MJSS

Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi

Mediterranean Journal of Sport Science

ISSN 2667-5463

Takım Uyumu ve Takım Başarısı Arasındaki İlişki: Üniversite Hentbol 2. Lig Takımları Örneği

İlknur ÖZDEMİR[1], Ali SEVİLMİŞ[2]

ORİJİNAL ARAŞTIRMA

[1] Pamukkale University, Acıpayam Vocational School Denizli/Türkiye

[2] Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Sports Science Faculty Karaman/Türkiye

Sorumlu Yazar: İlknur ÖZDEMİR

Orcid ID: 0000-0002-7405-375X

Öz

Çalışma aynı lig düzeyinde (2. lig) rekabetçi hentbol takımlarının, takım uyumu düzeyine göre başarı sıralamasını değerlendirmek ve takım uyumu ile başarı sıralaması arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Takım uyumu Carron ve ark. (1985) tarafından geliştirilen, Türk sporcularına Unutmaz ve ark. (2011) tarafından uyarlanan Takım Birlikteliği Envanteri (Group Environment Questinnaire-GEQ) ile belirlenmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda, müsabakada 1. olan takımlar ile diğer takımların görev uyumu düzeylerinin benzer olduğu bulunmuştur. Müsabakayı 1. ve 2. olarak tamamlayan takımların sosyal uyum düzeyleri en düşük, sonuncu olarak tamamlayan takımların ise en yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Erkek takımlarının görev uyumu düzeyi kadın takımlarından yüksek bulunmuştur. Ayrıca sosyal uyum ile takım başarısı arasında, görev uyumu ile cinsiyet arasında ilişki belirlenmiştir. Sonuç olarak takımların başarılı sıralamasında üst noktalara çıkmaları için görev uyumunun gerekli olmakla birlikte yeterli olmadığı, en alt lig düzeyindeki takımlarda yüksek sosyal uyumun başarısızlığa neden olabileceği ve erkeklerin kazanmak için kadınlardan daha fazla görev uyumu sergiledikleri belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Hentbol, 2. Lig, Başarı sıralaması, Sosyal uyum, Görev uyumu**.**

The Relationship between Group Cohesion and Team Achievement: The Case of University Handball 2. League Teams

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the success ranking of competitive handball teams at the same league level (2nd league) according to the group cohesion level and to determine the relationship between success ranking and group cohesion. Group cohesion was determined according to the Team Environment Questinnaire (GEQ), which was developed by Carron et al. (1985), and adapted to Turkish athletes by Unutmaz et al. (2011). As a result of the research, it was found that the task cohesion level of the teams that came first in the competition and the other teams were similar. It was found that the teams that completed the competition as 1st and 2nd had the lowest social cohesion levels, and the teams that completed the last place had the highest. The task cohesion level of the men's teams was higher than that of the women's teams. In addition, a relationship was determined between social cohesion and team success, and between task cohesion and gender. As a result, it has been concluded that although task cohesion is necessary, it is not enough to achieve top positions, high social cohesion in the teams in the lowest league may cause failure and men exhibit more task cohesion than women in order to win.

Keywords: Handball, 2nd league, Team cohesion, Social cohesion, Task cohesion.

Yayın Bilgisi

Gönderi Tarihi: 29.03.2021

Kabul Tarihi: 30.06.2021

Online Yayın Tarihi: 28.08.2021

Doi: 10.38.021/asbid.904958

Introduction

From the beginning of the history, people came together in groups to achieve a wide variety of purposes (Shaw, 1981). All groups (music / study groups, committees, social clubs, sports teams) have a purpose and instrumental basis for getting together (Carron & Brawley, 2000). It can be said that the sports teams, which are one of these groups, come together with the instrumental basis of being successful. The team is a community of people with shared responsibility, who demonstrate a level of performance bigger than the summation of individual inputs, creating positive synergies through coordinated efforts to achieve the same goal (Soyer et al., 2010). Sports teams differ from most other teams at some points. Sports teams have a unique clarity and consistency in terms of members (such as ability, goals, role definitions and relationships, team structure, rules and procedures) compared to organizational teams (Wolfe et al., 2005). Most groups have the potential for dispute between team members or between team and team management due to various structural issues (team goals, roles, overlapping roles or procedures to be followed). The disagreements are less due to the structures of sports teams (Pescosolido & Saavedra, 2012).

According to studies, group cohesion is critical to team performance in stressful and task-oriented environments (Charbonneau & Wood, 2018). Sports aim to win through competition due to its nature. In sports teams focused on winning, competitions can create intense pressure and stress on athletes. A high level of group cohesion facilitates the task and reduces social anxiety (Hardy et al., 2005) and this explains why cohesion is an important component for success in sports (Kozachuk et al., 2016). Cohesion is defined as a dynamic process reflected in part by the pursuit of the instrumental goals of a group and / or the tendency to stay and stay together in meeting the emotional needs of members (Carron & Brawley, 2000). We usually see that there is a positive effect of group cohesion on the individual's contribution to the group (Carron et al., 2002b). From the point of view of the athlete, we can understand the importance of the cohesion of the individual to the team with the words of Michael Jordan (2010) “Talent wins games, but teamwork and intelligence win championships." In addition, many studies concluded that there is a relationship between cohesion and performance achievement in sports (Carron et al., 2002a; Carron & Chelladurai, 1981; Heuzé et al., 2006a). Mullen and Copper (1994) stated that the strongest relationship between cohesion and group success is in sports teams, followed by military groups and then non-military groups. In this context, we can state that sports teams come together in cohesion to be successful. Cohesion in sports groups conceptualized by Carron et al. (1985) on the basis of task and social cohesion as a four-dimensional, dynamic structure that includes individual (individual attractiveness) and group (group integration) dimensions. Carron et al. (2002b) reported in their last meta-analysis that the study found a significant positive relationship between cohesion and performance, and they reported that task cohesion and

social cohesion were mutually related to performance (Carron et al., 2002b). Similarly, Carron et al. (2002a) stated that a strong relationship between task cohesion and team success in team sports was found (Carron et al., 2002a). Cohesion is a structure that can be examined in relation to both individual and group results (Hoyle & Crawford, 1994). Similarly, in team handball, the individual skills of each athlete constitute team performance (Heuzé et al., 2006a). In addition, the fact that every athlete has a key role in the functioning of the team affects group cohesion (Marcos et al., 2010). Members of cohesive groups have a tendency to put more effort to fulfill their tasks (Bray & Whaley, 2001). It has been shown that strong cohesion accelerates individual effort and persistence to reach the goals of the team, and thus group actions are in cohesion (Mach et al., 2010). Moreover, players in cohesive teams tend to have stronger shared beliefs about the competence of their teams. It has been stated that these tendencies of the players can lead the team to success (Paskevich et al., 1999). It has been stated in studies that a high level of group cohesion facilitates the task (such as better performance) and reduces social anxiety (such as less conflict) (Hardy et al., 2005). Nevertheless, it should be considered that high group cohesion has potential disadvantages as well as these advantages. It is stated that group cohesion is not always seen as a force that leads to productivity, as cohesion will strengthen both functional and dysfunctional behavior patterns, and high social cohesion is not always desired (Pescosolido & Saavedra, 2012). Langfred's (1998) suggests that cohesion is a double-edged sword. For example, he stated that in a group of students when the attention of students focused on subjects not related to academic work, the person who works hard or encourages the group to work will encounter resistance and this resistance will be stronger the more cohesive the group is. There are concerns that teams that have high social cohesion will fail to perform tasks efficiently, the team is likely to make fun of instead of working in practice, and that the group may decrease performance by reducing the task attention. Since socially cohesive teams will socialize together, it has been stated that athletes will sometimes get tired of their teammates as a natural result of the team's excessive interaction and socialization (Hardy et al., 2005). Also, in highly coordinated teams whose main focus is winning, if only the best players contribute to the team, other players will take small roles. This situation will cause the belief that the distribution of responsibilities of athletes in teams becomes narrower (Hardy et al., 2005). As a result, it is stated that although cohesion boosts the group performance, the tendency of the group to experience cohesion after successful performance may be stronger (Mullen & Copper, 1994).

There have been studies in the literature evaluating the different effects of the level of cohesion on various components. Marcos et al. (2012) stated that players whose success expectations did not match their performance had higher levels of cohesion at the beginning of the season compared to the end of the season, and that players whose success expectations matched their performance did not change during the season. Akpınar et al. (2011) stated that the cohesion levels (excluding individual

attractions to group-task (ATG-T sub-dimension) / the dimension reflecting the perceptions of individual members regarding their personal participation in group task) of the groups that participate in martial arts training were higher than the groups that participate in- aerobic training. They stated that the lack of interaction and contact in aerobic practices, and the fact that most of the martial arts are performed with a partner (as a couple) can be factors that explain this difference in cohesion. Rusu (2020) stated that task cohesion is similar between the teams playing in the first / second league (volleyball, basketball, handball), and that the teams playing in the second leagues are more socially cohesive than the teams playing in the first leagues. Høigaard et al. (2006) concluded that there is a negative relationship between football players' group cohesion and their perception of social loafing. When high task cohesion combined with high social cohesion the perception of social loafing will be lower. Eys and Carron (2001) stated that athletes who tend to be uncertain about the scope of their responsibilities in the basketball team have a lower perception of their team's task commitment. In addition, it has been reported that the uncertainty regarding the scope of responsibility in basketball teams is inversely related with task cohesion. They stated that if there is role ambiguity in the team (not being sure about who will do what when, where), there will generally be the absence of unity or cohesion in the team. Dorak and Vurgun (2006) found that volleyball players have higher group cohesion than handball players, and footballers have higher group cohesion than handball and basketball players. They stated that the group cohesion of the inexperienced athletes (who played for five years or less) was higher than the experienced athletes (those who played for eleven years or more), and experienced athletes are more egoist. Hatem and Aydın (2009) stated that athletes who find the group more socially attractive perceive their teams as more successful in the current season. In their evaluation of future success expectation, they stated that the athletes who find the group attractive in terms of social and duty, think that their teams will be more successful in the next season. In the study, they found that task attractiveness of the group did not contribute to the interpretation of perceptions about performance, on the contrary, social attraction predicted perceptions about performance. As a result, various studies have been conducted about group cohesion and different sports branches (Carron et al., 2002a), different intervals of the season (Heuzé et al., 2006a; Heuzé et al., 2006b), win / loss ratios (Bray & Whaley, 2001), successful / unsuccessful teams (Kocaekşi & Koruç, 2012), professional (Heuzé et al., 2006a), semi-professional (Marcos et al., 2010) and performance relations of teams playing at different league levels (Rusu, 2020) that include variables and effects that can be associated with group cohesion (such as role ambiguity, collective effectiveness, leadership). However, there is no study investigating the group cohesion level of teams (men / women) competing at the same league level (2nd league) with competitive purposes has been found. In addition, the 2nd league handball teams are the lowest level teams in the university league. It is thought that revealing the group cohesion in a way that supports the individual effort, persistence

and productivity of the athletes at the lowest league level will allow the team performance to be displayed successfully. For this reason, the purpose of this study is to determine the place of competitive handball teams at the 2nd league level in the success rankings according to their group cohesion levels and to reveal the relationship between group cohesion and success rankings.

Method

Participants

Twelve university handball teams (6 women, 6 men) and 145 people (women: 73, men: 72) participated in the Inter-University Handball 2nd League competitions. The average age of handball players is 21.17 ± 1.94 and their handball game experience is 3.90 ± 3.40 years. University handball competitions are held in three categories: Super League, 1st League and 2nd League. Those who are successful in their categories are promoted to the higher league, while the unsuccessful teams are relegated to a lower league. Teams that have completed at least a 3-month preparation period before the competitions were included in the study. All teams and players participating in the competitions in the Nevsehir group agreed to be a part of this study voluntarily.

Team Success

Team success is calculated on the basis of the points obtained by each team as a result of the matches played in the competition program. At the end of the competitions, evaluation was made by giving 2 points for each win, 1 point for a draw and 0 points for a loss.

Measures

To analyze the group environment, the Team Environment Questinnaire (GEQ) which was developed by Carron et al. (1985) and adapted for sports group in Turkish population by Unutmaz et al. (2011) was used. The inventory is composed of a total of 18 questions and 4 sub-dimensions (group integration-social (GI-S); individual attractions to the group-social (ATG-S); individual attractions to the group-task (ATG-T); group integration-task (GI-T)). In order to test the reliability of the inventory and its sub-dimensions, internal consistency coefficients calculated as .61 for individual attractions to the group-social sub-dimension (ATG-S), .67 for individual attractions to the group-task sub-dimension (ATG-T), .63 for group integration-social sub-dimension (GI) -S) and .65 for group integration-task sub-dimension (GI-T). The total internal consistency coefficient of the inventory was determined as .82. Each variable that constitutes the inventory is measured with 9-point Likert scale (1-Completely Disagree, ... 9-Completely Agree) rating scale. Inventory has 5 items

in individual attractions to the group-social sub-dimension (1, 3, 5, 7, 9), 4 items in individual attractions to the group-task sub-dimension (2, 4, 6, 8), 4 items in group integration-task sub-dimension (11, 13, 15, 17) and 5 items (10, 12, 14, 16, 18) in the group integration-task sub-dimension. ATG-T and GI-T were combined for task cohesion, and ATG-S and GI-S sub-dimensions were combined for social cohesion. Similarly, there are studies in the literature (Gardner et al., 1996; Light Shields et al., 1997) combining social cohesion and task cohesion levels.

Procedure

For this study, head coaches of the handball teams were contacted after receiving the official approvals from Turkey University Sports Federation (TÜSF) and handball technical board members. Necessary information was given to the head coaches of the 2nd League level men and women handball teams in the technical meeting about the content of the study. Considering that the success and failure of the team during the competition process may affect group cohesion, inventory applications were completed before the start of the competitions. Nevsehir group (6 female and 6 male total 12 teams) was included in the study. After the competitions are completed, the highest ranking (1st) men's and women's teams in the handball table will advance to the next league (i.e., 1st League). Universities Handball competitions occurred in 3 leagues from the highest level down to 2nd league. (Super league, 1st and 2nd league). Teams in the 2nd league level play in the lowest division. Therefore, the fact that only one of the men's and women's teams will be promoted to the upper league (1st league) increases the importance of the competition for success among teams. In addition, the 2nd League Handball Competitions were played in 2 different groups (Aydın and Nevsehir groups). The study was officially supported by TÜSF and the ethics committee approval was obtained from Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University (E-95728670-100-3900).

Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 25.0. Continuous variables were defined by the mean ± standard deviation, median (minimum - maximum values) and categorical variables were defined by number and percent. Kolmogorov Smirnov test and Shapiro Wilk tests were applied to determine if the data represents the properties of normal distribution. The skewness (-.186; .037) and kurtosis (-.960; -.365) values related to task cohesion and social cohesion levels were indicated, respectively. For the comparisons of the independent groups, we applied Independent samples t test and One Way Analysis of Variance (post hoc: Tukey test) when parametric test assumptions were provided. When parametric test assumptions were not provided, we used Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis Variance Analysis (post hoc: Mann Whitney U test with Bonferroni Correction).

Spearman correlation analysis was used for analyzing the relationships between continuous variables. Statistical significance was determined as p< .05.

Findings

As a result of the study, the comparisons of the teams participating in the university handball competitions according to their task and social cohesion levels, team success (Table 1) and gender (Table 2), were given respectively. In addition, in Table 3, the relationship between task/social cohesion and team success and gender was specified.

Table 1

Comparison of Task/Social Cohesion Level and Team Success

Team success		N	Task cohesion	Social cohesion
1		25	64.4 ± 12.36	47 ± 11.76
			68 (43 - 81)	46 (29 - 68)
2		24	54.46 ± 11.55	48.46 ± 7.65
			53 (35 - 80)	48 (39 - 69)
3		23	59.61 ± 15.78	52.61 ± 10.84
			55 (28 - 81)	53 (35 - 73)
4		31	54.03 ± 14.02	50.03 ± 6.26
			55 (33 - 81)	51 (36 - 60)
5		19	70.58 ± 8.19	54.63 ± 7.11
			74 (51 - 81)	52 (45 - 70)
6		23	64.61 ± 11.65	56.61 ± 9.99
			62 (43 - 81)	56 (36 - 73)
Inter-group	p	145	0.0001* (kwh=25.878)	0.004* (kwh=17.115)
			(2-5, 4-5)	(1-6, 2-6)

p< .05 statistically significant; all descriptive statistics were shown as Mean ± Standard deviation; median (minimum – maximum values); kwh: Kruskal Wallis Variance Analysis

When Table 1 was analyzed, we can conclude that task and social cohesion levels and team success are statistically significantly different. When the task cohesion is evaluated, the scores of the teams that finished 5th in the competitions are significantly higher than the teams that finished 2nd and 4th. When the social cohesion is evaluated, the success ranking of the teams that finished 1st and 2nd in the competitions is statistically significantly lower than the teams that completed the competitions 6th. The team completing the competition in the last place has the highest level of social cohesion.

Table 2

Comparison of Task/Social Cohesion with Gender

Gender	N	Task cohesion	Social cohesion
Woman	72	57.51 ± 14.66	51.04 ± 8.81
		55 (28 - 81)	50 (35 - 72)
Man	73	63.68 ± 12.1	51.56 ± 10.28
		65 (35 - 81)	52 (29 - 73)
Between groups p	145	.008* (z=-2.647)	.744 (t=-.327)

p< .05 statistically significant; All descriptive statistics were shown as Mean ± Standard deviation; median (minimum – maximum values); t: Independent samples t test; z: Mann Whitney U test

When Table 2 is examined, task cohesion level of men is significantly greater than women ($p < .05$). In addition, no difference was found between the social cohesion levels of the teams according to gender ($p > .05$).

Table 3

Task/Social Cohesion Level and Team Success and Gender Relationship

Variables		Task cohesion	Social cohesion
Success Ranking	r	.124	.308*
	p	.137	.00
Gender	r	.225**	.027
	p	.006	.744

p< .05 statistically significant correlation; r: Spearman Correlation Coefficient

When Table 3 is examined a significant relationship between team success and task cohesion was not found. A significant positive relationship was determined between team success and social cohesion scores. A significant relationship was determined between gender and task cohesion. No relationship was determined between social cohesion and gender.

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of the study is to compare the group cohesion level of competitive handball teams participating in interuniversity handball 2nd league competitions according to various variables (team success, gender) and to determine the relationship with these variables. The difference between the cohesion level and team success was determined. These differences occurred at the level of task cohesion as indicated in Table 1 (between 2nd & 5th and 4th & 5th). Differences in social cohesion levels are between teams which finished the competition 1st & 6th and teams which finished 2nd & 6th. The social cohesion scores of the teams that completed the competitions in the 1st and the 2nd place are lower than the other teams. In addition, it has been determined that the level of social

cohesion and team success are related. When the literature is examined, different results were concluded in many studies expressing the relationship between cohesion (task / social) and performance. First of all, there are studies reported that there is a positive relationship between cohesion and performance (Carron & Ball, 1977; Carron et al., 2002a; Carron & Chelladurai, 1981; Carron et al., 2002b; Widmeyer & Martens, 1978), insignificant relationship (Boone et al., 1997; Davids & Nutter, 1988; Tziner et al., 2003), negative relationship (Hardy et al., 2005; Landers & Lüschen, 1974; McGrath, 1962) and even an inverted 'U-shaped relationship (Wise, 2014). In addition, there are studies reporting that social cohesion is related to performance more than task cohesion is related (Bray & Whaley, 2001; Slater & Sewell, 1994). Also, there are studies stating that social cohesion is perceived as a negative performance factor more than task cohesion is perceived (Hardy et al., 2005).

The reason for these differences in the literature may be due to the change in the effect of cohesion on performance depending on the nature of the task that the group performed (Carron et al., 2002b; Dyaram & Kamalanabhan, 2005; Matheson et al., 1997; Williams & Widmeyer, 1991). In the literature, there is a lot of information about the positive side of the cohesion-performance relationship, but there are only a few studies that conclude to have negative or insignificant effects. This situation showed that it is necessary to analyze the cohesion-performance relationship in more detail from different angles. When looking at the studies in the literature, it has been reported that social cohesion may differ in teams that come together for different purposes, in this case it may be due to interest towards the application, or the cohesion levels of the teams may vary at different times of the season (beginning / middle / end), and this variability may have an effect on success. In addition, it is stated that the level of matches the team competes in (high school, university, professional team) is one of the issues to be considered. For this purpose, in our study, we will briefly mention a few studies that have examined the points we specifically mentioned (success & task / social cohesion; success & handball team; success & pre-competition; success & universities league; success & gender) in the cohesion/performance relationship.

In their study, Akpınar et.al (2011) found that the cohesion levels (in sub-dimensions other than ATG-T dimension) of the martial arts training group (aikido, taekwondo, karate, and kendo) were significantly higher from aerobics training groups (aerobics, aero-steps, high-low aerobics and physc-gym). The research suggests that all individuals have task cohesion perception levels similar to their groups in ATG-T dimension. When the sub-dimensions that are significantly different are evaluated, the high ATG-S dimension in the martial arts group was attributed to the effects on the structure of the sport. In other words, since the majority of technical practices in martial arts are performing with a partner (with a couple), it provides an environment of strong individual friendship, socialization and trust. Almost no interaction in movements in aerobic practices has been cited as a

possible cause of the lower cohesion level. It was stated that the high scores of the martial arts group in GI-T and GI-S dimensions may be due to the philosophical / spiritual purposes and the effect of the special clothes used in the applications. It was also stated that task cohesion is important for the participants who practice aerobics training, but they perceive the tasks individually, not as a group, during the applications. They stated that they concluded both task and social cohesion were important in martial arts training groups.

Carron et al. (2002a) investigated the relationship between task cohesion and team success, and evaluated elite university basketball (n = 18) and club football teams (n = 9) in terms of cohesion and winning rates. As a result of the study, it was reported that the relationship between cohesion and achievement in the ATG-T dimension was statistically significant in basketball and football groups. On the other hand, in the GI-T (Group Integration-Task) dimension, they indicated a strong significant relationship for basketball, while for football; they reported that there is no statistically significant relationship. Dorak and Vurgun (2006) investigated the level of group cohesion according to sports branches and reported that volleyball players had higher mean scores than handball players, and footballers had higher mean scores than handball and basketball players. He also stated that the experience levels of the players are effective in group cohesion, that the inexperienced athletes (five years and six) have greater levels of cohesion than the experienced athletes (eleven years and above), and the players think of themselves individually as they become professional. Gioldasis et al. (2016) reported that for football teams, cohesion positively or negatively affected performance during the season. Task cohesion was examined at the beginning of the season and mid-season, and they stated that it positively affected the team performance at the end of the season and mid-season. Looking at the relationship between social cohesion and performance, the study showed that social cohesion at the beginning of the season negatively affected performance at the end of the season, and social cohesion in the middle of the season positively affected the team's performance in the middle and end of the season. The results were attributed to the fact that teams with high social cohesion rates at the beginning of the season were likely not qualified enough to reach their goals.

Marcos et al. (2012) investigated cohesion, effectiveness and their relationship to success expectations throughout the season. In the results of the study, cohesion levels (social cohesion, task cohesion) of players whose success expectations did not match performance (ENP) are significantly higher at the beginning of the season than at the end of the season. It has been reported that there is no significant change in the cohesion levels (task, social) of the players whose expectations match performance (EMP), according to the season (beginning / end of the season). They stated that the reason for this situation was the high expectation at the beginning of the season as the players thought they would have a good season and their tendency to combine their efforts and perseverance by carrying more hope to succeed. They attributed the decrease in cohesion at the end of the season to

the fact that their expectations were not realized by perceiving the goals scored and conceded. On the other hand, it was stated that the cohesion levels of the teams whose expectations match performance at the end of the season were more consistent. It was stated that clearly defining the main goals of the season and matching the expectations of the player with the expectations of the team could be effective in the good final performance. It was stated that if the expectations of the players exceed the possibilities of the team, their level of cohesion may decrease, and this situation may also decrease the performance. Similarly, in handball (Heuzé et al., 2007) and basketball (Heuzé et al., 2006a) it is stated that the levels of all cohesion factors decrease as the season progresses and approaches to the end.

In another study conducted with professional basketball players, Heuzé et al. (2006a) reported that in the evaluations of the teams' pre-performance cohesion, the significant relationship was only with the GI-T sub-dimension. They also stated that the final performance was not related to the cohesion values (ATG-T, GI-S and GI-T). Similarly, Carron et al. (2002b) stated that the cohesion-performance relationship is strong in high school and inter-university sports, and weak in professional sports.

In his study, Rusu (2020) stated that the level of task cohesion was not different between the teams playing in the first / second league (volleyball, basketball, handball), and that the teams playing in the second leagues were more socially cohesive than the teams playing in the first leagues.

In summary, in studies conducted, applying with one type of clothing may increase cohesion (Spink & Carron, 1993), and the levels of cohesion and sub-dimensions may decrease as the season progresses and approaches the end of the season (Heuzé et al., 2007; Heuzé et al., 2006b), the levels of cohesion of the teams whose expectations match performance at the end of the season are more consistent (Marcos et al., 2012), the levels of cohesion in the teams playing in the first / second league are similar (Rusu, 2020) is indicated. Based on this, we can state that cohesion is a multi-dimensional structure and not all factors are equally important in all situations (Carron & Brawley, 2000), and many factors, including the structural differences of teams, can be effective in the cohesion and performance relationship. In our study, the level of task cohesion of the teams that finished the competition in the first place and the other teams is similar. However, the level of task cohesion for the teams that completed the competitions in the top (2nd) ranks is significantly lower than of the teams that finished in the last places (5th). This situation showed that high task cohesion is not enough to bring success. The main reason for us to make this inference is that the teams that complete the competitions in the last place (5th ranked teams) have high scores on task cohesion, but their success level is low. In short, we can state that high task cohesion will not predict success. The findings are similar to the studies stating that high cohesion failure teams do not show productivity (Wise, 2014),

but successful performance will increase group cohesion (Bakeman & Helmreich, 1975; Carron & Ball, 1977).

The level of social cohesion is the lowest for the teams that finish 1st and 2nd (the most successful), while it is the highest for the teams that complete the competitions in the last place. The difference between the teams that finished 1st and 2nd and the teams that finished 6th in the competition is statistically significant. The level of social cohesion is significantly lower for the teams that finished 1st and 2nd compared to the 6th. Teams with a low social cohesion level were more successful than teams with a high social cohesion level. Findings are similar to the study that stated that high social cohesion is perceived as a negative performance factor (Hardy et al., 2005). Furthermore, it was determined that no significant relationship between task cohesion and team success was found, but social cohesion and team success were related. While the findings contradict with studies suggesting that task cohesion is more closely related to performance than social cohesion (Kozub & Button, 2000; Salminen & Luhtanen, 1998; Williams & Widmeyer, 1991), social cohesion is more related to performance than task cohesion (Bray & Whaley, 2001; Slater & Sewell, 1994) and social cohesion is perceived as a negative performance factor rather than task cohesion (Hardy et al., 2005).

We can evaluate the reasons for these differences and similarities multidimensional. First of all, as stated in the studies in the literature, the studies were completed before the start of the matches with the idea that the time interval in the season and the results (success / failure) of the competitions will affect the cohesion level. The teams participating in the research were evaluated after the preparatory season for the competitions and before the matches started. Another point that can have an impact on cohesion is the league level of the teams. If university teams are participating in the competition for the first time, they must start at the 2nd league level and some of the teams that are successful according to the status in their groups can promote to the higher league. The most successful women's and one men's team in the group which is studied (Nevsehir) will be promoted to the upper league next year. Based on this information, we can state that the teams participating in the competition are not experienced in the handball league and are at the beginning level. This information we have mentioned about the status of the teams is known by the teams and athletes participating in the competition. For this reason, each team will compete fiercely to achieve the success of playing in a more prestigious league next year. In order to conclude the competition successfully in handball, it is necessary to show team performance in a way that will score more goals than the opponent in each match. In demonstrating team performance, each athlete will have to push their limits individually in order to win. Also, in encouraging the team to perform, members must develop attractive and strong bonds with other members and with the team (Beal et al., 2003; Mullen & Copper, 1994). On the other hand, it was stated that high cohesion in teams does not always predict

high productivity (Wise, 2014), while good performance leads to cohesiveness, cohesiveness does not lead to good performance (Bakeman & Helmreich, 1975).

In the study, no difference was determined between the success of the teams that completed the game in the first place and the other teams, and the teams with the lowest social cohesion (1st and 2nd) performed significantly more successfully than the teams with the highest level (such as 4th and 5th). Findings contradicts the popular view that there is a positive relationship between cohesion and performance (Carron & Ball, 1977; Carron et al., 2002a; Carron et al., 2002b; Evans & Dion, 1991; Williams & Hacker, 1982). On the other hand, it is stated that unsuccessful teams do not show productivity (Wise, 2014), cohesion will not lead to more successful performance, but successful performance will increase group cohesion (Bakeman & Helmreich, 1975; Carron & Ball, 1977). The high level of cohesion in unsuccessful teams allows the members to share the responsibility in the times of failure, allowing the members to endure the negative consequences of the event (Brawley et al., 1987). Based on the studies stating that the high level of cohesion positively affects the performance, it is predicted that the cohesive but unsuccessful teams (for example, the last ranked team in the league) will be able to be candidates for the more successful league rankings by reflecting the team performance to the field in the following years. On the other hand, the low social cohesion of the teams that finished the league in first place in the group gave them an advantage and enabled them to demonstrate their performances successfully in the field. As stated in the studies stating that the cohesion and performance relationship may vary at different times of the season, a similar result has emerged with the view that the high cohesion at the beginning of the season is not always consistent with the success goals. In addition, considering the studies indicating that successful performance will create greater cohesion (Bakeman & Helmreich, 1975; Carron & Ball, 1977), it is in line with the view that the cohesion of teams that successfully complete the league will be affected by success in performance and that they can increase steadily as their next goals are reached. Based on the mentioned reasons, the level of cohesion (task / social cohesion) in order for the newly joined teams in the league to be successful and to show the team performance that can compete in the upper leagues should increase with high performance and should led to the idea that they can be more successful.

In the study, a significant relationship was determined between gender and task cohesion. Task cohesion is higher in men than in women. It has been determined that there is no difference by gender in the level of social cohesion. In addition, it was determined that task cohesion is related to gender. Studies in the literature show different results between gender and level of cohesion. Rusu (2020) stated that men's and women's sports teams are not different in terms of social cohesion and task cohesion. Similarly, Akpınar et al. (2011), stated that there difference was not found between the cohesion levels of men and women who received martial arts training. On the other hand, Eys and

Carron (2001) reported that female athletes have a higher perception of task cohesion than male athletes. In addition, when the relationship between group cohesion and gender is evaluated, many studies stating that there is no relationship (Smith et al., 1994) or there is a negative relationship (Harrison et al., 1998).

The different results that indicate the difference between the cohesion level & gender and the relationship between the cohesion level and gender in the literature may be due to the differences of the study groups and tasks.

As a result, in the study, we thought that task cohesion was not sufficient in team success, and that high social cohesion in the newly joined teams in a short time could bring failure (such as the teams that ranked as the last). On the other hand, the low social cohesion of the teams that qualified for the upper league made us think that social cohesion that develops slowly in the upper leagues is advantageous. In addition, the fact that the task cohesion is higher in men's teams than women's teams has led us to think that being successful is more important for men and as a result they can take a more competitive approach.

For researchers for future studies, longitudinal examinations (beginning, middle and end of the season) are recommended by adding various variables (such as satisfaction, motivation, leadership) that can mediate the relationship between cohesion and success according to league levels. In addition, by following the success expectations of the teams, it can be followed up how the expectations and facts affect the cohesion at different intervals of the season.

References

Akpınar, S., Kirazcı, S. ve Aşçı, H. (2011). Group cohesion in exercise classes: An examination of gender and type of exercise class differences. Journal of Human Sciences, 8(2), 845-862.

Bakeman, R., & Helmreich, R. (1975). Cohesiveness and performance: Covariation and causality in an undersea environment. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11(5), 478-489. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(75)90050-5

Beal, D. J., Cohen, R. R., Burke, M. J., & McLendon, C. L. (2003). Cohesion and performance in groups: a meta-analytic clarification of construct relations. Journal of applied psychology, 88 (6), 989-1004. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.989.

Boone, K. S., Beitel, P., & Kuhlman, J. (1997). The effects of the win/loss record on cohesion. Journal of Sport Behavior, 20(2), 125-134. https://search.proquest.com/openview/0f5ea4b7b937c654d13179ba15623a88/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=30153

Brawley, L. R., Carron, A. V., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1987). Assessing the cohesion of teams: Validity of the Group Environment Questionnaire. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 9(3), 275-294. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.9.3.275

Bray, C. D., & Whaley, D. E. (2001). Team cohesion, effort, and objective individual performance of high school basketball players. The Sport Psychologist, 15(3), 260-275. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.15.3.260

Carron, A. V., & Ball, J. R. (1977). An analysis of the cause-effect characteristics of cohesiveness and participation motivation in intercollegiate hockey. International Review of Sport Sociology, 12(2), 49-60. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/101269027701200203

Carron, A. V., & Brawley, L. R. (2000). Cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. Small group research, 31(1), 89-106. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/104649640003100105

Carron, A. V., & Chelladurai, P. (1981). Cohesiveness as a factor in sport performance. International Review of Sport Sociology, 16(2), 21-43. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/101269028101600202

Carron, A. V., Bray, S. R., & Eys, M. A. (2002a). Team cohesion and team success in sport. Journal of sports sciences, 20(2), 119-126. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/026404102317200828

Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002b). Cohesion and performance in sport: A meta analysis. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 24(2), 168-188. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.24.2.168

Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 7(3), 244-266. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.7.3.244

Charbonneau, D., & Wood, V. M. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of unit cohesion and affective commitment to the Army. Military Psychology, 30(1), 43-53. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2017.1420974

Davids, K., & Nutter, A. (1988). The cohesion-performance relationship of English national league volleyball teams. Journal of Human Movement Studies, 15(5), 205-213.

Dorak, F., & Vurgun, N. (2006). Takım sporları açısından empati ve takım birlikteliği ilişkisi. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 4(2), 73-77. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000060

Dyaram, L., & Kamalanabhan, T. (2005). Unearthed: the other side of group cohesiveness. Journal of Social Sciences, 10(3), 185-190. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2005.11892479

Evans, C. R., & Dion, K. L. (1991). Group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. Small Group Research, 22(2), 175-186. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496491222002

Eys, M. A., & Carron, A. V. (2001). Role ambiguity, task cohesion, and task self-efficacy. Small Group Research, 32(3), 356-373. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/104649640103200305

Gardner, D. E., Shields, D. L. L., Bredemeier, B. J. L., & Bostrom, A. (1996). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and team cohesion among baseball and softball players. The Sport Psychologist, 10(4), 367-381. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.10.4.367

Gioldasis, A., Stavrou, N., Mitrotasios, M., & Psychountaki, M. (2016). Cohesion and performance in soccer: A causal model. Sport Science Review, 25(1-2), 97. https://doi.org/10.1515/ssr-2016-0006

Hardy, J., Eys, M. A., & Carron, A. V. (2005). Exploring the potential disadvantages of high cohesion in sports teams. Small Group Research, 36(2), 166-187. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496404266715

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface-and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. Academy of Management Journal, 41(1), 96-107. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5465/256901

Hatem, Ö., & Aydın, O. (2009). Spor takımlarında kolektif yeterlik, öz-yeterlik ve saygınlık algıları ile başarı algı ve beklentileri arasındaki ilişkiler. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 26(2).

Heuzé, J.-P., Bosselut, G., & Thomas, J.-P. (2007). Should the coaches of elite female handball teams focus on collective efficacy or group cohesion? The Sport Psychologist, 21(4), 383-399. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.21.4.383

Heuzé, J.-P., Raimbault, N., & Fontayne, P. (2006a). Relationships between cohesion, collective efficacy and performance in professional basketball teams: An examination of mediating effects. Journal of sports sciences, 24(1), 59-68. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500127736

Heuzé, J.-P., Sarrazin, P., Masiero, M., Raimbault, N., & Thomas, J.-P. (2006b). The relationships of perceived motivational climate to cohesion and collective efficacy in elite female teams. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 18(3), 201-218. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200600830273

Høigaard, R., Säfvenbom, R., & Tønnessen, F. E. (2006). The relationship between group cohesion, group norms, and perceived social loafing in soccer teams. Small Group Research, 37(3), 217-232. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496406287311

Hoyle, R. H., & Crawford, A. M. (1994). Use of individual-level data to investigate group phenomena issues and strategies. Small Group Research, 25(4), 464-485. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496494254003

Jordan, M. BrainyQuote.com.Available:https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/michael_jordan_167383. Accessed April 8, 2020.

Kocaekşi, S., & Koruç, Z. (2012). Başarılı ve başarısız hentbol takımlarının grup sargınlığı, kaygı, güdülenme ve yeterlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences, 23(3), 129-143.

Kozachuk, J., Foroughi, C. K., & Freeman, G. (2016). Exploring electronic sports: An interdisciplinary approach. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, 60(1), 2118-2122. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931213601479

Kozub, S. A., & Button, C. J. (2000). The influence of a competitive outcome on perceptions of cohesion in rugby and swimming teams. International Journal of Sport Psychology. 31 (1), 82–95.

Landers, D. M., & Lüschen, G. (1974). Team performance outcome and the cohesiveness of competitive coacting groups. International Review of Sport Sociology, 9(2), 57-71. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/101269027400900203

Langfred, C. W. (1998). Is group cohesiveness a double-edged sword? An investigation of the effects of cohesiveness on performance. Small Group Research, 29(1), 124-143. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496498291005

Light Shields, D. L., Gardner, D. E., Light Bredemeier, B. J., & Bostro, A. (1997). The relationship between leadership behaviors and group cohesion in team sports. The Journal of Psychology, 131(2), 196-210. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989709601964

Mach, M., Dolan, S., & Tzafrir, S. (2010). The differential effect of team members' trust on team performance: The mediation role of team cohesion. Journal of Occupational Organizational Psychology, 83(3), 771-794. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X473903

Marcos, F. M. L., Miguel, P. A. S., Oliva, D. S., & Calvo, T. G. (2010). Interactive effects of team cohesion on perceived efficacy in semi-professional sport. Journal of sports science medicine, 9(2), 320-325.

Marcos, F. M. L., Sánchez-Miguel, P. A., Sánchez-Oliva, D., Alonso, D. A., & García-Calvo, T. (2012). Evolution of perceived cohesion and efficacy over the season and their relation to success expectations in soccer teams. Journal of Human Kinetics, 34(1), 129-138. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2478/v10078-012-0072-y

Matheson, H., Mathes, S., & Murray, M. (1997). The effect of winning and losing on female interactive and coactive team cohesion. Journal of Sport Behavior, 20(3), 284-298.

McGrath, J. E. (1962). The influence of positive interpersonal relations on adjustment and effectiveness in rifle teams. The Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 65(6), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047395

Mullen, B., & Copper, C. (1994). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. Psychological bulletin, 115(2), 210–227. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.2.210

Paskevich, D. M., Brawley, L. R., Dorsch, K. D., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1999). Relationship between collective efficacy and team cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, Practice, 3(3), 210. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.3.3.210

Pescosolido, A. T., & Saavedra, R. (2012). Cohesion and sports teams: A review. Small Group Research, 43(6), 744-758. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496412465020

Rusu, O. (2020). The Evaluation of Cohesion in the Sports Groups within a Romanian City. Physical Culture Sport. Studies Research, 85(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2478/pcssr-2020-0001

Salminen, S., & Luhtanen, P. (1998). Cohesion predicts success in junior ice hockey. Perceptual Motor Skills, 87(2), 649-650. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1998.87.2.649

Shaw, M. E. (1981). Group dynamics. New York. McGraw-Hill.

Slater, M., & Sewell, D. (1994). An examination of the cohesion-performance relationship in university hockey teams. Journal of Sports Sciences, 12(5), 423-431. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/02640419408732192

Soyer, F., Can, Y., Güven, H., Hergüner, G., Bayansalduz, M., & Tetik, B. (2010). Sporculardaki başarı motivasyonu ile takım birlikteliği arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 7(1), 225-239.

Spink, K. S., & Carron, A. V. (1993). The effects of team building on the adherence patterns of female exercise participants. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 15(1), 39-49. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.15.1.39

Tziner, A., Nicola, N., & Rizac, A. (2003). Relation between social cohesion and team performance in soccer teams. Perceptual Motor Skills, 96(1), 145-148. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.2003.96.1.145

Unutmaz, V., Kiremitci, O., & Gencer, R. T. (2011). Takım Birlikteliği Envanteri'nin Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi. CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 6(2), 23-30.

Widmeyer, W. N., & Martens, R. (1978). When cohesion predicts performance outcome in sport. Research Quarterly. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education Recreation, 49(3), 372-380. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10671315.1978.10615547

Williams, J. M., & Hacker, C. M. (1982). Causal relationships among cohesion, satisfaction, and performance in women's intercollegiate field hockey teams. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 4(4), 324-337. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.4.4.324

Williams, J. M., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1991). The Cohesion-Performance Outcome Relationship in a Coactlng Sport. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology, 13(4), 364-371. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.13.4.364

Wise, S. (2014). Can a team have too much cohesion? The dark side to network density. European Management Journal, 32(5), 703-711. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.12.005

Wolfe, R. A., Weick, K. E., Usher, J. M., Terborg, J. R., Poppo, L., Murrell, A. J., Dukerich, J. M., Core, D. C., Dickson, K. E., & Jourdan, J. S. (2005). Sport and organizational studies: Exploring synergy. Journal of Management Inquiry, 14(2), 182-210. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492605275245