

The Analysis of Collective Efficacy Perceptions of Athletes Playing in Table Tennis Leagues In Turkey in Terms of Some Variables

¹A. Serdar Yücel, ²Murat Korkmaz and ¹Fatih Çoban

¹Fırat University School of Physical Education and Sports (BESYO)

²Güven Group Inc

Abstract: In team sports, trust and the belief in being successful (collective efficacy) among the athletes of team sports can be effective on performance. In the meantime, analyses of the factors that can be an effective factor on perceptions of collective efficacy become more of an issue in terms of bringing a different perspective to the subject. Therefore, the purpose here is to research the level of collective efficacy of athletes playing in table tennis leagues in Turkey and the reasons affecting it. Target population of the study is composed of 597 players playing in table tennis leagues of Turkey; its sample constitutes randomly selected 224 table tennis players. A two-part questionnaire containing questions related to the demographic features and collective conscious levels was applied to the participants. The questionnaire used in the study was previously used in another study and its reliability was provided. Data of the questionnaire obtained from the participants were analyzed with PASW Statistic 18 package program. Following the reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found as 0.90. As directed to the purpose of the study, Pearson correlation coefficient was used in analysis of data and Kruskal Wallis test was applied in comparisons with three or more groups. Moreover, Chi-Square test was used for independence research. Regression analyses were carried out with the purpose of determining to what extent the variables affect each other. In line with the researches conducted and data obtained, significant relations (<0.05) were found between the participants' age, period of being registered athletics, duration of playing in the same team and their collective efficacy perceptions. The more these variables increase, the more the belief in the team and skills of team players increase in a positive way. In summary, it was concluded that the variables of age, sex, period of being registered athletics, duration of playing in the same team and total number of athletes are the factors that are effective on collective efficacy perception and it was found that 82% of the participants are of the opinion that their teams have the capacity to show good performance.

Key words: Collective efficacy • Table tennis • Collective conscious • Performance

INTRODUCTION

One of the important variables having importance on performance levels of groups is the efficacy perception on which a highly emphasis has been given in recent years. The concept of efficacy is discussed under two different structures as self-efficacy and collective efficacy. The individual's perception about her/his own capability to work is stated as self-efficacy. Collective efficacy is the individual's perception regarding the working capacity of the group to which s/he belongs [1].

The concept of self-efficacy (self-sufficient) is the self-belief of individual regarding to what extent s/he will be successful in dealing with the problematic situations which the individual may come across in the future [2]. Bandura (1993) [3] defined the concept of self-efficacy as the concept of collective efficacy at group level. The belief of collective efficacy focuses on the ability of group to maintain its functioning under different situations of group dynamics Adapted from [4, 5]. According to the social cognitive theory, groups-just like individuals-are affected from their own efficacy beliefs while making their choices Adapted from [6, 5].

Corresponding Author: A. Serdar Yücel, Fırat University School of Physical Education and Sports (BESYO).

Collective efficacy contains interactive, coordinated and synergic social dynamics. Perceived collective efficacy should be seen as an emergent group-level attribute beyond being individual [7]. Collective efficacy is an emergent group level attribute which is a product of interaction dynamics among the group members Adapted from [8, 5].

Collective efficacy is the sense of competition shared within the team regarding the group's ability that makes efforts be successful which is demonstrated with the purpose of meeting the demands laid on group members [9]. As the collective efficacy can affect the team's collective effort and strength in tough conditions or defeats, it is an important factor for the success of sport teams and it is a characteristic generally observed in successful teams [4].

In general terms, collective efficacy is defined as the belief of group members in having the capacity required to achieve a certain target which exists in the group or to reach to a certain level of performance as a group [10]. Zaccaro *et al.* (1995) [9] uttered the collective efficacy as the expectations from the group members and efficacy to share the success [9].

Collective Efficacy in Sport: The concept of efficacy was defined as a productive capacity composed of scientific, social and behavioral sub-skills and discussed under two different structures as self-efficacy and collective efficacy. The researches conducted indicate that both self-efficacy and collective efficacy perception affect the success expectations and motivation levels accordingly and they may increase the individual's performance Adapted from [11, 1]. The hypothesis of social scientific theory suggesting the existence of a relation between self-efficacy and performance was tested with various researches and generally findings supporting this hypothesis were obtained Adapted from [12-15 and 1].

When it is considered that the individual has the required skills, it can be uttered that self-sufficiency has a positive effect on performance. Working together as inter-related team units lies behind the nature of team sports. So, this includes individual and collective will to succeed among members. Accordingly, team members don't make judgment by their own skills and evaluate the team as a whole Adapted from [16, 17].

Many studies were conducted as directed to examining the relation of self-efficacy with performance in various areas (learning, ability to adapt to new technologies, effectiveness of education etc.) and the findings indicating that it plays a crucial role in

determining the performance in many areas were obtained. In various researches, there exist some findings proving that high self-efficacy belief has positive effect on individual performance [18].

Following these findings, it can be asserted that there is a positive relation between self-efficacy beliefs of the individuals and performance levels of team members. In other words, high performance can be expected from the individuals with high self-efficacy beliefs.

"According to many researchers, the strength of the group stems from the possessed efficacy perception. The perceptions of group members regarding the group's efficacy and their preferences they will make for the group determine to what extent they will make an effort for the group and how long they will stay with the group in case of failures. Therefore, the perceived efficacy level significantly affects the targets put by the group for itself, the expectation to reach these targets, level of motivation, to what extent success will be achieved in assumed tasks, causal imposition on success and failures and the reactions given in case of success and failures. The groups with high efficacy belief put higher targets for themselves and their motivation levels increase, accordingly and they display better performance" Adapted from [4, 19-25 and 18]. Some psychologists have indicated that collective efficacy has a positive effect on sport performance Adapted from [2, 26 and 27].

Collective efficacy includes the perceptions of individuals about the performance capacity of the group more than the total self-efficacy of individuals in the group [28]. It is highly important for individuals to believe that their team is successful at sufficient level. As the positive collective efficacy may also affect the behaviors of athletes [17].

In many studies which examine the relation between collective efficacy belief and performance, it is stated that collective efficacy belief increases the success expectations of members and accordingly their motivation levels, then it positively affects the group performance. However, there are also some studies-even in few numbers- indicating that there isn't a relation between collective efficacy belief and performance, or there may be some negative relation between the aforementioned two variables [29, 30].

Some Studies about Collective Efficacy and Performance: Kesthan *et al.* (2010) [27] presented the positive relation between collective efficacy and team performance in their studies and asserted that the teams with high efficacy

deliver much better performance in comparison to the teams with low level of collective efficacy. In general terms, our findings support the significant effect of coaching behavior and collective efficacy on the successful team performance [27].

Ramzaninezhad *et al.* (2009) [31] set forth the idea that the collective efficacy positively affects the team performance. Moreover, they uttered that higher level of collective efficacy is in question for athletes of successful teams in comparison to the athletes of less successful teams and for athletes of less successful teams in comparison to unsuccessful teams.

Myers *et al.* (2004) [23] studied the relation between collective efficacy and team performance during the American football seasons. The results they obtained indicated that there is a reverse relation between collective efficacy and offensive performance and they presented the importance of collective efficacy on team performance [32].

The importance of collective efficacy stems from its key role on athletic performance. The results acquired from various sports point out that collective efficacy belief is associated with the performance in such sports as baseball [33], basketball [34, 26], football [24], volleyball [31] and softball [35]. Furthermore a significant positive relation between self-efficacy and sport performance was determined in the meta analysis study carried out by Moritz *et al.* (2000) [36, 37].

As a result of the findings obtained, Safkan (2010) [17] stated that collective efficacy levels of athletes can be discussed as a predictor of team performance. Ronglan (2007) [38] manifested in his study conducted with handball teams that collective efficacy is related to the previous performance of the team, team's history of wins and losses and team's preparation for next matches adapted by: [17]. In a research carried out by Heuze *et al.* (2007) [39], it was stated that collective efficacy perceptions of elite teams mentioned in the research are higher than the non-elite teams.

In this study, the purpose is to manifest the level of collective efficacy belief and some factors affecting this level and its relation with performance has been evaluated.

Purpose, Scope and Method: This research was conducted with 224 athletes. Some questions about demographic and collective conscious levels were addressed to the participants with the purpose of determining the athletes' teams and relations in the team. In this context, a two-part questionnaire was applied to

the participants. In this first part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked about their personal information (sex, age, their positions in the team etc.) with nominal scale as descriptive variables. In the second part, 7 opinions regarding the collective conscious were directed to the team and their opinions were questioned with 5 likert scale. Such a high value at the rate of 0, 90 was obtained following the Cronbach's alpha analysis that was carried out in order to test the reliability of the scale.

Pearson correlation coefficient was preferred in order to determine the relations in the data obtained and Kruskal Wallis test was used in comparisons with three and more groups. Chi-Square tests were also used for independence research. Regression analyses were applied with the purpose of determining to what extent the variables affect each other. The aforementioned tests were analyzed in PASW Statistic 18 package program.

Data Acquisition: A total of 224 athletes-63 athletes from super league, 31 athletes from the 1st league, 27 athletes from the 2nd league and 103 athletes from promotion league-whose ages range between 11 and 50 participated in our research. Due to the fact that table tennis league competitions in Turkey are held in stages, on different dates and in different cities, the period of gaining the research data approximately took 6 months. Firstly, short information regarding the study was given to athlete and team coaches in the application phase of the scale and their consent was taken for the application. Questionnaires were applied in various competition stages with face-to-face meetings before or after the competition in 2012-2013 season.

Measurement Tool: "Collective Efficacy Scale" developed by Riggs, Warka, Babasa, Betancoyrt and Hooker (1994) [40] was used in our study with the purpose of determining the level of collective efficacy. Although the scale was developed for indoor environment, Riggs *et al.* stated while defining the scale that each scale item can be adapted for any environment (office, academic working groups etc.) that necessitates working together [40]. The scale whose original name is "Collective Efficacy Beliefs Scale" was adapted to Turkish by Öcel (2002) [1] and named as "Collective Efficacy Scale" and the items were changed for sport teams. The scale measures the individual's belief in capacity of the group of which s/he is a member. Öcel (2002) [1] calculated the internal consistency coefficient of the scale as .70 in his study. "Collective Efficacy Scale" used in the research is

composed of 7 items. Some of these scale items were reversely graded. The scale is a Likert type measurement tool with all its items as 5 graded.

RESULTS

Application and Analyses: Concerning the results of the reliability analysis, 7 items that were included in the analysis were found to be at high reliability level [41-43].

The majority of the participants are composed of the players in amateur league with 46%. Regarding the sex distribution, the rate of male participants is seen to be higher with 60%. The rate of participants under the age of 15 and the ones in 16-25 age range is the same with a rate of 43%. Average age of the participants is 18, average duration of being a registered athlete is 6.9 years, average number of athletes in the team is 6 and average period of playing in the same team is 3.6 years. 90% of the participants play in the main position of the team. The coach's sex of 92% is male.

As Can Be Seen in Table 4:

- 39% of the participants agree with the statement that the skills of my teammates are above the average.
- 42% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that this team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.
- 44% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that this team does not have the capacity to deliver adequate performance.
- 32% of the participants agree with the statement that my teammates have precise game skill.
- 40% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills.
- 40% of the participants disagree with the statement that my team is not good enough.
- 36% of the participants disagree with the statement that some players in the team do not play well.
- There is a positive relation between age group and the statement "The skills of my teammates are above the average". The older the age is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of my teammates are.
- There is a positive relation between being interested in sport as registered and the statement "The skills of my teammates are above the average". The higher

Table 1: Reliability analysis regarding the scale

Cronbach's Alpha	Item Number
0,902	7

Table 2: Descriptive statistics regarding demographic findings of the participants

	Variables	F	%
Group	Super league	63	28%
	1st League	31	14%
	2nd League	27	12%
	Amateur	103	46%
Sex	Female	90	40%
	Male	134	60%
Age Group	15 and below	96	43%
	16-25	96	43%
	26-35	24	11%
	36 and over	8	4%
For how many years are you actively (as registered) involved in sport	1-5 years	118	53%
	6-10 years	55	25%
	11-15 years	29	13%
	16-20 years	15	7%
	21 years and more	7	3%
-Group			
Total number of athletes in your team-Group	1-5 people	176	79%
	6-10 people	28	13%
	11 people and more	20	9%
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	1-5 people	178	79%
	6-10 people	40	18%
	11 people and more	6	3%
Your position in the team	Main	202	90%
	Substitute	22	10%
Sex of your coach	Female	17	8%
	Male	207	92%

the period of being registered athlete is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of my teammates is.

- There is a positive relation between the period of playing in the same team and the statement "The skills of my teammates are above the average". The higher the period of playing in the same team is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of my teammates are.
- There is a negative relation between the period of playing in the same team and the statement "This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport". The higher the period of playing in the same team is, the higher the belief in the team becomes.
- There is a negative relation between sex and the statement "My teammates have precise game skill "This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport". This thought is less in females.

Table 3: Distribution of the participants' opinions regarding collective efficacy scale

Items	Completely				Absolutely		Standard
	Disagree	Disagree	Hesitant	Agree	Agree	Average	
The skills of my teammates are above the average.	12%	13%	20%	39%	17%	3,357	1,234
This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.	42%	38%	8%	8%	3%	1,924	1,062
This team does not have the capacity to deliver adequate performance.	38%	44%	8%	4%	4%	1,924	1,024
My teammates have precise game skill.	9%	18%	25%	32%	16%	3,263	1,197
Some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills.	40%	32%	13%	9%	6%	2,080	1,188
My team is not good enough.	38%	40%	10%	7%	5%	2,004	1,102
Some players in the team do not play well.	25%	36%	15%	17%	8%	2,469	1,252

Table 4: Correlation analysis of demographic variables with collective efficacy scale

Group1	Group2	Pearson Correlation
Age group	The skills of my teammates are above the average.	0,1617
For how many years are you actively (as registered) involved in sport-Group	The skills of my teammates are above the average.	0,1457
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	The skills of my teammates are above the average.	0,1388
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.	-0,1754
Sex	My teammates have precise game skill.	-0,1319
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	My teammates have precise game skill.	0,1421
For how many years are you actively (as registered) involved in sport-Group	My team is not good enough.	0,1428
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	My team is not good enough.	-0,1790
For how many years have you been in this team-Group	Some players in the team do not play well.	-0,1438

Table 5: Comparison related to the sex variable and item 5 (crosstab table)

		Some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills					Total
Variable		Completely disagree	Disagree	Hesitant	Agree	Absolutely agree	
Sex	Female	38	31	8	12	1	90
	Male	52	41	21	8	12	134
Total	90	72	29	20	13	224	

Table 6: Chi-Square analysis related to the sex variable and item 5

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11,295	4	,023
Likelihood Ratio	12,697	4	,013
Linear-by-Linear Association	1,379	1	,240
N of Valid Cases	224		

Table 7: Comparison related to the age variable and item 6 (crosstab table)

		My team is not good enough					Total
Variable		Completely disagree	Disagree	Hesitant	Agree	Absolutely agree	
Age Group	15 and below	37	38	11	5	5	96
	16-25	38	42	10	2	4	96
	26-35	8	8	0	7	1	24
	36 and over	3	1	1	2	1	8
Total	86	89	22	16	11	224	

Table 8: Chi-Square analysis related to the age variable and item 6

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29,944	12	,003
Likelihood Ratio	25,374	12	,013
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,445	1	,118
N of Valid Cases	224		

Table 9: Comparison of the participants' team and the period of being in the team with other teams (Anova test)

	For how many years have you been in this team- Group	N	Rank Average
This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.			
	1-5 years	178	118,03
	6-10 years	40	86,38
	11 years and more	6	122,58
	Total	224	

Table 10: Comparison of the participants' team and the period of being in the team with other teams (Kruskall Wallis Test)

	This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.
Chi-square	9,131
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,010

Table 11: Comparison regarding the period of being in the team and game skills of participants' teammates (Anova test)

	For how many years have you been in this team-Group	N	Rank Average
My teammates have precise game skill.			
	1-5 years	178	106,98
	6-10 years	40	137,11
	11 years and more	6	112,08
	Total	224	

Table 12: Comparison regarding the period of being in the team and game skills of participants' teammates (Kruskall Wallis Test)

	My teammates have precise game skill.
Chi-square	7,499
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,024

Table 13: Comparison regarding the period of being in the team and the participants' own team (Anova test)

	For how many years have you been in this team-Group	N	Rank Average
My team is not good enough			
	1-5 years	178	117,65
	6-10 years	40	93,39
	11 years and more	6	87,25
	Total	224	

Table 14: Comparison regarding the period of being in the team and the participants' own team (Kruskall Wallis Test)

	My team is not good enough
Chi-square	6,269
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,044

Table 15: Summarized results of regression analysis regarding item 4

Model	R	R Squareb	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,895	,800	,798	1,56364

Table 16: Results of regression analysis regarding item 4

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Model My teammates have precise game skill.					
1 Age	,107	,008	,609	12,867	,000
Total number of athletes in your team	,028	,017	,071	1,714	,088
For how many years have you been in this team	,220	,036	,288	6,101	,000

Table 17: Summarized results of regression analysis regarding item 6

Model	R	R Squareb	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,839	,704	,700	1,25174

Table 18: Results of regression analysis regarding item 6

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Model My team is not good enough.					
1 Age	,089	,007	,769	13,356	,000
Total number of players in your team	,016	,013	,060	1,187	,237
For how many years have you been in this team	,020	,029	,041	,705	,482

- There is a positive relation between being interested in sport as registered and the statement "My team is not good enough". The higher the period of being registered athlete is, the higher the negative thought for the skills of the team is.
- There is a negative relation between the period of being in the team and the statement "My team is not good enough". The higher the period of being in the team is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of the team are.
- There is a negative relation between the period of being in the team and the statement "Some players in the team do not play well". The higher the period of being in the team is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of the team players becomes.

Hypothesis 1: Sex and the statement "Some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills" are independent of each other.

Asymp Sig value was calculated as $(0,023) < 0, 05$. H0 hypothesis should be rejected accordingly. Sex and the statement “Some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills” are not independent of each other.

Hypothesis 2: Age and the statement “My team is not good enough” are independent of each other.

Asymp Sig value was calculated as $(0,003) < 0,05$. H0 hypothesis should be rejected.

Accordingly. Age and “My team is not good enough” are not independent of each other.

Hypothesis 3: The period of being in the team is not an effective factor on the statement “This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport”.

Sig $(0,010)$ value was calculated as $< 0, 05$. H0 hypothesis should be rejected accordingly.

The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement “This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport”. The individuals being in the team for 11 years and more think that their team is weaker.

Hypothesis 4: The period of being in the team is not an effective factor on the statement “My teammates have precise game skill”.

Sig $(0,024)$ value was calculated as $< 0, 05$. H0 hypothesis should be rejected accordingly. The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement “My teammates have precise game skill”. The ones being in the team for 6-10 years think that their teammates have more precise game skill.

Hypothesis 5: The period of being in the team is not an effective factor on the statement “My team is not good enough”.

Sig $(0,044)$ value was calculated as $< 0, 05$. H0 hypothesis should be rejected accordingly.

The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement “My team is not good enough”. The ones being in the team for 1-5 years think that their team is not good enough.

Statistics of Regression Analysis: The variable of ‘my teammates have precise game skill’, age, total number of players in the team and periods of being in the team were put to regression analysis. According to this, the results of the analysis are below:

As Can Be Seen in Table 16:

- The rate of the used independent variables to explain the dependent variable is found as 80%.
- One unit of change in age has an effect of 0.107 unit on precise game skill.
- One unit of change in total number of athletes in the team makes 0.028 unit contribution to the precise game skill.
- One unit of change in the period of being in the team makes 0.220 unit contribution to the precise game skill.

As Can Be Seen in Table 18:

- The rate of the used independent variables to explain the dependent variable is found as 70.4%.
- One unit of change in age has an effect of 0.107 unit on team efficacy.
- One unit of change in total number of athletes in the team makes 0.013 unit contribution to the team efficacy.
- One unit of change in the period of being in the team makes 0.029 unit contribution to the team efficacy.

CONCLUSION

Regarding the demographic profiles of the participants; they are amateur league players, male, in 15-25 age range, registered athlete for nearly 6.9 years, playing in the main position for 3.6 years in the same team.

- 39% of the participants have stated to agree with the statement that the skills of my teammates are above the average.
- 42% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that this team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport.
- 44% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that this team does not have the capacity to deliver adequate performance.
- 32% of the participants agree with the statement that my teammates have precise game skill.
- 40% of the participants completely disagree with the statement that some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills.
- 40% of the participants disagree with the statement that my team is not good enough.

- 36% of the participants disagree with the statement that some players in the team do not play well.
- The older the age is, the higher the positive thought for the skill of my teammates is.
- The higher the period of being a registered athlete is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of my teammates is.
- The higher the period of playing in the same team is, the higher the positive thought for the skill of my teammates is.
- The higher the period of playing in the same team is, the higher the belief in the team becomes.
- The women's belief in the skills of their teammates decreases in comparison to men.
- The higher the period of being registered athlete is, the higher the negative thought for the skills of the team is.
- The higher the period of being in the team is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of the team is.
- The higher the period of being in the team is, the higher the positive thought for the skills of the team players becomes.
- Sex and the statement "Some of my teammates should be excluded from the team due to their insufficiency in game skills" are not independent of each other.
- Age and the statement "My team is not good enough" are not independent of each other.
- The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement "This team is weaker than the other teams in the same sport". The ones being in the team for 11 years and more think that their team is weaker.
- The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement "My teammates have precise game skill". The ones being in the team for 6-10 years think that their teammates have more precise game skill.
- The period of being in the team is an effective factor on the statement "My team is not good enough". The ones being in the team for 1-5 years think that their team is not good enough.
- One unit of change in the period of being in the team makes 0.220 unit contribution to the precise game skill.
- One unit of change in age has an effect of 0.007 unit on team efficacy.
- One unit of change in total number of athletes in the team makes 0.013 unit contribution to the team efficacy.
- One unit of change in the period of being in the team makes 0.029 unit contribution to the team efficacy.

REFERENCES

1. Öcel, H., 2002. Relations Between Collective Efficacy, Self-Efficacy, Cohesiveness and Success Perceptions and Expectations in Team Players, Post Graduate Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.
2. Hodges, L. and A.V. Carron, 1992. Collective Efficacy and Group Performance. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 23: 48-59.
3. Bandura, A., 1993. Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2): 117-148.
4. Bandura, A., 1997. Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
5. Kurt, T., 2012. Self-Efficacy and Collective Efficacy Perceptions of Teachers, *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 10(2): 195-227.
6. Goddard, R.G., W.K. Hoy and A. Woolfolk Hoy, 2004. Collective Efficacy: Theoretical Development, Empirical Evidence and Future Directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3): 3-13.
7. Fernandez-Ballesteros, R., J. Diez-Nicolas, G.V. Carpara., C. Barbanelli and A. Bandura, 2002. Determinants and Structural Relation of Personal Efficacy to Collective Efficacy. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(1): 107-125.
8. Goddard, R.D., W.K. Hoy and A. Woolfolk-Hoy, 2000. Collective Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning, Measure and Impact on Student Achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 37(2): 479-507.
9. Zaccaro, S., V. Blair, C. Peterson and M. Zazanis, 1995. Collective Efficacy. In J. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-Efficacy, Adaptation and Adjustment*, pg. 305-328, New York: Plenum.

According to the Results of Regression Analysis:

- One unit of change in age has an effect of 0.107 unit on precise game skill.
- One unit of change in total number of athletes in the team makes 0.028 unit contribution to the precise game skill.

10. Kocaekşi, S., 2005. Determining The Relation between Group Cohesiveness in Successful and Unsuccessful Handball Teams and Affecting Variables and Success, Post Graduate Thesis, Hacettepe University, Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara, pp: 39.
11. Wood, R. and A. Bandura, 1989. Social Cognitive Theory of Organizational Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 361-384.
12. Cervone, D. and P.K. Peake, 1986. Anchoring, Efficacy and Action: The Influence of Judgmental Heuristics on Self Efficacy Judgments and Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50: 492-501.
13. Judge, T.A., C.L. Jackson, J.C. Shaw, B.A. Scott and B.L. Rich, 2007. Self Efficacy and Work Related Performance: The Integral Role of Individual Differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 107-127.
14. Pinder, C.C., 1998. *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Hall, Inc.
15. Weinberg, R., 1985. Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Cognitive Strategies in Enhancing Endurance Performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 17: 280-292.
16. Chow, G.M. and D.L. Feltz, 2008. Exploring The Relationships Between Collective Efficacy, Perceptions of Success and Team Attributions. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26(11): 1179-1189.
17. Safkan, Ü., 2010. Collective Efficacy in Elite and Nonelite Teams, Post Graduate Thesis, Mersin University, Institute of Health Sciences, pp: 8.
18. Öcal, H. and O. Aydın, 2009. Relations Between Collective Efficacy, Self-Efficacy, Cohesiveness Perceptions and Success Perceptions and Expectations in Sport Teams, *Faculty of Letters Journal*, 26(2): 157-158.
19. Bray, S.R., 2004. Collective Efficacy, Group Goals and Group Performance of a Muscular Endurance Task. *Small Group Research*, 35: 230-238.
20. Gibson, C.B., 1999. Do They Do What They Believe They Can? Group Efficacy and Group Effectiveness Across Tasks and Cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 138-152.
21. Gibson, C.B., A.E. Randel and P.C. Early, 2000. Understanding Group Efficacy. *Group and Organization Management*, 25: 67-98.
22. Guzzo, A.R., R.P. Yost, J.R. Campbell and P.G. Shea, 1993. Potency in Groups: Articulating a Construct. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32: 87-106.
23. Myers, N.D., D.L. Feltz and S.E. Short, 2004. Collective Efficacy and Team Performance a Longitudinal Study of Collegiate Football Teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 8: 126-138.
24. Myers, N.D., C.A. Payment and D.L. Feltz, 2004. Reciprocal Relationships Between Collective Efficacy and Team Performance in Women's Ice Hockey. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 8: 182-195.
25. Shea, G.P. and R.A. Guzzo, 1987. Group Effectiveness: What Really Matters? *Management Review*, 28: 25-31.
26. Watson, C.B., M.M. Chemers and N. Preiser, 2001. Collective Efficacy: A Multilevel Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27: 1057-1068.
27. Kesthan, M.H., R. Ramzaninezhad, S.S. Kordshooli and P.M. Panahi, 2010. The Relationship Between Collective Efficacy and Coaching Behaviors in Professional Volleyball League of Iran Clubs, *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 3(1): 01-06.
28. Carron, A.V., W.N. Widmeyer and L.R. Brawley, 1985. The Development of an Instrument to Assess Cohesion in Sport Teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7: 1-17.
29. Lindsley, D.H., D.J. Brass and J.B. Thomas, 1995. Efficacy-Performance Spirals: A Multilevel Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 645-678.
30. Marks, M.A., 1999. A Test of The Impact of Collective Efficacy in Routine and Novel Performance Environments. *Human Performance*, 12: 295-310.
31. Ramzaninezhad, R., M. Hoseini, M. Dadban and S. Shafiee, 2009. The Relationship Between Collective Efficacy, Group Cohesion and Team Performance in Professional Volleyball Teams, *Brazilian Journal of Biomotricity*, 3(1): 31-39.
32. Shearer, D., S. Mellalieu, C. Shearer and G.R. Davies, 2009. The Effects of A Video-Aided Imagery Intervention upon Collective Efficacy in an International Paralympic Wheelchair Basketball Team, *Journal of Imagery Research in Sport and Physical Activity*, 4: 1.

33. George, T.R., 1994. Self-Confidence and Baseball Performance: A Causal Examination of Self-Efficacy Theory, *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16: 381-399.
34. Chase, M.A., M.E. Ewing, C.D. Lirgg and T.R. George, 1994. The Effects Of Equipment Modification On Children's Self-Efficacy And Basketball Shooting Performance. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 65(2): 159-168.
35. Hepler, T.J. and M.A. Chase, 2008. Relationship Between Decision-Making Self-Efficacy, Task Self-Efficacy and The Performance of A Sport Skill, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, Volume 26, Issue 6, April 2008, pp: 603-610.
36. Moritz, S.E., D.L. Feltz, K.R. Fahrback and D.E. Mack, 2000. The Relation of Self-Efficacy Measures to Sport Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 71(3): 280-294.
37. Sabbaghian Rad, L. and S. Gharehgozli, 2013. Collective Efficacy Based on the Coaching Efficacy in Female Profesional Basketball Teams, *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(2): 469-475.
38. Ronglan, L.T., 2007. *Sport Psychologist*, 21(1): 78-93.
39. Heuze, J.P., G. Bosselut and J.P. Thomas, 2007. *Sport Psychologis*, 21(4): 383-399.
40. Riggs, M.L., J. Warka, B. Babasa, R. Betancourt and S. Hooker, 1994. Development and Validationaf Self Efficacy and Outcome Expectancy Scale for Job-Related Applications. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 54: 793-802.
41. Abou-Deif, M.H., M.A. Rashed, M.A.A. Sallam, E.A.H. Mostafa and W.A. Ramadan, 2013. Characterization of Twenty Wheat Varieties by ISSR Markers, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 168-175.
42. Kabiru Jinjiri Ringim, 2013. Understanding of Account Holder in Conventional Bank Toward Islamic Banking Products, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 176-183.
43. Muhammad Azam, Sallahuddin Hassan and Khairuzzaman, 2013. Corruption, Workers Remittances, Fdi and Economic Growth in Five South and South East Asian Countries: A Panel Data Approach *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 184-190.