

**Provided for non-commercial research and education use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.**



The Journal of Medical Entomology and Parasitology is one of the series issued quarterly by the Egyptian Academic Journal of Biological Sciences. It is an important specialist journal covering the latest advances in that subject.

It publishes original research and review papers on all aspects of basic and applied medical entomology, parasitology and host-parasite relationships, including the latest discoveries in parasite biochemistry, molecular biology, genetics, ecology and epidemiology in the content of the biological, medical entomology and veterinary sciences.

In addition to that, the journal promotes research on the impact of living organisms on their environment with emphasis on subjects such a resource, depletion, pollution, biodiversity, ecosystem.....etc.

www.eajbs.eg.net



The Effect of Disclosure Method on Coherence and Collective Efficacy of Basketball Player Girls.

Fereshteh Safaei¹, Afsaneh Sanatkaran^{2*}, Jaleh bagherly²

¹Department of Sport Psychology, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Alborz, Iran;

^{2*}Department of Physical Education and Sport sciences, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Alborz, Iran;

E-mail: Sanatkaran@kiau.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received:12/8/2018

Accepted:26/10/2018

Key words:

self-disclosure,
coherence,
collective efficacy,
Basketball.

ABSTRACT

The present study's aim was investigating the effect of disclosure method on coherence and collective efficacy of basketball player girls. For this purpose, 12 members of Gilan teenager player team in the age range of 14 to 18 were investigated this research is a semi-experimental type and is performed using a pre-test posttest plan. The researcher, after coordinated action with the intended team, initially held a meeting with the coach and the team caption. This meeting was held for better justification of the research purpose and being familiar with psychological team needs and its current situation. The player, according to a predetermined plan passed group sessions, these sessions with the coach presence. After the meeting, the results were recorded by players using Martins collective efficacy and group environment questionnaire (GEQ). The results showed coherence promotion among players specially after the coach presence in the group meeting. And also the results of collective efficacy questionnaire showed preparation or readiness subscale promotion in between players.

INTRODUCTION

The psychological interventions are described as the most important activities of practical sports psychologists because they looking for performing psychological methods to promote the athletes psychological functions and performance. Such as imagination, individual and group consultation, self-talk, visual and motion review, gradual meditation and calming. Therefore it ends to improve their performance to gain considerable positions in competitive fields. The psychological interventions are important in sports and is important in basketball psychology (Hadipoor et al, 2007). And also teamwork, coach-player interaction, group dynamics has an important role in team and group dynamics. Group members should have interaction, move forward common goals. Adopt with the environment needs and unify personal needs with other team members (Carron, Eys & Burke, 2007). Coherence is a dynamic process that is reflected in the group willing for solidarity and unity in following instrumental goals or member's emotional needs satisfaction. This description insists that solidarity and coherence are multi-dimensional.

Task coherence refers to the group member's cooperation together to achieve common small and macro goals, while social coherence reflects interpersonal attraction between group members (Weinberg, Robert Stephen, 2011). Coherence is assumed multi-dimensional, because many factors cause team coherence. Coherence is dynamic because it changes during time. Over time teams coherence promotes or degrades. All teams have motivation or reason for formation, this is the reason it is said coherence has instrumental dimension. The last dimension of coherence that was declared by Carron et al: (1998) is the emotional essence, because in one group several positive emotion may be created such as enjoyment and satisfaction feeling (Cotteril, 2012), and also you should remember that in group sports, the individuals have mutual action and success will be approached when teammates cooperate harmonically. Collective efficacy is described as common beliefs of a group, their total abilities for organizing and needed actions to access a certain level of achievements. This description expresses a characteristic in a group level related to the team's abilities and not total personal self-efficacies related to the group members. Collective efficacy is rooted in self-efficacy, it means that teammates when judging about their collective abilities concern their teammate's beliefs (Bandora, 1997). Self-efficacy implies beliefs about how the individuals can organize their mental and psychological abilities to perform a task collective efficacy is reflective of a group members beliefs about that groups abilities to synchronize and their collective resources, and also collective efficacy has a dominant role in sports who need a high level of interaction dependency and coordination to perform tasks. The sports such as Basketball, Football, Handball, Volleyball, Rugby, Hockey needs a high level of interaction and dependency between members, that try to coordinate group tasks. These tasks are essential for group aims and favorable results

(Afshari, 2015). Disclosure in it's simpler from refers to the methods that people let disclosure its details. It means to share our information with the others. Disclosure is one of the communicational approaches. The importance of disclosure is in this point that it can help self-knowledge. As David Johnson declares, (by disclosure and exposing myself to you, I provide you trust, attention, growth, obligation, self-knowledge), when we talk about ourselves, about our feelings and perceptions we get, better self-knowledge and get more awareness about ourselves and our sentiments. "Self-esteem" or "self-disclosure ends to" "self-excitement" in the case other people reflect a feed back of our behaviors we will be aware of the problems we may face, and will find out our mistakes. It's obvious the others cannot reflect us a right and favorable feedback unless we change to be "self-esteem" or "self-disclosure" (Ali Akbar Farhang, 1997). Self-disclosure is a sensible and important category and covers many negative and positive dimensions. Investigating the athlete's personal values is a way to know them better. The values are the main behavior determinatives (Weinberg, Robert Stephen, 2001). In a private disclosure approach, it's showed that it's effective in enhancing empathy, improving social cohesion, facilities communication (Cottrile Stewart, 2012). One of the reasons for success in sports performance is existing coherence. Coaches, players and sports experts remind group coherence and coordination as main factors of success (Lions, 2005). This issue has great importance in group sports. The relationship between team members for total success of that team has great importance. The history showed that successful teams are those that acted as a group (Cottrile, Stewart, 2012). Holding team meetings with the goal of disclosure helps in this relation. Team coaches should hold team meetings during the season, until the positive and negative emotions, truly, freely and in a constructive manner are expressed. If one team has a way

for actualized validation of his experiences can solve his conflicts, and thinks about clever measures. Teammates can talk about learning from their mistakes, redefine their goals, and continuity of their worthy behaviors. Considering that group efficacy has a strong and coherent relation traditional team building intervention that was utilized for coherence promotion should have some usage for group efficacy. The samples such as intervention in disclosure and mutual sharing practice. These interventions promote the team's dynamics (Cottrile, Stewart, 2012). If there isn't a specific problem at the team and the only aim is promoting coherence then the group disclosure technique is appropriate here (Yokelson, 1997). Psychological interventions have great importance in sports fields, and has importance is Basketball psychology too, because minor differences in players performance refer to specific psychological needs. Some researchers believe that psychological interventions should be distributed in Basketball psychological backgrounds (Hadipoor et al, 2007). Different sports fields need different extents of interactions and interdependencies between players for achievement. Generally, sports is divided in two groups of conceptions: Interactional and interactive sports, the sports that need less interaction between the team members, to achieve success. And sports that need more cooperation, for example, Basketball and Rugby need more task coherence, sports that have less dependency need less task coherence for success. As a result of dependency enhancement, more work and task coherence will be needed. So as much as the players rely on each other for achievement, more performance and task coherence will be needed. And significant factors. In this research, we are going to investigate the effects of disclosure method on collective coherence and efficacy in Basketball girls' team. So considering the importance of team sports, specially Basketball, that we are witness of its growth nationally, and considering that this sport has

many enthusiasts and it has appropriate potential to growth and promotion and also about collective coherence and efficacy there are researches and studies that are not widespread and also this research may be an important achievement to sport psychologists and coaches that can use it for their players performance progress. One of the other things that shows the importance of this research is creating more interest in group currents in sports and training psychology among trainer, researchers and athletes. Given that Basketball is a group sports field, we are searching that whether disclosure can affect collective coherence and efficacy of group member? It was a question for the researcher if disclosure effects on coherence and collective efficacy among girls Basketball team?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research is the semi-experiment type and is done by pre-test, after-test plan. And as much as the interaction is higher, coaches should have more attention to the team task coherence (Cottrile, Stewart, 2012), and also collective efficacy plays a dominant role in sports need a high level of interaction, dependency and coordination to perform duties. The sports such as Basketball, football, Handball, Volleyball, Rugby and Hockey needs a high level of interaction and dependency between members that try to coordinate group tasks. These tasks are essential to attain group tasks and favorable results (Bahrami, 2014). Qualitative researches between sports teams from one session of disclosure intervention team members (Holt & Dunn). Since sports interventions and physical activities make small groups moving toward change and movement, and coherence is introduced as an essential feature a group may not be successful without it (Levin, 1939). And in relation to collective efficacy, 25 years ago in the initial of this concept (Bendora, 1928). Sports psychology took a long distance toward collective efficacy expansion and understanding however there are many subjects related to collective efficacy that are not enough investigated. The researcher

considering group interventions and disclosure importance tried to investigate in this relation. Given the above point and significance of coherence and collective efficacy among sports teams, it's essential to investigate the effective factors to make necessary decisions to reduce the negative effects and investigate increasing the effectiveness of positive the statistical society is consisted of Basketball girl's teen's team of Gilan. The age range was 15- 18. The researcher, to choose appropriate samples, selected 12 members of a club team available. Initially, for data collection, a registration note sheet was used to receive the player's personal information. This questionnaire consisted of name, surname, age, education and sport history. And also GEQ (Group Environment Questionnaire) is prepared by Crown et al (1985). This questionnaire consists of two main social and task attitudes, and each of these attitudes consist of two group and individual attitudes. So the questionnaire consist of four subscales of coherence. Mentioned questionnaire consist of 18 items, each coherence is measure by several questions. Answer sheets are arranged based on Likert 9- value scale and to evaluate collective efficacy in Martinez et al exercise is used for collective efficacy that was validated by Bahrami et al, in 2014. This questionnaire consists 20 questions that measures 4 questions related to effort, 4 questions of

ability, 4 questions about readiness, 4 questions of perseverance and 4 questions about the alliance. Each question is scored based on 11 scored Likert scale from 0 (disagree) to 10 (completely agreed). This questionnaire I was normalized by Bahrami & Khajavi (2013) and after omitting 2 problematic questions, the second measurement model with 18 questions consisted (effort: 8, 10, 15, ability = 1, 5, 13, 14, readiness: 4,12,16,17, Alliance: 2, 6, 18. Perseverance: 3, 7, 9, 11) from fitness index, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient and intra-group correction that were acceptable. And it implies favorable reliability and validity of justified Persian version of collective efficacy scale in sports. In 2013, this questionnaire was normalized by Kavooosi et al. and its validity and credit were reported favorable (Kavooosi et al, 2013). For gathering the date, 12 individuals were selected, from Gilan teen's team to attend in this study. Before starting the intervention a justification meeting by the presence of the coach, the team's leader (Captain) in a certain data in the exercise place was held. This meeting was held by the aim of more coach and captain familiarity with the intervention process, session's number and the benefits of the works, and also the researcher was more familiar with the team's mental conditions, needs and competitive conditions

RESULTS

Table (1) the description of this intervention

1st session	Initially, pre-exam was performed. Then for the following session, the description of benefits and regulations of the intervention for participants and their preparation for self-disclosure and performing some tasks at home were specified.
2st session	Doing the first session of self-disclosure and sharing with other members.
3st session	This session, in the name of mid-session, was developed as a session for following the second session and also for more readiness and more coordination for the 4th session.
4st session	The last session of self-disclosure and sharing it with other members.
5st session	Follow up session. In this session, using a questionnaire, we tried to investigate the last session's effects more accurate.
6st session	Self-disclosure by the presence of the coach
7st session	Self-disclosure session by presence of the coach, and finally the after-test was performed.

Description of research sample, quantitative analysis using questionnaire data and using SPSS software was performed. For the research data analysis we used descriptive and inferential statistics. In descriptive part indicator such as: average, standard deviation, tables and charts were used to describe data. Inferential statistic part

Kolmogorov Smirnov test, analysis and Variance, and Bonferroni's follow- up test was used.

Findings:

Table 2- show age and sport history of participants, in the research, using the minimum, the maximum value, average and standard deviation.

Table 2. Description of age and sports history of participants

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard deviation
Age	15	18	2/16	1
Sports history	4	8	9/5	4/1

There isn't a significant difference between basketball player girl's coherence in basic condition, disclosure. Follow-up disclosure and disclosure. By the girls coach

presence ($F_{(3, 33)} = 9/11, p= 000/0$). So the Zero hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, Bonferroni follow-up test was used to specify the differences resource.

Table 3- The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for group coherence

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	006/36	3	002/12	90/11	000/0	52/0
Error	2/33	33	008/1			

The results of Bonferroni follow-up showed that:

- Between Bonferroni player girl's group coherence mean (average), in basic condition, ($M= 39/5, SD= 01/1$) and disclosure ($M= 75/5, SD = 2/1$), there isn't a significant difference ($p= 000/1$).
- Between coherence of Basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M= 39/5, SD= 01/1$) and follow-up disclosure ($M= 31/7, SD = 2/1$) there is a significant difference ($p= 003/0$). In other word self-disclosure in following-up ends to a significant increase of group coherence in between Basketball player girls.
- Between the mean group coherence of Basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M= 39/5, SD= 01/1$) and disclosure by the coach presence in comparison to the situation self-disclosure ended to a significant increase in group coherence of basketball player girls.
- Between the mean group coherence of Basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M= 75/5, SD= 2/1$) and disclosure follow-

up ($M= 31/7, SD= 2/1$) there isn't a significant difference ($p=083/0$).

- Between the mean group coherence of Basketball player girls, in self-disclosure situation and disclosure by the presence of girls coach, there is a significant difference ($p= 009/0$). In other words disclosure with the presence of a coach, in comparison to the situation with only self-disclosure caused a significant increase of Basketball player girl's group coherence.
- Between the mean group coherence of Basketball player girls, in follow-up disclosure ($M= 31/7, SD= 2/1$) and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence ($M= 26/7, SD= 58/0$), there isn't a significant difference ($p= 00/1$).
- Between individual tendency to the social group of Basketball player girls, in the basic situation, disclosure, follow-up disclosure, and self-disclosure with the coach presence. There isn't a significant difference.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis admitted ($p> 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in table 4 showed that there is a

significant difference between the averages of the tendency to girl basketball players. The social group, in the basic situation, self-disclosure, self-disclosure follow-up and disclosure with girls coach presence ($F_{(3, 33)} =$

63/5, $P = 003/0$). So zero hypothesis is rejected. So to determine the differences resource, Bonferroni's follow-up test was used.

Table 4. The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for the personal tendency to social-group

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	47/23	3	82/7	63/5	003/0	33/0
Error	7/45	33	38/1			

- There isn't a significant difference between the average and mean a personal tendency to the social group of basketball player girls in basic conditions ($M = 80/6$, $SD = 26/0$) and self-disclosure ($M = 65/6$, $SD = 51/0$) ($P = 000/1$).
- Between personal tendency to basketball player girls social-group in basic condition ($M = 80/6$, $SD = 26/0$) and self-disclosure follow-up ($M = 98/7$, $SD = 22/0$) there is a significant difference ($P = 01/0$). In other words, self-disclosure in follow-up caused a significant increase in the personal tendency to the social group of basketball player girls.
- Between the average personal tendency to social group of basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M = 80/6$, $SD = 26/0$), and self-disclosure with the presence of girls coach ($M = 23/8$, $SD = 18/0$), there is a significant difference ($P = 019/0$), in other words, self-disclosure with the coach presence, in comparison to the situation without disclosure, cause a significant increase of personal tendency to the social group of basketball player girls.
- Between the mean personal tendency to the social group of girls basketball players, in self-disclosure condition ($M = 65/6$, $SD = 51/0$) and self-disclosure follow-up between

girls ($M = 98/7$, $SD = 22/0$), there isn't a significant difference ($P = 113/0$).

- Between the average of the personal tendency to the social-group of basketball player girls, in disclosure follow-up situation ($M = 98/7$, $SD = 22/0$) and disclosure by the coach presence ($M = 23/8$, $SD = 18/0$), There isn't a significant difference ($p = 00/1$).

Between personal tendency to the basketball player girl's group-task, in the basic situation, disclosure, follow-up disclosure and disclosure, by the coach presence, there isn't a significant difference.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is not admitted ($P < 05/0$). So for Kroit correction, Green House Gizer was used. The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis by correction of Green House Gizer, in table 5, showed that there is a significant difference between personal tendency average to the group-task basketball-player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, and, follow-up disclosure, with the coach presence ($F_{(8/1, 6/20)} = 88/6$, $P = 006/0$). Therefore zero hypotheses is rejected, so Bonferroni follow-up test was used to determine the differences source.

Table (5): The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for the personal tendency to group-task

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	44/29	8/1	6/15	88/6	006/0	38/0
Error	04/47	6/20	27/2			

The results of Bonferroni follow-up test showed that:

- There isn't a significant difference between the average of the personal tendency to the basketball player girls group-task, in basic situation (M= 77/5, SD= 30/0), self-disclosure (M= 70/5, SD= 35/0).
- There isn't a significant difference between personal tendency to group-task of basketball player girls, in basic condition (M= 77/5, SD= 30/0), self-disclosure follow-up (M= 43/7, SD= 43/0). (P= 037/0). In other words self-disclosure in follow-up causes a significant increase of personal tendency to group-task basketball player girls.
- Between the average of personal tendency to group-task basketball player girls, in basic condition (M= 77/5, SD= 30/0) and self-disclosure with the coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 22/0), there is a significant difference (P= 031/0). In other word, self-disclosure in coach presence, in comparison to the situation without disclosure, causes a significant increase in personal tendency to the basketball player girl's group0 task.
- Between the average of the personal tendency to the basketball player girls group-task in self-disclosure situation (M= 70/5, SD= 35/0) and disclosure follow-up (M= 43/7, SD= 43/0) there isn't a significant difference (P= 143/0).
- Between the average of the personal

tendency to the basketball player girls group- task, in self-disclosure condition (M= 70/5, SD= 33/0), and self-disclosure with the girl's coach presence (M= 14/7, SD=22/0), there is a significant difference (P= 001/0). In other words, self-disclosure in presence of the coach in comparison to the condition of self-disclosure caused a significant increase in personal tendency to the task group of basketball player girls.

- Between the average personal tendency to the task group in follow-up condition of disclosure (M= 43/7, SD= 43/0), and self-disclosure with the girl's coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 220/), there isn't a significant difference (P= 00/1).
- Between-group task integration of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, disclosure follow-up and self-disclosure with the coach presence, there isn't a significant difference.

The results of the local test showed that Korits hypothesis remains (P=>05/0). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in table 6 showed that between the average of group integration task of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, self-disclosure follow-up, and disclosure with the girl's coach presence, there is a significant difference (F (3, 33)= 5/15, p= 000/0). Therefore the zero hypothesis is rejected. So to specify the differences resources, Bonferroni follow-up test was used.

Table6: The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis to integrate the group-task

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	4/67	3	4/22	5/15	000/0	58/0
Error	7/47	33	44/1			

The results of Bonferroni's follow-up test showed that:

- There isn't a significant difference between the average group integration task of basketball player girls, in basic condition (M= 08/4, SD= 41/0) and self-disclosure (M= 26/5, SD= 34/0).
- There is a significant difference between the average group integration of basketball

player girl's task, in basic condition (M= 08/4, SD= 41/0), and self-disclosure follow-up (M=73/6, SD=47/0). (P= 002/0). In other word self-disclosure in follow-up ended to a significant increase of task's group integration between basketball player girls.

- Between-group integration of basketball player girls task, in basic condition (M= 08/4, SD= 41/0) and self-disclosure with the

girls coach presence ($M= 03/7$, $SD= 24/0$), there is a significant difference. ($P= 000/0$). In other word self-disclosure with the coach presence, in comparison with the condition without disclosure, ends to a significant increase of group integration of basketball girl's task.

- Between the average of group integration of basketball player girls task in disclosure condition ($M= 26/5$, $SD= 34/0$) and self-disclosure follow-up ($M= 73/6$, $SD= 47/0$), there is a significant difference. ($P= 162/0$).
- Between the average of group integration of basketball player girls task in self-disclosure condition ($M= 26/5$, $SD= 34/0$) and disclosure with girl's coach presence ($M= 03/7$, $SD= 24/0$), there is a significant difference. ($P= 013/0$). In other word self-disclosure in presence of the coach, in comparison with disclosure condition increasing significant group task integration between girls' basketball player.
- Between the average group task integration of basketball player girls in

follow-up disclosure condition ($M= 73/6$, $SD= 47/0$) and self-disclosure by the girls coach presence, there isn't a significant difference. ($P= 00/1$).

There isn't a significant difference between group basketball player girls social-group integration in basic condition, self-disclosure, follow-up self-disclosure and disclosure with the coach presence.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is fixed ($P> 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in table 7 showed that between social-group average integration of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, follow-up disclosure and disclosure with the girls coach presence, there is a significant difference ($F_{(3, 33)}= 31/7$, $P= 001/0$). Therefore zero hypothesis is rejected. So to determine the resource differences, Bonferroni follow-up test was used.

Table (7). Table of frequency measurement Variance analysis for social-group integration

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	4/36	3	1/12	31/7	001/0	39/0
Error	8/54	33	66/1			

The results of Bonferroni follow-up test showed that:

There isn't a significant difference between the averages of social- group integration of basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M= 89/4$, $SD= 42/0$) and girls self-disclosure ($M= 29/5$, $SD= 44/0$). ($P= 00/1$).

- between the averages of social- group integration of basketball player girls in basic condition ($M= 89/4$, $SD= 42/0$) and girls self-disclosure follow-up ($M= 06/7$, $SD= 38/0$), there is a significant difference ($P= 019/0$). In other word self-disclosure in following-up caused a significant increase in social- group integration of girls basketball players.

- Between the averages of social- group integration of basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M= 89/4$, $SD= 42/0$) and

self-disclosure with the girls coach presence, there isn't a significant difference.

- There isn't a significant difference between social- group integration of basketball player girls, in self-disclosure condition ($M= 29/5$, $SD= 44/0$) and disclosure follow-up ($M= 06/7$, $SD= 38/0$). ($P= 065/0$)

- There isn't a significant difference between the averages of basketball player girls, in self-disclosure condition ($M= 29/5$, $SD= 44/0$) and self-disclosure by the coach presence ($M= 45/6$, $SD= 29/0$).

- There isn't a significant difference between social- group integration of basketball player girls in follow-up disclosure condition ($M= 06/7$, $SD= 38/0$) and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence ($M= 45/6$, $SD= 29/0$). ($P= 883/0$).

There isn't a significant difference between the collective efficacy of group basketball player girls in basic condition, self-disclosure follow-up self-disclosure and self-disclosure with the presence of the coach.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is accepted ($P > 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in Table (8) showed that, there isn't

a significant difference between the average collective efficacy of basketball player girls, in basic condition ($M = 62/5$, $SD = 54/0$), Self-disclosure ($M = 69/5$, $SD = 47/0$), self-disclosure follow-up ($M = 88/5$, $SD = 37/0$) and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence, there isn't a significant difference ($F_{(3, 33)} = 22/2$, $P = 104/0$). So zero hypothesis is confirmed.

Table (8): The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for collective efficacy

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	5/17	3	84/5	22/22	104/0	16/0
Error	7/86	33	62/2			

There isn't a significant difference between group effort of basketball player girls in basic condition, self-disclosure follow-up self-disclosure and disclosure with the coach presence. The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is fixed ($P > 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in Table (9)

showed that between the average of basketball player girls effort, in basic condition ($M = 94/5$, $SD = 7/2$), Self-disclosure ($M = 97/5$, $SD = 8/01$), self-disclosure follow-up ($M = 30/6$, $SD = 8/1$) and disclosure by the girls coach presence, there isn't a significant difference ($F_{(3, 33)} = 457/0$, $P = 714/0$). So the zero hypothesis is admitted

Table (9): The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for effort

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	09/5	3	69/1	457/0	714/0	04/0
Error	3/122	33	7/3			

There isn't a significant difference between group effort of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, and disclosure follow-up and self-disclosure with the coach presence. The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is fixed ($P > 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in Table (10) showed that there isn't a significant

difference between the average of basketball player girls ability, in basic condition ($M = 7$, $SD = 1/2$), Self-disclosure ($M = 31/6$, $SD = 9/1$), self-disclosure ($M = 31/6$, $SD = 9/1$), self-disclosure follow-up ($M = 66/5$, $SD = 1/1$), and self-disclosure with the coach presence ($M = 5/7$, $SD = 07/1$), there isn't a significant difference ($F_{(3, 33)} = 44/2$, $P = 081/0$). So the zero hypothesis is admitted.

Table (10): The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for the ability

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	5/23	3	8/7	44/2	081/0	18/0
Error	5/105	33	1/3			

Between-group basketball player girl's readiness in basic confidence, self-disclosure, self-disclosure follow-up and self-disclosure with the coach presence there is a significant difference.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is fixed ($P > 05/0$). The

results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in Table (11) showed that there isn't a significant difference between the average of basketball player girls readiness in basic condition, Self-disclosure, disclosure follow-up and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence, ($F_{(3, 33)} = 65/3$, $P = 022/0$). So the

zero hypothesis is admitted. Therefore to determine the different resource Benferroni follow-up test was used.

Table (11): The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for readiness

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	5/26	3	84/8	65/3	022/0	25/0
Error	7/79	33	41/2			

The result of Bonferroni follow-up test showed that:

- There isn't a significant difference between the average of basketball player girls readiness, in basic condition (M= 16/5, SD= 63/0) and Self-disclosure (M= 62/5, SD= 46/0). (P= 00/1).
- There isn't a significant difference between the average of basketball player girls readiness, in basic condition (M= 16/5, SD= 63/0) and Self-disclosure (M= 62/5, SD= 46/0). (P= 00/1).
- There isn't a significant difference between basketball player girls readiness in basic condition (M= 16/5, SD= 63/0) and Self-disclosure follow-up (M= 68/5, SD= 33/0). (P= 00/1).
- There is a significant difference between the average of basketball player girls readiness, in basic condition (M= 16/5, SD= 63/0) and Self-disclosure by the coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 29/0). (P= 046/0). In other words self-disclosure with the coach presence caused a significant increase of basketball player girl's readiness.
- There isn't a significant difference between the average of basketball player girls readiness in Self-disclosure condition (M= 62/5, SD= 46/0) and Self-disclosure follow-up (M= 68/5, SD= 33). (P= 00/1).
- There isn't a significant difference between basketball player girls average readiness in Self-disclosure condition (M= 62/5, SD= 46/0) and Self-disclosure with the girls coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 29/0). (P= 165/0).
- There isn't a significant difference

between basketball player girls average readiness in Self-disclosure follow-up condition (M= 68/5, SD= 33/0) and Self-disclosure with the girls coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 29/0). (P= 005/0). In other words, self-disclosure with the coach presence in comparison to self-disclosure in follow-up caused a significant increase in basketball player girl's readiness.

- There isn't a significant difference between basketball player girls average readiness in Self-disclosure follow-up condition (M= 68/5, SD= 33/0) and Self-disclosure with the girls coach presence (M= 14/7, SD= 29/0). (P= 005/0). In other words, self-disclosure with the coach presence in comparison to self-disclosure in follow-up caused a significant increase in basketball player girl's readiness.

There isn't a significant difference between the group basketball girl's player's perseverance, in basic condition, Self-disclosure, Self-disclosure follow-up and Self-disclosure with the coach presence.

The results of the local test showed that Kroit hypothesis is admitted (P> 05/0). The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis in Table (12) showed that between the average of basketball girl's player's perseverance, in basic condition (M= 81/4, SD= 8/1) self-disclosure (M= 72/4, SD= 6/1), self-disclosure follow-up (M= 72/5, SD= 8/1) and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence (M= 7/6, SD= 09/2), there isn't a significant difference ($F_{(3,33)} = 81/2$, P= 054/0). So the zero hypothesis is confirmed

12: The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for perseverance

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	2/30	3	08/10	81/2	054/0	20/0
Error	2/118	33	5/3			

Between alliance group basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, self-disclosure follow-up, and disclosure with the coach presence has a significant difference. The results of the local test showed that kroit hypothesis is admitted ($P > 05/0$). The results of frequency measurement in table 13 showed that there isn't a significant

difference between the averages of basketball player girl alliance in basic condition ($M = 13/5$, $SD = 6/2$), disclosure ($M = 97/5$, $SD = 6/2$), self-alliance follow-up ($M = 83/6$, $SD = 7/1$) and self-disclosure with the girl's coach presence ($M = 4/7$, $SD = 4/1$). ($F_{(3,33)} = 29/2$, $P = 096/0$). So the zero hypothesis is confirmed.

Table 13: The results of frequency measurement Variance analysis for perseverance

Resource	SS	df	MS	F	Sig	----
Intervention	7/35	3	9/11	29/2	096/0	17/0
Error	1/171	33	1/5			

DISCUSSION

The results showed that there is a meaningful and significant difference between the average of group coherence of basketball player girls in basic condition, disclosure, follow up and self-disclosure with the girl's coach presence. The girls' basketball player's coherence has increased in disclosure condition, with the coach presence, with the coach presence, in comparison with basic condition and self-disclosure without the coach presence. In other word girls basketball player's coherence, in follow-up sessions, in comparison with the basic condition and self-disclosure, without coach presence is increased.

The researches, using group environment questionnaire, showed that coherence is related to team performance, increase adherence, group size, responsibility document for performance consequences, absence reduction, members satisfaction and inter-team relationships (Crown et al, 1998), and also based on Danli et al (1978), existence or lack of existing coherence is not the subject, but the coherence amount and the condition of change, during the time, is the problem. Also, Carl Write (1968) introduce the high level of interaction one of coherence increasing factor among teams. In this investigation, it was found that the coach and trainer's presence has an important role and caused increasing player's coherence and after 6 weeks from the first self-disclosure, time factor was effective and in follow-up level, we saw increasing coherence. After the players achieved a better

understanding from each other, their interaction with each other, during 6 weeks caused more coherence among them.

Due to the research of (Phillis Windsor & Jimi Barker, 2011) we observed the team leaders important role that is the teams coach. After the disclosure session, in the team coach presence, one of the very important discussion subjects of the coach was about expectations and the player's role clarification in the team. Based on Caron, 2003, the individual's role understanding is introduced, so an important team Variance in sports. The roles in such a context are described in this way: A collection of expectations about favorable behaviors in a specific social condition (Eiz et al, 2006), and also (Eiz & Caron, 2001) has investigated the relationship of role ambiguity, task coherence and self-efficacy.

These investigators declared that those whom their role is not clarified for them have less understanding of team coordination, and the team has less attractiveness for them. The results of this hypothesis is in accordance with findings of Jim Barker et al, in 2014. They evaluated disclosure intervention and mutual sharing positive for the player's coherence, and reported increasing social identity and more friendly relationships after the intervention. The results showed that there is a significant difference between the average of personal propensity to the social-group of basketball player girls in basic condition, self-disclosure, and disclosure follow-up and self-disclosure with the girls coach presence. Personal propensity to the girls' basketball

player social group in basic condition in comparison with follow-up condition and also in comparison with disclosure with the coach presence, is increased. Due to Carron's remarks personal attractiveness in comparison to group refers to the personal and individual understanding related to motivations that cause to attract and preserve the person in the group. Carron & Dennis (2011) stated that the most important personal factor related to social coherence and task coherence in sports teams is individual satisfaction.

The results showed that between the average individual propensity to the task group of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure follow-up disclosure and disclosure with the coach presence, there is a significant difference. Self-disclosure, in follow-up in comparison to basic, causes increasing significant group-coherence of basketball player girls. Personal factors refer to personal characteristics of team members, Carron & Hosenblass (1998). These personal factors are divided into 3 special groups: 1- Geographical characteristics 2- recognition and motivation 3- Behavior. Carron and Dennis (2011) stated that the most important personal in relation to social coherence and task coherence formation, at sport teams, is personal and individual satisfaction. In supporting their ideas Vidmier & Williams (1991) reported that member's satisfaction is the best indicator for social and task coherence.

The results showed that there is a significant difference between the average of task group coherence of basketball player girls, in basic condition, self-disclosure, follow-up disclosure and self-disclosure by the girl's coach presence. Searching social support receives a positive relation between social support and his evaluation from group coherence (Race & Hardey, 2000). For example social support, provided by coaches, was in relation with the athletes' perceptions from task coherence, in high school football teams (Wester & Veis, 1991), with coherence and satisfaction in universities basketball teams (Veis, Fredrics, 1986), and with higher performance in universities football teams

(Garlando Beri, 1990). The results showed that there is a significant relation between the average of social- group coherence in between basketball player girls, in basic conditions, self-disclosure, follow-up disclosure and disclosure by the girls' coach presence. In this situation we observed disclosure was increased in basic condition in comparison with follow-up situation but didn't show a significant difference by the coach presence. We can refer to culture differences in coach's approach in coherence promotion. For instance Ryska et al (1999) in their studies investigated creating team coherence. They compared Australian & American trainer's approaches. It seems that American coaches more insisted creating and promotion strategies. Apparently this approach caused team task coherence, while the Australian trainers reinforced their team's social coherence through the player's coherence (Riska et al, 1999). The results showed that there isn't a significant difference between basketball player girl's collective efficiency, in basic condition ($M= 62/5$, $SD= 54/0$), self-disclosure ($M= 69/5$, $SD= 47/0$), follow-up disclosure ($M= 88/5$, $SD= 37/0$), and self-disclosure by the coach presence ($M= 11/7$, $SD= 35/0$). This result isn't in line with Barkers study results (2013) that investigated disclosure intervention on football players, to improve their performance. We can refer to the sports differences of the team with Barker's team under his studies, and also difference in team size, member's sex, player's culture, the coach leading style. In this relation (Carron & Hasonbals, 1998) specified collective efficacy with common characteristics of self-sufficiency, leadership, coherence and group- size. This research was done in Iran for the first time and more studies with various questionnaires are necessary to form stronger background for disclosure intervention. However, the results reported significant differences with readiness-subscale. Data showed significant increase of readiness from basic condition in comparison with self-disclosure with the coach presence. And also readiness improves after the coach presence in comparison with a follow-up

session. Based on research observations the intended team had lower collective efficacy, after the coach speech for the players, in the last session, we observed increasing readiness. The players, mentally and physically, evaluated themselves more ready after the intervention. And also the feedback transferring the information about team capacities may have the most effect on collective efficacy beliefs (Chaw & Felts, 2007). The researcher specified more session for the team, by the coach presence. Through this may be increasing collective efficacy is predicted. The objective of this research is investigating the effect of disclosure on coherence and collective efficacy of basketball player girls. The results of this study show increased coherence and also increased readiness among girls' basketball team. In this research, we observe the effective role of coach presence and positive role of disclosure sessions. The disclosure was evaluated as a positive intervention for the basketball team. In this research, we observed that relationship improvement and increasing the interaction and also more clarification of member's role by the team leader were positive factors for promoting members coherence and readiness.

REFERENCES

- Afshari, M. (2015). The relationship of mood with the collective efficacy of ghost boat women in 3 amateurs, semi-professional and professional levels. Senior Lecturer of Physical Education, Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch.
- Bahrami, A., Khajavi, D., Kavosi, M. (2014). Psychometric properties of Persian version of collective efficacy scale in sport. *Journal of Motion Exercise Studies and Sports Psychology*, 1 (1): 1-12.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: the exercise of control. *Freeman*, USA PP: 460-473.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agnetic perspective. In F.Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents. (1-43). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Biochamp, M., Ays, M. (2015). A group visionary in the psychology of exercise and practice, Translate by Farshad Tejari et al. Tehran; Bamdad book.
- Caroon, AV., Brawley, L.R., & Widmeyer, W.N. (1998). The measurement of cohesion in sport group. In J.L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 213_226). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology
- Carron, A., Eys, M., & Burke, 5. (2007). Team cohesion: Nature, correlates and development. In S. Jowett & D. Lavellee (Eds.), *Social psychology of sport* (pp.91_102). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Cotteril, S. (2012). *Psychology for sports teams: from theory to practice*, translation of the Afsaneh Sanatkaran et al. Karaj; Sarafraz.
- Danteh, V. J., & Grzelak, J. (2006). Appropriateness of self-disclosure. In G. J. Chelune (Ed.), *Self-disclosure. Origins, patterns, and implications of openness in interpersonal relationships* (pp. 151-176). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, A. (2006). Self-disclosure in personal relationships. In A. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 409-427). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press
- Hadipour, M., Shabani B, Gh., Erfani, N. (2007). Comparison and Recognition of the Relationship Between the Four Personality Characteristics of Eisenck and the Level of Aggression of Male Athletes Individuals and Teams in Hamadan City in 2006. The First International Scientific and Sports Conferences of Universities of the Islamic World.
- Lyons, A. (2015). *Understanding Sports Psychology: A Practical Guide* (Translated by Mohammad Khabiri). Tehran; Hatmi.

- Martinez_Santos, Raul; Ciruleos, Oscar. (2013). Collective efficacy, cohesion and performance in Spanish amateur femalebasketball. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte*, 22(1): 235-238.
- Vanberg, A., & Perlman, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Cambridge Handbook of personal relationships*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Weinberg, R. (2011). *Basics of Psychology of Exercise and Exercise* (Translated by Mohammad Kazem Vaez Mousavi et al). Tehran; Hatmi.