

Titel: Poster () Paper (x)	Docent
Författare, hemvist, e-post, tel-nr	Erwin Apitzsch, Institutionen för psykologi, Lunds universitet Erwin.Apitzsch@psychology.lu.se 046-222 9115
Abstract: (använd Times New Roman 11 pt inom detta utrymme)	<p>Introduktion</p> <p>Collective collapse is a phenomenon that occurs when the majority of the players on a team, after a good or normal start, suddenly perform below their expected standard, or when they underperform from the very start (Apitzsch, 2006). Reported results of a collapsing team revealed that the communication within the team became negative, players became irritated, and started to shout at each other, thereby negatively affecting each others' play (Apitzsch, 2009). The results generated the question: "What is the influence of emotions on team performance?"</p> <p>Syfte & teoretisk ram</p> <p>The aim of present study was to investigate the perception of emotions in an elite male handball team in two different situations in the 2008-09 season. In one game the team was playing at the home court and was expected to win. The team was leading the game but lost to Team I (collective collapse). In another game the team played an away game against an opponent, which was expected to win. The team was trailing but won the game against Team II (Winning edge).</p> <p>Metod</p> <p>Participants were 14 players who filled in questionnaires 10 weeks (Team I) and seven weeks (Team II) after the games against these teams. The methods used were the Individual Zones of Optimal Functioning (IZOF) by Hanin (1997, 2000) which covers emotions related to successful and unsuccessful performances as well as the Emotional Contagion Scale (Hatfield & Rapson, 2000). In addition to these questionnaires, items related to the influence of other players' emotions had to responded to.</p> <p>Resultat</p> <p>When the team played well, 49% (TI) respectively 65% (TII) of the emotions were positive and functional, whereas 5% (TI) respectively 0% (TII) were negative and dysfunctional. When the team played badly, 0% (both TI and TII) of the emotions were positive and functional, whereas 58% (TI) respectively 27% (TII) were negative and dysfunctional.</p> <p>The intensity of some of the perceived emotions on a 5-point scale when the team played well was: activity 2.2 (TI), 4.4 (TII), determined 1.6 (TI), 4.4 (TII), self-confidence 2.4 (TI), 4.2 (TII). The perceived emotions when the team played badly; Irritation 4.1 (TI), 1.6 (TII), angry 3.8 (TI), 1,8 (TII), fear of losing the game 3.6 (TI), 1.6 (TII).</p> <p>Generally, the players were more affected by positive emotions, 3.2 (on a 4-point scale) than by negative emotions, 1.8. There were just minor differences between starters and substitute players. The starters were influenced by negative emotions to a lesser degree than substitute players and, generally, had a narrower range of distribution.</p> <p>Five players were identified as having a significant impact on other players' performance. Player G was indicated as having the most positive influence on others, whereas Player A had the most negative influence on his teammates.</p> <p>Diskussion</p> <p>It is tentatively suggested that teams should appoint an expressive player to take the role of creating a positive atmosphere in the team in times of adversity, and to teach players who express negative emotions to change their behaviour.</p>