

The Effectiveness of Group Cohesiveness Training in Reducing Social Loafing

Rosalia Katarina Lamanepa¹, M. K. P. Abdy Keraf², R. Pasifikus Ch. Wijaya³

¹⁻³ Psychology Department, Nusa Cendana University

email : [1rosaliakatarinalamanepa@gmail.com](mailto:rosaliakatarinalamanepa@gmail.com), [2mcharryt4s@yahoo.com](mailto:mcharryt4s@yahoo.com),

[3pcwijaya@staf.undana.ac.id](mailto:pcwijaya@staf.undana.ac.id)

Abstract. Group cohesiveness training is a series of processes to develop and improve work by attracting group members and being motivated to remain within the group. This study aims to determine whether group cohesiveness training is effective in reducing social loafing on a group of Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA). This study used an experimental method with a one-group pretest-posttest research design. The subjects of this study used a total population of 28 subjects and only 25 people attended the training until completion. Using 4 aspects namely self-esteem, problem-solving, task cohesiveness, and social cohesiveness. Measure training using Mulvey's Social Loafing Scale and Carron's Cohesion Scale. Data analysis using paired sample test. Based on the analysis of research data, social loafing variables scored 0,337, and group cohesiveness scored 0,000. This shows that group cohesiveness training is less effective in reducing social loafing but is effective in increasing group cohesiveness.

Keywords: *social loafing, group cohesiveness training*

Abstrak. Pelatihan kohesivitas kelompok adalah serangkaian proses untuk mengembangkan serta meningkatkan kerja dengan menjadikan anggota kelompok saling tertarik dan termotivasi untuk tetap berada dalam kelompok tersebut. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah pelatihan kohesivitas kelompok efektif untuk menurunkan *social loafing* pada kelompok Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode eksperimen dengan desain penelitian *one-group pretest posttest*. Subjek penelitian ini menggunakan keseluruhan jumlah populasi sebanyak 28 subjek dan hanya 25 orang yang mengikuti pelatihan hingga selesai. Menggunakan 4 aspek yakni harga diri, *problem solving*, kohesivitas tugas dan kohesivitas sosial. Pengukuran pelatihan menggunakan skala *social loafing* dari Mulvey dan skala kohesivitas dari Carron. Analisis data menggunakan *paired sample test*. Berdasarkan analisis data penelitian, variabel *social loafing* mendapat nilai 0,337 dan kohesivitas kelompok mendapat nilai 0,000. Ini menunjukkan bahwa pelatihan kohesivitas kelompok kurang efektif menurunkan *social loafing* tetapi efektif menaikkan kohesivitas kelompok.

Kata Kunci: *social loafing, pelatihan kohesivitas kelompok*

Article history:

Received : 20 February 2021

Received in revised form : 19 March 2021

Accepted : 20 March 2021

Available online : 7 June 2021

Introduction

Humans are social beings that are interdependent. The role of humans as social beings leads to humans having the urge to interact with other humans (Umanailo, 2016). The interaction that results from this addiction creates a social need to live in groups. The need to make friends with other people is often based on the similarity of each person's characteristics or interests (Umanailo, 2016). This is called a social group.

According to Sarwono & Eko (2018), a group consists of two or more people who are perceived and perceived as a unit. There is interaction and interdependence to achieve common goals and to feel like a group. However, there are many difficulties and obstacles that will be experienced which will result in ineffective group strength and decrease the group's fighting strength. People become discouraged, morale drops, and they don't care about being together in group life. Situations like this lead to one of the social phenomena we know as social loafing.

Social loafing means less motivation and effort when individuals work in groups than when they work individually (Baron & Nyla, 2011). This symptom can be very harmful to the group if not treated promptly. Sarwono & Eko (2018) suggest a way to reduce social loafing by increasing people's commitment to mutual success, as groups are motivated to strive to achieve group goals. This refers to one of the local common groups, namely the Gemohing in Adonara, East Flores, which exhibits local culture, friendship, and togetherness similar to cohesiveness.

The term "gemohing" or "gemohi" or "moit" comes from the word Lamaholot (local language), namely: "gemohe", which means to take turns helping or working together, based on the principle of helping or serving one another without sharing the strengths and weaknesses of each differentiate (Tokan, 2019). One group that uses the Gemohing concept is Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA).

PEKKA is a group of weavers who live alone and have no husbands. They formed the group to improve their economy and well-being. They meet once a week with the indication that each member is divided into tasks before the meeting and that each of them is obliged to carry out her tasks when the meeting arrives. In the short interview that was conducted, it was said that some members were lazing around doing group tasks, and there

were also some workers who contributed no less to group tasks. This symptom is related to a non-cohesive group.

Cohesiveness is a positive and negative strength that leads to members staying in the group (Taylor et al., 2009). Lam (2015) suggests that one way to reduce social loafing is to increase the quality of communication and the cohesion of tasks. Anggreani and Alfian (2015) also suggest that having a group of members with high cohesion means that the members have responsibilities and often act as a group. This shows that social loafing and cohesion are linked.

When talking about groups and a problem that arises in an organization or group, the first thing that is often done is to solve it with a training program (Silberman & Auerbach, 2006). Training is a technique that allows you to review what has been learned, how the participants are changing, and what further steps can be taken (Silberman & Auerbach, 2006). Based on this explanation, it can be said that one of them can use the group cohesiveness training method to reduce social loafing.

Method

This research was conducted in the Witiham District, Adonara, East Flores Regency from December 2019 to January 2020. This type of research is a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental research design and a pre-test-post-test design for a group. The population in this study were all members of the PEKKA with a total of 28 people. The sample in this study was taken from the entire population, namely 25 people who had attended the training by the time it was completed.

The variables examined were social loafing and group cohesion. The social loafing scale consists of 13 items, of which 11 are favorite items and 2 are unfavorable items. This scale adapts the Social Loafing Scale developed by Mulvey (1998). Testing of the measuring device with 144 people. The test results show that the social loafing scale has an alpha of 0.836. The distribution of the social loafing scale is as follows:

Table 1.
The distribution of the social loafing scale

Number	Aspect	Items		Items Failed	Items Reliable
		F	UF		
1.	Perceived Social Loafing	2, 4	1, 5	1, 5	2, 4
2.	Anticipated Lower Effort	7, 8, 10, 12	-	10	7, 8, 12
3.	Sucker Effect	3, 6, 9, 11, 13	-	11	3, 6, 9, 13
	Total	11	2	4	9

From the table above, it can be concluded that 4 items have failed and 9 items have been declared reliable and can be used to measure a person's social loafing.

The scale used for group cohesiveness is that of Carron et al. (1985) developed the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ), which consists of 18 items with 16 favorite items and 2 unfavorable items. The test of the measuring device was carried out with 144 people. The test results show that the group cohesiveness scale has an alpha value of 0.900. The distribution of the group cohesiveness scale is as follows:

Table 2.
The distribution of the group cohesiveness scale

Number	Aspect	Items		Items Failed	Items Reliable
		F	UF		
1.	Individual attractions to the group-task	2,4,6,8	-	-	2,4,6,8
2.	Individual attraction to the group-social	1,3,5,9	7	7	1,3,5,9
3.	Group intregation-task	10,12,14, 16,18	-	-	10,12,14, 16,18
4.	Group intregation-social	13,15,17	11	11	13,15,17
	Total	16	2	2	16

From the table above it can be concluded that 2 items failed and 16 items were declared reliable and can be used to measure a person's group cohesion.

Result

1. Characteristics of the respondents

The participants in this study were PEKKA group Ina Gelekat and lived in the village of Watoone, Withama District, Adonara, East Flores Regency. Ina Gelekat is a group

that was founded in December 2011. Ina Gelekat herself means mothers who work sincerely. Armed with it, the women who gathered formed a group to introduce weaving to communities outside of East Nusa Tenggara.

Aside from weaving, they also have other duties, namely managing threads such as twisting threads, splitting threads, and threading them into the boards. This group has a meeting schedule once a week, namely on Wednesdays. Aside from weaving, they also do a lot of work, some raising cattle, opening kiosks, and even selling in markets. The following is the distribution of data from the PEKKA group:

Table 3.

Age distribution of the participants of group Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA)

Age (Years)	Amount	
	N	%
47-51	3	12
52-56	3	12
57-61	11	44
62-66	6	24
72-76	2	8
Total	25	100

Table 3 above shows that there are 3 participants (12%) with an age range of 47-51 years, 3 participants (12%) with an age range of 52-56 years, and 11 participants (44%) with an age group of 57 -61 years, there were 6 participants (24%) with an age range of 62-66 years and 2 participants (8%) with an age range of 72-76 years. The above data shows that most participants were from mothers between the ages of 57 and 61.

Table 4.

Distribution of the educational level of group Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA)

Education	Amount	
	N	%
Not graduate	3	12
Elementary School	15	60
Junior High School	4	16
Senior High School	2	8
Bachelor's Degree	1	4
Total	25	100

Table 4 shows that there were 3 participants (12%) who did not graduate, up to 15 participants (60%) with an elementary school education level (SD), 4 participants (16%) with a Junior High School education level (SMP), up to 2 participants (8%) with a senior high school education level (SMA) and up to 1 participant (4%) with a bachelor's degree (S1). The

data above shows that most participants came from mothers with an elementary school level (SD).

2. Location

The research location for the training was on the border of the village of Watoone, about 1 km from the place where the researchers lived. The research area has an area of 8 x 20 m. The research process uses two places, a place for group discussions and a place for games.

For research purposes, the location is first regulated by cleaning, namely: (1) preparing and cleaning the place (2) preparing the LCD projector (3) preparing the chairs (4) the training is held during the day to get better (5) prepare tools and materials (6) ensure safety. Everything was done together with the research assistant.

3. Implementation Process

Table 5.
Series of group cohesiveness training of group Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga (PEKKA)

Meeting	Materi	Time
Session 1	Opening	20 minutes
	Pre-test	20 minutes
	Groups Revitalization	40 minutes
	Theory	14 minutes
	Video	5 minutes
	Games	25 minutes
	Debriefing	35 minutes
Session 2	Theory	17 minutes
	Video	10 minutes
	Games	30 minutes
	Debriefing	30 minutes
	Post-test	15 minutes

Table 5 shows that the research time was carried out in 2 sessions. At the first meeting it was opened by the chairman of the Family Welfare Empowerment and the chairman of Ina Gelekat, then an ice-breaking. Then they form groups and complete the pre-test. The group then discussed resuscitation of the group, the results of the discussion being made a priority by the group. Followed by problem-solving material and self-esteem, then gaming. Then concluded with a debriefing.

The second meeting begun with an ice breaker, presented the material in terms of group cohesiveness and social cohesion, games, and then proceeded to the final debriefing. The meeting ended with a post-test.

4. Monitoring

The training was carried out twice, on Saturday (January 4th, 2020) and on Wednesday (January 8th, 2020). The training time starts at 10.30 a.m. - 3 p.m. WITA. The implementation of the data acquisition was carried out twice, namely before and after the test. There are 5 assistants to assist researchers in the research process.

The pre-test process is carried out at the first meeting. In small groups, each assistant joined the group, then gave each person the scale and stationery, and then explained the assistant for each question. The post-test process is carried out at the second meeting after the training is finished. The post-test was carried out in one of the group members' homes, divided by the scale and writing implements, and then completed while listening to the assistant's explanation.

5. The results of the analysis of the effectiveness of group cohesion training in social loafing

a. Normality test

The results of the normality test for social loafing and group cohesion with SPSS are shown in the table below:

Table 6.

Normality test

Variable	Sig.	A	Information
Social loafing (pre-test)	0,081	0,05	Normal
Group cohesion (pre-test)	0,436	0,05	Normal

From table 6 it can be concluded that the significance level for the variable social loafing (pre-test) is $p = 0.081 (> 0.05)$, which means that the data are normally distributed and the group cohesiveness variable (pre-test) $p = 0.436 (> 0.05)$, which means that the data is normally distributed.

b. Linearity test

The results of the linearity test for social loafing and group cohesion with SPSS are shown in the table below:

Table 7.

Linearity Test

Variable	Sig.	A	Information
Social loafing dan Group cohesion (pre-test)	0,013	0,05	Linear

Based on the table, it shows that the correlation coefficient for social loafing and group cohesiveness is 0.013, that the correlation is significant at 0.05, and that they have a linear relationship. This means that social loafing and group cohesion (pre-test) have a linear relationship.

c. Paired sample test

The results of the paired sample test for social loafing and group cohesion using SPSS are shown in the following table:

Table 8.

Paired sample test

Variable	Pre	Post	Sig
Group cohesion	67,72	72,28	0,000
Social loafing	17,76	18,80	0,337

Table 8 shows that the significance level for the group cohesiveness variable (pretest-posttest) $p = 0.000 (<0.05)$ indicates that training is effective in increasing group cohesiveness, while the social loafing variable (pretest-posttest) $p = 0.337 (<0.05)$ indicates that the training was not effective in reducing social loafing.

d. Correlation Test

The results of the correlation test for social loafing and group cohesion using SPSS are shown in the following table:

Table 9.

Correlation test

Variable	R	Sig.
Group cohesion dan Social loafing (pre-test)	-0,421	0,036
Group cohesion dan Social loafing (post-test)	-0,247	0,234

Table 9 above shows that the coefficient of correlation between the variable for group cohesiveness and social loafing on the pre-test is -0.421, which is negative, meaning that changes in the two variables are in different directions. Using the above criteria, it can be seen that the correlation of the two variables $p = 0.036 (<0.05)$ has a significant relationship.

This shows that the two variables are negatively correlated, meaning that social loafing decreases as group cohesion increases. While it was -0.247 in the post-test with the correlation of the two variables $p = 0.234 (> 0.05)$, there was no significant relationship. This shows that the two variables are unrelated.

Discussion

1. There is no significant effect of cohesion training in reducing social loafing

This is indicated by the pre-group cohesion training mean score on social loafing of 17.76, and after participation the mean score was 18.80, or in other words, group cohesiveness training was not effective in reducing social loafing.

This is because there are technical limitations in this field, so the research time will be shortened and the training module will be fixed in a short time. Based on Skinner's learning theory in Hergenhahn and Olson (2008), it is said that behavioral changes stem from the learning process. The behavioral changes takes a long time, supported by studies by Lally et al. (2010) suggests that the formation of a new behavior takes quite a long time, namely 21 days, so that it becomes a behavior that occurs automatically without the need for self-control. This determines why the exercise did not effectively reduce social loafing due to the short exercise time.

Another related factor is that could be caused by the research design. The one-group research design is considered a not good design as there is no comparison or control group (Seniati & Setiadi, 2017). However, the one-group design is the most widely used design as researchers often do not have the power in everyday life or it is very difficult to form research groups.

2. The training of group cohesiveness has a significant effect on increasing group cohesiveness

The mean cohesiveness value before participating in group cohesiveness training is 67.72. After performing group cohesiveness training, the mean value was 72.28. This indicates that the mean value increases due to participation in group cohesion training. This shows that group cohesiveness training is effective in increasing group cohesiveness.

This is in line with the research by Glass and Benshoff (2002), in which it is said that the increase in group cohesion is due to every challenge in daily life and the challenges given do not directly describe the training goals, but rather the participants themselves draw conclusions out of the process.

Another study conducted by Setianingtyas and Darokah (2013) states that cohesiveness arises when team members acquire part of the team's social identity. Cohesiveness is the glue that holds the group together and ensures that its members meet their commitments. In line with the theory of experiential learning, it has been proven that the more actively the participants participate in training activities, the higher the score. In addition, the provision of training through the experimental learning method is one of the appropriate learning processes to train and improve development in adults (Prihadi, 2004).

3. There is a negative relationship between group cohesion and social loafing

Based on the results of the data analysis, there are differences in the pre-test and post-test. The pre-test shows that there is a negative correlation between group cohesion and social loafing. The results of this study are in line with the research by Krisnasari (2017) that group members also like to strive for good outcomes for the group, so that together they try to meet the expectations of the group. Another study by Anggreani and Ilham (2015) found that individuals are willing to sacrifice for their groups and are happy to invest their efforts in the group.

The post-test shows that there is no correlation between cohesion and social loafing. This is due to various factors, such as the research process. Participants appeared to be actively participating in the activity, but were less active in asking questions. It appears from the material that when the researcher finished the material, the researcher asked if something was not understood or understood, she could ask questions, but no one asked. It is made clear by Skinner in Hergenhahn and Olson (2008; 127) that learning will take place effectively if there is a possibility for learners to provide immediate feedback on the learning process, regardless of whether or not they understood the information correctly. In addition, Hasibuan & Moedjiono (2012) affirmed that asking questions is an effective stimulus that promotes thinking skills. This process is the same as that of researchers, ie when researchers provide material or explanations about the research, participants are less active in asking questions. This learning process is necessary to achieve maximum conceptual mastery. This leads to less than optimal results in the post test results.

Another factor is the debriefing process: participants who gave their opinion gained and some gave positive opinions, but not all gave their own opinion. This made the final

stage debriefing process less optimal and affected the post-test process. Consistent with the opinion of Munthe (2015), the assessment is helpful in determining whether a program is worth continuing, revising, or stopping as it is considered useless. The assessment also measures the performance of each implemented program.

The results of this study show that correlation does not lead to causality. Mill's opinion (Hastjarjo, 2011) is that a causal relationship can be established when the cause precedes the effect, the cause is related to the effect, and there is no plausible explanation for the effect other than the cause. This makes the variable part of the group cohesiveness a condition sufficient to, in combination with other constellations of factors, bring about a decrease in social loafing. However, a constellation of factors such as group cohesion is not a necessary condition as there is a collection of other factors such as group size, skills and occupation that can also lead to a reduction in social loafing (Hastjarjo, 2011).

Conclusion

Based on the results of the research conducted, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. There is no effectiveness of group cohesiveness training in influencing decline in social loafing. This means that group cohesion training has not helped to motivate individuals to work in groups and to persuade individuals to remain attached to the group.
2. There is the effectiveness of group cohesiveness training in influencing the increase in cohesion. This means that group cohesion training can help individuals unite and remain in the group.
3. There are differences in the results of the analysis in the pretest-posttest. This shows that the cohesion of the group was unable to effectively show a clear connection with social loafing.

Suggestion

For community groups, it is suggested that the general public can find out information about the phenomenon of social loafing in order to identify it in groups and reduce the extent of social loafing that occurs. For educational institutions, it is suggested that educational institutions should be able to provide alternative literature in the form of social phenomena that arise in society, particularly problems closely related to social groups such as social loafing. For other researchers, it is suggested that more researchers may learn more about experimental research, especially in the context of related training that focuses on social loafing and cohesiveness.

References

- Anggraeni, F., & Alfian, I. N. (2015). Hubungan kohesivitas dan social loafing dalam pengerjaan tugas berkelompok pada Mahasiswa Psikologi Universitas Airlangga. *Jurnal Psikologi Kepribadian dan Sosial*, 4(2), 81-87
- Baron, R. A., Nyla R. B. (2011). *Social Psychology (13th Edition)*. Pearson Education
- Carron, Albert., & Brawley, Lawrence. (2000). Cohesion: Conceptual and Measurement Issues. *Small Group Research*, 31, 89-106.
- Glass, J. S., & Benshoff, J. M. (2002). Facilitating group cohesion among adolescents through challenge course experiences. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 25(2), 268-277
- Hasibuan & Moedjiono. (2012). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya
- Hastjarjo, T. D. (2011). Kausalitas menurut tradisi Donald Campbell. *Buletin Psikologi*. 19(1)
- Hergenhahn, B.R. & Matthew H. O. (2008). *Theories of Learning (Edisi Ketujuh)*. Jakarta: PT. Fajar Interpratama Mandiri
- Krisnasari, E. S. D., & Purnomo, J. T. (2017). Hubungan Kohesivitas Dengan Kemalasan Sosial Pada Mahasiwa. *Jurnal Psikologi UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim*, 13(1), 13-21
- Lally, P., Van Jaarsveld, C. H., Potts, H. W., & Wardle, J. (2010). How are habits formed: Modelling habit formation in the real world. *European journal of social psychology*, 40(6), 998-1009
- Lam, C. (2015). The role of communication and cohesion in reducing social loafing in group projects. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 78(4), 454-475

- Munthe, A. P. (2015). Pentingnya evaluasi program di institusi pendidikan: sebuah pengantar, pengertian, tujuan dan manfaat. *Scholaria: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 5(2), 1-14
- Prihadi, S. F. (2004). *Assessment centre*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Sarwono, S., & Eko A. M. (2018). *Psikologi sosial edisi 2*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika
- Seniati, L., Yulianto, A., & Setiadi, B., N. (2017). *Psikologi eksperimen*. Jakarta: PT Indeks
- Setianingtyas, A. F., Darokah. M. (2013). Pengaruh pelatihan team building untuk meningkatkan kohesivitas tim kerja di Inna Garuda Yogyakarta. *Empathy: Jurnal Fakultas Psikokologi*, 3(1), 1-30
- Silberman, M., & Auerbach, C. (2006). *Active training: A handbook of techniques, designs, case examples and tips*. San Fransisco: Pfeiffer
- Taylor, S. E., Letitia, A. P., & David, O. S. (2009). *Psikologi Sosial: Edisi Kesembilan*. Jakarta: Kencana
- Tokan, F. B. (2019, Agustus). Memahami peran dan sejarah Gemohing dalam pembangunan masyarakat. *Eposdigi.com*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eposdigi.com/2019/08/03/kearifan-lokal/memahami-peran-dan-sejarah-gemohing-dalam-pembangunan-masyarakat/> accessed on 30 August 2019
- Umanailo, M. C. B. (2016). *Ilmu Sosial dan Budaya Dasar*. Indonesia: FAM Publishing