

# Comparative Study of Team Cohesion among Medalist and Non-Medalst University Level Female Volleyball Players

Dr. Sameer Kumar Yadav<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Dalveer Singh Kaunteya<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, LNIPE, Gwalior, MP, India  
Email: annu1212[at]gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, K R PG Collage, Mathura, UP, India  
Email: d9411854876[at]gmail.com

**Abstract:** *Present study was conceptualize to compare the team cohesion of university level female volleyball players among medalist and non-medalist and only 48 female Intervarsity volleyball players from the west zone (24 medalist and 24 non-medalist players) were included in the study. Two medal-winning teams and two non-medal-winning teams were picked in order to collect relevant data and team cohesion was evaluated using the standardized group environment questionnaire (GEQ) developed by Albert V. Carron in 1985. Standard procedure and protocol were adopted for administration and collection of data. To compare the team cohesion among both selected group the independent t-test was employed as a statistical technique by using SPSS 20 at 0.05 level of significance. The degree of team cohesion between the two groups was predicted to be considerably different. The results of the statistical process revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the medalist and non-medalist female volleyball players from the West Zone intervarsity level in their judgments of group tasks and group integration social, thus Among the medalist and non-medalist west zone collegiate level female volleyball players, the hypothesis proposed for the current study was partially rejected and partially accepted on chosen factors.*

**Keywords:** Team Cohesion, Female Volleyball Players, Medalist and Non-Medalst Comparison

## 1. Introduction

The depth and breadth of interpersonal ties among group members is known as team cohesiveness. This sense of camaraderie among members encourages participation and keeps people motivated to reach the objectives. Teams that are cohesive have a "we-ness" mentality. Multidimensionality, instrumental basis, dynamic, and emotional nature are the four main aspects of the multifaceted process of team cohesion. The many distinct elements that contribute to the group members' ability to work as a unit are connected to multidimensionality. The dynamic nature means that the team goals and objectives alter over time. The emotional dimension relates to some of the benefits that members receive by keeping cohesive, whereas the instrumental basis is concerned with how members are devoted to one goal. Regardless of whether they are a sports team, military unit, fraternity, or business organization, teams that stick together are more likely to be successful in the tasks they are given (Helen Wale, 2023).

Numerous studies conducted in sports show a positive effect of cohesion on performance. If sports teams have a stronger relationship between cohesion and performance than other natural groups (military groups, business groups); The perception of success or failure is more acute (the results of each team in each pool in each division are disseminated by the national or regional media); That sports groups have stronger models of excellence (each tends to reach a higher sporting level) and a feeling as a larger group (membership in the sports team is a major contributor to the social identity of the players). In addition, the sports sector differs from other areas in that the active participation of members in the

formulation of group objectives is not necessarily linked to strong cohesion. The cohesion of a sports team does not depend on the joint development of the group's objectives, which are usually established by the club coach or club president. Thus, in teams, the preferred style of command is the "autocratic" style, only one person, usually the coach, deciding on the choices and behaviors to follow for the entire team (CherifNacer-eddine et al 2017).

Considering the importance of cohesiveness among the team sports the present study was conceptualize to compare the team cohesion of university level female volleyball players among medalist and non-medalist and further it was hypothesized that, there would be significant difference in team cohesion among medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players.

## 2. Methodology

48 female varsity volleyball players from the west zone were the only participants in the current study (24 medalist and 24 non-medalist players). For the purpose of gathering data, two medal-winning teams and two non-medal-winning teams were chosen. Standardized group environment questionnaire (GEQ) given by Albert V. Carron (1985) was used to gauge team cohesiveness. Using this as a foundation, four related constructs that help people work together in a group can be identified:

- Individual Attractions to the Group - Task Cohesion (IA-T);
- Individual Attractions to the Group - Social Cohesion (IA-S);
- Group Integration - Task Cohesion (GI-T); and

## d) Group Integration - Social Cohesion (GI-S)

The researcher made sure that volunteers understood the study's objectives and those they weren't being evaluated personally. With the coaches who accompanied the teams' approval, the questionnaires were distributed to the participants during the west-zone Intervarsity. Before delivering each exam, the people chosen for the research were personally contacted and given the pertinent instructions. After receiving these instructions, the person may perform at their best. Responses were assured to be kept private so that the subjects wouldn't hide their true emotions. The responses of the participants chosen for this study were graded using the authors' recommended answer keys. Independent t-test was used as a statistical technique to compare the team cohesion among both groups by the help of SPSS 20 at 0.05 level of significance.

### 3. Result

The data was obtained by questionnaire and then analyzed by using adopted statistical technique which was presented as below.

**Table 1:** T-table for variable group task of medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players

Group	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean difference	Standard error difference	T valve
Medalist	18.6465	7.85663	.75475	2.65253	.527*
Non medalist	16.9592	6.95473			

\*level of sig. 0.05, tab. t = 1.717

Table-1 indicates that the calculated t (.527) is less than the tabulated value and it was concluded that there is no significance difference in group task of the medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players.

**Table 2:** T-table for variable group social of medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players

Group	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean difference	Standard error difference	T valve
Medalist	32.4575	7.85663	6.39879	2.11458	3.67*
Non medalist	26.0000	6.74571			

\*level of sig. 0.05, tab. t = 1.717

Table-2 showed that the calculated t (3.67) is high than the tabulated value and it was concluded that there is significance difference in group social of the medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players.

**Table 3:** T-table for variable group integration task of the medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players

Group	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean difference	Standard error difference	T valve
Medalist	34.4348	7.45875	6.45989	1.89437	4.426*
Non medalist	25.5359	5.66423			

\*level of sig. 0.05, tab. t = 1.717

Table-3 reveals that the calculated t (4.426) is higher than the tabulated value and it was concluded that there is significance difference in group integration task of the

medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players.

**Table 4:** T-table for variable group integration social of the medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players

Group	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean difference	Standard error difference	T valve
Medalist	24.7516	6.87543	3.16839	1.78386	1.697
Non medalist	20.4765	6.16732			

\*level of sig. 0.05, tab. t = 1.717

Table 4 reveals that the calculated t (1.697) is less than the tabulated value and it was concluded that there is no significance difference in group integration social of the medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players.

### 4. Conclusion

The finding of the present study reveals that there was no significant difference in perceptions on group task and group integration social but there was a significant difference in perception on group social and group integration task of the medalist and non-medalist west zone intervarsity level female volleyball players. The results of this study are indicative that further research is needed to look into the true value of medalist and non-medalist of west zone intervarsity female players along with national and All India university players for acquiring right information related to team cohesion among female volleyball players according to the level of play. One of the most often used instruments in the current team cohesion study is the GEQ, which is acknowledged among worldwide methodologies. The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ), a four-scale tool with 18 items, gauges how cohesive sport teams are seen to be. The GEQ is internally consistent and has strong content validity, according to Carron et al. (1985). Our study's findings led us to the conclusion that poorer performance on group tasks and social group integration should serve as a caution to coaches because they don't appear to be a standard. It was suggested that it would be worthwhile to concentrate on team cohesiveness in co-educated sport teams based on variations in perceived team cohesion between medalist and non-medalist university level female volleyball players. As a social psychology concept, team cohesiveness is crucial for improving team effectiveness and members' perceptions of their level of satisfaction. It is regarded as a difficult idea that requires extra study and investigation in order to be fully understood and appreciated. The results of this study will be used to the teaching of sport psychology, in particular.

Hypothesis stated for the present study was partially rejected as no significant difference was found in perceptions on group task and group integration social further Hypothesis formulated in this study was partially accepted as significant difference was found in perception on group social and group integration task of the medalist and non-medalist west zone intervarsity level female volleyball players.

**References**

- [1] Brawley, L. (1990). Group cohesion: Status, problems, and future directions. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 21, pp. 355–379.
- [2] Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1998). Measurement of cohesion in sport and exercise. In: J. L. Duda (ed.), *Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology Measurement* (pp. 213–226).
- [3] Wrisberg, C. A., & Draper, M. V. (1988). Sex, sex role orientation, and the cohesion of intercollegiate basketball teams. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 11, 45–54.
- [4] Cherif Nacer-eddine, Guendouzen Nadir, Larbi Mohamed, Bouadjenek Kamal (2017), “Group Cohesion and Sport Performance”, *The Swedish Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol. 4 (8).
- [5] Helen Wale (2023), “Team Cohesion”, Updated February 21, 2023 retrieved from <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/management/team-cohesion/>