

## RELATIONS OF ATTACHMENT STYLES AND GROUP COHESION IN PREMIER LEAGUE FEMALE VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS<sup>1</sup>

M. ŞEFİK TİRYAKI AND FATMA ÇEPİKKURT

*Mersin University*

*Summary.*—The relations of attachment styles with group cohesion were monitored for premier league female volleyball teams. 74 volleyball players from 8 teams responded to the Relationship Scales Questionnaire and Group Environment Questionnaire. Pearson correlations indicated significant association of attachment styles with group cohesion. Specifically, a significant negative correlation was found between female volleyball players' individual attraction to the group-social subscale and fearful attachment style. In addition, there was a significant positive correlation for scores on the group integration-social and secure and preoccupied attachment subscales and a significant negative correlation for scores on the group integration-task subscale and preoccupied attachment style. In conclusion, attachment styles might be considered important in predicting group cohesion

Group cohesion is thought to be an important factor in team performance. Mullen and Copper (1994) asserted that the effect of success on cohesion appears to be greater than the effect of cohesion on performance. According to Carron (1982), cohesion is a process and has four major antecedents (environmental factors, personnel factors, team factors, and leadership factors), which affect its development. Attachment style of a person would also be considered a personnel factor (e.g., Backström & Holmes, 2001; Guerrero & Jones, 2003) so its association with group cohesion was investigated in this study. If such relationship was evident, which kind of group cohesion could be predicted for a coach.

Attachment has been defined as an intimate, permanent, and emotional bond or the relationship experienced with others sensed as a source of security (Bowlby, 1979, 1988; Ainsworth, 1989). For example, attachment styles between babies and mothers or caregivers were first described by Ainsworth (1967) and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978). Infants sense the primary caregiver (e.g., caregiver, parent, or mother) as a source of security. Attachment theory suggests that babies would form self and other working cognitive models through interaction with the primary caregiver (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980). These working models are internalized so they guide the individuals' past, present, and future interactions related to expectations and belief (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Ainsworth, 1989; Main, 1991). Also, at-

---

<sup>1</sup>Address correspondence to M. Şefik Tiryaki, Mersin University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Ciftlikkoy Kampusu, 33343, Mersin, Turkey or e-mail (sefikt@hotmail.com).

tachment patterns formed in early childhood are thought to extend to adult relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1991). Such working models continue during adolescence and adulthood and help individuals to predict and manage interactions with significant others (Bowlby, 1969). Bartholomew (1990) proposed that the attachment style could be best explained as how individuals perceive themselves and others in a relationship.

Bartholomew, *et al.* (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994b) constructed four category models for adult attachments with positive and negative views of self and others in relationships. In this model, individuals with positive views of self and of others are classified as "secure." These individuals, generally, have high self-esteem, and they trust others. Individuals with negative views of self and of others are conceptualized as "fearful," and they are seen as "shy." "Dismissing" individuals have high self-esteem and may have suppressed intimate relationships (positive view of self and negative view of others). Individuals who have a negative view of themselves and a positive view of others are classified as "preoccupied" and their behaviors show high dependency on others. Fearful and preoccupied people (negative self-views) view themselves as not being able to contact others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994a, 1994b).

Group cohesion is one of the most important topics in not only social psychology but also sport psychology. Many years ago, Festinger, Schachter, and Back (1950, p. 164) defined cohesion as "the resultant forces that are acting on the members who want to stay in a group." Again, Festinger, *et al.* mentioned two types of forces in this definition. Firstly, group attraction was expressed as the social aspects of the group. Secondly, control was stated as group productivity and performance. Later, resistance and attraction were included in a modified definition of cohesion (Gross & Martin, 1952).

As mentioned above, group cohesion is a topic important in the field of sport psychology. One reason is the belief that group cohesion would improve team performance. Carron (1982) defined group 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). In 1985, Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley proposed a conceptual model in an attempt to understand and measure cohesion in sports teams (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985; Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron, 1985). There are two broad comprehensive categories for this conceptual model. One is group integration and the other one is individual attraction to the group. Group integration includes an individual's perceptions about the similarity, closeness, and bonding within the group as a whole. Individual attraction to the group is related to individuals' perceptions in personal motivations, acting to

keep them in the group (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002, p. 171). Then, each category is divided into task and social orientations, and four measures of cohesiveness can be assessed: individual attraction to the group-task, individual attraction to the group-social, group integration-task, and group integration-social.

The attraction to the group-task construct reflects the individual team member's feelings about the attractiveness of the group task, the group productivity, and the group goals and objectives. This includes the attractiveness of the group as a social unit, and the social interactions within the group. The group integration-task construct is a measure of the individual team member's perceptions of the task-oriented similarity, closeness, and bonding within the team as a whole, and also of the socially oriented similarity, closeness, and bonding within the team as a whole (Widmeyer, *et al.*, 1985, pp. 19-20).

Attachment styles and group cohesion have been individually studied in many studies, such as continuing of relationship with attachment styles and conflicted behaviors (Bippus & Rollin, 2003), social talents (e.g., Guerrero & Jones, 2003), social talents and loneliness, (e.g., Di Tommaso, Brannen-McNulty, Ross, Burgess, 2002), health and illness (e.g., Feeney, 2000), attachment to parents and peers, family functioning, family systems, and culture (e.g., Harvey & Byrd, 2000; McCarthy, Noller, & Fouladi, 2001; Freeman & Brown, 2001; Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujiie, & Uchida, 2002), and control and satisfaction (e.g., Beesley & Stoltenberger, 2002).

While the attachment styles have not been studied in the sports domain, group cohesion has been. With that in mind, the relationship between group cohesion and leadership factors (Westre & Weiss, 1991; Shields, Gardner, Bredemier, & Bostro, 1997), group cohesion and role involvement (Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1987), group cohesion and level of competition (Granito & Rainey, 1988), group cohesion and group norms (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), group cohesion and mood, mood and stress (Henderson, Bourgeois, LeUnes, & Meyers, 1998; Terry, Carron, Pink, Lane, Jones, & Hall, 2000), and group cohesion and performance (win/loss) (Boone, Beitel, & Kuhlman, 1997; Matheson, Mathes, & Murray, 1997; Chang & Bordia, 2001; Carron, Bray, & Eys, 2002; Carron, Colman, & Wheeler, 2002) were studied. However, relations of attachment style with group cohesion seems not to have been studied until this study.

As remarked with respect to attachment styles, internalized or internal models are proposed to guide individuals' past, present, and future interactions (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Ainsworth, 1989; Main, 1991), since attachment patterns are thought to be formed during early childhood and extend to adulthood relationships (Bowlby, 1969; Feeney & Noller, 1991). So, it was expected that group integration (social/task) and individual attractions to

the group (social/task) in sports teams are interrelated with attachment styles. Were such relations assessed at the beginning of the season, a coach might better estimate what kind of group cohesion could be formed, depending on attachment styles. The purpose of this study was to investigate the association of group cohesion with attachment styles among premier league female volleyball players.

There were five hypotheses. Firstly, the correlation between social dimensions of cohesion and secure attachment style should be positive. Secondly, the correlation between social dimensions of cohesion with preoccupied attachment style should also be positive. Thirdly, the correlation between task dimensions of cohesion and preoccupied attachment style was expected to be negative. Fourthly, the correlation between task dimensions of cohesion and dismissing attachment style should be positive, and that correlation between social dimensions and dismissing attachment style should be negative. Fifthly, correlation between social and task dimension of cohesion and fearful attachment style should be negative.

#### METHOD

##### *Participants*

From eight teams in the Premier league 74 female volleyball players ranging in age from 16 to 32 years ( $M=22.5$ ,  $SD=4.2$ ) participated.

##### *Questionnaires*

*Cohesion.*—Group cohesiveness data were calculated using the The Group Environment Questionnaire (Widmeyer, *et al.*, 1985), which has 18 items, measuring aspects of cohesion: Individual attraction to the group–task (4 items), Individual attraction to the group–social (5 items), Group integration–task (5 items), Group integration–social (4 items). There were positive and negative statements about the team on the questionnaire, and subjects responded on a 9-point Likert scale anchored by 9: strongly agree and 1: strongly disagree or vice versa. Thus, higher scores reflected stronger perceived cohesiveness. According to Brawley, *et al.* (1987), the questionnaire reflects good internal consistency, content validity, concurrent validity, and factorial validity. In this study, an adapted form of the questionnaire for a Turkish population (Morali, 1994) was used, and reliability coefficients of subscales ranged between .76 and .79.

*Attachment style.*—Data were collected using the Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994a) of 30 items and four subscales. Attachment styles are Preoccupied (4 items), Fearful (4 items), Secure (5 items), and Dismissing (5 items).

One item of the Dismissing scale was used in reversed form in the Preoccupied scale. The remaining 13 items were omitted. According to Griffin

and Bartholomew (1994b), if 13 factors are used, only four attachment dimensions are obtained but if the remaining 17 factors are used, only four attachment styles are obtained. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale using anchors of 1: not at all like me and 5: very like me. The Turkish version was used; internal consistency of subscales ranged between .27 and .61 (Sümer & Güngör, 1999). The reliability coefficients of the Relationship Scale Questionnaire, originally developed in the USA, ranged from .41 to .70. Developers of the scale, Griffin and Bartholomew (1994b), explained that “the internal consistency of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire scores quite low . . . and this follows neither from the low number of items making up each scale, nor from some accidental psychometric flow in the construction of the scales. Instead, the internal consistencies of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire can be low because two orthogonal dimensions (self model and other model) are being combined” (p. 27).

#### *Design and Procedure*

The purpose of the study was explained to team coaches, and their permission was obtained. All athletes volunteered and first filled out the questionnaires one week before the season started, then also one week before the season ended. Before practice, the coach, assistant coach, and team manager brought the team together, and the researcher administered both questionnaires. During the administration of the questionnaires only the researchers and the athletes were present. The questionnaires were completed anonymously, and the coaches had no access to the individual information.

The paired-sample *t* test was applied to test possible mean differences for pre- and postseason administrations of the Group Environment Questionnaire. Then, mean values were calculated for pre- and posttest Group Environment Questionnaire subscale scores and Pearson correlation calculated to examine this association.

#### RESULTS

In Table 1 means and standard deviations are given for volleyball players. Pearson correlations for scores on the Group Environment Questionnaire with subscale scores of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire are presented in Table 2. There were no significant differences between pre- and postseason Group Environment Questionnaire subscale scores (Individual attraction to the group–task:  $t = .99$ ,  $p > .05$ ; Individual attraction to the group–social:  $t = 1.21$ ,  $p > .05$ ; Group integration–task:  $t = .09$ ,  $p > .05$ ; and Group integration–social:  $t = .21$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

The correlations of the Group Environment Questionnaire scores on Group integration–social with scores for the Secure and Preoccupied attachment subscales of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire were positive and significant. However, no significant values were found for the Group Envi-

TABLE 1  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS ON SCORES FOR GROUP ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE AND RELATIONSHIP SCALES QUESTIONNAIRE

Group Environment Questionnaire	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Relationship Scales Questionnaire	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Individual attraction to the group–			Secure	4.3	0.9
Social	6.8	1.5	Fearful	3.8	1.2
Task	7.1	1.8	Preoccupied	3.6	1.1
Group integration–			Dismissing	4.2	0.8
Social	5.3	1.6			
Task	7.3	1.8			

ronment Questionnaire of scores on Individual attraction to the group–social with Secure and Preoccupied attachment subscale scores of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire.

TABLE 2  
PEARSON CORRELATIONS FOR SCORES ON GROUP ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE AND ON RELATIONSHIP SCALES QUESTIONNAIRE SUBSCALES (*N* = 74)

Group Environment Questionnaire	Relationship Scales Questionnaire			
	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Individual attraction to the group–Social	.14	-.43†	.05	-.08
Individual attraction to the group–Task	.10	-.02	.12	-.06
Group integration–Social	.45†	-.33	.61†	-.06
Group integration–Task	.11	-.17	-.31*	-.06

\* $p < .05$ . † $p < .01$ .

Also, no positive correlations were observed for Task dimensions of cohesion with the Dismissing attachment style and no negative value between Social dimensions and Dismissing attachment style. The correlation for the Group Environment Questionnaire of scores on Individual attraction to the group–social with Fearful attachment style of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire was negative and significant but not for scores on Group integration–social, Individual attraction to the group–task, or the Group integration–task.

Although not listed as a hypothesis, there was, however, a significant negative correlation between scores for the Group integration–task of the Group Environment Questionnaire with Preoccupied attachment style measured on the Relationship Scales Questionnaire.

#### DISCUSSION

Most studies have examined associations of scores on group cohesion and performance. For example, a positive value was found in some studies of volleyball players (Ruder & Gill, 1982). Bergeles and Hatziharistos (2003) used interpersonal attraction as an estimate of cohesiveness of elite volleyball

teams, noting that scores of the teams were positively correlated with the teams' final places in a championship. As a different point of view, attachment styles could be used to estimate cohesiveness of elite female volleyball players in this study. The present results partially supported the first, the second, the third, and fifth hypotheses, but not the fourth. For the first hypothesis, the positive correlation for Group integration–social scores and those for a secure attachment style can be interpreted easily. Since individuals who show a secure attachment style see themselves and others positively, they are comfortable with autonomy and intimacy in their relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). They express their emotions verbally, look for support when under stress, and use constructive coping strategies. They are emphatic with others as needed (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

The expected positive correlation for subscale scores on Individual attraction to the group-social with a secure attachment style was not found so the second hypothesis was only partially supported. In other words, a positive relationship was found between a preoccupied attachment style and scores on the Group integration-social subscale, but not for those on the Individual attraction to the group-social. Since individuals who have a preoccupied attachment style see themselves negatively but see others positively, they are said to look for support from others and to be intimate with others, but their behavior depends on others' behavior (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Feeney & Noller, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994a, 1994b). Given the negative relationship of scores on Group integration–task with preoccupied individuals, the third hypothesis seemed to be supported. Yet, as with a secure attachment style a relation was lacking for persons with a preoccupied attachment style and scores on Attraction to the group-social. Hypothesis 4, which proposed a positive relationship with a dismissing attachment style and the task dimension of cohesion and negative relationship with social dimensions of cohesion, was not supported. Dismissing individuals were self-competent and self-confident. So, the task dimension of cohesion and dismissing attachment style were expected to be related (Bartholomew, 1990, 1993; Guerrero, 1996). The negative relationship expected between social dimensions of cohesion and a dismissing attachment style was not found because these individuals avoided interactions and viewed relations as unnecessary and unrewarding.

In this study, partial support for the hypothesis of a negative relationship between fearful attachment style and the task and social subscales of cohesion, was noted to be negative. With the expectation of having a negative attitude toward others, distrusting and rejecting, suggested feelings of worthlessness as well. Correlations should be with all Group Environment Questionnaire subscales. It appears reasonable that individuals who did not know each other at the beginning of their league season could stabilize task inte-

gration since tasks were common. Social integration in comprehension of group cohesion could be developed (Carron & Brawley, 2000). But, group formation, which depends on whether individuals in the group are task or socially oriented, could contribute to which task–social dimensions might be effective for the team.

Similarly, it was specified that individuals whose behavior reflects different working models may differ on a broad spectrum of social psychological dimensions (Backström & Holmes, 2001). These psychological dimensions were indicated as social support, relationship function, and interpersonal experiences like coping with stress, identity and personality, domestic violence, substance use, and religiosity. Since group cohesion has also a social psychological dimension, adding group cohesion to this list seems logical. Individuals who have different working models might also differ in their group cohesion. Moreover, it is recommended that associations of group cohesion and attachment styles should be studied with persons of different maturity and of various experience in competition. Knowing more about men and women athletes from different team sports could improve understanding and aid in development of theory.

#### REFERENCES

- AINSWORTH, M. D. S. (1967) *Infancy in Uganda: infant care and the growth of love*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Univer. Press.
- AINSWORTH, M. D. S. (1989) Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.
- AINSWORTH, M. D. S., BLEHAR, M. C., WATERS, E., & WALL, S. (1978) *Pattern of attachment: assessed in the strange situation and at home*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- BACKSTRÖM, M., & HOLMES, B. M. (2001) Measuring adult attachment: a construct validation of two self-report instruments. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 79-86.
- BARTHOLOMEW, K. (1990) Avoidance of intimacy: an attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*, 7, 147-178.
- BARTHOLOMEW, K. (1993) From childhood to adult relationships: attachment theory and research. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Understanding relationship processes*. Vol. 2. *Learning about relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Pp. 30-62.
- BARTHOLOMEW, K., & HOROWITZ, L. M. (1991) Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- BEESLEY, D., & STOLTENBERG, C. D. (2002) Control, attachment style and relationship satisfaction among adult children of alcoholics. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 24, 281-298.
- BERGELES, N., & HATZIHARISTOS, D. (2003) Interpersonal attraction as a measure of estimation of cohesiveness in elite volleyball teams. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 96, 81-91.
- BIPPUS, A. M., & ROLLIN, E. (2003) Attachment style and differences in relational maintenance and conflict behaviors: friends' perceptions. *Communication Reports*, 16(2), 113-123.
- BOONE, K. S., BEITEL, P., & KUHLMAN, J. S. (1997) The effects of the win/loss record on cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20, 125-134.
- BOWLBY, J. (1969) *Attachment and loss*. Vol. 1. *Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- BOWLBY, J. (1973) *Attachment and loss*. Vol. 2. *Separation: anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- BOWLBY, J. (1979) *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock.
- BOWLBY, J. (1980) *Attachment and loss*. Vol. 4. *Sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.



- BOWLBY, J. (1988) Developmental psychiatry comes of age. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 145, 1-10.
- BRAWLEY, L. R., CARRON, A. V., & WIDMEYER, W. N. (1987) Assessing the cohesion of teams: validity of the Group Environmental Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 275-294.
- CARRON, A. V. (1982) Cohesiveness in sport groups: interpretations and considerations. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 4, 123-128.
- CARRON, A. V., & BRAWLEY, L. R. (2000) Cohesion: conceptual and measurement issues. *Small Group Research*, 31, 89-106.
- CARRON, A. V., BRAY, S. R., & EYS, M. A. (2002) Team cohesion and team success in sport. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 20, 115-126.
- CARRON, A. V., COLMAN, M. M., WHEELER, J., & STEVENS, D. (2002) Cohesion and performance in sport: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-189.
- CARRON, A. V., WIDMEYER, W. N., & BRAWLEY, L. R. (1985) The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: the Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 244-266.
- CHANG, A., & BORDIA, P. (2001) A multi-dimensional approach to the group cohesion-group performance relationship. *Small Group Research*, 32, 379-406.
- DI TOMMASO, E., BRANNEN-McNULTY, C., ROSS, L., & BURGESS, M. (2002) Attachment styles, social skills and loneliness in young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1-10.
- FEENEY, J. A. (2000) Implications of attachment style for patterns of health and illness. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 26, 277-288.
- FEENEY, J. A., & NOLLER, P. (1991) Attachment style and verbal descriptions of romantic partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 187-215.
- FEENEY, J. A., NOLLER, P., & HANRAHAN, M. (1994) Assessing adult attachment: developments in the conceptualization of security and insecurity. In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachments in adults: theory, assessment, and treatment*. Bristol, PA: Kingsley. Pp. 269-308.
- FESTINGER, L., SCHACHTER, S., & BACK, K. (1950) *Social pressure in informal groups*. New York: Harper & Row.
- FREEMAN, H., & BROWN, B. B. (2001) Primary attachment to parents and peers during adolescence: differences by attachment style. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30, 653-674.
- GRANITO, V., & RAINEY, D. (1988) Differences in cohesion between high school and college football teams and starters and non starters. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 16, 471-477.
- GRIFFIN, D. W., & BARTHOLOMEW, K. (1994a) The metaphysics of measurement: the case of adult attachment. *Advances in Personal Relationships*, 5, 17-52.
- GRIFFIN, D. W., & BARTHOLOMEW, K. (1994b) Models of the self and other: fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 430-445.
- GROSS, N., & MARTIN, W. (1952) On group cohesion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 57, 533-546.
- GUERRERO, L. K. (1996) Attachment style differences in intimacy and involvement: a test of four-category model. *Communication Monographs*, 63, 269-292.
- GUERRERO, L. K., & JONES, S. M. (2003) Differences in one's own and one's partner's perceptions of social skills as a function of attachment style. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 277-295.
- HANDERSON, J., BOURGEOIS, A. E., LEUNES, A., & MEYERS, M. C. (1998) Group cohesiveness, mood disturbance and stress in female basketball players. *Small Group Research*, 29, 212-225.
- HARVEY, M., & BYRD, M. (2000) Relationship between adolescents attachment styles and family functioning. *Adolescence*, 35, 345-356.
- HAZAN, C., & SHAVER, P. R. (1987) Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- MAIN, M. (1991) Meta-cognitive knowledge, meta-cognitive monitoring, and singular (coherent) vs. multiple (incoherent) model of attachment: findings and directions for future research. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle*. London: Tavistock/Routledge. Pp. 127-159.
- MATHESON, H., MATHES, S., & MURRAY, M. (1997) The effects of winning and losing on female interactive and coactive team cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 30, 284-298.

- MCCARTHY, C. J., NOLLER, N. P., & FOULADI, R. T. (2001) Continued attachment to parents: its relationship to affect regulation and perceived stress among college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 33, 198-213.
- MORALI, S. (1994) [The comparison of the level of team cohesion in teams sports]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Univer., Turkey.
- MULLEN, B., & COPPER, C. (1994) The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: an integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 210-227.
- PRAPAVESSIS, H., & CARRON, A. V. (1997) The role of sacrifice in the dynamics of sport teams. *Group Dynamics*, 1, 231-240.
- ROTHBAUM, F., ROSEN, K., UJIE, T., & UCHIDA, N. (2002) Family systems theory and culture. *Family Process*, 41, 328-350.
- RUDER, M. K., & GILL, D. L. (1982) Immediate effects of win-loss on perceptions of cohesion in intramural and intercollegiate volleyball teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 4, 227-234.
- SHAVER, P. R., & MIKULINER, M. (2002) Attachment-related psychodynamics. *Attachment & Human Development*, 4, 133-161.
- SHIELDS, D. L., GARDNER, D. E., BREDEMIER, B. J. L., & BOSTRO, A. (1997) The relationship between leadership behaviors and group cohesion in team sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 131, 196-210.
- SÜMER, N., & GÜNGÖR, D. (1999) [Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish samples and cross-cultural comparison]. [*Turkish Journal of Psychology*], 14, 71-106.
- TERRY, P. C., CARRON, A. V., PINK, M. J., LANE, A. M., JONES, G. J. W., & HALL, M. P. (2000) Perceptions of group cohesion and mood in sport teams. *Group Dynamics*, 4, 244-253.
- WESTRE, K., & WEISS, W. (1991) The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and group cohesion in high school football teams. *The Sport Psychologist*, 5, 41-54.
- WIDMEYER, W. N., BRAWLEY, L. R., & CARRON, A. V. (1985) *Measurement of cohesion in sports teams: the Group Environment Questionnaire*. London: Sports Dynamics.

Accepted December 17, 2006.