

A LITTLE STUDY ON COHESION

Gazieva Zukhra

Researcher/ National University of Uzbekistan

UZBEKISTAN

independent.2017@inbox.ru

ABSTRACT

Current research considers the cooperation and relations between athletes only as a member of sport team based on the logic that the athletes as a team members take an active action during the championships. Coaches, doctors, managers and other group of professionals' impact on the sport team are not considered within the current work. Team cohesion is the most essential aspect of sport and social psychologies. Sport teams' success based on social activities, high cohesion, cohesively executing the instruction of coaches, likewise tactic and psychological abilities of each athlete to work in team. Moreover, the cohesiveness in sport teams requires social nearness, the unity of the team, close cooperation in task accomplishment, besides, moderate and reasonable feelings of attraction, sympathy and respect among the team members from each team member. In theory positive relationship between sympathy, friendship and cooperation among sport teams impacts on effectiveness and success of the teams' results. However, in practice social cohesiveness not always changes the result of task cohesion. Therefore, we consider it's preferable to research how group cohesion can influence on team performance with in this work. During our research, we used sociometry, Index definition of group cohesion Seashore, Carron's Group Environment Questionnaire, Test of H.Eysenck: Extraversion and Introversion, Hand test and Thomas-Kilmann's Conflict Management Modes, Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. The main aim of this study is to examine the relationship between task cohesiveness and social cohesiveness.

Keywords: Group Cohesion, Social cohesion, socialization.

INTRODUCTION

In team sports, the result of the game does not depend on the individual abilities of sportsmen. It is essential that athlete, the mechanism of interpersonal relations and the compatibility of team members' in the aggregate help to shape the group cohesion. The relationship between of the levels of the team cohesion and the team result is circular: a high result leads to an increase in the degree of cohesion, which in turn improves the result. The study of this phenomenon is one of the important steps in building a successful sports team. According to Leon Festinger, Stanley Schachter, and Kurt Back cohesiveness is a "the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group."The nature and strength of forces acting on a member to remain in the group may vary from member to member. Back found that in more cohesive groups, members made more efforts to reach agreement and were more influenced by discussion than in less cohesive groups, no matter what the basis of attractiveness was for joining the group. People in groups composed of members attracted to the group by a liking for other group members were chattier, but where cohesiveness was based on the prestige of the group, members were more cautious and less relational with one another, and where cohesiveness was based on the group as a means to a goal, members were more impersonal and task-oriented. A number of experimental investigations bear on the

factors determining group cohesiveness. Back found that he could produce high cohesiveness by stressing to members how much they would like each other, how important it was for the group to do well on the task since the task was a test of ability, or how prestigious the group was. Schachter produced clubs with high cohesiveness by grouping students who expressed moderate or high interest in their activities; he created clubs with low cohesiveness by grouping students who expressed little or no interest in their activities. Festinger's theory of social comparison had significant implications for group formation and group structure. He found that the drive for self-evaluation can lead people to associate with one another and to join groups. His theory suggests that the selective tendencies to associate with others of similar opinion and ability guarantee relative homogeneity of opinions and abilities within groups. The theory of social comparison was extended by The Concept of Social Cohesion Schachter to apply to the evaluation of emotions as well as to the evaluation of opinions and abilities. He demonstrated that the tendency to affiliate with others undergoing a similar experience increases when people are anxious. Schachter proposed that the process of social comparison often influences the emotions experienced by an individual.

Albert Carron and several colleagues proposed a model to understand and measure cohesion in sport teams. They considered cohesion to be a multidimensional construct and developed an 18-item inventory to measure cohesiveness in sports teams and exercise groups. They believed that their definition of cohesiveness incorporated its dynamic nature, its instrumental basis, and its affective dimension; therefore, the multidimensional character of their instrument could be utilized in a variety of groups in addition to the sports teams.

Cohesion has been defined as "group member's inclination to forge social bonds, resulting in members sticking together and remaining united" (Carron, 1982, p. 124). It has also been referred to as group cohesion or cohesiveness. It is one of the oldest and most widely studied variables in the group dynamics literature (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009; Mullen & Copper, 1994), and is fundamental to the fabric of group and social functioning. Despite cohesion being a widely studied construct, the construct appears to be poorly developed and consequently, the reported theories, and empirical findings of cohesion research are in disarray. Cohesion has been considered a critical group variable (Carron & Brawley, 2000; Eys, Loughhead, Bray, & Carron, 2009; Lott & Lott, 1965) because of the reported relationship between cohesion and positive group outcomes, such as job satisfaction, psychological well-being, and work-group performance (Beal, Cohen, Burke, & McLendon, 2003; Carless, 2000; Mullen & Copper, 1994). Attitudes and behaviors exhibited by cohesive teams include morale, group spirit, trust, friendship, cooperation, communication, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and sense of identification with the group (Andrews, Kacmar, Blakely, & Bucklew, 2008; Carless & De Paola, 2000; Chen & Tang, 2009; Friedkin, 2004; Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997).

In our investigation, participate three football teams from different divisions (high league "Locomotive", 1-division "NBU-Asia" and 2-division "Skiff"). The aim of our research was to (prove) show evidence that with improving social cohesion of members, improves performance and the results of team. After social closeness, correcting the task cohesion of team will positively influence on success. The age of athletes was from 16 to 40 years, there were 120 experimentalists. All results were mathematically analyzed by Spearman correlation.

A general correlation analysis of three teams showed that there were positive linear correlation between the GI-T and ATG-S ($r = .321^{(*)}$). This means that the higher the indicators

of the social involvement of the athlete, the higher is the index of task activity (cohesion). In addition, there were positive linear correlation between GI-T and Avoiding ($r = .267^*$). Which indicates that high or low rates of avoidance of conflicts are reflected in the results of task cohesion of group. According correlation GI-T and Extraversion scale have positive connection ($r = .302^*$). These facts indicate that a high extraversion of athletes is associated with group cohesion, conditioned by the task. However, GI-T and Internality have a negative correlation ($r = -.276^*$). Therefore, the high task cohesion of the team is due to low rates of athlete's internality and vice versa. Very interesting facts were received during our investigating. For example, the scale aggressiveness and internal scale have negative correlation ($r = -.309^*$). From which follows that excessive aggressiveness implies low internality and vice versa. Aggression and Compromising have negative correlation ($r = -.307^*$), it means high rates of aggressiveness suggest a low index of compromise and vice versa. Farther there were defined negative correlation ($r = .354^{**}$) between collaborating and aggressiveness. It is difficult to explain that the indicators of aggressiveness directly affects the cooperation. Maybe the excessive aggressiveness of athletes involves cooperation.

Let us look to NBU-Asia football clubs results. Because it is our experimental group and we will be correcting their actions during social skills trainings. This is a result until social skills training.

N BU-Asia	GE Q GI-T
G EQ ATG-T	- ,446(*)
G EQ GI -S	,581(**)

The scale GI-T and the scale ATG-T have negative correlation ($r = -.446^*$). It is obvious that data on table indicates that the individual tasks and team tasks do not always coincide. The positive linear correlation were between GI-T and GI-S ($r = .581^{**}$). It means social integration and task integration are interconnected with each other.

There were positive correlation between collaborating scale and GEQ ATG-T ($r = .525^*$). Which means that a high degree of cooperation implies the readiness of the athlete to the group goal. Also positive linear correlation follows between GEQ ATG-S and the scale Competing ($r = .667^{**}$). So the higher the rivalry, the higher social activity of the athlete.

Nbu -Asia	Collab orating
GEQ ATG-T	,525(*)
GEQ ATG-S	,667(*) *)

The experimental group in our investigation was NBU-Asia football club. After individual testing athletes, we used sociometry, to solve social relationships of team. Than we, organized two staged social skills trainings. First stages aimed to improve social relationships of group members and it consist of 6 sessions. These sessions included different exercises related to social closeness, nearness, and helped to gain personal information about group members and their interests. After finishing the first stage of social skills training, we retest our athletes.

From this table we could see that between GEQ GI-T and GEQ ATG-T positive correlation ((-, 544(*). The scale GEQ GI-T and GEQ GI-S also have positive correlation ((, 590(**). The new correlation follows between scales GEQ GI-S and GEQ ATG-S ((, 443(*). It means that athletes socially attracted to group activity and it helps to join them on task cohesion

1-retestNBU-Asia	GEQ ATG-T	GEQ ATG-S	GE Q GI-S	GEQ GI-T	Sea shore
GEQ ATG-T	1	-,456	-,441	-,544(*)	,260
GEQ ATG-S	-,456	1	,443(*)	,250	,179
GEQ GI-S	-,441	,443(*)	1	,590(**)	-,081
GEQ GI-T	-,544(*)	,250	,590(**)	1	,185
Seashore	,260	,179	-,081	-,185	1

and social integration of group.

On this table, there is no differential changes on results of NBU-Asia Football team.

1-retestNBU-Asia	Competing	Compromising	Avoiding	Collaborating	Accommodating
GEQ ATG-T	-,055	-,222	,070	,525(*)	-,213
GEQ ATG-S	,667(**)	-,066	,238	-,170	-,220
GEQ GI-S	-,189	-,056	,316	-,109	,159
GEQ GI-T	,040	-,186	,321	-,411	,228
Seashore	,366	-,323	,316	,146	,043

The second stage of our social skills training dedicated to correcting task cohesion of sport team. It consist of different cooperational exercices, rationally reacting on extraordinary job situations, to solve potential of team with low abilities, to make out of nothing. There were 6 sessions and after them we retested our athletes again.

From this table we can see that very changes in scales. The scale GEQGI-T and GEQ ATG-T have positive correlation ((,589(*). The correlation follows between GEQ ATG-S and GEQ GI-Salso ((, 462(*). The scale GEQGI-T and GEQ GI-S positively correlated ((,587(**).

2-retestNBU-Asia	GEQ ATG-T	GEQ ATG-S	GE Q GI-S	GEQ GI-T	Sea shore
GEQ ATG-T	1	,445	-,441	,589(*)	,450
GEQ ATG-S	,445	1	,462(*)	,350	,289
GEQ GI-S	-,441	,462(*)	1	,587(**)	-,233
GEQ GI-T	,589(*)	,350	,587(**)	1	,383
Seashore	,450	,289	-,233	,383	1

Last table of our investigation showed that the scale Compromising and GEQ ATG-S have positive correlation ((,046(*). It means that socially attraction of athletes to group makes them

more compromissive in task. Consequently, after improving social cohesion of team we can aimed to change the task cohesion. After social skills trainings NBU-Asia football club rise up from 6 position to 5 position on its league table.

2- retest NBU- Azia	Com peting	Com promising	Av oiding	Col laborating	Acco mmodating
GEQ ATG-T	,034	-,222	,18 0	,56 0(*)	-,313
GEQ ATG-S	,676 (**)	,046(*)	- ,256	- ,190	-,340
GEQ GI-S	-,269	-,066	,17 3	- ,208	,167
GEQ GI-T	,050	,206	,24 0	- ,321	,278
Seas hore	,387	-,453	- ,320	,13 4	,065

The study that we conducted only partially confirmed the theory of task cohesion. Although a general correlation analysis has proved our supposition, a particular correlation analysis yielded diverse results. That is, cohesion in its essence can be motivated by different reasons, be it a social component, or a task activity. We do not fully agree with the opinion of Carron in defining the team's cohesion as "a dynamic process that reflects the group's tendency to unite to achieve the set goals and objectives". In our opinion, without social cohesion, it is impossible to build unity of play as such. We presume that cohesion is, above all, an interpersonal relationship, and it generates common goals and objectives.

REFERENCES

1. Carron, A.V., Brawley, L.R., & Widmeyer, W.N. (1998). The measurement of cohesiveness in sport groups. In J.L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 213–226). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
2. Carron Albert V.; Steven R. Bray; Mark A. Eys. Team cohesion and team success in sport. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, Feb 2002 v20 i2 p119(8).
3. Bruhn.J. The group effect Social cohesion and Health outcomes. 2009.
4. [SopaIoan-Sabin](#). GROUP COHESION IMPORTANT FACTOR IN SPORT PERFORMANCE. Conference: *European Scientific Journal*, Volume: 2014