

Examining the Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance of Addis Ababa University Football Team

Tesfay Asgedom Haddera

Addis Ababa University, Sport Science Department, Ethiopia

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which respondent's perceptions of the relationship between task and social cohesion and performance in the cooperatives movement on Addis Ababa University Football players. Data was collected from 33 respondents via questionnaires. The results of Pearson correlation showed that there was positive significant relationship between organizational performances with team cohesion. In addition, both task and social cohesion were significantly correlated with organizational performance as predicted by hypothesis. Based on the result cooperative movement in which members have great relationship can add significance growth in the movement performance in the future. Conclusion: There was positive significant relationship between organizational performances with team cohesion subscales. The study has produced a main implication in how group cohesiveness contributes to the body of group-performance knowledge and practice. This study also could play a great role for other researchers to continue examining the direction on the relationship between team cohesion and organizational performance in different sport contexts.

Keywords: team cohesion, task cohesion, social cohesion, performance, cooperatives movement.

Introduction

Team cohesion and performance have been extensively researched in an attempt to quantify the strength and direction of their relationship. A recent meta-analysis identified Albert Carron and his colleagues to be the most influential researchers within the area of team cohesion (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002), and Carron's (1982) conceptual framework remains widely influential. Early studies established the cohesion-performance relationship, though agreement about which factor is driving this relationship (i.e., cohesion affecting performance or vice versa) has not yet been reached (Carron et al., 2002). Subsequent studies investigated moderating variables of team cohesion in an effort to devise strategies to help develop team cohesion and thus influence performance. Initially, research focused on exploring moderating variables of the cohesion-performance relationship with athletes, including: sport type (i.e. coactive or interactive), gender of the athletes, the performance measure used (i.e. self-report versus actual), and the competitive level of the team (Carron et al., 2002).

Group cohesiveness is considered to be one of the most important group variables and is generally linked to organizational performance. Cohesion is facilitated by emphasizing uniqueness or a positive identity related to group membership and also when individual team members understand and accept their role within group.

The degree of cohesiveness will determine the successfulness of cooperatives' activities such as in the economy, social and culture aspects (Sapran, 2010). Theoretically, group cohesiveness has come to play an important role in the study of group dynamics.

Carron (1982) defined cohesion as a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its goals and objectives. The researcher also developed a conceptual model of in explaining group cohesiveness-performance relationship. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between group cohesiveness and performance. Specifically, this

Examining the Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance of Addis Ababa University Football Team

study aims to investigate the relationship between task and social cohesion and performance in the context of cooperatives movement.

Team cohesion exists where players are united in a common purpose (Cashmore, 2002). Athletes often spend time together or share common interests outside of their chosen sport. This is known as social cohesion. Similar to group cohesion is task cohesion, where players are united to accomplish a specific task. A challenge to any team is the maintenance of the team, rather than focusing on the individual. If a team is composed of outstanding individuals, and as such the collective team will underperform. Teams composed of modest members are more likely to exceed all expectations.

Task cohesion or group integration is an indication of how well the team operates as a working unit, while social cohesion or individual attraction refers to how well team members like each other and the team's identity (Lavalley, Kremer, Moran and Williams, 2004).

Team cohesion is the ingredient that molds a collection of individuals into a team (Cox, 2007). Carron wrote of determinants of team cohesion (Cashmore, 2002). Situational factors such as living with or near each other, sharing hobbies and activities, similar uniforms and clothing, rituals of group cohesion, and a unique distinctiveness as a group. Personal factors, such as commitment and satisfaction, leadership factors, and a democratic style of leadership also support team cohesion. Team factors that support cohesion include the clarity with which each member understands and accepts his role with the team. Another factor is success. Success in competitive sports increases team cohesion. Further, as was discovered by other researchers, Carron concluded that smaller teams are more cohesive.

Research on cohesion within the sport and exercise psychology context has been based on Carron's conceptual framework. This conceptual framework remains widely influential to the

contributions found in cohesion literature and has led to the development of a model by Carron et al which assumes that each sport team develops perceptions of cohesiveness which are categorized as group integration (the perception of the team as a whole), and individual attractions to the group (the personal attractions to the group). Hardy et al report that four dimensions accounted for the majority of the variance in team cohesion. These are Group-Integration-Task, Group-Integration-Social, Individual Attraction to Group-Task and Individual Attraction to Group-Social.

Since the study involved individuals working together on a joint task, it's considered that the causal relationship between cohesion and performance are more powerful in explaining the correlation between group cohesiveness and organizational performance. Hunger and Wheelan (1984) in their study investigated the relationship between group dimensions and performance in a business simulation games. The high profit teams tended to be perceived by members who have strong relationship. It was concluded that a team with high task, cohesion will be more likely to achieved high profit than will a more social cohesion. Therefore, based on the above discussion, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- H1:* There is a relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational performance.
- H2:* There is a relationship between task cohesion and organizational performance.
- H3:* There is a relationship between social cohesion and organizational performance

Method

The subject sample consisted of 33 Addis Ababa Universityfootball team or competing at National League. The method of the study is descriptive correlation. The data was collected uses questionnaires and through field study procedures. The Statistic Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 18.0 was used to analyze the questionnaire data. Descriptive statistic were conducted to report the frequencies, means score and standard deviation

Examining the Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance of Addis Ababa University Football Team

of the demographic data, cohesiveness and organizational performance. The researcher used Pearson’s coefficient to find out the relationship between team cohesiveness and performance.

Measures

COHESION: Cohesion was measured using Group Environmental Questionnaire which was adapted from Carron, Brawely and Widmeyer (1985). The GEQ is an 18 item scale that assesses four dimensions i.e. individual attraction to the group social and task, group integration social and task. All items were rated on 9 point, Linkert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 9 (strongly disagree). Different research work showed that GEQ is internally consistent and exhibits factorial, content, concurrent and predictive validity.

Organizational Performance:

Organizational performance was measured using Murphy, Trailer, & Hill (1996) measures of efficiency, growth, profit, and size liquidity as it is an advantage when adapting multipole indicators that incorporates financial and non-financial performance in the assessment (Mia & Clarke, 1999). This questionnaire is a 6 items in which all items were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale and were coded on a scale of 5.

Results

Reliability Test: The reliability tests shown in Table 1 indicated an excellent reliability for all its components with a coefficient alpha of above 0.7 exceeding the minimum acceptable level as suggested by Nunnally (1978).

Table 1
Overall Internal Reliability

No	Variables	Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha)
1	Group cohesiveness	0.85
2	Task cohesion	0.77
3	Social cohesion	0.75
4	Organizational performance	0.77

Table 2 indicates that the highest frequency for age 21-25 range. In regard to education status diploma has highest frequency.

Table 2
Demographic information of players

Variable	Range	Frequency	Percent
Age	18 – 20	4	12.13
	21 – 25	20	60.60
	Above 26	9	27.27
	Total	33	100
Education Status	Certificate	4	12.13
	Diploma	21	63.63
	Bachelor	8	24.24
	Total	33	100
Sport experience	1 – 2years	3	9.09
	3 – 5years	23	69.69
	Above 5years	7	21.29
	Total	33	100

Examining the Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance of Addis Ababa University Football Team

Table 3
Mean, standard deviations, and inter-correlations among variables

No.	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1	Group cohesions	5.45	1.02	1			
2	Task cohesion	5.60	0.69	0.51*	1		
3	Social cohesion	4.75	1.15	0.46*	0.34*	1	
4	Organizational performance	3.72	0.62	0.54*	0.51*	0.36*	1

Note (No. 33) All correlations were significant at * $P < 0.01$

Table 3 presented Mean, standard deviations, and correlations among the variables of the study. It showed that group cohesiveness significantly related to the organizational performance ($r=0.54$, $P < 0.01$). This result implies the higher the group cohesiveness the higher the organizational performance of the movement. In addition the team cohesion (both task and social cohesion) were significantly correlated with organization performance as predicted by Hypothesis 2 and 3 ($r=0.51$, $P < 0.01$) ($r=0.36$, $P < 0.01$).

Discussion

The study was designed to examine the a) group cohesion and organizational performance b) specific relationship between dimensions of cohesion and organizational performance c) the longitudinal change in cohesion and performance and d) to understand the direction of effect between cohesion and organizational performance. The result demonstrated that group cohesiveness of participants do have a significant relationship with organizational performance in the context of cooperative movement. Group cohesiveness is more likely to influence performance according to finding support of Mullen and Cooper (1994) and Loughead and Carron (2004).

Individual Attraction to Group – Task and Group Integration – Task were both found to have moderately strong positive relations with teams' performance ratings, providing further support

for a team cohesion – performance link (Carron et al 2000). Hence it is important that strong relationship will have a high level of performance. In addition, Carless and De Paola (2000) where they suggested that members who work in the cohesive group believed that organization performance was the principle focus at any situation. The result indicated that how task cohesion had a stronger relationship with performance than social cohesion. Even though task and social cohesion are vital for the organizational performance of any team, task cohesion is higher than social cohesion (Wheelan 2004).

The study has produced main implication in how group cohesiveness contributes to the body of group-performance knowledge and practice. This study also could play a great role for other researchers to continue examining the direction on the relationship between cohesion and performance in different sport events.

Conclusion

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between team cohesion and performance on Addis Ababa University Football team. The result of this study indicates that there was positive significant relationship between performances with team cohesion on team of football athletes. Also, there was positive significant relationship between performances with team cohesion subscales. It means that with increase of organizational performance team cohesion is increased. The

Examining the Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance of Addis Ababa University Football Team

results also offer new perceptiveness for cooperative movement where members' strong relationship can further contribute to the growth of movement's performance. The cooperative movement needs to strengthen its degree of relationship or cohesiveness among members as its performance depends largely on it. The degree of cohesiveness among members determines the success of cooperativeness's performance in moving toward its future direction (Sapran 2010; Tan & Selvarani. 2008). The performance of a team depends on the degree of relationship or cohesiveness among members.

References

1. Singh, R. KanchanTarandeep (2012). Relationship between team cohesion and performance in Ball Games. VSRD Technical & Non-Technical Journal, Vol. 3 (5), 2012, 191-196
2. Ball, J & Carron, A. (1976). The influence of team, cohesion and participation motivation upon performance success in intercollegiate ice hockey. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 1,271-275.
3. Carron, A.V. Widmeyer, W.N. & Brawley, L.R. (1988). Group cohesion and individual adherence to physical activity. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 10, 119-126.
4. Carron, A.V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sports groups: Interpretations and considerations Journal of Sport Psychology, 4,123-138.
5. Carron, A.V., Widmeyer, W.N., & Brawley, L.R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sports teams: The group environment questionnaire. Journal of Sport Psychology, 7, 244-266
6. Hardy, J. Hall, C.R. & Carron, A.V. (2003). Perceptions of team cohesion and athletes' use of imagery. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 34: 151-167.
7. Carron, A. V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sport groups: Interpretations and considerations. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 123-138.
8. Carron, A., & Brawley, L. R. (2000). Cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. Small Group Research, 31(1), 89-106.
9. Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. Journal of Sport Psychology, 7, 244-266.
10. Gully, S. M., Devine, D. J., & Whitney, D. J. (1995). A meta analysis of cohesion and performance: Effects of level of analysis and task interdependence. Small Group Research, 26(4), 497-520.
11. Carless, S.A. & De Paola C. (2000). The measurement of cohesion in work teams. Small Group Research, 31(I), 71-88
12. Gross, N., & Martin, W. (1952). On group cohesiveness. American Journal of Sociology, 57, 533-546
13. Carron, A.V. &Chelladurai P. (1981). The dynamics of group cohesion in sport. Journal of Sport Psychology, 3 127-139
14. Petterson, M.M. Carron, A.V. &Loughead T.M. (2005). The influence of team norms on the cohesion-self-reported performance relationship. A multi-level analysis Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 6, 479-493
15. Brawley, L.R, Carron, A.V. &Widmeyer, W.N. (1988). Exploring the relationship between cohesion and group resistance to disruption. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 10, 199-213
16. Langfred, C.W. (1998). Is group cohesiveness a doubled-edged sword? An investigation of the effects of cohesiveness on performance. Small Group Research. 29 (I). 124-143.
17. Zaccaro, S.J., & Lowe, C.A. (1988). Cohesiveness and performance on an additive task: Evidence for

- multidimensionality. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128,547-558
18. Gully, S.M., Devine, D.J. & Whitney, D.J. (1995). A meta analysis of cohesion and performance: Effects of level of analysis and task interdependence. *Small Group Research*, 26(4), 497-520
 19. Cox. R.H. (2006). *Sport Psychology: Concepts and Applications* (6thed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
 20. Carron, A.V. Colaman, M. M. Wheelen J. & Stevens, D (2002) Cohesion and performance in sport. A meta-analysis *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-188
 21. Hunger, J.D. &Wheelen, T.L. (1984). The relationship between group dynamics and team performance in business simulation. *Academy of Management*, 10, 43 -45.
 22. Loughhead T.M. & Carron, A.V. (2004). The mediating role of cohesion in the leader behavior – satisfaction relationship. *Psychology of sport and Exercises*, 5, 1335-371
 23. Mia, I. & Clarke, B. (1999) Market competition management accounting systems and business unit performance. *Management Accounting Research* 10, 137-158
 24. Morgan, N.A. Kaleka, A. &Katsikeas. C. S. (2004) Antecedents of export venture performance a theoretical model and empirical assessment. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 90-108.
 25. Mullen, B. & Copper C. (1994). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113 (2) 210-227
 26. Murphy, G.B. Traitler, J.W. & Hill, R.D. (1996). Measuring performance in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Research*, 36, 15-23.
 27. Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
 28. Oliver L.W. , Harman, J. Hoover E., Hayes S.M. &Pandhi N.A. (1999). A quantitative integration of the military cohesion literature. *Military Psychology*, 11 (1) 57-83
 29. Podsakoff, P.M, Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman R.H. & Fetter, R (1990). Transformational leadership behaviors and their effect on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
 30. Sapran A.S. (2010) Exploiting cooperative movement strengths. *Pelancar*, 57-10-11
 31. Tan. C.C. &Selvarani, P. (2008, October 15) coping with cooperatives. *News Sunday Times*, pp. 5