = 127, number of teachers = 36)

Variable	Cultural Intelligence		Meta-cognitive Intelligence		Cognitive Intelligence		Motivational Intelligence		Behavioral Intelligence		Players' sporting history		Players' education	
Statistics	r	sig	r	sig	r	sig	r	sig	r	sig	r	sig	r	sig
Mass efficacy	0/64	0/04	0/61	0/05	0/58	0/06	0/16	0/32	0/33	0/20	0/12	0/08	0/02	0/41

Comparison of mass efficiency of national team players in different sports group showed a significant difference exists between their mass efficacy ($p \leq 0.007$). With an average between four sports, futsal, volleyball, handball and basketball by Scheffe post-hoc test, the results showed that between the futsal field and basketball ($p \leq 0.05$), and basketball and handball ($p \leq 0.01$), the difference is significant.

Table 3: Comparing the mass effectiveness of national team players from different sports

	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig
Inter-group	24118.29	3	4.244	0.007
Inner-group	232984.27	124		
Total	257102.56	127		

Table (4): Scheffe post-hoc test for comparison of studied groups

Sport	Sport	Mean \pm standard deviation	Sig
Futsal	Volleyball	10.82 \pm 2.38	0.99
	Handball	10.73 \pm -5.93	0.96
	Basketball	10.73 \pm 29.96	0.05
Handball	Futsal	10.73 \pm 5.93	0.95
	Volleyball	11.147 \pm 7.32	0.93
	Basketball	11.05 \pm 35.90	0.01

5. Discussion

This study shows there is a statically significant relationship between the mass effectiveness of national teams' players and cultural intelligence of their coaches. The correlation coefficient of 0.64 obtained results show a direct relationship between high cultural intelligence of coaches and collective efficiency of national team players. In other words coaches of high cultural intelligence are able to establish relationships with the intelligence of the players who have different cultures and ethnic groups will benefit and affect the performance of their players.

Data also showed that in mass efficacy variable, the highest score (387.38) achieved by handball players and minimum 351.48 score by basketball. Also on cultural intelligence the highest score (83.10) by the national basketball coaches, and the lowest score (75.62) is related to the sport of futsal. These data suggest that a high IQ basketball coach of the national team than other coaches and players have been able to establish a better relationship, but its efficiency is relative to other sports, and players have less effect on the other players. Consequently, factors other than technical or other factors are related to cultural intelligence.

The relationship between collective efficacy of national players wearing the components of cultural

intelligence (meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral) showed a statistically significant relationship between the components of cognitive, motivational and behavioral intelligence to mass effectiveness of the players in the meta-cognitive, meaning there was no significant relationship between the other components. However, the statistical analysis of the correlation coefficient obtained the cognitive component of (0.588) was statistically significant, but collectively with other components of cultural intelligence whatsoever. By looking at the data and statistical analysis, we can get the highest score ranging cultural intelligence is the basketball coach, who also scored the highest in the cognitive and meta-cognitive made. But after handball in the behavioral and motivational coaches, volleyball coaches get the highest score. In looking at the overall result representing the mean of this cultural intelligence and its components there were higher among coaches and players, as well as the efficiency is higher than average. An overview can be stated with coaches' motivational and behavioral components of the national teams who were not very successful, it is necessary to pay more attention in this field that coaches also have emotional issues. For as much as it can be affected by cognitive factors, motivational factors, emotional intelligence, behavior and cultural influences are important.

In comparison of mass efficiency of national players in different sports group showed no significant difference in these variables between players of different disciplines and national sports. The statistical analysis showed that the difference between basketball and football fields ($p \leq 0.05$), and basketball and handball ($p \leq 0.01$), was significant. Indicating that mass efficacy in basketball players earns more points. This difference was statistically significant. Collective efficacy basketball players earn lowest points and highest points are for handball players, indicating that they have better overall performance.

Bandura believes that motivation and performance in team sports are largely due to perceptions and beliefs of the players' ability and competence of the tasks successfully dependent. It is their belief in the ability of self-efficacy theory to examine self-efficacy and their ability to judge the people of the organization and to the performance of a series of desired activities defined. There are more of these problems in the theory of self-efficacy in relation to this or the people who already have a high self-efficacy, performed for tasks and objectives, comfortable and the head of them are doing it for the peace of the targets and will work hard to do homework in the face of difficulties and unpleasant conditions, showing great strength and therefore they

are more likely to be successful. The results show that this feature in handball players has the highest levels and in basketball players are at lower levels than the other three groups. The futsal athletes and volleyball have very close scores, which may be due to cultural intelligence of coaches of two sports that are very close together.

6. Conclusions

The findings of the study showed a higher overall level of cultural intelligence above average, although in some of the components of cultural intelligence among coaches of various sports studied, the rating was not the same, but by looking at the overall scores the optimum is achieved. In mass efficacy of the national team players, also showed the higher score than average is obtained in this variable which was not very good, although it has not to be noted. In summary, it can be said that for the effectiveness of coaches, in addition to considering other factors that come together in the work of team players, the coaches should be strengthened and improved in cultural intelligence and education should be taken into consideration for coaches in this field to improve the effectiveness of their work.

Corresponding author

Hossein Peiymani Zad

Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

Email: Peymanzad128@Gmail.com

References

1. Fayad, M., Jan Nisar Ahmad, Huda. (1384). Cultural intelligence is the need the diversity managers, policy magazine, the seventeenth year. No. 172.
2. Faghihi Nasser. (1381). Dynamic management of the organization, Tabriz Forouzesh publications.
3. Earley P.C & Ang s (2003); Cultural Intelligence: individual interactions across cultures. Stanford, CA. Stanfords Business Books- Earley, P.Christopher, Mosakowski, Elaine(October 2004) Cultural Intelligence, Harvard business Review, pp139-146
4. Anna L. Green., Aretha Y. Hill., Earnest Friday., Shawnta S. Friday," The use of multiple intelligences to enhance team productivity", School of Business & Industry, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida, USA.
5. Ilan Alon, James M. Higgins.(2005.)Global leadership success through emotional and cultural intelligences. Business Horizons,

- Volume 48, Issue 6, November–December, Pages 501-512.
6. Yi-Chun Lin Angela Shin-yih Chen(2012) . Cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on cross-cultural adjustment. Volume 36, Issue 4, July 2012, Pages 541–552.
 7. Mac Nab, B. (2012). International Travel Experience to help Improve Global Effectiveness, sciences letter.
 8. Carron, A, V, Housenblas, H., & Eys, M. A. (2005). Group Dynamic in Sport. (2nd ed). Ontario Book Crafters.
 9. Thomac, D, (2004). Domain and development of cultural intelligence: T important of mindfulness. *Journal of Group Organization Management*, 31, 76-99..
 10. Mokhtari, H. (1389). The relationship between leadership style and teachers with collective efficacy Premier League football teams, Khorasan, Master Thesis of PE. Islamic Azad University of Mashhad.
 11. Find, honey. (1385). Elected members; harmony or diversity policy, No. 178.
 12. Edmonds, W.(2009) The Role of Collective Efficacy in Adventure Racing Teams, Small Group Research. Thousand Oaks: Vol. 40, Iss. 2, pg. 163.
 13. Marcos, F.L., et al.(2010). Interactive effects of team cohesion on perceived efficacy in semi-professional sport, *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 9, 320-325
 14. -Feltz, D.L., Lirgg, C. D.(1998) Perceived team and player efficacy in hockey, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 83, 557-564

3/18/2013