

## **DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF GROUP COHESIVENESS TYPES: A CLARIFYING OVERVIEW**

---

AHARON TZINER  
*Tel-Aviv University*

*Group cohesiveness is one of the processes focused upon by the extensive research in the investigation of characteristics of the small group. However, the research literature generally deals with socioemotional cohesiveness, namely, that based on personal attraction between the individuals. Nevertheless, there are also studies which question this single-structure (one structural) type approach to cohesiveness.*

*The present article presents a differentiation between two types of cohesiveness according to the factors of its formation and preservation – cohesiveness on a socio-emotional basis and cohesiveness on an instrumental basis.*

*In addition, a further contribution has been made in this regard through discussion of possible distinct implications associated with each type of cohesiveness in three major areas of small group research: (1) Interpersonal communication; (2) processes of social influence; (3) group performance.*

### **A THEORETICAL PARADIGM OF ANALYSIS**

The subject of cohesiveness in the context of the small group has been studied thoroughly and extensively. Interest has been concentrated mainly on the sources of cohesiveness, its influence on intragroup interactive processes such as interpersonal communication, group pressure for uniformity, interpersonal attraction, etc. (Festinger, Gerard, Hyomovitch, Kelley, & Raven, 1952; Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1950; Kirshner, Dies, & Brown, 1978; Schachter, Ellerston, McBride, & Gregory, 1951; Shaw & Shaw, 1962). However, even the earliest literature in this field reveals a great deal of deliberation regarding a conceptual definition of cohesiveness. Festinger et al., (1950) present a very general and comprehensive approach in their view that cohesiveness is the product of the entirety of forces operating on the individual to remain in the group. The generality of this definition is its weak point, as it makes empirical research of the phenomenon very difficult. Thibaut (1950) and Back (1951) define cohesiveness as the desire to remain in or belong to the group because of its specific characteristics – belonging affords higher status or mediates in attainment of personal goals. Thibaut and Back, then, tend to be more specific in their definitions; therefore they achieve more definitiveness and clarity than Festinger et al. Although their approach is less comprehensive, it provides for more valid operationalism of the concept.

However, thorough examination of the two definitions reveals an even more essential difference: Thibaut and Back deal with cohesiveness as a drive pressing the individual to stay in the group (or to join it), a kind of internal force or set of forces originating in the characteristics of the group and operating on the individual to do his best not to be driven out of the group. Festinger et al., view the characteristics of the group as only part of the entirety of forces operating on the individual to stay in the group. Similarity of attitudes, socioeconomic status, values, and personality produce interpersonal attraction which motivates the individuals to seek a common social

framework (Byrne, 1961; Byrne & Clore, 1966; Byrne & Griffitt, 1966; Byrne & Nelson, 1965). Accordingly, these factors also constitute forces operating on the individual to remain in the group. Moreover, it seems that the term “product” (product of total forces), presented as the equivalent of cohesiveness, includes other meanings in addition to the forces pressuring one to remain in a group, such as patterns and strengths of interpersonal interaction and characteristic group norms of behavior. Thus, group cohesiveness is characterized not only by individuals’ remaining in the group or striving to belong, but also by certain behavioral patterns. Undoubtedly, Festinger et al., include a much wider variety of aspects in the concept of cohesiveness than do Thibaut and Back.

Gross and Martin (1952) were among the first few to disagree with the approach to cohesiveness posited by Festinger et al., and Thibaut and Back. Gross and Martin claim that there is no theoretical or empirical justification to treat cohesiveness as a unitary concept, that it is, rather, a social phenomenon based on various forces. They distinguish between two types of cohesiveness, according to the forces operating on the individual to remain in the group:

- (1) *Cohesiveness on the basis of interpersonal attraction between members of the group.* Belonging to the group and the desire to do so, are based on considering this affiliation as a goal of its own value, independent of the actual activities involved, the prestige or status afforded members of the group, etc.
- (2) *Cohesiveness based on the potential of the group to mediate in the attainment of material personal interests and goals which cannot be attained in the individualistic framework.*

Theoretically, Gross and Martin’s suggestion can be supported if we imagine a group with high status – for instance, a university senate or the Army High Command - which, by Thibaut and Back’s definition is characterized by high cohesiveness, but in which there will not necessarily exist personal attraction between members. In keeping with the distinction made by Gross and Martin, and also according to the interpretation given the definition of Festinger et al., a group characterized by a low level of interpersonal attraction is not cohesive. This logical contradiction exemplifies the problem of a unitary view of the concept of cohesiveness. Moreover, Gross and Martin do not rely just on the theoretical differentiation, but support it by presenting three criticisms of the study done by Back (1951).

- (1) The intercorrelations between the three different indices of cohesiveness presented in Back’s study vary in a range from 0.69 to -0.37.
- (2) Each group was ranked in each of the three indices in terms of level of group cohesiveness. Surprisingly, the same group received a different rank in each index.
- (3) Back emphasized that, in 73% of the groups characterized by low cohesiveness, the behavior of the participants was characterized by deliberate restriction of the communication flow (little communication through the process of performing tasks) as compared with the same patterns in only about 41% of the groups characterized by high cohesiveness. However, Back completely disregards the fact that, nevertheless, in some 27% of the groups with a low level of cohesiveness the flow of communication was not of a deliberate restricted type, and at the high level such behavior was found in 41% of the groups.

These three criticisms corroborate, albeit only theoretically, Gross and Martin’s position that cohesiveness cannot be treated with a unitary approach but rather that various patterns of cohesiveness must be examined in accordance with the factors on which the cohesiveness is based. It is, however, surprising to note that Gross and Martin’s criticism received only a little reaction in the literature (Evans & Jarvis, 1980; Wilson, 1978).

However, only a few researchers, such as Eisman (1959) submitted to empirical examination the above suggested proposal. Eisman actually undertook a replication of Gross and Martin’s position. He employed a number of indices of cohesiveness, some based on interpersonal attraction and others on attraction to the group. The correlations between the indices did not attain the generally accepted level of significance. This finding further supports the view that there are various patterns of cohesiveness.

Moreover, if Gross and Martin's differentiation is valid, different processes of intragroup interaction can be expected in groups characterized by cohesiveness of the first type (on the socioemotional basis) from in those of the second type (on the instrumental basis, *i.e.*, the groups as a device for attainment of personal goals). It is reasonable to assume that the lack of sufficient treatment of factors producing different types of cohesiveness and of the behavioral implications deriving from this are a result of the manipulation by which cohesiveness was created in the studies (Evans & Jarvis, 1980; Hackman, 1976).

Most of the studies which examined the factors in the crystallization of cohesiveness and its influence on the behavior of individuals in the group addressed themselves to socio-emotional based cohesiveness. That is, in these cases cohesiveness was induced using sociometric choice which may be regarded as reflecting interpersonal attraction. Assumptions which were not upheld in these studies, and findings contradicting the assumptions in studies in which cohesiveness of the second type was designed, without being aware of it, were disregarded in the literature. We will attempt in the following to present realms of behavior in which the influence of cohesiveness on the members of the groups was examined in various studies. However, this review of research will apply to the findings of the theoretical framework introduced by Gross and Martin. Our intention is not only to support the theoretical approach of distinction between different types of cohesiveness, but also to examine the implications regarding interactive processes derived from their existence.

### 1. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

The first process to be examined will be interpersonal communication in the group. In the study of group communication, interest has focused on comparison of groups with a high level of cohesiveness to those with a low level, with the intention of relating these differences to group structure. However, a thorough survey of the research paradigms and findings reveals aspects which were not emphasized and which are relevant to our theoretical framework.

Back, in a study which he undertook in 1951, made a basic assumption that in cohesive groups pressure is operated on the members to attain uniformity of opinions, attitudes and behavior patterns. This pressure is stronger in these groups than in groups which are not cohesive. The attempts to attain uniformity are expressed in mutual influence and in supervision of the individual's behavior patterns. These mutual influences are reflected in increased communication between members of the group; thus it is assumed that members of a cohesive group will devote more time to discussion and exchange of verbal information. In order to examine this hypothesis, Back teamed up subjects in groups at two levels of cohesiveness: high and low. Although he relates to cohesiveness as a unitary concept, he designed three different types of groups, in accordance with the various patterns of cohesiveness: (a) on the socioemotional basis of interpersonal attraction; (b) on the instrumental basis of perception of the group as a device to attain goals; (c) on the basis of attractiveness of the group for prestige.

Here we deal with the first two types of cohesiveness, on the assumption that the third type can be included in the second. The rationale for this conceptual unification is considerably supported by the correlations between the three indices of cohesiveness presented by Gross and Martin; the correlation between the second and third indices is  $r = 0.69$ . Moreover, a group which is attractive because of its prestige, in fact mediates in the attainment of personal goals, as the need for prestige fulfilled by joining a group can be seen as a possible goal. Therefore, we will distinguish between groups characterized as attractive because they provide a social framework for individuals initially bound by interpersonal attraction

– *socio-emotional cohesiveness* – and groups which are attractive because of the performance and attainment of goals associated with membership – *task-oriented (instrumental) cohesiveness*.

The subjects were asked to write stories based on pictures which they were given and, afterwards, to discuss their suggestions in the group. At the end of the discussion they were told to rewrite each story. Back and his assistants observed the group discussions and registered their quality and level of communicative interaction; in addition, they analyzed the degree of change which occurred in the stories which were written and rewritten individually.

First, Back examined the level of reaction to attempts to persuade. The researchers defined a scale of 1 to 5, the poles being *acceptance* and *rejection*, expressing the degree of acceptance or rejection demonstrated on the average by each individual in relation to the stories which were told by the rest of the individuals. Each individual received a grade on this scale; then the group averages were calculated. The findings were as given in Table 1.

TABLE 1: AVERAGE DEGREE OF ACCEPTANCE OF PARTNERS' ATTEMPTED INFLUENCING WITHIN GROUPS CHARACTERIZED BY DIFFERENT TYPES AND LEVELS OF COHESIVENESS

<i>Degree of Cohesiveness</i>	<i>Type of Cohesiveness</i>	
	<i>Interpersonal Attraction</i>	<i>Task Orientation</i>
high	2.10	2.22
low	2.49	2.85

Back concluded that, surprisingly, a higher level of rejection of the story presented by each individual is indicated in more cohesive groups. He does not come to terms theoretically with this finding, and he does not suggest an alternative interpretation, even though it might be explained that in groups of a high level of cohesiveness the pressure for uniformity is more intense. Therefore, the group tries to influence its members to attain norms set by the entire group. In this context, it is possible to understand the opposition in cohesive groups to accepting original stories of participants without making any changes in them.

Back completely disregards the distinct difference between the two types of cohesiveness in terms of the level of reaction. In groups characterized by both low and high cohesiveness of the socioemotional type of cohesiveness, we find a lower average level of rejection to stories told by individuals than in the groups of the same level of cohesiveness of the second (instrumental) type. Examined in the theoretical framework of qualitative differentiation between the two types of cohesiveness, certain interpretations arise.

The existence of groups characterized by socioemotional cohesiveness is based on the reciprocal relations of interpersonal attraction between the individuals. These relations of mutual affectivity are expressed in greater friendship and desire to spend time with the others; the tasks which they undertake are only a means of establishing the contact and the social framework which constitutes the final goal. As a result, less opposition and hostility is expected to be addressed toward one another, especially since strong opposition is likely to be viewed as a threat to the interpersonal attraction and consequently to the very existence of the group.

We have seen that even in cohesive groups of socioemotional basis, if the level of cohesiveness is high, pressure for uniformity can be expected – pressure which will be expressed as opposition to acceptance of original stories of individuals. However, the opposition to original stories of individuals will be less intense in a cohesive group of the second type, of the same level of cohesiveness. Relations of empathy and interpersonal attraction, which the individuals are not willing to endanger too much by strong opposition and pressure, are evidently the reason for the less harsh opposition in cohesive groups of the first type.

In another table, Back presents the average time devoted to interpersonal communication within each type of group (Table 2).

TABLE 2: AVERAGE TIME DEVOTED TO INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION WITHIN GROUPS CHARACTERIZED BY DIFFERENT TYPES AND LEVELS OF COHESIVENESS

<i>Degree of Cohesiveness</i>	<i>Type of Cohesiveness</i>	
	<i>Interpersonal Attraction</i>	<i>Task Orientation</i>
high	449 sec	321 sec
low	412.5 sec	415.5 sec

In this table, the difference between the two types of cohesiveness is even more outstanding. If the basis of cohesiveness is interpersonal attraction, the higher the level of cohesiveness, the more time is devoted to communicative interaction. This finding, which is not given sufficient treatment and emphasis by Back, is consistent with the essence of this type of cohesiveness. Since the group is perceived as a social framework, and this as the final goal, enabling expression on the intimate and organic relationships which develop between individuals because of interpersonal attraction, it is not surprising that, the more unified the group, the more intensive the interpersonal communication. Intensive verbal interaction simply indicates that the group has fulfilled the purpose for which it was established – to serve as a suitable social medium for the development and expression of interpersonal attraction.

On the other hand, in the groups characterized by cohesiveness of the task orientation (instrumental) type, the individuals are evidently interested in completing their common tasks as quickly and as effectively as possible. They tend to participate in discussion and to develop verbal interaction only if it is instrumental to coordination of the common process for attainment of the final goals. Therefore, the higher the cohesiveness of this type, the more uniform are the behavior patterns taken to complete tasks, and the less the need for interpersonal communication. This is expressed in the reduction of time devoted to discussions in groups characterized by a high level of cohesiveness. It might even be claimed that too much verbal interaction is likely to be viewed in these groups as harmful to effectivity, since time is wasted on activities which are not relevant to attainment of goals.

Pepitone and Reichling (1955) also studied patterns of communication, but their study was based on socioemotional cohesiveness. Assuming that cohesiveness is the degree of mutual attraction of members, they designed the research groups on the basis of interpersonal attraction. The researchers hypothesized that in groups of this type the individuals support and reinforce one another and therefore the interpersonal relationships are characterized by reciprocal openness, friendliness and intimacy. As a result, there is more expression of feelings and emotions such as hostility and affection. As predicted, the findings of their research show that, in groups of a high level of cohesiveness, the expression of hostility registered was twice that found in the groups characterized by low cohesiveness. Likewise, the interpersonal relations were much less formal and structured. They excelled in freedom and spontaneity, expressed by free movement in the room, many outbreaks of laughter and other physical behavioral reactions.

Pepitone and Reichling, though unaware of the significance of their findings beyond the framework of comparison of groups of different levels of cohesiveness, add an additional level to the theoretical distinction between types of cohesiveness. This study contributes to the understanding of interactive processes in groups based on reciprocal relations of interpersonal attraction. The picture which crystallizes reveals a variety of socioemotional communication and reactive spontaneity in the expression of emotions and feelings. Informal relations are characterized by openness, friendliness, mutual support and understanding, the tendency to accept and understand the verbal and behavioral messages transmitted by the other individuals. However, this description is valid for the network of relations and interactions typical of groups the cohesiveness of which is based on a socio-emotional basis.

Lott and Lott (1961), as did those before them who dealt with cohesiveness, designed groups of various levels of cohesiveness on the basis of interpersonal attraction, as expressed in the number of sociometric choices among the individuals in the group. Their approach was to examine the strength and intensity of the communication flow within the various groups, as a function of the level of cohesiveness. A ranked correlation calculated between the average number of group verbalizations and an index of group cohesiveness indicates  $r = 0.42$ . This finding provides further corroboration of the theoretical line used in the framework of this survey.

Another relevant piece of research to be pointed out is that of Shaw and Shaw (1962), who teamed up children according to their mutual sociometric choices. The children dealt with educational tasks in a group framework. The teachers who observed them reported that in cohesive groups there was a friendly, relaxed, calm atmosphere of cooperation expressed in the planning of joint strategy for action – involving all members of the group – before performance began. In contrast, the children in the non-cohesive groups generally demonstrated aggressiveness, hostility and competition with one another.

However, the major outstanding finding, which did not gain attention, relates to the fact that in the cohesive groups the children were involved for a *noticeably long time* in nontask activity, that is, in social activity, while the other groups were characterized by interpersonal conflicts. Thus, it can be concluded that, when group cohesiveness is based on socioemotional foundations, even the participants' behavior in formal tasks is considerably different from that of others. Since the *raison d'être* of these groups does not rely on viewing the group as instrumental for attainment of personal goals, it is not surprising that the group behavior patterns are directed to attainment of satisfaction on the socio-emotional level. Some noteworthy evidence emerging from the Kirshner et al., (1978) study may be conceived as supporting this contention.

In summary of this section, we may note that the outstanding approach indicated is that basically different patterns of interpersonal communication exist in each of the two types of group cohesiveness. As most of the studies surveyed dealt with the process of communication in groups of cohesiveness of the first type (socioemotional), it is necessary to further examine the communicative process in groups of the second (instrumental) type of cohesiveness.

It is reasonable to assume that the communicative interaction in cohesive groups of the first type is characterized by:

- (1) A high percentage of nonformal communication (if the group is involved in completion of tasks assigned by external factors).
- (2) Reactive mutuality – relative equality in distribution of communication messages – between members of the group. Furthermore, there is no one dominant figure to whom messages are directed or who relays most information.
- (3) A higher percentage of positive rather than negative socioemotional communication.
- (4) Authenticity – a lower threshold of emotional exposure.

On the other hand, the communication in cohesive groups of the second type appears to be characterized by:

- (1) A dominant person who holds a central position in the communication network.
- (2) A relatively small amount of communication, in general, since it is perceived as counterproductive in attainment of the group goals and a “waste” of time.
- (3) Lack of reactive mutuality – the communication is not divided equally among the participants, but rather a dominant person will-usually arise as the center of the exchange of communication.
- (4) A considerably greater amount of negative socioemotional communications, especially with those individuals perceived as not contributing or even reducing the effectivity of the group (particularly in the case of failure to attain group goals).

- (5) A formal, very informative type of communication, intended to relay information necessary for proper functioning.
- (6) A high threshold of emotional exposure.

## 2. PROCESSES OF SOCIAL INFLUENCE

Another process studied in the context of cohesiveness is the pressure for uniformity and conformity of behavioral and cognitive patterns, a process of social influence.

Festinger et al., (1950) examined groups of students living in common dormitories. Their findings indicate that, the higher the level of cohesiveness, the more the uniformity of ideas and opinions and conformity to group norms of behavior. However, here as well, the cohesiveness means mutual recognition and attraction, produced by living in common quarters. Common residence requires a process of adaptation and adjustment to a lifestyle, requiring compromise of opinions, attitudes and behavior patterns of all the individuals. Accordingly, individuals living together, and comprising cohesive groups, are characterized by relations of mutual attraction, formed on the basis of accumulated emotional experiences.

The reciprocal relations woven between them are immeasurably more significant than the role-relations necessary in group action for the attainment of temporary goals. The chances for replication of these findings – uniformity of opinions and attitudes or conformity to nontask behavior patterns – if the cohesiveness is *not* socioemotional seem very slight, since the existence of authentic and intensive relations completely independent of the requirements of the formal framework (or the formal requirements involved in task-fulfillment) are prerequisite.

Bovard (1951) focused his research on group influences on a somewhat unique level - cognitive-perceptual. The researcher designed four experimental groups, representing two essentially distinct types: leader-centered and group-centered groups.

The first type – group-centered – is similar in essence to the socio-emotional cohesive groups, since the researcher instructed the leader, who operated the group, to behave and operate as an integral component of the group, encouraging open free conversations on informal subjects (not relevant to tasks assigned the groups). This manipulation produced a group structure characterized by formation of emotional links. The second type – leader-centered – was constructed around the figure of a “leader” who was clearly separate from the rest of the group. Formal, distant behavior patterns were exhibited by the leader, who served as a medium for transfer of information from one individual to another in the group. Direct discussions or interpersonal ties – not mediated by the leader – were subtly repressed. The validity of the manipulations was examined by comparison between the two types of groups in terms of the number of informal comments (made by one individual to another, freely and on his own initiative) heard during the process of the experiment (Table 3).

TABLE 3: PERCENTAGE OF INFORMAL COMMENTS FROM THE TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS WITHIN THE TWO TYPES OF GROUPS

	<i>Leader-centered</i>	<i>Group-centered</i>
Group a	10%	61%
Group b	2%	34%

This table reveals that the manipulations indeed induced two types of groups, different in terms of the type of relations developed between the participant individuals, as reflected by differential communication patterns.

In the second stage, the subjects in the four groups were presented with objective stimuli, and were required to judge one of their physical attributes – that is, to estimate the length of a green rectangle. Each subject announced his estimate to the researcher, who presented them to the rest of the group. In addition, after all the subjects had announced their estimates, they were told the group average. They were then asked to

undertake the same task again. The major finding was the indication of a significant tendency in the group-centered groups to change their individual opinions in the direction of the "group norm". The implications of this finding are wide-ranging: the conclusion indicates that the socioemotional cohesiveness is likely to affect the individual even in the area of visual perception. The change is directed toward cognitive-perceptual uniformity, in this case for proximity to the group norm.

It seems that the summary comment of the 1950 study regarding the group's influence on its members in the cognitive realm is valid here as well. If our conceptualization of the two types of cohesiveness is correct, then it is *not* reasonable to expect that the influence of the task-oriented group on its members in the direction of uniformity on the cognitive level will be effective.

It is possible to consider the approach of Festinger et al. (1952) as a continuation of the research already carried out. The experimental groups were designed by manipulation of cohesiveness of the socioemotional type. This study's findings, indicating that an increase in the level of cohesiveness (of the first type) increases the pressure for uniformity of ideas, also corroborate the theoretical framework of differential treatment of the concept of cohesiveness. The researchers agree that if disagreements arise between the members of the group on a certain subject and if there are no objective data to determine the correct opinion or attitude the decision will be made according to each individual's subjective sense. He will be influenced in making this decision by the amount of endorsement received from the other members of the group and the force of the pressures operating for the attainment of uniformity. However, it seems that this generality is limited to that type of cohesiveness dealt with in this research.

However, findings inconsistent with those presented heretofore are reported in a study (Dowling 1958), which also manipulated socioemotional cohesiveness, and significantly distinct levels, according to the attraction between members. The research design was similar to that of Bovard (1951). In each group some members were assigned as "coached subjects". Each subject was asked to observe an instrument that produces autokinetic movement, and to estimate the size of the shape created. The subjects assigned to "cooperate" announced their estimates orally in order to influence the perception of the "naive" subjects. In the second stage, all the subjects – in each group a "naive" subject and the rest "coached subjects" – were requested to observe the instrument again and to restate their estimates. In contrast to the hypothesis, no significant difference was indicated between the different levels of cohesiveness; in all the groups the subjects' estimations tended to converge in a standard set by the "coached subjects". One of the causes for this inconsistent finding may be that the sample was composed of women students only, who from the beginning are characterized by a low stability threshold. Accordingly, little opposition to reception of positive or negative induction was revealed, and therefore their initial tendency to conform to group standards will be high. Thus, this influence is likely to be stronger than the accumulated effects of socioemotional cohesiveness on the perceptual processes.

Shelley (1960) is among the few researchers who studied cohesiveness of the second type in the context of pressure operated by the group for uniformity, although he was not aware that his manipulation created cohesiveness on a different basis from that most commonly found in the literature. He formed ad hoc experimental groups for the attainment of clearly defined goals. The central aim of Shelley's study was to examine the extent to which group consensus is related to status of the participants who significantly contribute to attainment of the goals.

The status is defined in terms of task-status, such as "operating the group to attain its goals," or "initiation of new ideas for group action". The basic assumption of the study was that, the more the contribution of a participant is considered significant for task-accomplishment, the greater her status will be. The view that group cohesiveness and consensus related to performance status are connected is based on the claim that

consensus ensures minimalization of conflict and encourages harmonious, effective personal interaction (task-oriented interactions). It is reasonable, then, to assume that, the higher the level of cohesiveness, the greater the group pressure for uniformity – expressed by a high degree of consensus – in terms of the perceived performance status of the individuals in the group. Every subject in the group was asked to note at least three names, in descending order, according to their contribution to progress of the group in attaining its goals. In every group, the degree of agreement on choice of the three members was calculated, as well as the level of attraction to the group. (The attraction was measured using the responses to the questions: If you were to participate again, would you prefer (1) to be in the same group? (2) to be in the same group with a change or changes of the members? (3) to be in another group?)

As predicted, the connection between the rate of agreement regarding performance status and cohesiveness was reflected in a significantly high correlation ( $r = 0.87$ ) between cohesiveness and the agreement about the first-choice as well as  $r = 0.59$ , between cohesiveness and the agreement regarding the ranking of the three members of highest status.

Let us refer again to the study of Lott and Lott (1961) which manipulated cohesiveness of the first type. They reported a correlation of  $r = 0.54$  between the level of cohesiveness and the index of conformity to group attitudes and opinions. This further reaffirms the above-mentioned approach to the connection between socio-emotional cohesiveness and group pressure for uniformity of ideas and attitudes. More recently, Hackman (1976) stated, too, that a high level of cohesiveness, regardless of type, induces pressures towards conformity to group norms. But he did not preclude the possibility that these pressures may differ in respect to their direction. Specifically, in our view group pressures toward conformity may be directed to facilitate either attainment of interpersonal objectives or performance effectiveness, depending whether they trace to socioemotional or to instrumental cohesiveness, respectively.

To sum up the aforesaid studies, we may conclude with some propositions that in our view should be submitted to empirical examination in forthcoming research.

- (1) In groups characterized by socioemotional cohesiveness, pressure is operated on the individuals in the group for uniformity of ideas and attitudes.
- (2) This pressure also emerged with regard to perceptual and other cognitive processes.
- (3) In the same groups, pressure is operated for the attainment of conformity to group norms of behavior.

However, in groups characterized by cohesiveness based on striving for common personal goals, we can expect:

- (1) Pressure for cognitive uniformity of opinions and attitudes, perceived as necessary to assurance of harmonious personal interaction, for the purpose of effective group performance.
- (2) Pressure for conformity of behavior patterns relevant to task-activities. (The group will operate pressure on its members to conform to group norms in the behavioral realm if it is necessary for effective performance.)

### 3. PERFORMANCE

This theoretical overview would not be complete without reviewing the topic which received a great deal of attention in the study of cohesiveness, namely, the relationship between cohesiveness and performance.

The conceptual framework in this area was outlined in the research of Schachter et al. (1951). In their basic assumptions, it is posited that, if one relates to the group product as a function of the group's success in influencing its members, then cohesiveness constitutes a major causal factor of the performance level. Accordingly, groups which assign performance a high valence, if they are cohesive will operate

greater pressure on their members to increase productivity. However, if a cohesive group operates for the reduction of productivity, its performance will be of a lower level than that of a group which is not cohesive. In their research, which was intended to verify their hypotheses, they constructed four types of groups, representing all the possible permutations of cohesiveness and valence of performance in terms of the group. (The researchers dichotomized the variables to two levels: high and low.) As in most of the studies reviewed, the cohesiveness manipulated was of the first type – that is, on a socio-emotional basis (interpersonal attraction).

The experimental examination indicated that there is not necessarily any connection between cohesiveness and high performance. It seems that groups which place high valence on performance do not differ – in terms of performance level – even if they have different levels of cohesiveness. This is not so if the group has a negative orientation (places negative valence) toward the performance of formal tasks assigned it by an external force. A group of this type will operate for the reduction of productivity of its members if it is cohesive.

The results of Berkowitz's (1954) replication of this study are somewhat different. In groups characterized by a positive orientation toward performance, a continuous increase was registered in group productivity in both levels of cohesiveness; the higher the cohesiveness, the higher the increase rate. In the groups characterized by a negative orientation toward performance, there was a drop in group productivity in both levels of cohesiveness, in the first session of the experiment. Later on, an increase was indicated in both levels of cohesiveness, and in the high level the trend was steeper than in the low level.

The conclusion indicated by both studies is that there are no consistent findings regarding the system of relations between cohesiveness and performance. This inconsistency may be related to the variation in the samples – the experimental one was composed of female students, while Berkowitz used male students only.

However, there is a series of studies characterized by a different approach. Goodacre (1951) established army units on the basis of sociometric choices. The effectiveness of these units was evaluated in the framework of their performance of the tasks assigned to them. An examination of the association between the levels of unit cohesiveness and the quality of performance revealed correlations varying from 0.62 to 0.78. The researchers concluded that there is a causal connection between cohesiveness and effectiveness of performance, since the high correlations were derived through manipulation of the independent variable (cohesiveness). Hemphill and Sachrest (1952) carried out a correlative research on army personnel, similar to Goodacre's research. The level of cohesiveness of 94 bomber crews was gauged using a sociometric index based on interpersonal choices of preferred peers for crew. Simultaneously, data were collected regarding precision of bombings of group targets. The interpersonal attraction among pilots in organic crews relative to that among pilots belonging to different teams (number of intergroup as opposed to intragroup choices) was used as an index for the level of team cohesiveness. This index is found in a correlation of  $r = 0.36$  with the criteria data. The association is significant, although not as high as in the previous study. It is reasonable to assume that the relatively low correlation is due to the lack of control of additional variables.

Speroff and Kerr (1952) and Van Zelst (1952) used an experimental approach similar to that of Goodacre. They staffed work groups on the basis of sociometric choices, and operated them in factories. In the course of the work performance, functioning indices were gathered, such as, the level of turnover, savings in cost of production, and number of accidents. The findings of these studies validate the assumptions – that is, the more cohesive the work group, the lower the turnover, the greater the savings in cost production, and the fewer work accidents occurred ( $r = 0.54$  between cohesiveness and accidents).

However, not all studies which examined socioemotional cohesiveness were successful in identifying significant correlations between cohesiveness and performance effectiveness. Seashore (1954) based his study on organic work groups in an

auto assembly plant. The performance effectiveness was evaluated using the measure of group production periodically at three-month intervals. The data did not support the hypothesis that group productivity would increase along with intensification of interpersonal interaction. In his theoretical discussion, the researcher posited that it is evidently necessary to take the group's orientation to performance of formal tasks (assignment of positive or negative value to attainment of goals set by external factors) into account.

In their study of the relationship between cohesiveness and performance, Cohen, Whitmyre, & Funk, (1960) used a laboratory setting, with the intention of ensuring maximal experimental control. Brainstorming teams composed according to sociometric choices were assigned problem-solving tasks, some "ego-involving" and some "nonego-involving". The researchers had hypothesized that individualism makes working together difficult, and therefore the mutual attraction in cohesive groups would create less inhibition to express individual ideas, thus producing more creativity. However, this hypothesis was not upheld in the experimental test. In contrast to predictions, the cohesive brainstorming teams did not produce many more ideas, nor more original ones than the noncohesive groups.

Yet, while inspecting the few studies that ascertained the posited impact of instrumental cohesiveness on group performance, the findings appear to be more conclusive. Specifically, Ball and Carron (1976) as well as Bird (1977), revealed some empirical findings that substantiate unequivocally the alleged relationship between the instrumental cohesiveness and group performance.

Combining all the studies reviewed in this section, we arrive at a number of summarizing conclusions:

- (1) The studies manipulated almost exclusively cohesiveness of the first type – on a socioemotional basis – in an attempt to ascertain how it affects the level of group performance. It may be that this is the reason for inconsistency of the findings. Presumably, the reversed direction of causality – that is, group performance as a determinant of cohesiveness level – asserted by some students of this research area (Backeman & Helmreich, 1975) is perhaps attributable alike to this inconsistency. Consequently, a possible conclusion is that in a group characterized by cohesiveness of the first type, there is not necessarily any association between cohesiveness and performance. The group motivational orientations – that is, the valence (negative or positive) assigned to performance of formal goals (the goal orientation) – constitutes a mediating factor between cohesiveness and group performance, if the former is of the socioemotional type.
- (2) The pattern of relationships between the level of cohesiveness and performance indices was studied much less in groups characterized by cohesiveness of the second type. In these groups there is less significance to group motivational orientation since, by definition, high cohesiveness indicates high task-orientation of the individuals in the group. A factor such as goal path clarity, noted by Anderson (1975), is among the factors of significant contribution to the association between cohesiveness of the second type and performance level. It is reasonable to assume that, the more defined and clear the routes to the goals, the stronger this association will be. Conversely, if the paths are ambiguous, the connection will be weaker.

### **SUMMARY**

In the course of this overview, we first attempted to renote and stress the existence of two distinct types of group cohesiveness. The first type of cohesiveness evolves whenever individuals join the group in order to derive emotional satisfaction provided by the very participation in the group, such as self-image, recognition, security. This type of cohesiveness is the product of personal attraction which, in terms of learning theories, creates a framework of positive reinforcements (rewards). The continued existence of the cohesive group of the first type is perceived by the individuals as a goal and challenge in itself, while the activities in which they are involved are secondary – they are instrumental to the existential goals of the social framework.

Cohesiveness of the second type – task (goal) oriented, that is, instrumental cohesiveness – is a product of relations of mutual dependency created between various individuals associated for the attainment of common goals which cannot be attained effectively outside of the group context. The participants emphasize factors which contribute to successful completion of the task and give little emphasis to interpersonal attraction.

Therefore, as our second target in this article, we endeavoured to delineate possible distinct patterns of behavior and interaction that may be implied by the two types of cohesiveness. For instance, in our view, in a cohesive group of the first type, the relationships will be affective, congenial, open, organic and authentic. In turn, in cohesive groups of the second type, the interactions will focus mainly on attainment of goals; all resources will be invested in creation of optimal conditions for effective performance, that is, coordination of individuals' activities, development of normative patterns of performance relevant behavior and maximal reduction of informal relations which constitute irrelevant investment. Finally, we suggest that the cognitive and behavioral implications derivable from the existence of the two types of cohesiveness, as partly highlighted herein should be submitted for further empirical examination and elaboration. Only empirical research could help to corroborate the twofold conceptualization of cohesiveness as well as the hypothesized distinct implications.

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. B. (1975). Combined effects of interpersonal attraction and goal path clarity on the cohesiveness of task-oriented groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **31**: 68-75.
- Back, K. W. (1951). Influence through communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **46**: 9-23.
- Backeman, R., Helmreich, R. (1975). Cohesiveness and performance. Covariation and causality in our undersea environment. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, **11**: 478-89.
- Ball, J. R., Carron, A. V. (1976). The influence of team cohesion and participation motivation upon performance success in intercollegiate ice hockey. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, **1**: 27 1-5.
- Berkowitz, L. (1954). Group standards, cohesiveness and productivity. *Human Relations*, **7**: 509-19.
- Bird, A. M. (1977). Development of a model for predicting team performance. *Research Quarterly*, **48**: 24-32.
- Bovard, E. W. Jr. (1951). The experimental production of interpersonal affect. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **46**: 52 1-8.
- Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction as a function of affiliation need and attitude similarity. *Human Relations*, **14**: 285-9.
- Byrne, D., Clore, G. L. (1966). Effect of economic similarity-dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **4**: 2204.
- Byrne, D., Griffitt, W. (1966). Similarity versus liking: a clarification. *Psychonomic Science*, **6**: 295-6.
- Byrne, D., Nelson, D. (1965). The effect of topic importance and attitude similarity-dissimilarity on attraction in a multistranger design. *Psychonomic Science*, **3**: 449-50.
- Cohen, D., Whitmyre, J. W., Funk, W. H. (1960). Effect of group cohesiveness and training upon creative thinking. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **44**: 3 19-22.
- Downing, J. (1958). Cohesiveness, perception and values. *Human Relations*, **11**: 157-66.
- Eisman, B. (1959). Some operational measures of cohesiveness and their interrelations. *Human Relations*, **12**: 183-9.
- Evans, N. J., Jarvis, P. A. (1980). Group cohesion: A review and reevaluation. *Small Group Behavior*, **11**: 359-70.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S., Back, K. (1950). *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A study of Human Factors in Housing*. Harper Row, New York.

- Festinger, L., Gerard, B., Hyomovitch, H., Kelley, H., Raven, H. B. (1952). The influence process in the presence of extreme deviates. *Human Relations*, **5**: 327-46.
- Goodacre, D. M., III, (1951). The use of a sociometric test as a predictor of combat unit effectiveness. *Sociometry*, **14**: 148-52.
- Hackman, J. R. (1976). Group influences on individuals. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*: 1455-1525. Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Hemphill, J. K., Sachrest, L. B. (1952). A comparison of three criteria of air crew effectiveness in combat over Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **36**: 323-7.
- Kirshner, B. J., Dies, R. R., Brown, R. A. (1978). Effects of experimental manipulation of self-disclosure on group-cohesiveness. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **46**: 1171-7.
- Lott, A. J., Lott, E. B. (1961). Group cohesiveness communication level and conformity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **62**: 408-12.
- Pepitone, A., Reichling, G. (1955). Group cohesiveness and the expression of hostility. *Human Relations*, **8**: 327-38.
- Schachter, S., Ellerston, N., McBride, D., Gregory, D. (1951). An experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity. *Human Relations*, **4**: 229-38.
- Seashore, S. E. (1954). *Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Groups*. Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Shaw, M. E., Shaw, L. M. (1962). Some effects of sociometric grouping upon learning in a second grade classroom. *Journal of Social Psychology*, **57**: 453-8.
- Shelley, M. W. (1960). Leadership and cohesiveness in small groups. *Sociometry*, **23**: 209-16.
- Speroff, B., Kerr, W. (1952). Steel mill 'hot strip' accidents and interpersonal desirability values. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, **8**: 89-91.
- Thibaut, J. W. (1950). An experimental study of the cohesiveness of underprivileged groups. *Human Relations*, **3**: 25 1-78.
- Wilson, S. (1978). *Informal Groups: An Introduction*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Van Zelst, R. H. (1952). Validation of a sociometric regrouping procedure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **47**: 299-301.

FURTHER READING:

- Bales, R. F. (1970). *Personality and Interpersonal Behavior*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and similarity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **62**: 7 13-5.
- Byrne, D. (1962). Response to attitude similarity-dissimilarity as a function of affiliation need. *Journal of Personality*, **30**: 164-77.
- Gross, N.; Martin, W. T. (1952). On group cohesiveness. *American Journal of Sociology*, **57**: 546-54.
- Hare, A. P. (1976). *Handbook of Small Group Research*, 2nd ed. Free Press, New York.
- Pepitone, A., Kleiner, R. (1957). The effects of threat and frustration on cohesiveness. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **54**: 192-9.

AHARON TZINER, PhD,  
 Department of Labour Studies,  
 Faculty of Social Sciences,  
 Tel-Aviv University,  
 Ramat-Aviv, Tel-Aviv,  
 Israel.

*Reprints of this paper are available from Dr. Tziner.*