

This is a refereed journal and all articles are professionally screened and reviewed

ORIGINAL ARTICLE**THE investigation of the relationship between the coach and teammates and the unity of the team in volleyball****¹Eyyüp NACAR, ²Atalay GACAR**^{1,2}*Department of Physical Education, Firat Üniversitesi, Turkey*

Eyyüp NACAR, Atalay GACAR: THE investigation of the relationship between the coach and teammates and the unity of the team in volleyball

ABSTRACT

A team, is a group in which have the same goals and priorities for which they work hard to achieve. With their own personal tactics and experiences, a coach is there to help them achieve the goals that are set. Thus, the coach is there to provide the team with influencing leadership. The teams' unity and the leaders influence upon such a unity comes to be an important role for which we cannot deny. The research; taking place in 2012-2013 seasonal activities of The Volleyball 2nd league (Male-Female) group competition of The Turkish University which from these teams 50 male and 44 female athletes have volunteered to participate in. In order to find out certain personal information about them the volunteers they have been given an "Personal Information Form". Designed by W. Neil Wildmeyer, Lawrence R. Brawley, Albert W. Carron (1985) the "Individual Charm-Task", "Individual Charm-Social", "Group Unity-Task" and "Group Unity-Social" have been used as a sub-dimensional survey for Team Unity. In order to measure the coach's leaderistic characteristics the survey by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980), which consists of 40 substances "Leader Characteristics of Sports", was used. The results was determined on a SPSS program packet level and for which the level of significance ($P < 0.05$) was determined. As a result; the teams in which participated in the research, we can say they are in possession of a coach for which gives great importance to training and education and is in favor of democracy, shows them social support, and rewards their success but also shows authoritative characterizes when needed. Looking at the results of team unity we can say, according to gender and different experiences, understanding of the task group, the team's success is more important to the integrity of "Group integrity-task" higher understanding of the athletes to the success of teams in group shows in the foreground tasks.

Key words: Sports, Volleyball, Team Unity, Leadership, Coach**Introduction**

In team sports, one of the important factors affecting the success and performance of the team can be said to be unity and team spirit.

In team games, in order to ensure the integrity and success of the leadership qualities that will work are the coaches and athletes that are willing to work in a manner to succeed. To portray the initiated goal the requirements would consist of a coach who is willing to try different techniques and for which the given techniques will work for the team and as well as fulfilling the teams requirements in order to achieve the ultimate goal [1].

Leadership is a person united for a common purpose to accomplish set goals, to understand the objectives of the group members, gain power to influence or determine the groups strengths, and which may affect the realization of these objectives effectively and defined to reach the ultimate goal [2]. According to Biçer (2006) leadership is, in spite of conditions, someone who can create a difference [3].

As can be seen from this definition, the case itself is the condition in which the leader can show bystanders the positive changes to the organization and its environment; for which is someone who can start such a movement and prove their courage. Therefore, the vision of the leader (ideal) and mission (task awareness of the reason for being there) will direct their own leadership [4].

A leader is someone who persuades the target and purpose of the employees of a given organization. The basis in the process of leadership is to influence others for a given goal. Breakthrough event is closely related to power supplies used by the leader [7].

Coach is considered as a leader, for which its leadership approaches and the relationship the coach portrays shapes the team as whole, which is not to mention inevitable [6]. Innate leadership qualities and characteristics of effective leaders which seem to be a gift from birth share the same common qualities. According to this, the teams coach must be successful in order to provide and environment

Corresponding AuthorEyyüp NACAR, Department of Physical Education, Firat Üniversitesi, Turkey
E-mail: enacar@firat.edu.tr

which are based on the characteristics of the coach [7].

Today, a variety of leadership behaviors and leadership styles has occurred and continues to occur over time with new styles. The type of leadership characteristics seem to have autocratic leaders, democratic leader, liberal leader, transformational leader, a visionary leader, the charismatic leader, situational leadership and strategic leader types. These behavior styles of leadership behaviors exhibited disclose the coach [1].

In this research, we made some definitions related to the coaches which according to, the coach as a technician uses the information necessary for the success of the athlete in the light of science, and then combines this information with sports skills and strategies and apply different temperament to people in order to be described as a person, a good organizer, trainer an effective manager, motivator, and athlete's independence, competence should be indicated in a winning educator. The coach's personality is of great importance for the success of the athletes or teams. Coach is a trainer as well as a guide has to hold some features to help gain the respect of athletes [8].

The coaches should demonstrate effective leadership skills in a group of athletes in which the physical, social, emotional and intellectual capacities in a way that they can, in a healthy way, perform an important role [1].

When reminded of the word Group we think of people who are fighting for the same purpose as which is a community made up of a collection of individuals. When the word group is used in sports we automatically think of teams. The saying there is no "I" in "team" and "we won as a team" are common phrases used [9]. Groups can be defined in various ways. "Perception" is recognition; "according to their perceptions of themselves as belonging to a particular group" consists of the group. According to the definition which focuses on the structure of the group, a group of two or more people, depending on the particular function and mutual realization in the coming together of people in this mutual commitment to play specific roles, these roles being played regulate certain "norm" in which development occurs [10].

A team ideally complements each other, or similar capabilities, common purpose and common values, and is largely believed that the performance objectives and targets, assessing their organizational composed of members of the given community. One of the main features of a team is that it creates a union between members. Association, by establishing a close link between the behavior of the team members to reach consensus and mutual support from and to each other means that they have become a whole [11].

Team spirit and the conflation sets one of the most important factors in the success or failure. The

biggest candidates for permanence are working together in harmony, accepting each other's success, the teams complementing each other all the time and realizing success creates success. Research shows; again the biggest indicator that determines the performance of teams and players is team spirit and harmony. Team spirit and harmony can reach the summit of high performance where the team realizes this and acts upon it. Comfort in the team, where athletes may be free, tolerant and unprejudiced adopted by members of the team, the player will stay away from emotional and mental problems, and thus will maximize performance. Compliance is the foundation of teamwork and trust [12,13,14,15].

Team cohesion is the integrity of the group that appears in the literature and is the concept of group solidarity and group identical to the association. All of these concepts, working for a particular team or group that holds the target association or adhesion, expressed as a commitment. Festinger, Schachter and Back (1950), state that the remains in a group of elements are expressed as the sum of the forces involved. Meanwhile Carron (1982) states the group of goals and objectives in maintaining the integrity of the group that holds together as a whole, is defined as a dynamic process [16].

Team unity has decisive factors. The team's most important factors affecting intra-union are general condition of the properties of the team. The first of these is the interaction within the team. The greater the interaction between team members and team members is how much they are associated with is how much stronger their bond will be. The second factor is the shared goals. Team members agree that they are objective, therefore unity increases. Unity of purpose connects its members encouraging them to successfully stimulate energy. The third is a personal commitment to the team. This is similar to the behavior and values of the members to adopt and to be with each other, which means they come to knowing and bonding with one another [15, 17].

In our study, Turkey Inter-University Volleyball 2 League (Women and Men) have coaches who work in teams competing in the leadership styles expected of them, by these teams, athletes, coaches, teams, the determination and unity of leadership behaviors were investigated.

Material- Method:

Research; The program of activities in the 2012-2013 season, Turkey Inter-University Volleyball 2 league. (Male- Female) teams participating in competitions and teams, limited to group of 50 male and 44 female athletes of service.

In our study, the validity and reliability studies that have been made previously Team Partnership Survey (GQE) and the Leadership Behavior Measurement Survey (LSS) were used. W. Neil Widmeyer, Lawrence R. Brawley, developed by

"The Measurement of Cohesion in Sport Team, Group Environment Questionnaire" (GQE) Team Sports Teams Association measurement questionnaire consists of four sub-dimensions [18].

These Dimensions are:

1. Individual charm Group – Mission
2. Individual charm Group – Social
3. Group Integrity – Mission
4. Group Integrity – Social

In order to determine the leadership behavior of coaches, Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) developed ideas for the Leadership Scale for Sports consisting of 40 items were used.

Gungormus, Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) Turkish translated the "Athletes Coach Behavior Detection" version for the reliability and validity of the Turkish university teams and players were tested [20].

The Universities \ basketball, judo, tennis, volleyball and soccer 367 athletes in different sports branches voluntarily participated. In this study, multivariate statistical techniques were used to test the factor structure of the scale is one of the Principal Component Analysis method which was used. According to the results of factor analysis of the original study, on the contrary, the 5-factor structure of the Turkish version of the scale and the four-factor structure emerged a total of 34 substances were identified. Analyses of substances covered by the meaning of the resulting four-factor structure are ordered according to their content, respectively, as follows.

These are:

- a-) Educational and Supportive Behavior (12 items)
- b-) Democratic Behavior (10 items)
- c-) Descriptive and rewarding behavior (7 items)
- d-) Autocratic Behavior (5 items):

In order to test the reliability of the scale, between Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient 0.71 (autocratic behavior) and 0.84 (educational support) were found. The internal consistency coefficient for the total scale was 0.87 [21].

The values in Table 2 are examined, volleyball players participated in the survey according to the variables of gender, Team Associated Levels, to compare the scores of the group integrity (Task) subscale, and a statistically significant difference was observed ($p > 0.05$). Individual Charm (Task), Individual Charm (Social) and Group Integrity (social) sub-dimensions were not observed statistically significant differences ($p > 0.05$).

Results:

According to Table 1 volleyball players looking to their score according to gender dimensions of leadership behaviors, social support behavior subscale, a significance difference was found ($p < 0.05$). Educational-didactic, democratic, autocratic and behavioral dimensions of positive feedback were found not much statistically significant difference was found ($p > 0.05$).

Table 1: Gender Variable Volleyball Players "Coach Leadership Behaviors" on Perceptions of the values of statistical distribution.

Leading Perspective	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p
Education and Tutorial	Female	44	23,13	7,68	92	0,84	0,40
	Male	50	21,88	6,76			
Democratic	Female	44	20,27	6,90	92	1,80	0,07
	Male	50	17,80	6,35			
Autocratic	Female	44	15,36	4,35	92	-0,39	0,69
	Male	50	15,72	4,31			
Social Support	Female	44	18,34	5,83	92	2,21	0,02
	Male	50	15,84	5,10			
Positive Feedback	Female	44	9,65	3,32	92	-0,03	0,97
	Male	50	9,68	3,13			

Table 2: Gender Variable Volleyball Players "Team Associated Levels" which Perceptions of the values of the statistical distribution.

Team Unity Size	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p
Individual Charm (Task)	Female	44	7,13	3,58	92	-1,48	0,14
	Male	50	8,32	4,07			
Individual Charm (Social)	Female	44	18,27	5,23	92	-1,03	0,30
	Male	50	19,26	3,95			
Integrity Group (Task)	Female	44	22,22	8,37	92	-2,48	0,01
	Male	50	25,82	5,48			
Integrity Group (Social)	Female	44	11,38	4,89	92	-0,76	0,44
	Male	50	12,08	3,84			

In the values of Table-2 were examined, volleyball players participated in the survey according to the variables of gender, Team Associated Levels are to compare the scores of the group integrity (Task) subscale, a statistically

significant difference was observed ($p > 0.05$). Individual Charm (Task), Individual Charm (Social) and Group Integrity (social) sub-dimensions were observed of no statistically significant differences ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3: Volleyball Coach Variable working with other players "Coach Leadership Behaviors" Perceptions of the values of statistical distribution.

Leadership Size		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p
Education and Tutorial	Yes	27	19,44	3,95	92	-2,66	0,00
	No	67	23,68	7,84			
Democratic	Yes	27	15,14	5,20	92	-3,73	0,00
	No	67	20,49	6,64			
Autocratic	Yes	27	15,00	4,52	92	-0,78	0,43
	No	67	15,77	4,23			
Social Support	Yes	27	14,48	3,10	92	-2,90	0,00
	No	67	18,02	6,02			
Positive Feedback	Yes	27	9,33	2,98	92	-0,06	0,52
	No	67	9,80	3,30			

Table 4: Workings with another coach with Variable Volleyball Players "Team Associated Levels" Perceptions of the values are of statistical distribution.

Team Unity Size	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p
Individual Charm (Task)	Yes	27	7,22	3,35	92	-0,86	0,39
	No	67	7,98	4,06			
Individual Charm (Social)	Yes	27	19,51	4,34	92	0,96	0,33
	No	67	18,50	4,70			
Integrity Group (Task)	Yes	27	24,88	7,11	92	0,64	0,52
	No	67	23,83	7,23			
Integrity Group (Social)	Yes	27	11,74	4,33	92	-0,02	0,98
	No	67	11,76	4,39			

According to Table 3 volleyball players who worked with other coaches dimensions of leadership behavior for which their scores were as follows: educational-didactic, democratic and social support behavior subscale, result in significant difference which was found ($p < 0.05$). Dimensions of autocratic behavior and positive feedback were found of no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$).

In which values of Table 4 are analyzed, according to the variables involved in research with volleyball players working with another coach, Team Associated Levels of points for the comparison of individual charm (Task), Individual Charm (Social), the Group integrity (Task) and Group Integrity (social) sub-dimensions there is no statistically significant difference that was found ($p > 0.05$).

Discussion Results:

2012-2013 season of Turkey Inter-University Volleyball 2nd league (Male- Female), a group of teams and their coaches who work in teams and athletes with leadership styles expected of them to work in, with the determination of perceptions of team unity findings are discussed in the light of the literature data.

In our study, according to gender dimensions of leadership behaviors of the coaches for which we look into their points; behavioral social support subscale, no significant differences were found ($p < 0.05$). Educational-didactic, democratic, autocratic and behavioral dimensions of positive feedback are of no statistically significant difference which was found ($p > 0.05$). According to these results, the coaches portrayed more social support to females than the male portion of our study.

Athletes according to gender dimensions of the association, analysis of the differences between the answers given by the lower aspects of the judgments; number of sub-dimension of the association according to gender, judgments of perceptions statistically significant difference was found between the answers given by the "group integrity-duty" ($p < 0.05$). For which the differences between male athletes and female athletes, compared to the "integrity-task group" were found that male athletes had a better understanding (Table 2). According to these results, female athletes behave more individual within the group from an understanding of the task, the male athletes are said that they are more connected to the understanding of the task group integrity and work more as a whole.

Volleyball players working with another coach's statistical dimension of leadership behaviors and their scores were as follows: educational-didactic, democratic and social support behavior subscale, where significant difference was found ($p < 0.05$). No statistically significant difference was found in dimensions of autocratic behavior and positive feedback ($p > 0.05$). Athletes who have different experiences with coaches educational-didactic, democratic and social support behavior seemed to have a tendency of less importance (Table 3).

Working with another coach volleyball athletes participated in the study according to the variables Team Associated Levels of points for the comparison of individual charm (Task), Individual Charm (Social), the Group integrity (Task) and Group Integrity (social) sub-dimensions of which no statistically significant difference was found ($p > 0.05$). Number of athletes associated with different levels of experience is analyzed, according to which

athletes' experienced higher levels of association with one another (Table 4). As the athletes in the experience of this team more than they think, and may have a positive opinion of this situation has been proposed for the team success.

Our research activities are related to a variety of domestic and foreign literature.

Çeyiz, (2007), who coached soccer in the province of Adana determined leadership styles of individuals in his work; Individuals engaged in coaching soccer teams in Adana in which leadership styles were identified as moderate autocratic [22]. Again, according to the examinations of the soccer coaches Donuk (2006), coaches focused on athletes emphasis on training and education, providing social support, semi-democratic, semi-autocratic leadership style, the athletes coaches less than the autocratic, democratic demands of being more determined [1].

Caliskan (2001), in his investigation the effects on the performance of athletes as a leader in the study of the behavior of , although this varies widely according to certain variables influence the behavior of coaches in general, has a decisive role on the performance of athletes, as well as a high level team players with each other and the team to be successful, fully players and coaches using the properties identified with the leadership team spirit with the emergence of creating a sense of ownership and control of a high performance to the team was argued. [23].

Ulukan (2006), determined the coaches leadership qualities and performance to determine the effect devotion to the soccer club located in the Turkcell Super League players in his study; soccer teams as a group leader to ensure the success of the unity and success of the coach and the players need to work upon their coaching style and athlete satisfaction decreases with the increase of the difference between choice which involves especially a significant relationship with affective commitment [24].

Seville (1997), "The Effects of Sports Leadership Behavior Team Success" master's thesis entitled, Handball I. to achieve success in the league, teams, coaches, and they are often prone to the autocratic leader behavior which was observed [25].

Garland and Barry (1987), examined the effects of leader behavior and the leader college soccer players (training and learning, democratic, autocratic, rewarding and social support, etc.) which were found to be in interaction with the athletes personal behaviors [26].

Ming-Feng Kao (2003), a study conducted by a team sports and individual sports team unity and leadership behaviors were compared for which significant differences emerged [27].

Jennifer Hightower (2000), in a study conducted by women's athletic teams, coaches, and team unity as well as leadership behaviors were investigated. Accordingly, the combination of different types of

leadership club relationship explained above, were found to be more effective in model mixed leadings [28].

According to his doctoral thesis, Moralı (1994), examined "Team Sports Team Associated Levels". Morali, Widmayer, Lawrence, Brawley, and Carron developed by the coexistence of team sports team for the measurement of inventory (GEQ) for the reliability study of the Turkish society has been translated to English. According to a study conducted by Moralı, dimensions of team unity, "the group integrity-social" minimal, "individual charm-social" were at the highest level. In addition, team unity in team sports is more important than individual sports, such as soccer teams, sub-groups, team unity is more than the number of athlete development as well as team dynamics and interactions [15,29].

Dorak and Vurgun (2006), examined a different study, for which the number of levels of empathy for team sport athletes showed significant correlation between the levels of association [16].

According to the study, we have concluded that the teams possess coaches in which concentrate on the emphasis on training and education, and a more democratic direction, behaviors, providing social support to them, who appreciate the achievements and of which is autocratic behaved.

Looking at the results of team unity, according to gender and different experiences, group integrity is more important to the success of the team. In addition we can say, "the integrity of group-task" is higher understandings of the athletes to the success of teams in group shows in the foreground tasks.

References

1. Donuk, B., 2006. Türkiye Profesyonel Futbol Ligleri Antrenörlerinin Liderlik Tarzlarının İncelenmesi ve Bir Model Yaklaşım. Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul
2. Koçel, T., 2000. "İşletme Yöneticiliği" s. 423, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
3. Biçer, T., 2005. Liderlik ve Ötesi, *Kobi Efor Dergisi*, sayı: 67, İstanbul
4. Biçer, T., 2008. Sporda Toplam Kalite Yönetimi ve Futbol Uygulamaları, Beyaz Yayınları, İstanbul, s. 12: 57-58.
5. Koçel, T., 2001. "İşletme Yöneticiliği" 8. Baskı s. 465, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
6. Özerkan, N.O., 2004. Spor Psikolojisine Giriş, Nobel Yayınları; Ankara.
7. Konter, E., 2004. Antrenörlük ve Takım Psikolojisi, Palme Yayıncılık; Ankara
8. Martens, R., 1987. "Coaches Guide to Sport Psychology" Human Kinetics Publishers, s. 38, Illinois.
9. Wann, D.L., 1997. *Sport Psychology*. New Jersey: Prentice hall, 298-303.

10. Şerif, M., C.W. Şerif, 1996b. Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş-I. Çevirenler: Atakay M, Yavuz A. Sosyal Yayınlar, İstanbul, s. 151
11. Akın, B., C. Çetin, V. Ekol, 1998. Toplam Kalite Yönetimi ve ISO 9000 Kalite Güvence Sistemi. Beta Basım, İstanbul, s. 148-184-186.
12. Ahronson, A., C. Eberman, 2002. Understanding Leadership and Teams in the Military Context. Prepared for the Director Canadian Forces Leadership Institute(CFLI).
13. Biçer, T., 2006. Şampiyonluğun Psikolojisi. Beyaz Yayınları, İstanbul, s.44.
14. Carron, A.V., S.R. Bray, M.A. Eys, 2002. Team Cohesion and Team Success in Sport. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 20(2):119-126.
15. Tatar, G., 2009. "Futbolda Takım Birlikteliği ve Liderin Takım Birlikteliği Üzerindeki Etkisinin İncelenmesi" Marmara Üniversitesi Yayınlanmış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul.
16. Dorak, F., N. Vurgun, 2006. Takım Sporları Açısından Empati ve Takım Birlikteliği İlişkisi, *Spor metre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, Ankara, 4(2): 74.
17. Eren, E., 2001. Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi. Beta Basım, İstanbul, s. 113-125: 460-477.
18. Widmeyer, V.N., A.V. Carron, L.R. Brawley, 1985. The Measurement of Cohesion in Sport Teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. *Sports Dynamics*, London, s. pp: 18-23.
19. Chelladurai, P., S.D. Saleh, 1980. Dimensions of Leader Behavior in Sports: Development of A Leadership Scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, p: 34-45.
20. Güngörmüş A.H., B. Gürbüz, F. Yenel, 2006. Spor İçin Liderlik Ölçeği'nin Sporcuların Antrenörün Davranışlarını Algılaması Versiyonunun Psikometrik Özelliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi, 9. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, 1043, Muğla.
21. Alpar, R., 2001. Spor Bilimlerinde Uygulamalı İstatistik, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
22. Çeyiz, S., 2007. "Adana İlinde Futbol Antrenörlüğü Yapan Bireylerin Liderlik Tarzlarının Belirlenmesi" Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Adana.
23. Çalışkan, G., 2001. Liderlik Açısından Antrenör Davranışlarının Sporcu Performansı Üzerine Etkisinin Değerlendirilmesi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya, (Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet Göral).
24. Ulukan, M., 2006. Futbolcuların Kulübe Bağlılıklarında Antrenörlerin Liderlik Özelliklerinin Rolü. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Konya, (Danışman: Prof. Dr. Azmi Yetim).
25. Sevil, T., 1997. Sporda Liderlik Davranışlarının Takım Başarısı Üzerindeki Etkileri. Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eskişehir, (Danışman: Prof. Dr. Fethi Heper).
26. Garland, D., J.R. Barry, 1987. Personality and Leader BEHAVIORS in Collegiate Football: A Multidimensional Approach to Performance, Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in New York City, NY.
27. Ming, F.K., 2003. Relationship Between Perceived Coach Leadership Behaviors and Team Cohesiveness Among Taiwanese Team and Individual Interscholastic Sport Participants, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Dakoto.
28. Hightower, J.V., 2000. Coaching Leadership Behaviors and Team Cohesion in Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Teams, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation University of Huston.
29. Morali, S.L., 1994. Measurement of Team Sports Team Unity and Solidarity. Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Health Sciences, Doctoral Thesis, Izmir, (Advisor: Asst. Assoc. Dr. HaticeÇamlıyer).