CHAPTER-II

RESUME OF RELEVANT STUDIES

In this chapter an attempt has been made to review the studies conducted on the effect of cooperation and competition upon interpersonal relationship. Some of the notable researches in this area are as follows:

Pareek. Udai & Dixit. Narendra (1974)used the maximizing difference game to study cooperative behaviour. played dyadically with the players not game was visible to each other. Ss were preadolescents, 20 girls, 23 independent boys and variables were Results indicate that 3 of employed. the independent variables correlated positively with the dependent variable at a significant level, and 20 of them correlated significantly in a negative direction.

Further in another study they had administrated to 150 preadolescent school children a cooperative and competitive disposition Inventory and a cooperative competitive pronenes Inventory. Ss also participated in 2 each subject wants either to games where maximise the difference in gain between partner and self, to play so that the partner gets equal points. variables measured included cooperation, competition, cooperative disposition, competitive disposition, cooperative proneness, competitive proneness, trust, trustworthiness, forgiveness, repentance, retaliation and exploitation, relationships between the different variables are discussed and suggestions are given for further studies.

Begum, Hamida A & Ahmed, Eliza (1986) examined individual group situations risk taking in and as a of function proneness to cooperation or competition using 80 male and 80 female students (aged 14-16 yrs). Ss were administered a cooperation and competition questionnaire and proneness a choice dilemma questionnaire. In same sex groups of 2-3 yrs, Ss were asked to discuss each problem on the choice dilemma questionnaire and to arrive at a group decision. show that both individual risk taking and shifting toward greater risk were significantly related to cooperation or competition proneness of Ss. Competition-prone Ss took greater risks than cooperation or neutral-prone Males took greater risks than did females in the initial administration of the choice-dilemma questionnaire.

Blanchard, Fletcher A; Adelman, Leonard & Cook,

studied effect of group Stuart W (1975) success failure upon interpersonal attraction in cooperating interracial groups. The effect of group success in failure upon interpersonal attraction cooperating $2 \times 2 \times 2$ interracial groups investigated in a was factorially designed experiment. The level of participation in the group's decision making (high or low) and race or white) served as the additional independent (Black variables. Fifty six 18-21 years old white male Ss from southern US towns exhibited significantly greater attraction for groupmates under the success as opposed to the failure condition. No main effects for the race the group member being evaluated or the level participation in decision making were obtained, nor there interactions among any of the 3 independent Separate analysis of the attraction ratings variables. given the white and the black groupmates further revealed that whatever elevated or depressed the ratings for one, similar affected the ratings for the other. A general satisfaction and dissatisfaction interpretation was offered to explain the effect of group success - failure on interpersonal attraction.

Johnson, David W. & Johnson, Roger T. (1985)

conducted a study with 48 Black and White 6th graders (stratified between groups for ability, sex and ethnic group membership) to determine whether 1) inter group cooperation and competition promote different levels to cross-ethnic interpersonal attraction, 2) majority and Ss react differently to cooperative learning minority experiences, 3) inter group and cooperation competition promote different inter-action patterns between minority and majority students. Ss participated for for 55 min/day 10 days. In the inter group cooperation (ICO) condition, emphasis was placed on how the entire class achieved. In the inter group competition (ICP), emphasis was placed on which group highest. achieved the Measures of achievement, interpersonal attraction, and interaction showed that there was more cross - ethnic social interaction in ICO than in the ICP condition. Majority of Ss made more task management, social, cross-ethnic statements than did minorities. is concluded that minority Ss reacted differently to conditions than did majority Ss; minority responded more positively to cooperative experiences and showed more satisfaction in their group's work.

Lefevure, LUC & Cunning Ham, John D. (1974),investigated the competitive orientation among Belgian College Students; - Effects of non-punitive different strategies playing the allocation game. Deutsch's allocation game was played by 90 students in 60 trials. 1st (Basic) condition, confederates In the playing Non-punitive and Deterrent strategies equally rewarded non-competitive behaviour and differentially Ss neutralized competition. In the 2nd and 3rd conditions, message increasing trust and a Reformed Sinner tactic decreasing trust preceded both strategies. Strategies and conditions produced independent differences. In basic Ss interacting with condition. the nonpunitive confederate obtained many more points than with the Deterrent confederate. Most points were produced by cooperative and individualistic behaviour. The message condition yielded more points in both strategies, while condition tended to decrease the the Reformed sinner earned in the Non-punitive strategy. number of points Trend toward greater competition among Flemish students students, which had than American been found consistently over several different games, was discussed in terms of possible cultural differences.

Alock, James E (1974) conducted his study on

cooperation, competition, and the effects of time pressure India. He studied the Canada and effects of time limitations on bargaining behaviour in 3 experiments with 20 female dyads of Canadian Undergraduates 20 male and (Exp-I), 20 male · and 18 female dyads of Indian undergraduates (Exp-II), and 24 dyads of Canadian undergraduates (Exp-II), and 24 dyads of Indian male undergraduates (Exp-III).

Findings of the study indicate that Canadian males reacted to time limits imposed by one of the bargainers in a manner consistent with the way North American males typically react to threat - by becoming competitive resisting yielding. and When the time limits were imposed by E, however, this same group reacted cooperatively. Canadian females and Indians of were all relatively cooperative, regardless of the of time limitation. Indian females, however, source were more passive than the other groups.

Arap. Maritim, Ezra K. (1984) examined the relationship of parental strictness to competitive and cooperative attitudes, as measured by Minnesota school. Affect Assessment, among 109 boys and 119 girls from grades 3, 4, 5 and 7. On the competitive items, boys

did not score significantly higher than girls, girls scored higher than the boys on the cooperative items. Girls perceived their parents as being more strict than For boys, a significant correlation was boys. between parental strictness items and competitiveness, for both competitiveness whereas girls and cooperativeness showed significant correlation with parental strictness. Ss expressed attitudes about their that were strongly correlated to their parents in attitudes. Results suggest that parental differences strictness may be significant in the development of sex differences in competitive and cooperative attitudes.

Codol, J. P. (1974) described continuing research to inter pares" isolate а "Primus (PIP) effect in competitive game situation. Ss were 210 males 17 and 18 years old, who rated themselves on how they would act in situations requiring cooperation or competition with a Cooperation included refusing partner. him aid. expressed desire to win at games was evidently stronger than any desire to please.

Ia Freniere, Peter J. & Charlesworth, William R. (1987) examined the effects of friendship and dominance

status in preschooler's resources utilization in cooperative/competitive situation.

Preschool Peers (aged 38.6 - 57.5 mo) 40 formed into 10 groups of 4 Ss each; each group was room containing a toy movie viewer that placed in a required the assistance to 2 children in order for 1 child to view the movie. Dominant Ss were able to gain access use the resource more than to the viewer and ranked classmates. Dominance rank did not predict resource utilization between same sex friends. High status groups friends used the resource more effectively and equitably than groups composed predominantly to low ranking children or nonfriends. Friendship relations rather than affiliative behaviour in the situation were associated with high resource utilization. A mixture of and opportunistic behaviours led to high quasi-agonistic resource utilization; agonistic behaviour were infrequent and unrelated to resource utilization.

Pack, D. Glenn & Rickard, Henry C measured Reports of group cohesion under high and low cooperation. A total of 22 boys in 3 groups attending a summer camp for emotionally disturbed children completed self-report

measures on days in which counselors observed high or low degree of cooperation within groups. Results support the hypothesis that students behaving cooperatively would report greater liking for group members and judge the group as a more attractive, cohesive unit.

T Josvold, Dean; Johnson, David W. & Johnson, Roger (1984) studied influence strategy, perspective — taking and relationships between high and low power individuals in cooperative and competitive context. (1984)

64 Undergraduates negotiated exchange an of They were assigned either high or resources in dyads. low power relative to the other and negotiated within a cooperative or a competitive context. Results indicate that within a competitive context unequal-power relationships resulted in the high-power Ss use of coercion and low-power Ss attempts to negotiate. Both high and perceived low-power Ss their relationship to dominated by egocentric focus on one's own goals attempts to control the other to meet one's needs. Within cooperative context, however, both high a were highly inducible to each other's low power Ss influences, needed resources were provided to each other,

trust and liking occured between Ss, and Ss high other's understanding each were more accurate in perspectives. It is concluded that unequal seemed to undermine negotiations within а competitive effective deteracting from working while not relationships within a cooperative context.

Judd, Charles M. & Pak, Bernadette (1988) studied out group homogeneity: Judgemerts of variability levels. Out groups individual and group are less variable or diverse generally seen as than in groups. Two explanations have been advanced for this out-group homogeneity effect. They differ in whether frequency of is differential stored examplars necessary condition for the out - group homogeneity modified minimal group paradigm effect. They used a to discriminate between the two. Their results suggest that when the group distinction is made salient anticipated competition out group homogeneity is obtained even with no difference in examplar frequency They also show that the effects of competition versus cooperation differ at the level of group judgements and group members, such that at the memory for individual group level out-groups are seen as less variable than in-groups under competition, but competition actually for information about individual increases memory combination This of out-group members. results is with clearly inconsistent an exemplar explanation of the out-group homogeneity effect.

SHIMIZU, JUN (1973)examined cooperative and competitive orientations of 20 groups of 60 male college students by means of the matrix game in which 5 blocks of the experimental groups were exposed to 5 levels of expectation of successful performance. Ss were instructed to group perform either cooperatively or competitively in maximize the amount of reward. Results indicate that group-oriented or cooperative behaviour prevailed the group output was perceived as not remarkably lower, than the group goal. Individualoriented or competitive behaviour prevalied when the obviously successful group output was or close to remarkably success, or when the group output was below the group goal.

Richmond, Bert O. & Weiner, Gerald P. examined cooperation and competition among young children as a

function of ethnic grouping, grade, sex and reward They assigned 108 pairs of 1st condition. and 2nd grades to a game situation which required cooperation in order to win prizes. There were 6 trials in each of 2 'conditions - cooperative and competitive. Significant differences were found in Ss cooperative competitive behaviour according to reward condition and ethnic Black Ss working together grouping. were more cooperative and less competitive than pairs of white, and white working black together were competitive than pairs of white but more competitive than pairs of white but more competitive than pairs biological of blacks. No sex differences significant. 2nd grades were more competitive than 1st suggesting that maturational grades, factors as well school experiences may result in greater competition among children.

Hagman, Joseph D. & Hayes, John F. (1986) investigated whether cooperative learning can effectively promote individual achievement, using 360 military trainees. Exp I compared the performance to 280 trainees after they had completed practical exercises under cooperative or individual learning. Results reveal that cooperative

learning improved individual test scores when coupled with group reward contingency, and significant benefits group size reached 4 members. occurred once employed 80 trainees to determine why group reward was necessary for obtaining enhanced individual achievement under cooperative learning. Two potential hypothesis were tested: (1) group reward effects are caused by increased individual trainee motivation to learn resulting from to perform ; (2) group reward pressure and encourages group mates to share information, and tutoring facilities individual learning. support the peer tutoring hypothesis.

Stingle, Sandra F. & Cook, Harold (1985)that playing a game hypothesized when in cooperative behaviour maximized reward, (1) 5 yr.old pairs of children would be most cooperative, 8 yr. old pairs would be moderately cooperative, and 11 yr. old would be least cooperative and that 8 11 yr. old and of boys would be more cooperative than their pairs female counterparts, and (2) 5 yr. old same sex differ in cooperative and would not non-cooperative Results from 42 children at each of the 3 age behaviour. groups (5, 8 and 11 yrs.) provide no support for

I and only hypothesis partial support for hypothesis 2. Eight and Eleven yrs. old pairs were relatively more cooperative and attained significantly more joint reward goals than 5 yrs. old pairs. pairs were not maximally cooperative, however, in terms of all of the dependent measures. In adjusting for initial differences on practice trails, 5 and 8 yr. olds less time than 11 yr. olds, and 11 yr. old boys significantly more time than all other pairs. Cooperative increased across trials, especially for task behaviour 11 yr. olds.

Concha, Pat; Garcia, Lourdes & Perez, Ana (1975) studied cooperation v/s competition; (A comparision of Anglo-American and Cuban-American youngsters in Miami). They 2 cooperation boards used Madsen to test cooperation and competition in a total of 96 Anglo-American and Cuban-American 10, 13 and 17 years olds. Significant effects for nationality and age were found, in that Anglo-Americans cooperated to a greater extent than Cuban-Americans and older Ss were more cooperative than young subjects.

Sherman, Richard C. described an experiment in which 153 undergraduates judged similarities and

dissimilarities among 20 nations under conditions in which they expected cooperative, competitive, or future no interaction with fellow Ss. Analysis of the similarity data by means of a multidimensional scaling technique (INDSCAL) reveals a 7 - dimensional configuration that correlated 72 with Ss original judgements. Comparisions hawks. moderates and doves (as determined between attitudes towards the vietnam war) indicate Vietnam political alignment important was more moderates and cultural hawks than to doves. Α geographical dimension that contrasted African and Asian nations was more salient to doves and moderates than differences among hawks. Perceptual to attitudinal greatest in the cooperation groups were condition, competition condition, in the and least in no-interaction condition. Hawks and doves were most affected by judgemental conditions, as indicated groups giving significantly less weight cultural - geographical dimensions in the cooperation condition than in either the competition or neutral conditions. Results support the hypothesis that the salience certain perceptual of dimensions function of both perceiver charactersitics and judgement conditions.

Gouran, Dennis S. & Baird, Sohn E. (1972). - An analysis of distributional and sequential structure in problem - solving and informal group discussions.

Studied 26 undergraduates who were divided 4 groups of 6 or 7 members, all of whom participated in both a problem - solving and an informal Statements were classified discussion. into categories: initiating theme, agreeing or disagreeing and giving or asking for information. Results showed that initiation of new themes was more prevalent in problem - solving groups while question - asking was proportionately greater in informal groups. Greater structure in types of statements was not found in problem - solving groups as expected, while a higher degree of structure them might be expected found in informal groups. Both days of groups seemed to process a low tolerance for conflict; however, disagreement in informal groups tended to be personal opinionated rather than a questioning of and statements or facts.

Further, Baird, John E (1975)examined sequential and distributional structures emerging in cooperative and competitive group discussions in an effort to determine whether group motivations or time preparation accounted for earlier findings reported J.E.Baird. Both exaplanations D. S. Gouran and by found support.

Dowell, Linnus J studied the effect competitive and cooperative environment on the comprehension College students cognitive task. were divided alphabetically into cooperation competition sets of 8. Each student was given a play booklet with 12 targets from which to develop rules for placing the target correctly. After 20 minutes, play booklets were collected and 30 item was administered in which each matrix test student identify if the targets were correctly was to placed. of the results observed between Comparisions groups were made by analysis of variance. It was found that learning cooperative environment was not more conducive to the learning, of a mental task than a competitive learning environment.

Sherman, Lawrence W (1986) studied cooperative versus competitive educational Psychology classroom:

From introductory educational Psychology classes students were differently taught, 3 with with 137 a cooperative goal structure and the other with an individually competitive goal structure. Α 2 - way measures analysis of repeated variance (A N O V A) design was used to examine pre and post learning within A11 4 test by treatments Ss. groups obtained significant gains on their post test scores as contrasted with their pre test scores. No significant differences were encountered among the 4 groups pre or post test scores. Affective differences were obtained among the 4 groups, indicating significantly more negative perceptions being associated with the competitive group as contrasted with the cooperative groups. The data suggested that students prefer cooperative goal structure.

Cook, Harold, Stingle, Sandra conducted study on the cooperative behaviour in children. They reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature relevant to cooperative behaviour of children. An attempt was made to delineate theoretical view points, to discuss definitions of

subcul tural variables behaviour. and to and social addition, some factors influencing interaction. In learning of cooperation were discussed. Methodological and inconsistent problems findings that limit generalizations concerning the process thought to relate to cooperative behaviour inchildren were described.

Srivastava, Ashok K.(1986) studied the effect of communication, information, and motivational orientation on cooperative Vs competitive game behaviour. 120 made indian undergraduates were assigned to 1 to 12 conditions in a 2x2x3 factorial design that varied communication (free Vs none),information (full Vs partial),and motivation (cooperative, competitive, or individualistic);all Ss participated in a version of the prisioner's dilemma game.

Results indicate that Ss were more selfish and used exploitation and cut-throat competition strategies more frequently in no communication, full informaltion, and competitive motivation conditions. There was a significant linear increase in selfishness over time.

Faroqui, M.A. made an attempt on motivation and morale in a cooperative group. He studied the effect of cooperative and competitive relations among group members, and of task nature & time perspective on the groups motivation & morale.

133 male undergraduates were tested in groups of 5 or 6.

Results show that goal oriented subjects had favourable effect on group motivation and morale.

Doise, Willem and Weinberger, Monique (1972) studied interactions under situations of cooperation, induced spontaneous competition. Ss were competition, and 90 male and 90 female students in a commercial school assigned in male/female pairs to 1 to 1 or 2 2 to task situations. Ss completed indices of differentiation, discriminative evaluation, masculinity feminity. Results indicate the individuals and different dimensions. Anticipation ofcompetitive interaction influenced responses on indices masculinity and femininity; competition accentuated masculinity of both persons involved in the task.

Gelb, Richard and Jacobson, Joseph L. (1988) Studied Popular and unpopular childrens interactions during cooperative and competitive peer group activities.

12 Popular and 12 unpopular 4th grade boys were videotaped as each attempted to gain entry into a cooperative competitive task involving 2 class and average in popularity. During mates who were competitive procedure, the unpopular entry Ss were more likely than their popular counterparts to break rules, emit silly noises, and appeal to authority,

children average in popularity directed more positive behaviours toward their well - liked class mates more derisive and dominating behaviour toward unpopular Unpopular Ss exhibited less negative behaviour in immature the benign, tension free atmosphere of cooperative project, and their peers more tolerant toward them than during competitive game. Findings suggest that contextual factors influence in social skills exhibited by the unpopular child.

Johnston, Mary; Markey, Cathleem Messe, Lawrence A; studied a sex difference in labeling effects on behaviour in Prisoner's Dilemma game.

Past research suggested that females appear less cooperative when playing the Prisoner's Dilemma game less likely than (PD) because they are males adopt a strategy that guides behaviour over trials. This inference served as the basis for speculating that females (more than males) would be influenced by whether or not alternatives in the PD labeled "Cooperation" or "Competition", a variable that should affect the ease with which strategies could be generated. 40 under graduates served as Ss. Results supported the hypothesis in that females "learned" a cooperative orientation more quickly when alternative were labelled, while this variable did not affect the behaviour of males.

Komorita, Samuel S. (1987) conducted study of Prisoner's person decomposed dilemma games (DPDs) constructed from a 2 by 2 prisoners dilemma game. Pruitt showed that some DPDs evoked greater cooperation than others, despite the fact that the offs identical all were in of the pay games, interpreted Pruitt's findings were interms of Η. Hamburger's "take some" and "give-some" games, and was hypothesized that DPDs in which the cooperative choice to rewards the other members of the group would evoke greater cooperation than DPDs in which the competitive choice punishes the other mambers. This hypothesis was tested, using 3 person DPDs and 63 male college students. Results support the hypothesis and discussed in terms of nonadditive utility are hypothesis, decision framing, and a theory of interdependence.

Lemaine, Gerard and Kastersztein, Joseph (1973) examined that in competitive situations some individuals manifest highly original social behaviour in moving goals. Research completed by the authorities which studies factors differentiating the organization of life space and strategies adopted to reach goals youngesters and students under by selected experimental conditions was reviewed.

Schmidt, constance R.; Ollendick, Thomas H. and Stanowicz, Laura B. (1988) examined developmental changes in the influence of social goals on cooperative competitive behaviour in children between the ages of and 13. Children played a game with a neutrally instructed peer under cooperative and individualistic instructions. The tendency to engage in cooperative to use attentional words combative moves and and varied interactively with age, sex, order instructions, and trials. Older children adapted their cooperative behaviour to fit assigned goals when individualistic trials preceded cooperation trials, Younger children did not. Older children adapted their competitive behaviour on two of five game trials, but Younger children did not adapt their competitive

behaviour on any trials. We observed no developmental differences in the overall levels of cooperation competition. However, younger children were more likely words to use attentional than other children, and both more attentional words under age groups used individualistic instructions than under cooperative instructions. The results suggest that older children were more flexible in adapting their social strategies to assigned goals.

MARTIN M. GROSSACK had done a study "Some on effects of cooperation and competition upon small problem behaviour". His main was to determine consequences of cooperation and competition on group cohesiveness, social influence and communications.

Following conclusions were found in that study.

- A. Cooperative subjects showed significantly more behaviour.
- B. Cooperative subjects received significantly more instrumental communication (opinion and information) and fewer consumatory communications (Tension and antagonism).

Deutsch's (1949) experimental study effects of cooperation and competition upon group process illustrated the difference between cooperative and competitive groups which can be expected if other variables like group organisations and motivation are controlled.

If the criterian for completion as ambiguous it is difficult to find a solution to the task.

most efficient groups those are in rules appropriate for the task. are In general cooperation results in better individual motivation, friendliness and group productivity. When group members expect to cooperate, self-oriented behaviour disrupts the group.

A mild stress results in higher productivity than no stress or extreme stress. Motivation to perform is higher when the task has a high degree of reality. Incomplete tasks are more readily recalled than completed.

Stephan C. Jones and Victor H. Vroom (1964) in

their research - "Division of Labour and Performance under cooperative and Competitive conditions", found following results.

data The questionnarie show some interesting reactions of cooperative differences in the affective competitive group members. In and general the cooperative groups expressed more positive about the situation they were more satisfied their performance and expressed more liking for each other than did competitive groups.

In small group research some work has been done on work satisfaction also by Katz and Kahan (1952), Zalezhik Christensen and Roethlis Berges (1958). Satisfaction has been influenced by competition and cooperation also (Deutsch, 1949, Mintz 1951, Grocc 1954, Stehdler, 1951).

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 satisfacton with the task (Phillips & D'Amica 1956, Manna & Manna

(1959)Damrine Haines and (1955).Because of their cooperative effort working cross purpose at considerably minimized production and increases. However. in group members highly case are not attracted to the group or to its goal, cooperation likely to be minimized. Maller (1929) noted that members voluntering for a group showed greater efficiency in comparision to those who constituted groups arbitrarily.

The effect of cooperation will also be minimal if in doing the task, division of labour is not ensured or it reward for the individual cooperating member is less than for competing individuals.

Berg, Thomas R. (1991) studied power and interdependence in groups: Views of managers and cooperation, independence employees :-(personality) competition, power, employee efficiency.

47 members and 143 employees from a large company rated each other's power and the extent to which they had developed cooperation, competition, and independence. Cooperation and power were related to perceived effectiveness of manager and employee. Cooperative goals

supplemented power and contributed to constructive organisational dynamics. Employees described cooperative competent and facilitative to their work. managers as who have developed cooperative goals indicated Managers employees had a positive impact on them that their were competent. Independence and Competition were strongly related to conclusions that the manager and the ineffective employee were and undermined work Not only does power occur performance. in cooperation, but it may be more prevalent in cooperation than competition.

Miller (1961)Warner Wilson and Norman examined shifts evaluations of and participants following intergroup competition. Intergroup competition was arranged following manner. Two men competed against two the several tasks. Winning and losing stooges on manupulated by having the stooges always win against half always lose against the other half. team and difference in favourability of a team before and ratings of the other participants on 27 personality traits dependent variable. Α significant was the inter between the experimental found action was treatment (win lose) object rated or and (Team mates

opponents). The relevance of the findings to five widely held hypotheses concerning the effects of interaction and competition on individuals and group was considered. Only the hypothesis that 'liking' is increased by interaction received unqualified support.

A perusal of the findings reveal that in small group lots of researches have been done upon group cohesiveness, work satisfaction, productivity of the group, group confirmity, interpersonal relationship and so on.