The relationship between team cohesion and self presentation on Fars province team sports athletes

Mania Ghasemi*1, Reza Nikbakhsh2, Tayebe Zargar2

1 Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch,Tehran, Iran

2.Department of sport management, Faculty of physical education and Sport Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding Author: maniaagh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Team cohesion focuses on how being a part of a group inferences performance as well as how psycho-social factor influence group behavior. Self-presentation involves the selective presentation of particular characteristics of oneself that would make the desired impression on others (Leary, 1992). The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between team cohesion and self presentation on Fars province team sports athletes. The population of the study consisted of 400 Fars province team sports athletes. The 150 athletes were selected as a sample. Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ; Carron et al., 1985) and Self-presentation in sport questionnaire (McGowan et al, 2008) were used. Results: The results of Pearson correlation indicate that there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion on team sport athletes. Conclusion: there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion subscales. Regression analysis indicates that team cohesion predict self-presentation.

Keywords: *team cohesion, self presentation, team sports, athletes*

INTRODUCTION

Team cohesion focuses on how being a part of a group inferences performance as well as how psycho-social factor influence group behavior, group performance better and group member are most satisfied when they are cohesive that is, they stick together remain united in pursuing goals. Cohesion is facilitated by emphasizing uniqueness or a positive identity related to group membership and also when individual team members understand and accept their role within group [1]. Cohesion has been defined as "a dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs"[2]. Cohesion also involves feelings of interpersonal attraction to other team members, aswell as the group itself. Over the years, research has shown team cohesion to be a multidimensional concept, not aundimensional one. Athletic teams are beginning to show an interest in experiential team building activities in order toenhance their team's performance as a cohesive unit 18 [3]. The intuitive assumption amongst coaches is that cohesive teams are likely to be more successful than non cohesive teams[4]. Research on cohesion within the sport and exercise psychology context has been based on Carron's [5] conceptual framework. This conceptual framework remains widely influential to the contributions found in cohesion literature and has led to the development of a model by Carron et al [6] which assumes that each sport team develops perceptions of cohesiveness which are categorized as group integration (the perception of the team as a whole), and individual attractions to the group (the personal attractions to the group). Hardy et al[7] report that four dimensions accounted for the majority of the variance in team cohesion. These are Group-Integration-Task, Group-Integration-Social, Individual Attraction to Group-Task and Individual Attraction to Group-Social.

The importance of cohesion for individual, team sports may be attributed to number of factors, including: minimizing rivalry among team members, increasing intra-team cooperation, enhancing social support, raising norms for productivity, increasing satisfaction and enjoyment, and lowering anxiety. Not all of these potential mediators of the cohesion-performance relationship for teams have been investigated, but research has confirmed the positive impact of several of these variables. One of these variables is self presentation concerns. The term impression management appears to suggest pretense and the deliberate

portrayal of false images; however, people tend to present images that are consistent with how they see themselves[8, 9]. Self-presentation involves the selective presentation of particular characteristics of oneself that would make the desired impression on others [10]. People engage in self-presentation for the ultimate goal of enhancing their well being.

Sport competition provides an environment that is prone to elicit real or imagined self-presentational concerns. Every time athletes compete they run the risk of poor performances and presenting undesirable images about their ability and competence to powerful others, such as judges, coaches, teammates, and spectators [10]. Within team sports, the result of self-presentational concerns and impression motivation may be more complex than in individual sports [10]. That is, the team context may serve to reduce self-presentation. As teammates become familiar with one another, others' impressions are less likely to be influenced by self-presentational behavior and the need to try to create a particular impression will be lessened [11]. Contrastingly, however, it is possible that within the context of team sports, self presentation may increase given the competition for desired rewards (e.g., team selection, starting positions) and necessary future interactions with important others upon whom the athlete is dependent (e.g., coaches and teammates).Perceptions of cohesion have been found to be related to individual behaviors that are associated with self-presentational concerns, including individual team member's experiences of competitive anxiety [12, 13]. More specifically, ATG-T was found to be negatively related to cognitive anxiety [13] and both ATG-T and GI-T are positively related to facilitative interpretations of anxiety symptoms with GI-T having the stronger relationship [12].These findings point to the potential role that the task dimensions of cohesion may have in regards to self-presentational concerns. Also, Divine [14]indicates that cohesion is significant predictor of self-presentation on sport. Carron et al., [15] found that anxiety, stemming from self-presentational concerns, is reduced when others are present. Therefore, the current research question is there relationship between team cohesion and self presentation on Fars province team sports athletes?

MATERIAL AND METHODS
Participant
The population of the study consisted of 400 Fars province team sports athletes. The 150 athletes were selected as a sample.
Measures
Cohesion. Cohesion was measured using the Group Environment Questionnaire [6]. The GEQ is an 18-item scale that assesses four dimensions of cohesion (GI-T, GI-S, ATG-T, ATG-S). All items are scored on a 9-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 9 (strongly disagree). Research has shown that the GEQ is internally consistent [6] and exhibits content, factorial [6], predictive [2], and concurrent [16] validity.

Adapted self-presentation in sport questionnaire. Self-presentation was measured using McGowan et al [17]questionnaire. This questionnaire is an 21-item scale that assess four subscales: concerns about appearing athletically untalented; physical appearance; appearing fatigued/lacking energy; and mental composure inadequacies. All items were measured on a 5-point continuous scale with anchor statements ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always).
Methods
The method of the study is descriptive correlation. The data was collected using questionnaires and through field study procedure. Descriptive statistics were used for describing and categorizing raw data and for measuring Mean, frequency, SD and table drawing. Regression andPearson coefficient were used. For analyzing data the SPSS software was applied and 93% of confidence level was considered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
There results of table 1 indicate that the highest frequency for age is belonging to 15-20 range. In regarding to education status diploma has highest frequency.

Table 1: Demographic information of athletes

Variable	Range	Frequency	Percent
Age	15-20	170	42.5
	21-26	117	29.3
	27-32	83	20.8
	33-38	30	7.5
	Total	400	100.0
	Diploma	171	42.8

Education status	Associate degree	85	21.3
	Bachelor	83	20.8
	Masters	58	14.5
	PhD	3	0.8
	Total	400	100
Sport experience	1-5 year	144	36.0
	6-10	179	44.8
	11-15	54	13.5
	Up to 16	23	5.8
	Total	400	100

As table 2 indicate there was significant interactive relationship between research variables. The results of Pearson correlation indicate that there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion on team sport athletes. Also, there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion subscales.

Table 2: Pearson coefficient between team cohesion and self- presentation

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Individual Attractions to the Group-Social	31.68	8.66	1					
Individual Attractions to the Group – Task	31.18	9.33	0.80**	1				
Group Integration-Task	30.37	9.25	0.68**	0.75**	1			
Group Integration-Social	22.70	7.32	0.57**	0.52**	0.66**	1		
Team cohesion	115.93	30.06	0.89**	0.90**	0.90**	0.77**	1	
Self-presentation	42.60	16.06	-0.32**	-0.36**	-0.32**	-0.31**	-0.38**	1

*P<0.05

According to table 3 team cohesion 15% predict self-presentation. As regression analysis indicate with increase of individual attractions to the group – task self presentation decreased (β=-0.24) and also with increase of group integration-social self presentation decrease (β=-0.16).

Table3. Regression associated with prediction of self- presentation according team cohesion and its subscales

	R	R^2	F (df)	Team cohesion	B	Beta	t	Sig
self- presentation	0.39	0.15	17.66*(4.395)		66.09		21.98	0.00
				Individual Attractions to the Group-Social	-0.05	-0.03	-0.36	0.72
				Individual Attractions to the Group – Task	-0.41	-0.24	-2.72	0.01
				Group Integration-Task	-0.03	-0.02	-0.21	0.83
				Group Integration-Social	-0.35	-0.16	-2.54	0.01

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between team cohesion and self presentation on Fars province team sports athletes. By nature, self-presentation is a social construct [11]. Carron et al [15] suggested that "to ignore the influence of the [group] is to risk obtaining an incomplete picture of self-presentation" (p. 55). The result of this study indicates that there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion on team sport athletes. Also, there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion subscales. It means that

with increase of self- presentation team cohesion is decrease. The result of this study is consistent with the results of Divine[14] and Carron et al [15]. They indicate the negative relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion, although, it was weak. Other result of this study was the ability of self-presentation to predict team cohesion. It means that when athletes' self-presentational concerns increase their team cohesion is decreased. Self-presentation theory indicates that self-presentational motivation increases as the importance or value of the outcome increases [18]. Sporting events such as playoffs or championship games may have more important self-presentational implications, as the outcome of the competition may be more important than regular season games. The current sample included sports at varying points throughout their season, which may lead to different self-presentational concerns

REFERENCES

1. Singh, R, Kanchan, Tarandeep. (2012). Relationship between Team Cohesion and Performance in Ball Games. VSRD Technical & Non-Technical Journal, Vol. 3 (5), 2012, 191-196.
2. Carron, A.V., Widmeyer, W.N., & Brawley, L.R. (1988). Group cohesion and individual adherence to physical activity. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 10, 119- 126.
3. Smith, J. S. (1996). The Effect of an Intervention Program on Cohesion with Ninth Grade Female Basketball Teams. Unpublished master's thesis, Oregon State University, Oregon.
4. Smith, R. E., and Smoll, F. L.1997. Coach-mediated Team building in Youth Sports". Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 9, 114-132.
5. Carron, A.V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sports groups: Interpretations and considerations. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 123-138.
6. Carron, A.V., Widmeyer, W.N., & Brawley, L.R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sports teams: The group environment questionnaire. Journal of Sport Psychology, 7, 244-266.
7. Hardy, J.; Hall, C.R. & Carron, A.V. (2003). Perceptions of team cohesion and athletes' use of imagery. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 34: 151-167.
8. Jones, E.E., & Pittman, T.S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic selfpresentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self. (Vol. 1, pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
9. Schlenker, B.R. (1980). Impression Management: The self-concept, social identity and interpersonal relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
10. Leary, M.R. (1992). Self-presentational processes in exercise and sport. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 14, 339-351.
11. Leary, M.R. (1995). Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior. Dubuque: WCB Brown and Benchmark.
12. Eys, M.A., Hardy, J., Carron, A.V., & Beauchamp, M.R. (2003). The relationship between task cohesion and competitive state anxiety. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 22, 66–76.
13. Prapavessis, H., & Carron, A.V. (1996). The effect of group cohesion on competitive state anxiety. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18, 64-74.
14. Divine, A. (2012). EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAM COHESION AND SELFPRESENTATION. Submitted Thesis to Degree of Masters of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor.
15. Carron, A.V., Burke, S.M., &Prapavessis, H. (2004). Self-presentation and group influence. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 16, 41-58. doi:10.1080/10413200490260044.
16. Brawley, L.R., Carron, A.V., &Widmeyer, W.N. (1988). Exploring the relationship between cohesion and group resistance to disruption. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 10, 199-213.
17. McGowan E, Prapavessis H, Wesch N. Self-presentational concerns and competitive anxiety. J Sport ExercPsychol 2008;30:383e400.
18. Leary, M.R., & Kowalski, R.M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two component model. Psychological Bulletin, 107, 34-47. doi: 10.1037/0033- 2909.107.1.34.