



Serdar Kocaekşi¹, Ziya Koruç²

¹Anadolu Üniversitesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu, Eskişehir, Türkiye
²Hacettepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri ve Teknolojisi Yüksekokulu, Ankara, Türkiye

skocaeksi@anadolu.edu.tr

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

AN INVESTIGATION OF COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AND TEAM COHESION LEVELS OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL HANDBALL PLAYERS IN TURKEY

Abstract

The aim of study was to investigate collective efficacy and team cohesion levels of successful (N=35) and unsuccessful (N=40) handball players. Group Environment Questionnaire and Collective Efficacy Scale were used to collect the data. The results indicated non-significant difference in the ATG-T-1 (F=2.750; p=.102) and ATG-T-2 (F=3.258; p=.075) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams. A significant difference was found in the ATG-S-1 (F=3.959; p=.050) and ATG-S-2 (F=5.922; p=.017) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams (p<0.05). Results revealed non-difference found between successful and unsuccessful teams' GI-T-1 levels (F=.256; p=.614), however a significant difference was found between successful and unsuccessful teams' GI-T-2 results (F=30.698; p=.000). The results indicated non-significant difference in the GI-S-1 (F=1.867; p=.176) and GI-S-2 (F=.316; p=.576) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams (p>0.05). A significant difference was found in the Collective Efficacy-1 (F=19.885; p=.000) and Collective Efficacy-2 (F=32.971; p=.000) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams (p<0.05). Findings suggested that collective efficacy of successful and unsuccessful teams are different.

Key Words: Cohesion, collective efficacy, success, handball

INTRODUCTION

Cohesion is one of the important issues of the group performance studies. Also it's an important factor for forming groups and implementing persistence of groups. In addition to these, cohesion is a multidimensional dynamic process and the foremost condition of sufficient or successful performance (Festinger et al, 1963). Team cohesion, considered by some theoreticians (Lott & Lott, 1965) to be the most important small group variable (Hardy, Eys & Carron, 2005). Cohesion has been defined as "a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its goals and objectives (Carron, 1982). Since the mid-1980s, most researchers have considered this construct from the perspective of a conceptual framework advanced by Carron and colleagues (Carron et al., 1985). In Carron's conceptual model, cohesion consists of four dimensions based on two levels of distinction. The first level distinguishes individual attractions to the group and group integration; the second level distinguishes the task and social aspects of group involvement. Thus, four constructs are identified: Group integration-task (GI-T), Group integration-social (GI-S), Individual attractions to the group-task (ATG-T) and Individual attractions to the group-social (ATG-S) (Carron et al., 1985). Efficacy is another important factor in team sports especially collective efficacy phenomena. Collective efficacy is term coined by Bandura (1982, 1986) to reflect the fact that groups often have collective expectations for success. According to Bandura (1986), many of the societal problems that individuals face, reflect group challenges that require collective effort to produce the necessary change. Furthermore, it is Bandura's belief that the ability to overcome many of these problems requires a sense of collective efficacy that the problems can be solved through concerted effort (Spink, 1990). Zaccaro, Blair, Peterson and Zazanis (1995) defined collective efficacy as "a sense of collective competence shared among individuals when allocating, coordinating, and integrating their resources in a successful concerted response to specific situational demands". Bandura (1990, 1997) suggested that this construct has important implications for sport teams because it should affect team choices, effort, persistence and performance, especially in sports that required interaction and interdependence to achieve task success (e.g. basketball). Previous research showed that these two different facts are significant predictors of achievement when they have evaluated (assessed) together (Spink, 1990; Paskevich, Brawley, Dorsch and Widmeyer, 1999; Kozub and McDonnell, 2000). Short (2005b), found positive relationship between team size and collective efficacy scores across

sports-except for “unity efficacy” with respect to which smaller teams were more efficacious. Carron et al. (2005), this results makes sense given that unity efficacy is the most closely related to team cohesion and team cohesion has been consistently shown to be higher in smaller-sized groups and teams (Feltz, 2008). This study will offer a different perspective about two important criteria for success which are cohesion and collective efficacy. Because it is not yet determined the relationship with success and collective efficacy. The aim of this study is to investigate collective efficacy beliefs and team cohesion levels of successful and unsuccessful male handball teams’ players.

METHOD

Participants: Participants were 75 athletes of six teams which attended Turkey Males Handball Super League in 2004-2005. Teams were selected as successful and unsuccessful according to their rank at the end of the league season. First three teams were accepted as a successful and the last three teams were counted as unsuccessful teams. The numbers of players who take places in successful teams are 40 in spite of this it’s 35 in unsuccessful teams.

Instruments

The Group Environment Questionnaire: Questionnaire was developed by Carron, Widmeyer and Brawley (1985) for assessing the cohesion levels of teams’ players and Turkish adaptation was made by Öcel (2002).

Collective Efficacy Scale: Scale was developed by Riggs, Warka, Babasa and Betancour, (1994) to measure the beliefs of individual towards to his/her groups’ capacity and adapted by Öcel (2002) to the Turkish culture.

Procedure: Scales were applied two times, first application was first half of the league and second application was administered second half of the league. The measurements were done in the first and second season of the Turkish Premier Man Handball League to all team and chosen the first three team is successful and chosen the last three team is unsuccessful.

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed by using descriptive statistic and MANOVA.

RESULTS

Table-1 Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA

		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Mean squares	SD	F	P	Eta-kare
ATG-T-1	Successful	35	13.74	3.67	33,126	1-74	2.750	.102	.004
	Unsuccessful	40	15.08	3.28					
	Total	75	14.45	3.51					
ATG-S-1	Successful	35	18.60	3.11	3,959	1-74	3.959	.050*	.002
	Unsuccessful	40	17.13	3.28					
	Total	75	17.81	3.27					
GI-T-1	Successful	35	17.80	3.85	.256	1-74	.256	.614	.147
	Unsuccessful	40	18.23	3.42					
	Total	75	18.03	3.61					
GI-S-1	Successful	35	13.26	2.73	1,867	1-74	1.867	.176	.032
	Unsuccessful	40	12.40	2.70					
	Total	75	12.80	2.73					
CE -1	Successful	35	22.80	4.36	19,985	1-74	19.885	.000*	.023
	Unsuccessful	40	27.15	4.08					
	Total	75	25.12	4.72					
ATG-T-2	Successful	35	13.71	3.22	3,258	1-74	3.258	.075	.018
	Unsuccessful	40	15.15	3.61					
	Total	75	14.48	3.49					
ATG-S -2	Successful	35	15.69	2.88	5,922	1-74	5.922	.017*	.035
	Unsuccessful	40	17.33	2.94					
	Total	75	16.56	3.01					
GI-T -2	Successful	35	15.74	3.58	30,698	1-74	30.698	.000*	.104
	Unsuccessful	40	19.70	2.57					
	Total	75	17.85	3.65					
GI-S-2	Successful	35	12.09	3.07	.316	1-74	.316	.576	.096
	Unsuccessful	40	12.50	3.28					
	Total	75	12.31	3.17					
CE -2	Successful	35	21.83	3.99	32,971	1-74	32.971	.000*	.295
	Unsuccessful	40	27.58	4.60					
	Total	75	24.89	5.17					

ATG-T: Individual Attractions to Group Task, ATG-S: Individual Attractions to Group Social, GI-T: Group Integration-Task, GI-S: Group Integration-Social, CE: Collective Efficacy.

Note: (1: The first measurement), (2: The second measurement)

As a result of MANOVA (Table 1), a significant differences was not found in the Individual attractions to the group-task (ATG-T)-1 ($F=2.750$; $p=.102$) and Individual attractions to the group-task (ATG-T)-2 ($F=3.258$; $p=.075$) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams. A significant different was found in the Individual attractions to the group-social (ATG-S)-1 ($F=3.959$; $p=.050$) and Individual attractions to the group-social (ATG-S)-2 ($F=5.922$; $p=.017$) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams ($p<0.05$). No

significant difference found between successful and unsuccessful teams' group integration task (GI-T)- 1 results ($F=.256;p=.614$), however a significant difference was found between successful and unsuccessful teams' group integration task (GI-T)- 2 results ($F=30.698;p=.000$). The results indicate that there was not a significant difference in the Group integration-social (GI-S)-1 ($F=1.867;p=.176$) and Group integration-social (GI-S)-2 ($F=.316;p=.576$) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams ($p>0.05$). A significant difference was found in the Collective Efficacy-1 ($F=19.885;p=.000$) and Collective Efficacy-2 ($F=32.971;p=.000$) levels of successful and unsuccessful teams ($p<0.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study which investigated the collective efficacy and team cohesion beliefs of successful and unsuccessful teams suggest that there is a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful teams as regards to some dimensions of collective efficacy and cohesion. Carron and et al., (2002) were suggested a strong relationship between cohesion and achievement. They found significant relationship between cohesion and achievement both basketball and soccer players in the individual attractions to the group-task dimension. Brawley and et al., (1993) proposed Group integration-social and attractions to the group-task sub dimensions are more related team achievement than other sub dimensions. The results of present study have supported to the Brawley and his colleagues findings. A significant difference was not found in the individual attractions to the group-task dimension in both half of the league. But in the second half of the league, a significant difference was found in the dimension of Group integration-task.

As indicated in the study of Carron and et al., (2002) there are too many studies which suggested the relationship between cohesion and achievement in different sports. For example; cohesion and achievement relationship in swimmers (Everett and colleagues), golfers (Williams and Widmeyer), athletics (track event) (Berardinis and et al.).

Another aim of this study was to investigate a relationship between collective efficacy beliefs and achievement. According to results there was a statistically significant difference between successful and unsuccessful teams in both halves of the league. Paskevich (1999) suggested, collective efficacy is a significant variable as a regard of team performance. Watson and et al., (2001) study results with basketball players showed that collective efficacy

beliefs of players were changing from the beginning to the end of the season and indicated that collective efficacy belief is positively correlated with performance.

Several researches have investigated collective efficacy in teams sports, findings indicate collective efficacy belief is an positive predictor of team performance (Feltz and Lirgg, 1998; Myers et al., 2004a). The most important cause of this result in present study was individuals' opinions might be changed about collective efficacy as a result of group based activities. In the case of achievement, the belief of collective efficacy is increasing but in the failure state collective efficacy belief is decreasing. The effect of time season on collective efficacy beliefs was also part of Short's study (Short & Short, 2005). Short showed that the pattern of efficacy scores increasing across the season wase evident for the CEQS subscales of effort and unity, as well as the total CEQS scores. Another study showed that prior performance positively predict subsequent collective efficacy within weeks across teams but that the opposite was the case for a given team from week to week (Myers and et al., 2004). As a group attribute cohesion has been recognized to both affect and be affected by collective efficacy (Sullivan & Feltz, 2005). Results of the present study were similar to the sport psychology literature. The essential cause of the differences between successful and unsuccessful teams' collective efficacy beliefs is the differentiation on self efficacy beliefs depend on achievement level. As a result, collective efficacy belief and cohesion levels of handball players are changeable according to being a member of successful and unsuccessful teams.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1982). Self efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122–147
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 2, 128 – 163.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Brawley, L.R., Carron,A. & Widmeyer,W.N. (1993). The influence of the group and its cohesiveness on perceptions of group-related variables. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 15, 245-260.
- Carron, V.A., (1982). “Cohesiveness in Sport Groups: Interpretations and Considerations” *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 4, 123-138.
- Carron, A.V., Widmeyer, W.N. & L.R. Brawley (1985). “The Development of Instrument to Assess Cohesion in Sport Teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire”. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 244-266
- Carron, A.V., Bray, R.S., & Eys, A.M. (2002). Team cohesion and team success in sport. *Journal of Sport Sciences*. 20, 119-126.
- Carron, A.V., Colman, M. & M. Wheeler, J., (2002). Cohesion and Performance in Sport: A Meta Analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-188
- Carron, A.V., Hausenblas, H.A., & Eys, M.A. (2005). *Group dynamics in sport (3rd ed.)*. Morgantown, Wv: Fitness Information Technology.
- Feltz, D. L. & Lirgg, C. D. (1998) Perceived team and player efficacy in hockey, [Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 557–564.](#)
- Feltz, D.L., Short, S.E., Sullivan, P.J., (2008) *Self- Efficacy in Sport: Research and strategies for working with athletes, teams, and coaches*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. (1963) *Social pressures in informal groups*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Hardy, J., Eys, M. A. & Carron, A. V. (2005). Exploring the Potential Disadvantages of High Cohesion in Sports Teams, *Small Group Research*; 36, 166-187
- Kozub, S. A. & McDonnell, J. F. (2000). Exploring the relationship between cohesion and collective efficacy in rugby teams. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 23, 120 – 129.

- Lott, A. J. & Lott, B. E. (1965). Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. *Psychological Bulletin*, 64, 259-309.
- Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L. & Short, S. E. (2004a). Collective efficacy and team performance: A longitudinal study of collegiate football teams, [Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice](#), 8, 126–138.
- Öcel, H. (2002). The Role of self efficacy, collective efficacy beliefs and cohesiveness in predicting player's evaluations of their teams past present performance and future performance expectancies. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Ankara
- Paskevich, D. M., Brawley, L. R., Dorsch, K. D. & Widmeyer, W. N. (1999). Relationship between collective efficacy and cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. *Group Dynamics*, 3, 210 – 222.
- Riggs, M.L., Warka J., Babasa, B., Betancour, R. & Hooker, S., (1994). Development and Validation of Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectancy Scales for Job-Related Applications. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 793-802.
- Short, S.E., & Short, M.W. (2005). Role of the coach in the coach-athlete relationship. *Lancet: Medicine and Sport*, 366 (Suppl. 1) S, 29-39
- Spink, K. S. (1990). Collective Efficacy in The Sport Setting. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 21, 380 – 395.
- Sullivan, P., & Feltz, D.L. (2005). Applying social psychology to sports teams. In F.W. Schneider, J. Gruman, & L. Coutts (Eds.) *Applied social psychology: Understanding and addressing social problems* (p, 129-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Watson, C. B., Chemers, M. M. & Preiser, N. (2001). Collective efficacy: A multilevel analysis, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1057–1068.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Blair, V., Peterson, C. & Zazanis, M. (1995). Collective efficacy. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (305 – 328). New Y