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SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. SUMMARY

Cohesion is the foundation for group behaviour. Description, explanation, prediction and control of group behaviour in sport must evolve from an understanding of the group’s cohesiveness.

Group dynamics investigators have long recognised the importance of cohesion in the study of sport groups. Cohesion has been linked to a number of factors critical to the development and vitality of the group; increased communication, conformity, productivity, satisfaction, social and task interactions, behavioural changes, persistance and attendance (Widmeyer, Brawley & Carron, 1985).

There was a felt need to examine cohesion relationships across varied sport types since the structure and function of types of sport are very different. Generally sport teams are classified into two types namely interacting and coacting. Interacting teams' performance is mainly based on the member's ability to work together in an effective and co-ordinated manner and the members are inter dependent. On the other hand coacting teams have a structure in which team members perform independently of one another during the pursuit of a common goal. In this study basketball was chosen to represent interacting type of sport and cricket to represent coacting type of sport.

Three hundred and fifty subjects were chosen for the study. However only two hundred and twenty eight respondents returned the questionnaire. Out of these only two hundred and one (basketball 105; cricket 96) were useable because of missing data. Only elite teams that participated in the first division of Chennai city league were selected for the purposes of the study.
The first purpose of the study was to test the significance of the difference among the four cohesion measures and measures of disruption and resistance with two types of sport groups namely interacting and coacting.

The second purpose was to analyse the relationships among cohesion measures and measures of disruption and resistance in each sport type and in total sample.

In order to achieve these purposes it was necessary to translate the group environment questionnaire into the Tamil language and assess its psychometric properties.

The tool that was used for the purpose was Group Environment Questionnaire. The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) consists of 18 items to measure four components of cohesion. Four items measured individual attraction to group at the task level (AGT); five items measured individual attraction to group at the social level (AGS); five items measured group integration at the task level (GIT); and four items measured group integration at the social level (GIS).

Tamil version of the GEQ was used since many of the participants were not proficient enough in English to understand the items in the Group Environment Questionnaire. The conventional translation back translation procedures were undertaken in order to ensure that the original meaning of the items were not lost or distorted.

In addition to the 18 items, the GEQ also includes two items to assess the extent to which a member believed that (a) specific events / actions would be disruptive of the group, and (b) the team would resist any disruptive influence.

The questionnaires were administered by research assistants to the participants at a weekday practice within the regular league schedule. Care was taken to avoid periods immediately prior to or following competition in an attempt
to avoid situation specific response biases. The instruments were completed individually and anonymously.

In order to test the significance of the differences between basketball and cricket players in the variables of the study, t-tests were performed.

Pearson's product moment correlations were computed to assess the significance of the relationships among the variables of the study. These correlations were computed for the two sports separately and for the total sample.

Two separate sets of stepwise multiple regression analyses were carried out to assess the total and unique influences of four cohesion measures on perceived disruption of the group and perceived resistance to such disruptions. In the first set disruption was the dependent variable while resistance was the dependent variable in the second set of regression analysis. Each set consisted of three regression analyses - one for basketball players, one for cricket players and one for the total sample.

5.2. FINDINGS

1. The items in the GEQ subscales were shown to be internally consistent. The subscales were not subject to response bias. The conceptual distinctions made among the measures of cohesion, disruption and resistance to disruption are supported by findings.

2. The means for the four cohesion measures ranged from 4.86 for group integration-social in cricket to 6.74 for group integration-task in basketball. None of the values for the four cohesion measures exceeded seven on a nine point scale. Only one of the values for the four cohesion measures was lower than the midpoint of 5 on the nine point scale.

3. Basketball and cricket teams did not differ in their estimation of attraction to group-task ($t(199) = 0.391; p = .696$) and attraction to group-social ($t(199)$
Similarly the two groups did not differ in their estimation of group integration-task \( (t(199) = 1.324; P = .53) \) and in their group integration-social \( (t(199) = 0.594; p = .187) \). There was no significant difference between basketball and cricket players in their perception of disruption \( (t(199) = -.430; p = .668) \). However these two groups differed in their estimates of the extent to which their groups would resist any disruptive forces \( (t(199) = 4.549; p<.000) \).

4. Correlation analyses brought out the following findings. In the basketball group (a) the four cohesion measures correlated significantly with each other \( (r>.198) \). (b) As for the relationship between the four cohesion measures and perceptions of disruption and resistance, attraction to group-social was significantly correlated with perceived disruption \( (r = .376; p<.001) \) and perceived resistance \( (r = .202; p<.05) \). Group integration-task was significantly correlated with perceived disruption \( (r = .343; p<.01) \). None of the other correlations of the cohesion measures with perceived disruption and resistance were significant. That is, attraction to group-task or group integration-social were not significantly correlated with either perceived disruption or perceived resistance. (c) perceived disruption was significantly correlated with perceived resistance \( (r = .348; p<.01) \).

5. In the cricket group (a) the four cohesion measures were significantly correlated with each other except in case of attraction to group-social and group integration-social. (b) As for the relationship between the four cohesion measures and perceptions of disruption and resistance, only one correlation was significant. Group integration-social was significantly correlated with perceived resistance \( (r = -.218; p<.05) \). (c) perceived disruption and perceived resistance were not significantly correlated.

6. In the total sample, correlations among the variables in the study mirrored the results in each group i.e. basketball and cricket players. Regression analyses brought out similar findings as in correlation analyses.
7. Regression of disruption on cohesion variables showed that (a) in basketball attraction to group-social accounted for more than half of the total explained variance (14.1% versus 26.6%). Group integration-task explained 5.9% of the variance. Group integration-social explained 6.6% of the variance. (b) In cricket, none of the cohesion variables were significantly correlated with disruption, the regression analyses failed to yield any useful result. (c) In the total sample, regression analysis showed that only attraction to group-social could enter the equation to explain 6.5% of the variance in disruption.

8. Regression of resistance on cohesion variables showed that (a) in basketball attraction to group-social explained 4.1% of the variance in resistance. Attraction to group-task explained 4.6% of the variance. The two group integration measures did not contribute uniquely to the explained variance in resistance. (b) In cricket group integration-social explained 4.7% of the variance in resistance. (c) In the total sample, attraction to group-social explained 3.1% of the variance and group integration-social explained an additional 2.1% of the variance in resistance.

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Tamil version of the Group Environment Questionnaire exhibited adequate, sound psychometric properties.

2. The participants of the study, both basketball and cricket players perceived only moderate levels of group integration and were attracted to their groups only moderately. The participants did not have any negative perceptions about the cohesiveness of their teams. Both basketball and cricket players perceived moderate levels of disruption and resistance to disruption.

3. The players in the two types of sport were similar in their orientation toward and in their perceptions of cohesion and disruption in their respective teams. As far as resistance to disruptive forces are concerned, basketball players who perceived elements of disruption in their group were also
confident that their group would resist such disruption whereas in cricket those who perceived higher levels of social integration perceived less resistance of the group to disruption and vice versa.

4. Reliable relationships might exist among the four cohesion measures among elite competitors whether they belong to a interacting sport like basketball or a coacting sport like cricket.

5. The relationships among measures of cohesion, disruption and resistance are more germane in interacting groups such as basketball than in coacting groups such as cricket.

5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Further research will be needed to clarify the lower internal consistency estimates of Tamil version of Group Environment Questionnaire compared to those reported by Carron et al.

2. It has to be verified in future research whether the results of this study that both basketball and cricket players would be similar in their orientation toward and in their perceptions of cohesion in their respective teams, would be replicated.

3. Cross-cultural studies on cohesion among national teams may bring out interesting findings.

4. Similar studies can be undertaken among elite women teams, which might bring out gender influence, if any.