

: S U M M A R Y :

In the early 1920's the social psychologists and the research worker of small group did not so much involve themselves in philosophical issues as with its methodology. In 1930's the small group researcher widened his field of study to include mass movement, prejudice rumour etc. In 1940's methodological development and empirical knowledge both acquired significance and gave thought to the study of leadership. In 1950's and 1960's particularly in the U.S.A. more interest was developed in the area and Festinger, Thibaut and Kelley were particularly responsible for focussing attention on the study of small groups.

In order that group dynamics was recognised as a relevant field of study the existence of a society promoting such a study was necessary. In the profession of social group work e.g. clubs, recreational groups, camps, athletic teams, it was realised that the technique of dealing with groups might prove rewarding by influencing behaviours, attitudes, personalities of the participants of these groups. The other professional field to have contributed to the study in the area was group

psychotherapy. Moreno also stressed the importance of psychotherapy in groups. His technique of role playing e.g. in psychodrama and sociodrama further contributed to research in group dynamics. The educationists thought it worthwhile to promote skills of leadership, cooperation, responsible membership and human relations. In the field of administration, management of larger organisation needed that the groups should be properly managed so as to yield better results in the fulfillment of the objects.

In the field of group dynamics the works of Lewin, Lippitt and white have made a significant contribution. The main objective of the researches done was to study the influence of experimentally induced group atmosphere on the individual members and group as such, groups of children aged about 10 and 11 years were formed to meet regularly over a period of several weeks and the leaders of these groups tried to induce the group atmosphere. While creating these groups, care was taken to ensure their initial compatability; by using sociometric test, play ground observations and teacher's interviews etc. The adult leaders behaved in a desired fashion for manipulating

experimentally the atmosphere of the group. The leadership also was categorised as democratic, autocratic and Laissez faire.

Kropotkin's work at the beginning of the century pointed to some of the social structures through which human cooperation has been carried on historically, and he offered many valuable insights into their functioning and context. His objective, however, was more moral than scientific. In India the early work of Radha Kamal Mukerjee and his students gave much attention to process of cooperation through which inter-family and inter-village projects were carried on in such areas.

Although cooperation is commonly contrasted with competition (a process in which efforts towards a common objective are separate and in rivalry with one another), it must be emphasised that the two rarely, if ever occur separately. Indeed, each may have a contributory relation to the other.

Competition requires at least a degree of prior cooperation that is necessary for the setting of rules and imposing of sanctions without which competition would dissolve into open war. Conversely it is doubtful that cooperation would be the major force it is, were it not for pressures of competition that spur some to cooperate with others as a means of enhancing their effectiveness in the struggle for existence. In any event, a purely cooperative or purely competitive relationship would be hard to imagine.

In groups which are motivated to cooperate all the members work towards a group goal which depends on interdependent activity on the part of the members, while in competition individual's reward depends upon his achievement which can usually be maximised only at the expense of other group members (May & Doob 1937).

Further in a cooperative social situation the goals for the individuals or subunits in the situation under consideration have the following characteristics - the goal regions for each of the individuals in the situation are defined so that a goal region can be entered (to some degree) by any given individual or subunit only if all

the individuals under consideration can also enter their respective goal regions (to some degree). All the members of the group are interdependent on each other and they have their common goals interrelated. In a Competitive social situation the goals for individuals or subunits in the situation under consideration have the following characteristic: If a goal region is entered by an individual or a subunit, the other individuals or subunits will to some degree, be unable to reach their respective goals in the social situation under consideration. The phrase contriiently interdependent goals will be used to identify any situation in which the individuals or the subunits composing it have their goals interrelated by the characteristic defined immediately above.

On an analysis of the cooperative situation it is revealed that if one individual makes a move in a direction the others also move in the same direction. On analysing the Competitive situation it is seen that the movement of an individual towards a goal has no necessary effect on the movement of others.

As indicated earlier small group research has assumed considerable importance in our modern social setting. The

study of the structure of the group and its dynamics can prove helpful in making the group function more effective. The questions that can be posed are whether the effective cooperation inside the group can yield better results or when the individuals within the group compete with each other. It was found that group members who have been motivated to cooperate, show more positive responses to each other, are more favourable in their perception, better involved in the task and have greater satisfaction with the task. (Stendler, Darmin and Haines 1951, Grossack 1954, Gotteil 1955, Harnack 1955, Phillips and D'Amico 1956, Thomas 1957, Mann and Nann 1959, Church 1962, Schmidt 1986, & Ollendick 1988). Because of their cooperative effort working at Cross purpose is considerably minimized and production increases (Mintz 1951, Schultz 1965, Kruglanski 1969, Gross et.al 1972, Lambert 1960, Raven and Eachus 1963, Dunn and Goldman 1966 K. H. Smith 1972). However, in case group members are not highly attracted to the group or to its goal, cooperation is likely to be minimized. The effect of cooperation will also be minimal if in 'doing the task, division of labour is not ensured (Hammond and Goldman 1961, Jones and Vroom 1964, Bruning and Mettee 1966, Richard & Joseph 1988, Peter & William 1987), or if the rewards for the individual cooperating

member is less than for the competing individuals (Rosenberg 1960, Miller and Hamblin 1963, W. P. Smith 1968 b, Samueles 1970, Weinstein and Holzbach - 1972, Hagman and Hays, 1986).

It has also been observed that in cases where the rewards for cooperative task is "Collective or group remuneration," the results of cooperation are not positive. In such cases "individual remuneration" Stimulated greater efficiency than group remuneration (Sorokin et al 1930). Usually cooperation within a group will increase if the group has to compete against another group (Sherif et al, 1961, Vinacke, 1964, Kalin and Morlowe 1968, Black and Mouton 1974).

Additional studies on cooperation and competition explore the effects of various member characteristics on group activity. These studies include (Kelley and Ring 1961, Dustin and Davis 1970, Faroqi 1973, Silverthorne, Chelcine and Imada 1974, Berg, Thomas R. 1991, Srivastava Ashok, 1986).

Thus in small group lot of researches have been done upon group cohesiveness, work satisfaction, productivity of the group, group conformity and so on.

Problem

The aim of the present investigation was to see the effect of cooperation and competition upon interpersonal relationship, anxiety and work satisfaction. This study consists of cooperation and competition as independent variable and interpersonal relationship, anxiety and work satisfaction as dependent variables.

Hypotheses

1. Interpersonal relationship will tend towards positive valence among the members of cooperative group whereas in competitive group the interpersonal relationships will tend towards negative valence.
2. There will be greater work satisfaction among members of cooperative group as contrasted with members of competitive group.
3. There will be more anxiety in competitive group than in cooperative group.

Graphical Presentation of the hypotheses :-

<u>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</u>	<u>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</u>
1) Cooperation	Interpersonal Relationship Work Satisfaction Anxiety
2) Competition	Interpersonal Relationship Work Satisfaction Anxiety

TASKS USED :

To test the above hypothesis the investigation required a number of tools for different purposes. Four tasks were prepared to keep all the subjects engaged. The tasks were as follows :-

- 1) Geometrical design.
- 2) Solving puzzles.
- 3) Greeting Card making.
- 4) Arithmetic sums.

TESTS :

Following tests were used to assess dependent variables,

- 1) Sociometric test.
- 2) A five point Rating scale for measuring work satisfaction.
- 3) A semantic Differential scale for measuring Inter personal relationship.
- 4) Sarason's General Anxiety Scale for children (GASC).

The sociometric test was prepared and given to ascertain the extent of friendliness amongst the students which helped in formation of groups.

SAMPLE :

The sample of -200- students was taken for this study. All the subjects were students of class VI to VIII (Age group 11 to 13 years) of Kendriya Vidyalaya, Baroda and Basant School, Karelibaug, Baroda.

PROCEDURE :

At first all the -200- students were given a pre-sociometric test, and the interpersonal relationship of the whole class was noted. Then -40- groups were formed on the basis of the results of the sociometric test. Of these, -20- groups were assigned to cooperative work and 20 to competitive work. Five members were put in each group. The members of cooperative group were required to help each other whereas those of the competitive group were required to work individually. The competitive situation was created by offer of some prizes.

All the groups worked -4- days on four tasks for one hour each day. The members of each cooperative and competitive group was given a rating scale to measure work satisfaction, a semantic differential scale to measure interpersonal relationship and Sarason's General Anxiety scale for children to measure anxiety immediately after each task was completed. In the end when all groups had finished all the tasks a post sociometric test was given to find out changes in the interpersonal relationship.

Results and Discussion :

To see whether the difference between the conditions are significant or not, t-test was administered, Data were processed and computed on p.c. The statistical results and analysis were derived with the help of p.c. based programming.

Initially the first hypothesis which is about interpersonal relationship was tested. On examining the data, graphs and statistical analysis it was found that in cooperative group there was very good interpersonal relationship. The highest rating of the scale is 7 and here the average of the interpersonal relationship for cooperative group is 6.5 which is very close to the maximum possible score. While in competitive group interpersonal relationship is only 4.3 which is low.

In the three scales of interpersonal relationship in the cooperative group the average for "intelligence" (intelligent or foolish) is 6.5, average for "Activity" (Active or Dull) is 6.3 and for "Goodness" (Good or Bad) the average is 6.9 It indicates that the member of cooperative group perceive

each other favourably. In competitive group the average rating for "Intelligence" (Intelligent or foolish) is 4.0. It can be easily said that there is a better interpersonal relationship among the members of the cooperative group than in competitive group.

Thus, it can be concluded that in the present study there was a positive interpersonal relationship among the members of the cooperative group, where as in competitive group it was not so.

The second hypothesis concerns experience of satisfaction with task. According to this hypothesis, the members of the cooperative group will be more satisfied with their task, while the members of competitive group will be less satisfied with each other and with their tasks. The t ratio is 3.33 which shows that difference between mean work satisfaction of cooperative and competitive group is significant at level 0.01. In both groups subjects were not equally satisfied with their performance. But work satisfaction increases from trial to trial in cooperative group while in competitive group the opposite trend was observed.

The third hypothesis as mentioned above states that more anxiety will be generated in competitive group than in cooperative group. The t ratio at 11.42 indicates that the difference in mean anxiety score of cooperative and competitive group is significant. In other words in cooperative group the members are less anxious than in competitive group.

In the observations of behaviour also while subjects were at work, it was marked that the competitive group subjects showed nervousness and anxiety. This was in clear contrast to the cooperative group where these negative elements of anxiety etc. were missing.

An attempt was also made to see whether in cooperative group the amount of anxiety gradually decreases from first trial to the last trial, and in competitive group anxiety gradually increases. To test this the average of the first and fourth day's anxiety score was calculated which reveals that when the members work cooperatively they become confident and so they are less anxious. In the case of competitive group the subjects have to work alone

and the whole responsibility of work is on one individual only, which causes a sort of nervousness and anxiety.

CONCLUSIONS :

The study yields following conclusions :-

- I) First hypothesis that "in cooperative group there will be a good interpersonal relationship while in competitive group the interpersonal relationship is not so good" is confirmed.
- II) Second hypothesis that "there will be greater work satisfaction among the members of cooperative group as contrasted with members of competitive group" is confirmed.
- III) The third hypothesis, that "there will be more anxiety in competitive group than in cooperative group" is confirmed.

These findings affirm all the hypotheses and the results were found to be significant.

Suggestion for further studies :

1. Cooperation and competition among Industrial workers as a function of ethnic group, grade, sex and reward condition also needs to be examined.
2. Motivation and morale in a Cooperative Vs. Competitive group is also a relevant subject matter for study.
3. It seems necessary to study age and sex difference in cooperative and non cooperative behaviour of children.
4. Relationship between Harijans and non Harijans students in intergroup cooperation and competition is also a relevant subject matter for study.
5. Relationship between socio-economically backward and non-backward students/classes in intergroup cooperation and competition may also be studied.
6. An Analysis of cooperation and competition amongst late adolescents/college students also needs to be conducted.