

## A STUDY ON GROUP COHESIVENESS AND PARTICIPATION LEVEL IN DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES IN DISTRICT TEHRI GARHWAL OF UTTARANCHAL STATE

R. P. Singh<sup>1</sup> & B. B. Singh<sup>2</sup>

Groups like Self- Help Group, Mitra Krishak Mandal, Youth club, Mahila Mangal Dal, Jalagam Vikas Samiti, Mahila Utthan Samooch, etc. are being organized for developmental activities /programmes in the country. These groups are responsible to carry out the development programme successfully. They are supposed to achieve the goal of development programme through group approach. This approach has given a model of mass promotion. The high systematic center directed model of mass promotion reflect a series of activities developed over a period of time for the purpose of achieving some levels of participation; like decision making, implementation, benefit sharing, evaluation/ monitoring and organizing the masses.

There is tendency on the part of planners and managers to complain about the absence of people's participation in the developmental process and the element of uncritical acceptance and ratification of the programmes. Since most of the developmental activities/programmes are facing various problems concerning the process of development like satisfaction, alienation and participation (Panandikar and Mehra, 1986). The increased popularity of participatory methods in research, developmental activities and rural extension in our country is attracting the mind of development communicators.

To exploit the groups on the lines of desirable behavior both psychologically and socially, it is essential for them to be dynamic.

To make groups more dynamic, result oriented, several studies have shown that as group cohesiveness increases there is more frequent communication among members, less absenteeism and higher productivity. On these lines the present study was conducted entitled "Perceived cohesiveness of group members and participation in developmental activities: A study of district Tehri Garhwal of Uttarnchal". The objectives were to determine the perceived group cohesiveness of the members of the group, to study the level of participation of members in developmental activities and to determine relationship between group cohesiveness and participation level.

### METHODOLOGY

An exploratory research methodology was followed. Out of nine blocks of district Tehri Garhwal, only two blocks namely; Chamba and Narendra Nagar were selected purposely. These blocks were having different types of groups, similar types of developmental activities were in operation and majority of population was engaged in agriculture. There were three types of groups selected namely; Mahila Mangal Dal (MMD), Self-Help Group (SHG) and Jalagam Vikas Samiti (JVS) in both the blocks. Three villages from each selected block were selected having at least one group in each selected village. Thus, total six villages were selected comprising two villages having MMD, two villages having SHG, and two

1. Asstt. Prof. Ext., Hill Campus Ranichauri, 2. Prof. & Head, Department of Agril. Communication G.B.P. U.A. & T., Pantnagar.

villages having JVS (Table 1). The respondents were selected on the basis of census method. Under the independent variables; Age, sex, caste, literacy level and land holdings were considered and group cohesiveness and participation level was taken as dependent variable. Data were drawn through interview schedule. In this study the sample size was of 120 respondents, which comprises of 76 members of MMd, 22 members of SHG and 22 members of JVS. The data were analyzed with appropriate statistical tools like mean, standard deviation and correlation coefficient. The relationship between dependent variables; group cohesiveness and participation level were established on the basis of data drawn.

The group cohesiveness was measured in different ways in the sociological and psychological studies. In this study, the group cohesiveness was measured through a modest Inventory of Individually Perceived Group cohesiveness (IIPGC) score, developed by Johnson (1976). He defined the group cohesiveness, as 'it is a group property that can be perceived by individual members regarding the degree, extent or strength of mutual attention given by the membership to process of cooperation, expectational control and task communication'.

The participation level was measured through an inventory developed by Santhanam et al. (1984). This inventory consider all the components of the developmental project/ programme cycle, i.e. project formulation, implementation and monitoring/ evaluation on the one hand and involvement of the various types of personnel including the community on the other. The involvement of the community is elaborated to indicate the extent of participation from no participation to full responsibility. The total score of extent of participation and level of participation together was taken as participation level.

The mean score of group cohesiveness and

participation level were correlated in all the selected groups. T-test was applied for knowing the test of significance of the relationship.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The fact emerged from quantitative analysis were presented under different sections. The relationship between group cohesiveness (IIPGC) score and participation level score are presented below;

**Group Cohesiveness and Participation level of Mahila Mangal Dal**—Individually perceived group cohesiveness (IIPGC) mean score of MMD was relatively low (15.75) and the mean score of participation level was also less (42.50) among the selected groups. The correlation coefficient was negative (-0.23069) (Table 2). The reasons for the above results may be lack of awareness, motivational variation, exposure variation, etc. In fact, the construction of MMD was not self-motivated. It is initiated by the governmental agency, which has its own compulsion like target achievement. For the active participation, education and communication have to be participative and receiver centered rather than being top down (Paulo Freire, 1975).

**Group Cohesiveness and Participation level of Self-Help Group**—The mean score of IIPGC was maximum (65.20) and the mean score of participation level was moderate (41.40). The correlation was negative (-0.30117) but not significant (Table 2). It showed that the cohesiveness of the group was greater but the participation was moderate. It may be due to the developmental activities not related to their real need, so the symbolic gesture of participation could not occur. Here the lack of leadership, training and exposure opportunity may cause less participation. The results have been supportive to the study of Evert and Savara (1989) which revealed that the success of Annapurna Mahila Mandal where the level of participation were highest among five

organizations was due to its leadership, training and exposure opportunity for informal sector women. Uphoff (1987) who stressed on opportunity indicator and prevalence indicators in participation also supports it.

**Table 1. Groupwise village and respondent distribution**

Groups	Villages	No. of members N=120
MMD n=76	Kotigad	46
	Maur	30
SHG n=22	Jaikot	11
	Bemar	11
JVS n=22	Chaupariya	11
	Banali	11

**Group Cohesiveness and Participation level of Jalagam Vikas Samiti**—The participation level mean score of JVS was highest (61.95) and the perceived group

cohesiveness mean score was moderate (43.3). The correlation coefficient was negative (-0.124) but not significant (Table 2). The result showed that the group cohesiveness and participation level was hardly related. The reason could be the groups were formed after election of the executives. As a result, the perceived group cohesiveness of members in group was less but the motivation of the elected members was more, so the members had greater responsibility with group activities and group goals. Results showed that the sense of responsibility among the elected members of the group was relatively more. The results have been supportive to the statement of Onibon (2000) that the potential of the concept of participation should include the concept of responsibility.

**Table 2. Relationship between IIPGC and participation level**

Groups	IIPGC Mean	IIPGC (SD)	Participation level (mean)	Participation level(SD)	Correlat. Coff.	T-test
MMD n=76	15.75	3.50	42.5	1.83	-0.23069	2.015 E-62
SHG n=22	65.20	6.51	41.40	22.40	-0.30117	0.00023
JVS n=22	47.3	2.79	61.95	7.99	-0.124	1.166 E-7

## CONCLUSION

The relation between group cohesiveness and participation level was hardly established because both, group cohesiveness and participation level were attached with more

psychological aspects. There is need to explore this issue in depth which will enable to the research scientists, planners, managers and extension personal to increase the participation level in the development programme/ projects.

## REFERENCES

1. Johnson, D.L. 1976. Summary of field studies of the Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness (IIPGC). Technical Report No. 2. Institute of Human Research, USA.
2. Onibon, F.A. 2000. From participation to responsibility. *Forest, Tree and People*. Kathmandu, Nepal. 42; 46-50.
3. Panandikar, V.A. Pai and A.K. Mehra. 1986. People's participation in family planning. New Delhi: Uppal Publication.
4. Paulo Freire. 1975. Education for critical consciousness, Education as the practice of freedom. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Rio de Janeiro.
5. Santhanam, M.L., C. Yogendrasastry and S. Vijaya Kumar. 1984. People's Participation: Some psychological Dimensions. *Journal of Rural Development* 3: 249-329.
6. Uphoff, Norman. 1987. Approaches to community participation in agriculture and rural development, Cornell University Rural Development Committee.