

# ***THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES***

## **The Relationship between Group Cohesiveness and Performance: An Empirical Study of Funded Youth Groups in Nakuru Municipality, Nakuru County, Kenya**

**Kemboi Jebet Francisca**

Masters of Arts Student, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,  
Department of Peace Security and Social Studies of Egerton University, Kenya

**Dr. Ngetich Kibet**

Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Arts and Social  
Sciences, Department of Peace Security and Social Studies of Egerton University, Kenya

**Dr. Bor Eric Kiprono**

Lecturer, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,  
Department of Peace, Security and Social Sciences of Egerton University, Kenya

### **Abstract:**

*One of the most constantly studied constructs in group dynamics research is cohesiveness since Organizations have increasingly become dependent on group cohesiveness in striving for better performance. Therefore, this study examined the level of group cohesiveness in the studied youth groups and its relationship with groups' enterprise performance. Data was collected from a 165 respondents through Interview Schedule and Focus Group Discussions. The results showed that the groups are highly cohesive but there was no relationship between the high level of cohesiveness and Enterprise Performance. The results present new perspectives for groups doing joint businesses that although task and social cohesion are considerably important, task cohesion is higher than social cohesion and will determine the success of groups doing joint business. The study also highlighted the need for future empirical research on group cohesion and performance in others context.*

**Keywords:** group cohesiveness, task cohesion, social cohesion, youth groups, group enterprise performance

### **1. Introduction**

Groups are social systems made up of people in interaction. Groups exhibit different behaviour—more than the sum total of each group member's individual behaviour and differ from mere aggregates of individuals because the latter have no interdependence, interaction, or common goal (Forsyth, 2010). Forsyth adds that groups are often more effective than individuals in accomplishing tasks, devising solutions to problems and achieving innovative goals because a group possesses more talent, skills and ideas and that there is strength in unity. Mullins, (2002) however states that this claim is yet to be proven.

The forces that result from the interactions of group members are often referred to as group dynamics which influence the behaviour of both individual group members and the group as a whole. Inattention to group dynamics can have a negative effect in meeting members' socio-emotional needs and goal attainment (Toseland & Rivas, 2005). Groups can unleash both harmful and helpful forces (Toseland & Rivas, 2005). Group dynamics usually result in greater or lesser performance than would occur if the individuals worked alone rather than as members of the group. This process is called synergy (Forsyth, 2010). According to Toseland & Rivas (2005) four dimensions of the group help determine the synergy levels. These are Interaction patterns, group cohesiveness, group social integration and group culture. Group cohesiveness is considered to be one of the most important group variables and is generally linked to organizational performance. Therefore, research on the organizational performance would be inappropriate without focusing this variable (Elenkov, 2002).

According to Harun and Mahmood (2012), cohesiveness refers to two main construct namely task and social cohesion. The sources of group cohesiveness include most of the variables affecting interpersonal attraction such as similarity of backgrounds and attitudes. Pennington (2002) listed a variety of factors that influence the cohesiveness of groups including mutual attraction and similarities with respect to status, goals and values. Pennington noted that how strongly attracted members are to the group also affects motivation to work harder to ensure success in the achievement of the groups' goals.

Cohesiveness is also influenced by the degree and nature of communication among group members and feedback from members of the groups (Levine and Moreland, 1998). In turn, group cohesiveness influences a number of group processes such as verbal and non-verbal interaction the effectiveness of social influence, productivity and satisfaction of group members

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Group Cohesiveness and Enterprise Performance

Elenkov (2002) studied patterns of interaction between groups that were high or low in cohesiveness and observed that relative to low cohesive groups, high cohesive groups were more cooperative and more praise worthy of each others' accomplishment. Similarly, Pennington (2002) suggested that members belonging to highly cohesive groups experienced greater satisfaction than those in less cohesive groups. Hoegl and Proserpio (2004) indicated that if people are close to one another, it will strengthen closer proximity that in turn, facilitates better performance. These findings support the conclusion of Loughhead and Carron (2004) that group cohesiveness is more likely to influence performance. Therefore, it is necessary to encourage organizations not only to obtain stronger learning capability, but also to have work environments characterized by group cohesion, since these are some of the main routes to generating a total improvement in organizational performance. But differences from others studies that are most likely to explain the differences in the results are the nature of the subject's populations and the nature of the task performed.

The fact that group cohesiveness would be associated with performance was not surprising. In a meta-analysis of cohesion-performance relationship, Carron, Colman, Wheeler & Stevens (2002) found that group cohesiveness had a moderate relationship with performance. In addition, Carless and De Paola (2000) suggested that members who work in the cohesive groups believed that organization performance was the principal focus at any situation. There was need to study group cohesion and performance in other contexts. The current study was done in the context of youth groups doing business jointly.

Furthermore, the results of Harun and Mahmood (2012) indicated that task cohesion had a stronger relationship with performance than social cohesion. It supported the previous study (Wheelan, 2010) that although task and social cohesion are considerably important, task cohesion is higher than social cohesion. Business performance was however evaluated from a single perspective. The current study measured business performance using primarily outcome-based financial indicators (e.g. business growth, profitability, capital growth).

Green and Motiki (2011) study findings indicated that there were meager opportunities of participation for members and this made members feel no sense of belonging. Stogdil (1972) notes that it's important that group members see themselves as a part of a group working together towards a goal for cohesiveness to exist. Group members' sense of belonging was interrogated among other cohesion measures. According to Borman (1990) highly cohesive groups interact in an open climate where individuals are free to ask questions, disagree with one another; even the ability to work through inevitable group conflict in such a constructive climate will only serve to strengthen group cohesion. Contrary to this view, Green and Motiki (2011) study findings indicated that disputes were most serious cause of non-operating groups. A chi-square test reflected a significant correlation between the status of projects and presence of group disputes. As a result, the meetings were used in discussing disputes and not focused on decisions relating to project progress. Similarly, Place *et al.* (2009) indicated that group conflict were reported by 69% of the groups and linked to structural factors like group size. These conflicts also hindered performance of the groups. The two studies were silent on the existence of group structure put in place to solve disputes to the satisfaction of the members so that cohesion is maintained. Another key factor that is important for group cohesion is adherence to laid down rules. According to Langfred (1998) the relationship between cohesiveness and performance is moderated by the strength of group norms. In Place *et al.* (2009) study, frequency of rules violation were related to lateness (128 incidents), absence in group meetings (43 cases) and issues of misconduct (27 cases). 12% of respondents mentioned that adherence to rules is a major factor contributing to success of the groups. This fact was also collaborated by Zeller (1998) who noted that groups that had internal rules and regulations demonstrated better repayment rates. The same results were reported by Wenner (1995) who also adds that members that adhered to rules/norms enjoyed a good working relationship and were always productive.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Study Design

The study made use of cross-sectional survey research design of selected youth groups. This design involved interviewing youth group members and their leaders. The choice of this research design was made possible based on its ability to obtain information by conducting personal interviews at a time convenient for respondents and make predictions about the population being studied (Koul, 1984). It also has the ability to determine the amount of correlation between two or more variables. In the case of this study, the survey design was useful in examining the possibility of the relationship between group size and performance.

### 3.2. Population

The target population was all the youth group members and leaders in Nakuru Municipality whose groups benefited from Nakuru Town Constituency Youth Enterprise Scheme in 2007 and whose records are available at the Nakuru District Youth Office. The total number of these youth groups was 20 and the total number of youth group members inclusive of the leaders was 358.

### 3.3. Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis for this study was an individual youth group member and a group leader who gave information that provided insights into group dynamics.

### 3.4. Sampling and Sampling Procedures

Probability sampling was used where each sampling unit of the population had a known and specified probability of inclusion in the sample. It also provided an efficient system of capturing the variations that exist in the target population. A sampling frame which had details of youth groups in Nakuru Municipality had already been obtained. In order to determine a representative sample size of youth groups' members to be drawn from the total population of 358, this study adopted a formula by Kathuri and Pals (1993) for estimating a sample size  $n$  from a known population size  $N$ . Therefore a sample size of 165 group members inclusive of group leaders was studied. A leader from each of the selected youth groups (chairperson, treasurer or secretary) was purposively selected by virtue of their position to constitute sample for group leaders. The rest of group members were randomly selected to constitute sample for group members. This gave every individual member in each group an equal chance of being selected into the sample. This was also preferred as it gives more precise estimates.

### 3.5. Data Collection

To collect primary data, the study utilized interview schedules, and focused group discussions. The choice of interview schedule was deemed necessary because many of the group members may not be adequately educated. Each group member was approached through their leader separately, interviewed and appropriate responses filled in the questionnaire by the researcher. A total of 4 FGDs was conducted to supplement data and also explain any variations in responses of group leaders and group members. Participants ranged between 4 to 8 discussants in a group.

Secondary data was also collected to supplement the primary data. This included documented information on group dynamics. Data was sourced from government offices, internet, libraries (books, journals, periodicals, theses and government publications).

### 3.6. Pilot Study

The interview schedule was pilot tested among 11 members of Molo Uprising Youth Group in Molo to identify weaknesses, ambiguities and omissions so as to improve the quality of the questionnaires. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was computed for the instrument. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 or over was assumed to reflect the internal reliability of the instruments (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000).

### 3.7. Data Analysis

Qualitative data was generated from FGDs. The interviews were first transcribed. Data was then summarized and grouped to each question and coded based on established themes, sub-themes and patterns. The researchers will extract selected comments, and use selected material to generate short case studies to illustrate findings generated using interview schedule. Quantitative data from completed interview schedule was edited, coded and entered into SPSS 19.0 and cleaned for analysis. Frequencies, percentages, mean, mode, standard deviation were computed and presented in tables and charts. Rank Correlation, Spearman Correlation and Pearson Correlation were used to measure the relationship between the independent and the dependent variables.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Measures

- Group cohesiveness. Group cohesiveness measured the degree to which work groups were closely knitted and cohesive. Group cohesiveness was measured by 8 items. All items were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, whereby 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.
- Enterprise performance: Enterprise performance was measured by capital growth, profitability and business growth

### 4.2. Assessment of Group Cohesiveness in the Groups

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
Majority of the members generally like being in the group (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	11 (55%)	5 (25%)	4.0
Group members enjoy activities they undertake (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (15%)	13 (65%)	4 (20%)	4.1
Members find it easy to agree on group goals (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	3.6
Majority of members abide by the group norms/rules (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	4 (20%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (65%)	3 (15%)	3.7

Majority of the members attend groups meetings (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (75%)	4 (20%)	4.1
Members feel being part of the group (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	13 (65%)	5 (25%)	4.1
Group conflicts are resolved amicably (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (75%)	4 (20%)	4.1
Members freely share their opinions on group activities always (n=20)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (70%)	4 (20%)	4.1

Table 1: Group Leaders' Ratings on Group Cohesion

The results revealed that indeed majority of the group members generally like being part of the groups. This is evidenced by the leaders at  $\bar{X} = 4.0$ , which implied strong group liking. Specifically, 55% of the group leaders agreed while 25% strongly agreed that members generally liked being in the groups, 10% were not sure while 10% disagreed. The group leaders that disagreed have seen some lack of interest with the group within the membership. Groups vary in terms of how long it can hold the interest of its members. Pennington (2002) notes that how strongly attracted members are to the group also affects motivation to work harder to ensure success in the achievement of the groups' goals. In addition, when individuals value their membership in the group and find it rewarding to work collaboratively with their group members, they may expend greater effort, thereby developing a sense of belonging and commitment.

Another measure of group cohesion was the strong sense of members liking of group activities. The group leaders indicated that members had strong liking for group activities  $\bar{X} = 4.1$ . Specific results revealed that 65% of the group leaders agreed to members liking of group activities, 20% strongly agreed while 15% were not sure. This indicates that according to the group leader's assessment, the group members enjoy doing the group activities the group is involved in and this increases cohesiveness.

Members also had no much difficulty in agreeing with group goals since the average rating by group leaders was  $\bar{X} = 3.8$ . This implies that members to a large extent agreed on group goals, therefore it was fairly easy to conduct group activities in one direction. The group leaders who agreed were 55% and 15% strongly agreed. More than one quarter of the leaders 25% however disagreed indicating that in as much as the majority was in agreement, some of the group members had other preferences in terms of group goals.

The level at which members abide by the group rules and regulations also indicate their level of commitment to the group. This study sought to know from both leaders and group members how well members abide by the rules. The study results revealed that to some extent members did not abide by the group rules, leaders rating was  $\bar{X} = 3.7$ . Majority (65%) of the group leaders surveyed agreed while 15% strongly agreed that members did abide by the group rules, 20% however were of the contrary opinion that is majority of the members did not abide by the rules. These results mean that rules were enforced in some groups more than others. Zeller (1998) noted that groups that had internal rules and regulations demonstrated better repayment rates. Wenner (1995) also adds that members that adhered to rules/norms enjoyed a good working relationship and were always productive. Socially established and shared beliefs regarding what is normal, correct, true, moral and good generally have powerful effects on the thoughts and actions of group members (Baron, 2004). Group norms develop in groups often because they are necessary for the group to survive and/or to achieve its ends. Group life is dependent upon trust and a certain amount of loyalty. Furthermore, Baron (2004) commented that norms provide codes of behaviour that render social life more predictable and efficient. They also act to reduce uncertainty in difficult situations and provide a way forward for interaction.

Attendance of group meeting was fairly good in the groups according to an average rating  $\bar{X} = 4.1$  by group leaders. This indicates that to a large extent, members were committed to attendance and participation in group activities indicating high levels of group liking thus cohesion. Specifically, majority 75% of the group members agreed while 20% strongly agreed that members attended group meetings, only a minority 10% disagreed. The results indicate that groups have put measures to ensure group members attend group meetings.

Proper handling of group disputes enables members to co-exist and pull together in the same direction to achieve groups' business goals. Groups with inadequate dispute resolution mechanisms are therefore less cohesive. Disputes were amicably solved in most of the youth groups sampled for the study. Mean leaders rating on how amicably conflicts were resolved  $\bar{X} = 4.1$ . Leaders could have rated conflict resolution higher since they were responsible for ensuring proper dispute resolution mechanisms were in place. In their part, 75% of the group leaders agreed in addition to 20% who strongly agreed that conflicts were resolved amicably, only 10% disagreed. Place *et al.* (2009) indicated that group conflict were reported by 69% of the groups and linked to structural factors like group size. Conflict is a sign of a healthy team if it occurs at the right time. It indicates that the team is processing through important and emotionally charged issues instead of avoiding them. Reinertsen (2000) adds that without disagreement it is difficult to get commitment and cohesion. It's however important for groups to have efficient internal dispute resolution mechanisms to better their chances of group survival and growth. Productive conflict resolution involves learning how to disagree over issues and situations such that an altered understanding of the situation occurs, coming up with a solution that can benefit the entire team and strengthen the efficacy among team members (Dixon *et al.*, 2002). The following FGD excerpts give more insights:

*“Even when we are a group it does not mean that we do not have disputes or disagreements. People disagree from time to time but the conflict is often resolved. The conflicts have made our group stronger.”* (9<sup>th</sup> August, 2013)

*“Everytime there is conflict between one or two persons we always remind ourselves of our group goals which everyone should focus on.”* (13 August, 2013)

*“As a result of conflicts within the membership our group split into two.”* (13 August, 2013)

Finally in evaluating group cohesiveness, how freely members share opinions with one another on matters related to the group could indicate that members feel part, and have a responsibility to the group. It also indicates that members influence themselves and provide feedback on group activities. The study results indicated that generally, members freely shared opinions on group enterprise matters according to the high mean rating  $\bar{X}$  = 4.1 for group leaders. The distributions of responses were that 70% of the leaders agreed while 20% strongly agreed that members shared opinions freely, 10% however disagreed. Open communication results in increased confidence and even more interaction within the group such that discussions begin to focus more specifically on problem-solving tasks and on developing alternative strategies to accomplish the tasks. Effective interpersonal communication in a team ensures that thoughts, facts and opinions do not go unheard and are not misinterpreted, as they have the potential to reduce the logical soundness of a decision. Green and Motiki (2011) study findings indicated that there were meager opportunities of participation for members and this made members feel no sense of belonging. Further, Stogdil (1972) notes that it's important that group members see themselves as a part of a group working together towards a goal for cohesiveness to exist.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
Majority of the members generally like being in the group (n=138)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.2%)	24 (17.4%)	89 (64.5%)	22 (15.9%)	4.0
Group members enjoy group activities (n=138)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (4.3%)	112 (81.2%)	20 (14.5%)	4.1
Members find it easy to agree on goals of the group(n=138)	0 (0.0%)	8 (5.8%)	6 (4.3%)	106 (76.9%)	18 (13.0%)	4.0
The group helps members to achieve their personal goals	2 (1.4%)	20 (14.5%)	12 (8.7%)	87 (63.0%)	17 (12.3%)	3.7
Majority of members abide by the group norms/rules (n=138)	0 (0.0%)	21 (15.2%)	2 (1.4%)	85 (61.6%)	30 (21.8%)	3.4
Majority of the members attend groups meetings (n=138)	2 (1.4%)	47 (34.1%)	2 (1.4%)	64 (46.4%)	23 (16.7%)	3.9
Group conflicts are resolved amicably (n=138)	30 (21.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	86 (62.3%)	22 (16.0%)	3.9
Members freely share their opinions on matters related to the group activities always time (n=138)	2 (1.4%)	7 (5.1%)	3 (2.2%)	100 (72.5%)	26 (18.8%)	4.0

Table 2: Group Members' Ratings on Group Cohesion

The results revealed that indeed majority of the group members like being part of their groups generally. This is evidenced by the tie in rating on group liking between members and leaders at  $\bar{X}$  = 4.0, which implied strong group liking. According to the group members surveyed, 64.5% agreed while 15.9% strongly agreed. Minority 2.2% disagreed while 17.4% were undecided. Those that disagreed may have lost interest with the group while those that are undecided may be composed of members that are fairly new to the group and so they are still adjusting and building friendship. One aspect of cohesiveness according to Forsyth (2004) is based on group members' liking for one another and on their desire to be in the group. This aspect is called "maintenance-based" cohesiveness. For example, several people may form a group because they are attracted to one another. Generally, cohesive groups have several positive qualities that can be recognize and agreed upon. For example, cohesive groups have a general perception of "we-ness." There is a feeling of friendship and loyalty among group members (Forsyth, 2004). As already noted, this is evident in the groups. Liking is thus the most important element in maintenance-based group cohesiveness. It is a powerful force that influences whether people want to be with one another. As such, it has an impact on whether a group is drawn together cohesively.

Group members were also asked to rate their liking of group activities as a measure of cohesion. The group members average rating was  $\bar{X}$  = 4.1. This rating of group members was close to group leaders in that 81.2% agreed, 14.5% strongly agreed while 4.3% were not sure. None of the group members disagreed or strongly disagreed. This implied a high level of liking of group activities among members. Cohesiveness increases when people do things that they enjoy in groups. This shows that during the initial stage of group formation there was mutual agreement on group activities that were desirable to the members. It follows then that over time the groups still enjoy doing these activities.

Members also had no much difficulty in agreeing with group goals since that average rating was  $\bar{X}$  = 4.0. Members rating on agreement on group goals indicated a strong agreement, 76.9% agreed while 13.0% strongly agreed. The group goals therefore are

desirable for the majority of the group members. On the contrary, 5.8% disagreed; none strongly disagreed while 4.3% were not sure. This percentage of group members who disagreed may have had other goals which were not agreeable to the majority. A group might attract a person if the group has an attractive goal. Even within an atmosphere of hostility, group goals have the power to affect cohesiveness. Group members will remind themselves of their group goals that bind the group.

This study also sought to know from group members how well members abide by the rules. The study results revealed that to some extent members did not abide by the group rules, members rating of  $\bar{X}=3.4$ . Majority 61.1% of members agreed while 21.8% strongly agreed, 15.2% disagreed while 1.4% were not decided. Abiding by group rules was also lowly scored by group leaders. Group norms occupy a prominent role in the general behaviour of all groups. When group members do not abide by the rules set it becomes a challenge to the leaders as such a group is hard to manage. The low score also means that groups have not put penalties in place that would help reduce the flouting of rules and enhance high levels of discipline. Its important that group members move towards one direction cohesively to enhance performance.

Attendance of group meeting was fairly good in the groups according to an average rating  $\bar{X}=3.9$  by group members. Majority 46.4% of the group members agreed while 16.7% strongly agreed that majority of members often attended group meetings however, on the contrary opinion 34.1% disagreed while 1.4% strongly disagreed, while another 1.4% were not sure. This shows a variation within the groups in terms of attendance of meetings. Groups have penalties for members who absent themselves but enforcement of the same vary from one group to the other thus the difference. Meetings are usually avenues where group members interact, get feedback on group activities and chat the way forward for their group. Their prompt attendance is thus a show of cohesiveness as members desire to make their own contribution in making the group activities successful.

Handling of group disputes amicably fosters group cohesion. Group members mean on how amicably conflicts were resolved was  $\bar{X}=3.9$ . Majority 62.3% agreed while 16.0% strongly agreed that disputes were amicably solved. However, 21.7% strongly disagreed. This implies that 21.7% were victims or witnessed cases of conflicts which were not handled satisfactorily therefore they strongly disagreed. Disputes or disagreements are inevitable in groups but what is important is the mechanisms put in place to resolve such conflicts amicably. From the average rating, the leadership seems to be managing the group well. When disputes are left unresolved it kills the motivation of the group members and some fell out from the group.

Finally, how freely members share their opinions with one another was evaluated. The study results indicated that generally, members freely shared opinions on group enterprise matters as indicated by the high mean rating  $\bar{X}=4.0$ . 72.5% of the group members agreed while 21.1% strongly agreed that opinions were shared freely. Minority 5.1% disagreed while 1.4% strongly disagreed. The more cohesive a group is, the more "friendly" its conversation will be. Group members will be stating their own positions, arguing, reasoning, agree or disagree with each other. This process serves to build group cohesion even more and encourage members to share what they have.

A t-test analysis was also done on the means of the two samples and the calculated value  $|t_0|=-2.8963$  is less than tabulated  $t_{0.025}(18)=2.101$ . This means that there is no significant variation between the two samples (group leaders and group members) on group cohesiveness. Both samples represent the population that the sample is drawn from. Either of the samples can therefore be relied on to measure the dependent variable which is group enterprise performance.

#### 4.3. Group Cohesiveness and Business Performance Indices

Cohesiveness can be high, moderate, or low. Results from this study show that the level of cohesiveness is high in the groups implying that the group members value their group membership, and wish to remain members. Despite the high ranking on group cohesiveness, Chi-square analysis on members ratings on cohesiveness revealed no significant relationship between cohesiveness and business performance indicators as follows: cohesiveness and capital growth  $X^2(138)=114.0$ , ns, cohesiveness and profitability  $X^2(138)=61.22$ , ns, Cohesiveness and business growth  $X^2(138)=33.63$ , ns, Cohesiveness and overall business index  $X^2(138)=482.24$

These results are explained thus: Too much cohesiveness can reduce efficiency. Luthans (2002) notes that too much cohesiveness can be dysfunctional when team members' waste time in chatting or when they engage in group-think. According to George and Jones (2004), a moderate level of group cohesiveness helps to ensure that group members actively participate in the group. George and Jones further note that research suggests that a moderate level of cohesiveness is optimal and is most likely to contribute to an organization's competitive advantage. Also, as group cohesiveness increases, the extent of group members' participation within the group increases. A moderate level ensures that group members interact and communicate with one another, though not so much that they do not perform their roles. Further, increasing levels of cohesiveness increases conformity to group norms. People in cohesive groups have greater pressure to conform than people in non-cohesive groups. The theory of groupthink suggests that the pressures hinder the group from critically thinking about the decisions it is making. Giordano (2003) has suggested that this is because people within a group frequently interact with one another and create many opportunities for influence. It is also because a person within a group perceives other members as similar to themselves and are thus, more willing to give into conformity pressures. Too much cohesiveness discourages deviance needed to change dysfunctional norms, and moderate cohesiveness is recommended.

Additionally, as group cohesiveness increases, emphasis on group goal accomplishment increases within the group. Whilst team cohesiveness results in goal accomplishment when team and organizational goals are aligned (George and Jones, 2000), highly cohesive teams have very powerful dynamics, both negative and positive, which impact on performance. For an organization to be effective, the different groups need to cooperate with each other and to be motivated to achieve organizational goals. A moderate level of cohesiveness thus motivates group members to accomplish both group and organizational goals.

The lack of a relationship between cohesiveness and business performance can also be attributed to the fact that the nature of cohesion exhibited in the groups is social as opposed to task cohesion. The youth came together to form groups based on friendship and

similarity of locality. The kind of cohesion that exists is based on group maintenance. The results of Harun and Mahmood (2012) indicated that task cohesion had a stronger relationship with performance than social cohesion. It supported the previous study (Wheelan, 2010) that although task and social cohesion are considerably important, task cohesion is higher than social cohesion.

#### 4.4. Conclusions

From the study findings, the groups studied are highly cohesive and this cohesiveness is highly valued by the group members. The cohesiveness is more of social than group task related. The study further concludes that highly cohesive groups are not always productive. Too much cohesiveness has reduced efficiency as members waste time in chatting or engaging in groupthink. The groups have greater pressure to conform which hinder the group from critically thinking about the decisions it is making.

#### 4.5. Policy Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommends that youth groups should also be informed on the detrimental effects of group cohesiveness. Research suggests that a moderate level of cohesiveness is optimal and is most likely to contribute to an organization's competitive advantage and ensures that group members interact and communicate with one another. Specific attention within groups in strengthening task cohesion among members is essential.

#### 4.6. Areas for Further Research

Researchers have had divergent results on cohesiveness performance relationship depending on the context. This study has highlighted the need for future empirical research on group cohesion and performance in others context and the identification of mediating factors in the cohesiveness performance relationship.

### 5. Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to God almighty for being my pillar of strength throughout my studies. I am also greatly indebted to my University Supervisors Dr Kibet Ngetich and Dr Eric Kiprono Bor who have shaped my thesis through selfless scholarly guidance, useful contributions and constant encouragement. I have come this far because of them.

It would also be ungrateful of me if I do not acknowledge all the respondents who are members and leaders of youth groups in Nakuru Municipality for taking time off their activities to attend to my research needs. Their input which was key to this research is highly appreciated.

Moreso, I do thank my siblings for their material, moral support and encouragement. Special thanks go to my husband Evans not only for his support but also patience during the entire study period.

### 6. References

1. Baron, R.S. (2004). "Social Skills." In Gartner, et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurial Dynamics*, 220-233. London: Sage Publications.
2. Bormann, E. (1990). *Small Group Communication. Theory and Practice*. New York: Harper Collins
3. Carless, S.A. and De Paola, C. (2000). The measurement of cohesion in work teams. *Small Group Research*, 31(1), 71-88
4. Carron, A.V. and Spink, K.S. (1995). The Group Size-Cohesion Relationship in Minimal Groups. *Small Group Research*, 26(1), 86-105
5. Carron, A.V., Colman, M.M., Wheeler, J., and Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-188
6. Dixon, A.L., Gassenheimer, J.B. and Barr, T.F. (2002). Bridging the Distance Between Us: How Initial Responses to Sales Team Conflict Help Shape Core Swelling Team Outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* 22,4: 247-258
7. Elenkov, D.S. (2002). Effects of leadership on organizational performance in Russian companies. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 467- 480
8. Forsyth, D. (2010). *Group Dynamics (5<sup>th</sup> Edition)* Belmont:Wadsworth
9. Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co
10. George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2000). *Essentials of Managing Organizational Behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
11. George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2004). *Essentials of Contemporary Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers
12. Giordano, P.C. (2003). "Relationships in adolescence." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 257-281
13. Green, J.M. and Motiki, A. (2011). The performance of income generating projects supported by the Botswana National Literacy Programme. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences*, 39, 0378-5254
14. Goudan, D.S. (1970). "Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to the Study of Leadership," *Central States Speech Journal*, 21, 217-223
15. Harun, M.M. and Mahmood, R.B. (2012). The Relationship between Group Cohesiveness and Performance: An Empirical Study of Cooperatives Movement in Malaysia. *International Journal of Cooperative Studies* Vol. 1(1), 15-20
16. Koul, L. (1984). *Methodology of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Van Education Books
17. Langfred, C.W. (1998). Is Group Cohesiveness a Double-Edged Sword? An Investigation of the Effects of Cohesiveness on Performance, 29, 124-143, Retrieved on 9/12/2011. Available at [www.researchtrends.com/...issue 25-Nov-2011](http://www.researchtrends.com/...issue 25-Nov-2011)

18. Levine, J.M. and Moreland R.L. (1998). Small Groups in D.T Gilbert, S.T Fiske, and G. Lindzey (Eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (4<sup>th</sup>ed). New York: Taylor and Francis
19. Loughead, T.M., and Carron, A.V. (2004).The mediating role of cohesion in the leader behavior- satisfaction relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercises*, 5, 355- 371
20. Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational Behavior*. Ninth edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill
21. Mullins, L. (2002). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*, 6th ed. New York:Pearson
22. Place, P., Kariuki, G., Wangila, J., Kristjanson, P., Makauki, A. and Ndubi, J. (2002). Assessing the factors underlying differences in group performance. Empirical findings from the Highlands of Central Kenya. International Food Policy Research Institute. Capri Working Paper No. 25
23. Penington, D.C. (2002). *The Social Psychology of Behaviour in Small Groups*. Newyork: Taylor and Francis
24. Steiner, I.D. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. New York: Academic Press
25. Stewart, G.L. (2003). Toward an understanding of the multilevel role of personality in teams. In
26. Barrick, M.R and Ryan A.M. (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
27. Stewart, G.L. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Review of Relationships Between Team Design Features and Team Performance. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 29-55
28. Stogdill, R.M. (1972). Group Productivity, Drive and Cohesiveness. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 8, 26-43
29. Toseland, R.W. and Rivas, R.F. (2005). *.An Introduction to Group Work Practice* (5th ed). Boston. Pearson
30. Wenner, M. (1995). Group Credit: A means to improve information transfer and local repayment performance. *Journal of Development Studies*, 32 (2), 263-81
31. Wheelan, S.A. (2010). *Creating Effective Teams: A guide for members and leaders* (3rd ed). Los Angeles: Sage Publications
32. Zeller, M. (1998). Determinants of Credit Performance in Credit Groups: The role of program design intra-group risk pooling and social cohesion. *Economic Development and Cultural change*, 46 (1), 599-620