

Managers' Cultural Intelligence and Social Capital, and Performance: A Case Study of Cultural Institutions

Hamideh Jafari

Sama Technical and Vocational Training College, Rudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rudehen, Iran

ABSTRACT

The current study was conducted to examine the relationship between cultural intelligence and social capital and performance of managers in cultural institutions and community centers of Tehran. Thus, 147 managers were selected among cultural institutions and community centers through 22 districts of Tehran city using multistage clustered sampling. A correlation test and stepwise regression were used to analyze data. Results of correlation test indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between relational cognitive dimensions of social capital as well as its total score and performance of managers. Moreover, the results show that there is a significant and positive relationship between meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions of cultural intelligence as well as its total score and performance of managers. The results of stepwise regression analysis indicate that contribution of relational and cognitive dimensions of social capital as well as contribution of meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions of cultural intelligence is significantly positive in predicting performance of managers.

KEYWORDS: cultural intelligence, social capital, performance, managers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural institutions centers can play an effectively important role in improving moral life of different classes by providing optimal entertaining cultural and artistic services due to their public position as well as their connections to revenues of urban management. Managers as the leaders of cultural organizations have most important role in the success or failure of such organizations (Mehrra et al., 2012). Managers of large- and small-scale community centers and cultural institutions are responsible for managing cultural problems of the society; what they do systematically represents in performance quality of these organizations and social system. Providing effectively suitable cultural service requires suitable performance of management for planning, organizing, allocating resources, facilities and credits as well as providing human force. On the other hand, effective management of these organizations is not imaginable in social and cultural settings with their special sensitivities and elegance lacking cultural and social skills of managers. Cultural intelligence and social capital of these managers is a discussion which received a great attention in recent decades. In modern societies cultural diversity exists everywhere and good connections became a greater challenge. To cognize, value and support these differences can maximize individual productivity in his work place (Bibikova and Kotelnikov, 2006). Increasing cultural intelligence, manager and the organization can have a basis for understanding and mutual respect and increase their ability to identify solutions and raise the overall performance of the organization (Deng and Gibson, 2008). Cultural intelligence is the most important capability which could be applied for appropriately dealing with multi-cultural situations. Cultural intelligence helps demonstrating appropriate behavior with quick and accurate understanding of different cultural factors (Moon, 2010). On the other hand, social capital enables members of an organization to interact with each other and effectively and efficiently achieve their common goals in the forms of networks, norms and trust (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). Recently, cultural organizations need managers who are able to continually adapt with people of different cultures and manage cross-cultural communication; are familiar with different cultures and can interact with other cultures by providing trust and suitable communicational networks. For this purpose, managers will require cultural intelligence and social capital. According to above and lack of studies conducted in the field of relationship between cultural intelligence and social capital and performance of managers in cultural center (Cheng, 2007) this study examines the relationship between cultural intelligence and social capital and performance of the managers in community centers and cultural institutions of Tehran.

*Corresponding Author: Hamideh Jafari, Sama Technical and Vocational Training College, Rudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rudehen, Iran. Email: jafari_hamideh@yahoo.com

Cultural Intelligence and Performance

The concept of cultural intelligence was first developed by Early and Antitheses two defined cultural intelligence as an ability to learn new patterns in cultural interactions and to provide appropriate behavioral responses to these patterns. In fact, they believe that cultural intelligence is the ability of an individual to successfully adapt with new cultural environments which are usually different from one's own culture. Cultural intelligence is an individual ability to understand, interpret and effectively act in situations of cultural diversity; it is consistent with those concepts related to intelligence where intelligence is considered something more than a cognitive ability (Earley and Peterson, 2004; Kajbafnezhad et al., 2011). Most researchers considered four main components of cultural intelligence including meta-cognition, cognition, motivation and behavior (Earley and Ang, 2003; Imai and Gelfand, 2010). Meta-cognition: this component considers a process which people use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge. In other words, this refers to how to achieve knowledge about cultural issues. Meta-cognition promotes active thinking about people and different cultural situations and directs them to the representation of recognition. Meta-cognition involves formulating strategies before cross-cultural clash, examining the assumptions during clash and balancing mental plans if real experiences are different from former expectations. Cognition includes individual mental skills to describe and explain behaviors in new conditions and understand the nature of culture and its differences and dissimilarities. Cognition involves identifying values, social norms, beliefs and symbols of other cultures. Motivation helps people maintain constant in new situations, resist against problems to be consistent with other cultures. In fact, this shows individual motivation to be consistent with new cultures. Finally, behavior refers to behavioral capabilities and abilities of an individual to adjust with those verbal and nonverbal behaviors which are suitable for communicating with different cultures. In fact, this focuses on those verbal and nonverbal behaviors people demonstrate in unfamiliar cultural settings.

Experimental findings in the area of cultural intelligence and people performance show that cultural intelligence positively influences on the performance of managers and employees. For example, Rahimnia et al. (2010) investigates the influence of cultural intelligence on task performance of managers. Their findings showed that there is a significant positive relationship between cultural intelligence and task performance of managers. Moreover, cognition and behavior significantly influence on the performance of managers. Abzari et al. (2010) showed that there is a significant relationship between cultural intelligence and its components (meta-cognition; cognition; motivation and behavior) and team effectiveness. Motivation and behavior can predict team effectiveness. Accordingly, Kazemi (2011) showed that there is a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and its components (meta-cognition, cognition, motivation and behavior) and performance. Ang et al (2005) examined the influence of cultural adjustment and intelligence on cultural judgment and task performance. Their findings show that meta-cognitive and cognitive components of cultural intelligence influence on cultural judgment and on the other hand meta-cognition and behavior positively influence on task performance. Findings of a study among 225 international managers in China show that cultural intelligence plays an important role in decreasing anxiety of these managers and increasing their effective communications both of which finally improve task performance of these managers (Shaffer et al, 2006). Stone-Romero et al. (2003) showed that motivational component of organizational intelligence is highly correlated to task performance of managers; since, high motivated managers do not tend to learn expectations of role while encountering different cultures whereby they improve their performance. Recent findings show that employees of international companies with high cultural intelligence subsequently have high performance (Fakhreldin, 2011).

Social Capital and Performance

During past 30 years, the concept of social capital developed in areas such as economics, management, politics and particularly social sciences. As many emerging concepts, different definitions have been provided for social capital; some of them will be explained as follows. Sabatini (2009) considers social capital as a resource people gain from social structures and takes advantage of it to meet their interests. Costa and Peiro (2009) consider social capital as a series of potential and de facto resources which forms influenced by a stable network of established relations, interactions and mutual cognitions. Bagnasco (2012) describes social capital. He believes that social capital is defined by its specific functions and this type of capital does not have unique entity and identity; instead it has multiple entities with two features in common. First, it includes some aspects of social structures and second, it facilitates relations and action and reactions between members within social structures. Greve et al. (2010) considers social capital as a capital provided by people by which access to existing resources to increase expected benefits of their significant instrumental activities. Portes and Landolt (2000) define the social capital as individual ability to provide benefits by membership and participation in social networks or other social structures; finally the definition of social capital provided by Putnam (2002) which is documented in most studies, refers to interpersonal relations, social networks, norms related to interactions and reliability. Accordingly, there are various definitions reflecting

views of their providers. Nevertheless, social capital can be considered as resources located in relational networks which are able to demonstrate in individuals, organizations, societies and communities with various interests. In so far, different dimensions of organizational social capital have been provided by the experts. In this regard, Leana and Van Buren (1999) suggested an organizational social capital model that has two main components:

Dependence: Dependence is the tendency and ability of individuals to define and determine collective goals of the group. An individual tendency to participate in a collective action relies on a belief that individual efforts which will directly benefit the entire system also indirectly benefit to the individual.

Trust: Without a degree of trust is unlikely to make an agreement on the goals or achieved them. Thus, both components of dependence and trust are essential for organizational social capital. In other words, only high degree of mutual trust and tendency to collective goals among members will achieve benefits of social capital for organizational goals, job flexibility, integration and the creation of intellectual capital (Pastoriza et al, 2008). In this regard, Vilanova and Josa (2003) consider seven main components for social capital including: trust (norms), common values, relationships, cooperation, mutual commitment, mutual understanding and networks. According to Putnam (2002) social capital includes trust, networks, norms and mutual relations. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) classified social capital as three structural, cognitive and relational dimensions. Structural dimension is related to the properties of social systems and networks of relations as a whole. In other words, it refers to the overall pattern of communication between members. The most important aspects of this dimension are the presence or absence of network links between members, network condition and suitable organization. In general, this focuses on whether individuals are related to each other (Bolino et al, 2002). Relational dimension refers to personal relationships which people develop due to a history of interactions as well as special relationships such as respect and friendship which influence on people behavior. This focuses on nature and quality of relationships (such as trust, confidence) in the organization (Bolino et al, 2002); its most aspects include reliability, norms and executive guarantee, requirements and expectations, identity and identification. Cognitive dimension refers to resources providing representations, interpretations and systems of shared meanings among the members such as codes, common languages and shared narratives (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). In the other world, the cognitive dimension deals the extent that employees share a common vision and understanding within a social network. Since other researchers used this model, the present study considered these three dimensions of organizational social capital as the main framework. Little is known about the relationship between social capital and individual performance. For example Memarzadeh et al. (2009) evaluated the effect of social capital on the performance of staff using Nahapiet and Ghoshal model and showed an increase in social capital lead to developed performance of human resource. Some domestic studies indicated that social capital has positive impact on the performance of organizations. Findings of Thompson (2005) also suggest that social capital plays an important role in enhancing the performance of employees and employees improve their performance by enhancing the quality of social networks, trust and appropriate relations. The findings of Shaw et al. (2005) also show that leaving work is related to a weak social capital, consequently, poor performance and the likelihood of turnover is very high. Moran et al. (2005) evaluated the effect of social capital on the performance of the managers. Their findings suggest that social and relational capital positively influence on improvement of daily executive tasks and executive activities.

Research Questions

Are cultural intelligence and its dimensions related to the performance of managers?

Are social capital and its dimensions related to the performance of managers?

Are cultural intelligence and its dimensions related to the performance of managers?

Do components of social capital have the ability to predict performance of managers?

Do components of cultural intelligence have the ability to predict performance of managers?

METHODS

Studied population includes managers of community institutions and cultural institutions of Tehran. Using multistage cluster sampling of 22 districts in Tehran, 147 managers were totally selected and study tools were performed among them. Data obtained were analyzed using Pearson correlation and stepwise regression.

Research instrument

Social Capital: Faraji questionnaire (2010) was used to measure organizational social capital. This questionnaire consists of 24 items with structural dimension including 7, relational dimension including 11 and cognitive dimension including 6 items. The reliability of this tool is confirmed in Faraji (2010). In this study, the Cronbach's

alpha for structural, relational and cognitive dimensions is achieved as 0.78, 0.82 and 0.91, respectively and for all the tools as 0.80 suggesting that the reliability of this tool is acceptable.

Cultural Intelligence: Early and Ang tools (2003) were used to measure cultural intelligence. The questionnaire contains 20 items and four components of strategy or meta-cognition, knowledge or cognition, motivation and behavior. This tool is scored based on a five-point Likert. Using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each component of meta-cognition, cognition, motivation and behavior, the reliability of this tool is 0.79, 0.80, 0.85 and 0.77, respectively and for the entire questionnaire is 0.86.

Performance: a researcher made tool was used to measure performance of the managers. This tool contains 20 items which generally measure the performance of managers. To ensure the validity, this tool has been subjected for experts and necessary modifications were made. To ensure reliability, this tool was implemented as a pilot in the

Sample and the obtained Cronbach's alpha (0.78) shows good reliability of the tool.

RESULTS

Findings of the correlation between variables are listed in Table 1. The findings show that the correlation of cognitive dimensions and relationship with performance of managers is 0.29 and 0.48, respectively. These coefficients are significant in $p < 0.01$ and there is a positive relationship between them. But there is no significant relationship between structural dimension and performance of managers. Moreover, the correlation coefficient between social capital and the performance of organizational managers is $r = 0.36$ suggesting a significant positive correlation between social capital and performance of managers. Thus, among dimensions of social capital, only cognitive and relational dimensions are positively correlated to performance of managers.

Table 1: correlation matrix between social capital and the performance of managers

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Relational	3.14	0.89	1					
2 Cognitive	3.23	0.64	0.16**	1				
3 Structural	3.36	0.81	0.39**	0.19**	1			
4 Social Capital	2.91	0.56	0.77**	0.56**	0.50**	1		
5 Performance	2.42	0.71	0.29**	0.48**	0.05	0.36**	1	

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Table 2 shows the correlation between dimensions of cultural intelligence and the performance of managers. Findings indicate that the correlation coefficient between meta-cognitive dimension of cultural intelligence ($r = 0.48$) and cognitive dimension. Table 2: correlation matrix between cultural intelligence and the performance of managers

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Meta-Cognitive	2.37	0.87	1					
2 Cognitive	3.47	0.70	0.59**	1				
3 Motivational	2.29	0.69	0.47**	0.55**	1			
4 Behavioral	2.32	0.61	0.28**	0.56**	0.43**	1		
5 Cultural Intelligence	2.61	0.48	0.77**	0.75**	0.75**	0.59**	1	
6 Performance	2.42	0.71	0.23**	0.48**	0.64**	0.46**	0.59**	1

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Finally, total score of cultural intelligence by performance of managers is 0.59 suggesting a significant positive relationship between them. Thus, all dimensions of cultural intelligence as well as cultural intelligence itself generally have a significant positive correlation by performance of managers. The results of stepwise regression analysis (Table 3) for performance of managers in terms of social capital dimensions suggest that in the first step cognitive component is inserted in the equation and 23% variance in the performance of managers is explained by this component. In the second step, cognitive and relational dimensions are inserted together in the equation and by adding this dimension 27% variance in the dependent variable, performance of managers, is explained.

Table 3. The result of stepwise regression analysis to predict performance by social capital components

Steps	Model	R	R ²	B	β	t	p
First step	Cognitive Dimension	0.48	0.23	.53	0.48	6.58	0.001
Second step	Cognitive Dimension Relational Dimension	0.52	0.27	.49 .18	0.44 0.23	6.17 3.10	0.001 0.001

Furthermore, to determine the contribution of social capital dimensions in predicting the performance of managers based on regression coefficients and considering the second step it is clear that the contribution of cognitive and relational dimensions of social capital in predicting the performance of managers is 0.44 and 0.23, respectively. Structural dimension was removed from the equation due to lack of significant contribution in predicting the performance. The results of stepwise regression to predict the performance of managers in terms of social capital components show that motivation is inserted in the first step and 41% variance (Table 4) in the performance of managers is explained by this component.

Table 4. The result of stepwise regression analysis to predict performance by cultural intelligence

Steps	Model	R	R ²	B	β	t	p
First step	Motivational	0.64	0.41	0.66	0.64	10.14	0.000
Second step	Motivational Behavioral	0.67	0.45	0.56 0.26	0.54 0.22	8.97 3.32	0.000 0.000
Third step	Motivational Behavioral Cognitive	0.70	0.48	0.52 0.27 0.15	0.50 0.23 0.18	7.6 3.56 3.01	0.000 0.000 0.000
Third step	Motivational Behavioral Cognitive Meta-Cognitive	0.71	0.50	0.59 0.29 0.16 0.16	0.57 0.25 0.19 0.15	7.92 3.83 3.29 2.22	0.003 0.000 0.000 0.028

In the second step, motivation and behavior are inserted together and by adding them 45% variance in independent variable, performance of managers, is explained. In the next step, by adding cognition explained variance of performance reaches 48%. In the third step, meta-cognition as well as motivation, behavior and cognition result in 50% explained variance in the performance of managers. Furthermore, to determine the contribution of motivation, behavior, cognition and meta-cognition in predicting performance based on regression coefficient in the fourth step, it is clear that the contribution of motivation, behavior, cognition and meta-cognition in predicting performance of managers is 0.57, 0.25, 0.19 and 0.15, respectively. Obviously, motivation, behavior, cognition and meta-cognition play a significant role in predicting performance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to examine the relationship between cultural intelligence and social capital and performance of managers in community institutions and cultural institutions of Tehran. The results showed that there is a positive correlation not only between social capital and performance of managers, but also between cognitive and relational dimensions of social capital and performance of managers; thus they are significant predictors for performance of managers in community centers and cultural institutions. These findings are consistent with Memarzadeh et al. (2009), Fakhrahbary (2008), Thomson (2005) and Shaw et al. (2005). As noted above, social capital in environments where people interact with each other can play a decisive role in optimal performance of individuals and organizations. Therefore, managers of community centers and cultural institutions by cognitive capitals can develop vision, norms, understanding and common rules within a social network whereby improve their managing performance. On the other hand, these managers by relational capitals can trustfully communicate with clients, coworkers, senior managers and other organizations and improve their performance. In general, there is a positive relationship between high social capital of managers in community centers and cultural institutions and their performance.

Other findings of this study showed that cultural intelligence and its meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral components had a positive correlation by performance of managers and these components are significant predictors for performance of managers in community centers and cultural institutions. Thus, obtained findings are consistent with Rahimnia et al. (2009), Kazemi (2011), Ang et al. (2005), Shaffer et al. (2006) and Fakhreldin (2011). Significance of cultural intelligence for the managers is due to ethnic groups and cultures,

dialects and customs, and their attitudes in organizations or outside. Thus, managers of cultural centers must be equipped with skills of social intelligence due to interaction with different cultures and ethnicities and their role in cultural improvement to perform better. Managers of cultural institutions, aware of cultural similarities and differences, obtaining and understanding cultural knowledge and their intellectual processes in cultural problems, inner motivation for multi-cultural interactions and finally, their capability to adjust with verbal and nonverbal behaviors in cross-cultural clash, can significantly improve their performance. Due to the acquisition of a substantial part of cultural intelligence skills and capabilities, different ways can be performed to foster and promote cultural intelligence of managers. According to Earley and Mosakowski (2004) to enhance cultural intelligence it is necessary to select a training plan following test of this intelligence in people and determination of their weaknesses and strengths. That is, if behaviorally cultural intelligence of an individual is low, he can participate in relevant courses; or if he is weak in cognitive dimension, his inductive and deductive reasoning can be fostered. Furthermore, simulation exercises playing role can be suggested to increase cultural intelligence of managers (Rahimnia et al., 2010).

REFERENCES

- Abzari, M., Etebarian, A., &Khani, A. (2010). Influence of Cultural Intelligence on Team Effectiveness (A Case Study: Mobarakeh Steel Company of Isfahan). *Development Management* , 2 (4), 25-41.
- Fanakar.Bahri, M. (2008).the Relationship between Social Capital and Performance of Human Capital in Welfare Organizations: Social Security Organization. MA Thesis, AllamehTabatabaai University, Faculty of Social Sciences.
- Faraji, H. (2009). A Comparative Evaluation of Soical Capital Condition inFaculties of Human, Social and Behavioral Sciences of Tehran University According to Their Experts.MA Thesis, Faculty of Psychology and Training Sciences of Tehran University.
- Kazemi, M. (2011).the Relationship between Cultural Intelligence and Performance of Employees in Jame'e Al-Mostafa Al-Alamieh.MA Thesis, High Educational Institute of Ghom, Department of Public Management.
- Memarzadeh, G., Ataii, M., &Akbari, A. (2009).Role of Social Capital on Improving the Performance of Employees.Development Management (3), 9-15.
- Rahimnia, F., Mortazavi, S., &Delaram, T. (2010).Investigating the Influence of Cultural Intelligence on Task Performance of Managers.Modiriati e Farda (22).
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., &Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371.
- Bagnasco, A. (2012). Trust and social capital.The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology, 33, 252.
- Bibikova A and Kotelnikov V., (2006), Cultural intelligence (CQ): knowledge, arts and skills.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., &Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations.*Academy of management review*, 505–522.
- Cheng, L. R. L. (2007). Cultural Intelligence (CQ) A Quest for Cultural Competence. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 29(1), 36–42.
- Costa, A. C., &Peiró, J. M. (2009). Trust and social capital in teams and organizations—antecedents, dynamics, benefits and limitations: an introduction. *Social Science Information*, 48(2), 131–141.
- Deng, L., & Gibson, P. (2008).A qualitative evaluation on the role of cultural intelligence in cross-cultural leadership effectiveness. *International journal of leadership studies*, 3(2), 181–197.
- Earley, P. C., &Mosakowski, E. (2004).Cultural intelligence. *Harvard business review*, 82(10), 139–146.

- Earley, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2004). The Elusive Cultural Chameleon: Cultural Intelligence as a New Approach to Intercultural Training for the Global Manager. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(1), 100–115.
- Earley, P., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford business books.
- Fakhreldin, H (2011). The effect of cultural intelligence on employee performance in international hospitality industries: a case from the hotel sector in Egypt. *International Journal of Business & Public Administration*, 8(2), 1-18
- Greve, A., Benassi, M., & Sti, A. D. (2010). Exploring the contributions of human and social capital to productivity. *International Review of Sociology–Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, 20(1), 35–58.
- Imai, L., & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 112(2), 83–98.
- Leana, C. R., & Van Buren, H. J. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *Academy of management review*, 24(3), 538–555.
- Moon, T. (2010). Organizational cultural intelligence: Dynamic capability perspective. *Group & Organization Management*, 35(4), 456–493.
- Moran, P. (2005). Structural vs. relational embeddedness: social capital and managerial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(12), 1129–1151.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998); "Social Capital, Intellectual capital & the organizational advantage"; *Academy of management Review*, 23(2), 242-260.
- Pastoriza, David; Arino, Miguel A. & Ricart, Joan E. (2008). Ethical Managerial Behaviour as an Antecedent of Organizational Social Capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(2).329–341.
- Portes, A., & Vickstrom, E. (2011). Diversity, social capital, and cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 461–479.
- Putnam, R.D. (2002); "Bowling alone: America's declining Social Capital"; *Journal of Democracy*, 6(10): 65-78.
- Putnam, R. D. (2002). *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society*. Oxford University Press,
- Sabatini, F. (2009). Social capital as social networks: a new framework for measurement and an empirical analysis of its determinants and consequences. *Journal of Socio-economics*, 38(3), 429–442.
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gregersen, H., Black, J. S., & Ferzandi, L. A. (2006). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 109–125.
- Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., Johnson, J. L., & Lockhart, D. E. (2005). Turnover, Social Capital Losses, and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 594–606.
- Stone-Romero, E., Stone, D. L., & Salas, E. (2003). The influence of culture on role conceptions and role behavior in organizations. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52: 328–362.
- Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive Personality and Job Performance: A Social Capital Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 1011–1017.
- Vilanova, E.P. & Josa, R.T. (2003). Social capital as a managerial phenomenon. Working Paper, Tampere University of Technology.

- Mehrara, A., Razaghi, M. E., Moosavi, S. J., & Hajizadeh, M. (2012). Study of Knowledge Management Efficiency on Employees Performance in Kerman Sport and Youth Offices. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(10), 10656–10662.
- Kajbafnezhad, H., Ahadi, H., Heidarie, A. R., Askari, P., & Enayati, M. (2011). Difference between Team and Individual Sports with Respect to Psychological Skills, Overall Emotional Intelligence and Athletic Success Motivation in Shiraz City Athletes. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 1(11), 1904–1909.