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Abstract
The study investigated the Relationship between Motivation, Personal Satisfaction of Team Members, Conformity to Teams Norms and Team Performance. Two hypotheses were postulated and tested. The survey research design was adopted to conduct the study. The sample included two thousand and eighty-eight athletes (players of six sports) surveyed through a purposive sampling techniques from among the selected team sports in Nigeria Spots Zone One. The 4-Scale Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) and Structured Interview were the instruments used for the study. Results of data analysis and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient tested at .05 level of significance indicated that there is a significant linear relationship between team performance and the entire set of predictor (Independent Variables (F 1,2048 = 1625972 P < .05). The observed R of .995 was significant and that 99% of the variance in team performance can be accounted for by the independent variables. With all predictor variables in the model, all the independent variables except for motivation are important for better prediction of team performance. On the basis of the findings, suggestions and recommendations were made on how to maintain and improve team performance.
Introduction
In evaluating high performance teams, Maxwell, and Zettersten (2001) identified two ways of thinking about effectiveness. First, one can consider those internal factors or conditions within a team that make the team more productive or perform better than another team doing a similar type of task. These include roles of coaches on team and what skills they need to develop to ensure productivity within the team. Second, there are external factors that reside outside of the team which have impact on performance and effectiveness. These are types of infrastructure or communication systems existing, impact of reward system, organizational culture and structures on the team’s performance.

Ajayi (2000) identified cohesion properties as personal satisfaction, stability of team members, team success, effective communication, structured team goals, calamity of individual role performance, conformity to team norms and the size of the team. They are considered as the adhesive property of groups and the force that binds group members together.

Ajayi (2002), equally opined that athletic contest in the recent times has taken a dimension of professionalism where expertise is highly needed. Successful sports competition requires more than mere training or camping athletes in pre-season or during season alone. Physical practice is important in improving cohesiveness; however, psychological attributes of peak performance must not be neglected.

Employees could also be effective depending on the package of incentives offered by the organisation in which they work for. This view was supported by Awosika (1986) who observed that everyman has a right to leisure time irrespective of age, nature of work and obligatory engagements. Onifade (1987) opined that recreation is a fundamental and universal need because man has found outlets in it for self-expression, personal development, and self-satisfaction.

This study therefore attempts to investigate the extent to which factors like motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms will determine team performance. It was hypothesized that (i) there is no significant predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms and team performance; and (ii) there is no difference in the contribution of each of the predictor variables and team performance.
Method
The study employs the use of Ex-post-facto research design. This is so because the independent variables being investigated have already occurred. Thus, no manipulations of any sort of the variables by the researcher as could have been done for experimental studies.

The population consists of all members of team sports (U – 17, under 20 and senior categories) and Coaches from selected team sports in Nigeria Sports (Zone one) that is Lagos, Ogun, Osun and Oyo State. The sample of the study comprised of six selected team sports in the research area. This consisted of 1193 males and 857 female Soccer, Cricket (Male only), Volleyball, Basketball, Hockey and Handball fell into the sample of the study and were used for the study.

The instruments used was 4-Scale Group Environmental Questionnaire (GEQ) (Widmeyer, Brawley and Carron, 1992) reviewed by Ezeigwe (1998) which was further adopted and expanded to meet the needs of the variables in the hypotheses of this study. This was divided into two sections to cover the independent variables of motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms. The scale is a 32 item scale of 4-point Likert Scaling format of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). The scale is made up of two sections. Section A contains items to measure the sex, sports, status in the team, length of years in team, marital status, level of participation and medal won. Section B of the instrument contains items to measure motivation. Items like “Athletes in my team have a natural urge after their involvement in competition” and “Sports programmes/training programmes are designed properly so that the player become self-motivated in my team” are contained under this sub-scale. To measure personal satisfaction of team members, items like “I am always satisfied with the degree of motivation given to me by my Coach” and “There is always a feeling of satisfaction for being a member of my team or group” were used. In order to determine conformity to team norms, items like “Adherence to the rules and regulations of the team helps us to stay together” and “Understanding and respect for the beliefs, culture and sport rules associated with the group encourages cooperation among our members” were included.

The reliability of the instrument was established by administering the instruments on a sample of 50 respondents from Ondo State Sports Council.
in another National Sports Zone. After two weeks, a test-re-test of the instrument was conducted using the same respondents for the purpose of correlational computation. The reliability was established by correlating the first and second responses and this was found to be more than 0.68 showing that the instrument was reliable.

The researcher administered the instruments with the assistance of a proctor in each of the Zonal Sports Offices. The instrument was administered on the respondents (team members, all categories) from the four National Sports Zones after due permissions from their Team Manages and Coaches.

The multiple regression method of data analysis and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient were used to analyze the data for this study. The results of data analysis are presented in order of hypothesis.

Results
Hypothesis by hypothesis presentation and interpretation of results are presented below.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and team performance.

Data were subjected to multiple regression analysis with all predictor variables entered into the model. Results which were tested for significance at the 0.05 level are presented in Table 1.

(a) Predictors (constant) motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms.

(b) Dependent Variable: Team Performance

There is a significant predictive relationship between team performance and the entire set of predictor variables – motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms. (F1,2048 = 16259.72; P < .001). The null hypothesis that there is no significant predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and team performance cannot be sustained by the findings of this study and was therefore rejected.

The model summary of the analysis is presented in Table 2.

(a) Predictors (constant), motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms.
Results indicated that the predictor (Independent) variables (motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms) are related to the criterion (dependent) variable (team performance).

The observed R of .996 was found to be significant at the .05 level of significance (Table 1); and about 99.2% of the variance in team performance can be accounted for by motivation, personal satisfaction of team members and conformity to team norms.

The second hypothesis, which stated that there is no difference in the contribution of each of the predictor variables of motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and the criterion variable of team performance was equally rejected. With all the predictor variables in the model, the importance of each of the independent variables in the prediction of team performance was sought. The results of the analysis are provided in Table 3.

(a) Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

The result indicated that the conformity to team norms is the best predictor of team performance among selected team sports. This is followed by personal satisfaction of team members. Motivation is not a good predictor of team performance among selected team sports when some other predictor variables in the model are considered. However, each independent variable is positively related to team performance among selected team sports.

Results indicated that motivation and team performance among selected team sports are related positively. The observed R of .142 was found to be significant at the .05 level. However, only about 2% of the variance in the effectiveness of team sports could be accounted for by motivation. This indicated a weak tendency of the variables to predict the criterion variable.

Discussion

The hypothesis which stated that there is no significant predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and team performance among selected team/sports was rejected. This means that there is a significant predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and team players generally rendered their services in order to meet certain needs as highlighted in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Locke and Latham (1998) also argued that an individual motivation is enhanced when
feedback is provided on performance. Graham (1996) also supported these findings when he said the most important factor is individual – recognition more important than salaries, bonuses or promotions.

Prapavessis and Carron (1997) found that group cohesion was related to greater sacrifice for the group and conformity to group norms, while Ajayi (1999) confirmed that when there is conformity, group role performance become more clear, more accepted and members will be ready to perform their roles. Ogunleye (2003) indicated that conformity to team norms has strong correlation with team performance.

Lane and Chappel (2001) supported the notion of the findings of Ogunleye (2003) that personal satisfactions of team members are team success scan predict performance in basketball. Given that team Cohesion showed some utility for predicting personal satisfaction with performance, identifying factors associated with cohesion has some relevance.

The second hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference in the contribution of each of the predictor variables and team performance among selected team sports was rejected. For instance, conformity to team norms singly predicted effective team performance. The finding implies that the higher the conformity to team norms by players, the higher their effectiveness in the team would be and better performance results. This is a very important result in that conformity is not simply loyalty or compliance, but rather, a whole-hearted support of the organizational ventures, goals and values. Martin and Nicholls (1987) also viewed commitment (conformity) as encapsulating given all of yourself while at that extra effort, accepting change, cooperation with others, self- development, respecting trust, pride in abilities, seeking improvements and giving support. Commitment (Conformity) would be expected to enhance performance.

There is significant predictive relationship between personal satisfaction of team members and team performance among selected team sports. The findings that corroborated earlier finding reported by Patrick, Eisenberge and Armeli (1998) who indicated that sufficiency of pay, benefits and rewards, family oriented policies and actions; quality of the supervisory relationship; promotions etc can influence an employee’s positive feelings about their employer. In the case under study, medical facilities are available to players of the team sports. This is in addition to the prompt payment of
allowance/bonuses, good transportation to and from training/competition venues etc. These represent concrete or tangible incentives that give these players satisfaction with themselves.

The findings that motivation was not significant in predicting employee effectiveness in highly revealing. While motivation is slightly positively related to team performance among selected team sports, it only predicted about one percent of the total variance of team performance among selected team sports. The implication is that while motivations a desirable attribute of any player, it is not strong enough to stimulate effective performance in teams. Hence, team handlers who desire better output should rely less on mere appeal to sentiment.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study has helped to determine the predictive relationship between motivation, personal satisfaction of team members, conformity to team norms and team performance among selected team sports. Conformity to team norms were found to exert more influence on team performance among selected team sports followed by personal satisfaction of team members and little effect of motivation. Based on this premise, the following recommendations were made.

Team handlers (Coaches Managers, etc.) should do everything possible to create a work environment (during trainings, at competition and after competitions) that indicates that the team players are valued. They must address fairness, quality of supervision during and after training and competitions and support for team players’ life style such as time off to deal with hobbies, recreation, politics or other interests.

The team players should be ready to be more effective on their job (trainings and competitions), they should also reflect a sense of excitement about their work, profession, which results in the motivation to perform well.
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Table 1: Analysis of Overall Relationship between Team Performance and the Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>123449.175</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8229.945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1029.519</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>50.616</td>
<td>16259.72</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124478.694</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>58845.945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Model Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>0.71145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Relative Contributions of Motivation, Personal Satisfaction of Team Members and Conformity to Team Norms to Team Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>6.711</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>26.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Team Norms</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>6.599</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction of members</td>
<td>2.883</td>
<td>6.705</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>