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5.1. Discussion of Treatment Effects.
5.2. Discussion of Group Comparisons.
5.1 DISCUSSION OF TREATMENT EFFECTS:

The discussion of the results of analysis of variance accounting the effects of independent variables on dependent variable (social behaviour in terms of group pressured) in systematically given here as under:

The analysis of variance (Table 4.2) shows that F ratio for various levels of crowding is significant at .01 level of significance (F = 246.69 > .01). It indicates that different levels of crowding are significant treatment levels influencing the conformity of college graduates. Thus the main hypothesis (1) is confirmed through this finding of the study.

Further it indicates that there exits a linear relationship between degree of crowding and conformity. It means that as the degree of crowding increases in the same proportion the degree of conformity increases or vice-versa. Frankly speaking, there is none study that indicates relationship between conformity and crowding behaviour as such even indirect studies can be quoted here for explanation purpose. Crowding situation demands high competition tolerance (Jain,1976). There is a positive relationship between conformity and tolerance.
Once this tolerance develops it may also affect the behavioural pattern of the person (Griffitt and Veitch, 1979). Some social psychologists have argued that in case of crowding, tension increases. Tension may be also a significant factor that reads conformists tendencies among persons of a group (Chaubey, 1992).

Table 4.2 indicates that F ratio for the effect of locale on conformity is significant. The value of F obtained for locale is 233.26 that is significant greater than .01 level of significance. It means that locale plays very important role in group pressure behaviour. Thus the main hypothesis (2) is accepted. Further it seems that there exists a linear relationship between locale and conformity. Thus, the findings of present research refers that there is a decreasing tendency towards group pressure among subjects from urban locale to rural locale means urban subjects are much social than rural subjects.

Table 4.2 depicts significant F ratio for the effect of family type on conformity. The value of F obtained 528.68 that is significant at greater than .01 level of significance. It means that family type appear to be significant factor that affects conformity. Thus the main hypothesis (3) is accepted. This is very attracting and important result that a member of
joint family reflects higher social behaviour than a member of nuclear family.

Table 4.2 indicates that the F radio for the interaction of crowding and locale is significant ($F = 22.62 > .01$). It, thus, confirms the interaction hypothesis 4 and suggests that crowding behaviour and locale not only work independently but they affect in combined on conformity. It means that crowding and locale influence conformity simultaneously.

The ANOVA table 4.2 reveals a significant F ratio for the interaction of locale and family type is 23.78 which in significant at .01 level of significance. Thus the finding of the study confirms the interaction hypothesis 6. It denotes that locale and family type not only work independently but they work simultaneously also. In this the findings of the study indicate that locale and family type as situational variables go hand to hand influencing conformity.

The ANOVA (table 4.2) shows that F ratio for the second order interaction of crowding, locale and family type is 49.63 which is significant greater than .01 level of significance. It means that the said three independent variables interact significantly to influence the college graduates of both sexes. Thus this finding of the present
research influence the second order interaction hypothesis 7. It is, thus, discernible to conclude that crowding, locale and family type act simultaneously and influence conformity. So, these three factors interactional effects becomes effective in case of conformity.

The findings of the study upto the point indicate that crowding, locale and family type influence conformity independently. Crowding and locale, crowding and family type, locale and family type interact significantly. When all these variables- crowding, locale and family type, of the study are combined together, their interactional influences on conformity appear.
5.2 DISCUSSION OF GROUP COMPARISONS:

Apart from the analysis of main and interaction effects of independent variables on conformity, group comparison were also analysed with the help of statistical techniques that determines the direction of influence of different treatment levels of independent variables in this case. Therefore, the discussion of group comparisons will be made in the following pages:

COMPARISON OF CONFORMITY OF HIGH, MIDDLE AND LOW CROWDING GROUPS:

Table 4.3 shows the mean conformity scores of high, middle and low crowding groups. Their numerical values are 15.80, 12.40, 9.32 and their standard deviations are 3.75, 4.12, 5.08 respectively. Table 4.4 reveals that the value of CR run between the mean conformity scores of high and middle crowding subjects is 4.25 which is significant at .01 level of significance. The CR value obtained between the conformity scores of high and low crowding subjects is 7.04 which is also significant at .01 level of significance. Further the value of CR obtained between middle and low crowding subjects is 3.21 which is also significant at .01 level of significance.
It means that the three groups differ significantly with each other with regard to their conformity as an index of social behaviour. Thus this finding indicates the direction of influences of crowding in case of conformity.

Table 4.3 further reveals that high crowding college graduates of both sexes have obtained significantly highest mean conformity scores, low crowding subjects have obtained significantly least mean conformity scores and middle crowding subjects come in between the two groups so far as their mean conformity scores are concerned. Thus it leads us to conclude that high crowding subjects are more conformist and middle crowding subjects are much conformist than low crowding subjects. These finding, thus, as a whole suggest that as the crowding of the subjects increases their conformity also increases which suggests a positive relationship between the two variables.

Crowding is a psycho-social variable. Psychologists perceive it as personal and situational variable. Apart from physical density, there is psychological discrepancy on ground of tolerance ambiguity tension etc. from high to low crowding group these psychological dimensions play very crucial role in conformistic tendencies of high-middle and low group in context of crowding. High crowding-
high conformity and low crowding-low conformity. Apart form these variable, many other variables e.g. social status, social esteem are also involved indirectly in case of conformity.

**COMPARASION OF URBAN, RURBAN AND RURAL SUBJECTS:**

Table 4.5 expresses the mean conformity scores of urban, rurban and rural subjects, and their numerical values for means and standard deviations are 16.52, 12.30, 9.64, and 6.90, 5.06, 4.07, respectively. Table 4.6 points out that the values of C R between pairs of urban -rurban, urban -rural, and rurban-rural are 3.64, 3.78, 2.71 respectively which all are significant at .01 level of significance . It indicates that these three groups differ significantly with each other in regard to conformity. Thus this finding indicates the significance of locale in case of conformity .

Table 4.5 further reveals that urban group has obtained significant highest mean score, rural background group has obtained significantly least mean score and rurban locale subjects are in between the two groups in case of their conformity mean scores concerned. Thus it can be concluded that rural locale subjects are least conformist urban motivated subjects are highest conformist and rurban
locale subjects run in middle trend of conformity. As a conclusion, it may be said that as the locale of subjects changes from urban to rural background, their conformity also changes, that hints about direct relationship between the two variables.

How does the locale affect conformity? Frankly speaking, urban citizens are much mature how to behave rather than rural citizens. Urban people know etiquette and manners. They always try to follow social norms. Their conventional/traditional and typed lifestyle always motivate them in a convergence manner. They want to live in a democratic way. They are much democrat than villagers specially in country like ours. Indian villagers are facing a lot of challenges from different corners. They are lesser dynamic much static than city fellows. Among cities, to some extent in towns also democratic life style has been established - people have adopted it. And, among Indian villages democracy is facing a lot of challenges. Traditions are much alive there- they believe among them till now. Democracy is curse not boon for them. It is a prime factor for disorganising people of there. So, we can say that these so many dimensions of locale affect conformist tendencies or social behaviour of a person. Thus it hints upon a general belief that villagers are
much traditional - conventional than city fellows. Because Indian scenario among villages are in a crucial phase it will take time in stability in life style of them (villagers). So it needs replicate investigation also.

**COMPARISON OF CONFORMITY OF JOINT AND NUCLEAR FAMILY SUBJECTS:**

Table 4.7 depicts the mean conformity scores of joint and nuclear family subjects and their numerical values for means and SDs are 15.70, 9.42 and 3.56, 5.04 respectively. Table 4.8 expresses that the value of C R between pairs of joint and nuclear type family subjects is 6.98 which is significant at .01 level of significance. It indicates that these two groups differ significantly with each other in regard to conformity. Thus this finding indicates that family-type is a significant influencing correlate of conformity.

Table 4.7 further reveals that joint family type subjects have obtained statistically significant higher mean score for conformity, nuclear family type subjects have significantly least mean conformity score. Thus it leads us to conclude that joint family subjects are higher conformists and nuclear family subjects are lesser conformists. So it can be concluded
that according to nature of family type of subjects changes, nature of conformity tendencies also changes. There exists a relationship between family type and conformity.

Cohesiveness among family members are widely studied by social psychologists in conformity. As cohesiveness increases, conformity tendencies increases. If we consider as an index in family for social behaviour we can observe that among members of nuclear family. There are greater chance of cohesiveness comparatively to joint family members. So the result should be that nuclear family members are much socially than joint family members. But the result is vice-versa. Joint family members are much social in India.

The nation like ours is a country of classics. Family disorganisation also affects the personality of a person. Nuclear family persons have certain weaknesses in case of security fearfulness, tension, depression etc. There is much probability of neurotic tendencies in members of nuclear families than joint family members. From joint family system to nuclear family system, it is an experimentation phase in Indian society. We are first generation who have faced the challenges of family disorganisation encircled with problem of personal disorganisation too. This is not the
accepted and established norm of Indian families. These may be underlying reasons to differ in result in case of family type. After two-three generations, may be that coming generations can dilute the problems of family organisation— they may be habituated for such crucification of persons in families. So family-type is very important variable in social behaviour.

At last, it is necessary to mention that each cell of present study has exceptions— means they differ in behaviour apart from their group. They can not be explained on the basis of generalisations derived from such democratic researches. Exceptions should be studies— it needs further investigations. May be their results are boons for us because exceptions are much original, innovative, creative than majority of population.