Social Loafing Among Resort Hotel Employees

Martina Meg B. Azur, Marc Angelo Lauren E. Castillo, Glecie I. Hornilla, Kate Ann Sherizh P. Mendoza, Princess V. Sanchez and Melinda V. Tolentino
College of International Tourism and Hospitality Management
Lyceum of the Philippines University, Batangas City, Philippines

Abstract –This study aimed to understand the reason why there are social loafers, identify other people's perspective or understanding social loafers, understand how it affects an individual's intention to leave the industry, and spread awareness of how to cope up with people who are experiencing this condition. The study used descriptive method and with 285 resort hotel employees as respondents. It was found out that majority of the respondents are 21-30 years old, female, working in the housekeeping department of the resort hotels. The respondents have showed the existence of social loafing in the hospitality industry which can be best described as individuals who are leaving their tasks for their co-workers to accomplish. Most co-employees observed to show apathy, distractive disruptive behavior, social disconnectedness, and poor work quality in different instances but all to a great extent. As a result of their existence in the industry, they affect the group and team performance. When grouped according to position, age, and sex, the responses based on the observation towards a social loafer remains not significant, yet the study has shown significance when it comes to the effect of the social loafer when grouped according to their profile variables which indicated that sex has a significant relationship to social loafing.

Keywords: Social Loafing, Resort Hotel, Social Loafer

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry in the Philippines is booming all year round due to the noise it makes internationally because of the many factors that makes the country very inviting for all kinds of tourists from foreign to even local ones. Being in the hospitality industry, it means that one shall be prepared for diversity, not only when it comes to work but also to the people that everyone will be dealing with.

As individuals working in the industry, people are expected to deal with different kinds of people from different cultures on a day to day basis. Given the fact that not everyone has the capacity to get along with different types of people especially in groups, this could trigger many individuals into experiencing this condition.

Social loafing which is described as a person who thinks that his participation is not being recognized by his group is due to the increase of the size of people working in a group where in its increase is accompanied with the growing member of social loafers [1].

Social Loafing may be caused by participants choosing goals that are less ambitious when others were presently working under assumption that the task will be easier when others are involved with lower goals, individuals expect less efforts [2].

Having a social loafer within a group working in the industry can be very risky for a company that requires their employees to be well coordinated in a way that could help them in achieving the goals and objectives of the company.

Social loafers in the industry are the culprit of low performance and reduced productivity. Social loafing is a phenomenon of a person who makes fewer contributions to a group effort than they would if they were solely charged with the responsibility [3].

Batangas is known for many things like its century's old churches, irresistible delicacies, a volcano within the lake a strong accent and the butterfly knife. But more than this is the popularity of Batangas beaches [4]. Laiya located at San Juan, Batangas has quite a number of Resort Hotels which is known internationally. With over 22 resort hotels in the area, an average of 14 million tourists arrives yearly to visit the great beaches and luxurious accommodations in the area.

The study will be done to further understand the reason why there are social loafers, identify other people's perspective or understanding to social loafers, understand how it affects an individual's intention to leave the industry, and spread awareness of how to cope up with people who are experiencing this condition. This research will be of help to the

resort hotel industry in relation to their employees' mental health. On the other hand, this will also be benefitting CITHM students as the study will emphasize and give importance to work's collaboration and cooperation among their students during their stay in the university in preparation for their future careers.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine the effects of social loafing; this is the intention of the employee to leave the resort hotel. More specifically, to present the profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Gender, and Position; determine a social loafer through his/her personal characteristics; determine a social loafer's judgement towards the group in terms of: perceived social loafing, anticipated lower effort ; determine perception of the co-employees towards a social loafer in terms of: apathy, distractive disruptive behavior, socially disconnected, and poor work quality ; identify effects of having a social loafer in a group in terms of: expects others to pick up the slack ; team performance ; determine social loafer as the reason of leaving the industry in terms of satisfaction and turnover intention.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used descriptive method in order to describe the "Effect of Social Loafing on Intention to leave among Resort Hotel Employees. Descriptive Research is defined as a research method that describe as the characteristics of the population or phenomenon that is being studied. It rather focuses on the what is the purpose of the research being conducted and not on why it is being studied (Bhat, 2019). Descriptive research is therefore designed to describe the characteristics of a specific idea being studied.

Participants of the Study

The respondents of the study are those employees of resort hotels located in Laiya, San Juan, Batangas. The resort hotels included in the study have a range of 60-100 employees. The survey was conducted to 22 resort hotels all over the area, with a total of 285 respondents.

Instrument

To attain the necessary data the instrument was adapted from the past research. The questionnaire is divided into four parts. Part I is to determine if a person is a social loafer through his/her personal characteristics. Part II is to interpret a social loafers' judgement towards the group. Part III is the observation towards the social loafers and Part IV is to see the effects of having a social loafer in a group. The instrument obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.781 which implies that the questionnaire has a good internal consistency and reliable for use to this study.

Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed to the respondents, which are the employees from different resort hotel in San Juan, Batangas. Then after the researchers collected the questionnaire, tabulated and tallied. For the statistical analysis the tabulated data was sent to the statistician.

Data analysis

The questionnaire were retrieved, tallied, encoded and analyzed using different statistical tools such as frequency distribution, weighted mean, Independent sample t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). These tools will be used based on the objectives of the study. In addition, all data would be treated using statistical software known as PAWS version 18 to further interpret the results of the study. The given scale was used to interpret the result of the study in terms of personal characteristics: 4.50 – 5.00 = Not at All Characteristics; 3.50 – 4.49 = A little characteristic; 2.50 – 3.49 = Rather characteristic; 1.50 – 2.49 = Much characteristic; 1.00 – 1.49 = Very characteristic. The given scale was used to interpret the result towards social loafer: 4.50 – 5.00 = To a Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50 – 4.49 = To a Great Extent (GE); 2.50 – 3.49 = To a Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50 – 2.49 = To a Least Extent (LE); 1.00 – 1.49 = Not at All (NA).

Ethical Consideration

To observe a highly confidential nature of survey, no particular names were mentioned in the report. The identification of the respondent was not revealed. No personal opinions given by the researchers, only information and result based on the data gathered in the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 represents the percentage distribution of our respondents based on their position, age, and sex

96

P-ISSN 2362-8022 | E-ISSN 2362-8030 | www.apjeas.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Volume 6, No. 4, October 2019

_____

shows us that among 285 respondents which are all employees of resort hotels in San Juan, the highest percentage of the respondents which is 32.30 percent or 92 of our respondents came from the housekeeping department, followed by the people in the front office department which is 23.20 percent or 66 respondents, and third is the people involved in food production which is 20.40 percent or 58 respondents and last are those working in the restaurants, which is just 8.80 percent or 25 respondents.

Table 1.Percentage Distribution of the Respondent's Profile

Profile Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Position		
Housekeeping	92	32.30
Front Office	66	23.20
Food and Beverage	44	15.40
Food Production	58	20.40
Restaurant	25	8.80
Age		
Below 21 years old	25	8.80
21-30 years old	136	47.70
31-40 years old	100	35.10
41-50 years old	22	7.70
51-60 years old	2	.70
Sex		
Male	135	47.4
Female	150	52.60

Table 1 shows the percentage distribution of the respondent's profile. Majority of the respondents are aged 21-30 years old with a 47.70 percentage, which indicates that individuals in the industry are those who are very much capable of accomplishing activities that requires physical effort. This certain type of individuals in the age group is considered efficient and productive at work.

It followed by with the age bracket of 31-40 years old with 35.10 percent they are those experienced individuals in the field, who identified to be with enough experience that ensures precise work with less possibility of mistakes. Lastly, the smallest number of people still in the industry belongs to the age 51-60 years old which are most likely the people who have the longest experience in the field.

In terms of sex which are greatly essential as mentioned through other social loafing studies [5], where it was mentioned that gender roles have something to do with the possibility of experiencing social loafing. In our survey, 52.60 percent of the respondents are female that corresponds to 150 respondents on the other hand, 47.40 percent of the respondents or 135 are male.

Table 2 presents the personal characteristics of a social loafer. It was observed that the composite mean of 2.24 would mean much characteristic. The top 3 indicators which has showed the highest weighted mean are Leaves work for the next shift which he/she should really complete got a weighted mean of 2.41, followed by puts forth less effort that other members of his/her work group, with a weighted mean of 2.34, and the third which is defers responsibilities he/she should assume to other team members with a weighted mean of 2.27.

Table 2. Personal Characteristics of Social Loafer

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. Defers responsibilities he/she should assume to other team members.	2.27	Much Characteristics	3
2. Puts forth less effort on the job when other people are around to do the work.	2.17	Much Characteristics	7.5
3. Does not do his/her fair share of the work.	2.24	Much Characteristics	4
4. Spends less time helping customers if other people are present to serve customers.	2.17	Much Characteristics	7.5
5. Puts forth less effort than other members of his/her work group.	2.34	Much Characteristics	2
6. Leaves work for the next shift which he/she should really complete.	2.41	Much Characteristics	1
7. Is less likely to approach a customer if another team member is available to do this.	2.15	Much Characteristics	9
8. Take it easy if other people are around to do the work.	2.20	Much Characteristics	5
9. Defers customer service activities to other team members if they were present	2.18	Much Characteristics	6
Composite Mean	**2.24**	**Much Characteristics**	

Most social loafer showed behavior in which they used to leave their work unfinished to be continued by the person who will be working in the next shift. This

kind of behavior mostly affects the quality of work made by the group as unfinished work piles up and consumes more time. According to Pryor [6], there are existing individuals in the company who are more than willing to fix every error that they spot. In this case, they are the ones being left to accomplish the work which are left unfinished by the social loafers.

The least three (3) in the indicators which least describes the behavior showed by a social loafer are: defers customer service activities to other team members if they were present with a weighted mean of 2.18, followed by puts forth less effort on the job when other people are around to do the work, and spends less time helping customers if other people are present to serve customers which both has a weighted mean of 2.17, and lastly which is less likely to approach a customer if another team member is available to do this with a weighted mean of 2.15.

The least 3 in the indicators show that somehow, social loafers are forced to behave differently if other team members are there working with them. For a reason, they are ashamed of being seen by their co-employees slacking off during their working hours. Newcomer [7] said that being ashamed raises the ability of a person to present their best self. In this kind of situations, they will therefore exert effort in doing better in some ways.

Table 3. Social Loafers Judgement Towards the Group in terms of Perceived Social Loafing

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. Members of my group are trying as hard as they can.	4.28	GE	1
2. Members of my group are "free-loaders".	4.07	GE	2
3. Members of my group are contributing less than I anticipated.	3.97	GE	4
4. Given their abilities, my group members are doing the best they can.	4.06	GE	3
Composite Mean	**4.09**	GE	

Table 3 shows the social loafers' judgement towards the group in terms of perceived social loafing. This has a composite mean of 4.09 that means the above-mentioned indicators describe the social loafers' judgement to a great extent.

Indicators, member of my group are trying as hard as they can got a weighted mean of 4.28 and ranks first the social loafers see the people within the group to be exerting effort to achieve their goals through coordination in order to accomplish the task. This are the worker who are more willing to do hard work in all the task allotted for them. Often times, individuals

prioritize the projects joyously without doubt. Study show [8] that when you work independently you typically set your schedule, tackle your projects in a manner that suits your preferences, and are solely responsible for outcomes. In team environment, ideas are shared workloads divided on a group consensus wherein they act effectively when determining project scope and directions. Understanding and committing to this group dynamic has the willingness and eagerness to finish the job.

Indicators given abilities to my group members are doing the best they can got a weighted mean of 4.06 which ranks 3rd and members of my group are contributing less than I anticipated got a weighted mean of 3.97 ranked Fourth. Group with the given ability and doing the best they can social loafers and free loaders pays no contributions at all but only the ones who are willing to do their job comes with a successful and accomplished task. Given the ability that the social loafers lack, they do their best for the group most especially to the tasks given to them which is claimed as their road to success.

Being lazy is the most common reason that someone is not successful showing less effort is automatic and involuntary. This is social cognition that takes very little to no effort. When walking into a room with a dozen people, you can easily tell the difference between a person who contribute to have a successful business. In performing a task individual also engaged in low effort thinking like doing something to achieve it and will fail if they don't spend it with full effort [9].

Table 4 shows the social loafers' judgement towards the group in terms of anticipated lower effort, with a composite mean of 3.90 which describes the above-mentioned indicators to a great extent.

Indicators, Because some group members are not trying as hard as they can, the rest of my group will probably put in less effort, and because some members are not doing their share, I don't think anyone in my group is going to do work as hard as they could on this project both ranked 1.5 with the same weighted mean of 3.94.

Being in a group means that the work load is divided unto the individuals in the group, this therefore requires everyone to insert less effort compared when they are to do things on their own. But being in a group does not exactly mean that they do not have to try their best since the quality of the service being provided will decrease since everyone inserts less effort compared to a group where

_____

everyone inserts the same effort which can therefore result to very satisfactory service. According to study [10], for a team to have success, all members must consistently work together to achieve their common goal. Unfortunately, not all groups stand in a united front. Sometimes, poor team members often cause dysfunction and strife.

Table 4. Social Loafers Judgement Towards the Group in terms of Anticipated Lower Effort

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. Because some group members are not trying as hard as they can, the rest of my group will probably put in less effort.	3.94	GE	1.5
2. Some of my group members are putting in less effort than they could, so other group members will not try as they could.	3.83	GE	4
3. Because some members are not doing their share, I don't think anyone in my group is going to work as hard as they could on this project.	3.94	GE	1.5
4. Since some group members are not expending much effort in this project, others on the group will likely reduce their effort.	3.90	GE	3
Composite Mean	**3.90**	GE	

On the other hand, since some group members are not expending much effort in this project, others on the group will likely reduce their effort which has a weighted mean of 3.90, and some of my group members are putting in less effort than they could, so other group members are not trying as hard as they could which has the lowest weighted mean of 3.83.

This would mean that even though there are individuals in the group who are not trying or exerting a huge effort on accomplishing their goals, it does not affect everyone in the group because there will still be individuals exerting effort even if they see that they can see that there are other individuals exerting as much as effort as they do. Being assertive is required when working in the industry, when lazy co-employees ignore their own work and asks you to do it instead, they are more likely to keep their behavior going. Helping an individual once or twice is called teamwork yet doing the task on their behalf is going to be a bad habit for those who are being favored [11].

Table 5 shows the observation of the co-employees towards social loafers as to apathy; this has a composite mean of 4.15 which indicates that all

indicators mentioned are relevant to the observation on a great extent. The indicators which showed the highest weighted mean are that the social loafer was not interested in the topic/task assigned to the team (4.44), and that the social loafer expected others to pick up the slack with no consequences to him/her (4.18).

Table 5. Observation of the Co-Employees Towards a Social Loafer as to Apathy

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The social loafer was not interested in the topic/task assigned to the team.	4.44	GE	1
2. The social loafer did not care about earning a high grade in the class.	4.15	GE	3
3. The social loafer expected others to pick up the slack with no consequences to him /her.	4.18	GE	2
4. The social loafer just did not care.	3.97	GE	5
5. The social loafer was just plain lazy.	4.01	GE	4
Composite Mean	**4.15**	GE	

Being interested in a topic or task has a lot to do on how motivated an individual can be. Not all individuals in a group can be interested in the topic or task, which therefore tends to have less motivated individuals in the group. This lack of interest will result to some members of the group being left out since they will not be participating or contributing much. Employees who make unjustifiable excuses are the kind of individuals who are often implying that they show no interest in accomplishing the assigned task, employees who show great interest in a specific task does the job immediately after it was assigned. Since the work needs to be done, having these types of individuals within the group can be frustrating.

The social loafer was just plain lazy got a weighted mean of 4.01, and the social loafer just did not care got the lowest weighted mean of 3.97. This indicates that these characteristics barely apply to how the co-employees observe the social loafer.

Showing no care at all to the group really does happen in the industry. Human beings can be ignorant if they choose to be one. This can be because being in a group can result to free riding wherein some members barely or completely do not share any contributions to the group. As stated [12], the amount of contribution of the members in a large group is one of the biggest concerns. In the workplace being in a group makes some individuals freeloaders who are not contributing to accomplished work due to their laziness and their want not to do any kind of work.

Table 6. Observation of the Co-Employees Towards a Social Loafer as to Distractive Disruptive Behavior

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The social loafer had trouble paying attention to what was going on in the team.	4.15	GE	3
2. The social loafer engaged in side conservations a lot when the team was working.	4.16	GE	2
3. The social loafer mostly distracted team's focus from its goals and objectives.	4.18	GE	1
Composite Mean	**4.16**	GE	

Table 6 shows the observation of the co-employees towards a social loafer as to distractive disruptive behavior which has a composite mean of 4.16 which mean that the indicators used in the variable is relevant to a great extent.

The social loafer mostly distracted team's focus from its goals and objectives got has a weighted mean of 4.18 which ranked number 1, followed by the social loafer engaged in side conversations a lot when the team was working with a weighted mean of 4.16.

Having a social loafer in a group can really affect the team's performance as their behavior simply affects everyone in the group. Distracting the team members in various ways can divert the members attention away from their goals and objectives. Being in the hospitality industry, keeping the team focused is a must to be able to provide excellent service. Without focus, a team is most likely to achieve their goals and result to frequent failures in many aspects. Study show [13], that having a social loafer in a group constantly causes disputes and problems at work since their presence affects the members which results to the decrease in productivity in everyone's work.

The social loafer had trouble paying attention to what was going on in the team has the lowest weighted mean of 4.15. This indicates that among the above-mentioned observations, this characteristic is least visible on the behavior showed by the social loafer.

Not being able to pay attention to the groups status will then result to lack of awareness of the current status of the team in terms of their performance. Having individuals who are not paying attention reduces the groups productivity because of the absence of some individuals who are not well aware of the current issues being faced by the group. The lack of attentiveness results to an individual not paying attention to detail that often result to mistake and make success in the workplace harder to achieve [14].

Table 7. Observation of the Co-Employees Towards a Social Loafer as to Socially Disconnected

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The social loafer did not like one or more of the team members.	4.05	GE	2
2. The social loafer did not get along with one or more members of the team.	3.97	GE	3
3. The social loafer was not part of the clique and did not seem to belong to the team.	4.06	GE	1
Composite Mean	**4.02**	GE	

Table 7 shows the observation of the Co-Employees towards a social loafer as to socially Disconnected. Indicator The social loafer did not like one or more of the team members, got a weighted mean of 4.05 is the second indicator that is pointed to be the reason why the social loafer prefers to be socially disconnected. Because that they feel that they can do better in a task when doing it alone. Social loafers prefer not to work because they do not feel they are belonging in the group or there are individuals within the group who the loafers do not want to work with.

Last, with a weighted mean of 3.97 the social loafer did not get along with one or more members of the team. The group probably gives less appreciation and does not pay attention to the people who had given only few contributions, they are only giving favor to those who gave huge help. Social loafers are feeling more lonesome in terms of being part of the team since they do not see the value within the group. There might be no pulling factor for him/her to participate.

Being in a team helps accomplish goals, provided with the right vision, groups can be expected to relate to each other and set their direction to keep everyone working as one. This rather helps them be more efficient through moving towards their goals. Being in a team helps an individual build up his/her talents and skills since they are working as one. They learn from each other's strategies and this helps them strengthen the core of their team. Removing distractions is an element required to achieve the team's goals and objectives [15].

100

P-ISSN 2362-8022 | E-ISSN 2362-8030 | www.apjeas.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Volume 6, No. 4, October 2019

_____

Table 8. Observation of the Co-Employees Towards a Social Loafer as to Poor Work Quality

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The social loafer came poorly prepared for team meetings.	4.02	GE	2
2. The social loafer had trouble completing team-related homework.	4.00	GE	3
3. The social loafer did a poor job of the work he or she was assigned.	4.06	GE	1
4. The social loafer did poor quality work overall on the team.	3.96	GE	4
Composite Mean	**4.01**	GE	

Table 8 shows the observation of the co-employees towards a social loafer as to poor work quality. This has a composite mean of 4.01 which means that indicators used are relevant to a great extent.

The social loafer did a poor job of the work he/she was assigned got the highest weighted mean of 4.06, followed by the social loafer came poorly prepared for team meetings. Doing less of what is expected on the specific task assigned is one factor that affects the overall outcome of a group. A single work that fails when piled up is also a lot of unsuccessful tasks that has been accomplished. Some underlying reasons may be due to the lack of knowledge on the task assigned or just being ignorant when in the job are the reasons why a poor job is done. Study [16] said that not being able to do things right in the first attempt requires an individual to set it right as quickly as possible in the second attempt this results to damaging the morale of a person and impacts their employees that can lead to poor work quality since productivity and efficiency is being decrease

The social loafer had trouble completing team-related homework has a weighted mean of 4.00, followed by the lowest in the ranking which is the social loafer did poor quality work overall on the team which has a weighted mean of 3.96.

Not being able to accomplish a single task with a good quality does not mean that the social loafer has completely failed in all aspects. There can be specific tasks which can be a person's weakness but on the other hand, there are also tasks which can be easily done by an employee. Since this case may vary on every situation, we can say that the social loafer does not completely fail on his/her work. People submit sloppy work for a number of different reasons. For example, they might feel rushed for time due to procrastination or poor time management. They might rush through tasks because they are excited to finish a project, or they may have low ambition and not care about the quality of their work. Sloppy work not only damages a person's career, but it can also negatively impact on entire team's morale, goals, objectives and productivity [17].

Table 9. Effects of Having a Social Loafer in a Group

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The team members had to waste time explaining things to the social loafer.	4.35	GE	1
2. Other team members had to do more than their fair share of work.	4.05	GE	2
3. Other team members had to redo or revise the work done by the social loafer.	4.01	GE	3
Composite Mean	**4.14**	GE	

Table 9 shows the effects of having a social loafer in a group. This has a composite mean of 4.14 which means that the effects are showing relevance to a great extent.

The team members had to waste time explaining things to the social loafer got the highest weighted mean of 4.35, followed by other team members had to do more than their fair share of work which got a weighted mean of 4.05.

Explaining things over and over again to some individuals is really time consuming and also disturbs other individuals who shall be doing their own tasks. This reduces the work efficiency of the group that could have accomplished their own tasks within the given amount of time but failed to do so since they had to cover up for the other individuals who are having a hard time in doing their own task. The results of social loafing in the team took so much time before completing their task. The meetings took longer period than the expected time, which is mainly because the team members had to waste time to explain things to the social loafer. Other members had to do more work than others and also be there to improve and correct the mistakes made by the social loafer. Because of all this causes of delay, the group are usually missing their deadlines as they cover up more time than what is expected [18].

Other team members had to redo or revise the work done by social loafer with the lowest weighted mean which is 4.01, this means that most of the time people had to do something to fix the social loafers

work because it was done wrong or just partially correct.

Redoing or revising as the other factors mentioned is time consuming and really reduces the efficiency and quality of the work or service provided by the group. Things could have been easier for everyone if tasks are made correctly in the first place that having to do the same thing all over again because of the failure to do so on the first attempt. Not finishing the task on time can be disappointing to those who work on the task and more so to those who are expecting the task to be finished on a giving amount of time since some individual are trying to avoid doing the task, they are more likely to give it up [19].

Table 10. Effects of Having a Social Loafer in a Group as to Team Performance

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
1. The work had to be resigned to other members of the team.	3.99	GE	3.5
2. The team had fewer good ideas than other teams.	3.99	GE	3.5
3. The team missed deadlines.	4.04	GE	2
4. The team's final presentation was not as high quality as that of other teams.	4.06	GE	1
Composite Mean	**4.02**	GE	

Table 10 shows the effects of having a social loafer in a group as to team performance. The indicators show a composite mean of 4.02 which means that all indicators are relevant to a great extent.

The team's final presentation was not as high quality as that of other teams has the highest weighted mean of 4.06, followed by the team missed deadlines which has a weighted mean of 4.04. Having individuals who are not being able to perform well in a group reduces the quality of work and services rendered by a team. In the industry, the system functions as a whole that even a small failure in one aspect directly affects the outlook of the customers as a whole. This is why providing the standard amount of effort is required so that the company as a whole provides a better outlook for the company. According to research [20], that if you are in a management position for long enough at some point you are likely to encounter an employee whose performance is not up to par. While you may be tempted to ignore the problem and hope it goes away, it is more likely that the problem will only get worse. An underperforming employee can have a negative effect on the rest of the workplace, because other employees are forced to

pick up the slack. This can lead to everything form feelings of resentment to burnout to high turnover. On the other hand, the indicators the work had to be reassigned to other members of the team, and the team had fewer good ideas than other team has the lowest weighted mean which is 3.99.

One's failure to accomplish a task requires another person to do it. Since tasks cannot be left unaccomplished or finished as a failure. In some instances, failure is often a result of the lack of participation of some individuals to accomplish the task, having a negative outcome can therefore serve as the sole basis to say that the task has not been made with the effort of everyone in the group. When having a social loafer in a team can affects one's group performance since an individual with social with social loafing. For some reason, a negative effect of a social loafer with the group performance is that most of the time, when the social loafer does not contribute, it then leads to having the work reassigned to other team members [21].

Table 11. Social Loafing as one of the Reasons of Leaving the Industry

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
Satisfaction			
1. I am happy with this company.	4.24	GE	1
2. I enjoy dealing with this company.	4.20	GE	2
3. I am pleased with the relationship this company has established me.	4.19	GE	2
Composite Mean	**4.21**	**GE**	
Turnover Intention			
4. I feel I may change my job within 2-3 years.	3.94	GE	2
5. I often think about leaving my job.	3.95	GE	1
6. I want to find a new job if possible.	3.91	GE	3
Composite Mean	**3.94**	**GE**	
Over-all Composite Mean	**4.07**	**GE**	

Table 11 shows how social loafing is a contributory factor to the reasons of leaving the industry. This has an overall composite mean of 4.07, in which satisfaction has a composite mean of 4.21 and turnover intention with a composite mean of 3.94.

In terms of satisfaction, most employees are happy with the company where they are working which is shown in the table with a weighted mean of 4.24, followed by the indicators which state that the employees enjoy dealing with their company and that they are pleased with their relationship that the company has established with them. These two indicators have a composite mean of 4.20 and 4.19.

102
P-ISSN 2362-8022 | E-ISSN 2362-8030 | www.apjeas.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Volume 6, No. 4, October 2019

Having satisfied and happy employees has a lot to do on how the company deals with their guests as a whole. Seeing employees having a great time while doing their work makes them more active, motivated, and productive. This positivity that starts with the employees themselves really does reflect on the company itself. According to study [22], ensuring the happiness of a company's employees provides the company itself with the success which they always dream of. Having fully satisfied people working for the company makes sure that they are more productive and helps the company to avoid the negative effects of having a high turnover rate, which costs the company a fortune.

When it comes to turnover intention, it shows that most employees are often thinking about leaving their job which has a weighted mean of 3.95, followed by the employees who feels that they may change their job within 2-3 years with a weighted mean of 3.94 and lastly is the employees who wants to find a new job if possible that has a weighted mean of 3.91.

Some employees often think about leaving their job for some reasons like the workplace could have been toxic for some individuals that they would rather leave the job and seek for a new one rather than having to deal with their work-related issues. The workplace environment has a lot to do about how a person would stay or leave their job since it will be unhealthy for their mental health if they would be working with toxic people in a toxic environment. In parallel to having happiness and satisfaction, employee turnover happens when employees face complicated situations within the company. Working in an environment which requires being in a group does not only make it hard for social loafers but to the co-workers also. This leads to frustration, which worsens and leads to individuals voluntarily leaving the company [23].

Table 12. Difference of Responses on the Observation Towards Social Loafer as to When Grouped According to Position

	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Apathy	0.396	0.812	Not Significant
Distractive Disruptive Behavior	0.759	0.552	Not Significant
Socially Disconnected	1.179	0.320	Not Significant
Poor Work Quality	1.606	0.173	Not Significant

Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05

Table presents the comparison of responses on the observation towards social loafer when grouped according to position. It was observed that all computed p-values were all greater than 0.05 alpha level, thus the researchers fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means that there was no significant difference observed. Based on the result that we can see on table 3.1, when grouped according to position, the co-employees are more likely to see the social loafer as a person who contributes to poor work quality because based on table 4.4 a social loafer does a poor job of the work he or she was assigned because the individual was not interested in their jobs.

They are not productive in their works, which reflects on their actions in the workplace. Social loafers are lacking in progress within themselves because they do not have trust in their personal abilities, and they do not pay attention on what is happening within the workplace. Poor work quality has a big effect in the workplace because it will affect other members on how and what they can do to come up with excellent service. Due to the contribution of the social loafer which leads to poor work quality, the co-employees are less likely to express apathy towards the social loafer.

Employees should not be identified by their poor performance when it comes to their work, yet we shall also see the underlying causes that lead to this output. Gaining insights about such situations helps the employees in working out for a solution to their problem when it comes to their performance [24].

Table 13. Difference of Responses on the Observation Towards Social Loafer as to When Grouped According to Age

	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Apathy	0.231	0.921	Not Significant
Distractive Disruptive Behavior	0.590	0.670	Not Significant
Socially Disconnected	1.529	0.194	Not Significant
Poor Work Quality	0.590	0.670	Not Significant

Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05

Table 13 shows the comparison of responses on the observation towards social loafer when grouped according to age. It was observed that all computed p-values were all greater than 0.05 alpha level, thus the researchers fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means that there was no significant difference observed. Age has a lot to do when it comes to how people perceive things in different situations. Often times, people who are older and more experienced have wider understanding and are more considerate

103
P-ISSN 2362-8022 | E-ISSN 2362-8030 | www.apjeas.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Volume 6, No. 4, October 2019

towards others with the fact that they may have encountered certain situations, which are more likely to be somehow related or alike from what they have encountered.

In relation to be a person who interacts with a social loafer, it is not to be considered as a factor on how they interact with them. We observed that people from different age brackets are giving the same perception towards the social loafer wherein towards others with the fact that they may have encountered certain situations which are more likely to be somehow related or alike from what they have encountered.

Since there is not much interaction within the workplace, social loafers fear that the loss of interaction lowers their chance to get the promotion every employee ever wants. This lack of interaction leads to social loafing [18].

Table 14. Difference of Responses on the Observation Towards Social Loafer as to When Grouped According to Sex

	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Apathy	1.415	0.158	Not Significant
Distractive Disruptive Behavior	1.203	0.230	Not Significant
Socially Disconnected	1.285	0.200	Not Significant
Poor Work Quality	1.311	0.191	Not Significant

Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05

Table 14 shows the comparison of responses on the observation towards social loafer when grouped according to sex. It was observed that all computed p-values were all greater than 0.05 alpha level, thus the researchers fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means that there was no significant difference observed.

Based on the result that we can see on table 3.3, it showed us that when grouped according to sex, people respond to the social loafer with apathy. Because of the observation that the individual is somehow pushing himself into something that he does not want to do. Lacking passion for what you are doing is one factor that makes an individual less productive at work. This makes an individual perceive that they do not work for a purpose and sees work as a burden every day. In some cases, some individuals are just not happy with their work and want to have a career change but due to some reasons, cannot leave the current job.

Even dedicated workers can be not productive, yet the problem arises when all the workers are not productive since they will not be able to accomplish their work. This can affect the groups output and performance since the environment will become toxic [25].

Being unprepared in doing something will be a contributory factor why the certain task fails. Being unprepared even to little aspects like meetings is certainly a waste of time for the listeners especially when all the factors discussed are unhelpful [26].

Table 15. Difference of Responses on the Effects of Social Loafer When Grouped According to Profile Variables

	Expects others to pick up the slack			Team Performance		
	F-value	p-value	I	F-value	p-value	I
Position	1.867	0.116	NS	1.48	0.208	NS
Age	0.162	0.957	NS	0.478	0.752	NS
Sex	-2.758	0.006	S	-1.627	0.105	NS

Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05

Table 8 presents the comparison on the effects of social loafer. It observed that there was a significant difference observed on expects other to pick up the slack when grouped according to sex since the obtained p-value of 0.006 was less than 0.05 alpha level. This means that the responses differ significantly and reveals that the effects were observed more on male than female. Men doing less effort and less sociable in a group or working alone because their rest assured that there is someone that will do more effort to achieve the daily task, while women are more responsible with their task to achieve their goals. In addition, women doing works even though it's not part of their jobs just to achieve their goals. Men most of the time do not have interest on the works that not related to their jobs. Besides, women are more passionate to their works because it is the essence and the things that women only have compared to the men. Also, women want to spend time doing something rather than doing nothing.

Women work 10 percent harder to men in the today's officers. The conclusion was based in the product of two other statistics. First, both men and women complete 66 percent of their work. Women are assigned and spend more time on non- promotable task than men. In other words, men don't want to do are begin handed by women [16].

104
P-ISSN 2362-8022 | E-ISSN 2362-8030 | www.apjeas.apjmr.com
Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Volume 6, No. 4, October 2019

Table 16. Action Plan Based on the Result of Study

Key Result Area/ Objectives	Strategies	Expected Outcome	Person/ Agency Involved
1. To ensure social loafer does not do poor quality work overall on the team.	To track progress on their task and establish key milestone with estimated completion dates.	Team will be challenged to do their work and will then result to improvement of their outputs.	Manager
2. To make sure that the social loafer gets along with other members of the group.	Provide activities which can help build interpersonal relationships with everyone in the team.	People within the group will be closer to each other so that everyone gets along together.	Co-workers
3. To make the social loafer pay attention to what is going on in the group.	Assign tasks to the social loafer to keep them busy	Team will improve and achieve their goals and objectives.	Co-Worker
4. To make social loafers care about their work	Giving recognition and rewards to employees who are doing excellent work.	Employees will start to pay attention and care about the results and outcome of their work.	Owner

From the study of Gabrenya et al. [5], women identified to be less vulnerable to social loafing than men through their different culture. In addition, men are more individualistic, and women are more interactive. Women expressed less social loafing than men across different cultures. The authors argued that regardless of the change in social roles, genetic and historical roles continue to make men more individualistic and women more rational (Kughiara, 2015).

CONCLUSION

Social loafers can be easily spotted in an environment as they project behaviors which can be best described as people who are always leaving their tasks for other people to accomplish, and they are also not exerting effort on their tasks and defers their responsibilities. Social loafers always think negatively of their group and this can be best described as seeing that most of the time they think their groups are contributing less than what they anticipated and that their co-employees are not trying as hard as they do. People who are getting a chance to deal with social loafers has different ways of expressing their observation towards the social loafers. Some of them expressed apathy seeing that the social loafer is not interested in the task being assigned to them; other sees that the social loafer has a distractive disruptive behavior shown in a way that the social loafer mostly distracts the teams focus from its goals and objectives. There are also some who seems to see the social loafer who is socially disconnected in a way that they can see that the social loafer was not part of the clique or clearly does not belong to the group and lastly, some of them thinks that the social loafer contributes mostly to having poor work quality in a way that he/she does a poor job of the task being assigned. The negative effects of having a social loafer in a group is that they had to waste their co-employees time in explaining things to them as they do not understand things in just one explanation and also the team's final presentation was not of high quality as to those of other teams. Social Loafer leave his/her workplace because of their personality that they can't communicate well to their workmates. In this case, they intend to leave in the industry because they lack in satisfaction where they leave their work and they are not interested to give effort to the workplace.

.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that there are no social loafers in a group to have a productive and efficient team. Spotting the social loafers as soon as possible shall help the team to improve their strategies and come up with plans to help out a social loafer to improve their behavior. Providing employees with equally divided tasks in order for them to have fair share of work shall therefore ease the social loafer and remove his way of thinking that the job being disseminated among them is not fair. Being aware of a social loafers behavior, co-employees shall find ways to help out them in ways like giving them the task of his/her best interest, assigning tasks to keep them busy in order to avoid them lurking around other employees to distract them, having the team welcome the social loafer and form a good office relationship, and help the social loafer to improve their work by guiding and teaching them to do a better work.

Ensuring that all employees has equal knowledge in all the tasks being assigned will make things quicker as they can all be able to handle all kinds of tasks without having to disturb other employees, this can also lead to improvement of the quality of work and service provided by the team since everyone will

be sharing a part in contributing their knowledge. Ensure every worker's perception in a group work most specially in their workplace where they can feel that they are connected with every co-worker. Giving them the incentives will make them stay in the industry.

REFERENCES

[1] Nordmeyer, B. (2016). "What Is Social Loafing in the Workplace?" Retrieved from: https://woman.thenest.com

[2] Meier, J. (2017). "Social Loafing: More is less when it comes to work". Retrieved from: https://www.google.com

[3] Moon, L. (2017). "The secret to removing Social Loafing from the workplace" Retrieved from: http://sourcesofinsight.com

[4] https://www.thepoortraveler.net/2016/03/best-batangas-beach-resorts-rates/

[5] Gabrenya Jr, W. K., Wang, Y. E., & Latané, B. (1985). Social loafing on an optimizing task: Cross-cultural differences among Chinese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *16*(2), 223-242.

[6] Pryor, M. (2016). "You can't fix everything". Retrieved from: https://www.google.com/

[7] Newcomer, L. (2016). "Shyness in the workplace". Retrieved from: https://www.google.com

[8] McQuerrey, L. (2019). "How to Work Effectively in a Team Environment" Retrieved from: https://smallbusiness.com.chron.html

[9] Morgan, M. (2015). "Effort in a Workplace" Retrieved from: https://www.aubreydaniels.com

[10] Ward, S. (2019). "How to make your Small Business more Successful" Retrieved from: https://www.thebalancesmb.com

[11] Sese, C. (2015). "6Tips for being more Assertive at Work" Retrieved from: https://www.goodtherapy.org\

[12] Weimer, M. (2019). "Noncontributing Members in a small group: An Important Distinction". Retrieved from: https://www.facultyfocus.com

[13] Luzajic, T. (2017). "6 types of terrible employees and How to handle them" Retrieved from: https://www.humanity.com

[14] Karrera, M. (2017). "How to develop your attention to detail skill" Retrieved from: https://www.careeraddict.com/

[15] Community Tool Box (2018). "Building Teams: Broadening the Base for Leadership". Retrieved from: https://ctb.ku.edu

[16] Hearn, S. (2018). "Managing Poor Performance" Retrieved from: https://www.clearreview.com

[17] MindTools (2019) "Dealing with Sloppywork" Retrieved from: https://www.mindtools.com

[18] Deleau, J. (2017). Social Loafing Construct Validity in Higher Education: How Well Do Three Measures of Social Loafing Stand Up to Scrutiny?.

[19] Porter, J. (2018). "Why you can Never Finish Anything & How to Finally Change it". Retrieved from: https://www.fastcompany.com.html

[20] Career, B. (2019). "Tips to handle underperforming Employees" Retrieved from: https://resources.careerbuilder.com/

[21] Heibutzki, R. (2019). "Decreased Productivity". Retrieved from: https://work.chron.com

[22] Alt, A. (2018). "Create a Happy Workplace & Boost Employee Engagement" Retrieved from: www.snacknation.com

[23] Liou, K. (2014). "Employee turnover and retention" Retrieved from: http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in

[24] Poppin, (2019) 3 Factors That Cause Poor Performance in the Workplace Retrieved from: https://www.popinnow.com

[25] Drucker, P. (2012). *Managing in a time of great change*. Routledge.

[26] Green, A. (2014). "The 5 Worst People to Have in Your Meeting and How to Deal With Them". Retrieved from: https://www.quickbase.com