International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics
Volume 119 No. 12 2018, 14867-14880
ISSN: 1314-3395 (on-line version)
url: http://www.ijpam.eu
Special Issue

ijpam.eu

Impact of Group Cohesiveness on Performance of the Acadamicains in Chennai- An Emperical Study

[1]D. Anitha Kumari and [2]H. Rahamath Sulthana
[1]Dept of Management Studies,
VISTAS, Chennai.
anitha.sms@velsuniv.ac.in
[2]Dept of Management Studies,
VISTAS, Chennai.
rahamathsulthana@gmail.com

Abstract

The ages old expression that "birds of feather, flock together" describes the concepts of cohesion. The primary objective is to study the impact of group cohesiveness on performance of the academician's in Chennai. In this study the researcher has take up a descriptive research method. The applied sampling procedure of the study is purposive sampling under probability sampling technique. The determined sample sizes of 1020 are equally distributed to all 102 colleges. Hence, the sample size from each college came to 10 faculties. Hence the final sample included for the study came to 918 respectively. The identified male and female respondents of the present study came to 321 to 597 respectively. T-test, Reliability Test, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Two Group Discriminate Analysis, Multiple Regression Analysis and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) has adopted for analysis. The study concluded that the level of performance in the group among the female faculty members are higher than the male faculty members. . Hence, the educational institutions should focus on the group organization, group motivation and group activities to enhance the recital of their staffs.

Key Words: Group, Cohesiveness, Performance, Measures, Employee and employee's relationship

1. Introduction

Academicians' may believe their mainly imperative job is to educate but "such a view is restricted and sophisticated. Teachers are societal human being with common desires such as approval, belonging and supremacy to be convening in the circumstance of groups. If their societal desires are fulfilled, they can form a consistent faction.

The teaching responsibility of academicians in scientific and administration organization mirror their centrality in speak to the crucial learning assignment in the middle of enlightening establishment of advanced knowledge. Academicians educate, distribute and communicate essential or practical awareness to learners and facilitate learners with the wisdom development and be relevant the acquaintance. In this erection of the teaching job and accountability; the academicians are the contented specialist, and students are regarded as learners. In the occupation surroundings, it is essential for all workers to carve up a general aim, specifically, to entire responsibilities that will help the concern or managerial group. Having workforce employment toward an ordinary purpose endorses interdependency along with the co-workers; if everyone panel associate does their fraction, the duty will in appropriate way move towards mutually. A unified labour setting amplify the chance of member of team liking and provide as an inducement for workers to turn up geared up and enthusiastic to get the enhanced of the everyday jobs of the day. Lack of solidity surrounded by a functioning atmosphere is definite to outcome in redundant pressure and strain in the centre of co-workers. As might be normal, when workers do not get along in concert, labour suffers.

Qualities of teaching and learning provision are by far the most salient influences on students' cognitive, affective, and behavioural outcomes of schooling – regardless of their gender or backgrounds. Kenneth J. Rowe (2008) The Importance of Teacher Quality as a Key Determinant of Students' Experiences and Outcomes of Schooling Principal Research Fellow, ACER, It is teachers' conscientiousness to endorse group cohesiveness

2. Cohesiveness and Group Performance

Are groups that we have passed through the earlier period of assemblage growth more productive than those that bypass the orientation, conflict, and cohesion stages? The newly formed group, with its lack of cohesion and structure, possibly will be capable to carry out responsibilities in which human beings' efforts are pooled; nut tasks that require a high coordination of effort may prove difficult. Yet having suffered through a period of conflict followed by a growth of cohesion is no guarantee that the group will perform effectively. In most cases groups that are very cohesive, like the Beatles, are highly successful; blessed by members who were committed to the group and its objectives, the Beatles overcame obstacle after obstacle to finally achieve their shared goal

(Greence, 1989, Littlepage, Cowart & Kerr, 1989). Yet cohesiveness does not always go hand in hand with productivity, because the group's goal may not necessarily be to maximize productivity. Consider the results of a major survey of 5871 factory workers in 228 groups. This study found that the ore cohesive the groups, the less the productivity levels varied in the middle of associate; affiliate of unified teams produced nearly equivalent amounts, but individuals in non cohesive groups varied considerably more in their productivity.

Relationship Between Group Cohesiveness, Performance Norms, And Productivity

		Cohesiveness	
		High	Low
Performance Norms	High	High productivity	Moderate productivity
	Low	Low productivity	Moderate to low productivity

Source: Stephen P. Robbins & Timothy A.Judge, 2011, 'Organizational Behaviour', Pearson Education, Pg no. 294.

Statement of Problem

After globalization and privatation all organizations are facing tuff competitions. Many organisations performance has come down due to lack of group cohesiveness. This is applicable to education industry too. Hence if any organization has to succeed they must have group cohesiveness among their employees. Many studies related to this topic has been done in manufacturing and service sectors like information technology, bank, transports etc., But no study has been so far conducted among the academicians.

3. Research Methodology

In this study the researcher has take up a descriptive research method. The applied sampling procedure of the study is purposive sampling under probability sampling technique. Both primary and secondary data are collected for this study. The determined sample sizes of 1020 are equally distributed to all 102 colleges. Hence, the sample size from each college came to 10 faculties. Hence the final sample included for the study came to 918 respectively. The identified male and female respondents of the present study came to 321 to 597 respectively. T-test, Reliability Test, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Two Group Discriminate Analysis, Multiple Regression Analysis and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) has adopted for analysis.

4. Performance

It shows the point of performance achieved through the group cohesiveness among the employees Wech (1998). It may be connected to personal (Zaccaro

and Love, 1986) and organizational (Wong, 1992[1]). It is the ultimate aim of the organization to motivate the group cohesiveness among the employees (Stewark and Barrick, 2000[2]). In the current research, these are measured with the help of variables drawn from reviewed Mullen and Copper, 1994[3]; Jaffe and Nebanzahl (1990[4]).

Variables in Performance (PER)

Sl.No.	*Variables in PER*	*Sl.No.*	*Variables in PER*
1.	Job satisfaction	6.	Interpersonal relationship
2.	Worklife balance	7.	Employee engagement
3.	Career development	8.	Organizational citizenship behavior
4.	Placement produced	9.	Students relation
5.	Student's pass	10.	Employeer – Employee relationship

The employees are requested to rate these variables at 5 point scale.

Sample Composition by Demographics

1. Wong, L., (1992), "The effects on cohesion on organizational performance: A test of the models: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Technological University, Lubbock.
2. Stewart, G.L., and Barrick, M.R., (2000), "Team structure and performance: Assessing the mediating role of intra team process and the moderating role of task type", **Academy of Management Journal**, 43(4), pp.135-148.
3. Mullen, B. and Copper, C., (1994), "The relationship between group cohesiveness and Performance: An Integration", **Psychological Bulletin**, 115(5), pp.216-227**.**
4. Jaffe, E.D., and NebanZahl, I.D., (1990), Group Interaction and Business game Performance, Simulation and Graming, 21(1), pp.133-146.

Descriptive Statistics

Sl. No	Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	Gender	Male	321	34.97	34.97
		Female	597	65.03	100
2	Designation	Assistant Professor	586	63.83	63.83
		Associate Professor	222	24.18	88.01
		Professor	110	11.99	100
3	Department	B.E / B.TECH	446	49.38	49.38
		M.E / M. TECH	105	11.43	60.81
		Science & Humanities	193	21.02	81.83
		MBA	106	11.34	93.17
		MCA	68	07.30	100
4	Age	Upto 25	114	12.41	12.41
		26 – 30	105	11.43	23.84
		31 – 35	234	25.49	49.33
		36 – 40	194	21.13	70.46
		Above 40	171	28.62	100
5	Qualification	Only Post Graduation	691	75.27	75.27
		Post Graduation with M.Phil.,	75	8.17	83.43
		Post Graduation with Ph.D	152	16.56	100
6	Marital Status	Single	114	12.42	12.41
		Married	761	82.89	95.3
		Others	43	4.69	100
7	Experience	Upto 3 years	196	21.35	21.35
		4 – 5years	244	26.57	47.92
		6-10years	257	27.99	75.91
		Above 10 years	221	24.09	100
8	Salary	Upto 20,000	144	15.68	15.68
		20,001 – 30,000	169	18.40	34.08
		30,001 – 40,000	241	26.25	60.33
		40,001 – 50,000	202	22.00	82.33
		Above 50,000	162	17.67	100

- The faculty members are male and female faculty members.
- The important gender amongst the faculty members are female.
- The dominant designation amongst the faculty members are assistant professors amongst mutually male and female faculty members.

- The most important department amongst the male and female faculty members are B.E. / B.Tech.

- The important age amongst the faculty members are 31 to 35 and 26 to 30 years.

- Many faculty members have P.G qualification.

- The dominant marital status amongst the male and female faculty members is 'married'.

- The important years of experience amongst the faculty members are 6 to 10 and 4 to 5 years

- The dominant monthly earnings amongst the faculty members are 30,001 to 40,000 and 40,001 to 50,000.

Performance of the faculty members

The performance of the faculty members is the ultimate aim of their group cohesiveness. In the current research, the performances of the faculty members have been calculated with the assist of 10 variables. The faculty members are requested to rate these 10 variables at 5 point scale respectto their classify performance at their college. The mean score of each variable in performance (PER) amongst the male and female faculty members have been worked out discretely along with it's 't' statistics. The domino effect are specified in Table 4.2.37.

TABLE : Faculty members view on variables in Performance (PER)

Sl.No.	*Variables in PER*	*Mean scores amongst faculty members*		*'t' statistics*
		Male	*Female*	
1.	Job Satisfaction	3.1714	3.8472	-2.8142*
2.	Work Life balance	3.2085	3.7633	-2.6442*
3.	Career development	3.2117	3.8011	-2.7029*
4.	Placement Produced	3.0891	3.6699	-2.6908*
5.	Student's Pass	3.1891	3.7088	-2.5774*
6.	Interpersonal relationship	3.2886	3.7423	-2.4119*
7.	Employee engagement	3.2541	3.7517	-2.5914*
8.	Organizational citizenship behavior	3.4117	3.6909	-0.5496
9.	Student's relation	3.3088	3.7342	-2.1173*
10.	Employer employee relationship	3.2667	3.7717	-2.5041*

*Significant at 5 % stage.

The highly viewed variable in PER by the male faculty members are organizational citizenship behaviour and student's relation while their mean score are 3.4117 and 3.3088 correspondingly. Amongst the female faculty members, these two are job satisfaction and career development while it's mean score are 3.8472 and 3.8011 correspondingly. Regarding the view on variables in PER, the significant difference amongst the male and female faculty members have been noticed in their view on nine out of ten variables in PER while their respective 't' statistics are significant at 5 % stage.

Variables in Performance and it's Reliability

Before summarizing the score of variables in PER, it is imperative to observe it's reliability and validity. The score of all ten variables in PER have been added for confirmatory factor analysis in classify to observe it. It domino effects in content and convergent validity. The overall reliability of variables in PER have been estimated with the assist of cronbach alpha. The domino effect are revealed in Table 4.2.38.

TABLE : Reliability and Validity of variables in Performance

Sl. No.	*Variables in PER*	*Consistent factor loading*	*'t' statistics*	*Composite reliability*	*Average variance extorted*
1.	Work Life balance	0.9117	4.1172*	0.8069	57.02
2.	Career development	0.8704	3.8441*		
3.	Interpersonal relationship	0.8519	3.3089*		
4.	Organizational citizenship behavior	0.8117	3.1188*		
5.	Student's Pass	0.7802	2.7996*		
6.	Employee engagement	0.7504	2.7117*		
7.	Job Satisfaction	0.7219	2.6024*		
8.	Employer employee relationship	0.6845	2.5147*		
9.	Placement Produced	0.6517	2.3084*		
10.	Student's relation	0.6118	2.1173*		
Cronbach alpha: 0.8242.					

*Significant at 5 % stage.

The added ten variables in PER clarify it to an extent of 82.42 % while it's cronbach alpha is 0.8242. The consistent factor loading of variables in PER are superior than 0.60 which disclose the content validity. The significance of 't' statistics of the consistent factor loading of the variables in PER reveal it's convergent validity. It is also completed by it's complex trustworthiness and normal discrepancy extorted while these are superior than it's standard minimum of 0.50 and 50.00 % correspondingly.

Score on Performance amongst the faculty members

The score on the performance amongst the faculty members is calculated by the mean score of the variables in performance. It is denoted by SPER. In the current research, the SPER is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of faculty members based on their SPER is specified in Table 4.2.39.

TABLE : Score on the Performance (SPER) amongst the faculty members

Sl.No.	*SPER*	*Number of Faculty members*		*Total*
		Male	*Female*	
1.	Less than 2.00	29	90	119
2.	2.00 – 3.00	108	104	212
3.	3.01 – 4.00	121	219	340
4.	Above 4.00	63	184	247
	Total	321	597	918

The important SPER amongst the faculty members are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 37.04 and 26.91 % to the total. The important SPER amongst the male faculty members are 3.01 o 4.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitutes 37.69 and 33.64 % to its total correspondingly. Amongst the female faculty members, these two are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 36.68 and 30.82 % to its total correspondingly. The analysis disclose that the stage of performance amongst the female faculty members are higher than that amongst the male faculty members.

Discriminate Validity amongst the Important Components of Group Cohesiveness

In total, there are four important components of group cohesiveness, it is imperative to observe the degree of mutual exclusiveness amongst the four important components before observe its impact on performance amongst the faculty members. It is observe d with the assist of mean of AVE and the square of correlation co-efficient.

TABLE: Discriminate Validity amongst ICGC

Sl. No.	*Mean of AVEs Square Correlation Co-efficient*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*5*
1.	GIS		.5502	.5255	.5342
2.	IGS	.5419		.5464	.5551
3.	IGT	.4908	.5242		.5304
5.	GIT	.4886	.4554	.5179	

The mean of AVE between the GIS and IGS (0.5502) is higher than it's square of correlation co-efficient (0.5419). The mean of AVE between the IGT and GIT (0.5304) is higher than it's square of correlation co-efficient (0.5179). The same domino effect are seen in all possible pairs in IGCC. It disclose the degree of mutual exclusiveness amongst the important components of group cohesiveness.

Impact of Group Cohesiveness on the Performance of the faculty members

While the components of group cohesiveness amongst the faculty members may have its own influence on the stage of performance of the faculty members, the current research has made an attempt to observe it with the assist of multiple regression analysis. The fitted regression model is:

$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + \ldots b_4X_4 + e$

Whereas

Y – Score on the performance amongst the faculty members

X_1 – Score on group integration local amongst the faculty members

X_2 – Score on individual attraction to group social amongst the faculty members

X_3 – Score on the individual attraction to group task amongst the faculty members

X_4 – Score on the group integration task amongst the faculty members

$b_1, b_2, \ldots b_5$ – regression co-efficient of independent variables

a – intercept and

e – error term

The impact of ICGC on the performance of the faculty members have been observe d amongst male, female faculty members and also for pooled data. The domino effect are revealed in Table 4.2.41.

TABLE : Impact of Group Cohesiveness on Performance amongst the faculty members

Sl. No.	*ICGC*	*Regression co-efficients amongst faculty members*		
		Male	*Female*	*Pooled Data*
1.	GIS	0.1886*	0.1971*	0.1903*
2.	IGS	0.0971	0.1441*	0.1242*
3.	IGT	0.0443	0.1841*	0.0886
4.	GIT	0.1472*	0.2117*	0.1901*
	Constant	0.4173	0.6545	0.5996
	R^2	0.7245	0.7846	0.8042
	F statistics	7.6646*	8.0884*	8.3949*

*Significant at 5 % stage.

The significantly influencing ICGC on the performance amongst the male faculty members are GIS and GIT while their respective regression co-efficient are significant at 5 % stage. A unit increase in the stage of GIS and GIT result in an increase in the stage of performance of the male faculty members by 0.1886 and 0.1472 units correspondingly. The changes in the ICGC amongst the faculty members clarify the changes in their stage of performance amongst them to an extent of 72.45 % while its R^2 is 0.7245.

Amongst the female faculty members, the significantly influencing the ICGC on their performance are GIS, IGS, IGT and GIT while their respective regression co-efficient are significant at 5 % stage. A unit increase in the stage of above said from ICGC result in an increae in their performance by 0.1971, 0.1441, 0.1841 and 0.2117 units correspondingly. The changes in the stage of ICGC clarify the changes in the stage of performance to an extent of 78.46 % while it's R^2 is 0.7846.

The investigation of united data discloses the importance of GIS, IGS and GIT in the determination of the performance of the faculty members. The important influencing ICGC on the performance of the faculty members are GIS and GIT while their regression co-efficients are 0.1903 and 0.1901 correspondingly. In total, the changes in the IGCC clarify the changes in the stage of performance of the faculty members to an extent of 80.42 % while it's R^2 is 0.8042.

Direct and Indirect effect of Group Cohesiveness on the Performance

The stage of group cohesiveness amongst the faculty members may have its own direct and indirect influence on the performance of the faculty members. The direct effects of the group cohesiveness on the performance have been observe d with the assist of the multiple regression analysis. It is imperative to observe both direct and indirect effect of group cohesiveness with the assist of structural equation modeling. The independent variables added for the analysis are the score on various components of group cohesiveness namely Group Integration Social (GIS), Individual Attraction to Group-Social (IGS), Individual attraction to Group Task (IGT) and Group Integration Task (GII) whereas the added mediator variables are the involvement and perception towards group namely group attitude, group thinking, group activities, group awareness and group discussion. The added dependent variable is the performance of the faculty members.

The fit indices of the path model have been observe d with the assist of chi-square, RMR, GFI, AGFI and CFI. The chi-square value is 602.03 is significant at two % stage. The RMR (0.0109) is less than 5 % stage. The GFI, AGFI and CFI are superior than 0.90. All these domino effect indicate the validity of fitted path model for the SEM.

There is a significant positive impact on the performance is made by GIS, IGS and GIT while their direct path co-efficients are significant at 5 % stage. The indirect effect through group attitude is made by GIS and GIT while their indirect path co-efficient are significant at 5 % stage whereas the significant at 5 % stage whereas the significant indirect effect though group thinking is made by the same GIS and GIT. The significant indirect effect on performance though group activities is made by GIS, IGS and GIT whereas if it is through group awareness, the GIS, IGS and IGT are the significant influences on the performance. It is through the group discussion, the significant influences are all GIS, IGS, IGT and GIT while their path co-efficients are significant at 5 % stage.

The higher total effect of components of group cohesiveness on the performance is seen through group activities while it's total effect is higher of 1.3078 compared to other total effects. The SEM infers that the effect of group cohesiveness through the group activities is more powerful than the other mediator variables to influence the performance of the faculty members.

Discussion of results towards research objectives in relation to prior literature

Martens, R and Peterson (1971) and Podsakoff et al (1997). The significant mediator role of group activities in between the antecedents of group cohesiveness and performance recall the findings of the Zaccaro and McCoy (1988); Weck et al., (1998). The significant positive influence of the

components of group cohesiveness on the level of performance is similar to the findings of Larders et al., (1982) and Mossholder and Bedeian (1987). The important benefits raised through group cohesiveness namely self confidence and high performance recall the finding of Tziner (1982).

5. Conclusion

The present study conclude that the rank of team consistent amongst the female faculty members is higher than that amongst the male faculty members. The rank of contribution and perception towards team is also higher amongst the female faculty members than that amongst the male faculty members. Hence, the educational institutions should focus on the team organization, team motivation and team activities to enhance the recital of their staffs.

References

[1] Andrews, MC., Kacmar, K.M., Blakely, G.C., and Bucklew, N.S., (2008), "Group Cohesion as an enhancement to the Justice affective commitment relationship", Group organization management, 33(3), pp.736-755.

[2] Beal, D.J., Cohen, R.R., Burke, M.J., Mc Lenden, C.L., (2003), "Cohesion and Performance in Groups: A meta analytic classification of construct relations", Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(8), pp.989-1004.

[3] Jaffe, E.D., and NebanZahl, I.D., (1990), Group Interaction and Business game Performance, Simulation and Graming, 21(1), pp.133-146.

[4] Larders, D.., wilkinsor, .M.O.Halfield and Barber, H(1982) , "Causality and the cohesion – performance relationship, journal of sport psychology ", 4(1), pp: 170 -183.

[5] Martens, R and Peterson, J.A. (1971), " Group cohesiveness as a determinant of success and member satisfaction in team performance", International review of sports sociology, 6 (1), pp : 49-59.

[6] Mossholder, K.W., and Bedeian, A.G., (1983), "Group interaction processes: Individual and Group Level effects", Group & Organizational Studies, 8(2), pp.187-202.

[7] Mullen, B. and Copper, C., (1994), "The relationship between group cohesiveness and Performance: An Integration", Psychological Bulletin, 115(4), pp.210-227.

[8] Mullen, B. and Copper, C., (1994), "The relationship between group cohesiveness and Performance: An Integration", Psychological Bulletin, 115(5), pp.216-227.

[9] Podsakoff.P.,Mackenzie, S., & Ahearne, M. (1997) ,"Moderating effects of goal acceptance on the relationship between group cohesiveness and productivity", Journal of applied psychology, 82, 974-983.

[10] Stewart, G.L., and Barrick, M.R., (2000), "Team structure and performance: Assessing the mediating role of intra team process and the moderating role of task type", Academy of Management Journal, 43(4), pp.135-148.

[11] Tziner, A., (1982), "Differential effects of group cohesiveness types: A classifying overview", Social behavior and Personality, 10(1), pp.227-239.

[12] Weck, B.A., Mossholden, K.W., Stell, R.P. and Bunett, N., (1998), "Does work group cohesiveness affect individuals performance and organizational commitment?", Across Level examination Small group research, 29(4), pp.472-494.

[13] Wong, L., (1992), "The effects on cohesion on organizational performance: A test of the models: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Technological University, Lubbock.

[14] Zaccaro, S.J., and McCoy, M.C., (1988), "The effects of task and interpersonal cohesiveness on performance of a distinctive group task", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18(2), pp.837-851.

[15] Zaccaro, S.J., Lowe, C.A., (1986), "Cohesiveness and performance on an additive task: Evidence for multidimensionality", Journal of Social Psychology, 128(2), pp.547-558.