

Team Cohesion among Under 22 and Under 19 National Level Cricket Players

Dr Anil Kumar, A.B.*

**Physical Education Instructor, Government First Grade College, Shikaripura, Kuvempu University, Shimoga, Karnataka, India,*

Abstract: Team cohesion is the degree to which individual members want to contribute to the group's ability to continue as a functioning work unit. Members of cohesive teams have emotional and social bonds that link them to one another and to the group as a whole.

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to compare the team cohesion between Under 22 years and Under 19 year's cricket male players.

Procedure:

To achieve the purpose of the study, the data was collected from 120 cricket players who have participated in the Under 22 years and Under 19 years semi final matches in the national tournament. To assess the team cohesion of cricket players the standardized Group environment questionnaire constructed by Albert V Carron was administered to the players before the match. The data collected was treated with 't' test statistical technique to achieve the purpose.

Results: The results shows Under 22 years cricketers found significant in individual attractions to group task and group integration task and there is no significant difference in individual attraction to group social and group integration social.

Keywords: *Team Cohesion, Individual Attractions to Group Task, Group Integration Task, Individual Attraction to Group Social, Group Integration Social.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In modern sports, successful performance is determined by number of factors. For optimum performance at higher level, variety of aspects must be addressed.

Psychological preparation considers the painstaking daily workouts and is objectively based on the current level of the performance. Psychological information is presented to coaches who are responsible for training as well as the welfare of the players. A number of psychological techniques have been developed to help players reduce stress and gain the mental skills needed for a competition.

Team cohesion was the sum of the forces that causes member to remain a part of the team. Team cohesion was a dynamic process, which was reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its goals and objectives.

Cricket is a type of sport characterized by maximal effort and close integration by teamwork and deep cohesion. The term "team work" universally connotes operation on the part of a number of individuals working toward a common goal. Cooperation exists in all walks of life and is an integral part of every success.

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to compare the team cohesion between Under 22 years and Under 19 years cricket male players.

Procedure: To achieve the purpose of the study, One hundred and twenty subjects were selected from teams which played semi final matches. The age group of the subjects was ranging from 16 years to 22 years. To achieve the purpose of the study team cohesion data was collected by administering the standardized Group environment questionnaire constructed by Albert V Carron before the match. This questionnaire measures Individual attraction to group task, Individual Attraction to group social, Group integration task and group integration social.

Statistical technique: The data collected from the subjects was treated with statistical technique 't' test to find out the difference in team cohesion between Under 22 years and Under 19 years National Level Cricket Players with the help of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

Results: The data collected for the study was analyzed and results are presented in the following tables

Table 1 Shows Mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Individual attraction to group task

Sl.No.	Game	N	Mean	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
1	Under 22 years	60	28.77	6.64	2.97
2	Under 19 years	60	25.05	7.68	

*significant at 0.05 level.

The above table shows the calculated ‘t’ value 2.97 which is significant at 0.05 level, since this value is higher than the table value 1.96.

Table 2 Shows Mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Individual Attraction to group social

Sl.No.	Game	N	Mean	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
1	Under 22 years	60	32.93	7.47	1.01
2	Under 19 years	60	31.61	7.88	

*significant at 0.05 level.

The above table indicates the calculated ‘t’ value 1.01 which is not significant at 0.05 levels, since this value is lesser than the table value 1.96.

Table 3 Shows Mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Group integration task

Sl.No.	Game	N	Mean	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
1	Under 22 years	60	34.18	7.43	3.59
2	Under 19 years	60	29.18	6.11	

*significant at 0.05 level.

The above table shows the calculated ‘t’ value 3.59 which is significant at 0.05 levels, since this value is higher than the table value 1.96.

Table 4 Shows Mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of group integration social

Sl.No.	Game	N	Mean	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
1	Under 22 years	60	22.27	6.69	1.79
2	Under 19 years	60	20.15	5.09	

*significant at 0.05 level.

The above table shows the calculated ‘t’ value 1.79 which is not significant at 0.05 levels, since this value is lesser than the table value 1.96. When mean values are compared under 22 years cricketers are having more mean value of group integration social than Under 19 years cricketers.

II. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The results of the study shows that Under 22 years cricketers found significant in individual attractions to group task and group integration task than the under 19 years cricketers and there is no significant difference in individual attraction to group social and group integration social between Under 22 years and under 19 years cricketers. In individual attractions to group task under 22 male cricketers found significant because that is the age to develop the group relation and due to the experience they get in that age. In group integration task also under 22 cricketers found significant than under 19 because that is age normally the players have peak performance, to demonstrate high performance in team games group integration task in very important.

III. CONCLUSION

The data analysis shows that in Individual attraction to group task and Group integration task Under 22 years National Level Cricketers are attracted more to group task than the Under 19 national cricketers. There is no significant difference in Individual Attraction to group social and group integration social.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Nolan, Olivia et al. 2002. "The relationships between perceived coaching behaviours and team cohesion among school age cricketers in an Australian Setting". *Exercise Psychology*. HMSC236, Sydney.
- [2]. Widmeyer, W.N., Brawley, L.R. and Carron, A. 1985. The measurement of cohesion in sport teams: The group environment questionnaire. *Sports Dyn*BABE RUTH. (n.d.). BrainyQuote.com. Retrieved June 13, 2013, Andersen, M. B. (2000). *Doing sport psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- [3]. BALL, J.R. & CARRON, A.V. (1976). The influence of team cohesion and participation motivation upon performance success in intercollegiate ice hockey. *Canadian Journal of Applied*
- [4]. BIRD, A.M. (1977). Team structure and success as related to cohesiveness and leadership. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 103: 217-223.
- [5]. CARRON, A.V.; BRAWLEY, L.R. & WIDMEYER, N.W. (1998). The measurement of cohesion in sport groups. In J.L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology*
- [6]. CARRON, A.V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sport groups: Interpretations and considerations. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 4: 123-138.
- [7]. CARRON, A.V.; BRAWLEY, L.R. & WIDMEYER, N.W. (2002). Normative data for GEQ. In A.V. Carron (Ed.), *Group environmental questionnaire: Test manual* (pp. 42-56). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- [8]. WIDMEYER, W.N.; CARRON, A.V. & BRAWLEY, L.R. (1993). Group cohesion in sport and exercise. In R.N. Singer, M. Murphey & L.K. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sport psychology* (pp. 672-692). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- [9]. WIDMEYER, W.N. & MARTENS, R. (1978). When cohesion predicts performance outcome in sport. *Research Quarterly*, 49: 372-380.