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Abstract

Group cohesion is a social process that characterizes groups whose members interact with each other and refers to the forces that push group members closer together. Group cohesion has its own relevance in the place where there is a team. Even though the people work together, Group cohesiveness, the concept which has been used here for the study, can probably be a novel term to many organizations. It is not necessary that many are familiar with this term. The study entitled “Study on the relevance of group cohesion in an organization” is an attempt to understand and evaluate how many organizations and its members use this concept on their way to reach their desired goals. In addition to this it also focuses on the problems faced by the people when they are with their team members. It is to be noted that Group cohesion cannot always provide favorable results not to mention the group working can also generate some problems between the members. Thus it will seriously affects the employee performances.
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INTRODUCTION

Working together as a group to achieve the desired goals has an everlasting relevance. When the members of an organization or an institution come forward as a group with the aim to give top notch performance it not only enhances the productivity but also creates good harmony between all the members. Organizational Behaviour is certainly incomplete without understanding Group Cohesion. Thus the proper and efficient use of group cohesion in an organization bolsters the group working and creates a good team spirit among its members. Though the concept sounds as an onerous one to understand it is quite simple in every aspect. Group cohesiveness is the extent to which group members are loyal and committed to the group and to each member. When the group is highly cohesive the members work well together, support, validate and trust each other further they are generally effective at achieving their chosen goals. Obviously the group cohesion brings a good attachment between the members in an organization. In this study we mainly focus on the value and the need for having the group cohesion in every organization.

Even though the people work together, Group cohesiveness, the concept which has been used here for the study, can probably be a novel term to many organizations. It is not necessary that many are familiar with this term. The study entitled “Study on the relevance of group cohesion in an organization” is an attempt to understand and evaluate how many organizations and its members use this concept on their way to reach their desired goals. In addition to this it also focuses on the problems faced by the people when they are with their team members. It is to be noted that Group cohesion cannot always provide favorable results not to mention the group working can also generate some problems between the members. Thus it will seriously affects the employee performances.

The quote “Unity is Strength” which has been framed by renowned American poet Mattie Stepanek adds more meaning to the concept of teamwork. Group Cohesion is an important factor in team performance and it also refers to the strength of bonds between group members, the unity of a group, the feeling of attraction between group members or the degree to which members coordinate their efforts to achieve goals, so this study started from the idea that in groups there we can find positive relationships of sympathy, friendship, and cooperation the activity is most effective and the results are better. Undoubtedly the study helped a lot in analysing the apt value of the concept. Contribution of team work in enhancing the employee performance and organization’s productivity is clearly analysed here. Using the questionnaire survey method, I tried to discover how improving the relationships inside the team can influence the performance of a group. In spite of having the chance for the rise of some disputes, disagreements and altercations between the members, group cohesion’s value is always irreplaceable.
LITERATURE REVIEW

It is always ideal to go through the findings made by brilliant and adept scholars for getting adequate insight into the respective topic. The group cohesion has been evolving as a buzzword in the fields related with the organizational behavior. Its value and the relevance is the sole reason why the concept is being subjected to thorough study. So far many researchers have conducted deep analysis on the group cohesion. Many scholarly studies have associated strong group performance with a high level of group cohesion among the members.

Jeannine Ohlert & Christian Zepp in their research paper entitled “Sport & Exercise Psychology Research” which was published in 2016 defined the group cohesion as “a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs”. It has been mentioned in their study that the group cohesion can be considered an inevitable concept that urges and motivates the team members to work together with common spirit to achieve the target and it is quite free to be applied in any field that accepts the importance of a group. Paul B. Paulus & Nicholas W. Kohn has clearly covered the pros and cons of group cohesion in their paper “Handbook of Original Creativity” issued in 2012. They have shared from the prospective mind that group cohesion enhances the task performance. Their emphasis on task commitment and the group pride sets their ideas a little bit apart from that of others. They mentioned that group cohesion would be a great predictor of innovation and it leads to group creativity. It is likely that the group cohesion can have either positive or negative impacts. Sometimes it may create some disagreements or disputes between the teammates. Lata Dyaram & T.J. Kamalanabhan in their journal named “Journal of Social Sciences” which was published in 2005 suggests that the relationship between group cohesion and performance is not that much simple as it seems and may not results in better performance. Their study highlights the need for future empirical research that could test the relationship the cohesiveness and performance. The journal states that it is necessary to look into some other factors which form best combination such as co-workers satisfaction, group size norms and interdependence on task etc. rather than cohesiveness alone. Because all these factors have its own effect.

Objectives of the study

The entire study has been carried out on the basis of following objectives:

- To analyse how the group cohesion helps the members of an organization in enhancing their performances.
- To find out how the concept facilitates the relationship between the employees

Research Methodology

- **Primary data:** Primary data required for the study has been collected from various respondents with a well framed questionnaire.
- **Secondary data:** Journals and articles published by renowned authors, websites and study reports were used as the secondary data.
- **Sample design & Sample size:** Samples were collected on random basis from 60 respondents consisting of students and employees who are residing in the various parts of Chennai and Alappuzha. Convenient sampling method is used for the study.
- **Collection of data:** Both primary and secondary data have been used here for the better completion of the study.
- **Sampling technique:** Convenient sampling technique which helps us easily to reach the population which is to be studied has been used here. It is mainly due to its convenient accessibility and easiness to collect the data within short span of time.
- **Population of the study:** The studied population includes students and employees
- **Tools of data analysis:** The primary data collected for the study has been analysed using IBM SPSS
Analysis and discussion

**Table 1**

Have you ever been a part of any group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The table informs us that 90% that is the majority of total respondents have been a part of at least one group and 10% of the respondents have no experience in working with the group. It indicates that still people may not be aware of it or don’t get the chance to work in groups.

**Table 2**

Respondents’ satisfaction of group’s performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly dissatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The table and the chart conveys that merely 9 respondents (15%) are highly satisfied with their group performance, 11 respondents (18.3%) say they are just satisfied. 18 respondents (30%) which is the majority stand in neutral option and they can’t whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied. 15 (25%) are dissatisfied and the 7 (11.7%) respondents express their higher dissatisfaction about their group performance. We can understand that the percentage of people who are dissatisfied with the performance (22%) is more than that of satisfied ones (20%).

**Table 3**

No. of respondents aware of group cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The phenomenon of framing the group so that the members of the group can support, help and validate one another in reaching the desired goal is Group Cohesion. It is transpired through the study that still in this modern era there are people who are not aware about the group cohesion or working as a group. Even it is smaller in size that is 3%, it should be considered with very much seriousness.
Table 4

Purposes behind the use of group cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve the goals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate and strengthen the bond between the members</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To bring unity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employee performances</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The table and chart given here provides a concise idea about for what purposes does an organization use group cohesion. It is to be highlighted from the responses we have received that all the organizations use group cohesion for at least one purpose that can be anyone which has been mentioned. Besides the mentioned purposes some has responded that their organization uses group cohesion for some other purposes too.

Table 5

Group cohesion in achieving the objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Group cohesion has helped 55 respondents (91.7%) in achieving the objectives they have desired. When majority admits, it adds more value to the relevance of group cohesion. At the same time 5 respondents (8.3%) shared that they couldn’t attain their objectives. Even though it is in minor it requires more attention.

Table 6

Level of willingness to help each other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

When we interpret the responses which have been collected here 41 (68.3%) of the total respondents are always willing and 18 (30%) are sometimes willing to help their team members to achieve the desired goals. Their ultimate desire to reach the goals could be the reason that drives the respondents to do so. Only a respondent (1.7%) has mentioned his unwillingness.
Table 7

| Chance for disputes between the members |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid yes        | 28        | 46.7     | 46.7           | 46.7              |
| Valid no         | 32        | 53.3     | 53.3           | 100.0             |
| Total            | 60        | 100.0    | 100.0          |                   |

Source: Primary data

Unless there are any disputes groups will give better output. From the data received here we can evaluate that 28 respondents admit they never experienced any disputes within their group. But 32 responses give an idea disputes have occurred and it shall happen in the future also. So it is the obligation of team members to act with a mutual understanding.

Table 8

| Level of likeness to spend more time with team members |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid yes        | 51        | 85.0     | 85.0           | 85.0              |
| Valid no         | 9         | 15.0     | 15.0           | 100.0             |
| Total            | 60        | 100.0    | 100.0          |                   |

Source: Primary data

From the above table we are able to read that 51 respondents like to spend more hours with their team members. The unity they have experienced or the happiness they felt or some other factors could be the reason that generates willingness in their mind. Meanwhile 9 respondents don’t like it. It can be mainly due the restrictions put over them or some other bitter experiences they have suffered.

Table 9

| Personal gains from the cohesion |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid yes        | 45        | 75.0     | 75.0           | 75.0              |
| Valid no         | 15        | 25.0     | 25.0           | 100.0             |
| Total            | 60        | 100.0    | 100.0          |                   |

Source: Primary data

Rather than organizational gains, personal gains also can be derived from group cohesion. 45 respondents (75%) agree with this and 15 respondents (25%) say they never had any personal gains.

Table 10

| Type of working helped most |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid            | Individual working | 12    | 20.0       | 20.0               |
|                  | Group working     | 48    | 80.0       | 100.0              |
| Total            | 60        | 100.0    | 100.0      |                   |

Source: Primary data

The data added here evaluates the preference of respondents in working. 48 respondents expressed that the group working helped them most in achieving the goals they had been dreaming of. It also reveals the team spirit and unity existed in their working. Merely 12 prefers individual working.
Table 11
Relevance of group cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

In light what the respondents had experienced in the past they rated the relevance of group cohesion in a 5 point rating scale. None rated ‘very effective’ and ‘not very effective’. Majority that is 38 (63.3%) of the total respondents are in neutral stands. So they are in an option somewhat like probability. 18 respondents (30%) rated group cohesion as very effective in reaching the goals on the contrary merely 4 rated as not effective.

Table 12
Success with group cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Benefits which have been derived from group cohesion urged 38 respondents (63.3%) to approach the concept favorably, consequently they think that group cohesion leads to success. Perhaps due the unfavorable results 22 respondents (36.7%) don’t think group cohesion always gives good results.

Conclusion

Group cohesion or team cohesion is inevitable from the space with groups. The concept has wider appeal in the areas of organizational behavior and all other fields’ kindred to organizational behavior. Even though we are living in a modernized world where we get access to any kind of information, the term group cohesion is still an abstruse one, which means there are a few people who are not even aware of the term, but the interesting part is that many among them are familiar with the idea the group cohesion conveys its top range in dealing with unity and bond between the people makes the concept a unique one. Certainly it is one among the exceptional and magnificent theories ever framed. Group cohesiveness has always been at least implicitly associated with a greater willingness of group members to exert themselves on behalf of the group and therefore with increased group productivity and performance. Along with the positive sides the negatives have also been studied here. It is quite easier for an assiduous minded person to overcome all the bad sided associated with group cohesion. Group cohesiveness may better be viewed as a construct with different aspects, and that the aspect of cohesiveness that has to do with group members’ commitment to task performance and goal achievement is the most important in predicting group performance [Brian Muller and Carolyn Copper, 1994]. The concept should be extended to many and it should gain all the relevance required in the upcoming eras.
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