



## Group Conformity and Social Loafing Among Indoor Games Player & Outdoor Games Players: A Correlative Study

Chavan Nitin Sitaram  
Jige Subhash Vitthalrao

### Introduction:

The word conformity means an action with in accord with prevailing social stands, attitudes, practices etc. It may be correspondence in form, nature, or character; agreement, congruity, or accordance. This influence occurs in small groups and society as a whole, and may result from subtle unconscious influences, or direct and overt social pressure. Conformity can occur in the presence of others, or when an individual is alone. For example, people tend to follow social norms when eating or watching television, even when alone. Conformity is often associated with adolescence and youth culture, but strongly affects humans of all ages. Although peer pressure may manifest negatively, conformity can have good or bad effects depending on the situation.

In the social psychology of groups, social loafing is the phenomenon of people deliberately exerting less effort to achieve a goal when they work in a group than when they work alone. This is seen as one of the main reasons groups are sometimes less productive than the combined performance of their members working as individuals, but should be distinguished from the accidental coordination problems that groups sometime experience.

**Objective:** Objective of the study was to investigate the group conformity and social loafing among Indoor Game Players and Outdoor Game Players.

### Hypotheses:

- 1) There is no significant difference in group conformity among Indoor Game Players and Outdoor Game Players.
- 2) There is no significant difference in social loafing among Indoor Game Players and Outdoor Game Players.



**Research Methodology:**

**Sample and Data collection:**

As a sample for present study, total 90 games players were taken from Aurangabad city (45 - Indoor Game Players + 45 Outdoor Game Players). The age range of sample players were of 18-23 years . Purposive sampling technique was used for choosing samples. Group conformity scale and social loafing scale were administered individuals as well as a small group. While collecting the data for the study the later approaches was adopted.

**Tools**

**Group Conformity Scale:**

The test of group conformity is developed and standardized by Q.G.Alam and Dr.Ramji Shrivastava. All the items of the scale are presented in simple and brisk style. Each of the item has two answer (multiple Choice) ‘YES’ and ‘NO’ The test has high reliability and validity coefficients.

**Social Loafing:**

Social Loafing scale by Q.G.Alam and Dr. Ramji Srivastava (1990) has been used. The responses obtained on a three point scale were scored as 0, 1, and 2. An individual subject could secure a minimum of zero and a maximum of 30 marks in either of the conditions in individual or group a – 0 mark, b – 1 mark, c – 2 mark. The reliability and validity of social loafing scale was determined.

**Variable**

**Independent variable-** Type of Players : a) Indoor b) Outdoor

**Dependent Variable:** Group Conformity and Social Loafing

**Analysis and Discussion.**

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, 't' values

Dimension	Outdoor Game Players (N=45)		Indoor Game Players (N=45)		't'	df	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Group Conformity	38.49	4.63	24.74	4.21	7.50**	88	< .01
Social Loafing	38.60	5.69	45.77	6.28	7.40**	88	< .01



Table 1 shows that, the Mean of Outdoor Game Players an dimension group conformity was 38.49 and mean of Indoor Game Players on dimension group conformity was 24.74 the difference between the two mean was highly significant  $(88)=7.50.$ ,  $p < .01$ . It indicates that, null hypothesis had been rejecting there was no significant difference between team and Indoor Game Players with respect to group conformity. Alternative hypothesis has been accepted which reveals that, Outdoor Game Players had significant high group conformity than the Indoor Game Players.

Mean of Outdoor Game Players on dimension group conformity was 38.60 and mean of Indoor Game Players on dimension social loafing was 45.77, the difference between the two mean was highly significant  $t(88)=7.40.$ ,  $p < .01$ . Null hypothesis had been rejecting there was no significant difference between team and Indoor Game Players with respect to social loafing. Alternative hypothesis has been accepted which reveals that Indoor Game Players had significantly high social loafing than Outdoor Game Players.

#### **References :**

- Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., & Akert, R. M. (2007). *Social Psychology* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Upper Saddle River. NJ: Person Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Fletcher. G.J.O. and Clark, M.S. (eds) (2001) *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology; Inerpersonal Process*. Oxford: Black well
- Karua, Steven J.; Williams, Kipling D. (1993). “ Social loafing; A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration”. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 65 (4): 681-706
- Zaccaro, S.J. (1984) Social loafing; The role of task attractiveness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 99-106.