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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate team cohesion among basketball players in the National Classic League in Kenya. The study intended to establish the differences in social and task cohesion in the teams, teams’ cohesiveness and the win-loss records, and gender differences in the teams and the teams’ size and their degree of social and task cohesion. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The target population comprised 180 players derived from teams in the 2010 National Classic League Season. A stratified random sampling procedure was used in the study to select respondents based on gender. Six players were sampled from each team to make a sample of 130 (72%). A self-administered questionnaire was used as a tool for data collection. Data were subjected to statistical analysis using the descriptive statistics and other data were analyzed and tabulated into simple frequencies and percentages and presented in the form of graphs and pie charts. ANOVA was used to test research hypotheses (H01), Kruskal Wallis for research hypotheses (H02), and Spearman’s Correlation of Coefficient for research hypothesis (H03). The conclusions drawn suggested that social cohesion was managed well with smaller groups of players, policy engaging the players be formulated to improve sports participation, further research be done in other sports areas to investigate social and team cohesion. Other variables to be investigated in relation to cohesion include coach’s style of leadership, motivation and ethnic affiliation. Studies can also be done at lower levels of basketball game like in universities and middle level colleges.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Research studies indicate that cohesive teams are likely to be highly successful (Carron, 1982). It is certain that a highly cohesive team would achieve more than a team whose members’ exhibit discontent, conflict and disruption (McGrath, 1984). However, at the same time, it is unreasonable to assume that all successful teams are also highly cohesive in nature.

The quest for sport psychologists working with teams is to identify constructs that relate to performance and manipulate them to improve performance. Sport psychologists are faced with a plethora of possible constructs that could relate to performance, and thus selection of one to work with presents a challenge (Murphy & Tammen, 1998). A number of psychosocial variables have been found to predict sports performance. For example, the size of the crowd in a stadium watching a match contest may have a significant positive effect upon the team’s performance as they cheer and support their players. However, one of the most interesting psychosocial influences which the present study was out to deal with is the concept of team cohesion. Informally, coaches and athletes refer to team cohesion as togetherness, team unity, spirit, and the “sense of teamwork”. Popular opinion holds that team cohesion is necessary for a team to play to its potential (Murphy & Tammen, 1998). It is evident that the tremendous feeling of team spirit inherent in the 1980 United States
Olympic ice hockey team enabled it to sweep the Gold away from the rest of the competitors at Lake Placid (Seppo & Hatfield, 1986). Joe Namath, after retirement as the quarterback of the New York Jets and Los Angeles Rams, once told a reporter that the aspect of the game that he would miss most was the tremendous feeling of comradeship that he shared with his teammates (Seppo & Hatfield, 1986).

One of the prime examples of both the players and coaches’ beliefs that teams’ cohesion and playing success are related appeared in an issue of The Sporting News (May 28, 1984) regarding the phenomenal season start of baseball’s Detroit Tigers with 32 wins and 5 losses. In an interview with reporters, Detroit Tiger player, Darrell Evans was quoted as saying,

This club grew up together. Nobody here thinks of himself. There are no media-seekers, and that’s important because everyone shares in the appreciation. I’ve enjoyed a lot of teams. We’ve been close, but I’m enjoying the game more now, with this club, than any time in my career (p. 3).

Along the same lines, Sparky Anderson in Seppo and Hatfield (1986) noted that there were no individual heroes on the team, just a 25-man roster playing good baseball (p. 3). Conversely, the public and the players themselves are often quick to point out that an athletic team didn’t play together as a unit when the team is met with an unexpected defeat (Seppo & Hatfield, 1986).
Researchers have identified two types of cohesion; task cohesion is defined as a general orientation toward achieving a group's goals and objectives, while social cohesion is defined as a general orientation toward developing and maintaining social relationships within a group (Carron, Widmeyer & Brawley, 1985). In the realm of sport, a coach and the team must be concerned with both task and social cohesion. This is because increase in both task and social cohesion will ultimately lead to success. It is important to appreciate that success does not always mean winning. Goals are an important ingredient of success and they play a major role in the development of individual athletes' skill and in the development of task cohesion. However, not all teams have the ability to win, but they can all experience success through the accomplishment of goals. Success is an important aspect of task cohesion, therefore, the more successes a team experiences, the higher the cohesion (Carron, 1982). Indeed, goals can help significantly in the development of task cohesion, hence increasing chances of success.

The concept of team cohesion and how it can affect athletic performance was the main focus of the present study. Although there is scarcity of literature in Kenya on this issue, team cohesion can help in defining and contributing to team sports success. Previous studies (Carron, 1982) have addressed such issues as the development of cohesion in athletic teams; but the primary concern of the present study was with the cohesion-performance relationship.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Investigations into the influence of team composition on team performance, in terms of task-related attributes (for instance, personality traits, cognitive abilities) often assume this relation to be mediated by the strength (intensity) of the interpersonal relations (social cohesion) among team members. A number of local studies have been done in soccer on factors that have an effect on teams’ performance, and their areas of focus including tactical and technical factors (Simiyu, 2005), lack of coaching programmes and poor preparation for international competitions, lack of international visits to gain experience, financial constraints, haphazard residential training, lack of professional players and poor state of sports administration (Versi, 1986). However, little has been done locally in the context of psychological factors such as stress, personality and cohesion. There is, therefore, scarcity of local knowledge on these variables, which are important ingredients for teams’ performance. Thus, this study sought to examine the psychosocial variable of team cohesion in team performance using basketball players in the National Classic League of the year 2010 in Kenya. To establish the degree of social and task cohesion in the teams, teams’ cohesiveness and their win/loss records were examined. The study was interested in establishing the influence of gender and team size on cohesion and team performance.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between team cohesion and sports performance in terms of win/loss record of the basketball teams in the Kenya National Classic League of the year 2010.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between team cohesion and team performance among basketball players in the National Classic League of the year 2010 in Kenya. The specific objectives were:

(i) To determine the degree of cohesion (task and social) among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya in 2010.

(ii) To determine whether there is a relationship between cohesion and performance among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya in 2010.

(iii) To determine the differences in cohesion between male and female players in basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya in 2010.

(iv) To determine the relationship between team size and cohesion among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya in 2010.

1.5 Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

(i) What was the extent of social and task cohesion in basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?

(ii) Did the team cohesiveness have any significant relationship with the performance of basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?
(iii) Was there a difference in cohesion between male and female players among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?

(iv) Did the teams’ size in basketball teams significantly affect cohesiveness in the national classic league in Kenya during the 2010 league season?

1.6 Null Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were addressed in the study:

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between the teams’ social and task cohesion and their performance in basketball in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between male and female players and team cohesion in basketball teams in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between the teams’ size, and cohesiveness in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the following assumptions:

(i) The basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya possessed some levels of task and social cohesion.

(ii) There is a relationship between team (social and task) cohesion and the performance of teams in the National Classic Basketball League in Kenya.
(iii) There is a relationship between the players’ gender and cohesion among players in the National Classic League in Kenya.

(iv) There is a relationship between team size and cohesion in the national classic league in Kenya.

1.8 Significance of the study

The findings of this study will provide more knowledge to team managers, coaches and / or sport psychologists on the significance of task and social cohesion and team performance. The team managers and coaches could utilize the findings of this study to develop team-building strategies to improve team cohesiveness. The findings of this study would probably help players to realize the contribution of cohesiveness to their team’s success hence, strengthening their social skills and relations. Conversely, the findings are useful source of information to guide policy-makers on the influence of task and social cohesion to a team’s performance. This guides policy-makers to plan for and adopt sound strategies in teams’ management with an aim of improving performance.

There is scarcity of literature in the area of team cohesion and sports performance in Kenya. Hence, the findings of this study have added knowledge in this area. In addition, this study contributes knowledge for the purposes of cross-cultural comparisons on effects of team cohesion in basketball and other types of sports. The information obtained from the findings may be important feedback to those handling basketball teams. It has also highlighted the significance of sports psychologists and
psychological knowledge in guiding players towards achievement of optimal performance.

1.9 Scope of the Study
The study was conducted on basketball players in the National Classic League in Kenya in the 2010 season to investigate team cohesion and its effect on performance.

1.10 Limitations of the Study
Successful performance of a team is influenced by varied variables such as technical and tactical, preparation, personal and environmental factors but the researcher concentrated only on variables related to team’s social and task cohesion. Also, there was limited control of other intervening variables such as motivation, personality, players mood, leadership styles, facilities and equipment.

1.11 Conceptual Framework
This study adopted the model of cohesion developed by Carron et al., (1985). These authors developed an instrument known as the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) that was effective in determining the effect of working as a social group than individual to performance. The model of cohesion identifies four key contributing factors that interact to facilitate social or task cohesion. These include environmental, personal, team and leadership factors as illustrated in Figure 1.1 below.
Figure 1.1: A General Conceptual System for Cohesiveness Determinants in Sport Teams

Source: Adapted from Carron et al., 1998:63)

The factors described in Figure 1.1 are the major determinants of the level of team cohesion. Group task would increase the desire for group to succeed and team stability. Environmental factors relate to leadership and personal factors lead to increased team cohesion thus, successful performance. Personal factors including affiliation, motivation and satisfaction increase the likelihood of task completion in players. With such personal factors, the players shall be readily predisposed to enhance team factors. Hence, the team factors of desire for success, group orientation, ability and stability, will increase group’s task completion, hence group success.
Nevertheless, leadership factors too come in to blend on the personal and team factors. The leadership behaviours and styles including coach–team and –athlete relationship will determine social and task completion hence team’s success. Thus, these main factors amount to team cohesion hence overall team’s success.
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

- **Team Cohesion**: Refers to the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of common goals. For example, preparing for a tournament.

- **Social Cohesion**: Is how well players in a team get along with each other personally. In this study, social cohesion was based on the number of players in a team that were liked or disliked by each player in the same team.

- **Task Cohesion**: Refers to the perception of the basketball players in Kenya’s Classic League in 2010 in terms of playing, celebrating victories and accepting defeat as teams.

- **Team Size**: Refers to the total number of players in the teams in the classic league in the 2010 season.

- **National Classic League 2010**: The Competition involving 10 male and 10 female senior clubs in basketball in the year 2010 in Kenya.

- **Homogeneity**: Similarity of characteristics within members of a team.

- **Sports Performance**: Wins and losses of basketball teams during the classic league 2010.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the review of related literature with reference to the concept of cohesion, success, satisfaction and its relationship to sports performance. Finally, a summary of literature review is presented.

2.1 Team Cohesion

Team cohesion is defined as the total field of forces causing members to remain in group (Sheryl & Bruce, 2005). Cohesion is the degree and the tendency of teams to stick together in unity, solidarity, and pulling together to achieve a certain objective. Team cohesion starts with the clarity of the specific performance objective starting with building of confidence in team members.

There are two types of cohesion: task cohesion and social cohesion. Task cohesion refers to the general orientation toward achieving a group's goals and objectives. On the other hand, social cohesion consists of a general orientation toward developing and maintaining social relationships within a group (Carron, Widmeyer & Brawley, 1985). These two culminates into team cohesion. Indeed, a number of factors can affect team cohesion leading to its differential influence on teams’ performance. According to Sheryl and Bruce (2005), team cohesion is affected by various factors, including:
Trust: It is rated as one of the most important aspects of team cohesion. It is the bond that permits any kind of significant relationships for good coexistence in a team (Sheryl & Bruce, 2005).

All players in a team sport should trust each other. Managers and/or coaches may organize social activities geared towards team building. Basketball teams in the National Classic League are made of amateur elite players. Their main target is to win among other competitors and can be realized through trust and collaboration originating from being involved in planning the attack, working out strategies and tactics to ensure excellent scores. This will ensure increased team cohesion leading to successful performance (Lencioni, 2005).

Communication: Team managers need to create conducive environment that supports effective communication within the group. If possible, team leaders should encourage face-to-face communications either by purposefully placing the team together in a centralized location and/or organize recreational/outdoor activities. This creates a human touch and provides an atmosphere for shared laughter thus generating a bonding process in which players feel closer together (Lencioni, 2005). Managers who initiate humour have been shown to be more likely to become an integral part of a socially cohesive team (McGrath, 1984). However, it’s important to avoid negative humour and jokes since they can also result to hatred and negatively affect the expected successful performance. This removes the barriers between managers and players leading to improved cohesion.
**Popularity:** This is the extent to which a sport is commonly played and well-known among cross-cultural setups. If a sport is unpopular (like Baseball in the UK or netball in US) then there will be few people interested to play this sport. Thus, it would be difficult to find teams to play against, hence team cohesion will be low. However, if a sport is popular (Basketball in the US), there will be many people wishing to identify themselves with such a sport. Very popular sports are associated with great achievements in terms of income, individual fame and even one becoming a celebrity. Successful basketball players like Michael Jordan are legends known worldwide due to his good performance. Players in the National Classic League may look forward into becoming icons and therefore, must work as a team for best performance. The idea of working together will promote team cohesion.

**Homogeneity:** This is mostly dependent on the team composition and organization. If the team members are similar in terms of age, status, experience, qualification, ambitions, social background, attitudes, ability, commitment and personality, they would have homogeneous group thus improving team cohesion. Conversely, teams where members have similarities are more cohesive and this may display coordinated behaviour patterns and a higher degree of performance (Lencioni, 2005). If possible, such factors can be considered in team selection. In contrast, heterogeneity of team members may uncover unpleasant differences that can compromise team cohesion. Further, a common group or team identity will have positive consequences on performance within a co-acting team sport like basketball. The social bonding and
task unity that develops in groups is pleasing to members. This study, therefore, sought to investigate the effect of homogeneity of a team on task and social cohesion and the performance of teams in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 season.

**Leadership:** Team organizational context involves basic structures in its hierarchical system. A study by Jowett *et al.*, (2004) examined the extent to which athletes' perceptions of their relationship with their coach add to the prediction of team cohesion beyond what is predicted by perceptions of coach leadership. The study involved four self-report instruments that measured perceptions of group cohesion, coach leadership, and the nature of coach-athlete relationships which were completed by 111 university athletes in America. Findings from the study revealed that leadership variables predicted more variance in task and social cohesion when relationship variables were included. Moreover, leadership and relationship variables were shown to be better and stronger predictors of task cohesion than social cohesion.

Research has shown that a team is likely to be more cohesive when its structures favour close contact (Sheryl & Bruce, 2005). The leaders and players of teams should be consistent and knowledgeable in working with teams. The ability of team leaders to:

- Positively influence commitment of players fosters higher team cohesion.
- Initiate open communication between all stakeholders.
- Involve players in decision-making.
- Discuss behavioral expectations and discipline.
• Reward / acknowledge good performances and organize consultative meetings where players can air their grievances.

Leadership that portrays the above qualities is likely to develop stronger team cohesion and hence successful performances. The study assessed the effect of leadership on the task and social cohesion and teams’ performance in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

**Team size:** The number of players is determined by the nature of the sport. Team sports have rules that govern the expected number of players. It’s important to utilize each team member especially in their respective play positions. Lencioni (2005), maintained that the number of players in a team would positively influence team cohesion. However, large teams are characterized by being more difficult to manage; less united in purpose and in ability change thus lowering their team cohesion. Managing a small number of players in sports can be easy to organize hence improved team cohesion.

Spink (1995) investigated the relationship between cohesion and group size in exercise groups. The study compared the perceptions of cohesiveness of members of small and large exercise classes assessed in group development for a period of 13 weeks. The purpose of study was to determine how an intervention programme focusing on team-building principles would influence perceptions of cohesiveness in small and large exercise classes. It was concluded that perceptions of task and social cohesion are greater in smaller groups, and that a team-building programme can offset the negative
impact of increased group size. This study was conducted to investigate the effect of team size on task and social cohesion and sports performance among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

2.2 Relationship between Success, Satisfaction and Performance

Research has shown that there is a relationship between player satisfaction and successful performance. Relationship between team cohesion and performance is primarily co-relational rather than casual (Sheryl & Bruce, 2005). Cohesion is associated with the extent to which team players are satisfied. Satisfaction refers to an individual’s feeling towards their participation in a team, (Rintaugu, 2013). If an individual has a high degree of satisfaction they are more likely to feel good about themselves and their participation hence good performance. However, if a group lacks the ability to gain satisfaction substantially through its performances, team cohesion may decrease. Cohesive teams are more productive than less cohesive teams in performance. Martens and Robinson (1997) conducted a study on collegiate intramural basketball teams and found out that success in performance was dependent on individual satisfaction. Similarly, team players’ satisfaction may lead to team cohesion hence successful performance. Therefore, it is important to promote team satisfaction through motivation and other forms of appraisals to the players. A circular model of relationship shows the effect of satisfaction on team cohesion and performance as illustrated in Figure 2.1 below.
Figure 2.1: Circular Model of the Relationship Between Success, Satisfaction and Performance.

Source: Adapted from Martens & Peterson, 1997:124

Figure 2.1 above illustrates that the moment team players are satisfied as there is a strong team cohesion resulting into successful performance. However, lack of satisfaction may result to low team cohesion thus poor performance. Players’ satisfaction originates from the style of leadership, remuneration/allowances if any, adequate training that boosts their confidence and other forms of motivation that are provided to the team. This study, therefore, sought to assess the effect of player’s satisfaction on team cohesion within the basketball teams in the National Classic League 2010 season.

2.3 Relationships Between Degree of Interaction and Team Cohesion

The degree of interaction in a particular sport is also an important factor in team cohesion. Cox, (1990), suggests that sports could be categorized into high interaction in team sports (e.g. basketball, rugby, football) and low interaction individual sports...
(e.g. swimming, shooting, and cycling). Basketball is the main sport in this study and it is a group sport and highly interactive. Members of the team are expected to:

(a) have a common identity that distinguishes them from other teams.

(b) be socially attracted to each other.

(c) be ready to complement each other.

(d) put their team work before their own interest.

(e) possess inner/ personal discipline.

(f) share goals and aims.

A team whose players have the above qualities are destined to register improved team cohesion and perform better in the sports competitions (Wisel, 1994). However, individualized sports depend on a player’s characteristic and preparedness in executing the skills to win the competition. Basketball is a team sport and players must have the qualities mentioned above for better results. Figure 2.2 below illustrates the outcome of low and high interaction in relation to the degree of team cohesion.

**LOW INTERACTION**

- high team cohesion → less good performance
- low team cohesion → less good performance

**HIGH INTERACTION**

- high team cohesion → good performance
- low team cohesion → less good performance

*Figure 2.2* Relationships Between Team Interaction and Degree of Cohesion on
Team Performance

Source: Adopted from Cox, 1990:14

Figure 2.2 shows that high team cohesion in a low interaction sport causes low performance. The implications of such observations is to guide coaches and sport psychologists in assessing team cohesion and develop team-building strategies to improve task cohesion, hence, developing the ‘we’ mentality. Eriksson (2000) describes how the ‘we’ mentality can raise the performance of all the players in a team and help reduce the pressure associated with big events and also describes eight key attributes of an effective team, which promotes team cohesion. The attributes may include:

- Trust among all the team players and the technical team.
- Free communication within players and managers.
- Participatory decision-making.
- Democratic leadership style.

Consequently, all personnel handling teams should aim to inculcate into the players the above attributes so as to increase cohesion. This study therefore sought to assess the effect that the degree of interaction had on team cohesion and performance in the game of basketball in the National Classic League 2010 Season.

2.4 Review of Related Literature on Team Cohesion and Sports Performance

Whilst there seems to be a significant relationship between cohesion and performance in sports, the subject has been researched most extensively within the fields of
management, leadership and psychology. Many credible studies exist in academia, with distinct and conflicting conclusions emerging on the subject. On one hand, there are some expert authorities those who believe that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that team cohesiveness and achievement tend to be positively related. Many theorists however, conclude that cohesion amongst team members tends to promote productivity (Cox, 1990; Martens & Peterson, 1997), which can be directly related to positive performance outcomes.

Above all, there is also a selected team of personnel that promotes mixed and inconclusive stance towards the relation of team cohesion and performance. In the final analysis, however, evidence has accumulated to suggest that high levels of team cohesion can occasionally detract from performance, quality and productivity. In the same vein, highly cohesive groups are often more enjoyable to be part of; but potentially less productive (Seppo & Hatfield, 1986), the overwhelming evidence of research and personal experience indicates that, in general, a positive correlation exists between cohesion and performance. And this has always been an enduring fascination among coaches and sport researchers as well as fans. Indeed, some of the studies reviewed indicate a positive relationship between team cohesion and performance.

One of the earliest studies supporting this relationship was conducted by Stogdill (1987) who examined the degree of team cohesion and the number of yards gained on each offensive play for the Ohio State Buckeyes football team. The degree of cohesion was rated by eight high school coaches who sat in the stands and quantified the level
of team coordination in terms of a subjective 9-point rating scale. The level of coordination was defined as the degree of complementary and coordination appeared to be analogous to the teamwork item found on the Sport Cohesiveness Questionnaire. Stogdil (1987) concluded from these measurements that team cohesion and performance (i.e. yards gained) were related under conditions of high drive. However, this result does not mean that team cohesion caused high levels of performance but that the two variables were related. Stogdill’s study did not clearly indicate the relationship between team cohesion and performance. However, the coordination measure of team cohesion appeared to be more of measure of performance than its cohesion.

Although most of these studies have examined the effect of performance out-comes upon athlete’s perceptions of team cohesion at the end of the season, Ruder and Gill (1982) demonstrated the effect of single game outcomes in both intramural and intercollegiate women’s volleyball teams upon team cohesion. The study showed that team cohesion is not static and phenomenally stable but seems to change throughout the season. The study further showed that winning teams had a rise in group’s cohesion following the game, while losing teams suffered a decline. The transitory effect of game outcome on team cohesion was much more pronounced for the intramural teams than the intercollegiate teams. The latter seemed to portray a greater degree of stability for this team attribute. Even though, sports psychology researchers have shown a relationship proceeding from cohesion to performance and from performance to cohesion. (Peterson & Martens, (1997; Gill, 1987) states that, the
directional influence seems to proceed to a greater degree from performance to later cohesion. Indeed, most studies by (Cox, 1990; Seppo & Hatfield, 1986, Stogdil, 1987) have shown more of an effect of performance upon later cohesion rather than vice versa. But from another perspective, it would seem desirable to determine whether the effect of cohesion has a significant effect upon later performance.

Consequently, agreement among team players is an important component for team sports because it can influence a team’s collective effort, their persistence in tough situations or defeat, and is a characteristic often observed in successful teams (Bandura, 1997). Some psychologists have consistently demonstrated that collective efficacy has positive effects on sport performance (Carron, 1992; Feltz & Lirgg, 1998; Greenlees et al., 1999; Watson et al., 2001). The key aspects comprising collective efficacy are shared beliefs among the team, coordinative capabilities between members, collective resources for task success, and situational specificity of demands (Zaccaro et al., 1995). For collective efficacy to be present within a team, these key elements should be prevalent.

Following these suggestions, some studies have examined the relationship between these two constructs in the group sports. Paskevich et al. (1999) investigated the cohesion collective efficacy relationship in university and club volleyball teams. Results showed the positive relationships between task cohesion and collective efficacy. The positive relationship between task cohesion and collective efficacy was also supported by another study involving rugby-union teams. Kozub and McDonnell, (2000) found that task cohesion was positively associated to collective efficacy. They
also noted that social dimension of cohesion did not add significantly to associated collective efficacy. In line with Kozub and McDonnell’s (2000) results, Heuze et al. (2006) found athletes’ perceptions of task cohesion were positively related with their perceptions of collective efficacy, although another positive relationship was found between social dimension of cohesion and collective efficacy. Ronayne (2004) also found a significant relationship between two dimensions of group cohesion (task and social cohesion) and collective efficacy at the early season and especially at the late season measurement.

Empirical research has indicated that high group cohesion associated with successful sport performance are related in a number of sports including basketball (Carron et al., 2002), soccer (Murray, 2006), and baseball (Boone et al., 1997). Gardner et al., (1996) showed that group cohesion is hypothesized to positively influence performance and success. Carron et al., (2002) demonstrated a strong positive relationship between cohesion and team success. The results showed that there were no differences between the cohesion-to-success and the success-to-cohesion relationship. Grieve et.al (2000) found that performance has more impact on cohesion than cohesion has on performance.

Fox (1984), found no significant relationship between cohesion and success, and also indicated that there is a conflicting relationship between cohesion and success, and those both positive and negative relationships were found. In this study, there was a significant relationship between team cohesion and performance. In the teams where
team cohesion was high within groups, recorded more wins than those with less team cohesion within the group. Therefore, social and task cohesion within players of a team positively affected performance of the teams that participated in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

On the other hand, previous studies indicated that collective efficacy could influence the team performance. Hodges and Carrons’ (1992) findings showed that, following failure, groups high in collective efficacy increased their efforts and performance; whereas groups low in collective efficacy showed deterioration in performance. Lirgg et al., (1994) and Davis (1996) investigated the relationship between collective efficacy and performance, and found that collective efficacy was positively correlated with group performance. Similarly, Spink’s (1990) study of elite volleyball teams demonstrated that high efficacy teams performed significantly better in a competitive tournament than did teams with low levels of collective efficacy. Therefore, within the area of team sport, both collective efficacy and group cohesion would appear to share some commonality in influencing sport performance on numerous occasions in the past.

All in all, cohesion, in the context of teams, is all about the joining together of individuals to form a united and cooperative whole. Cohesion is an overall measure of group togetherness, and is based on three key factors: interpersonal attraction, defined as the tendency of one person to evaluate another person in a consistently positive manner; individual commitment, towards the collective and its objectives/goals; and
feelings of personal satisfaction and pride, based upon the perceived achievements and/or opportunities derived from membership. If all three of these factors are found to be abundant within the majority of team members, the team can be considered relatively cohesive. Performance can be defined as a measure of the effectiveness and efficiency of a given team, and its individual members, in pursuing predetermined objectives and goals. A team winning more matches is likely to have greater social and task cohesion between and within groups.

A study by Wisel (1994) on steps to success in Basketball revealed that one great measure of a team composition is the diversity of team members and evaluated two groups, one group had similarities in age, race, sex, academic standards and backgrounds. Findings from this group showed that there was heightened team cohesion thus excellent performance. The other group differed in terms of age, race, academic standards, backgrounds but same sex; results indicated low cohesion and strain in good performance. This was a good indicator that homogeneity in a team was a key to improved team cohesion hence successful performance.

According to Davis (1996), the size of a team dictates the number of coaches assigned to it. It is difficult to promote team cohesion with large number of players in a team due to the diversity in skill levels. The coach will require more time to train and assess to ascertain the abilities of each player. Consequently, in coaching sports skill, a smaller number will ease the extent of output from the coach therefore cohesion develops more quickly in small groups since there is minimal room for disintegration.
It’s also easier to attain stability, learn and manage behaviour patterns, organize team building activities and or reduce loading (the tendency for individuals to lessen their effort when they are a part of a group). The improved cohesion leads to successful performance. This study, therefore, investigated the effect of team size on team cohesion within the basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

A study by Lencioni (2005) on the five dysfunctions of a team, suggests that the initial stages of building a strong team cohesion are team members sharing their background details to show homogeneity. This sharing is a step towards allowing themselves become vulnerable to each other and stem up trust amongst the group. However, this study was carried out in San Francisco. There was need to investigate the effects of homogeneity in the Basketball Teams National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

Criticisms are often made that performance tends to be measured chiefly by results, with little concern for the internal processes of teams and other less tangible, but potentially important outcomes. This point notwithstanding, the link between performance and results is both logical and practical when we consider that the reason we form teams in the first place is because we wish to achieve certain objectives and goals. To take a negotiated position on the matter, while team process is indeed of interest, and one could well argue that analysis of performance should involve greater attention to internal team processes, it is the end results that should, and inevitably do, prove the final and overriding measure of success or failure.
Ruder and Gill (1982) studied the effect of preseason cohesiveness upon performance measures, i.e. the win-loss record in 3-main intramural basketball teams by means of the Sport Cohesiveness Questionnaire. In addition to the formation of male and female teams, the authors grouped the teams into three ability levels according to a pre-season standardized basketball skills test. As such, the researchers were able to examine whether the cohesion-performance relationship differed by ability level i.e. good, average and poor and by gender. They hypothesized that the higher ability groupings might evidence a stronger relationship between team cohesiveness and performance. Similarly, the lesser ability teams might be more stable than the lesser ability groups and it was believed that these teams might be more sensitive to the social team factor.

Research study by Gaertner (1992) examined the effect that a common group or team identity had on positive consequences on performance within a co-acting sport (football) team. The survey study used ninety-four high school football players from four eastern regional schools that measured strength of identification with the team as a whole, as offensive versus defensive units, or as individual players. Results from the findings revealed that a single team unity factor that predicted membership in both offensive and defensive unit construct indicated that players on winning teams (as determined by season win-loss record) emphasized team unity more than players on teams with losing records. Implications for the applicability of team identification to previous notions of team cohesion are discussed. This idea was used to determine the effect of homogeneity as a factor in the extent of task and team cohesion and performance in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.
In another study, Carron, Bry and Eys (2003) examined the relationship between task cohesion and team success in elite basketball and football teams, measuring just the group integration task and group attraction to task categories of cohesion from the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ). Each member of the 18 basketball and 9 football teams responded to the items from the questionnaires and after the end of their regular season, they ranked each response from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). The key findings were as follows:

(i) The mean team cohesion scores for basketball teams were 6.05 for group integration task and 6.11 for attraction to group task. For football teams, the mean scores were 6.33 and 7.04.

(ii) Scores in both categories were highly correlated with team success for both sports, success being defined as match results over the season, excluding play-offs. The teams with the highest ‘team cohesion’ scores had the best season won-loss percentage records.

The study offers clear evidence that real-world sport teams benefit from high levels of task cohesion. The strength of the relationship between cohesion, as measured by the task categories of the GEQ, and team success as measured by the win: loss record was higher and the researchers believed that this was because they focused on task cohesion using the GEQ. The researchers integrated individual scores to produce a
team cohesion score, and then related these scores to an indisputable measure of team success.

Research has showed that team cohesion and athletic performance is associated (Wisel, 1994). However, this established association does not mean that a causal relationship between the two variables can be assumed. To have a true test of causality, one would have to manipulate team cohesion experimentally and then observe the systematic changes in team success. Experimental manipulation of team cohesion would imply an actual intervention on the part of investigators to weaken cohesion in some teams and strengthen it in others. Most of these studies have been conducted from the West and it is worthwhile to conduct a study in Kenya.

Interestingly, research into cohesion using the Group Environmental Questionnaire has suggested that ‘task’ cohesion is more important for team success than ‘social’ cohesion. This could explain why it is possible for team mates to dislike each other and still win (Carron et al., 1982). Most coaches and athletes prefer team mates to like each other, but it appears that as long as they are completely focused on their common task and share the same goals and beliefs, success is possible even without social cohesion. Another example of this principle at work is the Chicago Bulls which dominated the NBA in the 1980s: the team members allegedly didn’t speak to each other off court, but practised and competed together with 100% professionalism and commitment and maintained an excellent performance (Carron et al., 1982).
2.5 Rewarding System

An organization’s reward system in acknowledging good performance may increase team cohesion (Kirkman, 2002). Team members must be motivated to use the knowledge and skills to achieve shared goals. Other forms of motivating players can create conditions to avoid problems such as social disparities, joy riders, and reduced sense of self-pity or praise. In the absence of such problems, there is strong team bond hence, improved team cohesion.

2.6 Gaps in Literature

The literature so far reviewed indicates a significant relationship between cohesion and team performance, both positive and negative relationships. In a positive relationship, the study by Carron et al., (1985) offers clear evidence that Real-world sports teams benefit from high levels of task cohesion. In a negative relationship, Carron et al., (1982) found that success can be realized even without social cohesion as long as players play professionally and with commitment.

Research has shown that trust is immensely important in increasing team cohesion and/or performance. In his study on challenges to virtual success, Kirkman (2002) indicated that trust is the bond that allows any kind of significant relationship to exist between people. Trust between members of a team is a key success to a cohesive team and cohesion. This study, therefore, sought to find out the effect of task and social cohesion on team performance within basketball teams in the National Classic League.
Social cohesion is non-task in focus and refers to social relationships (i.e. friendships, bonding) within a group or team. To achieve high social cohesion, it is essential for the group members to feel accepted and respected by one another and to value their membership in a sport group (Yukelson et al., 1984). Social cohesion is apparent in feelings of pride, unison, harmony and a sense of shared purpose.

Social cohesion is often identified by the sense of ‘we’ or togetherness exhibited by successful athletic teams (Carron, 1993). The nature of the sport experience, essentially described as a win/lose situation, was shown to have an effect on the interpersonal relationships of team members (Myers, et al., 2004). Myers et al., (2004) stated, “it seems likely that success should make it easier for individuals to interact with each other in a more harmonious fashion while failure should put a strain on interpersonal relationships” (p. 366). While this hypothesis was supported, it should be assumed that only winning teams are socially cohesive. Actually, unsuccessful teams can increase cohesiveness by concentrating on the process, not the outcome of athletic contests (Murray, 2006).

Similarly, losing provides an opportunity for the regrouping of the team and a reevaluation of its goals and objectives. Yukelson et al., (1984) identified four factors of cohesiveness representing both social and task-related values (p.114). These factors were labelled unity of purpose, valued roles, quality of teamwork, and attraction to the group. Two of these factors, quality of teamwork, and unity of purpose are related to the group as a unit factor identified by Carron (1993), while valued roles and attraction
to group reflect individual reactions to the group itself, or individual to group cohesion. Only one factor, attraction to group, represented both social and task components. Gruber and Gray (1981) identified six factors of cohesiveness in a study of various levels of basketball competition. These factors were labelled team performance satisfaction, task cohesion, affiliation cohesion, self-performance satisfaction, desire for recognition, and value of membership.

The level of social interaction among group members and the level of cohesion perceived may be influenced by the type of sport group being considered. Bird (1997) identified two general classes of sport groups, interacting and co-acting. Interacting sport teams are those in which the individual contribution of each team member is directly related to the achievement of the group goal such as basketball and soccer (Bird, 1997). Myers (2004) determined that as intergroup competition increases, cohesion increases as a result of a “reaction to a common enemy” (p. 375). While this adversary is commonly seen as the opponent in an athletic event, it is possible for the teammates to unite against an unpopular coach or other such internal factors (Hall, 1985).

Co-acting sport teams are teams in which the outcome of a contest is a result of individual performance scores that are averaged to arrive at a team score such as golf or bowling teams. Performance and the attainment of goals then become an individual responsibility. In this perspective, cohesion can have a positive or negative influence on success. Co-acting teams are generally more successful in low cohesion situations,
whereas the opposite is true for interacting teams (Landers, Wilkinson, Hatfield, & Barber, 1982). Bird (1997) attributed this to the fact that in interacting team situations, the performance of one team member can either benefit or hinder the achievement of group goals; therefore, the effective interweaving of talents and personalities is advantageous. Landers et al., (1982) determined that the nature of the sport group, that is, whether it is an interacting or co-acting sport, will determine how cohesive the group becomes. Carron and Chelladurai (1981) found that perceptions of cohesion differed among athletes competing in interacting versus co-acting sports. Landers et al., (1982) stated that “sports involving interaction like basketball are more likely to display a positive relationship between cohesion and performance, whereas co-acting sport teams tend to display a negative or null relationship between these same variables” (p. 182).

In sport today, the role of the coaching staff has gone beyond rolling a ball out and administering pep talk. According to Anshel (1994), “one of the greatest challenges to coaches in sport is to ensure that all athletes are invested in the team’s long term success” (p. 280). Essentially, coaches are being called upon to develop cohesion. Interweaving individual talents and channeling the energies of these individuals and their behaviours toward the accomplishment of predetermined team goals can be essential in building cohesion.

Most of the sport-related research has focused largely on individual goal-setting-performance relationships. Of the research that has been completed on team goal
setting to build cohesion, most researchers have evaluated team goals as a collective phenomenon (Brawley Carron, & Widmeyer, 1992). Zander (1994) suggests four types of goals that may exist concurrently within any group: (a) an individual member's goals for self, (b) an individual member's goals for the group, (c) the group's goal, and (d) the group's goal for individual members. By addressing the individual or group level goal setting practices, two potentially significant aspects of group goal setting are ignored. Dawson, Bray, and Widmeyer (2002) examined the goal setting practices of university team sport athletes using Zander's (1994) four-dimensional conceptual framework of group goals. Participants were intercollegiate athletes (155 males and 80 females) belonging to various sport teams.

Acceptable style of leadership is another key aspect of influencing team cohesion. In a study on building team cohesion, Sheryl and Bruce (2005) suggest that leaders should involve the players in decision-making. Democratic leaders who incorporate the ideas of the players in their planning are likely to promote team cohesion than the authoritative leaders. The study was also carried out in America hence the need to assess the effects of leadership on team cohesion in the Basketball teams in the National Classic League.

In his study on groups’ interaction and processes, McGrath (1984) stated that interaction is an element of improving team cohesion. During interaction, members are able to communicate freely. Effective communication within a group is ideal. Managers should create supportive environment that promotes open communication. The power of shared laughter and spirit of communication generates a bonding
process in which people feel closer. This helps to remove the barriers that separate leaders from players. Active communication within all members of the team encourages health relationships leading to strong team cohesiveness enhancing good performance. This study investigated the effect of communication on team cohesion within the basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

A majority of the studies were conducted in other countries other than Kenya. These countries have diverse sport environment as compared to the Kenyan situation (Carron et al., 1982; Davis, 1996; Kirkman, 2002; Lencioni, 2005; McGrath, 1984; Sheryl, 2005; Wisel, 1994). For instance, the methods of leadership and control of the teams in the studies reviewed showed a major difference on how the clubs in Kenya were being managed. Therefore, there was need to carry out a similar study to find out whether the same factors have any effect in team cohesion and performance within the basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used in the study. These include; research design, target population, sample size, and sampling procedures, instrumentation, pretesting of the instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis and data presentation techniques.

3.1 Research Design
This study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey research design involves observation and description of the phenomena being studied in ways that are accurate, concise, and easily understood without influencing its way. The phenomenon is studied in a completely natural and unchanged natural environment (Borg & Gall, 1983). It is relevant because it is used to assess attitudes and opinions about events, individuals or procedures (Gay, 1992). This research design was deemed appropriate for the study on the relationship between team social and task cohesion on performance of basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 Season.

3.2 Variables of the Study
The main variables of this study were teams’ cohesion, (social cohesion and task cohesion), which were the independent variables. The dependent variable was the
performance (win/loss) in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 season.

3.3 Target Population

The target population comprised both male and female basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya. There are normally eighteen male and eighteen female players in the teams which are vetted through competitive selection and qualify in the number of points to the National Classic League, teams play in designated groupings or pools and winners proceed to the national classic league. According to Kenya Basketball Federation, each team has approximately a total of 18 players, which implies that the study targeted 180 players. Each team was restricted to enter not more than twenty (20) players for the season.

3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Stratified sampling procedure was used to select basketball players of not less than two years’ experience in clubs that participated in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 season on the basis of gender. In the male stratum, seven players were then randomly sampled from each team to constitute a sample size of 70 respondents for the study, whereas in the female teams, six players were randomly selected to give a total of 60 respondents, hence the total sample of 130 (72%) respondents for the study of the target population. This proportion of the total population is acceptable in a descriptive research design according to (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).
3.5 Instrument for Data Collection

A self-administered questionnaire was the tool for data collection in this study. The questionnaire was a modified version of one developed by Carron, Widmeyer and Brawley (1985). According to Bless and Achola (1987), questionnaire is a suitable tool for data collection in descriptive survey study because a large coverage of the population can be realized with little time, personnel and cost. Since the initial questionnaire was used in USA, the variables used were modified to suit the Kenyan situation. The questionnaire consisted of three sections, where section one captured the demographic details of the respondents i.e. age, gender and playing experience, section two captured social interactions within team-mates (to gauge on social cohesion) and section three dwelt on performance in Basketball league win-loss record sections as indicated in the match results forms at the Kenya Basketball Federation (task cohesion). The questionnaire consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions (5-point rating) to provide for structured responses. These items were weighted on the likerts type scale of strongly disagree, disagree, undecided agree and strongly disagree. They were scored as 5, 4,3,2,1 and negatively worded statements were scored in the reverse.

3.6 Pre-Testing of Instrument

The questionnaire was subjected to both validity and reliability assessment. The draft questionnaire was given to two lecturers in the Department of Recreation Management and Exercise Science of Kenyatta University to critique the clarity and adequacy of the research instrument. In this way, consistency and content validity were achieved.
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), judgment made by a team of professionals or experts in a particular field can assist in determining the suitability of a research instrument. In this connection, the researcher established face and content validity by seeking expert judgments from the university supervisors while developing and revising the research instruments. This was done by holding discussions, making relevant comments and suggestions that were synchronized.

The purpose of the pre-testing of the instrument was also to determine the feasibility of the study. During the pre-testing, test-retest method was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. Thirty players from Jomo Kenyatta University of agriculture and Technology were used to conduct the test-retest procedure of the research instrument. The pre – test and post – test scores were correlated and a reliability index of 0.82 was obtained. This was considered adequate for the study.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

A letter of introduction stating the form of study was written to the secretary general of Kenya Basketball Federation to seek for authority to conduct the study. After that, the secretary general copied the letter of request to all team managers who linked up the researcher with the teams.

3.8 Data Analysis

The data obtained were subjected to editing and coding and organized for statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data were
tabulated in the form frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Kruskal Wallis was used to test the hypotheses (H₀₂), one – way ANOVA test was used to test hypothesis (H₀₁) to find out the differences between variables and Spearman’ Correlation of coefficient for research hypothesis (H₀₃), to analyze the degree of relationship between the two variables. These tests were deemed relevant since the researcher was dealing with multiple numbers of groups to find out the extent to which task and social cohesiveness affect team performance. The ANOVA is appropriate when comparing more than two means as in the case of hypothesis one. Kruskall Wallis is used when there are more than two sets of data that were ranked. Spearman’s correlation is tenable when establishing the relationship like the case of team cohesion and team performance (Kothari, 2004 Babbie, 2001).

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The researcher assured the respondents of confidentiality, anonymity and privacy. Before administering the research instrument, the respondents were briefed on the requirements and the procedure for responding to the items. Emphasis was placed on voluntary participation and that the respondents were at liberty to withdraw from the study if they were not comfortable. A promise to access the study results after completion was given to the respondents.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of analysis of data, interpretation and discussion of the findings of the study. The first section deals with description of demographic characteristics of the subjects. The second section deals with the analysis of the hypotheses.

4.1 Sample Description

In this section, gender, age, marital status, and number of players are described.

4.2.1 Gender of Subjects

The distribution of subjects based on gender is shown in Fig. 4.1

Figure 4.1: Gender distribution

Figure 4.1 shows that that most of the respondents were male, 70 (54%), while females were 62 (46%). There was a small margin showing disparity of the gender
representation in favour of males. Similar gender imbalance is common in various aspects of sports played by both male and female (Sheryl & Bruce, 2005). The history of sports shows that most sports were initially tilted towards the male gender where participation in sports was associated with exposing male to drills which would assist in fights against their enemies (Wuest & Bucher, 1999). This phenomenon is changing to date as more females are engaging in both amateur and professional sports (Murray, 2006). During the time of the study, the male teams had a considerable number in terms of their representation. With regard to popularity, Basketball has been prominent among the male than female, starting from the American Basketball League. The respondents’ age categories are shown in the next section.

4.2.2 Age of the Subjects

The subjects were requested to indicate their age range. Majority of the respondents at 109 (84.2%) of the subjects were below the ages of 30 while the others at 21(15.8%) were between the ages of 30 and below 40 years. The players’ age distribution is shown in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Age characteristics (n=130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.1, a higher number of the subjects, 29(22.3%) were within the ages of 26 and 27 years. The next proportion of the subjects, 24(18.5%) were between 28 and 29 years. This implies that majority of players were in their younghood, which is the epitome of physical activity (Murray, 2006). The subject’s age limits were commensurate with elite basketball players for successful performance in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 season.

4.2.3 Marital Status of the Respondents

The player’s distribution based on their marital status is shown in Figure 4.2 below
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**Figure 4.2: Marital status**

Figure 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents, 100 (77%) were single, while 30 (23%) were married. This generally reflects the typical characteristics of a sample within this particular study since the majority were in their teenage category and unmarried. The age bracket for marriage in Kenya is generally between 21 - 30 years.
for women and 25-30 for men (Vicky, Janet & Patricia, 1995). Second, after marriage, female players may be tied by family responsibilities and obligations hence making basketball not to be a priority to them.

4.2.4 The Number of Players in the Teams

The study also sought to find out what the effect of the team size would have on team cohesion and performance. To determine the number of players per team, the subjects were asked to indicate how many players they were in their individual teams. The number of players per team as reported by the respondents is summarized in Figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3: Number of players in the teams](image)

A total of 116 (89%) of respondents indicated 12 - 15 as the number of players in their teams, while the remaining 14 (11%) indicated between 16 - 20 players in their respective teams, as shown in Figure 4.4. The number may have been influenced by
remuneration and allowances paid to the players by their clubs and other forms of motivation and talent among players.

4.3.0 Social Cohesion

The analysis of the extent of social cohesion is presented in table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Number of friends the players had in the team versus number of players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of friends a player has in the team</th>
<th>Number of players in each team</th>
<th>12 – 15</th>
<th>16 – 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that most of the players had many friends in the team and this implies that the more the number of players in a team, the less the friends (i.e. Social Cohesion) in the teams for every individual, implying that the strength of friendship among players increases with decrease in the number of players per team. Carron and Spink (1993) note that togetherness as a feature of a team’s environment along with communication are important features that need to be addressed in order to achieve social cohesion. Social get-togethers were thus organized in which all team members
would gather up and spend some quality time outside of basketball in order to become closer friends. Carron and Spink (1993) suggest that having the team members spend time together away from the sporting world, allows for trust relationships to develop, and by getting to know one other on a personal basis, players develop a stronger bond. In addition, the players were also asked whether there are any players they dislike in their teams. Their responses are summarized in Figure 4.4.

![Figure 4.4: Players disliked in teams](image)

As shown in Figure 4.4 above, only minority proportion of 27(21%) of respondents indicated that there were players they disliked in their teams, but majority 98 (75%) indicated that they did not dislike any. However, 4% of the respondents were non-committal on whether they had players whom they disliked in the team.

Previous research has been conducted in order to identify and explore personal attributes which are associated with participation in sports. Attributes such as self-
estee, pride and competition within a team and attitudes towards other players in a team have both negative and positive effects (Murray, 2006). Findings from the present study have revealed that social cohesion thrived in teams in the study. However, further analysis for those who indicated they disliked some players in their teams showed that they did so for the following reasons; laziness, pride and selfishness. Players’ negative relations in a team hinder social cohesion thus compromising good performance (Myres, 2004). The reasons that influenced players for each other are shown in Figure 4.6 below.

**Figure 4.5: Reasons for disliking some player by respondents in the teams**

Findings in Figure 4.5 show that that were several factors causing or leading to dislike amongst players in a team. The results revealed that selfishness at 95% was the most mentioned reason that influenced dislike within members of a team, followed by pride
and laziness, and least was bad attitude. Selfish players may not trust others as equal
performers (Lencioni, 2005), hence can compromise the output of the team since some
players perceive themselves as better players than their partners. Similarly, laziness
could be another influence of team performance. Players in team sports need to have
same urge in leading their teams to win matches. However, some players have been
found to relax and depend on the efforts of others to claim success (Paskevich, et al.,
1999). This attribute may negatively affect social cohesion needed for successful
performance in a team.

4.3.1 Task Cohesion
Research has shown that socially cohesive teams improves on their task cohesion and
are able to handle win/loss situations without blaming other teammates (Gill, 1977).
The study assessed the extent to which team players reacted to a win or a loss. Their
responses are shown in Figure 4.7 below.
As shown in Figure 4.6, majority of the respondents indicated that they played as a team (124, 96%), celebrated as a team (124, 96%) and lost as a team (99, 76%). These responses are indicators of strong team task cohesion. Teams that celebrated their success and embraced a loss collectively were more compact than those who only acknowledged winning alone (Ruder, & Gill, 1982). This is supported by the degree of agreement and disagreement given by respondents to the following statements shown in Figure 4.7 below.
As indicated in Figure 4.7, most outstanding is the fact that majority of players in the teams have the desire to help each other as presented by 81(62%), majority are happy with the amount of influence they have on their teams 66(51%) and majority assume responsibility for poor performance 64(49%). These and others analyzed in Figure 4.7 are indicators of strong team cohesion. The analysis of the hypotheses commences with a brief description of the team cohesion scale characteristics as shown in Figure 4.7 followed statistical analysis of hypotheses shall.
The scale as shown in Figure 4.7 above depicted positive skewed kind of distribution indicating that majority of respondents displayed a higher level of cohesiveness in their teams. Indeed, this is evidenced by a high mean of 78.5 and a standard deviation of 9.51.

![Histogram of Team Cohesion Scale](image)

**Figure 4.8: Team cohesion scale characteristics**

### 4.3.2 Relationship between Team Cohesion on Team Performance in Basketball among Teams in the National Classic League

One-way ANOVA test was used to measure whether there was a significant effect of team cohesion on team performance in basketball teams in the National Classic League at 0.05 level of significance. The summary of analysis is shown in table 4.3 below.
Table 4.3: One-way ANOVA Test for effect of team cohesion on team performance in basketball Teams in the National Classic League

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Win / loss in teams</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Won</td>
<td>282.075</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.506</td>
<td>3.732</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>529.018</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>811.093</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>233.786</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.482</td>
<td>6.386</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237.972</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>471.758</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3 above showed that there was a significance difference between team cohesion and team performance in the National Classic League at 0.05 level of significance. This implied that winning or losing depended much on whether the team was cohesive or not, with high team cohesion most likely to lead to a win and a loss being associated with low team cohesion. Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significance relationship between team cohesion and team performance in basketball teams in the National Classic League was not accepted. Stogdill (1987) examined the degree of team cohesion and the number of yards gained on each offensive play for the Ohio State Buckeyes football team. The degree of cohesion was rated by coaches who sat in the stands and quantified the level of team coordination in terms of a subjective 9-point rating scale. Stogdill (1987) concluded from these measurements that team cohesion and performance (i.e. yards gained) were related under conditions of high drive. However, results in Table 4.3 above, does not indicate that team cohesion caused high levels of performance but that the two variables were related.
Ruder and Gill (1982) showed that team cohesion is not static and phenomenally stable but seems to change throughout the season. It further showed that winning teams had a rise in group’s cohesion following the game, while losing teams suffered a decline. Indeed, the cohesiveness of the team is likely to influence the team's performance and more so the player's mood. A successful team is likely to be associated with positive mood and engender feelings of cohesion. A difficult issue for researchers is to unpack the direction of relationships between mood, cohesion, and performance. Research has found that social cohesion is not only related to sport performance, but also related to mood (Terry et al., 2000).

Carron et al., (2003) examined the relationship between task cohesion and team success in elite basketball and football teams, measuring just the group integration task and group attraction to task categories of cohesion from the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ). The key findings indicated clear evidence that real-world sport teams benefit from high levels of task cohesion. The strength of the relationship between cohesion, as measured by the task categories of the GEQ, and team success as measured by the win: loss record was higher than in previous research.

Recent studies in the domain of sport psychology, acknowledge the importance of team cohesion, in terms of collective efficacy (i.e. social) and cohesion to ensure successful collective outcomes (Carron et al., 2002); (Heuze et al., 2006; (Myers et al., 2004). Bandura (1986) proposed collective efficacy as an extension of self-efficacy and suggested that collective efficacy is more than just the sum of individual efficacy
levels within the group. Collective efficacy involves the individuals’ perceptions regarding the group’s performance capabilities. Collective efficacy beliefs are substantial implications for group effort and performance, especially for tasks requiring interaction among group members for success (Bandura, 1986).

4.3.3 Difference in Social and Task Cohesion Between Male and Female Basketball Teams’ Players in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in social and task cohesion between male and female basketball teams’ players in the National Classic League in Kenya, 2010. The summary of analysis is shown in table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Kruskal-Wallis test for the difference in cohesion between male and female basketball teams’ players in the national classic league 2010 season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test Statistics(a,b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>Chi-Square .027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67.51</td>
<td>Df 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. .870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that males had higher means (67.51±) than females of (64.40±) on social and task cohesion. However, the results of the analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference in cohesion between male and female basketball team players in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 season. Hence, the null hypothesis that there would be no significance difference in cohesion between male
and female basketball teams’ players in the National Classic League was accepted. The researchers examined whether the cohesion and performance relationship differed by ability level (i.e. good, average and poor) and by gender. Respondents were asked whether team cohesion was a major factor in success for male than for female teams.

### 4.3.4 Relationship Between Team Size and the Extent of Social and Task Cohesiveness in Basketball Teams in the National Classic League

Spearman’s correlation of coefficient test was performed to establish the relationship between teams’ size and the extent of cohesiveness in basketball teams in the National Classic League. The summary of analysis is presented in Table 4.5 below.

#### Table 4.5: Spearman’s correlation of coefficient test for the relationship between teams’ size and the extent of social and task cohesiveness in basketball teams in the National Classic League

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team size</th>
<th>Team cohesion score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team size</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.196(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team cohesion score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.196(*)</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results of analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between teams’ size and the extent of cohesiveness in basketball teams in the National Classic League at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between teams’ size and the extent of cohesiveness in basketball teams in
the National Classic League at 0.05 level of significance was not accepted. Indeed, the issue of team size and teams’ cohesion as presented in Table 4.2 indicated that the strength of friendship among players increases with decrement in the number of players per team. If one is to accept that there is indeed a cohesion-performance effect, as found in the hypothesis on team cohesion and performance, the actual magnitude of this significance requires a little more delving. It should be noted that proponents (Bray & Whaley, 2001; Grieve, Whelan, & Meyes, 2000) typically emphasize that its potency is dependent upon a raft of unstable factors, the most consistent and salient of these are given as: the degree of interaction between team members, the size of the team and the ‘reality’ of the team. First, one should consider the frequency of interaction between team members, which is held by many as the most important factor. However, this aspect was not investigated in the study.

The fact is that, preventing inevitable quarrels and / or disputes, the more often individual team members interact with each other, the more cohesive that team will tend to become. This is important because cohesiveness enhances performance most of all during endeavors where sub-optimal results arise from inadequate coordination and cooperation between team members. Because of this, the cohesion-performance effect is often at its most evident within the context of team sport, wherein each individual typically has their own unique interdependence and coordination of these efforts is essential in achieving quality outcomes.

The second factor, team size, has been shown to have a major affect upon the magnitude of several other team phenomena, so it is, therefore, logical that it would
have influence over the cohesion-performance effect. Cohesiveness in larger teams suffers due to varied levels of personalities, and expectations within members of a team. This makes sense in that members of larger teams may find it more difficult or intimidating to socialize with each other, or indeed, simply do not have the time or opportunity to forge bonds with everyone. Typically then, one should expect the magnitude of the cohesion-performance effect to be greater in smaller teams and lower in larger teams. Finally, the ‘reality’ of the team is said to have a notable affect the magnitude of the cohesion-performance effect. The term ‘reality’ refers to the purpose, manner and context under which a team has been brought together. The implication is that ‘real’ teams have both a history and a weight of interaction that makes their cohesion-performance effect tend to be of a greater magnitude than teams that are artificially formed, including experimental or evaluative groupings, or short-run, such as teams brought together for a single match or tournament (Seppo & Hatfield, 1986).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations related to findings of the study. The study aimed at assessing the relationship between team cohesion and performance of the teams that participated in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 season. The following research questions and hypotheses were answered and tested, respectively:

(i) What was the extent of social and task cohesion in basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?
(ii) Did the teams’ cohesiveness have any significant relationship with performance in basketball teams in the national classic league in Kenya during the 2010 league season?
(iii) Was there a difference in cohesion between male and female players among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?
(iv) Did the teams’ size significantly affect cohesion among basketball teams in the National Classic League in Kenya during the 2010 league season?

The following hypotheses were formulated in this study:
Ho1: There is no significant relationship between the teams’ social cohesion and their performance in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.
Ho$_2$: There is no significant differences in cohesion between male and female players in basketball teams in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.

Ho$_3$: There is no significant relationship between the teams’ size and cohesiveness in basketball teams in the 2010 National Classic League in Kenya.

Data were collected by use of questionnaire from 130 participants who were taking part in the 2010 basketball national classic league in Kenya. The data collected were analyzed through one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Kruskal Wallis and Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The following were the findings on the relationship between social and task cohesion and team performance in the teams that participated in the National Classic League in Kenya 2010 Season.

i) Majority of the respondents were male, 70 (54%), while female were 60(46%).

ii) Majority of the players were within the age range of 21-30 years of age which was within the most active period of a players’ sporting life.

iii) Majority of respondents 116 (89%) indicated 12 - 15 as the number of players in their teams, while the remaining 14 (11%) indicated between 16 - 20 players in their respective teams. This greatly influenced social cohesion thus promoting successful performance.
iv) The findings indicate that the more the number of players in a team, the fewer the friends, leading to lower social cohesion. This may negatively influence team performance. Conversely, only 27(21%) of respondents indicated that there were players they disliked in their teams, and majority 103(75%) indicated that they did not have players that they disliked. The great number of dislikes within members of team had a negative effect on social and task cohesion, thus hindering successful performance.

v) Majority of respondents indicated that they played as a team 124(96%), celebrate as a team and lose as a team, 124 (96%), and this showed the evidence of strong team cohesion where team-mates celebrated a win or loss together. However, the friendship within the group had a positive effect on social cohesion in a team hence, improving performance.

vi) Most outstanding indicators of strong team cohesion was that majority of players 81 (62%) in the teams had the desire to help each other, majority 66 (51%) were happy with the amount of influence they had on their teams, and majority 64 (49%) assumed responsibility for poor performance in the teams.

vii) The results of analysis showed that there was a significance relationship \( p<0.05 \) between team cohesion and team performance in the National Classic League.

viii) The results of the analysis showed that there was no significance difference \( p>0.05 \) in cohesion between male and female basketball team players in the National Classic League.
ix) The results showed that there was a significant relationship (p<0.05) between teams’ size and the extent of cohesiveness in basketball teams in the National Classic League. It was difficult to maintain social and task cohesion in the large teams as compared to small teams. This had a negative effect on successful performance.

x) The results showed that majority of the respondents, 100 (77%), were single. This generally reflects the typical characteristics of a sample within this particular age since the majority were in their youthful category and unmarried. Social responsibility in the family could be seen as a factor that could tie the members.

5.2 Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from the findings of this study on the relationship between team cohesion and sports performance in teams participating in the National Classic League in Kenya, 2010 are as follows;

i) Large size of the teams had a significant relationship on the extent of cohesion. It was apparent that it was easier to promote cohesion in smaller teams than large ones.

ii) Friendships within a group would promote cohesion and team performance. However, the study indicated there were some players who were disliked by their teammates which negatively affected team cohesion and good performance.
iii) There was positive task cohesion in teams where team mates celebrated wins and losses of matches together.

iv) There was no significant difference between male and female respondents with regard to team cohesion among them.

v) Both social and task cohesion are positively related to successful performance in basketball.

5.3 Recommendations

i) Coaches and players need to consider the need for fostering cohesion in their teams as it is most likely to be related to win-loss patterns in team sports. A consideration should also be emphasized on the size of the teams as large teams are likely to be less cohesive hence more chances of loss in matches.

ii) Small teams are highly cohesive and have high chances of winning. Teams are, therefore, encouraged to have a limited number of players so as to increase the cohesiveness of players and increase chances of improving their performances.

iii) Team managers to be more innovative in organizing social events and functions that regularly bring team members together to enhance their cohesiveness.

iv) Coaches need to educate and create awareness among their players on the importance and contribution of cohesion to teams’ performance.
v) Coaches need to encourage players to be concerned about the social and psychological needs of their teammates. This will enhance social cohesion between teammates.

5.4 Recommendation for Further Research

i) There is need to conduct similar studies on cohesion of teams in other sports like soccer, rugby and hockey, among others. Other variables to be investigated in relation to cohesion include coach’s leadership style, motivation and ethnic affiliation.

ii) There is need to conduct other studies on the relationship between cohesion and sport performance while controlling for variables such as competitions/leagues.

iii) Studies should be done at lower levels of Basketball, like the universities, middle level colleges and secondary schools leagues.

iv) There is need to conduct studies to establish whether same level of cohesion is maintained throughout the Basketball season.
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Dear sir/madam,

RE: CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN BASKETBALL TEAMS IN THE NATIONAL CLASSIC LEAGUE 2010

I am a student at Kenyatta University pursuing a Master’s degree in Sports Science. I am currently doing my research based on team cohesion in basketball teams. I kindly request you to allow me to carry out research on these clubs in order to administer the questionnaires to the players.

The researcher would like to assure that the data collected will be treated confidentially and will be used for this research purpose only.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully

MUCHEKE CHARLES MUTHIAINE
APPENDIX II

CONSENT FORM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

a) This is a research study. Through sampling procedures you happen to be included in this study
b) You may choose to or not to participate in this study.
c) You are requested to respond to all questions.
d) Remember this is not an examination of any kind. Therefore, any response you give is correct.
e) Respond to the questionnaire items appropriately by filling in and or ticking against a given option.
f) You are free to ask the researcher for any clarification in cases whereby you do not understand what the question/item demands.
g) All the information given will be treated with ultimate confidentiality and anonymity.

Consent for participation

Sign: …………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you in advance for your anticipating response of participating in this study.

Yours faithfully,

MUCHEKE CHARLES MUTHIAINE
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION MANAGEMENT AND SPORTS SCIENCE KENYATTA UNIVERSITY.
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

Please tick the most appropriate response that applies to you or fill in the blank space provided

SECTION A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(i) Type of league ________________________________

(ii) No. of players in your team ________________________________

(iii) No. of times the team has won:_________ Lost: _____________ in the past one year

(iv) Gender

Female [ ]

Male [ ]

(v) Age group (Years)

21-30 [ ]

31-40 [ ]

41-50 [ ]

Above 50 [ ]

(vi) Marital status

Married [ ]

Single

(vii) How many friends do you have in the team? ________________________________

(viii) What activities do you share with members of your team?

___________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________

(ix) Do you dislike any players in the team? Yes:___ No: ___ Non-committal:___

Give reasons for your dislike?

___________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

(x) Are there popular and unpopular players in your team? Yes___ No ___

Number of popular ____________ Number of unpopular ____________

(xi) When you win do you celebrate as a team or you give credit to only talented players

Yes: [ ]

No: [ ]

Non-committal: [ ]
When you lose a game, do you blame particular players in the team or a team as a whole? Team[   ] particular players[   ]

SECTION B: Tick the box that best describes your views on each category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not happy with the amount of influence I have on the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm unhappy with my team’s level of desire to win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This team does not give enough opportunities to improve my personal performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like the technical strategy of this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team members have conflicting aspirations for the team’s performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a team member has a problem, everyone wants to help him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our team members do not communicate freely about each player’s responsibilities during competition and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate the extent to which the following factors affect performance of your basketball team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few individuals are important in determining winning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated strategy of entire time helps the team to win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team wins when each player pursues his/her own performance goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team stands higher chances of winning when players help each other in event of problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team performs well when players communicate freely during practice and competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team’s performance is enhanced when all players do not blame one another for mistakes made during play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION