The purpose of this study was to determine if team cohesion could be enhanced for 9th grade female basketball teams with the implementation of a 14-week intervention program. The intervention program was designed from cohesion building strategies proposed in the literature with the help of three coaches and a leading sport psychologist in the field of cohesion. 41 ninth grade female basketball players belonging to four teams participated in the study. The Group Environment Questionnaire was used to measure cohesion. It was administered on the third week of the season and again at the end. The data were analyzed using both the individual and the team as the unit of analysis. The findings varied according to which unit of analysis was used. When the team was used, no posttest differences were found, however, the effect sizes suggested that the intervention was effective for the task subscales of the GEQ. A lack of statistical power for the team analysis greatly reduced the probability of finding that the meaningful differences were statistically significant. When the individual was used, the intervention was found to be statistically detrimental for the task subscales. The effect sizes supported this finding. The qualitative data that was collected suggested that the coaches believed the intervention had practical utility, and was effective. While this study did not empirically show that the intervention was effective, it did demonstrate that the intervention is practical enough to implement. Furthermore, the qualitative data and the effect sizes for the team analysis provide some evidence that the intervention may have been effective for the task dimension of team cohesion. Therefore this study produced an intervention that can be used as a starting point for future cohesion building investigations.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Successful group performance is an extremely valuable commodity in today’s world. The livelihoods of businessmen, educators, and coaches depend upon the successful performance of their respective group. Carron (1982) defines cohesion as “the 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” (p. 124). This construct is what enables individual members of a group to temporarily forgo their unique personal motives and replace them with group-oriented motives. Group cohesion not only creates a strong desire for team success, it enables the group to pull together during adversity and rise to the occasion “when the chips are down.”

The 1988 Cincinnati Reds provide a good example of how important group cohesion can be in order for a group to perform well. The Reds, a major league baseball team, were heavily favored to win the National League West, however, they finished the season seven games behind the first place Los Angeles Dodgers. Relief pitcher Rob Murphy provided some insight as to why the very talented Cincinnati Reds did not perform at the level everyone expected. He said, “We’ve got a funny chemistry here. It’s a strange mixture of guys. They’re all good guys: I don’t have any personal problems with any of them. They are guys who have great talent and good dispositions, but the mix—something’s not there. I can’t really explain it other than it’s a strange chemistry” (Cox, 1990, p. 336).

Because of the potentially significant influence that banding together and remaining united in the pursuit of a common goal can have on group performance, it is not surprising
that group cohesion has been heavily researched. The majority of sport-related research on
team cohesion has examined the consequences of cohesion (Carron, 1988). Group
performance, group stability, and individual satisfaction are the three most heavily
researched consequences of cohesion with group performance receiving the greatest
amount of research interest. Carron (1988) summarized the relationship between cohesion
and performance success into three conflicting findings. The first is that teams high in
cohesion tend to experience more success. The second finding is that teams low in
cohesion tend to experience more success. The third finding suggests that no relationship
exists between team cohesion and performance success.

These conflicting results can be understood if the task demands a sport team faces
are taken into account (Weinberg & Gould, 1995). Team sports can be categorized as
either coacting or interacting. Teams are described as coactive if interaction is not a
necessity in order for the team to be successful and attain team goals. Sports such as golf,
bowling, skiing, and wrestling are good examples of coacting teams. Studies which
examined coacting teams generally have found no relationship, or even a negative
relationship, between team cohesion and performance. Interactive task demands require a
team to interact and cooperate in order to be successful. Sports such as basketball, hockey,
football, and volleyball are good examples of interacting teams. Studies that have
examined interactive teams have found a positive relationship between cohesion and
performance.

Because of the positive relationship between cohesion and performance associated
with interactive teams, researchers have sought to understand the antecedents of cohesion.
Carron (1982) developed a conceptual model of cohesiveness in sports teams. The model
suggests that the development of cohesion is affected by four antecedents: environmental
factors, personal factors, team factors, and leadership factors. The model depicts the effect
these antecedents have on the development of cohesion, and the subsequent consequences of group cohesion which are categorized as either group or individual outcomes.

Several leading researchers in small group research and sport psychology (Anshel, 1990; Carron, 1984; Cox, 1990; Tutko & Richards, 1971; Yukelson, 1984; Zander, 1982) have suggested general guidelines for developing group cohesion. These suggested guidelines are: establishing open communication, fostering knowledge and acceptance of roles, collective goal setting, forming sub-unit pride within overall team identity, avoiding the formation of social cliques, resolving conflict through team meetings, establishing communicative links between coaches and players, creating positive group standards and developing a method of assessing individual adherence to the standard, frequently rewarding excellence, and focusing on success before discussing failure.

While many cohesion building guidelines have been suggested, studies empirically testing whether cohesion can be developed in the sport setting by following these guidelines are lacking. McClure and Foster (1991) examined how the implementation of a personal growth program influenced group cohesiveness within a women’s gymnastics team. As the focus of the study was on the effectiveness of the personal growth program as a cohesion building method, the effectiveness of the specific guidelines proposed in the literature was not examined. Carron and Spink (1993), however, found that cohesion could be enhanced in a fitness class through a psychological intervention program using the proposed cohesion building strategies. Their study has been the only attempt to determine whether cohesion can be enhanced by implementing the strategies sport psychologists have suggested. This unique study was conducted in the exercise setting, therefore, the proposed strategies still have not been tested in a sport setting.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine if team cohesion can be enhanced for 9th grade basketball teams with the implementation of a 14-week intervention program. The intervention program employs practical team building strategies focusing on open coach-player communication development, open intra-team communication development, increased player social interaction, individual role explanation, fostering a general value for all roles, reliance upon teammates, establishing a sense of individual ownership in the team, and collective goal-setting.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

A review of the literature leads to the hypothesis that the incorporation of a 14-week intervention program consisting of practical cohesion building strategies will result in greater individual perceptions of team cohesion as measured by the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) for ninth grade basketball players as compared to players in the control group.

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

\[ H_0: \mu_0 \geq \mu_1 \]
\[ H_1: \mu_0 < \mu_1 \]
Where: \( \mu_0 \) = control group mean score on the GEQ following the intervention
\( \mu_1 \) = experimental group mean score on the GEQ following the intervention
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

This study measured team cohesion with the Group Environment Questionnaire (Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron, 1985). This instrument is theoretically grounded and is based upon Carron’s (1982) conceptual model of cohesiveness in sport teams. The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) divides cohesion into two categories: group integration and individual attraction to the group. Group integration is defined as a member’s perceptions of the group as a unit. It represents the closeness and unification of the group as a whole. Individual attraction to the group is defined as a member’s personal attractions to the group, and it represents the motives working on the individual to remain in the group. Each of these categories have both a social and task aspect. The social aspect can be viewed as the development of social relationships within the group, while the task aspect is “a general orientation toward achieving the group’s goals and objectives” (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985, p. 248). Because of the two categories and the two aspects present in each category, four sub-scales of cohesion are identified: group integration-task (GI-T), group integration-social (GI-S), individual attraction to group-task (ATG-T), and individual attraction to group-social (ATG-S).

ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Subjects filled out the Group Environment Questionnaire truthfully.
2. Coaches in the experimental group accurately reported how they employed the intervention strategies.
3. Coaches in the control group accurately reported the degree of similarity between the cohesion strategies that they implemented and the cohesion strategies that were part of the intervention.
LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations to the study.

1. No members of any team were required to fill out the GEQ, which means that all subjects were volunteers. All subjects were invited to participate in the study, but all players had the option to not volunteer. However, this was not a severe limitation due to the fact that all players volunteered to participate.

2. It was not possible to know for certain what strategies the coaches in the control and experimental group actually employed. Due to geographical, financial, and time restrictions, the researcher did not observe to see if coaches in the experimental group were implementing the intervention strategies, or if coaches in the control group were implementing similar cohesion building strategies. However, both control and experimental coaches provided the researcher with a report of the strategies they used throughout the season.

4. The number of subjects involved in the study was relatively small. This was not consistent with the original design, but rather an artifact of the difficulties associated with field research.

DELIMITATIONS

The results from this study will be delimited to ninth grade female basketball teams in Northwest Oregon. Furthermore, the results will only generalize to Class AAAA high schools.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The parent disciplines of sociology and social psychology first explored the construct group cohesion. Much of the present knowledge concerning team cohesion came from small group research conducted by these parent disciplines. Hundreds of studies have been conducted, hundreds of articles have been published, and many books have been written concerning cohesion. For the purpose of this review, the information will be categorized as follows: definitions, conceptual model, antecedents, outcomes, and intervention strategies.

DEFINITIONS OF COHESION

Festinger, Schachter, and Back (1963) defined group cohesion as “the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group” (p. 164). Is team cohesion the total field of forces that cause members to remain on a team? From a sport perspective, this definition is not adequate because it does not take into consideration the dynamic nature of team cohesion (Cox, 1990). The definition also leaves out the importance of team goals and objectives (Cox, 1990). Carron (1982), a sport psychologist, defined team cohesion as “a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of goals and objectives” (p. 124). Carron’s definition accounts for the dynamic nature of team cohesion and stresses the importance of team goals and objectives. In this study, team cohesion will be defined according to Carron.

Team cohesion was once considered to be a single construct. However, Mikalachki (1969), Brawley, Carron, and Widmeyer (1993), and Carron and Spink (1993) have demonstrated that there are at least two distinct and separate dimensions of team cohesion.
The two dimensions most often examined are social cohesion and task cohesion. Social cohesion reflects the degree to which team members like each other and enjoy each other's company. Task cohesion reflects the degree to which group members work in unison to achieve group goals. Because recent research has consistently found several cohesion dimensions, cohesion is now considered to be multidimensional.

Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer (1985) presented a conceptual model of the multidimensionality of group cohesion shown in Figure 1. The model differentiates between group integration and individual attractions to the group. Group integration refers to a member's perceptions of a group in totality, while individual attractions to the group refers to a member's personal attractions to the group. Member's perceptions of the group in totality and their individual attractions to the group can be focused on task or social aspects. Four constructs of team cohesion can now be identified: group integration-task, group integration-social, individual attractions to group-task, and individual attractions to group-social.

Figure 1 - A conceptual model of group cohesion. (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985)
CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF COHESION

Carron (1982) developed a conceptual framework with which to systematically study cohesion in exercise and sport. His model outlines four major antecedents influencing the development of cohesion: environmental factors, personal factors, leadership factors, and team factors. The model categorizes outcomes influenced by cohesion into group outcomes and individual outcomes. Carron’s conceptual approach is diagrammed in Figure 2. This present study is grounded in Carron’s conceptual model and will serve as the framework with which to analyze relevant research on team cohesion.

Figure 2- Carron’s (1982) conceptual system for cohesiveness in sport teams
ANTECEDENTS OF COHESION

Carron's book *Group Dynamics in Sport* (1988) provides several tables that outline various factors suggested in the literature to influence team cohesion. The factors are organized according to his 1982 conceptual system and are placed into what he proposed are the four basic antecedents of cohesion. This review of the literature uses his framework as a beginning point and focuses primarily on those studies conducted in the physical domain.

**Environmental Factors**

Environmental factors are the most general and exist in the situation itself. Contractual responsibilities such as legal contracts, eligibility rules, and geographical restrictions have been shown to influence cohesion (Carron, 1982). Organizational orientation represents the difference among organizations in goals and strategies for achieving those goals. Social pressure against dropping out, due to group norms, has also been demonstrated to influence cohesion (Carron, 1982).

The size of the team or group has also been demonstrated to influence cohesion. Widmeyer, Brawley, and Carron (1990) placed recreational basketball players, matched for ability, into teams of 3, 6, or 9 members. The teams practiced for 2 weeks and then competed in a 3-on-3 basketball league lasting for 7 weeks. Task cohesion was highest for teams of 3 and lowest for teams of 9. Social cohesion was highest for teams of 6 and lowest for teams of 9. Performance was highest for teams of 6, and lowest for teams of 9. These results clearly show that an optimal team size exists in order to maximize team cohesion.
Personal Factors

A second category of factors influencing the development of cohesion is the individual characteristics of the members in the group. Cohesion has been shown to be enhanced when individual personalities (Preston, Peltz, Mudd, & Froscher, 1952, cited in Carron, 1988) and social background (Eitzen, 1975) are similar. Similarity in attitudes, beliefs, and motives has also been shown to increase cohesion (Terborg, Castore, & DeNinno, 1976). Widmeyer, Brawley, and Carron (1985) found that gender can influence team cohesion. They found that in team sports, male athletes scored higher in social cohesiveness than female athletes.

Grand and Carron (1982) found that individual satisfaction with the task influenced the development of cohesion with university and junior hockey teams. Martens and Peterson (1971) found that cohesion, performance, and satisfaction are related in a circular fashion when looking at intramural basketball players. They proposed that high team cohesion leads to increased individual and group performance, which leads to increased individual and group success. This increase in success will then lead to greater individual satisfaction. The increase in individual satisfaction leads to higher team cohesion.

Williams and Hacker (1982) examined this proposed circular relationship with women's intercollegiate field hockey teams. Their results support the idea that satisfaction may be an intervening variable in the circular relationship between performance and cohesion.

Granito and Rainey (1988) and Gruber and Gray (1982) examined whether being a starter or non-starter influences team cohesion with football and basketball players. Both studies found that playing status does influence team cohesion. The results from the two studies suggest that starters tend to be more task conscious, and are more committed to team goals.
Both studies also examined the relationship between playing status and social cohesion. Granito and Rainey examined high school and college football players and they did not find starters and non-starters to differ in this regard. However, Gruber and Gray examined elementary, junior high, high school, and college basketball players, and the results suggested that starters have greater affiliation desire, and value their membership on the team to a greater degree.

Leadership Factors

A democratic style of leadership has been found to be positively associated with team cohesion (Carron & Chelladurai, 1981; Westre & Weiss, 1991). Carron and Chelladurai (1981) examined high school basketball players and the results suggested that a democratic decision style, in which members participate in the decision making process to some degree, increases team cohesion more so than an autocratic, consultative, or delegative approach. The players who were most involved with the leadership of the group held the highest perception of team cohesion. Westre and Weiss (1991) examined high school football teams and they found that a democratic leadership style was positively associated with increased task cohesion. The relationship between a democratic leadership style and social cohesion could not be tested due to the unreliability of the social cohesion sub-scales used to measure social cohesion. Carron (1988) explains the findings from these two studies by stating that: “Collective input into a decision provides group members with greater ownership of the decision and the group. A feeling develops that it was our decision for our group” (p. 165).

Role clarity, role acceptance, and role performance are considered to be very influential factors to cohesion. Ensuring that every member on the team understands their role has been shown to be integral to the development of team cohesion (Anderson, 1975;
Schriesheim, 1980). It is extremely important to note that players must not only understand their individual roles, but they must accept and carry them out (Carron, 1984).

Feedback and the implementation of a reward system have been shown to influence cohesion in several studies (Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1979; Westre & Weiss, 1991). As important as feedback is, it is only a specific type of communication, and good communication in general is a necessary antecedent of cohesion (Yukelson, 1984). Open communication between players and the leader greatly impacts team cohesion in a positive manner (Yukelson, 1984). Carron (1993) proposes that in order to build a team atmosphere, an open climate must be created in which discussing problems and areas of concern is encouraged. He states that increases in communication are related in a circular manner with group cohesiveness.

Team Factors

Many team factors influence team cohesion, but perhaps the most influential may also be the least controllable. Previous performance success has been found to greatly affect cohesion both positively and negatively (Carron & Ball, 1977; Williams & Hacker, 1982). In fact, there has been great debate as to whether cohesion influences performance success or if performance success influences cohesion. Through cross-lagged studies, Landers, Wilkinson, Hatfield, and Barber (1982), Williams and Hacker (1982), and Shangi and Carron (1987) have shown that cohesion and performance success are related in a circular fashion. In this proposed circular relationship, performance success leads to increased cohesion, and the increase in cohesion leads to further performance success. Several sport psychologists, including Carron (1984), have gone as far as to suggest that coaches try to avoid difficult schedules early in the season.
Collective team goal setting offers great team building potential. Team cohesion has been found to be related to the team satisfaction with group goals and with group goal setting for competition (Brawley, Carron & Widmeyer, 1993; Zander, 1971).

Team stability, the relative amount of time that a group of athletes have remained together, impacts team cohesion as well. Carron (1984) suggests that team cohesion and stability are related in a circular fashion. The longer team members have been together, the more cohesive they become, and then it becomes less likely that they will choose to leave (Weinberg & Gould, 1995). Brawley, Carron, and Widmeyer (1988) found that college recreational basketball teams higher in cohesion exhibited a higher perceived resistance to disruption.

The orientation of the group task is central to team cohesion (Carron, 1984). In coacting sports, sports that do not require coordinated interaction in order to attain group goals, individual team members are primarily concerned with their individual performance. Swimming, track, golf, bowling, wrestling, and archery are good examples of coacting sports. In interacting sports, individual team members need to be primarily concerned with the overall team performance if they are to interact in a coordinated effort. When sport task is taken into consideration, performance has been found to be an outcome of cohesion for interacting sports such as basketball (Gruber & Gray, 1982) and hockey (Ball & Carron, 1976).

Group structure has been hypothesized to influence team cohesion. Plutchik (1981) found that teams having a large degree of role differentiation more readily develop cohesion. Plutchik suggests that teams comprised of many specialized members will exhibit greater cohesion. As the percentage of team members who feel that they are critical to the team's success increases, it stands to reason that cohesion will increase accordingly.
OUTCOMES OF COHESION

Carron (1982) proposes that cohesion influences two general types of outcomes, group outcomes and individual outcomes. It is important to note that most research designs that have examined outcomes of cohesion have been correlational in nature.

Group Outcomes

To many coaches, team performance is perceived as the most important group outcome. Despite the strong effect performance success has on cohesion, higher levels of cohesion often lead to increased performance (Landers, Wilkinson, Hatfield, & Barber, 1982; Shangi & Carron, 1987; Williams & Hacker, 1982). Teams high in cohesion work hard in a coordinated effort towards the attainment of group goals.

The circular relationship of team stability has already been discussed, however, it is important to remember that it is an outcome of cohesion as well as a factor influencing cohesion. Carron (1988) points out that team stability can be manifested in three ways. The first measure of team stability is the drop-out rate. Cohesive teams tend to retain members better than less cohesive teams, and so drop-out rates are lower. Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1988) found that even in coed adult exercise classes, where the group concept is not generally promoted, higher group cohesion leads to lower drop-out rates. A second measure of team stability is absenteeism and tardiness. Spink and Carron (1992) explored this measure of stability with female exercise participants and they found that higher cohesion was related to lower absenteeism and tardiness. The third measure of team stability is the group’s ability to resist disruptive events. Brawley, Carron, and Widmeyer (1988) explored this measure and found that group members who were high in task and social cohesiveness believed that their group could overcome specific disruptive events proposed to them by the researchers.
Individual Outcomes

Individual satisfaction has been found to be a correlate of team cohesion (Carron & Spink, 1993; Williams & Hacker, 1982). Williams and Hacker found that members of cohesive female intercollegiate field hockey teams find the experience more satisfying than members on less cohesive sport teams. Carron and Spink examined this relationship in the exercise setting and found that individual satisfaction was increased for participants exercising in team-building groups. Their intervention program emphasizing team building concepts effectively increased group cohesion and individual satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, a circular relationship between cohesion and satisfaction appears to exist with increases in satisfaction leading to greater cohesion and increased cohesion leading to greater individual satisfaction (Martens & Peterson, 1971; Williams & Hacker, 1982).

The important point to remember is that individual satisfaction is a strong correlate of cohesion.

Grand and Carron (1982) found that group structure not only is a factor of team cohesion, but it is also an outcome. They found that as a group’s cohesion increases, individual role clarity, role acceptance, and role performance are improved. Increases in role clarity, role acceptance, and role performance will subsequently increase team cohesion.

INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

The many positive outcomes associated with cohesion highlight the importance of identifying strategies that increase cohesion. Many sets of guidelines devised to assist coaches in developing team cohesion have been developed by researchers. With each of these sets of guidelines, the researchers have implied that if coaches will follow the
suggested procedures, team cohesion will be enhanced. A list of 49 guidelines researchers have proposed for the development of group cohesion is presented in Appendix A. This list was formed from summarizing the suggestions presented in the work of Anshel (1990), Carron (1984), Cox (1990), Cratty (1983), Murray (1985), Straub (1980), Tutko and Richards (1971), Yukelson (1984), and Zander (1980). Unfortunately, few experimental studies have been conducted to test the effectiveness of group cohesion strategies.

Rainey and Schweickert (1988) examined the effect of a spring trip on the cohesion of a NCAA Division III baseball team. In this case, the spring trip was tested as a potential cohesion building method. The results suggested that the spring trip itself was not related to higher cohesion. The members of the team that went on the spring trip did not perceive the team to be significantly more cohesive than the members of the team that stayed home. This could be due to the fact that the study only examined a single team and that particular team performed poorly and lost the majority of the games played during the trip.

McClure and Constance (1991) also tested a cohesion building method. They examined the effects of membership in a personal growth program on group cohesiveness with a women's collegiate gymnastics team. The personal growth program consisted of group sessions during which the members present discussed various topics of interest to the team. They divided the team in half and used 8 members for the control group, and 8 members for the treatment group. They found that the personal growth program increased cohesiveness within the treatment group. Because of the design of the study, however, it could not be ascertained if the personal growth program is effective at increasing total team cohesion, although it was found to be effective at increasing cohesion for a small group of 8 individuals.

Carron and Spink (1993) conducted the only study to date that has tested if cohesion can be developed according to the strategies proposed in the literature. They devised an intervention program focusing on team-building concepts for fitness classes.
Eight university aerobics classes served in the treatment group, while nine classes served in the control group. Each class met three times a week for 13 weeks. The intervention consisted of cohesion building strategies that focused on: fostering the perception of group distinctiveness, increasing positional stability, facilitating group norms, promoting individual sacrifice, and increasing member interaction and communication. Carron and Spink found that the intervention was successful in that members in the treatment group held higher perceptions of class cohesion than members in the control group. Class cohesion was measured with a version of the GEQ modified for an exercise setting. This is a very important study as it is the only empirical test of cohesion development strategies, although it only examined these strategies in the exercise setting. It is still not known whether these strategies help develop cohesion in the sport domain.

**SUMMARY**

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 goals and objectives” (Carron, 1982, p. 124). Carron (1982) provided a model by which to study group cohesion. The model suggests that there are four antecedents to group cohesion, and two categories of outcomes. The antecedents are environmental factors, personal factors, leadership factors, and team factors. Outcomes of cohesion are categorized as either individual outcomes such as satisfaction, or group outcomes such as increased performance.

The relationship between cohesion and performance has been heavily researched. The relationship appears to be circular (Landers, Wilkinson, Hatfield, & Barber, 1982; Shangi & Carron, 1987), with performance success being an antecedent to and an outcomes of cohesion. Satisfaction has been found to play a part in this circular
relationship. Martens and Peterson (1971) suggest that high team cohesion leads to increased individual and group performance, which leads to increased individual and group success. This increase in success will then increase individual satisfaction, and the increase in individual satisfaction leads to higher team cohesion. Because of the importance of both individual satisfaction and overall high group performance, it is necessary for practitioners and coaches to aid in the development of team cohesion.

Researchers have produced many lists comprised of cohesion building strategies for the purpose of aiding coaches and practitioners in the development of team cohesion (Anshel, 1990; Carron, 1984; Cox, 1990; Murray, 1985; Straub, 1980; Yukelson, 1984; Zander, 1982). Strategies have focused on the areas of: open communication, role clarity and acceptance, collective goal setting, team and sub-unit pride development, placing importance upon everyone’s contribution and role, the establishment of high productivity norms, and the formation of a group identity.

While many cohesion building guidelines have been suggested, these guidelines have not received empirical support as to their effectiveness in the sports domain. Methods of developing cohesion have been examined including a spring trip (Rainey & Schweickert, 1988) and membership in a personal growth program (McClure & Foster, 1991). However, these studies did not examine the effectiveness of cohesion building strategies proposed in the literature. Carron and Spink (1993) empirically tested whether or not cohesion could be developed in the exercise setting with these strategies. They found that the strategies were effective in the exercise setting, but the utility of cohesion strategies recommended in the literature for sport teams remains unknown. Thus, the purpose of this study was to empirically test if the cohesion developing strategies proposed in the literature would in fact develop team cohesion in a sport setting.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

PARTICIPANTS

For this study, four ninth grade female basketball teams were selected from a Northern Oregon Class AAAA conference. The teams were randomly assigned to either the control or treatment group. Both the treatment and the control group were comprised of two teams. Each team was comprised of approximately 10 players, which led to a total of 41 participating subjects.

The study originally planned to use both male and female teams. 10 teams originally agreed to participate in the study, 5 female and 5 male teams. All but one of the five male teams dropped out of the study right before the first administration of the Group Environment Questionnaire. This made it impossible to use male teams in the study. The five female teams finished the study, however, the results of one team were not used in the analysis because that team only used 4 of the 13 intervention strategies that made up the intervention. The study began with 10 teams, and ended with 4 teams.

Because ninth grade basketball teams are comprised of players that have recently come from different middle schools, it is assumed that ninth grade basketball teams will possess less initial cohesion than high school varsity teams. Because the majority of members have not played with each other, ninth grade basketball teams should have greater potential for cohesion development when compared, for example, to a varsity team. Since the majority of Class AAAA high schools draw students from more than one middle school, only Class AAAA teams were used as subjects. All teams that were used in the study were comprised of players from at least two different middle schools.
Because performance success has been found to be both an antecedent and a consequence of cohesion, the win/loss records of the teams used in the study were compared to see if the groups were equivalent. The control group had a combined record of 18 wins and 15 losses (a .550 winning percentage). The experimental group had a combined record of 20 wins and 17 losses (.540 winning percentage). The researcher felt that the two combined win/loss records were close enough to be considered roughly equivalent, and subsequently made the assumption that the performance success variable was controlled for the two groups.

Written informed consent was obtained from each individual team member (see Appendix B). A description of the procedures was given, and the possible risks and benefits to the subjects were discussed. Subjects were ensured that their participation was completely voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time. Subjects were assured that the school’s, team’s, and their personal identities, were confidential and would not appear in any write up of the study. Parent or guardian informed consent was also obtained for each subject (see Appendix B).

**INSTRUMENTS**

This study measured team cohesion with the Group Environment Questionnaire (Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron, 1985). This instrument is theoretically grounded and is based upon Carron’s (1982) conceptual model of cohesiveness in sport teams. The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) divides cohesion into two categories: group integration and individual attraction to the group. Each of these categories has both a social and task aspect, therefore, four sub-scales of cohesion are identified: group integration-task (GI-T), group integration-social (GI-S), individual attraction to group-task (ATG-T), and individual attraction to group-social (ATG-S). All 18 responses (4 ATG-T, 5 ATG-S,
5 GI-T, and 4 GI-S) are recorded on 9-point Likert scales. See Appendix C for the complete copy of the GEQ.

Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1985) reported evidence of content validity and internal consistency for the GEQ. Content validity was assessed by mailing summaries of the GEQ conceptual model to five experts in the area of group dynamics who were asked to comment on, and make deletions or additions to the items representing each construct. The experts' responses confirmed the decisions of the research team. Evidence of reliability was produced in two subsequent studies which assessed the internal consistency of the GEQ. The internal consistency values found for the four sub-scales were .75, .64, .71, .72 for ATG-T, ATG-S, GI-T, GI-S, respectively. Evidence of factorial validity was also found. Through a series of three studies, Brawley, Carron, and Widmeyer (1987) provide evidence of concurrent, predictive, and construct validity for the GEQ. Li and Harmer (1996) also assessed the factorial validity of the GEQ, and they found that the GEQ possessed adequate factorial validity as a measure of group cohesion for intercollegiate athletes.

Not all research has shown the GEQ to be reliable on all four sub-scales. The GEQ was not reliable on all four sub-scales for Westre and Weiss (1991). In fact only the task sub-scales were reliable which made it difficult to draw conclusions about the social factor of cohesion in their study. Furthermore, Schutz, Eom, Smoll, and Smith (1994) examined the factorial validity of the GEQ with high school athletes and they did not find support for the four factor structure that comprises the GEQ due to low internal consistencies among the four sub-scales. Although it is important to recognize potential shortcomings with this assessment tool, the GEQ is the most widely used measure of team cohesion in sport and exercise psychology and is the best measure of cohesion available.
PROCEDURES

The researcher contacted the athletic director of each potential school. When the athletic director of the high school granted the researcher access, the researcher asked each ninth grade basketball coach if he/she would participate in the study. This process was repeated until 10 coaches agreed to participate in the study. The teams were randomly assigned to either the experimental or the control group. Players coached by the experimental and control coaches were asked to complete the GEQ at the start and at the end of the season.

Every effort was made to maintain equality in terms of the amount of time and contact spent with coaches in the control and treatment groups. The coaches in the experimental group were contacted by phone, and a convenient individual meeting time arranged. The first goal of the meeting was to present the potential benefits of cohesiveness for their team. The benefits discussed included increased task and social interactions, greater role acceptance, increased individual satisfaction, lower drop-out rates, and increased performance.

The second goal of the meeting was to explain the intervention program to the coaches, and to answer any questions the coach might have concerning the intervention. The researcher and coach discussed every phase and obligation of the study from the implementation of the study, to the activity evaluation sheets, to the two GEQ assessments. The coach was given a written copy of the intervention detailing when and how he/she was to implement the specific cohesion building protocols. The coach was given the researcher's home and work phone numbers in case any questions or problems arose. The experimental coaches were each asked not to mention the nature of the study nor the strategies they would be implementing to any opposing coach until the end of the season. This was critical in order to ensure that the control group would be acting in their normal
manner, and not changing their behavior because they found out what others were doing. These meetings lasted approximately 60 minutes. Throughout the study, the researcher made three periodic phone calls to the experimental coaches to check on how the intervention was going and to aid in keeping the coaches accountable and on task.

Coaches in the control group were contacted over the phone and individual pre-season meetings were also set up. During these meetings the coaches were informed that the study would be examining adolescent group dynamics. They were asked to conduct the season in the same manner that they normally do. The only impositions that were placed upon them were the two GEQ assessments, and the time that it took to examine the activity packet at the end of the season. At the end of the season they were asked to look at the activity packet and fill out the evaluation forms for activities they performed that were similar to the activities in the intervention program. By having the coach fill out evaluation forms for similar activities that he/she performed, the researcher was able to ascertain the degree to which the coaches in the control group implemented cohesion building strategies that were similar to the strategies employed in the experimental group. The researcher also made three periodic phone calls to the control coaches to check on how the season was going. This was another attempt to equate the contact time spent with both coaching groups.

**Intervention**

The intervention consisted of 13 activities (see activity packet in Appendix D). The activities focused on open coach-player communication development, open intra-team communication development, increased player social interaction, individual role explanation, fostering a general value for all roles, reliance upon teammates, establishing a sense of individual ownership in the team, and collective goal setting.
The intervention program itself was constructed from cohesion building strategies suggested in the literature (see Appendix A for the listing of 49 suggested strategies). The activities developed for the intervention can be linked to Carron’s 1982 model of team cohesion. All the activities are developed around a key cohesion antecedent found in Carron’s model (environmental factors, individual factors, leader factors, team factors). Input from three individuals having coaching experience as well as familiarity in the sport psychology and sport pedagogy domains was also used to help develop the intervention program. The input from the coaches helped to establish practical utility. The first individual had six years experience in coaching basketball at both the high school and college levels. The second individual had experience coaching in a variety of sports, including girls basketball for four different seasons. The third individual had 18 years experience in coaching basketball at the junior high, high school, and collegiate level. He had also coached summer basketball camps for 12 years.

These three individuals gave extensive input as to the number of activities, how to improve the activities, the effectiveness of the activities, the practicality of the activities, and how to reword the information to make it clearer. Their input was invaluable and helped to ensure that the intervention was perceived by the treatment coaches as potentially effective and not too burdensome or demanding.

Feedback from a sport psychologist not associated with the research project was also used in the development of the intervention. This sport psychologist was a leading researcher in the field of cohesion. The sport psychologist checked to ensure that the activities in the intervention program were representative of what was being proposed in the literature, therefore, establishing that the intervention program can be used as an empirical test of the cohesion building strategies/ideas proposed in the literature.

The specific protocols associated with the intervention program were introduced by the experimental coaches during the third week of the season and were maintained
throughout the season. Experimental coaches self-monitored the degree to which they used the team building strategies and followed the intervention program by filling out an evaluation form for each activity once it was completed and then sending them in to the researcher. This procedure was employed in order to increase self-awareness and encourage compliance with the intervention procedures.

**Evaluation Procedures**

In order to assess the effects of the intervention program, the GEQ was administered during the second week of the season and also at the end. It was administered in a classroom setting by the researcher who employed standardized instructions. All coaches left the room during the evaluation. The subjects were assured that their answers would remain confidential, and that their coaches would never see or have access to their responses.

According to Tuckman (1965), there are four general stages of group development, those being testing-dependence, conflict, cohesion, and functional roles. Tuckman proposes that it is best to wait until midseason to assess cohesion because an accurate assessment of cohesion can only be taken at the third stage (cohesion stage) in the developmental sequence of small groups. McClure and Foster (1991) suggested that measuring cohesion at the beginning of the season may lead to an inflated score because “the pre-season is marked by an optimistic, albeit sometimes unrealistic, anticipation of the forthcoming season” (p. 312). They suspect that assessments of cohesion during this time period “more often depict team members’ aspirations for a sense of belongingness or togetherness rather than any measure of reality” (p. 312). If an initial measurement of cohesion is inflated, it makes it difficult to obtain results suggesting that an intervention is effective.
Even though the midseason may be the optimal time to attain an initial measure of group cohesion, coaches may be less willing to start an intervention late in the season. Coaches have much more time to begin a fairly intensive intervention at the beginning of the season than they do midway through the season. Furthermore, if cohesion development truly produces positive effects for the team members, these effects should be maximized by beginning the intervention as early as possible. Even if the initial assessment of cohesion is not accurate, it will be comparably inaccurate for both the experimental and control groups, and assuming that the final assessment is accurate, the net change in scores will depict the effectiveness of the intervention. The intervention was begun during the third week of the season in order to take an early initial measurement of cohesion, and yet give the teams two weeks to establish a baseline measure of cohesion. Other reasons include making it as long as possible, and allowing strategies better suited for early implementation to be conducted near the start of the season.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Two different analyses were conducted to statistically examine the effect the intervention had on the experimental condition teams as compared to the control condition teams. Consistent with the recommendations outlined by Horn (1985), both the team and individual were used as the unit of analysis, which required two univariate repeated measures ANOVAs to be conducted for each of the GEQ subscales. Using the team as the unit of analysis takes into account variation related to the team as a whole, while using the individual as the unit of analysis takes into account the individual variation across players. A univariate design was chosen instead of a multivariate design because of the low number of teams (N=4).

This present study experienced difficulty when it used the team as the unit of analysis. 10 teams originally agreed to participate in the study, 5 female and 5 male teams. All but one of the five male teams dropped out of the study right before the first administration of the GEQ. This made it impossible to use male teams in the study. The five female teams finished the study, however, the results of one team were not used in the analyses because that team did not execute a sufficient number of the intervention activities (only 4 of the 13 intervention strategies). Therefore, the study began with 10 teams, and ended with 4 teams. This lead to a small sample size when the team was used as the unit of analysis and, subsequently, to a very low degree of statistical power.

Prior to conducting the inferential statistics, reliability coefficients, correlation coefficients, and descriptive statistics were calculated. These were conducted in order to determine the degree of internal consistency for each subscale, the interrelationships among the variables, and to provide means and standard deviations.
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

The internal consistency of the four subscales of the GEQ was examined using Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficient, where .70 is generally considered the minimum acceptable value. A Cronbach alpha coefficient was produced for each administration (pre- and posttest) of the GEQ's four subscales. This resulted in each subscale having two alpha coefficients which are listed in Table 1. For three of the four subscales the pre-and posttest alpha coefficients varied greatly. Only the GIS subscale had similar pre- and posttest alpha coefficients. Westre and Weiss (1991) encountered problems with the reliability of the GEQ when studying high school athletic teams. The majority of reliabilities coefficients for the four subscales were below .70. Based upon a criterion employed in existing studies, Westre and Weiss decided to use any subscale that had a Cronbach alpha which rounded to .60, and consequently were able to retain two of the four subscales for subsequent analyses.

By using any alpha that rounded to .60, all four subscales were able to be used in this study. The posttest AGS subscale had an alpha of .54 which did not round to .60. Given that it would be unreasonable to delete the entire subscale because the posttest alpha was .01 away from the cutoff, the AGS subscale was included with the other three subscales.

Table 1  Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the pre- and posttest GEQ subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGS</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several items were deleted from the subscales in order to increase the alpha coefficients. For the AGS subscale, Item #1 (I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this team) and Item #5 (Some of my best friends are on this team) were deleted from the GEQ. For the AGT subscale, Item #2 (I'm not happy with the amount of playing time I get) was deleted. For the GIS subscale, no items were deleted. For the GIT subscale, Item #10 (Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance) and Item #12 (We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance by our team) were deleted.

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS**

Correlations among the four subscales of the GEQ were calculated in order to examine the interrelationships among the four subscales. It was important to determine how similar or dissimilar the subscales were from one another. The correlations ranged from .026 to .533 (see Table 2). The correlations suggest that the subscales were similar yet distinct enough to avoid being redundant. This adds support to the belief that cohesion is a multidimensional construct.

**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS**

Means and standard deviations were calculated by team for treatment and control conditions for both administrations of the GEQ. As can be seen in Table 3, Team 1 increased from pre- to posttest on the AGS and GIS subscales, stayed the same on AGT, and decreased on GIT. Team 2 decreased from pre- to posttest on all four subscales. Both Team 3 and Team 4 increased from pre- to posttest on three of the four subscales. Both
increased on the AGS and AGT subscales. Team 3 also increased on the GIT subscale, but decreased on GIS. Team 4 decreased on the GIT subscale and increased on GIS.

Table 4 lists the mean scores and standard deviations of the GEQ subscales by experimental condition using the team as the unit of analysis. The treatment condition experienced gains from pre- to posttest on all four subscales, while the control group experienced losses on all but the AGT subscale. Table 5 lists the mean scores and standard deviations of the GEQ subscales by experimental condition using the individual as the unit of analysis. The treatment condition experienced losses from pre- to posttest on all four subscales, while the control condition experienced gains on all four subscales.

**Table 2** Correlations among pre- and posttest subscales of the GEQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-AGS</th>
<th>PRE-AGT</th>
<th>PRE-GIS</th>
<th>PRE-GIT</th>
<th>POS-AGS</th>
<th>POS-AGT</th>
<th>POS-GIS</th>
<th>POS-GIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-AGS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-AGT</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-GIS</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-GIT</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS-AGS</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS-AGT</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS-GIS</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS-GIT</td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-tailed Significance: * .01 ** .001
### TABLE 3 Mean team scores and standard deviations for pre- and posttest subscales of the GEQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAMS</th>
<th>PRE-AGS</th>
<th>POS-AGS</th>
<th>PRE-AGT</th>
<th>POS-AGT</th>
<th>PRE-GIS</th>
<th>POS-GIS</th>
<th>PRE-GIT</th>
<th>POS-GIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREATMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 1</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.816)</td>
<td>(1.58)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 2</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 3</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Mean scores of the GEQ subscales for experimental conditions using the team as the unit of analysis (standard deviations are in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>PRE-AGS</th>
<th>POS-AGS</th>
<th>PRE-AGT</th>
<th>POS-AGT</th>
<th>PRE-GIS</th>
<th>POS-GIS</th>
<th>PRE-GIT</th>
<th>POS-GIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREATMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 Mean scores of the GEQ subscales for experimental conditions using the individual as the unit of analysis (standard deviations are in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>PRE-AGS</th>
<th>POS-AGS</th>
<th>PRE-AGT</th>
<th>POS-AGT</th>
<th>PRE-GIS</th>
<th>POS-GIS</th>
<th>PRE-GIT</th>
<th>POS-GIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREATMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>(.878)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEAM ANALYSIS

A 2 x 2 (Group x Time) repeated measures analysis of variance (RM ANOVA) was conducted for each of the four dependent variables using team means (N=4). The Group by Time interaction with GIS as the dependent variable was significant, F(1,2) = 83.58, p < .05, and simple ANOVAs suggested that groups significantly differed on the pre-intervention scores for the GIS subscale. Specifically, the control group was significantly greater than the treatment group on social group integration at pretest. The four RM ANOVAs did not suggest any other significant differences between the control and treatment groups with the four subscales of the GEQ. The degree of statistical power achieved for the team analysis was estimated to be no higher than .30 for a large effect size. This figure is an estimate taken from a paper presented at the AAHPERD National Convention in April of 1996 by Schutz, Potvin, and Park.

Effect sizes (ES) were calculated to determine the meaningfulness of differences found between groups. Thomas, Salazar, and Landers (1991) propose that effect sizes should always be calculated when examining group differences since effect sizes examine those group differences in a different manner than statistics. The control group was compared to the treatment group for all four subscales [i.e., ES=(Treatment Mean - Control Mean) / Control SD], (Gibbons, Ebbeck, & Weiss, 1995). A positive effect size suggests that the treatment group is meaningfully greater than the control group, and a negative effect size suggests that the control group is meaningfully greater. The effect size for the group difference at pretest on the GIS subscale was -1.07. Effect sizes are considered moderate in magnitude if values range from .41 to .70, and large in magnitude if values are greater than .70 (Thomas, Salazar, & Landers, 1991). Thus the pretest difference on the GIS subscale between the control and treatment groups, with the control group being higher, was both statistically significant and meaningful. The effect sizes for all four subscales at
posttest are listed in Table 6. The effect sizes for the task subscales are very large, however, the effect sizes for the social subscales are mixed. The AGS effect size is small, but the GIS is large and negative. The initial pretest difference for the GIS is what has caused the GIS effect size to be negative. When effect sizes are calculated it is assumed that the groups are equal at pretest. Thus the effect sizes for the social subscales are meaningless and suggest that the intervention was not effective for the social subscales. The task effect sizes align very closely with, and give support to, the main research question of whether or not the intervention was effective. If one was basing a judgment solely on the team analysis effect sizes, one would determine that the intervention was indeed effective for the task subscales.

**TABLE 6** Effect sizes (ES) for group differences at posttest on the four GEQ subscales for both the team and the individual analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM ANALYSIS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSCALE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS**

A 2 x 2 (Group x Time) repeated measures analysis of variance (RM ANOVA) was conducted for each of the four dependent variables using individual player means (N=41). Significant Group by Time interactions were found for two of the four subscales: AGT, \( F(1,39) = 13.88, p < .05 \); and GIT, \( F(1,39) = 6.03, p < .05 \). On the AGT subscale, the control group was significantly higher at posttest than was the treatment group. On the
GIT subscale, the control group again experienced a higher posttest mean score. No significant difference was found between the groups on the AGS subscale. A significant group main effect was found for the GIS subscale, F(1,39) = 5.13, p < .05, with the experimental condition having a significantly higher pretreatment mean score. The effect size for this main group effect was large (.95). Effect sizes were -.57 for the AGT subscale, and -.71 for the GIT subscale (see Table 6 for the complete listing of all effect sizes at posttest). The effect sizes suggest that the intervention produced differences that were meaningful only for the task subscales, and that the control group was meaningfully greater at posttest. This is opposite of what the team analysis found. The degree of statistical power achieved was estimated to be .80 for a large effect size. The estimate was calculated from tables in the 1996 Schutz, Potvin, and Park paper.

**QUALITATIVE DATA**

Qualitative data were collected concerning the experimental coaches' feelings about the intervention, as well as what activities the control coaches employed that were similar to the cohesion building activities comprised in the intervention. This was collected from the Coach Feedback Sheets in the activity packets that all coaches received either at the beginning of the season (treatment) or at the end of the season (control). Information was gathered from individual meetings and both formal and informal conversations that the researcher had with the coaches.

**Activity Implementation by Treatment Coaches**

The coaches reported having implemented most of the activities. "Rodge" (Coach 2) implemented 12 of the 13 activities, while "Deb" (Coach 1) implemented 10. Neither coach implemented Activity #12 (Learning Each Other's Responsibilities) because it was
not applicable since both teams used a motion offense. The motion offense requires players to know and execute everyone’s responsibilities and movements. Since no one position had unique responsibilities, the activity would not have been worthwhile. Deb only reviewed the team goals one time instead of reviewing the goals twice, and Deb also did not execute Activity #4. Deb wanted to finish all of the activities, but she said that she ran out of time.

**Treatment Coaches’ Feelings About the Intervention**

The two treatment coaches stated that they were glad that they participated in the study, and believed that the intervention was very effective in terms of increasing team unity. Some of the activities were lengthy and demanding, but both agreed that the time invested in the intervention was well worth it. Rodge asked if he could use the intervention with his teams in the future. Rodge said that he liked it so much, that he wanted to use it with all his teams. The data gathered from the Coach Feedback Sheets are listed below.

**EXPECTATIONS (ACTIVITY #1)**- Both coaches felt that after completing this activity their teams better understood the expectations that they had for them, and it helped “lay the groundwork for the season.”

**OPEN DOOR POLICY (ACTIVITY #2)**- The coaches believed that this is important to do, and Deb stated that personal discussions are always effective in bringing out things with her group. Rodge found it very difficult to have a traditional open door policy because he did not have an office inside the building. His open door time was right before and after practice.
GOAL SETTING (ACTIVITIES #3, #11, #13)- They both stated that the goal setting activities were very successful and Deb said that the activities were “very successful in focusing ourselves on what we wanted to accomplish.” Rodge executed all three of the goal setting activities. He found the goal setting guideline, provided to him in the activity packet, to be very useful and effective.

COMMUNICATION AND SOCIAL INTERACTION (ACTIVITY #4, #9, #10)- Both coaches enjoyed these activities and believed that their teams enjoyed them as well. Rodge stated that the interviewing activity (#4) was “very fun,” although he found that even though he attempted to make it a very safe environment there was “some teasing.” Overall, however, he found it to be a positive activity. Activity #9 was also found to be very enjoyable and positive by both coaches. Rodge stated “the players ate this up! Being able to tell positive things and hear them about themselves was key. Self-esteem wanders in freshmen girls!” Rodge found that it was difficult to keep all sarcasm out. Both coaches conducted multiple social functions (#10) rather than just one. Deb described the social functions as “very relaxed, wonderful.” The functions ranged from team breakfasts, dinner and games at the coach’s house, and lunch after practice. When asked how to improve this activity, Deb said “do it often.”

INDIVIDUAL ROLES (ACTIVITIES #5, #7)- The coaches stated that these activities “give the girls an idea of where they stand” and that there were less hurt feelings. Both found it to be most effective when the positive traits of players were emphasized during the personal discussions. Rodge stated that “having the players realize how much everyone relies on each other from the most talented player to the least” was what made the activities effective.
TEAM RELIANCE (ACTIVITY #6)- Both coaches incorporated team reliance building drills into their everyday workouts. Reliance drills are such things as requiring the ball to be passed four times before a shot is taken, or outlawing dribbling during a scrimmage and forcing everyone to pass the ball in order to move it around the court.

CREATING TEAM OWNERSHIP (ACTIVITY #8)- Both coaches attempted to create individual team ownership. They incorporated this activity into various parts of their team's daily workouts. Both teams had the players run two conditioning periods, in the hope that team ownership as well as peer leadership would develop. The two coaches felt that this activity helped lead to the development of both.

LEARNING OTHERS' RESPONSIBILITIES (ACTIVITY #12)- This activity was not applicable to either team, since both teams used a motion offense in which all players learn and execute approximately the same duties and responsibilities in their set half court offense.

Control Coaches' Execution of Similar Cohesion Building Activities

Through the qualitative data gathered from each coach, it was found that each of the two teams in the control group participated in certain activities that were similar in nature to the cohesion building activities in the intervention program. The control teams conducted three activities that were similar, but only one was conducted with the same intent, focus, and effort.
One control team talked about goal setting, although this team did not actually sit
down and collectively set team goals. Nor did the team review the set goals and keep track
of them on a display in the locker room. Both teams discussed the value of individual
roles, and the importance of the many various roles on a team. However, the teams did not
devote a specific team meeting towards the discussion of the importance of individual roles.
The control teams, therefore, discussed goal setting and individual roles, but they did not
address these topics extensively. Finally, the control teams conducted drills that focused
on building team reliance, and they reported having done it in as much depth and as often
as the experimental teams did.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to empirically test if the cohesion developing strategies proposed in the literature would in fact develop team cohesion in a sport setting. The results did not support the main hypothesis that the implementation of a cohesion building program would increase a team’s cohesiveness. There are two possible explanations as to why the intervention was not statistically effective. One explanation is that the strategies proposed in the literature may be ineffective for building team cohesion. A second explanation is that the findings may be the result of several factors peculiar to this study. It is the belief of the research team that the best explanation is that the non-significant results are due to factors specific to this study.

The unit of analysis must be taken into account. When the individual was used as the unit of analysis, the findings were vastly different than when the team was used as the unit of analysis. The control group tended to have higher cohesion scores at posttest when analyzed by the individual. A few significant Group by Time interactions were found with the control group being the more cohesive condition at posttest. The effect sizes were moderate and large which indicates that the differences between the groups were meaningful as well as significant. This is in direct opposition to the findings generated by the team analysis. This clearly shows the importance of which unit of analysis is selected.

When the team was used as the unit of analysis, the findings were not significant. Nevertheless, the mean values and the task subscale effect sizes suggested that the intervention did increase the experimental group’s task cohesion scores. With the team as the unit of analysis, the experimental condition increased from pre- to posttest on the task subscales of the GEQ, while the control group did not. The effect sizes for the difference between the two groups on the task subscales were large. This indicates that, although not
statistically significant, the treatment group had meaningfully higher scores on the task subscales. Furthermore, the qualitative data definitely supports the utility and effectiveness of the intervention. Both coaches expressed that they enjoyed implementing the various intervention protocols, and that they believed the intervention was effective in building a "tighter" and "closer knit" team. One coach went as far as to say that he intended to use the intervention with all of his future teams.

No studies in the sport psychology realm that have examined team cohesion development have used the team as the unit of analysis. This is due to the fact that it is extremely hard to get a sufficient number of teams to participate in order to have an adequate sample size. However, team cohesion is a team construct. The team must be taken into account, as the majority of the variables influencing cohesion are team related. What type of leader the coach is, the performance success experienced by the team, the social relationships formed, and the high school sport environment, are all variables unique to a particular team. Examining individuals as opposed to groups loses the very essence of what team cohesion is. Future research in this area should strive to obtain a large enough sample size to be able to use both the individual and the team as the unit of analysis.

This study experienced the difficulty of trying to use the team as the unit of analysis. All but one of the five male teams dropped out of the study right before the first administration of the GEQ. Most of these coaches simply stated that they were too busy to spend the time necessary to learn about the intervention, and one coach just said that he had changed his mind. This made it impossible to use male teams in the study, and, consequently, examine the effect of the cohesion intervention across genders. Future research efforts should be prepared for difficulty in obtaining an adequate number of male and female teams, and take measures to overcome the obstacles so that both genders can be represented.
One possible explanation as to why the intervention was statistically ineffective is that the study lacked sufficient power to show group differences. A .30 power level for a large effect size severely limits an analysis attempting to find significant differences between groups. The low power level in this study can be attributed to two factors. The first is that the sample size was very small (N=4), a drawback of using the team as the unit of analysis in this investigation. The second reason is that the reliability coefficients for the GEQ subscales were low. Reliability directly affects the power estimate when using the tables presented in the 1996 paper by Schutz, Potvin, and Park. The intervention that was employed in this study may have significantly impacted the cohesion levels of the experimental teams, however, it is impossible to know for certain because there was such a low amount of statistical power. Future research can avoid low statistical power by obtaining a much larger sample size of teams and by using several reliable cohesion assessment tools. Using a variety of assessment tools might also give a fuller and more accurate picture and description of a team's cohesion level. Future research could also benefit by using qualitative data to a larger extent. Simply interviewing both the coaches and the players may greatly add to the insight and knowledge gained from an investigation.

Another reason as to why the intervention did not produce significant increases in cohesion for the experimental condition is that the control group was not perfectly “pure.” The control teams conducted three activities that were similar, but only one was conducted with the same intent, focus, and effort. It is difficult to speculate on the degree to which the control group’s impurity influenced the study. Only one of the 13 activities was conducted in an equivalent manner, and that activity was not seen as one of the most important or impacting intervention activities. Since only one non-imperative activity was universally conducted, it seems that the control group’s impurity may not have significantly influenced the results.
Another explanation for the non-significant results is that the treatment group may not have adhered to the intervention closely enough. Since the adherence checks of the treatment coaches were self-monitoring in nature, it is possible that they did not conduct the intervention activities in the manner in which they were supposed to. The coaches were asked about the intervention over the phone, and they filled out self-report feedback forms, but they were never directly observed. Through conversations and the feedback forms turned in, the primary researcher is convinced that Rodge (Team 2) executed the intervention in a sufficient manner. Rodge completed 12 out of the 13 activities, and put forth much effort in conducting the activities in a positive and serious environment. Deb (Team 1) attempted most of the activities, but through conversations and the feedback forms turned in, the primary researcher feels that Deb did not exert as much effort as did Rodge. Attempting to shorten the intervention and only using the critical activities may be worthwhile to future investigations. Investigators in the future may want to determine which individual activities are the most effective. This could be ascertained by both quantitative and qualitative methods. A quantitative study could be conducted to compare different treatment groups implementing various versions of the intervention packet, and qualitative data could be obtained from both the players and the coaches concerning which activities appeared to develop team cohesion the most. The intervention could then be shortened and made even more appealing to practitioners by increasing the practical utility of the intervention.

Rodge coached for 5 seasons at the freshman level prior to the study, while Deb had only coached for one season prior to the study. This may have influenced how the coaches set about implementing the intervention, since experience can certainly impact how a coach interacts with his/her team. Rodge expressed that he was extremely satisfied and pleased with the effectiveness and utility of the intervention. Deb was pleased with the intervention, but not to the extent that Rodge was. It seems possible that the coaching
experience Rodge possessed contributed to his satisfaction with the intervention. The intervention would not be comfortable and simple for a relatively inexperienced coach to implement due to the nature of many of the activities, which suggests that the intervention might be better suited to experienced coaches. This appears to be an interesting area for future research. Future studies may want to determine whether or not choosing only coaches that feel comfortable conducting the difficult activities will impact the results.

When performance success is examined in relation to the differences in pre- and posttreatment means, the results were consistent with what the literature would propose, that performance success is significantly related to cohesion (Carron & Ball, 1977; Williams & Hacker, 1982). Team 2 had a poor record, 7 wins and 12 losses (.368 winning percentage). Team 1 had a much better record, 13 wins and 5 losses (.722 winning percentage). It is no surprise that Team 2 also reported lower posttreatment levels of cohesion on all four subscales than Team 1. Future studies using an intervention to improve team cohesion will need to examine the impact of the mediating role performance success plays on a team’s cohesion level. Measures must be taken and ways must be found in which to minimize or equally distribute performance success’s impact among all groups in a study.

Another explanation for the non-significant findings is that the intervention program was not introduced in a manner sufficient for cohesion development. The intervention program was introduced at the beginning of the third week of the season, giving the intervention a total of 14 weeks in which to work. The 14 weeks were interrupted by a 2 week Christmas Break which means that the teams only spent 12 weeks together once the intervention had begun. This may have not been enough time for the intervention to produce significant change.

By introducing the intervention at the beginning of the third week, it may not have allowed the intervention to work to its potential. Three of the thirteen activities
(expectations, goal setting, open-door policy) need to be conducted as early in the season as possible, preferably during the first week of practice. Because of the necessity of obtaining an initial measure of cohesion and the advice in the literature suggesting this should not be done during the preseason, these activities were implemented during the third week versus the first. This may have adversely affected the study, and it may have kept the treatment group from maximizing the potential cohesion gains from the intervention program. Future research needs to be conducted to link the intervention strategies to the stages of cohesion development. If the intervention strategies could be linked to theories of cohesion stage development, such as Tuckman (1965), the exact timetable of when to implement each activity in the intervention could be established. This would definitely increase the potential effectiveness of the intervention.

Tuckman (1965) proposes that it is best to wait until midseason to assess cohesion because an accurate assessment of cohesion can only be taken at the third stage (cohesion stage) in the developmental sequence of small groups. McClure and Foster (1991) suggested that measuring cohesion at the beginning of the season may lead to an inflated score because “the pre-season is marked by an optimistic, albeit sometimes unrealistic, anticipation of the forthcoming season” (p. 312). They suspect that assessments of cohesion during this time period “more often depict team members’ aspirations for a sense of belongingness or togetherness rather than any measure of reality” (p. 312). It is very likely that the initial measurement of cohesion taken during the second week of this study was inflated, and may have made it more difficult to interpret the results of this study. Perhaps future research needs to try to incorporate multiple assessments of cohesion across the season in order to better capture the “dynamic” quality of cohesion. This would allow researchers to begin the intervention on the first day of the season, and yet not worry too much about an inflated pretest cohesion measure since there will be several more cohesion measures taken. The subsequent measures will allow the researcher to observe how the
cohesion level has changed across the season, and an inflated initial measure could be identified.

A more remote possibility is that differences may have emerged if the posttest had been earlier in the season before final team standings were determined. The final team standings may have impacted the results, and this influence may have been avoided by ending the intervention and giving the final administration of the GEQ several weeks before the end of the season.

This study examined the cohesion development of intact teams, and so the design of the study was a quasi-experimental design rather than a true experimental design. The design of the study could be made to be a true experimental design by randomly assigning the individuals into teams. This obviously could not be done with high school athletic teams, but it could be done in the youth sport setting and in college activity classes. This might prove to be a more controlled setting in which to test the intervention program. However, the settings will be different, and the results from a college activity class may not generalize well to a high school basketball team.

Examining cohesion development along with other related constructs might also be beneficial to future research efforts. Satisfaction, performance, and drop-out rate have all been shown to be influenced by changes in cohesion (Carron, 1982). Examining one of these constructs along with cohesion may provide a clearer picture as to what is happening, and possibly give additional input as to why. For example, it may be that the intervention has not significantly increased cohesion, but it may have increased individual satisfaction. This would be important to know.

Despite the apparent ineffectiveness of the intervention in this study, the intervention packet that was developed is the only one ever designed for, as well as empirically tested, in a competitive team sport setting. It was comprised of strategies proposed in the literature, and then adapted to be practical in the sport setting with the input
of three coaches, the research team, and a leading sport psychologist in the field of cohesion. This study suggested that indeed the intervention has practical utility and can be realistically implemented with coaches at this level. The development of this intervention will contribute to future team cohesion research efforts, by either being used as the intervention in sport settings or by serving as a starting point. Creating an intervention program aimed at increasing team cohesion will be much less time consuming as a result of the present investigation.

Team athletics have become so popular that today they are an integral part of society. Sport can offer many benefits for participants if they choose to participate. Group cohesion is one potential outcome along with the correlates of cohesion that include individual satisfaction, adherence, and performance success. Therefore, the challenge is to devise an ecologically valid program that can systematically increase cohesion in sport teams. This study has assisted in the development of such a cohesion program that can benefit both the researcher and the practitioner.


APPENDIX A

COHESION BUILDING IDEAS PROPOSED IN THE LITERATURE

The following 49 guidelines are a list of common suggestions that researchers have made towards the development of group cohesion. This list was formed from summarizing the suggestions proposed in the work of Anshel (1990), Bird and Cripe (1986), Carron (1984), Cox (1990), Cratty (1981), Lott and Lott (1965), Murray (1985), Straub (1980), Tutko and Richards (1971), Yukelson (1984), and Zander (1980).

PRIDE
1) Develop pride within sub-units of the team and recognize players for their special contributions.
2) Emphasize the importance of pride in the group, its sources and its consequences for the team. Make seniors responsible for developing pride developing ideas.

ROLES
1) Have the players become acquainted with the responsibilities of other players. One way is for them to observe and record the efforts of other athletes at their position.
2) Allow players to know their status on the team and provide a justification for that status.
3) Make sure that each member understands that his contribution to the team is valued.
4) Use various means to underscore how each teammate depends upon the work of each other for the success of their unit.
5) Clearly outline individual roles to team members and stress the importance of each role to the overall team success. Athletes must clearly understand, accept, and carry out their individual roles
6) A coach should in various ways underscore the fact that winning or losing is a product of team effort.
7) To promote motivation and team loyalty, players should be informed about their status on the team, given an explanation for this status, and told what they can do to upgrade or maintain it. Each athlete should feel that he or she has an important role with the team.
8) Recognize excellence. Those individuals who excel within their designated roles and who contribute to group goals should be recognized.

**DISCIPLINE**
1) Emphasize the value of discipline.
2) Disciplining players should be consistent for all team members.

**TEAM FOCUS**
1) Emphasize the unity of the group, the score as a product of team effort
2) Indicate to the members separately how membership helps each individual, so that each will see the group as an attractive entity.
3) Develop team drills and lead-up games that encourage member cooperation. Many other drills must be developed that teach athletes the importance of reliance upon teammates.

**GOAL SETTING**
1) Establish a high norm for productivity by setting up specific, quantitative, and challenging team goals for both inseason and out-of-season.
2) Take care in the selection of group goals so that these are realistic challenges, no unreasonably hard or easy ends. Set standards of excellence for all skills and activities.
3) Don’t be afraid to change goals that are found to be unreasonably difficult.
4) Once goals have been set, consider what obstacles might prevent fulfillment of these goals and how the obstacles might be overcome by the team.
5) Involving the entire group in goal-setting activities results in a form of psychological contracting, which instills in group members an increased commitment to team goals and a greater awareness of the degree of effort and discipline required to reach those goals. Through a coach’s guidance, teams should set both long-term distal goals and short-term proximal goals.
6) Emphasize the process of goal attainment or achievement, not just the final outcome.
7) Goals should be based on performance, not only on outcome. There should always be something to feel good about after the contest regardless of the final outcome.
8) Set team goals and take pride in their accomplishments. When these goals are reached, players should collectively be encouraged to take pride in their accomplishments and then set more goals.
PLAYER LEADERSHIP AND INPUT

1) Encourage talk in the group about how performance can be improved and how the boring parts of athletics can be made more engaging.

2) Leadership should be developed among team members. Coaches are mistaken in assuming that they are (and should be) the only team leader.

3) Perhaps player leaders can lead discussions among themselves about developing or maintaining team cohesion.

4) Develop a feeling of "ownership" among the players. Individual players need to feel that the team is their team and not the coach's team. This is accomplished by players being involved in decision making for the team. Individual players need to feel that their voices will be heard.

COMMUNICATION

1) Encourage task and social communication at all levels within the team: coach-athlete and athlete-athlete.

2) Open the communication channels- create an atmosphere in which athletes have the freedom to express their ideas and feelings in a constructive, democratic way.

3) Stay in touch with interpersonal grapevines- individuals with high interpersonal prestige and status should be utilized as communication links between the coaching staff and the players so coaches can stay in contact with the prevailing attitudes and feelings of the group.

4) During the season it is important to conduct regular team meetings to allow both positive and negative feelings to be expressed in an open, honest, and constructive manner.

5) Coaches should be "in touch" with their players and should know something personal about each player.

6) Allow representatives from each sub-group to meet regularly with the coach.

7) It is wise to have player-selected leaders meet with the coach on a regular, prescheduled basis to discuss issues of concern.

MEMBER INTERACTION

1) Members don't have to like each other, but they need to respect each other.

2) Players should not be "allowed" to hurt the feelings of teammates. The coach has an obligation to protect the rights of each athlete on the team. Scapegoating, blaming, and chronic teasing must be stopped quickly, or cohesion will dissipate.
3) Established players should be asked to integrate the newcomer into the larger group and to help outline task expectations. The selected individuals should be warm, sensitive, mature, have good communication skills, be capable of establishing personal contact, and interact in a positive manner on and off the field or court.

4) Social cliques that benefit only a few athletes at the expense of alienating the majority of team members should be avoided. A plan should be developed to split up clique members, especially if they are evident during the competitive event.

5) Since cliques characteristically work in opposition to the task goals of a team, their formation must be avoided. Cliques often form as a result of (1) constant losing, (2) player’s needs not being met, (3) players not getting adequate opportunities to play, and (4) coaches who promote the development of cliques through the use of “scapegoats” or personal prejudice.

6) Avoid the development of social cliques by alternating roommates, thus encouraging socializing by the team as a whole.

**MISC.**

1) Avoid excessive personnel turnover.

2) Create common expectations of appropriate behavior- norms should be conducive to the goals the group is striving to achieve.

3) providing opportunities for success through:
   a. positive and negative reinforcement
   b. praising the demonstration of cooperation while losing as well as winning
   c. rewarding team effort, not just individual effort

4) Do not expect any more from the team than you are willing to give or demonstrate.

5) The appropriate use of humor and praise in verbal and nonverbal forms is advantageous in generating feelings of mutual satisfaction and enjoyment.

6) Encourage group identity. This may be done through team blazers, jackets, social functions, and so forth.

7) Avoid an excessively difficult schedule early in the season if possible.

8) Encourage intrateam competition and rivalry in individual sports.

9) Highlight areas of team success, even when the team loses a game or match.
Dear Basketball Player:

You have been selected to participate in a special project. In this project, we are interested in how you think and feel about things that happen in sport and on your team. This is so we can try to make sport more fun for all players.

We would like you to read and answer the questions on the following pages. It will take about 20 minutes. This is a survey, not a test. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. Since players are very different from one another, each of you will be putting down something different. Only the research team will see your answers, not your parents or your coach, or anybody else. We are interested in how you feel about sports, so all your answers to these questions are important.

If you want to go ahead and answer the questions, please sign your name on the line below and write the date. There will be no penalties to you if you decide not to answer the questions. Your parent(s) have already told us that it is all right with them if you want to do it. If you want to stop at any time, just tell us. Also, if you have any questions about what you will be doing or any questions at all, just ask us.

Thank you so much for your help.

Signature

Date

Print Name

STOP AND WAIT FOR MORE INSTRUCTIONS
INFORMED CONSENT

Player’s Perceptions of Team Cohesion

Your child is invited to participate in a research study which will examine team cohesion as perceived by individual team members. The principle researcher for this study is Vicki Ebbeck, an assistant professor in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at Oregon State University. Your high school Athletic Director has already given his approval and support of this research project. Your child was selected as a possible participant in this study because he/she is planning to participate on the freshman basketball team.

If you decide to allow your child to participate in this study, he/she will be asked to complete a questionnaire along with the rest of his/her team. The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to administer. It is very important to get as many players as possible involved in the study in order to have an adequate sample size for analyzing the questionnaire responses. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. All subject entries in the computer data files will be identified by a number. Your child’s participation is entirely voluntary and he/she is free to discontinue participation at any time.

The benefits of this study are several. The proposed research will contribute to the body of scientific knowledge concerning team cohesion development, and the results will be very useful to practitioners and coaches.

If you have any questions about the research at any time, please contact Dr. Vicki Ebbeck, Langton Hall, 737-6800. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in a research project, please contact the Research Office, Oregon State University, 737-3437. You may request a copy of this form to keep.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you agree to allow your child to participate in the research study, and that you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Parent/Guardian Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________

Child’s Name (please print): ___________________________
APPENDIX C

GROUP ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Albert V. Carron
Lawrence R. Brawley
W. Neil Widmeyer

This questionnaire is designed to assess your perceptions of your athletic team. There are no right or wrong answers so please give your immediate reaction. Some of the questions may seem repetitive but please answer all questions. Your candid responses are very important to us.

Your responses will be kept in the strictest confidence (Neither your coach or anyone other than the researchers will see your responses). You have been asked to indicate your name only in the event that we need to match two pieces of information on each player.

NAME (print) ____________________________ Age____ Sex M_ F_

TEAM (Name of High School)____________________________________________________

NAME OF YOUR COACH________________________________________________________
The following questions are designed to assess your feelings about YOUR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT with this team. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements.

1. I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this team.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

2. I’m not happy with the amount of playing time I get.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

3. I am not going to miss the members of this team when the season ends.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

4. I’m unhappy with my team’s level of desire to win.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

5. Some of my best friends are on this team.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

6. This team does not give me enough opportunities to improve my personal performance.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

7. I enjoy other parties more than team parties.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. I do not like the style of play on this team.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. For me this team is one of the most important social groups to which I belong.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
The following questions are designed to assess your perceptions of YOUR TEAM AS A WHOLE. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements.

10. Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

11. Members of our team would rather go out on their own than get together as a team.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

12. We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance by our team.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

13. Our team members rarely party together.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

14. Our team members have conflicting aspirations for the team’s performance.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

15. Our team would like to spend time together in the off season.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

16. If members of our team have problems in practice, everyone wants to help them so we can get back together again.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

17. Members of our team do not stick together outside of practices and games.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

18. Our team members do not communicate freely about each athlete’s responsibilities during competition or practice.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE
APPENDIX D

TEAM COHESION

ACTIVITY PACKET
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY #</th>
<th>ACTIVITY TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussing Expectations</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establishing An Open Door Policy</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Setting Team Goals</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interviewing Each Other</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explaining Individual Roles</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Developing Team Reliance</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stressing Individual Role Importance</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creating Team Ownership</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Discussing Teammates Positively</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conducting a Social Function</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Examining Team Goal Progress</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Learning Each Other’s Responsibilities</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Examining Team Goal Fulfillment</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ACTIVITY IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Discussing Expectations</td>
<td>First Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Establishing An Open-Door Policy</td>
<td>First week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Setting Team Goals</td>
<td>First week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Interviewing Each Other</td>
<td>Early, before games begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Explaining Individual Roles</td>
<td>Just before games begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Developing Team Reliance</td>
<td>Throughout season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Stressing Individual Role Importance</td>
<td>After a few games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Creating Team Ownership</td>
<td>Throughout season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Discussing Teammates Positively</td>
<td>Mid-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 Conducting a Social Function</td>
<td>Mid-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 Examining Team Goal Progress</td>
<td>Mid-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 Learning Each Other’s Responsibilities</td>
<td>Mid-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 Examining Team Goal Fulfillment</td>
<td>End of Season</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSING EXPECTATIONS - Activity #1

PURPOSE:
To convey and explain your expectations to your players through a discussion, and to get the players thinking about what expectations they have for the team.

IMPLEMENTATION: As early as possible- preferably during the 1st meeting.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Correct number of provided worksheets
-Pens/pencils for everyone
-Access to a chalkboard or dry erase board

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 25 minutes

OVERVIEW: There are four parts to this exercise. During the first part, the coach will list his/her expectations on the board for the team to observe. During the second part, each player will list on a worksheet the importance of each expectation. During the third part, the team will discuss what they listed to be the importance of each expectation. During the fourth part, the coach will explain to the team why he/she believes the expectations are important. During this part, the team can also suggest whether or not the list of expectations should be modified.

PROCEDURE:
1. List for the players your expectations for the team on the chalkboard or dry erase board.

2. Distribute the provided worksheet to all players. Give the players 5-10 minutes to list the relative importance of the first five of your expectations for the upcoming season.

3. Facilitate team discussion concerning the relative importance of the first five expectations you have for the team. Start with the first expectation listed on the board, and ask for a volunteer to read what he/she listed as the importance to the team of that expectation. If no one volunteers, pick someone. Attempt to get everyone to participate and provide their input. You may accomplish this on a volunteer basis or you may have to resort to an ordered sequence.

4. After the team has discussed the five expectations fairly thoroughly, explain to the team why you believe each of all of your expectations are important. Then ask the team if there are any expectations that they would like to add. Schedule additional time if needed.

* Make a final list of the team expectations and post a copy of it somewhere in the team locker room where the team members will view it regularly.

NOTES:
*The following are examples of coach expectations that the literature has suggested are very successful in helping to build team cohesion.
  1. This team will win together and will lose together. We are a team made up of individuals, not individuals making up a team.
  2. Members do not have to be great friends, but they must respect each other. That means members must respect each other's feelings and opinions.
  3. Players and coaches will communicate openly and honestly with one another.
4. Teammates will support and encourage each other rather than be negative and critical. Teammates will be positive and constructive with one another when someone is going through adversity.

5. Team members will take responsibility for their individual performance. No blaming or scapegoating will be tolerated.

6. Everyone has a unique and valuable role on this team and will be treated as such.
ACTIVITY #1 WORKSHEET

* List why each expectation listed below is important to the team having an enjoyable and successful season.

1) IMPORTANCE-

2) IMPORTANCE-

3) IMPORTANCE-

4) IMPORTANCE-

5) IMPORTANCE-
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #1 Discussing Expectations

NAME:_________________________ DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
ESTABLISHING AN OPEN DOOR POLICY- Activity #2

PURPOSE: To create an open communication channel between the players and the coaches.

IMPLEMENTATION: As early as possible in the season- preferably during 1st week.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Correct number of provided worksheets
-Enough pens or pencils for everyone

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 25 minutes

OVERVIEW: There are three parts to this activity. The first part will consist of asking the team to break up into pairs and generate a list of potential benefits and difficulties of having an open-door policy. The second part will be a collective discussion about what the players came up with. The third part will simply be the formal installment of an open-door policy by the coach.

PROCEDURE:
1. Divide the team up into pairs and pass out a provided worksheet to each pair. Explain what an open-door policy is. A true open-door policy is when all members of a team feel that the coach wants each and every one of them to come into his/her office, at any time, and discuss any area of concern that they might have, either with the team or their personal lives.
   You may wish to prime the discussion by identifying potential problems players might have in coming to talk with you. Give the players 10 minutes to list all the potential benefits and difficulties of an open-door policy. Explain that an example of a potential difficulty might be such things as what a player may encounter when he/she attempts to discuss a problem or concern with the coach.

2. Facilitate a team discussion about what each pair listed on the worksheets. Ask for volunteers, or pick someone to read what his/her pair listed. After a potential difficulty is mentioned, discuss how that difficulty can be overcome! Encourage discussion about suggested benefits as well. Attempt to have everyone participate and offer input.

3. Formally install an open-door policy by ensuring your athletes that they are free to come to you at any time and discuss issues of concern they might have with the team as a whole, any basketball-related concern, or any concern or problem they might have outside of basketball. Explain that they may have to wait or withstand interruptions due to your busy schedule, but that you want them to come to you and discuss issues of concern with you.

NOTES:
Emphasize that when players are discussing concerns with coaches they need to communicate openly and honestly. Reassure the players that the coaches will always be honest with them as well. Confidentiality will always be kept except for issues that the law requires you to report. The better everyone understands each other, the greater the chance is for the team to be successful and harmonious.

Explain that the immediate resolution of conflicts is central to creating open communication channels. If a team member has a complaint or a conflict with the coach or another teammate, he/she should take the initiative to resolve the situation and clear the air with
that person. Players should not just gripe, complain, and vent their feelings. It is important to respond to the problem quickly so that negative feelings don’t build up and explode later.

* How you deal with parents, is outside the scope of this activity. If you would like to include parents in the open-door policy, that is up to you.
ACTIVITY #2 WORKSHEET

Potential Benefits Of An Open-door Policy:

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

Potential Difficulties A Player May Encounter When Trying To Speak With The Coach About A Personal Problem Or Team Issue:

1. 

2. 

3.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #2 Establishing an open-door policy

NAME:_________________________ DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
SETTING TEAM GOALS- Activity #3

PURPOSE: To collectively set team goals.

IMPLEMENTATION: As early in the season as possible.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: - Enough provided worksheets for everyone
- Access to a chalkboard or dry erase board

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: Two 20 minute phases

OVERVIEW: There will be two phases to this exercise that will take place on different days. During the first phase, the coach will discuss with the team the goals he/she has for the team. During the second phase, the team will generate 3-4 additional team goals. Each team member will generate two team goals, and then the team will select the three goals that they wish to be added to the list of team goals. The list will be posted and progress towards the fulfillment of the goals will be tracked.

PROCEDURE:

PHASE 1

1. Generate a list of team goals you think are appropriate for your team. A worksheet is provided for you to help assist in this process. List the team goals on the player worksheet and then make copies of it for the players.
2. Gather the team together and give each of them the provided player worksheet that has your goals listed on it. Give each of them a copy of the goal setting advice included in the packet.
3. Discuss with the team the importance of goal setting and how it can greatly enhance performance.
4. Discuss with the team the relative merits of each goal you listed on their worksheets.
5. Ask the team to go home that night and independently complete their worksheets by generating two additional team goals. Tell them to use your goals as a model when completing the worksheets. Explain the necessity of following the “checklist for making team goals” in order to generate appropriate team goals. Explain what a timeline is, and give examples of strategies for obtaining goals.
6. Have the players turn in their worksheets to you. Compile a list of all the appropriate team goals that the players suggested on their worksheets. Make sure to only put the goals that meet the standards of the “checklist for making team goals” on the list. If you have to rewrite the goals in behavioral terms, go ahead and do so.

PHASE 2

1. Gather the team together and write the list of suggested team goals on the board. You may decide to collate the suggestions onto a single piece of paper and hand that out.
2. Explain to the team how you compiled the list, and that goals that did not meet the standards in the “checklist for making team goals” were eliminated.
3. Have the team look the list over for a few minutes. Facilitate a brief discussion concerning the suggested goals and then vote upon which goals the team would like to adopt in addition to the goals you chose for the team. The exact number of adopted goals is up to you.
4. Have the team discuss timelines as well as strategies for achieving each goal.
5. Create a chart with all of the team goals on it (the goals you chose and the goals chosen by the team). Make sure to include a timeline and strategies for achieving each goal. Post this chart somewhere in which the team will view it regularly such as the lockerroom.
GOAL SETTING GUIDELINES

CHECKLIST FOR MAKING TEAM GOALS

1. Is the goal attainable?

2. Is the goal clear?

3. Is the goal challenging?

4. Can the outcome of the goal be completely controlled by the team?

5. Can progress towards the goal be tracked and measured?

The above checklist is a tool that you should use when creating team goals.

1. The goal must be attainable, not impossible. Impossible goals inevitably lead to frustration.

2. The goal must be clear and specific enough to avoid any misunderstanding.

3. The goal must not be too easy. It must be challenging in order to be optimally effective.

4. The goal must be completely under the control of the team. Goals such as winning a championship are not completely controllable by the team. The goals should be performance based, not outcome based. A goal such as hitting 80% of your free throws in the final 2 minutes of the game is controllable and performance based.

5. The goal must be quantitative in nature in order to be measured and tracked over time. It can't be too broad or general. If it is, you may never know if the goal was reached. To be in better shape than all your opponents is an important goal, but it is too general to be a very effective goal. In order for a goal to be an effective motivator and performance enhancing tool, you must be able to measure your current progress and tell whether or not you have achieved the goal.

* When you sit down to construct your team goals, make sure that every goal you set meets these standards and criteria. If the goals do not meet these standards, the goals will not be effective, and may in fact be detrimental to morale and performance.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #3 Setting Team Goals

NAME:____________________   DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
INTERVIEWING EACH OTHER- Activity #4

PURPOSE:
1) For you to learn personal information about your players outside of basketball.
2) For teammates to learn more about each other outside of the basketball context.

IMPLEMENTATION: Early part of the season, after final team selection has been made.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Enough provided worksheets for everyone
                        -Enough writing utensils for everyone
                        -Notepad and Pen or Pencil for the Coach

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: Carried out over approximately 1-3 weeks

OVERVIEW: There are three phases to this activity. The first is an interview phase in which personal information about each player will be gathered. The second is a report phase in which players will report to the group what they learned about other team members. The third phase is a recall phase during which the team will be encouraged to recall the personal information reported to the group about each player.

PROCEDURE:
The exact procedure you will use is a decision you must make according to what is feasible for your team. The exact procedure is not extremely important, however, it is critical that your procedure has the three phases described below.

1. Interview Phase - * This phase can be a separate activity conducted during practice, or it can be conducted outside of practice on the players' time.

   Hand out the provided worksheet to each team member. Divide the team up into pairs. To the degree that is possible, try to pair members up with players they are unfamiliar with. Another way to choose pairs is to randomly pull names out of a hat. Have the pairs interview one another according to the questions on the worksheet. Tell the players that over the next two weeks, reports will be given to the team concerning the information gained during the interviews. They will be required to give the report without their written answers. If there is an odd number of players, have one group of three players interview each other.

2. Report Phase - * This phase will need to be carried out over several sessions according to the size of your squad. Only 3-4 people should give reports so that the team is not overloaded with personal information about their teammates. The idea is quality, not quantity. Use as many sessions as is needed in order for everyone to make a report about the team member they interviewed. Use your note pad to keep track of who has reported and who has been discussed, so that everyone has personal information shared to the group. Take appropriate measures to ensure that everyone is discussed.

   Ask for a volunteer to report to the group about what he/she learned about his/her partner during the interview. Have a copy of the interview worksheet handy in case you need to prompt the reporter by reminding him/her about the various questions on the worksheet. Tell the team that they will be responsible for the information reported to them, so they should adopt strategies to remember it.
You can simply ask the reporter to report to the group all that they remember from the interview, or you can cut down on time and have him/her report the two or three most interesting things he/she learned about the interviewee. The choice is up to you and the amount of time you have to spend on this activity.

3. **Recall Phase** - * This phase should be integrated into practice time. It will be more effective if it is conducted in small portions throughout practice at opportune times such as: rests during conditioning period, changes between drills, warm up, etc.

   Ask the team to recall 2-5 things that the team has learned about a particular player. Neither the interviewer nor the interviewee should be allowed to give answers. The team should collaborate and jointly come up with the required amount of shared pieces of information. Continue this phase whenever it is conducive to your schedule, just make sure that the team is required to recall information about everyone. Use your note pad to keep track of who has been discussed, but also make the team responsible for remembering who has and who hasn’t been discussed.

   Make a point to discuss some of the personal information you learn about a team member with him/her throughout the season. A simple thing such as remembering a birthday or the name of a girlfriend/boyfriend, shows a player that you care.
ACTIVITY #4 WORKSHEET

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. Where would you like be living and what would you like to be doing 20 years from now?

2. What was the most fun or memorable activity you were involved in over the summer?

3. What would you like others to know about you?

4. How would you describe yourself?

5. What is the most embarrassing thing that has ever happened to you?

6. What are you most proud of in your life?
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #4  Interviewing Each Other

NAME:__________________________  DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
EXPLAINING INDIVIDUAL ROLES- Activity #5

PURPOSE: Explain to each team member his/her individual role on the team.

IMPLEMENTATION: Right before games begin to be played.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: None

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: ?

OVERVIEW: Each player will meet with the coach individually to discuss what the coach perceives his/her individual role to be on the team.

PROCEDURE:

1. Meet once with each player individually and discuss with them what you perceive his/her individual role presently is on the team. The meeting can take place in your office or off to the side during practice. The setting is up to you, however, the meeting must be private.

NOTES:

Explain to each player where they stand on the depth chart, how much playing time they will probably get and when they will get it, what specific responsibilities they may have when they get in, and what responsibilities they may have in practice. Responsibilities may be such things as: a garbage or hustle player, a defensive specialist, a shooter, a scrimmage player who will help the star player get better and in so doing help to improve the team, a team leader, a leader by example, an encourager, etc... **Make sure you are prepared to discuss a specific important individual role with every player.**

You may need to provide some justification for why you believe a player should have a particular role. If the player asks how you have made your decision, explain to him/her your evaluation system and what methods you have used to evaluate his/her ability and potential contribution to the team.

Another critical component of this exercise is to explain to each player what they can do to upgrade or maintain their role. **It is imperative that you not only stress that the roles are subject to change, but you provide the players with specific information as to how they can improve.** Players must feel they have the opportunity to increase or change their respective role. The goal of this exercise is for every player to understand and accept his/her role as a temporary role, and to learn what they can do to upgrade or improve their individual role on the team. **However, make sure that you do not breed a false sense of optimism or set up unrealistic expectations.**

Remind each player that their role is extremely vital to the team’s overall success due to team success being a product of team effort and performance.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #5 Explaining Individual Roles

NAME:_________________________ DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
DEVELOPING TEAM RELIANCE - Activity #6

PURPOSE: To teach the players the importance of relying upon their teammates.

IMPLEMENTATION: Any time.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: None

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 15 minutes, 4 times throughout the season

OVERVIEW:

PROCEDURE:

The purpose of this activity is to conduct four drills or lead-up games throughout the season that are designed solely for the purpose of teaching the importance of relying upon teammates. A drill that emphasizes the importance of teammate assists could be conducted, or a scrimmage that limits the amount of dribbling and requires several passes before a shot, could be conducted.

An example of a drill that emphasizes teammate assists, is simply requiring five passes before any shot can be taken.
An other example of a team reliance drill is scrimmaging without allowing players to dribble. The ball can only be passed from teammate to teammate.
Team reliance drills can focus on defense also. By allowing points to be scored only by defensive stops during a scrimmage, defensive team work and teammate reliance can be sharpened.

* Many drills are run for the single purpose of skill development, these drills or games must be run only to develop team reliance and team work.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #6  Developing Team Reliance

NAME:____________________    DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
STRESSING INDIVIDUAL ROLE IMPORTANCE - Activity #7

PURPOSE: For players to understand the importance of all individual roles on the team.

IMPLEMENTATION: After a few games have been played

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Access to a chalkboard or dry erase board

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 20 minutes

OVERVIEW: There are two parts to this activity. During the first part, the coach will explain how each team has many individual roles and that they are all critical to the team’s success. During the second part, the coach will facilitate a team discussion concerning the relative importance of five roles that the coach will have previously listed on the board.

PROCEDURE:

1. Create a list of five roles on a team that you believe to be critical to a team’s success and list them on the chalkboard or dry erase board. The roles can be of your choosing, however, some emphasis should be placed upon non-performance based roles such as vocal leader, leader by example, encourager, supporter, and reserve player. Performance based roles such as rebounder, garbage player, passer, and shooter are extremely important and everyone is aware of that. However, the purpose of this activity is to stress the importance of the non-performance roles. This will help everyone to understand that every team member has an important role on the team, not just the starters and star players. When choosing what roles you wish the team to discuss, ask yourself what are the essential roles necessary for a successful team? Can the team have more than one leader as well as more than one type of leader?

2. Explain that the team is only as strong as its weakest link, and that makes everyone’s role on the team extremely important, and everyone’s contribution valuable. Because of this, you would like the team to discuss the importance of the specific individual roles listed on the board. Facilitate the discussion by asking for volunteers or by picking people. Make sure that everyone participates equally. Possible questions might be: If a team is missing role X, what will be the consequences? In what ways will the team benefit if a team member fulfills role X very well?

End the activity by explaining that everyone will have an important role on this team and that everyone should take a great deal of pride in their respective individual role. Make sure to point out that players can have multiple individual roles on a team. They should take pride in every positive role they fulfill for the team.
ACTIVITY #7 Stressing Individual Role Importance

NAME:______________ DATE:________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
CREATING TEAM OWNERSHIP- Activity #8

PURPOSE: To give the players a feeling of control and ownership in the team by planning and running two conditioning periods.

IMPLEMENTATION: Any time except very early in the season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: May vary

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: Two conditioning periods

OVERVIEW: The players will design and run 2 different conditioning periods. The coaches will only sit back and watch. Coaches may decide to participate.

PROCEDURE:
1. Explain to the team that you are going to let them plan and execute two conditioning periods. Specify a time limit to the conditioning periods. The conditioning periods you choose to let them run are up to you. Tell them that the coaches will do nothing but observe in an unobtrusive manner. You may decide to participate with the team if you so choose.
   
   Let the players have full control and see what they come up with. Let them figure out how to make the decisions about what to do. This should help to develop leaders, and/or give leaders a chance to improve their leadership ability and influence. This could be a positive or negative leadership opportunity, so you must monitor the situation and take measures to prevent this from having a negative effect on the team. Most of the time they will work just as hard as they normally do during conditioning, possibly harder.

2. Right after the first player conducted conditioning period is over, evaluate how it went and give the team your evaluation.
   
   If it went well, congratulate them being specific about why it was good.
   
   If it was a poorly done, explain that they are only hurting themselves and their teammates by not working as hard as they can. Engage the team in a discussion about what they can do to improve the session. You may need to discuss their choice of conditioning drills and educate them about what to do, or you may need to discuss ways in which they can improve their team decision making skills.

3. Whenever you decide, have the players run the second conditioning period. If the first conditioning period did not go well, run the second soon after the first one.

4. When it is over, again make an evaluation and give it to the players. Tell the team members that for a team to truly be successful, every member must fully invest in the season. The more each member puts into the season and the more personal responsibility each member takes for helping the season turn out to be successful, the more likely the team is to do well.
   
   If the conditioning period went well, congratulate them. If the period did not go well, tell them you are disappointed. You might try giving them another chance, or if you they will not do well on the third try, leave it be and go on from there.

NOTES:
The purpose of this activity is to give the players some involvement in the management of the team and to create a sense of personal ownership in the team. This should help the players perceive the team as being their team, not just the coach's team. Taking ownership in the team will tend to cause players to invest more in the season and therefore work harder and give more of themselves to the team.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #8  Creating Team Ownership

NAME:________________________ DATE:_________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
DISCUSSING TEAMMATES POSITIVELY- Activity #9

PURPOSE: To make members aware of what their teammates and coaches think are positive aspects about them.

IMPLEMENTATION: Near Mid-season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Note pad and writing utensil for coach only

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: Varies

OVERVIEW: This activity will be conducted over several sessions according to the size of your squad. The group will sit in a circle and take turns discussing the positive things that they know about a designated team member. By the end of all the sessions, all team members will have had their positive aspects discussed by the group.

PROCEDURE:

1. Bring the team together and sit down in a circle. Start the activity by picking a specific team member. Then verbally list 2-3 characteristics, facts, or aspects, that you believe are positive about that player. Such things as: basketball skills, grades, style, humor, personality, mentally tough, social skills, reputation, hobbies, work ethic, etc., are examples of positive things you can mention. Have everyone in the group take a turn and talk about the positive aspects of that same team member in the exact manner as you just did.

   The players can repeat positive aspects that have already been mentioned, but encourage them to be creative and get into this activity. The players must not be allowed to be negative or sarcastic, they must be sincere about the things they discuss. How you set the activity up is the key! It will not work if you do not set it up in a serious and interesting fashion. It should be fun, but not silly or making fun of and/or belittling another individual.

2. Continue the activity with a new player until you are out of time for that particular session. Make sure to write down who has been discussed in order to ensure that everyone eventually gets discussed. Conduct as many sessions as are necessary in order for everyone to have a turn. Probably no more than 3-5 members should be discussed in any one session in order to keep the session meaningful and interesting.

NOTES:

This activity does not have to be a formal activity, it could be incorporated during a rest in conditioning or during a water break. Incorporate it into practice anyway you deem appropriate, just make sure that it is a meaningful activity for the team.

If time is a problem, or if the positive aspects being discussed about players are becoming too redundant, you can choose to not have the entire team discuss the same player. For instance, you could have only 1/2 of the team discuss a player, and then move on to discussing a new player. The choice is yours. Figure out how much time you have for this activity and how the activity is going, and then make your decision.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #9  Discussing Teammates Positively

NAME:_________________________ DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
CONDUCTING A SOCIAL FUNCTION- Activity #10

PURPOSE: To provide a chance for team members to socially interact in a context outside of basketball.

IMPLEMENTATION: Sometime between when games begin and Mid-season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: May vary

OVERVIEW: This activity is a social activity that the team will engage in outside of the basketball context. What type of activity, where, and for how long is up to you. During the activity, a talent show will take place involving the entire team.

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: Your decision

PROCEDURE:

1. Take the team away from the gym and have them interact in some sort of social activity outside of the basketball context.
   - What social activity you decide upon is up to you. It could be something such as: a pizza feed, a Bar-B-Q, a volleyball game at the park, a swim party, etc.. Try to come up with an activity that is not too taxing on your resources. By getting the players off campus and away from the basketball environment, they will be free to socialize, talk, and communicate with one another in ways that may be different from the way they socialize, talk, and communicate in the basketball context. This activity should help them get to know each other and interact in ways that may be new to them. At the very worst, it will provide an additional positive and enjoyable shared experience, which will bring the team that much closer together.
   - You can ask the team to vote upon what social activity they would like to do and how they want to finance it, or you can just decide. It is up to you. Obviously, it must be something that does not eliminate some team members because of it being a financial burden.

2. During the pizza feed, or what ever social activity you choose to do, conduct a talent show. A day or two before the social activity, divide the team up into two to four groups and tell them that each group will perform a skit. Try to divide the team up into equal cross-sections of the team. If social cliques appear to threaten the activity, then divide and place the members of the cliques into different groups.
   - Tell the team that each group can prepare as much or as little as they wish for their respective skit. Make sure to emphasize that every member of the group must be equally involved in the skit.
   - Tell them to make the skits tasteful and they can not be offensive. The skits should not be religious or racial in nature. Fellow players and coaches are open game for impersonations as long as the person being impersonated will not take offense to the impersonation. If the players poke fun at fellow teammates or coaches make sure that they do it in fun, and that the recipients perceive it as “done in fun” and not as a malicious or negative act.
   - The players should get into this, and it should be a very enjoyable experience. Try to make sure that it is enjoyable for everyone.
* A small group pictionary tournament, charades, or a family feud game, could be used instead of a skit during the social activity. Just make sure that everyone participates, and it is a positive and enjoyable experience for everyone.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #10  Conducting a Social Function

NAME: ___________________  DATE: __________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
EXAMINING TEAM GOAL PROGRESS- Activity #11

OBJECTIVE:
1) To collectively examine progress towards the achievement of team goals.
2) To refine team goals if needed.

IMPLEMENTATION: Near Mid-season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: -Access to a chalkboard or a dry erase board
-The previously made display of team goals

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 15 minutes

OVERVIEW: This activity has two parts. The first part will be a systematic review of each team goal and the progress the team has made toward achieving it. During this part the goals can be refined or deleted. Strategies to overcome obstacles preventing goal achievement will be collectively generated as well. The second part will be a session in which the team can add new and additional team goals to the list. The coach will then make a new display for the team goals taking into account any changes that have been made.

PROCEDURE:

1. Present the display of team goals so all the members on the team can see it. Tell the team that you are going to review each goal and the teams progress towards achieving it. Facilitate team discussion about the team’s progress towards achieving each goal. Begin with the first goal listed.
   
   **Have you achieved the goal? Are you on track to achieve it?** If so, GREAT. If you are not on track to achieve the goal, WHY NOT? What are the reasons or obstacles? What specific strategies can the team use to overcome those obstacles? Write these strategies up on the board.

   **Is the goal too easy? Is it too difficult?** If it is, then adjust the difficulty level.

2. Ask the team to think about any team goals that they would like to add to the list. If there are any additional team goals that they would like to add, make sure the goals pass the standards set with the “checklist for making team goals” so that they are specific, controllable, and challenging.

3. Make a new display for the team goals. Make sure to take into account any changes that the team has made. Remember to display the team’s previous progress towards achieving the respective goals. Place the display in a position in which the team will view it regularly. Continue to record team progress toward goal fulfillment.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #11  Examining Team Goal Progress

NAME: ______________________  DATE: __________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
LEARNING EACH OTHER’S RESPONSIBILITIES- Activity #12

PURPOSE:
1) To acquaint each player with the responsibilities of other positions.
2) To emphasize the importance of each position’s responsibilities to the team’s success.

IMPLEMENTATION: Near Mid-Season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: None

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 15-20 minutes

OVERVIEW: The team will scrimmage against each other with each player participating in a position he/she is unfamiliar with. If a team uses a motion or continuity offense, then the team should play basketball with a football.

PROCEDURE:

1. Divide the team up into two even teams. Decide upon a method of ensuring that every player will be playing a position unfamiliar to them. It will be best if the responsibilities required of the players in the scrimmage are responsibilities that they rarely carry out in their normal positions. A suggested method is for the point guards to play the small forward position, the shooting guards to play the power forward position, the small forwards to play the post or center position, the power forwards to play the shooting guard position, and the centers to play the point guard position. This method strives to place each player in a position that requires vastly different skills than they normally use at their regular positions.

2. Allow the teams to begin scrimmaging. Officiate the game with the normal stringent rules so as to give the players a sense of the difficulty other players have in executing their assignments. If the centers are traveling or double dribbling, call them for it. They will gain a greater appreciation for the difficulty of bringing the ball up the floor.

3. It is important that every player is allowed playing time in the scrimmage.

4. End the scrimmage with a talk about how important it is for the team to play as a disciplined machine each part having a unique assignment and executing that responsibility to the best of their ability. Worrying about the assignments of others and how well they are playing is not their concern. Encouraging a player who is not playing well is a positive action, but griping or complaining is not. Trying to do more than your job is also not a positive action, because it detracts from the execution of your individual assignment.

5. If a team uses a motion or continuity offense, a football should be used in the scrimmage. Because of the interchangeable nature of the roles in these types of offenses, this activity will need to be adjusted or an entirely new activity may need to be designed to develop sensitivity and understanding among players. Using a football instead of a basketball will require the teammates to work together while playing in unfamiliar roles.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #12  Learning Each Other's Responsibilities

NAME:_________________________    DATE:___________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?
EXAMINING TEAM GOAL FULFILLMENT- Activity #13

OBJECTIVE: To collectively examine goal achievement across the season.

IMPLEMENTATION: At the end of the season.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: The previously made display of team goals

ACTIVITY TIME LENGTH: 15 minutes

OVERVIEW: This activity has two parts. The first part will be a systematic review of each team goal and the progress the team made toward achieving it. The second part will be a chance for the coach to tell the team how important goal setting will be during their entire lifetimes.

PROCEDURE:

1. Present the display of team goals so all the members on the team can see it. Tell the team that you are going to review each goal and the team’s progress towards achieving it. Facilitate the team in a discussion about the team’s progress towards achieving each goal. Begin with the first goal listed.
   
   Did you achieve the goal? Were you on track to achieve it? If so, GREAT. Express how proud you are of the team for accomplishing a challenging team goal.

   If you did not achieve the goal or were not on track to achieve it, ask the team what they believe the reasons are. What specific strategies could the team have used or use next time to overcome those obstacles?

   Was the goal too easy? Was it too difficult? If it was, then ask the team how they could have adjusted the difficulty to an optimal level.

2. Explain to the team how important it is to learn how to set effective goals, because goal setting will be a very critical skill throughout their entire lives. They must learn how to set specific, measurable, controllable, and challenging yet attainable goals. It does not stop there, however; they must learn to develop strategies and plans aimed at achieving those goals. They must also learn to evaluate their progress toward goal achievement and make appropriate goal refinements and strategic changes.
COACH FEEDBACK

ACTIVITY #13  Examining Team Goal Fulfillment

NAME:____________________   DATE:__________

1. What aspects of this activity were effective and worked well?

2. What aspects of this activity were ineffective or impractical?

3. If you were to do this activity again, what improvements could be made to make it both more effective and practical?