

RESEARCH ARTICLE :

Analyzing the group dynamics among rural self-help group women

■ **M.V. KARUNA JEBA MARY, T.N. SUJEETHA, J. THILAGAM AND J.V. RAVICHANDRAN**

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :

Received :
22.07.2017;
Accepted :
11.08.2017

SUMMARY : The present study conducted at Theni district of Tamil Nadu. The purpose was to analyse the group dynamics among the members of rural self-help group women. Aundipatti, Periyakulam and Uthamapalayam blocks were identified with the sample of 220 SHG women. Group co-operation, decision making process, group role, motivation, participation, leadership behaviour, group value and group behaviour have been selected as group dynamic components. components were subjected to principle component analysis and factor analysis.

How to cite this article : Mary, M.V. Karuna Jeba, Sujeetha, T.N., Thilagam, J. and Ravichandran, J.V. (2017). Analyzing the group dynamics among rural self-help group women. *Agric. Update*, **12** (TECHSEAR-9) : 2577-2581.

KEY WORDS :

Group dynamics,
Factor analysis, Self-help groups

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Group Dynamics is the study of how individuals effectively, or ineffectively, function as a group. A large number of different disciplines contribute to effective group functioning. For instance, group dynamics demands a basic understanding of leadership styles, communication skills, decision making processes, interpersonal facilitation, organizational behavior, and conflict resolution. The purpose of training in group dynamics is to break down barriers between people and to facilitate a sense of cohesiveness among members of a group. In all human interactions there are two major ingredients-content and process. The first, content deals with the subject matter or the task upon which the

group is working. The second ingredient, process, is concerned with what is happening between and to group members while the group is working.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

Theni district of Tamil Nadu has been selected for the study in view of its spectacular performance in SHG movements as compared to other districts. Three blocks viz., Aundipatti, Periyakulam and Uthamapalayam have been selected based on the availability of more number of SHGs. Two NGO's have been identified and selected from each block which were operating more number of SHGs. Two self-help groups have been selected from each of the two NGO from each block. Self-help

Author for correspondence :

M.V. KARUNA JEBA MARY
Department of
Agricultural Extension
Rural Sociology, Tamil
Nadu Agricultural
University, COIMBATORE
(T.N.) INDIA
Email : jebamaryextn@gmail.com

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Groups, which were operating more than two years, were selected. In this way, total twelve self-help groups were selected for the investigation. All the members of the selected Self-help Groups were selected for the present study. Thus, in total, there were 220 respondents. Data collection was done with the help of pre-tested structured interview schedule.

Group dynamics index (GDI) :

Group dynamics index was arrived by adding the score of each indicator viz., group co-operation, group decision making, group role, motivation, participation, communication, leadership, group behaviour and group value. The group dynamics index was calculated by adopting the following formula :

$$GDI = \frac{(I_{1x} < I_{2x} < I_{3x} < \dots \dots \dots I_{9x})}{(I_{1y} < I_{2y} < I_{3y} < \dots \dots \dots I_{9y})}$$

where,

GDI - Group dynamics index

I_{1x} - Total score obtained by 1st indicator

I_{9x} - Total score obtained by 9th indicator

I_{1y} - Total maximum possible score for 1st indicator

I_{9y} - Total maximum possible score for 9th indicator

Based on calculated composite group dynamics index the respondents were classified into three categories viz., low, medium and high. Furthermore it was used for other statistical analysis.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Group dynamics was operationalized as an extent to which the existence of selected indicators is perceived by the respondents at a given point of time. Keeping the objective in mind further attempts have been made to measure the existing group dynamics among self-help

group women members by taking into consideration all the indicators. The indicators were identified by reviewing the literature and as suggested by various authors. They were group co-operation, group communication, decision making process, group role, motivation, participation, leadership behaviour, group value and Group behaviour. Group dynamics responses for the identified nine components were obtained from self hel group members on a five point continuum scale viz., Most Prevalent (MTP), More Prevalent (MRP), Moderately Prevalent (MOP), Less Prevalent (LSP) and Least Prevalent (LTP) in their group for which the scores given were 5,4,3,2 and 1, respectively.

Group co-operation index contributes highly (0.78) as all the forces acting upon group members are mutually satisfying. During the survey, it was observed that SHG members mutually helped each other for taking decisions on financial as well as SHG related activities. Further, they were meeting on regular basis in group, share responsibilities among themselves. So, a strong ‘we feeling’ existed among the group members. Communication index had another high value (0.70). During the survey, it was observed that communication among members of self-help groups contribute in exchange of their experience. The transparency in sharing information about loan processing, payment details, exposure visits and trainings were existed among the members.

From the above table further it could be observed that decision making behaviour had 0.57 index value. Self-help group increases power to take decisions in common activity related to village and also in SHGs. Leaders and members mutually take decisions for the betterment of the SHG which might have contributed for relatively high. SHG members exhibited the 0.62 group roles index value.

Table 1 : Indicator-wise group-dynamics index

Sr. No.	Index of group-dynamics indicators	Index score
1.	Group co-operation index	0.78
2.	Group communication index	0.70
3.	Group decision making index	0.57
4.	Group roles index	0.62
5.	Group motivation index	0.52
6.	Group participation index	0.65
7.	Group leadership index	0.64
8.	Group value index	0.76
9.	Group behaviour index	0.59
	Overall Mean index	0.651

Elsewhere in the study, it has been reported that members are performing their assigned roles and had clarity about their roles. Motivation index was very much low among self-help group members (0.52) compared with other group dynamics index indicators. During the survey, it was observed that most of the SHG members reported to have joined the group for getting monetary benefits. Members have been motivated by the NGO officials in the earlier period only. Also, there exists lack of adequate follow up by the officials. This might be the reason for low index value for motivation compared to other indicators.

Self-help group members established an index of participation to the tune of 0.65. All members in the SHG did participate in the group meeting actively and express their feelings among themselves. This regular interaction in meetings enhances the group strength by bringing consensus on all issues. From Table 1 it could be further inferred that self-help group members exhibited more leadership behaviour (0.64). The leader listen patiently

to the members problems and takes initiatives to solve others problems. Further, the leaders take decision by involving all members which has been witnessed by the investigator through participation in one of the group members.

People are attracted to others who relate the same likes and values; and it might be interpreted that common values are the most important of the factor that create and maintain group harmony and solidarity. Since, SHG members exhibited high level of coordination. This would have resulted in common group value (0.76). Table 1 further depicts that SHG members exhibited a score of 0.59 for group behaviour. It was already explained that members participate in the meeting without absenteeism and cooperate with leaders in loan disbursement.

The overall analysis indicated that the indicator of group dynamics (at a given point of time) did exist among the members in varied dimension as per their perceived rating.

Table 2 : Eigen values for group dynamics indicators

Sr. No.	Factor	Eigen values	Percentage of variance	Cumulative per cent of variance
1.	I	2.629	29.209	29.209
2.	II	1.785	19.837	49.046
3.	II	1.235	13.727	62.773
4.	IV	1.169	12.991	75.764
5.	V	1.053	11.698	87.462
6.	VI	0.494	5.491	92.952
7.	VII	0.422	4.687	97.639
8.	VIII	0.206	2.285	99.924
9.	IX	0.007	0.076	100.000

Table 3 : Rotated factor (Varimax) matrix of each indicators

Sr. No.	Group-dynamics indicators	Factors				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Group co-operation	0.247	-0.168	0.021	0.849	0.065
2.	Group communication	-0.185	0.125	0.857	-0.246	0.058
3.	Group decision making	-0.050	-0.021	-0.058	0.050	0.957
4.	Group roles	0.775	-0.112	-0.103	-0.328	-0.266
5.	Group motivation	0.828	0.011	-0.019	0.304	-0.024
6.	Group participation	-0.248	0.095	0.861	0.158	-0.204
7.	Group leadership	-0.060	0.990	0.018	-0.069	-0.035
8.	Group behaviour	0.874	-0.082	-0.033	0.212	0.166
9.	Group value	-0.059	0.990	-0.003	-0.075	-0.004
	Eigen values	2.629	1.785	1.235	1.169	1.053
	% of variation explained	29.209	19.837	13.727	12.991	11.698
	Cumulative % variation explained	29.209	49.046	62.773	75.764	87.462

Principle component analysis of indicators towards group-dynamics :

Principle component analysis was carried out with all the indicators and the results furnished in Table 2. Table 2 could provide details of Eigen values and percentage of variance explained by the components. The components which have more than one Eigen value were selected. Thus, from the nine components, five factors were extracted and these factors together explained a total variance of 87.46 per cent have been explained towards group-dynamics. Therefore, it could be concluded that first five factors which have more than one Eigen value are contributing 87.46 per cent variation towards group-dynamics.

Rotated factor (Varimax) matrix of indicators :

From Table 3, each factor column was scanned for identifying the indicators which are more significantly correlated with the particular factor. Thus, from each factor column, the indicators having a factor loading of more than 0.7 were selected and grouped in Table 4.

The data in Table 4 further revealed the grouping of indicators under each factor with their factor loadings.

Factor I has been identified as 'Prime factor' as it explained 29.209 per cent of variation in group-dynamics. From the table, it could be inferred that under factor 1, group behaviour influencing the group-dynamics into greater extent with the highest factor loading of 0.874 followed by group motivation (0.828) and group roles (0.775). Since, these factors primarily deal with roles, activity and interaction of the individual, it has been termed as 'Group sensitizing factor'.

Factor II- Among the total variation of 87.462 per cent, the second factor alone explained the group-dynamics variation to the extent of 19.837 per cent. Thus, factors 1 and 2 together contributed 49.046 per cent

variation in group-dynamics (Table 34). From the results, it could be concluded that two indicators in factor II viz., group leadership and group value have been found to manipulate the group-dynamics equally to a greater extent with the highest factor loadings of 0.990 and it has been named as 'Group influential factor'.

Factor III- It could be further seen from the Table 36 that among all the variables group communication (0.857) and group participation (0.861) have been observed to have grouped under Factor III. Among these variables, group participation had high factor loadings and it has been named as 'Group interaction factor'. The members of the SHGs were reported to be young, with an average age of about 36 years and the members did have similar social and financial backgrounds. This contributes to easier interaction and smoother communication among members, facilitating equal opportunity of self-expression within the group and makes them to actively participate in SHG and social development activities.

Factor IV- It could be observed from the Table 36 that only one variable, group co-operation was in factor IV, which had higher loadings of 0.849. This factor accounted for 13.727 per cent of variance and the factor has been labeled as 'Group integration factor'. The high performance level of groups might be because of cohesiveness and trust between the members, which are highly required for the groups to be effective.

Factor V- Finally, it is tangible from table that only one variable, decision making behaviour which had higher significant loading (0.957) on factor V. This factor accounted 11.698 per cent of variance and the factor mainly depends upon the decision making behaviour. Hence, it has been named as 'Group democratic factor'.

The leader takes a decision with involvement of other group members of SHG, makes decisions without

Table 4 : Factors-wise indicators with factor loading

Factors	Socio-indicators	Factor loadings
Factor 1	Group roles	0.775
	Group motivation	0.828
	Group behaviour	0.874
Factor 2	Group leadership	0.990
	Group value	0.990
Factor 3	Group communication	0.857
	Group participation	0.861
Factor 4	Group co-operation	0.849
Factor 5	Group decision making	0.957

topic changing and support other members' in making decisions in consensus. Further, the leader feels the majority's decisions valid in the SHG, attempts to get all members participate in decisions of SHG and feels the gains of recognition for his contribution in decision making process.

Conclusion :

Group dynamics of self-help groups could influence its successful functioning and level of performance. Each identified component was of group dynamics was analysed through index scores. Contribution of component towards the group was determined and grouped into factors. The indicators namely group value and group leadership could be the determining factors of group dynamics. Group behaviour, group motivation and group roles were emerged as the prime factors of group dynamics. Here group motivation is the least contributing indicator for group dynamics. Appropriate activities should be planned to motivate the SHG members for the active participation in all activities.

Authors' affiliations :

T.N. SUJEETHA, J. THILAGAM AND J.V. RAVICHANDRAN,
Department of Agricultural Extension Rural Sociology, Tamil Nadu
Agricultural University, COIMBATORE (T.N.) INDIA

REFERENCES

Asokhan, M. (2006). Empowerment of rural women through self-help groups- An empirical analysis. Ph.D. Thesis, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, T.N. (INDIA).

Gupta, M.L. and Gupta, N. (2006). Economic empowerment of women through SHGs. *Kurukshetra*, **54** : 23-25..

Kothari, C.R. (2008). *Research methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Age International Private Limited, NEW DELHI, INDIA.

Palmurugan, M. (2002). Prospects of empowering farm women in irrigated farming system. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, T.N. (INDIA).

Ponvannan, V. (1995). Communication behavior of trainees. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Killikulam, KERALA (INDIA).

Ramayah, T., Muhamad, J., Aizzat, M.N. and Koay, H.L. (2003). Internal group dynamics, team characteristics and team effectiveness. *Internat. J. Knowledge, Culture & Change Mgmt.*, **3**: 11-14.

Saravanakumar, M. (2000). Impact of TANWA in the empowerment of farm women. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, T.N. (INDIA).

Sekaran, U. (2010). *Organizational Behaviour - Text and Cases*. Tata McGraw Hills Publishing Company Limited, NEW DELHI, INDIA.

Senthamarai, G., Manoharan, M. and Paul Mansingh, J. (1997). Socio-personal and psychological characteristics of farm women. *J. Extn. Edu.*, **7**(5): 1607-1608.

Teli, R.B. (2010). Micro-finance through self-help groups in India: Performance, problems and remedies. *Indian Co-operative Rev.*, **7**(1): 69-81.

Vashisht, S., Khanna, K., Arora, R. and Yadav, N. (2008). Dimensions of group dynamics effectiveness of self-help groups of rural women in Haryana. *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, **8**(1): 42-45.

Vipinkumar, V.P. and Singh, B. (2000). Correlates of effectiveness of self-help group dynamics of horticulture farmers. *J. Extn. Edu.*, **11**(2) : 23-34.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ 12th Year of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★