

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Mary Vanessa Draper entitled "Sport Team Cohesion: Goal Orientation as a Function of Level of Sport Involvement." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Physical Education.

Craig A. Wrisberg

Craig Wrisberg, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Ralph E. Jones

Patricia A. Beitel

Joy D. Alessandri

Accepted for the Council:

Lew Minkel

Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature M. Vanessa Dye

Date 8/5/85

SPORT TEAM COHESION: GOAL ORIENTATION AS A FUNCTION
OF LEVEL OF SPORT INVOLVEMENT

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Mary Vanessa Draper

August 1985

DEDICATION

To my parents, who have encouraged and supported me in anything I have ever undertaken.

To Kathy Benn, whose support I have needed and whose example I have had, whenever it came time to take that next step.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks go to Dr. Craig Wrisberg who, by example, has related the intensity and excitement with which one should approach teaching and research. Without his patience, persistence and support, this project would not have evolved.

In addition, I am grateful to the following professors for their participation on my thesis committee and for their continued support and suggestions throughout the project: Dr. Ralph Jones, Dr. Pat Beitel and Dr. Joy DeSensi.

I would also like to express my gratitude to coaches Pat Head Summitt and Don DeVoe for their cooperation in providing the varsity teams surveyed in this study and to their assistants, Lea Henry and Ray Schreider for their time in administering the questionnaires involved.

Finally, I would like to thank the participants: the men's and women's University of Tennessee basketball teams, the Lamda Chi and Phi Kappa Tau fraternities and the Chi Omega and Sigma Kappa sororities.

ABSTRACT

This study was done in an effort to identify team cohesion factor patterns. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which a relationship exists between the level of sport involvement of a team sport participant and the type of goal orientation (task or social) exhibited by that participant. Twenty-six male and female varsity (high level of involvement) basketball players and twenty-three male and female intramural (low level of involvement) players were administered two sport team cohesion questionnaires: the Multidimensional Sport Cohesion Instrument (Yukelson, 1982) and the Group Environment Questionnaire (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1983). Both of these tests are designed to assess one's perception of team cohesion and provide a means to measure and differentiate task and social elements.

A total task score and a total social score were obtained for each subject on each test. Mean task and social cohesion scores were tabulated for the varsity group and the intramural group on each test. A t-test for independent samples was performed. No significant group differences were found within the task dimension on either the MSCI or the GEQ. For the social dimension, no significant difference was found on the MSCI, but a significantly higher social orientation among intramural participants was found on the GEQ. It was concluded that there is very little relationship between the level of sport involvement of a team sport participant and the type of goal orientation exhibited by that individual.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose of the Study.	3
Scope of the Study.	3
Operational Definitions	3
Hypotheses.	5
Significance of the Study	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	7
Fundamental Forces that Influence Team Cohesion	7
The Degree of Professionalization as It Relates to Level of Sport Involvement.	11
III. METHODOLOGY	15
Subject Selection	15
Testing Instruments	17
Testing Procedure	18
Analysis Procedure.	19
IV. RESULTS	21
V. DISCUSSION.	24
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	32
Summary	32
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	33
REFERENCES.	35
APPENDIXES.	38
APPENDIX A.	39
APPENDIX B.	41
APPENDIX C.	47
APPENDIX D.	52
APPENDIX E.	54
VITA.	61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Participation on sport teams can be a source of personal satisfaction for the individual. The degree of that satisfaction is determined by what the individual expects from the team experience and what the individual actually derives from the experience. "Sport team" implies a group and any inquiries involving the internal framework of groups are based on theories of group dynamics. Group dynamics is an area of study focusing on the "nature of groups, the laws of their development and their interrelations with other individuals, groups and larger institutions" (Cartwright and Zander, 1968, p. 5). A component of group dynamics that examines the internal relationships of the group is group cohesion which has been defined as "the adhesive property or force that binds group members together" (Carron, 1980, p. 234). Cohesion is thought to be a property of all groups and is measured on a continuum based on the level of "interpersonal cooperation" within the group (Steiner, 1972). It has been suggested that variance along this continuum can be attributed to certain factors associated with the particular goals of the group (Steiner, 1972; Gruber and Gray, 1981).

Research in the area of cohesion has traditionally focused on an investigation of the forces that actually influence the development of team cohesion. Investigators have taken several approaches

ranging from one that defines cohesion as a unidimensional phenomenon and focuses on interpersonal attraction alone to another broader, multi-dimensional approach which suggests that cohesion is determined by task-related forces and social related forces, dependent on the goal orientations of the group (Carron, 1980; Carron and Chelladurai, 1981; Donnelly, et al., 1978; Feldman, 1968). More recent studies have suggested that there is a shift in goal orientation as the individual progresses from a "play" attitude to a "professionalization" attitude toward sport participation (Kane, 1982; Webb, 1969). Moreover, the degree of professionalization of attitude has been found to be directly related to the level of sport involvement (Kane, 1982).

In summary, the available literature suggests the influence of both goal orientation and degree of professionalization of attitude on cohesive properties in team sport. Research has indicated that groups in general (outside the sport environment) exhibit basically two different goal orientations: task and social (Yukelson, 1982). In a 1951 study, Back showed evidence of the influence that the group's goal orientation has in determining the basis of the group's cohesiveness. The reviewed literature suggests the need to examine the influence of goal orientation within the sport setting in order to determine whether or not the level of involvement of a sport team participant might influence the goal-orientation of those team members and thus determine the forces that control the development of team cohesion.

Purpose of the Study

The present study represented an attempt to determine the extent to which a relationship exists between the level of sport involvement (further defined by the degree of professionalization of attitude) of a team sport participant and the type of goal orientation (task or social) of that participant.

Scope of the Study

The data collection occurred during January and February of 1985. The 49 subjects were male and female varsity and intramural basketball players at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The subjects signed a consent form ensuring the confidentiality of their responses to the sport cohesion questionnaires; they were then asked to complete a personal data sheet concerning their present level of sport involvement as well as all prior team sport experience. All of the subjects were then administered two sport team cohesion questionnaires, the MSCI (Yukelson, 1982) and the GEQ (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1984).

Operational Definitions

Terms used in this study are defined in the following section. Where appropriate, operational definitions are given.

1. Cohesion -- The forces that bind group members together (Carron, 1980).

2. Level of Sport Involvement -- The level of competition in which the individual is involved; identified in this study as either high level (university varsity basketball participants) or low level (university intramural basketball participants) and further differentiated by the indicated degree of professionalization of attitude.
3. Degree of Professionalization of Attitude -- The extent to which an individual has shifted from a "play" attitude toward sport to one of "professionalization" (Kane, 1982; Webb, 1969); indicated in this study by a self-rated scale of the importance of skill and success in sport competition (Appendix A).
4. Goal Orientation -- The achievement aims of the group, defined in cohesion studies as: a) task orientation -- where the primary group objective is performance. In this study, the level of task orientation was measured by subject's total scores on task-related items on the MSCI (items 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, and 37) and the GEQ (items 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24); and, b) social orientation -- where the primary group objective is relationships. In this study, the level of social orientation was measured by subjects' total scores on the social-related items on the MSCI (items 1, 5, 6, 9, 18, 19, and 20) and the GEQ (items 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, and 23).

5. MSCI -- Multidimensional Sport Cohesion Instrument (Appendix B). A sport cohesion questionnaire that measures and makes a distinction between task- and social-related factors in sport groups (Yukelson, 1982).
6. GEQ -- Group Environment Questionnaire (Appendix C). A sport cohesion questionnaire designed to measure the individual's perception of team cohesion, making a distinction between task- and social-related factors in sport groups (Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer, 1983).

Hypotheses

1. Varsity sport participants will score higher than intramural sport participants on MSCI and GEQ variables associated with task cohesion.
2. Intramural sport participants will score higher than varsity sport participants on MSCI and GEQ variables associated with social cohesion.

Significance of the Study

Defining the factors that influence cohesion is important to the coaching profession in that the degree of cohesion presumably reflects the level of compatibility and unanimity among team members (Eitzen, 1985). Team cohesion enhances the importance of membership for the participant and affects feelings of closeness and dedication

to efforts for the benefit of the team (Yukelson, 1982). The attainment of this concept of unity leaves the coach more able to devote time and effort to more effective strategies, team play and successful results (Gruber and Gray, 1981). The awareness of the most basic elements of team cohesion might enable a coach to more accurately assess the team environment and more easily identify the needs of the individuals on the team, creating an atmosphere more conducive to the attainment of team cohesion.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review of the literature examines: 1) the fundamental forces that have been shown to influence team cohesiveness, and 2) the concept of degree of professionalization of attitude as it relates to the level of sport involvement.

Fundamental Forces that Influence Team Cohesion

The majority of research in the area of cohesion in team sports has emphasized either the forces that actually affect the development of team cohesion or the relationship between team cohesion and team performance. Theories concerning the forces associated with team cohesion originally viewed cohesion as a unidimensional concept. Investigators focused on the degree of interpersonal attraction or the attraction of an individual to the group, defining cohesion solely in these terms (Carron, 1980). With this single concept as the focal point, the primary instrument used to measure cohesion was the Sport Cohesion Questionnaire (Martens, Landers and Loy, 1972). This questionnaire purportedly measures seven defineable characteristics of cohesion; but, as Carron (1980) notes, all seven are associated with one concept, that being the attraction of an individual to the group. Earlier, Lott and Lott (1965) had addressed cohesion as a group trait, determined by the extent of affirmative feelings between group members.

This viewpoint supported the "Attraction to group" theory and virtually ignored the existence of an impact of the specific goals of the group and the influence of the accepted group behavior on the individual members (Feldman, 1968). Problems associated with a unitary concept of cohesion gave rise to the need to examine cohesion as, at least, a bidimensional phenomenon.

Development of the bidimensional approach led to the identification by Homans (1951) of two forces that presumably draw individuals to a group. These forces were defined as task orientation and social orientation. Task orientation suggests that group cohesiveness is based on similar task or performance objectives, while social orientation suggests that cohesiveness is based on the common desire for satisfying the need for interpersonal relationships (Lewin, 1948). Enoch and McLemore (1967) elaborated on this thought by suggesting that individuals are attracted to a group because of either personal preference for one another or by the desire to achieve some goal that the group imposes on the individual. Although an overlap may exist, the individual is presumed to usually gravitate toward one orientation or the other.

More recent research accepts Homans' theory of bidimensionality (1951) but adds yet another measure to the concept of cohesion by identifying a third influencing force, labeled "Normative force," which refers to a property that describes the individual's desire to adhere to a set of values or behaviors that a group sets forth

(Feldman, 1968; Donnelly, et al., 1978). Feldman's studies show positive relationships between normative forces and both task orientation and social orientation. This being the case, it would appear that group cohesion is indeed a multidimensional concept (Yukelson, 1982).

The development of the multidimensional approach to the study of group cohesion created the need for a revised testing device that would assess task-related forces and social-related forces (Yukelson, 1982). Yukelson adjusted the Sport Cohesion Questionnaire and devised the Multidimensional Sport Cohesion Instrument (MSCI). The MSCI contains questions that measure four factors found to be significant determinants of cohesion in sport groups. The four factors are labeled, "United of Purpose," "Quality of Teamwork," "Attraction to Group," and "Valued Roles."

The "Unity of Purpose" component is comprised of questions relating to the importance of coaching procedures and qualities, the clarity of team goals, evaluation of team goals, faith in teammates and ability to compensate for a teammate's weaknesses. "Quality of Teamwork" items measure the support, respect, compatibility of roles, self-sacrificing capabilities and communication means within the group. "Attraction to the Group" questions pertain to feelings of enjoyment, acceptance, pride, worth and significance; essentially it is an indication of the importance of interpersonal relationships to the respondent. "Valued roles" items identify the individual's

concept of self in relation to the team in regard to task and social contributions.

"Unity of Purpose," "Quality of Teamwork" and, to a lesser degree, "Valued Roles" items contain variables that measure the task-related forces influencing the cohesiveness of a sport team while "Attraction to Group" and to some degree, "Valued Roles" questions measure the social-related forces affecting cohesiveness (Yukelson, 1982). Analysis of an individual's responses to each of these categories should presumably allow a determination of the nature and level of goal orientation of that individual.

More recently, Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer (1983) have developed a cohesion questionnaire that is similar to the MSCI, but has fewer questions and a shorter range of possible responses. The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) has four categories of questions that are designed to assess levels of a) attraction to group-task: a measure of the individual's feelings about his/her own contributions to the group's performance and productivity; b) group integration-task: a measure of the individual's feelings about the unanimity of the group regarding the group's task; c) attraction to group-social: a measure of the individual's feelings about his/her involvement and position in the group in regards to interpersonal relationships; and d) group integration-social: a measure of the individual's feelings about the unanimity of the group as a social unit. As in the case of Yukelson's (1982) MSCI, the GEQ is designed to assess the

individual's perceptions of team cohesiveness. To date, no published research has utilized this instrument. However, it appears to offer the potential of additional assessment of the forces influencing sport team cohesiveness, particularly those depicting the levels of task and social orientation of respondents.

The Degree of Professionalization as It Relates to Level of Sport Involvement

Several recent studies have supported the idea that an individual's attraction to a group is not based solely on what the group has to offer. In addition, the individual must feel that the group traits are compatible with his/her own needs and values (Yukelson, 1982). The individual will seek a group that he/she perceives has similar incentives and intentions, creating a "homogenous perception of events" (Van Bergen and Koekebakker, 1959). Belonging to a group involves a certain degree of conformity to the values and goals of that group (Corey and Corey, 1982). Moreover, it is expected that the more closely related the group goals are to the individual's goals, the more attractive the group will be to the individual. Sport team participants have been generally classified as one of two types: play oriented or professionally oriented (Kane, 1982; Webb, 1969). Webb (1969) observed that as children progress from typical child games to involvement in more organized, formal competition, there is an attitude change characterized by a greater emphasis

on achievement of skill and success. This attitude, labeled "professionalization of attitude" (Kane, 1982, p. 290), suggests a shift in the nature of the goals from those of a social orientation to those of an increasing task orientation. With an increase in the level of athletic competition or involvement, there evolves a shift towards task orientation. Individuals who participate in organized sport consistently regard skill and success as priorities over fairness (Loy, et al., 1976; Mantel and Vander Velden, 1974). Again this would suggest an orientation toward task achievement rather than social integration.

In light of these studies, it appears that participants involved in more formal, organized levels of competition are characteristically more task oriented. If skill and success are the primary incentives of a participant, then that individual would be expected to be attracted to sport situations emphasizing these varsity characteristics. On the other hand, participants who do not experience as great a shift toward a professionalization of attitude and who maintain more of a play attitude will not be motivated as much by achievement incentives but by incentives associated with social integration. This is reflected in a higher regard for fairness and less emphasis on skill and victory (Webb, 1969). These participants would be expected to be found in less formal, although organized, competitive situations such as school intramural teams.

Observations of groups in non-sport settings have lent support to the notion that the nature of the group determines the forces

cohesion. For example, Back (1951) showed that groups with different activity focuses were cohesive for different reasons. Within groups whose members are primarily friends and in which friendship is the primary basis for membership, the members are more interested in the development and maintenance of close interpersonal relationships and could be described as socially oriented (Cartwright and Zander, 1960). Similarly, Anderson (1975) observed that interpersonal attraction was found to be the primary element of cohesion in casual social groups. A comparable sport setting might be a fraternity/sorority team. In contrast, Cartwright and Zander (1960) described groups whose members are primarily contributors to some task performance and more interested in the effective, efficient performance of that task, as task-oriented. Anderson's (1975) study concurs with this description of task-orientation, revealing that task or goal objectives determined the cohesiveness of more formal performance-driven groups. A comparable sport setting might be a college/university varsity team.

In summary, when observing cohesion in sport groups, it has been suggested that investigators should examine not only the goal objectives of the groups but also the individual member's perception of the group's goals and how they relate to their own incentives. The fact that individuals can experience a graded shift in goal orientation, ranging from a play attitude to a professionalization attitude, implies that there are different degrees of professionalization exhibited at different levels of competition. Furthermore, in

reference to "goals of the group," analysis of the forces that influence team cohesion reveals significantly different cohesion tendencies of a task-affiliated nature and a social-affiliated nature. This is not to suggest that cohesive properties are associated with one affiliation and not the other, but that the factors contributing to the emergence of each type of cohesion are different.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In the present study, the goal orientation of two sport teams differing in level of competition (and presumably in the degree of professionalization of attitude), identified as a lower level inter-mural team and a higher level varsity team, was measured to determine whether differences existed in the levels of task and social orientation of the groups. It was hypothesized that college intramural players, because of their lower competitive level (and presumably lesser degree of professionalization of attitude), would exhibit higher levels of social-oriented responses while college varsity players, because of their higher level of competition (and presumably greater degree of professionalization of attitude) would exhibit higher levels of task oriented responses. Nature and level of goal orientation was determined through administration of the MSCI (Yukelson, 1982) and the GEQ (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1983), both of which are designed to assess levels of task- and social-related forces influencing team cohesion. This chapter specifies the details concerning the subject selection, testing instruments, testing procedure and the data analysis procedures used in this study.

Subject Selection

Subjects for this study were students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Selection was based on the individual's present

level of sport involvement and their past experience in organized sports. This was determined by information obtained from the personal data sheet (Appendix A). This information was used to assign the subjects to one of two groups: Group V consisted of 26 university varsity basketball players and Group I was made up of 23 university intramural basketball players.

Additional control elements were as follows:

1. Within each group, both males and females were represented. Group V contained 12 females and 14 males. Group I contained 13 females and 10 males. This control was added in order to ensure a more encompassing representation of the sport participant population.
2. Group I contained only those intramural participants with no college varsity experience. It was assumed that this criterion aided in the distinction between high (varsity) and low (intramural) level of sport involvement.
3. Group I was limited to fraternity and sorority intramural players. It was assumed this restriction would add control to variables associated with normal levels of social interaction among group members. In other words, both varsity athletes and fraternity and sorority groups tend to spend time together outside of practice and games and develop a familiarity that might not exist with non-fraternal intramural teams whose members do not necessarily socialize beyond their competitive association.

Testing Instruments

The tests that were administered to these two groups were the Multidimensional Sport Cohesion Instrument (MSCI) (Yukelson, 1982) and the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1983). The MSCI (Appendix B) is a forty-one item questionnaire designed to measure task and social factors contributing to sport team cohesion. The task factors fall under two categories: a) "Unity of Purpose" includes questions numbered: 13, 14, 17, 25, 26, 31 and 34, and b) "Quality of Teamwork" includes questions numbered: 2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 30, 35 and 37. The test items designed to measure social factors are categorized as, a) "Attraction to Group" which includes questions numbered: 1, 5, 6, 9, 19 and 20, and b) "Valued Roles" which includes question number 3. Remaining questions serve as "lie detectors."

Each question has a response range of one to eleven, measuring negative or positive attitudes toward the nature and activities of the group. While the majority of the responses are scored in a negative to positive direction, items 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 24, 27, 28, 30 and 35 are scored in a positive-to negative direction. Therefore, the responses to these items were inverted prior to data analysis.

The GEQ (Appendix C) is a twenty-four item questionnaire designed to measure the individual's perception of team cohesion, reflecting both task and social factors. The questions are designed to indicate either a task (items 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22

and 24) or social (items 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21 and 23) orientation. Each question has a response range of from one to nine. Items 1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are scored from strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 9. Items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23 and 24 are scored from strongly disagree = 9 to strongly agree = 1. Therefore, responses to the latter group of questions were reversed in value prior to data analysis.

Testing Procedure

The subjects were administered the MSCI and the GEQ by the project director or by a member of the Athletic Department staff. Included with the testing instruments was a personal data sheet (Appendix A) indicating the name, age and sex of the participant as well as the nature of the subject's past and present sport team involvement and experience. Two additional questions appeared on the "demographic sheet" for the purpose of evaluating the subject's degree of professionalization of attitude. The subjects responded to questions that assessed their perception of the importance of skill achievement and victory when competing in sport (Appendix A).

The nature of the study was explained to the subjects by either the project director or the administering athletic department staff member. The importance of providing completely honest answers was emphasized and the subjects were asked to sign a consent form (Appendix D) with the knowledge that all individual data would remain confidential and would be compiled and discussed only as group data.

All participants were given as much time as they needed to read the questions carefully, lend some thought to their answers and respond to each question.

The following directions concerning response procedures were read to subjects:

1. "The MSCI answers are of a graded response range of 1 to 11; the GEQ responses range from 1 to 9."
2. "Circle the one number that best measures your response."
3. "Not all answers are arranged in a negative to positive direction. On some questions "1" denotes a positive response."
3. "Your answers will be kept confidential so please be completely honest in your responses. This is the only way valid results will be obtained."

Analysis Procedure

Analysis of the questionnaire data adhered to the following format:

1. Each test (MSCI and GEQ) was scored and analyzed separately.
2. For each test, questions were first categorized according to either task or social orientation.
3. Responses in each category were totaled and each subject given a total task affiliation score and a total social affiliation score. A higher score in either area

presumably indicated a higher level of that type of goal orientation.

4. Means and standard deviations for the task and social orientation scores were calculated for each group.
5. To determine the significance of mean variation between the two groups, a t-test was used for each type of orientation score; the level of significance used was .05.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between the level of sport involvement of a team sport participant and the type of goal orientation (task or social) of the participant. It was hypothesized that varsity participants would score higher than intramural participants on MSCI (Yukelson, 1982) and GEQ (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1984) variables associated with task cohesion while intramural participants would score higher on MSCI and GEQ variables associated with social cohesion.

In order to test for differences in task and social cohesion factors of the two sport groups, subject's responses to items from both the MSCI and the GEQ team cohesion questionnaires pertaining to each of these constructs were tabulated. A total task cohesion score and a total social cohesion score were obtained for each subject on each of the questionnaires. The means and standard deviations for the task and social cohesion items on each questionnaire for both the varsity and the intramural groups are presented in Table I. One varsity and one intramural subject did not complete all questions on the GEQ. Therefore, the data of these two subjects were not included in the GEQ analysis.

Table I. Means and Standard Deviations of the Total Groups of Varsity and Intramural Subjects

	MSCI				GEQ			
	Task		Social		Task		Social	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Varsity	122.3	23.4	63.4	12.7	93.0	19.4	62.4	14.8
Intramural	112.2	16.2	62.6	10.2	95.6	12.5	69.5	7.6

Separate t-tests for independent samples were performed on the task and social cohesion scores for each questionnaire. Inspection of Table I reveals that the MSCI task cohesion scores of varsity participants were higher than those of intramural participants. However, the t-test for individual samples performed on these scores indicated no significant difference between the means of the task scores of varsity and intramural groups, $t(47) = 1.7$, $p > .05$. For the GEQ test, the scores of the intramural group of subjects on the task cohesion items were higher than those of the varsity subjects. Again the results of the t-test revealed no significant difference, $t(45) = .722$, $p > .1$. Inspection of the MSCI social cohesion scores for the two groups reveals slightly higher scores for varsity subjects than for intramural subjects, although the difference was not significant, $t(47) = .234$, $p > .1$. The GEQ data estimating the strength of

social cohesion factors indicates that the intramural group scored higher than did the varsity participants. A t-test performed on these scores revealed a significant difference between the groups, $t(45) = 2.7, p < .01$.

In summary, the results of the t-tests suggested no support for the first hypothesis that varsity participants would score higher than intramural participants on variables associated with task cohesion. However, partial support for the second hypothesis that intramural participants would score higher than varsity participants on variables associated with social cohesion was obtained.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of this study as well as some possible explanations for the findings are discussed. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between the level of sport involvement of a team sport participant and the goal orientation of that individual. It was hypothesized that: a) varsity participants would score higher than intramural participants on MSCI (Yukelson, 1982) and GEQ (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1983) test items associated with task cohesion, and, b) intramural participants would score higher than varsity participants on MSCI and GEQ test items associated with social cohesion.

Analysis of the total group test scores suggested very little significant relationship between a participant's level of sport involvement and the type of goal orientation exhibited by that individual. One interpretation of these results is that sport participants, regardless of their level of involvement, display cohesion patterns that include both task and social elements. These findings were consistent with research conducted by Gruber and Gray (1981) which revealed that task cohesion factors were present to varying degrees at all levels of competition involving male basketball players from elementary through large college/university varsity squads. Affiliation cohesion (synonymous with this study's definition of social

orientation) was also found to some degree at the elementary, small college and university levels of competition but not at the senior high level.

The results of the present study do not concur with the findings of Kane (1982) which suggested that there is a greater task orientation among varsity athletes when compared to nonathletes. A possible explanation for this discrepancy may be that the intramural players surveyed in the present study, having been derived from a large state university campus, have generally more competitive sport experience than nonathletes. Although the intramural subjects in the present study were screened and eliminated if they indicated post-high school varsity experience, this would not discount the possibility that the intramural samples included very experienced, competitive participants. This might be expected to produce a shift toward a professionalization of attitude about sport involvement and perhaps increase the level of task-orientation. As a result, the total task factor group mean of intramural participants would possibly be higher and closer to that of the total varsity group mean, revealing no significant differences in the goal orientations of the two groups.

Upon examination of the findings of Kane (1982) and Gruber and Gray (1981) as they relate to the present study, it should be noted that Kane's research assessed an exclusively female population while Gruber and Gray's study was limited to males. The present

study included both males and females and the total group analysis suggested little relationship between the level of sport involvement and the goal orientation exhibited by that individual. However, observation of the distributions of the raw scores on the task cohesion items (Appendix E) of males and females in each group indicated a different trend and revealed findings within the male and female varsity subgroups that suggested the potential influence of performance factors on subjects' responses; factors that might have affected the resulting mean difference between the varsity and intramural groups.

Specifically, 92% of the male varsity group fell below the varsity mean on the MSCI task items and 71% of the male varsity group fell below the varsity mean on the GEQ task items. This would suggest an overall low regard for task-related factors among the male varsity squad surveyed in this study. These results could conceivably be a reflection of the psychological state of this team at the time of testing. It should be pointed out that the male varsity team had endured several successive losses at the time the questionnaires were administered. This fact could account for a general feeling of dissatisfaction that might have influenced team members' perceptions of the quality of task cohesion factors.

Although studies focusing on the relationship between team cohesion and team performance have produced conflicting results, Gruber and Gray (1981) found team performance satisfaction to be

an important factor underlying the cohesion factors in male varsity basketball players at several levels of competition. In regard to this assumption, it should be noted that the female varsity squad surveyed in this study was enjoying a very successful season at the time of assessment, supporting the notion that team performance satisfaction could be a point to consider when assessing the cohesive factors of a team "in-season." Thus it is possible that dissatisfaction among male varsity players represented in the present study may have accounted for their low rating of task-related cohesion factors which in turn may have lowered the mean task score of the total varsity group and therefore reduced the predicted mean difference in the task scores of the varsity and intramural groups.

In addition, inspection of the mean scores in Table II reveals that the male varsity group obtained the lowest mean score on the social-related items as well. According to Williams and Hacker (1982), social cohesion influences member satisfaction with a team, which in turn, is a function of task or performance satisfaction. In essence, this suggests that there is a relationship between performance of a team and the interpersonal relationships on that team. As was noted earlier, the male varsity group in this study had experienced several successive losses at the time of testing. Based on Williams and Hacker's (1982) findings, this could have affected their feelings of social cohesion and resulted in a lower rating of these items. In contrast, the female varsity squad was experiencing a very successful

Table II. Means and Standard Deviations of Male and Female Varsity and Intramural Groups

Group	MSCI				GEQ			
	Task		Social		Task		Social	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Varsity-Male	110.5	18.0	57.2	11.3	78.0	13.5	50.1	7.4
IM-Male	108.5	14.8	62.2	10.5	90.0	9.5	69.7	6.9
Varsity-Female	145.0	11.2	69.0	10.4	109.0	9.5	75.6	8.0
IM-Female	115.0	15.4	63.0	10.2	100.0	12.6	69.5	8.2

season at the time of testing which could have enhanced their feelings of social cohesion, resulting in a high ranking of the social cohesion items and indicating a very similar attitude toward the team's social atmosphere as that exhibited by intramural teams. Based on the data presented here, it appears that social factors are equally regarded among intramural and varsity participants, showing no support for the second hypothesis.

An additional observation that should be addressed concerns the validity, and reliability of the testing instruments used in this study in accurately estimating the variables being measured. In terms of validity, the MSCI is designed to assess the emphasis placed on the significant determinants of cohesion in sport groups,

identified as "Unity of Purpose," "Quality of Teamwork," "Attraction to Group" and "Valued Roles" (Yukelson, 1982). The GEQ is designed to assess the individual's perception of team cohesion (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1984). Both tests differentiate between task- and social-related items. Although a distinction is made between task and social orientation and a means is provided to assess the strength of both factors, the questions aimed at team cohesion are naturally group oriented. Therefore, an individual's responses may be a reflection of the group atmosphere at the time of assessment rather than a true evaluation of an individual's general goal-orientation, which was the intent of this study.

In terms of the reliability question, both the MSCI and the GEQ contain a reversal of point values in regard to the positive or negative assessment of each of the factors. On both tests, a series of questions might be scored 1 to 9 (or 11) reflecting low to high perception of a task or social factor, followed by a question scored high (1) to low (9 or 11). This tactic is designed to insure the consistency and honesty of the subject. However, in spite of the fact that the subjects were instructed to be alert to these reversals, a close observation of the data from a few subjects suggested inconsistent rankings within the tests. For example, one respondent gave these contradictory ratings for the following questions:

MSCI #23: In general, I think the teamwork on our team is poor.

1 2 (3) 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

MSCI #8: How good do you think the teamwork is on your team?

1 2 3 (4) 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Very Good

Not Good At All

Despite the fact that these two items assess the same concept (i.e. teamwork), question #23 is valued in a negative to positive direction and #8 is valued in a positive to negative direction. It appeared that some of the individual subjects may have missed these reversals and therefore their true goal-orientation on those items may have been masked.

These observed inconsistencies were even more pronounced within the data concerning the social dimension of team sport cohesion which varied considerably according to the testing device used. Total group analysis of the MSCI revealed no significant difference between the social orientation scores of varsity and intramural groups ($p > .1$). However, results of the GEQ analysis revealed significantly higher scores for the intramural group ($p < .01$). The different trends obtained using the two cohesion instruments may be a reflection of the question construction on each of the instruments. On both tests, responses were ranked 1 to 9 (or 11) and, for the most part, in a negative to positive direction. However, the wording of certain questions (similar to the two task items cited above) on both tests

were reversed with a "1" designating a positive response. On the MSCI, only one of the seven social-related items was reversed while on the GEQ, six of the ten social-related items were reversed. The increased opportunity to misinterpret the questions on the GEQ may have accounted for the inconsistency in the pattern of results arising from the scores on the two instruments. The possibility that misinterpretation was more prevalent with GEQ items suggests that the trends found for the MSCI, which indicated no significant support for the second hypothesis, may be more reliable. Although the problem of misinterpretation occurred infrequently in this study, it is possible that the reversal procedure reduced rather than promoted consistency, and therefore influenced the reliability of the results.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between the level of sport involvement of a sport team participant and the type of goal orientation of that individual. Subjects included male and female varsity and intramural basketball players from a large university campus. Two questionnaires were administered to each subject: the Multidimensional Sport Cohesion Instrument (Yukelson, 1982) and the Group Environment Questionnaire (Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer, 1983), both of which are designed to:

- a) assess perceptions of the cohesion factors within a group, and
- b) distinguish task- and social-related factors.

It was hypothesized that:

- a) varsity participants would score higher than intramural participants on variables associated with task cohesion and
- b) intramural participants would score higher than varsity participants on variables associated with social cohesion.

Analysis of the test results provided only one significant difference between the two groups in regard to goal orientation; specifically, intramural participants had a significantly higher social cohesion score on the GEQ test. However, due to the questionable scoring reliability of the GEQ social-related items, this difference must be interpreted cautiously.

Conclusions

Based on this study, it was concluded that varsity participants do not have a significantly greater task orientation than intramural participants, suggesting that task cohesion factors may be consistent at varying levels of sport involvement.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for consideration by future investigators:

1. Variables influencing the psychological mood of a team at the time of testing should be included. These variables may have an influence on the team members' perceptions of the quality of the cohesive factors and consequently on the emphasis placed on these factors. These variables might include the win-loss record at the time of testing and the time of season during which the test is administered.
2. A more precisely defined criteria for subject selection should be incorporated. For example, the extent of competitive experience of intramural subjects might be included as an independent variable.
3. Responses to the questionnaire items used in this study should be compared to those of questionnaire items worded and scored in a consistent manner. This would enable a

more clearcut determination of the reliability of the
MSCI and GEQ instruments.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. B. Combined effects of interpersonal attraction and goal path clarity on the cohesiveness of task oriented groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 68-75.
- Back, K. W. Influence through social communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 9-23.
- Carron, A. V. Social Psychology of Sport. Ithaca, New York: Movement Publications, 1980.
- Carron, A. V. and Chelladurai, P. The dynamics of group cohesion in sport. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1981, 3, 123-139.
- Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R. and Widmeyer, W. Neil (1983). The Group Environment Questionnaire (Available from A. V. Carron, Department of Physical Education, University of Western Ontario).
- Cartwright, D. and Zander, A. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Donnelly, P., Carron, A. V. and Chelladurai, P. Group Cohesion and Sport. Ottawa: CAHPER Sociology of Sport Monograph Series, 1978.
- Eitzen, D. Group structure and group performance. In D. Landers (ed.), Psychology of Sport and Motor Behavior II. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 1975.
- Enoch, J. R. and McLemore, S. D. On the meaning of group cohesion. Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, 1967, 48, 174-182.
- Feldman, R. A. Interrelationships among three bases of group integration. Sociometry, 1968, 31, 30-46.
- Gruber, J. J. and Gray, G. R. Factor patterns of variables influencing cohesiveness at various levels of basketball competition. Research Quarterly, 1981, 52, 19-30.
- Homanes, G. C. The Human Group. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1951.
- Kane, Mary Jo. The influence of level of sport participation and sex-role orientation on female professionalization of attitudes toward play. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1982, 4, 290-294.

- Loy, J., Birrell, S. and Rose, D. Attitudes held toward agonetic activities as a function of selected social identity. Quest, 1976, 26, 81-93.
- Lewin, K. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper and Row, 1948.
- Lott, A. J. and Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent & consequent variables. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-309.
- Martens, R., Landers, D. M. and Loy, J. W. Sport Cohesiveness Questionnaire. Washington, D. C.: AAHPER, 1972.
- Mantel, R. and Vander, Velden L. The relationship between professionalization of attitude toward play of preadolescent boys & participation in organized sport. In G. Sage (ed.), Sport and American Society. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- Steiner, K. Group Process and Productivity. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Webb, H. Professionalization of attitudes toward play among adolescents. In G. S. Kenyon (ed.), Sociology of Sport. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1969.
- William, J. M. and Hackee, C. M. Casual relationships among cohesion, satisfaction and performance in women's intercollegiate field hockey teams. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1982, 4, 324-337.
- Yukelson, D. P. Group cohesion in sport: A multidimensional approach. Doctoral Dissertation, North Texas State University, 1982.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SUBJECT INFORMATION

SUBJECT NUMBER _____ AGE _____ SEX _____

1. Present sport team involvement: Varsity Intramural (circle one)
2. Past sport team involvement: List the sport and the number of years you were a participant:

<u>COLLEGE VARSITY</u>	<u>SPORT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF YEARS</u>
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
<u>HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY</u>	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
<u>CITY, REC., CHURCH, AAU, USVBA, ETC.</u>	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

3. To what degree do you regard skill achievement as a priority when you compete?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely low	low	moderately low	neutral	moderately high	high	extremely high

4. To what degree do you regard victory as a priority when you compete?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely low	low	moderately low	neutral	moderately high	high	extremely high

APPENDIX B

In this survey, you will be asked to give your opinion to a number of questions regarding sport group interactions. For each question, a scale from 1 to 11 is provided. In each case, circle a number from 1 to 11 to indicate that response which best expresses your feeling about each question. There are no right or wrong answers. Please consider each question carefully and be sure you fully understand what each item is asking. Please respond to all items on the questionnaire.

1. Compared to other athletic teams that you have been a member of, how much do you value your membership on this team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
2. Rate the degree to which your team has well defined roles in that each person knows what is expected of them.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| well defined
roles | | | | | | | | | | poorly defined
roles |
3. How much do you feel your role or contribution to the team is valued by your teammates?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| very much
valued | | | | | | | | | | not valued
at all |
4. How much do you feel your role or contribution to the team is valued by the coaching staff?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| very much
valued | | | | | | | | | | not valued
at all |
5. How much do you enjoy playing with this particular team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
6. Do you feel you are an accepted member of this team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
7. In general, how much confidence do you have in your teammates' capabilities?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| no confidence
at all | | | | | | | | | | a great deal
of confidence |
8. How good do you think the teamwork is on your team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| very good | | | | | | | | | | not good at all |

- 2 -

9. Rate the degree of pride you feel in being a member of this team.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| no sense | | | | | strong sense | | | | | |
| of pride | | | | | of pride | | | | | |
10. In general, how much admiration do you have for your teammates?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| no admiration | | | | | a strong sense | | | | | |
| at all | | | | | of admiration | | | | | |
11. Rate the degree of unselfishness on your team (i.e. teammates are willing to sacrifice their own glory for the benefit of the team).
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| extremely | | | | | extremely | | | | | |
| unselfish | | | | | selfish | | | | | |
12. How important is it to you that your teammates are on the same wavelength with one another (i.e. teammates are thinking alike in order to achieve successful team performance).
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | very much so | | | | | |
13. Do you feel your teammates have a clear understanding of the goals the team is striving to achieve?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | very much so | | | | | |
14. Are you committed to the operating procedures your coach sets down for your team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not committed | | | | | extremely | | | | | |
| at all | | | | | committed | | | | | |
15. Rate the degree of support and mutual respect players have for one another.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| extremely | | | | | not supportive | | | | | |
| supportive | | | | | at all | | | | | |
16. How well do you think your teammates work together within their roles in order to achieve successful team performance?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not well | | | | | extremely | | | | | |
| at all | | | | | well | | | | | |
17. How well does your coach prepare your team, both mentally and physically to demonstrate its skills during competition (i.e. strategy, roles and operating procedures are well understood).
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not well prepared | | | | | extremely well prepared | | | | | |

- 3 -

18. How strong a sense of belonging do you feel you have to your team?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 very strong not strong at all
19. Do your teammates make you feel significant and worthwhile?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 not at all very much so
20. How satisfied are you with the friendships that you have developed within your team?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 not satisfied at all extremely satisfied
21. In general, I feel my role or contribution to the team is not valued by my teammates?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 strongly agree strongly disagree
22. In general, I do not feel much pride in being a member of this team.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 strongly agree strongly disagree
23. In general, I think the teamwork on our team is poor.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 strongly agree strongly disagree
24. Rate the degree of loyalty you have to your team.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 extremely loyal not loyal at all
25. How much faith do you have in the players who are starters on your team in terms of their ability to execute the skills that are expected of them?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 no faith at all high degree of faith
26. How much faith do you have in the players who are substitutes on your team in terms of their ability to execute the skills that are expected of them?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
 no faith at all high degree of faith

- 4 -

27. Rate the degree to which your coach creates an atmosphere where players have the right and freedom to express their ideas and feelings in a democratic way.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| open, democratic atmosphere | | | | | | | | | | closed atmosphere |
28. In general, our team seems to fall apart easily, and lose its intensity in crucial situations (i.e. when the going gets tough).
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| strongly agree | | | | | | | | | | strongly disagree |
29. Do teammates tolerate different behavior by other team members off the field?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
30. Conflict never seems to be resolved on our team (i.e. teammates argue alot and have trouble getting along with one another).
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
31. Do you feel your team has an effective method by which to re-evaluate the goals and objectives the team is working toward?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very mucj so |
32. In general, I do not feel a strong sense of belongingness to this team.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| strongly agree | | | | | | | | | | strongly disagree |
33. Rate the degree of intensity with which your team works toward its goals.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not intense at all | | | | | | | | | | extremely intense |
34. To what extent do your teammates pick up the slack for one another when certain members are not playing well?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
35. Do you feel you team is disciplined in terms of carrying out or executing the strategies that have been set down by your coach?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| well disciplined | | | | | | | | | | not disciplined at all |

- 5 -

36. To what extent does someone on your team take charge when things are going bad, which in turn, gets the rest of the team to work together in a coordinated manner.
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| no one takes charge | | | | | | | | | | someone always takes charge |
37. Do you perceive your team to be closely knit?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not close at all | | | | | | | | | | very close |
38. How well do you feel people on your team get along with one another off the playing field?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not well at all | | | | | | | | | | extremely well |
39. Do you desire to continue to be a member of this team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
40. Do you feel your team sticks together well when things are going bad?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not at all | | | | | | | | | | very much so |
41. Are you committed to your role on the team?
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| not committed at all | | | | | | | | | | extremely committed |

APPENDIX C

GROUP ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to assess your perceptions of your athletic team. There are no right or wrong answers so please give your immediate reaction. Some of the questions may seem repetitive but please answer ALL questions. Your candid response are very important to us.

There are two sections. The first concerns your feelings about your personal involvement with the team and the second your perceptions of the team as a whole.

Section 1.

The following questions are designed to assess your feelings about your PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT with this team. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements.

1. The type of competition this team offers is attractive to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

2. I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this team.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

3. I'm not happy with the amount of playing time I get.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

4. I enjoy the praise I get from my teammates about my performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

5. I am not going to miss the members of this team when the season ends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

6. I'm unhappy with my team's level of desire to win.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

7. Some of my best friends are on this team.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

8. This team doesn't give me enough opportunities to improve my personal performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

9. I enjoy other parties more than team parties.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

10. The success of this team is attractive to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

11. I don't like the style of play on this team.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

12. For me this team is one of the most important social groups to which I belong.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

Section 2.

The following questions are designed to assess your perceptions of your TEAM AS A WHOLE. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements.

13. Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

14. Members of our team would rather go out on their own than get together as a team.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

15. We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance by our team.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

16. Our team members rarely party together.

[illegible]

17. Our team members have conflicting aspirations for the team's performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

18. Everyone laughs and jokes on our team.

[illegible]

19. Our team members accept constructive criticism from each other about their performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

20. When things get tough our team seems to fall apart.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

21. Our team would like to spend time together in the off season.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

22. If members of our team have problems in practice, everyone wants to help them so we can get back together again.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

23. Members of our team do not stick together outside of practices and games.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

24. Our team members do not communicate freely about each athlete's responsibilities during competition or practice.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree							Strongly Agree	

APPENDIX D

DRAPER AND WRISBERG 1985
CONSENT FORM

I, _____,
hereby volunteer to participate in a research study examining the effects of
level of competitive experience on sport team cohesion.

I understand that I will be administered a two-part questionnaire that
will focus on my personal feelings about my team, my teammates and my per-
ceived team status.

Other details of the study have been explained and I have had the
opportunity to ask questions of my own. I understand that I may raise
further questions with the experimenter at any time.

I have been told that I may withdraw from the study at any time. I
understand that my scores will remain confidential and that only group
results will be discussed in written reports of the study.

Date: _____ Participant: _____

Experimenters:

APPENDIX E

MSCI TEST SCORES

Varsity = Subjects 1-26 (Males: 1-14; Females: 15-26)
Intramural = Subjects 27-49 (Females: 27-39; Males: 40-49)

MSCI Task Scores

The following series of numbers represents subject responses to the MSCI task-related items numbered 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 37, respectively. (Underlined items are those with reversed scoring.)

Subject #	Scores															Total
1	9	7	3	8	9	7	8	9	10	10	6	6	9	7	2	110
2	7	8	7	10	11	8	7	9	10	11	7	7	10	10	7	129
3	8	5	7	7	9	6	7	10	10	9	7	6	7	7	4	109
4	3	3	2	10	11	3	10	10	10	4	4	8	9	8	4	99
5	6	5	6	9	10	6	11	11	10	7	7	10	10	9	9	126
6	9	8	10	10	11	10	9	11	11	11	1	10	7	10	9	137
7	6	4	8	8	8	9	9	9	8	8	4	5	8	4	7	105
8	6	7	2	7	9	5	9	8	7	4	6	6	9	10	7	102
9	3	3	7	10	11	7	4	10	6	5	1	5	10	7	3	91
10	5	8	9	11	10	9	11	10	9	11	11	11	11	8	10	144
11	7	9	6	7	9	7	7	9	9	9	8	8	6	8	8	117
12	6	3	5	7	7	5	6	4	7	1	6	7	3	8	2	77
13	7	8	8	5	7	6	5	7	4	6	8	5	5	4	5	90
14	4	7	9	10	9	6	7	11	8	5	8	7	4	8	7	110
15	4	11	10	11	11	10	10	11	10	10	11	11	10	11	11	152
16	10	9	10	11	11	10	9	10	11	6	10	10	9	10	11	147
17	11	11	10	11	10	11	11	11	11	10	11	11	10	11	11	161
18	10	11	11	11	11	11	10	11	11	11	11	10	10	11	10	160
19	7	9	8	10	9	7	8	10	8	8	9	9	9	6	9	126
20	10	10	11	11	11	11	10	11	10	8	11	11	9	9	11	154
21	8	9	8	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	9	9	10	9	10	138
22	5	7	10	6	10	11	8	10	10	11	11	7	7	7	10	130
23	8	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	10	9	10	10	11	11	153
24	8	11	10	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	11	10	9	9	11	147
25	11	8	8	10	10	10	8	11	9	9	8	8	7	5	11	133
26	9	11	11	11	11	11	10	11	10	9	9	9	9	9	10	150
27	7	3	10	10	7	11	10	10	8	9	11	11	7	8	11	133
28	4	9	11	10	11	10	10	10	10	9	11	9	9	9	10	142

Subject #	Scores															Total
29	6	4	8	5	5	7	7	4	9	4	11	3	5	4	9	91
30	6	5	8	10	10	9	10	4	10	6	11	9	9	9	11	127
31	2	1	1	9	11	1	11	10	9	9	1	10	10	8	9	102
32	7	9	11	8	9	11	10	5	10	8	10	9	2	9	9	127
33	7	9	8	9	6	5	8	9	9	8	2	9	7	7	10	113
34	10	6	9	9	8	3	8	6	8	8	8	8	8	4	8	111
35	4	5	5	10	10	6	6	8	8	5	6	11	9	2	10	105
36	6	10	10	10	10	10	9	6	9	8	10	7	9	8	8	130
37	8	6	9	10	11	9	9	8	9	9	9	6	8	7	9	127
38	8	4	4	9	9	1	9	7	7	7	10	6	11	3	11	106
39	8	7	4	6	8	5	6	4	7	4	9	3	4	8	7	90
40	6	9	7	9	6	8	8	8	9	7	6	8	9	6	10	116
41	6	4	4	7	4	4	6	3	7	7	7	6	7	4	3	79
42	5	9	4	10	9	10	8	3	10	7	8	5	11	2	9	110
43	6	9	6	9	5	6	6	6	7	6	7	7	8	3	7	99
44	6	9	8	9	10	9	9	8	9	4	5	9	10	5	10	120
45	3	6	2	8	5	8	7	8	9	7	7	4	9	6	9	98
46	9	8	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	5	10	9	10	140
47	6	9	10	10	6	10	8	5	10	10	10	4	9	9	9	125
48	5	4	4	7	5	8	7	5	7	7	6	6	8	6	10	95
49	10	3	8	9	5	8	8	3	8	5	8	5	7	6	10	103

MSCI Social Scores

The following series of numbers represents subject responses to the MSCI social-related items numbered 1, 5, 6, 9, 18, 19 and 20, respectively. (Item #18 has a reversed scoring scale.)

Subject #	Scores							Total
1	10	9	10	10	10	9	5	63
2	10	10	11	11	10	10	11	73
3	6	7	7	11	7	5	4	47
4	11	9	11	11	1	11	4	58
5	10	8	10	9	8	9	8	62
6	11	11	9	11	11	10	8	71
7	7	6	6	8	8	8	8	51
8	9	10	3	7	4	5	7	45
9	11	8	10	8	9	10	8	64
10	10	9	10	11	9	10	9	68
11	8	7	10	8	4	8	8	53

Subject #	Scores							Total
12	6	3	6	8	5	6	1	35
13	7	4	10	5	5	5	7	43
14	10	11	11	11	9	10	7	69
15	11	11	11	11	10	10	10	74
16	11	11	10	11	10	10	10	73
17	11	11	11	11	11	11	10	76
18	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	77
19	10	7	4	8	3	7	6	45
20	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	77
21	10	8	8	9	9	9	10	63
22	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	77
23	11	11	11	11	10	10	11	75
24	10	9	11	11	10	9	11	71
25	7	7	7	8	6	9	10	54
26	11	10	11	11	11	11	11	76
27	6	11	11	11	11	11	11	72
28	10	11	11	11	11	11	11	76
29	9	10	11	8	10	3	3	54
30	8	10	10	10	10	10	11	69
31	8	11	11	11	11	11	11	74
32	6	10	9	5	7	10	9	56
33	11	9	9	7	9	5	8	58
34	2	6	1	6	5	9	11	40
35	11	11	11	11	11	4	11	70
36	8	11	11	9	10	10	10	69
37	8	8	10	11	11	10	10	68
38	10	11	11	11	2	10	11	66
39	8	8	8	8	5	7	6	50
40	6	8	9	8	8	8	8	55
41	5	6	6	6	3	5	6	37
42	9	11	11	9	11	10	11	72
43	8	11	8	8	6	6	8	55
44	9	10	10	10	9	9	10	67
45	9	10	8	11	6	7	10	61
46	10	10	10	10	11	11	11	73
47	11	11	11	11	11	10	9	74
48	9	11	11	11	7	8	7	64
49	10	10	9	11	7	7	10	64

GEQ TEST SCORES

Varsity = Subjects 1-26 (Males: 1-14; Females: 15-26)
 Intramural = Subjects 27-49 (Females: 27-39; Males: 40-49)

GEQ Task Scores

The following series of numbers represents subjects' responses to GEQ task-related items: numbers 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24, respectively. (Underlined items are those with reversed scoring.)

Subject #	Scores														Total
1	8	4	7	3	5	8	2	3	2	3	5	7	2	3	62
2	9	2	7	3	8	8	7	7	9	5	5	8	4	8	90
3	8	2	6	5	8	8	8	5	8	3	5	5	5	5	81
4	9	6	9	8	7	8	8	7	9	8	7	8	7	7	108
5	1	1	8	7	5	8	6	8	8	7	5	5	6	6	81
6	5	5	5	8	3	9	8	8	8	7	3	3	2	4	78
7	5	3	5	3	7	4	7	4	8	3	7	5	7	6	74
8	6	4	6	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	7	3	3	5	63
9	8	7	8	2	3	5	2	3	7	3	1	4	6	4	63
10	9	1	4	3	8	7	8	8	6	4	9	9	7	9	92
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--
12	6	5	5	5	5	5	1	6	8	5	2	5	1	5	64
13	6	9	5	5	5	5	2	4	5	6	4	5	6	3	70
14	9	9	9	4	8	6	6	4	8	7	1	6	6	7	90
15	9	2	8	9	2	9	9	8	8	9	6	8	9	5	101
16	8	9	8	8	8	9	9	8	9	7	8	9	9	8	117
17	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	9	123
18	8	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	116
19	7	4	6	7	4	7	7	6	7	5	7	5	7	6	85
20	8	9	8	8	9	5	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	8	115
21	6	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	8	104
22	8	9	8	5	9	5	9	9	6	9	5	5	9	9	105
23	8	6	8	3	7	8	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	8	107
24	9	5	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	117
25	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	110
26	9	4	6	8	9	8	9	9	9	9	8	7	8	7	110
27	9	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	6	9	9	9	9	9	120
28	8	9	9	7	8	8	8	7	8	7	8	4	7	8	106
29	8	9	4	3	5	7	7	7	8	8	8	7	5	4	90
30	5	2	8	9	2	9	8	8	7	8	8	9	9	9	101

Subject #	Scores													Total
31	7	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	124
32	5	8	7	8	7	8	8	7	2	8	8	8	5	97
33	7	9	8	3	3	7	9	5	9	1	4	2	4	74
34	8	7	8	9	8	6	7	6	5	7	3	7	6	92
35	7	8	9	8	6	9	4	9	5	7	7	7	5	98
36	8	9	9	7	9	9	7	7	7	5	8	5	7	105
37	9	8	7	5	8	5	9	7	8	9	5	5	5	95
38	9	5	8	9	7	5	8	7	7	5	9	8	8	103
39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--
40	7	7	5	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	7	6	7	90
41	7	2	3	8	3	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	5	81
42	7	9	4	4	4	5	7	7	7	4	7	8	5	83
43	7	5	6	6	7	8	3	7	5	6	4	8	6	82
44	8	2	8	3	8	8	6	7	5	5	8	5	4	82
45	8	2	8	9	7	8	3	7	6	7	2	9	5	89
46	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8	9	7	3	7	7	109
47	9	5	9	9	3	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	107
48	7	3	7	9	7	1	6	2	9	9	8	7	7	88
49	9	8	9	4	3	9	7	5	8	7	5	3	4	88

GEQ Social Scores

The following series of numbers represents subjects' responses to GEQ social-related items: numbered 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21 and 23, respectively. (Underlined items are those with reversed scoring.)

Subject #	Scores										Total
1	5	3	2	3	8	3	1	7	3	7	42
2	9	7	7	4	8	2	4	8	5	4	58
3	1	1	1	1	9	6	6	8	5	7	45
4	5	6	2	3	8	2	2	8	6	6	48
5	1	4	4	7	8	4	5	8	4	8	53
6	8	8	6	3	7	2	8	7	8	7	64
7	7	6	3	3	3	3	6	4	7	7	49
8	3	4	3	5	5	2	2	7	2	8	41
9	5	6	3	2	6	2	1	5	4	6	40
10	9	9	8	7	9	2	1	8	6	1	60
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--
12	7	5	1	3	5	8	5	8	1	1	44

Subject #	Scores										Total
13	4	6	6	3	6	6	5	6	6	5	53
14	7	9	1	2	9	5	2	9	8	3	55
15	8	9	8	9	5	3	7	9	6	6	70
16	9	9	9	7	9	7	8	9	7	7	81
17	9	9	9	8	9	8	9	9	9	9	88
18	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	89
19	7	7	5	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	72
20	9	9	5	8	9	1	4	5	7	9	66
21	7	8	8	3	7	5	5	8	7	8	66
22	2	9	9	9	9	7	1	9	5	9	69
23	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	9	8	8	82
24	9	9	9	7	9	7	8	8	9	9	84
25	8	8	8	5	5	6	6	9	3	8	66
26	9	9	7	8	9	7	8	7	8	8	80
27	8	1	9	1	1	3	5	9	9	7	53
28	9	9	3	5	9	5	2	8	3	2	55
29	8	8	8	7	7	3	3	8	4	7	63
30	2	1	8	9	7	8	8	8	9	9	69
31	9	1	7	9	1	6	9	9	9	9	69
32	7	8	9	5	5	8	8	8	7	8	73
33	9	9	1	5	8	9	9	6	7	4	73
34	8	9	9	9	4	4	5	7	9	9	73
35	9	9	9	9	5	5	9	9	9	1	74
36	7	9	9	9	6	5	6	8	8	7	74
37	9	9	2	9	8	8	7	7	8	8	75
38	9	9	9	9	5	8	9	9	8	8	83
39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--
40	2	8	8	8	3	6	7	4	6	6	58
41	8	3	8	5	3	5	8	7	7	5	59
42	9	8	9	4	3	5	9	5	5	7	64
43	3	8	9	7	7	7	8	7	7	6	69
44	9	7	8	5	7	7	9	5	7	8	72
45	8	8	8	7	8	8	6	5	7	7	72
46	9	9	9	2	8	7	8	4	8	9	73
47	9	9	9	9	8	8	4	6	4	7	73
48	8	8	9	9	7	8	8	5	8	7	77
49	9	7	9	5	8	8	9	7	9	9	80

VITA

Mary Vanessa Draper was born in Nashville, Tennessee, on August 22, 1957. She graduated from Harpeth Hall Preparatory School in June 1975. The following September she entered Florida Southern College, and in April 1979 she received a Bachelor of Science degree in Health/Physical Education. In September 1979 she accepted a teaching position at Mulberry High School in Polk County, Florida, and remained there as Physical Education Instructor/Volleyball Coach for five years.

In the fall of 1984 she accepted a teaching assistantship at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and began study toward a Master's degree in Physical Education. She received the Master of Science degree in August 1985.