GROUP AND ITS ROLE IN REGULARITY OF AN ORGANIZATION

Yahya Naghizadeh[1], Horiyeh Shahzadeh[2]
1- Ph.D Student of Strategic Management of Passive Defense, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran
2- MS.C Student of Exercise Management, Teheran Pardis University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT: There are a variety of legal types of organizations, including corporations, governments, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, armed forces, charities, not-for-profit corporations, partnerships, cooperatives, and universities. A hybrid organization is a body that operates in both the public sector and the private sector simultaneously, fulfilling public duties and developing commercial market activities. A voluntary association is an organization consisting of volunteers. Such organizations may be able to operate without legal formalities, depending on jurisdiction, including informal clubs. Organizations may also operate in secret and/or illegally in the case of secret societies, criminal organizations and resistance movements.
KEYWORDS: Group, Organization, Regularity.

INTRODUCTION

In the social sciences a social group has been defined as two or more people who interact with one another, share similar characteristics and collectively have a sense of unity (Turner, 1982). Other theorists, however, are a wary of definitions which stress the importance of interdependence or objective similarity (Platow et al., 2011; Turner, 1982). Instead, for researchers in the social identity tradition "a group is defined in terms of those who identify themselves as members of the group"(Reicher, 1982). Regardless, social groups come in a myriad of sizes and varieties. For example, a society can be viewed as a large social group.

GENERAL COMMENTS

2.1. The social cohesion approach
A social group exhibits some degree of social cohesion and is more than a simple collection or aggregate of individuals, such as people waiting at a bus stop, or people waiting in a line. Characteristics shared by members of a group may include interests, values, representations, ethnic or social background, and kinship ties. Kinship ties being a social bond based on common ancestry, marriage, or adoption. In a similar vein, some researchers consider the defining characteristic of a group as social interaction (Hare, 1962).
Renowned social psychologist Muzafer Sherif formulated a technical definition with the following elements:

A social unit consisting of a number of individuals interacting with each other with respect to:
1. Common motives and goals
2. An accepted division of labor, i.e. roles
3. Established status (social rank, dominance) relationships
4. Accepted norms and values with reference to matters relevant to the group
5. Development of accepted sanctions (praise and punishment) if and when norms were respected or violated (Muzafer and Carolyn, 1956)

Though a group can have any number of members, Sherif held that the optimal size is three persons. A group of three persons can achieve better problem solving abilities than the best three or more individuals can accomplish individually. Group behaviours have a beneficial effect thus in augmenting the group's abilities and at the same time it has a detrimental or negative effect also. This is because members at wrong stimuli can launch into destructive endeavors, since their wrongdoings will not be found out as individual wrongdoings or of a single person; they have the cover of the group. An example being individuals forming a violent mob burning buses and destroying other public properties.

This definition is long and complex, but it is also precise. It succeeds at providing the researcher with the tools required to answer three important questions:
1. "How is a group formed?"

Corresponding Author: Yahya Naghizadeh, Ph.D Student of Strategic Management of Passive Defense, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran. **E-mail:** nagizadeh47@hotmail.com

----

2. "How does a group function?"
3. "How does one describe those social interactions that occur on the way to forming a group?"

2.2. Significance of that definition
The attention of those who use, participate in, or study groups has focused on functioning groups, on larger organizations, or on the decisions made in these organizations (Herbert, 1976). Much less attention has been paid to the more ubiquitous and universal social behaviors that do not clearly demonstrate one or more of the five necessary elements described by Sherif.

Some of the earliest efforts to understand these social units have been the extensive descriptions of urban street gangs in the 1920s and 1930s, continuing through the 1950s, which understood them to be largely reactions to the established authority (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). The primary goal of gang members was to defend gang territory, and to define and maintain the dominance structure within the gang. There remains in the popular media and urban law enforcement agencies an avid interest in gangs, reflected in daily headlines which emphasize the criminal aspects of gang behavior. However, these studies and the continued interest have not improved the capacity to influence gang behavior or to reduce gang related violence.

The relevant literature on animal social behaviors, such as work on territory and dominance, has been available since the 1950s. Also, they have been largely neglected by policy makers, sociologists and anthropologists. Indeed, vast literature on organization, property, law enforcement, ownership, religion, warfare, values, conflict resolution, authority, rights, and families have grown and evolved without any reference to any analogous social behaviors in animals. This disconnect may be the result of the belief that social behavior in humankind is radically different from the social behavior in animals because of the human capacity for language use and rationality. Of course, while this is true, it is equally likely that the study of the social (group) behaviors of other animals might shed light on the evolutionary roots of social behavior in people.

Territorial and dominance behaviors in humans are so universal and commonplace that they are simply taken for granted (though sometimes admired, as in home ownership, or deplored, as in violence). But these social behaviors and interactions between human individuals play a special role in the study of groups: *they are necessarily prior to the formation of groups*. The

psychological internalization of territorial and dominance experiences in conscious and unconscious memory are established through the formation of social identity, personal identity, body concept, or self-concept. An adequately functioning individual identity is necessary before an individual can function in a division of labor (role), and hence, within a cohesive group. Coming to understand territorial and dominance behaviors may thus help to clarify the development, functioning, and productivity of groups.

2.3. The social identification approach
Explicitly contrasted against a social cohesion based definition for social groups is the social identity perspective, which draws on insights made in social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Here, rather than defining a social group based on expressions of cohesive social relationships between individuals, the social identity model assumes that "psychological group membership has primarily a perceptual or cognitive basis" (Turner, 1982). It posits that the necessary and sufficient condition for individuals to act as group members is "awareness of a common category membership" and that a social group can be "usefully conceptualized as a number of individuals who have internalized the same social category membership as a component of their self-concept" (Turner, 1982). Stated otherwise, while the social cohesion approach expects group members to ask 'who am I attracted to?', the social identity perspective expects group members to simply ask 'who am I?'.

Empirical support for the social identity perspective on groups was initially drawn from work using the minimal group paradigm. For example, it has been shown that the mere act of allocating individuals to explicitly random categories is sufficient to lead individuals to act in an ingroup favouring fashion (even where no individual self-interest is possible) (Tajfel *et al.,* 1971). Also problematic for the social cohesion account is recent research showing that seemingly meaningless categorization can be an antecedent of perceptions of interdependence with fellow category members.

While the roots of this approach to social groups had its foundations in social identity theory, more concerted exploration of these ideas occurred later in the form of self-categorization theory (Turner and Reynolds, 2001). Whereas social identity theory was directed initially at the explanation of intergroup conflict in the absence of any conflict of interests, self-categorization

----

theory was developed to explain how individuals come to perceive themselves as members of a group in the first place, and how this self-grouping process underlies and determines all subsequent aspects of group behavior (Turner, 1987).

2.4. Types of groups

Primary groups According to Charles Horton Cooley (1864–1929), a primary group is a small social group whose members share personal and lasting relationships. People joined in primary relationships spend a great deal of time together, engage in a wide range of activities, and feel that they know one another well. In short, they show real concern for one another. In every society, the family is the most important primary group. Groups based on lasting friendships are also primary groups (Gerber and Linda, 2010).

Secondary groups, in contrast to primary groups, are large groups involving formal and institutional relationships. Secondary relationships involve weak emotional ties and little personal knowledge of one another. Most secondary groups are short term, beginning and ending without particular significance. They may last for years or may disband after a short time. The formation of primary groups happens within secondary groups.

Primary groups can be present in secondary settings. For example, attending a university exemplifies membership of a secondary group, while the friendships that are made there would be considered a primary group that you belong to. Likewise, some businesses care deeply about the well-being of one another, while some immediate families have hostile relations within it.

Individuals almost universally have a bond toward what sociologists call reference groups. A reference group is a social group that serves as a point of reference in making evaluations and decisions (Gerber and Linda, 2010).

2.5. Development of a group

If one brings a small collection of strangers together in a restricted space and environment, provides a common goal and maybe a few ground rules, then a highly probable course of events will follow. Interaction between individuals is the basic requirement. At first, individuals will differentially interact in sets of twos or threes while seeking to interact with those with whom they share something in common: i.e., interests, skills, and cultural background. Relationships will develop some stability in these small sets, in that individuals may temporarily change from one set to another, but will return to the same pairs or trios rather consistently and resist change. Particular twosomes and threesomes will stake out their special spots within the overall space (Bales, 1950).

Again depending on the common goal, eventually twosomes and threesomes will integrate into larger sets of six or eight, with corresponding revisions of territory, dominance-ranking, and further differentiation of roles. All of this seldom takes place without some conflict or disagreement: for example, fighting over the distribution of resources, the choices of means and different subgoals, the development of what are appropriate norms, rewards and punishments. Some of these conflicts will be territorial in nature: i.e., jealousy over roles, or locations, or favored relationships. But most will be involved with struggles for status, ranging from mild protests to serious verbal conflicts and even dangerous violence.

By analogy to animal behavior, sociologists may term these behaviors *territorial behaviors* and *dominance behaviors*. Depending on the pressure of the common goal and on the various skills of individuals, differentiations of leadership, dominance, or authority will develop. Once these relationships solidify, with their defined roles, norms, and sanctions, a productive group will have been established (Paul, 1959).

Aggression is the mark of unsettled dominance order. Productive group cooperation requires that both dominance order and territorial arrangements (identity, self-concept) be settled with respect to the common goal and with respect to the particular group. Often some individuals will withdraw from interaction or be excluded from the developing group. Depending on the number of individuals in the original collection of strangers, and the number of hangers-on that are tolerated, one or more competing groups of ten or less may form, and the competition for territory and dominance will then also be manifested in the intergroup transactions.

2.6. Dispersal and transformation of groups

Two or more people in interacting situations will over time develop stable territorial relationships. As described above, these may or may not develop into groups. But stable groups can also break up in to several sets of territorial relationships. There are numerous reasons for stable groups to "malfunction" or to disperse, but essentially this is because of loss of compliance with one or more elements of the definition of group provided by Sherif. The two most common causes of a malfunctioning group

----

are the addition of too many individuals, and the failure of the leader to enforce a common purpose, though malfunctions may occur due to a failure of any of the other elements (i.e., confusions status or of norms).

In a society, there is an obvious need for more people to participate in cooperative endeavors than can be accommodated by a few separate groups. The military has been the best example as to how this is done in its hierarchical array of squads, platoons, companies, battalions, regiments, and divisions. Private companies, corporations, government agencies, clubs, and so on have all developed comparable (if less formal and standardized) systems when the number of members or employees exceeds the number that can be accommodated in an effective group. Not all larger social structures require the cohesion that may be found in the small group. Consider the neighborhood, the country club, or the megachurch, which are basically territorial organizations who support large social purposes. Any such large organizations may need only islands of cohesive leadership.

For a functioning group to attempt to add new members in a casual way is a certain prescription for failure, loss of efficiency, or disorganization. The number of functioning members in a group can be reasonably flexible between five and ten, and a long-standing cohesive group may be able to tolerate a few hangers on. The key concept is that the value and success of a group is obtained by each member maintaining a distinct, functioning identity in the minds of each of the members. The cognitive limit to this span of attention in individuals is often set at seven. Rapid shifting of attention can push the limit to about ten. After ten, subgroups will inevitably start to form with the attendant loss of purpose, dominance-order, and individuality, with confusion of roles and rules. The standard classroom with twenty to forty pupils and one teacher offers a rueful example of one supposed leader juggling a number of subgroups (Ralph, 1974).

Weakening of the common purpose once a group is well established can be attributed to: adding new members; unsettled conflicts of identities (i.e., territorial problems in individuals); weakening of a settled dominance-order; and weakening or failure of the leader to tend to the group. The actual loss of a leader is frequently fatal to a group, unless there was lengthy preparation for the transition. The loss of the leader tends to dissolve all dominance relationships, as well as weakening dedication to common purpose, differentiation of roles, and

maintenance of norms. The most common symptoms of a troubled group are loss of efficiency, diminished participation, or weakening of purpose, as well as an increase in verbal aggression. Often, if a strong common purpose is still present, a simple reorganization with a new leader and a few new members will be sufficient to re-establish the group, which is somewhat easier than forming an entirely new group. This is the most common factor.

CONCLUSION

Group dynamics was founded by sociologists and psychologists, but it has spread to many other branches of the social sciences. The relevance of groups to topics studied in many academic and applied disciplines gives group dynamics an interdisciplinary character. For example, researchers who prefer to study individuals may find themselves wondering what impact group participation will have on individuals' cognitions, attitudes, and behavior. Those who study organizations may find that these larger social entities actually depend on the dynamics of small subgroups within the organization. Social scientists examining such global issues as the development and maintenance of culture may find themselves turning their attention toward small groups as the unit of cultural transmission.

REFERENCES

Bales RF. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. MA: Addison-Wesley 1950;pp:33.

Gerber M, Linda J. Sociology 7th Canadian Ed. Toronto, Ontario: Pearson Canada Inc. 2010;pp:149.

Hare AP. Handbook of small group research. New York, Macmillan Publishers 1962.

Herbert SA. Administrative Behavior. 3rd ed. Free Press 1976;pp:123-153.

Muzafer SH, Carolyn SH. An Outline of Social Psychology. Harper & Brothers, New York 1956;pp:143–180.

Paul SJ. Animal Behavior. The University of Chicago Press 1959:pp:281.

Platow MJ, Grace DM, Smithson MJ. Examining the Preconditions for Psychological Group Membership: Perceived Social Interdependence as the Outcome of Self-Categorization. Social Psychological and Personality Science 2011;3(1):225.

Ralph L. Primate Aggression, Territoriality, and Xenophobia. Academic Press, New York, and London 1974;pp:496.

Reicher SD. The determination of collective behaviour. In: Tajfel H (Ed.), Social identity

----

and intergroup relations. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1982;pp:41-83.

Tajfel H, Billig M, Bundy RP, Flament C. Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. European Journal of Social Psychology 1971;2:149-178.

Tajfel H, Turner JC. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin WG, Worchel S (Eds.), the social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey 1979;pp:33–47.

Turner JC, Reynolds KH. The Social Identity Perspective in Intergroup Relations: Theories, Themes, and Controversies. In: Brown Gaertner SL. Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology 2001;3(1).

Turner JC. Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory. Oxford: Blackwell 1987;pp:42-67.

Turner JC. Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In: Tajfel H. Social identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 1982;pp:15–40.