



Correlation Between Locus of Control with Student's Social Loafing in Group Task

Priscilla Deborah Rouly Simanjuntak¹, Rika Eliana²

^{1,2}Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received: Jun 30, 2019

Revised: Oct 13, 2019

Accepted: Feb 01, 2020

Keywords:

Locus of control,
Social Loafing;
Students.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the relationship between locus of control and social loafing of students on group-based tasks. The results of the study of 300 students in the University of North Sumatra showed there is a positive relationship between locus of control and social loafing. The data obtained in this study indicates that the more internal a person's locus of control, the lower the tendency to decrease their effort on working in a group. The majority of subjects have low tendency to do social loafing and prefer to work in small groups. There is no gender difference either in subject's locus of control or on the tendency to do social loafing. Collectivistic belief in Indonesian society may be one of the causes of students's low tendency to do social loafing.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Priscilla Deborah Rouly Simanjuntak

Fakultas Psikologi,

Universitas Sumatera Utara,

Dr. Street T. Mansur No. 9, Padang Bulan Campus, Medan, 20155, North Sumatra, Indonesia

Email: roulysimanjuntak@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of group assignments is increasingly popular in the world of lectures. Group assignments have become an integral part of the learning process, both for lecturers and students. The Higher Education Curriculum (KPT) is now also applying group assignments as a form of assignment given to students. The University of North Sumatra itself uses a competency-based curriculum (KBK) where one of the learning models of this curriculum is *small group discussion*. In this small group discussion, students of the lecture participants were asked to create a small group (5 to 10 people) to discuss materials provided by lecturers or materials obtained by members of the group (Dikti, 2014). Through small group activities, students will learn to things like being a good listener, working together for joint assignments, providing and receiving constructive feedback, respecting dissent, supporting opinions with evidence, and appreciating diverse viewpoints such as gender, culture, and others (Dikti, 2014). Based on the results of research interviews with students from several faculties at the University of North Sumatra stated that group assignments are often given to students. Students from the faculty of Psychology admitted that in one semester of lectures that are usually filled with 6-7 courses, group assignments will be given at least 5 courses. Similarly, students from the faculty of Agribusiness, they stated that there are at least 3 courses that provide group assignments in one semester. They realize

group tasks are sometimes difficult because they have to manage time to work together, but group tasks also help them in doing difficult tasks. Some of the following studies reveal the benefits of group tasks. According to (Heller, Keith, and Anderson, 1991) group assignments can improve students' ability to solve problems. While (Webb, 1995) group tasks can make one learn news sciences and abilities, and learn to work with others to maximize the performance and output of the group.

Group tasks can also improve the performance of a person where according to (Allport, 1920), in (Hogg, 2011) the effect of the group on the performance of a person is social *facilitation*, i.e. the increase in performance caused by the presence of others. The results of these studies certainly revealed that group assignments have many benefits for a student. But reality is certainly not always what we want, there are often obstacles in doing group tasks. A conflict that is allowed to occur in a group can hinder the work of a group (Hitchcock & Anderson, 1997). Conflicts in group tasks can be caused by things like the presence of group members, or the activeness and contribution of group members. The presence of a person does not always improve the performance of students. Research by Ingham, Levinger, Graves, and Peckham, 1974 found that a person's performance will decrease as the group grows. Individuals also decrease their efforts while working in groups compared to their efforts while working alone (Latane, Williams, & Harkins, 1979). The lack of contributions and effort given by group members can also cause problems in the work of group tasks, they seem to rely on other group members to complete tasks that should be done by all members of the group. Group assignments that are supposed to invite students to be active are precisely what hinder students.

Research by (Ingham et al., 1974) and (Latane et al., 1979) states that a person's performance can be reduced while working in a group. This phenomenon is better known as social *loafing*, and until now, *social loafing* has become one of the main problems that inhibit the effectiveness of group-based tasks. *Social loafing* is a tendency of a person to reduce his efforts while working in groups compared to when working individually (Karau & Williams, 1993). *Social loafing* can occur in any form of task, ranging from sports activities such as running (Høigaard, Tofteland, & Ommundsen, 2006), arrow races (Heize & Brunel, 2003), and activities that require cognitive effort such as assessing exams (Petty, Harkins, Williams, & Latane, 1977). (Piezon and Ferree, 2008) found that *social loafing* appears not only in groups that do tasks directly, *loafing* also occurs in *online* groups. *Social loafing* doesn't just impact on individuals who do *loafing*. Other members of the group also suffered losses from *social loafing*. *Social loafing* can generate envy in the group and decrease the potential and cohesion of a group and affect the performance, presence and satisfaction of the group (Duffy & Shaw, 2000). The loss of *loafing* is also certainly felt by *loafing* actors, because his behavior not only decreases the performance of group members but also his own performance, such as research conducted by (Zahra, 2015) which states that low academic achievement is associated with high *social loafing* tendencies (Alnuaimi et al., 2009). Almost all students have ever felt the loss of *social loafing*. From the above exposure, *social loafing* can be seen due to various factors, including individual factors such as motivation to achieve (Hart, Karau, Stasson, & Kerr, 2004). Low or high motivation of one's achievement can be caused by the *tendency of locus of control* that exists in them (Fini and Yousefzadeh, 2011). Therefore, the cause of individuals doing *social loafing* while doing group tasks can be caused by the *tendency of locus of control* of individuals. From the description, the researchers intend to examine whether there is a link between *locus of control* and *social loafing*.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The method of data collection used in this study is the scale of psychology because the data that wants to be measured in the form of psychological concepts that can be expressed indirectly through behavioral indicators that are translated in the form of statement items (Azwar, 2000). Scale method can also describe aspects of individual personality, can reflect the self that is usually not aware of the respondent concerned, respondents are not aware of the direction of the answer or conclusions expressed statements or questions (Azwar, 2010). The data processing in this study was conducted with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 16. Before the collected data is analyzed, then first conducted an assumption test that includes: (a). Normality Test Normality test is a test about the

normality of data distribution. The use of normality test because in parametric statistical analysis, the assumption that data must have is that the data is distributed normally. Test normality in this study by looking at coefficients using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov technique. The data is said to be distributed normally if the value of the coefficient $p > 0.005$. (b). Linearity Test This linearity test is used to find out if two variables, namely locus of control and social loafing, have a linear relationship or not significantly. The linearity test in this study was conducted through Test for Linearity in SPSS program.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this study showed that *locus of control* has a relationship with social loafing in students. This can be seen from the magnitude of the correlation value (r) which is 0.393 with $p=0.00$. A positive r value indicates that the direction of *locus of control's* relationship with social loafing is positive, which means the more internal the *locus of control* the subject the lower the subject's tendency to do social loafing, and vice versa. Research by Fini and Yousefzadeh (2006) states that students with internal *locus of control* are responsible for the tasks given to them and believe their achievements will depend heavily on the efforts they put in. Supported by research conducted by (Hart et al., 2004) which states that students who have high motivation will be immune to the tendency to do social loafing because they will work the form of tasks that can improve their achievements. According to (Bernardi, 2001), (Schultz & Schultz, 2009) and (Stewart, 2012) individuals with internal *locus of control* have traits such as having good self-control, having high aspirations and initiatives in achieving goals, and actively seeking information. Based on these characteristics, students with internal *locus of control* are predicted to have a low tendency to do social loafing. In accordance with the research conducted by (Suryaningrum et al., 2012) individuals with internal *locus of control* will be reluctant to engage in unethical behavior and be responsible for their work. Based on previous exposures, individuals with internal *locus of control* will have a tendency to do small social loafing. They will feel responsible for the tasks assigned both individual and group tasks.

Based on the results of additional research, it was seen that the majority of the study subjects were in the internal category and followed by the research subjects who were in the neutral category. According to Schultz, 2009 research shows that age affects a person's locus of control, where a person tends to be more internal with age, and peaks in middle adulthood. They also mentioned that most students tend to have an internal locus of control. The subjects of this study were students aged 19-22 years, if guided by the explanation above, it is natural that 46.71% of the study subjects fall into the category. However, keep in mind that age factors are not the main factors that can affect the locus of control, there are also other factors such as race factors, economic conditions, and family. From the data collected, the results were obtained that 79.93% of research subjects had a tendency to do low social loafing, 17.76% of subjects with moderate tendencies, and 2.30% of subjects with high tendencies. It can be seen that students in some faculties at the University of North Sumatra have a tendency to do low social loafing. This may be due to the number of groups that are usually formed when the subject performs a group task. data shows that the majority of subjects (67.76%) prefer to work in a group of 2-5 people rather than working in a group of more than 5 people. One of the factors that affect social loafing is the size of the group. (Latane, Williams, & Harkins, 1979) states that the larger the group members will increase one's tendency to do social loafing. Individuals will feel their contributions are shared with other members of the group. Another additional result is that there are no notable gender differences from both *locus of control* variables and social loafing variables. No gender dominates any of the variables, the male and female scores are almost the same and there are no significant differences. From the data collected, the results of the subject score based on faculty stated that the majority of subjects were in the category of *locus of control* that is neutral, only subjects from the Faculty of Economics were in the category of internal *locus of control*. While in the mean of social loafing score, all faculties are in the low social loafing category, but the Faculty of Medicine obtained the highest mean score which means the subject of the Faculty of Medicine has a tendency

to do social *loafing* greater than research subjects from other faculties. One of the learning methods of Competency Based Curriculum (KBK) is group tasks. From the results of the study, students showed that they have a low tendency to do *social loafing*, this means that the learning method of group assignments from KBK was successfully applied because from the results of the study students did not show obstacles in doing tasks in groups. Cultural factors may also play a role in the low tendency of students to do *social loafing*. The reason students are reluctant to do *loafing* can be due to the culture of collectivism embraced by the people of Indonesia. Research by (Early, 1989) states that *social loafing* is more common in individualist cultures than collectivists. Individuals with a collectivist culture will place the goals and work of the group as the main thing. In addition, they also believe that individual contributions are essential to the success of the group (Earley, 1989). This cultural factor of collectivism can be the cause of Universitas Sumatera Utara students tend to be reluctant to do *social loafing* when doing group tasks.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis that has been done in the previous section, it can be drawn the conclusion of the research as follows. (a). In accordance with the results of the study, locus of control is proven to have a positive relationship with social loafing. The more internal locus of control an individual has, the lower the student's tendency to reduce their efforts when doing group tasks, and vice versa. (b). The results showed most research subjects had an internal locus of control. (c). The majority of research subjects have low social loafing tendencies and only 7 research subjects have a high social loafing tendency. (d). The majority of research subjects chose to work in groups of 2-5 people rather than working in groups of more than 5 members. (e). There was no gender difference either in the locus of control variable or on the social loafing variable in the study subject. (g). The method of learning group assignments from competency-based curriculum was successfully applied by students of the University of North Sumatra, as evidenced by the results of research that showed that the majority of students have a low social loafing tendency. 7. The culture of collectivism embraced in Indonesia can be the cause of USU students reluctant to do social loafing.

REFERENCES

- Alnuaimi, O., Robert, L., & Maruping, L. (2009). Social Loafing in Brainstroming CMC Teams: The Role of Moral Disengagement. Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). Psychological testing (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster / A Viacom Company.
- April, K. A., Dharani, B., & Peters, K. (2012). Impact of Locus of Control Expectancy on Level of Well-Being. Review of European Studies, 4(2), 124-137.
- Azwar, S. (2000). Penyusunan Skala Psikologi. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar. (2010). Sikap Manusia (Cetakan IX). Jakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Bernardi, R. A. (2003). A theoretical model for the relationship among: Stress, locus of control, and longevity. Business Forum, 26(3), 27-33.
- Brickner, M.A., Ostrom, T.M., & Harkins, S.G. 1986. Effects of Personal Involvement: Thgought-Provoking Implications for Social loafing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 51: 763-769.
- Carrim, N., Basson, J., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control in a South African call centre environment. South African Journal of Labour Relations, 30(2), 66-81.
- Charbonnier, E., Huguet, P., Brauer, M., Montel, J. (1998). Social Loafing and Self-Beliefs: People's Collective Effort Depends on The Externt to Which They Distinguish Themselves As Better Than Others. Social Behavior and Personality, 26(4), 329-340
- Claudia Y D Hoeksema-Can, O., & Gaillard, A. W. K. (1999). Fighting fatigue in work groups: Psycho-social remedies against fatigue-induced performance decrements. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society ...Annual Meeting, 1, 757.
- Cory, S. N., Reeves, T. E., & Martinez, G. (2015). Moral Disengagement And Locus Of Control In Business School Freshmen: Gender Differences. Southern Journal of Business and Ethics, 7, 106-117.
- Davies, W. M. (2009). Groupwork as a form of assessment: common problems and recommended solutions. High Education, 58, 563-584.

- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2008). *Buku Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Pendidikan Tinggi*. Jakarta.
- Duffy, M.K. & Shaw, J.D. (2000). The Salieri syndrome: Consequences of envy in groups. *Small Group Research*, 31(1), 3-23.
- Earley, P. C. (1989). Social Loafing and Collectivism: A Comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(4), 565-581.
- Fini, A. A. S., & Yousefzadeh, M. (2011). Survey on relationship of achievement motivation, locus of control and academic achievement in high school students of Bandar Abbas (Iran). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30(2011), 866 – 870
- Ghonsooly, B., & Rezvani, Y. (2011). The Effect Of Efl Teachers' Locus Of Control On Efl Learners' Reading Achievement. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 1(2), 97-111.
- Grimes, P. W., Millea, M. J., & Woodruff, T. W. (2004). Grades-who's to blame? student evaluation of teaching and locus of control. *Journal of Economic Education*, 35(2), 129-147.
- Halpert, R. (2011). The Locus of Control Construct's Various Means of Measurement: A researcher's guide to some of the more commonly used Locus of Control scales. Will To Power Press. Beach Haven, NJ.
- Harkins, S.G., & Szymanski, K. (1989). Social Loafing and Group Evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(6), 934-941.
- Hart, J. W., Karau, S. J., Stasson, M. F., & Kerr, N. A. (2004). Achievement motivation, expected coworker performance, and collective task motivation: Working hard or hardly working? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(5), 984-1000.
- Heize, J. P., Brunel, P. C. (2003). Social Loafing In A Competitive Context. *Int. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1, 246-263.
- Heller, P., Keith, R., & Anderson, S. (1991). Teaching problem solving through cooperative grouping. Part 1: Group versus individual problem solving. *American Journal of Physics*, 60(7), 627-636.
- Hitchcock, M. A., Anderson, A. S. (1997). Dealing with Dysfunctional Tutorial Groups. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*. 9(1), 19-24.
- Høigaard, R., Tofteland, I., & Ommundsen, Y. (2006). The Effect of Team Cohesion on Social Loafing in Relay Teams. *International Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 18(1), 59-73.
- Hogg, M.A., & Vaughan, G.M., (2011). *Social Psychology* (6th Ed). Pearson Education Limited. England.
- Howerton, D. L., Enger, J. M., & Cobbs, C. R. (1992). Locus Of Control And Achievement Of At-Risk Adolescent Black Males. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association.
- Ingham, A. G., Levinger, G., Graves, J., & Peckham, V. (1974). The Ringelmann Effect: Studies of Group Size and Group Performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10(4), 371-384.
- Kader. A. A. (2014). Locus of control, student motivation, and achievement in principles of microeconomics. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(9), 1-11.
- Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI). Tugas. Diakses secara online pada 1 Mei 2016 <http://kbbi.web.id/tugas>
- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (1993). Social loafing: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(4), 681-706.
- Karimi, R., Alipour, F. (2011). Reduce Job stress in Organizations: Role of Locus of Control. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(18), 232-236.
- Kugihara, N. (1999). Gender and Social Loafing in Japan. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(4), 516-526.
- Latane, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(6), 822-832.
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Jaworski, R.A., & Bennett, N. 2004. *Social loafing: A Field Investigation*. *Journal of Management*, 30: 285-304.
- Manichander, T. (2014). Locus of Control and Performance: Widening Applicabilities. *Paripex - Indian Journal Of Research*, 3(2), 84-86.
- Mathur, R. (2014). Academic achievement of college students and their locus of control. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 1(3), 78-83.
- Ogunyemi, K. (2013). Ethics education and locus of control: Is rotter's scale valid for nigeria? *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 7(1), 1-10.
- Petty, R. E., Harkins, S. G., Williams, K. (1977). The effects of group size on cognitive effort and evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 579-582.
- Piezon, S.L. & Donaldson, R.L. (2005). Online groups and social loafing: Understanding student-group interactions. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(4).

- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized Expectancies For Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28.
- Schultz, D., & Schultz, S. (2009). *Theories of Personality Ninth Edition*. USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Siswoyo, D. (2007). Ilmu Pendidikan. Yogyakarta: UNY Pers.
- Smith, B. N., Kerr, N. A., Markus, M. J., & Stasson, M. F. (2001). Individual differences in social loafing: Need for cognition as a motivator in collective performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 5(2), 150-158.
- Stewart, T. (2012). Undergraduate Honors Service Learning & Effects on Locus of Control. *Journal Of Service-Learning In Higher Education*, 1, 70-85
- Sudjana, Nana. (2001). *Penelitian dan Penilaian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- Suryaningrum, D. H., Hastuti, S., & Suhartini, D. (2013). Accounting Student and Lecturer Ethical Behavior: Evidence from Indonesia. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 5(1), 31-41.
- Szymanski, K., Harkins, S. (1987). Social Loafing and Self-Evaluation With a Social Standard. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 53(5), 891-897.
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, M. L. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and social loafing: The role of personality, motives, and contextual factors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 142(1), 89-108.
- Wagner, J. A. III. (1995). Studies of Individualism-Collectivism: Effects on Cooperation in Groups. *Academy of Management Journal*. 38(1), 152-172.
- Webb, N. M. (1995). Group Collaboration in Assessment: Multiple Objectives, Processes, and Outcomes. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17(2), 239-261.
- Winkel, W.S. (1997). *Bimbingan & Konseling di Institut Pendidikan (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Wirasarana Indonesia.
- Ying, X., Li, H., Jiang, S., Peng, F., & Lin, Z. (2014). Group laziness: The effect of social loafing on group performance. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(3), 465-472.
- Zahra, Y., Eliana, R., Budiman, Z., Novliadi, F. (2015). Peran Jender dan Social Loafing Tendency Terhadap Prestasi Akademik dalam Konteks Pembelajaran Kooperatif. *Psikologia*, 10(1), 1-9.