

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8312335

Beck, Pearl

THE LIMITS OF INDIVIDUAL CONFORMITY: A FIELD STUDY

City University of New York

PH.D. 1983

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE LIMITS OF INDIVIDUAL CONFORMITY:

A FIELD STUDY

by

PEARL BECK

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1983

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

November 1, 1982
date

Edgar F. Borgatta
Chairman of Examining Committee

January 1, 1983
date

Robert D. Saltzberg
Executive Officer

Prof. Edgar Borgatta

Prof. Stanley Milgram

Prof. Stephen P. Cohen
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

THE LIMITS OF INDIVIDUAL CONFORMITY:
A FIELD STUDY

by

Pearl Beck

Adviser: Professor Edgar Borgatta

This study was undertaken to determine whether those variables associated with non-conformity in experimental settings would predict non-conformity in a field setting. A Jewish Socialist summer camp was chosen as the setting for the research. The camp conditions resembled those of a natural experiment. It brought together a group of previously unacquainted adolescents for a time-limited period, during which they were subjected to an intensive, structured program aimed at promoting a socialist belief system.

The independent variables hypothesized to relate to non-conformity were consensus, psychological conformity, attraction to the group, and popularity. Consensus was measured by the attitudinal convergence among an individual's referents. Two subsets of referents were distinguished: those with whom the individual had relatively weak ties and those with whom the individual had relatively strong ties.

Non-conformity, the dependent variable, was measured by the discrepancy between an individual's attitude and the mean attitudes of his referents. A camper's level of non-conformity was assessed on three dimensions: social justice, individual justice, and closedmindedness.

Greater non-conformity was predicted where: there existed a high level of attitudinal diversity among an individual's referents, an individual was low on psychological conformity, an individual was low on attraction to the group, and when an individual was popular. It was also hypothesized that the magnitude of influence exerted by the independent variables would be greater for subsets consisting of an individual's close friends than for subsets consisting of an individual's more distant referents.

The results indicate that the process of conformity depends on whether or not the values involved are socially relevant. Socially relevant attitudes were found to be affected by consensus--a social structural variable--whereas the personal attitudes were found to be more affected by psychological conformity--a personality variable. Attraction to the group was only weakly related, while popularity was not at all related, to attitudinal non-conformity. The discussion focused upon circumstances under which each of these processes occurs as well as upon the implications of using various research modalities for studying conformity.

Acknowledgments

Because dissertation writing is a mostly solitary endeavor, I was especially grateful to those who helped and encouraged me while I was working on it. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them.

Ed Borgatta, my advisor, deserves special thanks for his methodological assistance, his consistently encouraging attitude and for his ongoing involvement often at the expense of personal convenience.

I welcome this occasion to express my appreciation and gratitude to Stanley Milgram. Over the years he has demonstrated an unusual capacity to be both intellectually nourishing and personally supportive.

The suggestions offered by my third committee member, Stephen P. Cohen, helped sharpen the focus of this dissertation and stimulated me to explore my personal, as well as intellectual, interest in the topic.

In addition, I want to thank my outside readers, Florence Denmark and William Helmreich, for the time they spent and for their instructive comments.

Janet Weinglass, my close friend and colleague, played an indispensable role in all stages of the dissertation process. Her interest in ideas and personal generosity were invaluable to me. I am deeply grateful to her. I am also thankful for the useful feedback that I received from Joyce Wackenhut who volunteered to read my thesis.

To my parents, Alex and Ruth Beck, I owe a great deal. They have always encouraged me to pursue my interests and have sustained me throughout with their confidence and love.

I want to thank David Newman for enduring many years of indecisions, visions and revisions and for providing me with a positive model of commitment to one's work and to what one believes in.

Of the many friends who assisted me in innumerable ways, I would like to extend a special thanks to Marlene Stulbach, Nat Schleifer, Russell Miller and Lee Bearson. Their prodding, mercifully seasoned with humor, was especially important during that final stretch.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I	INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH 1
	Background 1
	A Discussion of Variables that Predict Conformity 8
	Conformity Research and Field Methodology 15
	Hypotheses 18
II	METHOD 20
	Subjects 20
	Rationale for Selecting a Summer Camp for Field Setting 20
	Description of Camp 20
	Procedure and Description of Instrument 22
III	RESULTS 26
	Overview 26
	Constructing a Measure of Conformity 26
	The Relationships between the Individual Independent Variables and Non-Conformity 35
	Results for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets 52
IV	DISCUSSION
	Attitude Change in a Field Setting 62
	Predictors of Non-Conformity 64
	The Conformity Process and the Dimensions on which Conformity Occurs: Are They Related? 70
	The Impact of Strong Social Bonds 72
	Useful Research Modalities in Studying Conformity 73
	Directions for Future Research 77
	Implications and Conclusions 78
	APPENDICES 80
	REFERENCES 92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1	Factor Loadings for Attitude Items Used to Measure Conformity 28
2	Means of Items Used to Measure Conformity 29
3	Average Non-Conformity Scores for Entire, Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets 36
4	Mean Level of Consensus on the Dependent Variables 37
5	Pearson Correlations between Consensus and Attitudinal Non-Conformity for Dependent Variables 39
6	Pearson Correlations between Consensus and Attraction to the Group for the Dependent Variables 40
7	Mean Psychological Conformity Scores for Time 1 and Time 2 42
8	Pearson Correlations between Psychological Conformity and Attitudinal Non-Conformity for Dependent Variables 43
9	Pearson Correlations between Attraction to the Group and Attitudinal Non-Conformity for the Dependent Variables 45
10	Pearson Correlations between Popularity Level and Attitudinal Non-Conformity 47
11	Partial Correlations between an Individual's Time 1 and Time 2 Scores Controlling for the Group Score at Time 2 49
11a	Partial Correlations between an Individual's Time 2 Score and His Group's Time 2 Score, Controlling for the Individual's Time 1 Score 49
12	Percentage of Variance Contributed to Attitudinal Non-Conformity by Consensus, Attraction to the Group, and Psychological Conformity 50
13	Correlations between Consensus and Attitudinal Non-Conformity for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets 54

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE	Page
14 Correlations between Consensus and Attraction to the Group in Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets	55
15 Correlations between Attraction to the Group and Attitudinal Non-Conformity in Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets	56
16 Correlations between Psychological Conformity and Attitudinal Non-Conformity in Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets	58
17 Percentage of Variance Contributed to Attitudinal Non-Conformity by Independent Variables for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets .	60

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A Table A: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	80
B Questionnaire	81
C Operationalization of Independent and Dependent Variables	85
D A Critique of Theoretical Assumptions and Methodological Tendencies in Conformity Research	87

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND
REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

Background

Although it is virtually impossible to conceive of life without a social component, tensions and conflicts inevitably arise in relationships. A person often finds that the strong social bonds that he once pursued vigorously have become threats to his own identity. This conflict is particularly acute when an individual's attitudes, beliefs or ambitions vary greatly from those of the group. In such situations, a person is confronted with several difficult choices: should he submerge his individuality and conform, or should he strike an independent course and brace himself for possible censure and social estrangement?

This conflict has also concerned a variety of other literatures. It has been expressed philosophically as the tension between free will and determinism (James, 1921; Sartre, 1956). Utopian writers have described both hypothetical and actual societies in which social cohesion and individual freedom co-exist (Kanter, 1972; Talmon, 1975; Kateb, 1972). Similarly, the literature on group psychotherapy has been concerned with identifying the level of

cohesion that facilitates self-expression and growth (Frank, 1957; Back, 1954; Truax, 1961). While psychoanalytic writing has stressed the need for both separation and closeness (Freud, 1921; Fromm, 1941), sociological literature has emphasized the tension between individual and group needs, as well as the fundamentally social character of human life (Cooley, 1904; Durkheim, 1949; Toennies, 1957).

In social psychology, research on the social formation of an individual's beliefs and behaviors has played a prominent role. Allport (1962) has referred to social influence as "the master problem of social psychology." The present research will deal with one type of social influence, namely conformity, and will focus on factors that predict non-conformity. Research on conformity has identified the ways in which groups influence the individual, as well as the circumstances under which this influence occurs.

Conformity has been found to occur when groups put pressure on individuals--and particularly deviant individuals--to change their attitudes towards those held by the group (Schacter, 1951; Berkowitz & Howard, 1959; Emerson, 1951). Research has demonstrated that disagreement creates dissonance (Festinger, 1957; Lott & Lott, 1961; Brehm & Cohen, 1962) or imbalance (Heider, 1958) and that dissonance is especially great when the group is attractive. An effective method of reducing this dissonance is to change one's opinion in the direction of that held by the group.

Before turning to a more specific discussion of conformity research, an overview of major issues in the conformity literature is presented.

An Overview of Several Issues in Conformity Research

Normative versus comparative social influence. Deutsch and Gerard (1955) distinguished between the comparative and normative functions of social norms. A group is said to exert comparative influence when its behavior provides members with information concerning reality. Normative influence occurs when people conform to the group because of positive expectations that they have concerning the group. In this situation, people conform in order to foster and/or strengthen positive feelings among group members. The need to be "correct" has been posited as the motivational basis for comparative influence, while the desire to be socially accepted has been related to attraction based (e.g. normative) influence.

The majority of studies deal with conformity as a source of comparative rather than normative influence. In addition, most conformity research focuses on a manipulated majority or consensus among group members, and has little to do with the "ought" or morally obligatory qualities of social norms.

Public versus private commitment. Allen (1965) pointed out that public conformity may actually reflect two different psychological states: conformity with or without agreement

with the group. When conformity corresponds with actual change in one's private position, then the behavior shouldn't change in the group's absence.

Festinger (1953) hypothesized that public conformity will be accompanied by private acceptance if the person wants to remain a member of the group that is attempting to influence him. Private acceptance is less likely to occur when a person no longer cares to be a member of the group. The typical paradigm in conformity research requires the subject to publicly commit himself to a particular alternative. The effects of moving from a public to a private choice are often explored in this way.

Deutsch and Gerard (1955) measured conformity under three different conditions. In one condition, the subject wrote his choice on a sheet of paper before finding out how the majority had judged the stimulus. He was told not to sign the paper and that it would be collected at the end of the experiment. In the second treatment, the subject recorded his choice on a "magic pad" whereas in the third "public commitment" condition, the subject both recorded his choice on paper and signed his name, knowing that the sheet would be collected. Greatest independence was found in the "public commitment" and "written commitment" conditions, followed by the "magic pad" condition. The researchers conclude that normative social influence to conform to one's own judgment will reduce the impact of the normative influence to conform to the judgment of others.

Another study (Raven, 1959) provided subjects with a hypothesized description of a juvenile delinquent ("Johnny Rocco") and asked them how the boy should be dealt with. In the public condition, each subject was told that his decision would be circulated among the group members, while in the private condition the subject was told that his decision would be confidential.

When confronted with a false group consensus (written on the blackboard), 39% of the subjects in the "public" condition changed toward the group norm, as compared to 26% in the private condition. One concludes from this literature that private commitment is a stronger measure of endorsement than public commitment.

Attitudinal discrepancies. A number of experiments have been conducted in which people have been confronted by discrepant attitudes. Information concerning the attitudes or opinions of the other subjects can be provided to the "target" subject in one or two possible ways. He can be confronted in a face to face context with other people who agree or disagree with him (e.g. Asch study). Alternatively, the subject can be provided with information concerning others' opinions and attitudes. This information can take the form of data (e.g. Raven, 1959) or specific symbols such as lights (Crutchfield, 1955).

An experiment conducted by Fisher, Rubenstein, and Freeman (1956) exposed subjects to discrepant judgments under two modes of presentation--one involving public

commitment and one not involving public commitment. Subjects were told to estimate the number of dots on each of a series of 50 slides. Subjects were exposed to discrepant information that was either based on their own estimate or that was independent of their estimates. Although researchers discovered some evidence of subjects being influenced by the discrepant information in the no-commitment condition, more dramatic evidence for this phenomenon was found in the commitment condition. There, subjects anticipated the accomplice's judgment and therefore overestimated up to three times the number of dots. By presenting their subjects with such similar stimuli, Fisher, Rubenstein, and Freeman gave them the opportunity to arrive at a resolution that is unavailable in situations such as the Asch study. In conclusion, it appears that when confronted with attitudes discrepant from their own, people usually move in the direction of those attitudes.

Movement versus congruence conformity. Another distinction that has been made in the conformity literature is the difference between a radical alteration in an individual's beliefs and a more subtle change in his attitudes. Hollander (1971) refers to the former kind of conformity as "movement conformity." He contrasted this type of conformity with "congruence conformity" which he viewed as being more anchored to previous attitudes.

Research Questions

Although the traditional conformity research identified the strong pulls that groups exert over their members, it failed to examine the parameters of the influence process.¹ For instance, the following questions have not been adequately addressed: What is the relative importance of the different variables that affect conformity? Which people conform and which people do not conform?

The current research attempts to address these questions empirically by examining the relationships between various causes of conformity in a field setting. It will utilize a design that is conducive to the analysis of multiple variables. Conformity will be defined as "a change in an individual that occurs as a result of a real or imagined group pressure toward some norm or standard." The study will examine conformity involving the "private acceptance of attitudes," as opposed to "compliance"-- behavior change without any underlying attitude change (Kiesler, 1969).

The section that follows discusses the specific variables hypothesized to predict conformity.

¹A brief critique of several theoretical assumptions and methodological tendencies in the area of conformity research is included in the Appendix.

A Discussion of Variables that Predict Conformity
Consensus (Attitudinal Convergence)

Consensus will be defined as the extent to which attitudinal convergence exists among group members. The importance of this variable was established by Asch (1956) who discovered that a unanimous majority had a much greater impact on conformity than a non-unanimous majority. Others (Bennett, 1965; Mouton, Blake, & Olmstead, 1956) have also determined that a non-unanimous majority produces much less conformity. Hardy (1957) found that a group unanimous in its attitudes brought about greater private acceptance as well as greater public conformity. Thus we can conclude that an individual is more influenced by a group that is relatively united than by one that is attitudinally diverse.

Interestingly, Asch (1951) found that conformity greatly decreased both when the group consensus was shattered by a confederate who served as a "partner" to the subject, and when a confederate answered even more incorrectly than the group. Allen (1965) proposed two theories to explain the conformity reduction in these situations. First, the partner's divergent view might have served to legitimize opposition to the group, thereby freeing the subject to express his own position. Alternatively, the subject's actual perception of the situation might have been bolstered or "restructured" as a result of exposure to the partner's views.

Psychological Conformity

A number of studies have found that people who are oriented towards receiving approval from others, are more likely to conform. Thus, Tuddenham and McBride (1958) reported that women who conformed most were concerned about their answers not appearing "peculiar" to the other participants. Similarly, Moeller and Applezweig (1957) found that college women with high motivation for social approval conformed significantly more, while those high on self-approval conformed least.

Schroder's (1958) subjects who never yielded had previously indicated that they attached less importance to the evaluation of a supposed source of disapproval. When personality inventories have been used, similar results were obtained. McDavid and Sistrunk (1964) administered the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Scale to their subjects before giving them a conformity manipulation. They found conformity to be greatest among high scorers on a subscale measuring "over-concern with social restraints or standards."

Thus, the literature indicates that there is a relationship between an individual's personal predisposition to conform and his conformity in actual behavior. This relationship will be pursued below in the context of the study.

Referents

The term "reference group" has been widely used in the social sciences to identify the bases of social comparisons (Stouffer et al., 1949; Hyman, 1960; Newcomb, 1943; Merton & Rossi, 1968). "Reference group" has been employed to refer to any group that an individual is oriented towards, including a group other than his own. According to Kelley (1968), reference groups serve as "standards of comparison for self-appraisal or as the sources of an individual's norms, attitudes, and values."

Reference groups have been found to strongly affect people's attitudes--both when introduced experimentally and when made salient to group members in natural settings (Gordon, 1952; White, 1957; Kelley, 1955). Although White (1957) demonstrated that people's behavior can also be influenced by groups outside of their immediate reference group, Walker and Heyns' (1962) results indicated that a person will be most affected by his own membership group.

"Conformity to what?" is one of the key questions that must be addressed in conformity research. Determining whether or not an individual is conforming requires knowing the norms of his referents or reference groups. This is especially true regarding non-conformity. As Cooley (1904) pointed out: a person who appears to be a non-conformist might actually be "keeping time to another music."

In actuality, the accurate identification of a person's referents or reference groups is not a simple task. People

often have multiple referents or are not cognizant themselves of the sources that influence their attitudes and behavior. Most conformity research circumvents this problem by providing the subject with a "ready-made" group.

Laboratory studies, for instance, typically restrict the number of reference groups to the one experimental group.

Hare (1962) noted that reference groups are rarely treated as a variable in studying conforming behavior, but are instead "left as an unspecified part of the variance in conformity." The Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1950) study similarly neglected to include alternative reference groups. Although they admitted that it is important to identify individual "anchorages" to other groups, these researchers confined their sociometric measures to density ratings for the two "formal" groups--Westgate and Westgate West. Commenting on their methodology, Golembiewski (1960) stated:

this omission is significant . . . for casual designation of the unit may result in mixed data as subjects response stimulus varies from the formal unit to a constituent sub-unit which is psychologically relevant for the subject.

Therefore, we can conclude that when studying conformity, an attempt should be made to identify an individual's sets of friends. Lott and Lott (1961) found a positive relationship between the degree of mutual positive attitudes existing among group members and their conformity to a purported group standard. Similarly, Festinger et al. (1950) discovered that the number of friendship choices in a group was positively related with conformity to group

standards. Network theorists have also pointed to a relationship between closeness in personal relationships and uniformity (Boissevain, 1974; Bott, 1957). To summarize, in the literature that has examined different types of relationships, a distinction has been made between closer and more distant ones. An individual has been found to conform to closer rather than more distant referents.

Attraction to the Group

The social psychological literature also supports a relationship between attraction to the group (often referred to as "cohesiveness") and conformity. A psychological measurement of attraction is often based on members' evaluations of the group as a whole. Bovard (1951) compared "group-centered" to "leader-centered" college teaching. He asked students to rate their liking for the class as a whole. Mann and Baumgartel (1952) asked employees whether or not they endorsed the statement: "our crew is better than others at sticking together."

Many studies have found attraction to the group and conformity to be positively related. Back (1951) determined that this relationship obtained even when three different bases of attraction (personal attraction, effective performance, and prestige) were used. In the Festinger,

Schacter, and Back (1950) study, a $-.53$ correlation was found between a court's cohesiveness and the percentage of the court's residents who deviated from its set norms. Gerard (1954) and Berkowitz (1954) both found greater initial attitude change toward the group norm in "high attraction" groups, and also greater resistance, at a later date, to a counter-attitudinal message.

Nevertheless, several studies have discovered a negative relationship, or no relationship, between attraction and conformity (Downing, 1958; Harper, 1961; Wilson, 1960; Walker & Heyns, 1962). Explanations proposed to account for these negative findings have included the following: the conditions compared may have been too similar in level of attraction to affect conformity differentially; the subjects might not have regarded such temporary groups as possessing any long-term consequences for them; the attraction ratings might have been more a reflection of the subjects' acceptance of the experimental instructions than accurate indications of their positive feelings towards the group.

While consensus and attraction have been viewed interchangeably in the literature, the present approach views them as conceptually similar, but distinct variables. Empirical research supports the independence of these two variables. Eisman (1957), who employed a measure of "cohesiveness" and a measure of "attitudinal similarity among group members," found only a $+0.11$ correlation between the two variables.

Research suggests the need to distinguish between cohesiveness and consensus in order to determine whether or not individuals conform only to those groups which they like. Although attraction to the group has long been considered one of the most powerful determinants of conformity, people have also been known to conform to the attitudes and behaviors of those whom they do not like.² An individual's motivations to conform in such cases are not likely to be as apparent as when the group is perceived as attractive. In fact, a different set of motivations might be involved in these situations. For example, Asch (1950) discovered that fear of appearing "foolish" had a powerful effect on behavior in a group where the individual was the sole dissenter. In this situation, consensus appeared to have had a greater impact on the individual subjects' behavior than attraction. Thus, although there is some evidence supporting the independence of attraction and consensus, a more careful investigation of their separate effects is considered necessary. In addition, there is a need to clarify the relationship between attraction and conformity, and specifically to identify the conditions under which these two variables are not related.

²This does not refer to the "forced compliance" endemic to coercive groups, but rather to the voluntary conformity of normative groups (Etzioni, 1960).

Social Status/Popularity

Social status refers to the relative position one occupies in a social structure. In a group, it is most often associated with the status of one person over another. Popularity is usually measured by the number of nominations that a person receives. The more popular, higher status, person usually has the capacity to influence the behavior of others.

Hollander (1958) has posited an inverse relationship between popularity and conformity. He suggested that higher status people will be permitted greater freedom both to innovate and to deviate. According to him, this occurs after they have accrued "idiosyncrasy credits" as a result of participating in the group and initially conforming to the group's expectations. Therefore, this literature suggests that non-conformity will be highest among more popular individuals. This relationship is pursued in the context of the study.

Conformity Research and Field Methodology

The previous review of the research on conformity focused on the various psychological variables associated with conformity. Most of the studies discovered positive relationships between conformity and a specific independent variable. Yet it is possible that the level of conformity obtained in these laboratory studies would not obtain in natural settings where other variables also operate. The

present research was therefore undertaken to examine both the separate and the combined effects of the preceding variables on conformity.

A field setting was selected because it lends itself to the study of the inter-relationship between conformity and social processes in a manner that does justice to real life conformity situations. Field settings permit the researcher to measure the relationship between a dependent variable and multiple independent variables. For these reasons, the attitudes being studied are more likely to be meaningful to the subjects. In addition, unlike laboratory studies, field research can measure change over long, as well as short, periods of time.

Despite the advantages of field settings, they present the researcher with certain practical difficulties, which is probably why only a few such studies have been conducted in this area. Two of the most well known field studies on conformity are those conducted by Newcomb (1937) of Bennington college students and by Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1950) of the Westgate graduate student housing project.

Newcomb's study found that Bennington coeds became less conservative between their freshmen and senior years and that these less conservative attitudes tended to persist even after students left college. Popularity, measured by the number of nominations that a woman received from her peers, was found to be related to level of conservatism: the more popular women were usually less conservative.

Newcomb's findings also suggested that those women who were initially most conservative were less likely to attain positions of leadership and prestige.

A more detailed exploration of the conformity process was undertaken by Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1950). Specifically, they hypothesized that the emergence of a group standard is a prerequisite for attitude change. To determine whether or not such a group standard operated, they investigated the means by which the group enforced the standard, the relation between conformity and the group structure as well as the structural properties of those members who deviated from the standard.

The setting chosen by Festinger, Schacter, and Back was particularly well suited for studying this problem. They selected two adjacent graduate student housing projects whose populations were relatively homogeneous and calculated the ratio of in-court to out-of-court sociometric choices. The researchers determined that the level of court-cohesiveness was related to homogeneity of attitude and activity patterns. Thus, Festinger, Schacter, and Back found that the more cohesive courts exerted stronger forces on their members to conform and also had the lowest percentages of deviants.

Both these studies represent valuable contributions to the field of conformity research. Utilizing psychometric choices, the researchers demonstrated that conformity can occur in natural settings. But, because of the limited

methodologies and statistical procedures available at the time, neither study was able to successfully examine the joint effects of several variables on conformity. Most importantly, both studies have in common an arbitrary operational definition of "reference groups." Instead of establishing which specific individuals influenced a given person, they confined their study of influence to identifiable formal groups. By doing so they overlooked the possibility that a person may be influenced by different "referents" (e.g. by closer rather than more distant referents)--that is, by different individuals who are not specifically associated with one particular group. The present research intends to build upon these previous studies. It will utilize a multivariate statistical approach to examine the influence of multiple variables on conformity in field setting.

Hypotheses³

1. As the level of attitudinal consensus among an individual's referents decreases, his or her level of non-conformity will increase.
2. As a person's level of psychological conformity decreases, his or her level of attitudinal non-conformity will increase.
3. As a person's attraction to the group decreases, his or

³All hypotheses will be tested at the .05 (two-tailed) level of significance. Probability levels between .06 and .10 (two-tailed) will be referred to as a trend or as "approaching significance."

her level of attitudinal non-conformity will increase.

4. As a person's popularity increases, his or her level of attitudinal non-conformity will increase.
5. As the strength of friendship bonds increases, the relationship between consensus and attitudinal non-conformity will increase.
 - a. The strength of friendship bonds will not affect the relationship between psychological conformity and attitudinal non-conformity.
 - b. As the strength of friendship bonds increases, the relationship between attraction to the group and attitudinal non-conformity will increase.
 - c. As the strength of friendship bonds increases, the relationship between popularity and attitudinal non-conformity will increase.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The study was conducted in a summer camp. The 74 campers who participated voluntarily in the research were between the ages of 14-18. The sex ratios were evenly split. (Table A in the Appendix contains demographic data and the response rates).

Rationale for Selecting a Summer Camp for Field Setting

As Sherif (1936) and others (Lippitt, Polansky, Redl, & Rosen, 1958) have noted, summer camps are, in many ways, akin to natural laboratories. Relationships in such isolated and impermanent social environments tend to congeal and intensify quickly, thus permitting researchers a compressed view of social processes. Additionally, summer camps foster strong interpersonal bonds and are therefore particularly conducive to the study of norm formation and social influence.

Description of Camp

The camp that was chosen as the focus of this study is affiliated with a Jewish Socialist movement. This movement has been active in the U.S. since the 1930's and has been affiliated throughout the years with Zionist political

parties. Run by and for young people, this movement attempts to provide its members with a knowledge of Jewish culture and history through extensive educational programs. It attempts to teach its members a specific set of beliefs and behaviors. Central to its ideology is the belief in the importance of moving to Israel--and specifically to a collectively owned and formed agricultural settlement (a kibbutz).

This movement has emphasized summer camping from the very beginning. Through "learning by doing," camping has provided it with opportunities to instill Zionist and Socialist values in its members. The goal of this movement's summer camping program is to form a temporary, self-sufficient, Jewish and Zionist community that pools its resources, does its own labor, and as much as possible, models itself on the collective communities of Israel. For adolescents, the age group studied in this research, the camp experience also provides formal and informal leadership training experiences.

In this organization's ideology, Zionism is inextricably tied to visions of social justice. Its ideal "just society" would be guided by an ethic of social equality, as opposed to individualism. Resources would be distributed on the basis of need, according to Socialist economic principles. Although individualism is devalued, this movement endorses the importance of fulfilling oneself both as an individual

and as a movement member.¹

This movement aims to foster an enhanced sense of interpersonal responsibility among its members. The development of strong social bonds is perceived as a prerequisite for realizing this goal. Because strong social ties are also considered important for the movement's educational efforts, it attempts to establish organizational structures that are maximally conducive to the transmission of information. Successful indoctrination of group members is regarded as dependent upon the existence of a centralized authority, a well-defined hierarchy, and a high degree of intra-group consensus. Although it advocates specific values and encourages strong commitment among its members, this movement also prides itself on its ideological flexibility. (For example, one finds an endorsement of the "right to be confused" in its brochures.)

Procedure and Description of Instrument

A survey was administered to the campers during the first week of camp and again during the last week of camp-- 7 1/2 weeks later.

The questionnaire, which required approximately 20 minutes to complete, contained two parts. (A copy of the instrument is included in the Appendix.) The first section

¹Usually overlooked is the potential for conflict between this kind of self-expression and the uniformity of purpose demanded by the movement.

was designed to identify a person's referents, while the second section contains personality and attitude scales.

The independent variables selected for the study--consensus, attraction to the group,² and psychological conformity were those that were hypothesized in the literature to be related to conformity. Items concerning attitudes towards distributive justice and closedmindedness were included because they figure prominently in the movement's ideologies. Items in the questionnaire were used to assess each of the following variables:

1. Consensus: Attitudinal convergence among the following variables were measured.³
 - a. Attitudes towards Distributive Justice: A hypothetical situation was presented to the campers that required a decision concerning the allocation of scarce resources (places on a baseball team). The campers were asked to indicate the extent of their endorsement of several allocation principles (e.g. winner takes all, equity, equality). These principles were

²In addition, the "attraction to the group" variable most probably had a great deal of face validity for the campers because of the strong emphasis placed upon engendering a sense of community among movement members.

³These variables correspond with the two-variable theory of values posited by Rokeach (1973). He hypothesized that the major variations in political ideology are reducible to opposing value orientations concerning the political desirability or undesirability of equality and freedom. Thus, the distributive justice variable in the present study can be seen to correspond with Rokeach's equality variable, while "closedmindedness" is analogous to his "freedom" factor.

adapted from Deutsch's (1976) model of the determinants of distributive justice.

b. Attitudes concerning Closedmindedness: Campers were asked several questions adapted from the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (1960). Items included: "I don't like people who are in favor of presenting only one point of view to their campers," "Too many differences of opinion within one's own movement can be dangerous."

2. Referents: The campers were asked to list the "kids who you share feelings with." In order to obtain a measure of the strength of a camper's bonds with his referents, this inclusive list could be broken down into two further subsets consisting of:

a. Reciprocated choices: This subset can be considered to correspond with relatively strong social bonds (Boissevain, 1975; Mitchell, 1969).

b. Non-Reciprocal choices: This subset can be considered to correspond with relatively weak bonds.

3. Psychological Predisposition to Conformity: A self-reported conformity scale was used to measure the extent to which a person reports being oriented toward others' opinions and the extent to which he reports seeking social approval. It included items such as "When in a group of people I usually did what others wanted rather than making suggestions," "I would rather not be too different from others."

4. Attraction to the Group: The campers were asked to indicate how strong their ties were to those they had listed

in response to the "referents" question. Another question inquired whether they expected to "outgrow" their friends from camp.

5. Popularity: As in traditional sociometric research (Jennings, 1943), popularity will be measured by the number of nominations that a person received. Those with the highest number of nominations will be considered to be more "popular."

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overview

To understand the process of attitudinal conformity, it was first necessary to construct an attitude measure. This section will begin by describing how the variables used to measure attitudinal conformity were chosen and how the final attitude measure was devised. It will then focus on the separate relationships between attitudinal conformity and each hypothesized independent variable. The inter-correlations between the independent variables will also be discussed. Finally, the joint effect of these independent variables on the dependent variable will be analyzed using a regression procedure. These results will first be presented for the entire friendship set--that includes both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships. The section concludes by contrasting the findings for the reciprocated set with those of the non-reciprocated friendship set.

Constructing a Measure of Conformity

Choosing Specific Attitude Items

In order to detect attitudinal conformity on several dimensions, a wide range of variables were included in the original survey. A Quartimax factor analysis was performed

in order to decrease the number of items. Only those with factor loadings higher than .35 were included in the final selection. Table 1 indicates that three main dimensions emerged: attitudes towards distributive justice, closed-mindedness, and attitudes concerning authority and structure. Together these factors accounted for 54.5% of the variance. The first factor, attitudes towards distributive justice, accounted for 27.5% of the variance. Closedmindedness contributed 17.4% of the variance, while attitudes concerning authority and structure accounted for 9.6% of the variance.

Which variables changed over time? Subsequent elimination of variables occurred by determining which variables changed over the course of the summer. Because the study aimed to identify those variables associated with attitudinal change, it was important to include only items that actually changed over time. According to the results of paired t -tests, presented in Table 2, equality, the item endorsing the equal distribution of resources, changed most over the course of the summer ($t(54) = 9.83, p < .001$). The direction of this change, from a lesser to a greater advocacy of equality, corresponds with the camp's socialist orientation.

Similar changes occurred with the other variables used to measure alternative modes of distributive justice. Significant change indicating movement away from an individualistic mode of distributive justice was reflected in the decreased endorsement of a "winner takes all" orientation

Table 1
Factor Loadings for Attitude Items Used to
Measure Conformity^a

Item	Attitudes towards Distributive Justice	Closed- mindedness	Attitudes concerning Structure and Authority
	1	2	3
1. Winner takes all	-.78	-.13	-.08
2. Equity	-.84	.09	-.00
3. Equality	.41	-.07	-.18
4. Campers money should be pooled	.39	.09	.16
5. Public disagree- ment among movement members is wrong	.02	.83	-.02
6. Differences of opinion are dangerous	.06	.49	-.00
7. It's important to present more than one point of view	.12	-.74	.10
8. A clear chain of command is necessary	-.11	.16	.49
9. Rules and structure are needed	.06	.12	.62
10. Compromise is important	.00	-.23	-.69
11. Total commitment is required	.07	.18	.78
12. Discipline is important	.03	.00	.54

Percent of variance accounted for:	27.5	17.4	9.6

^aQuartimax Rotation used.

Table 2
Means of Items Used to Measure Conformity

Item		Time 1	Time 2	p*
1. Winner takes all ^a (<u>n</u> = 54)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.65 2.52	2.48 2.04	< .001
2. Equity ^a (<u>n</u> = 54)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.41 2.57	2.50 2.03	< .01
3. Equality ^a (<u>n</u> = 54)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	4.00 2.57	8.21 1.73	< .001
4. Campers money should be pooled (<u>n</u> = 50)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	1.69 1.03	1.56 .96	n. s.
5. Public disagree- ment among move- ment members is wrong (<u>n</u> = 51)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.80 1.09	3.34 1.21	< .05
6. Differences of opinion are dangerous (<u>n</u> = 49)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.18 1.09	2.76 .96	< .05
7. It's important to present more than one point of view (<u>n</u> = 51)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	2.69 .95	2.91 1.16	n. s.
8. A clear chain of command is necessary (<u>n</u> = 53)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.14 1.18	2.76 1.05	< .05
9. Rules and structure are needed (<u>n</u> = 51)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	3.59 1.13	3.73 1.07	n. s.
10. Compromise is important (<u>n</u> = 51)	\bar{X} <u>SD</u>	2.42 1.09	2.39 .96	n. s.

Table 2 (continued)

Item		Time 1	Time 2	p*
11. Total commitment is required (<u>n</u> = 53)	\bar{X}	3.24	3.26	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	1.35	1.27	
12. Discipline is important (<u>n</u> = 53)	\bar{X}	2.52	2.70	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	.92	.87	

^aThese items were measured on a 1-9 scale. All other items were measured on 1-5 scales.

*Paired comparison t-tests used to determine significance levels.

(\underline{t} (54) = 3.98, $p < .001$), and of the equity principle (\underline{t} (54) = 2.84, $p < .01$). This principle advocates a proportional relationship between an individual's relative input to the group outcome and his share of the rewards.

Increased closedmindedness was evidenced on the following items:

It's wrong for a member to publicly disagree with another movement member in the presence of non-movement members (\underline{t} (54) = 2.30, $p < .05$).

Too many differences of opinion within one's own movement can be dangerous (\underline{t} (50) = 2.54, $p < .03$).

For the movement to succeed a clear chain of command is necessary (\underline{t} (50) = 2.04, $p < .05$).

The standard deviations of each of these items is also presented in Table 2. It is interesting to note that the standard deviation for each variable has decreased over time. Although none of these differences emerges as significant, this trend is uniform across eleven of the twelve items. This decrease in the standard deviations probably signifies an increasing convergence of attitudes.

Which variables did not change? Variables that changed over the summer appeared to differ in specific ways from variables that did not change. A perusal of the Time 1 and Time 2 means (in Table 2) for all the variables reveals that the more strongly worded, authoritarian items (e.g. those loading highly on factor #3) such as "People who believe that discipline is necessary to run a movement are my kind of people," "Only by having rules and structure do young people learn about setting their own limits," "People don't

know what they are talking about if they believe that a movement can exist without demanding total commitment from its members," are the ones that did not change over time. In fact, if any movement was evident for these items it was in the direction of increased openmindedness. It is possible that many of these items touched upon real issues in the everyday life of the campers. To the extent that they experienced discipline and structure as personally constraining, the campers were less likely to endorse these items as positive values.

Deriving the Indices

Thus, it appears that change over time was evident on two dimensions: attitudes towards distributive justice and closedmindedness. The three items previously mentioned in relation to closedmindedness will be combined to create an index.

Constructing a similar index for the distributive justice dimension turned out to be less straightforward. Although the equity, winner takes all, and equality items were all found to load highly on the first factor (see Table 1), their intercorrelations were not uniformly high. The correlations between equality and equity and between equality and winner takes all ($R = -.31$; $R = -.36$), were much lower than their (e.g. equity and winner takes all) correlations with each other ($R = .63$).

In addition, further internal analysis indicated that the item "equality" was related to other variables in a different manner than the "equity" and the "winner takes all" items. For instance, while equality was highly correlated (.31) with the item advocating the pooling of the campers' money, the correlations between this item and equity and between this item and "winner takes all" were not significant. Thus it appears possible for the campers to endorse equality without necessarily rejecting a more individualistic distributive mode (represented by the equity and winner takes all items). It seems that the "equality" item means something distinct to the campers and is likely picking up a socialist ideology. For these reasons it will be discussed separately from the other two items. From hereon, the "equality" item will be referred to as "social justice" while the other two items (equity and winner takes all) will be combined and will be referred to as "individual justice."

Deriving the Referents' Attitudes

In order to obtain means and standard deviations for each subject's reference group on every dependent measure, an aggregation procedure was conducted. This procedure derived the means and standard deviations of each camper's friends' attitudes on all three dependent variables. (The camper's own scores were excluded from this calculation.)

To determine whether the hypothesized relationship between independent and dependent variables was related to the intensity of friendship bonds, a parallel aggregation procedure was conducted on groups consisting of reciprocated friendship choices. Unlike the other aggregation set (which will be referred to as the "entire" set), where each person's group included all the people whom he or she mentioned as "close friends," the reciprocated friendship set only included reciprocated choices. Because several subjects' groups did not include any reciprocated nominations, the total number for the reciprocated friendship set is smaller ($n = 55$) than for the entire set ($n = 68$). An identical aggregation procedure was conducted with non-reciprocated friendship choices. (The n for this set was 53.)

Deriving the Dependent Variable

Conformity has been defined for purposes of this research as the deviation of an individual's score from the group score on a set of attitudes that have changed over time. The dependent variable therefore consists of a deviation score: the individual's score at Time 2 has been subtracted from the individual's reference group score at Time 2.¹ Thus, while large deviation scores correspond with

¹Because magnitude, rather than direction of deviation, was being studied, the deviation equation was formulated so that the smaller score (e.g. either the individual score or the group score) was always subtracted from the larger score. The resulting deviation score will therefore be an absolute (non-negative) number.

non-conformity, small deviations between the group and the individual signify conformity.

Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations of these deviation scores for the entire friendship set, as well as for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets. The prediction that non-conformity (as measured by the deviation scores) will be larger in the non-reciprocated than in the reciprocated set was substantiated in the case of the social justice and the closedmindedness variables. In the case of the individual justice variable, the mean for the reciprocated friendship group was larger than for the non-reciprocated friendship group, but this difference was not significant.

The Relationships Between the Individual Independent Variables and Non-Conformity

Consensus

Consensus was operationalized as the level of attitudinal convergence that existed among a person's referents. The three dependent variables--attitudes towards individual justice, attitudes towards social justice, and closedmindedness--were the attitudes used to measure consensus. The standard deviations of the aggregated friendship groups were used to determine the level of attitudinal convergence.

Table 4 indicates that a fair amount of attitudinal variability existed for all three dependent variables. Attitudes toward social equality displayed the greatest amount of variability (the mean SD across all friendship

Table 3
Average Non-Conformity^a Scores for Entire,
Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets

Dependent Variable		Entire	Reciprocated	Non-Reciprocated
Individual Justice	\bar{X}	3.23	3.49	3.87
	<u>SD</u>	2.66	2.39	3.35
Social Justice	\bar{X}	1.73	1.51	2.82
	<u>SD</u>	1.34	1.53	2.19
Closedmindedness ^b	\bar{X}	2.21	2.39	2.90
	<u>SD</u>	1.17	1.08	2.05

^aMeasured by deviations of individual scores from group scores.

^bVariable measured on 1-5 scale. All others measured on 1-9 scales.

Table 4
Mean Level of Consensus on the Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	\bar{X}	<u>SD</u>
Individual Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	2.12	1.27
Social Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	2.77	1.40
Closedmindedness ^a (<u>n</u> = 58)	1.58	.34

^aVariable measured on 1-5 scale. All others measured on 1-9 scales.

sets on this variable was 2.77, SD = 1.40).

The original hypothesis predicted that non-conformity would increase as the level of attitudinal convergence in an individual's friendship group increased. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that an individual is freer to vary attitudinally from the group's mean attitude when attitudinal diversity exists among the group members.

Positive correlations are anticipated along the three dependent variables and consensus. The correlations between consensus and the three dependent variables are presented in Table 5. The results indicate that the consensus variable is significantly related to non-conformity on both the individual justice index and on the social justice variable (R = .27, p < .05; R = .67, p < .001, respectively). The correlation between consensus and closedmindedness approaches but does not achieve statistical significance (R = .19, p < .08).

Table 6 contains the bivariate correlations between consensus and attraction to the group. Because standard deviations are used to measure consensus, an inverse relationship is expected. That is, as attraction to the group increases the standard deviations are likely to decrease--corresponding to an increase in consensus. Although the correlations are in the appropriate (negative) direction, they are not significant.

Table 5
Pearson Correlations between Consensus and
Attitudinal Non-Conformity for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variables	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	.27	< .05
Social Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	.67	< .001
Closedmindedness (<u>n</u> = 58)	.19	< .10

Table 6
Pearson Correlations between Consensus and
Attraction to the Group for the Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.10	n.s.
Social Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.15	n.s.
Closedmindedness (<u>n</u> = 58)	.06	n.s.

Psychological Conformity

It was hypothesized that the need to conform will differ from person to person and that an individual's psychological predisposition to conformity will be associated with attitudinal conformity. The following items were included in this index:

When in a group of people, I usually did what others wanted rather than making suggestions.

I don't like campers who make a point of being different.

I would rather not be too different from others.

The mean for this index was 6.48, while the standard deviation was 1.6. A 1-9 scale was used to measure this variable (where 1 corresponds to low psychological conformity, while 9 corresponds to high psychological conformity).

Table 7 presents the means and the standard deviations for the psychological conformity scores at Time 1 and Time 2. Because psychological conformity was conceptualized as a personality characteristic, it was expected to remain constant over time. Indeed, no significant change occurred in the campers' level of psychological conformity over the course of the summer ($t = 1.30$, $p < .10$).

It was hypothesized that psychological conformity and attitudinal non-conformity would be inversely related. That is, the higher a person's psychological conformity, the smaller his deviation from the group mean. Table 8 indicates that significant correlations were found between psychological conformity and both the social equality

Table 7
Mean Psychological Conformity Scores for
Time 1 and Time 2

		Time 1	Time 2	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Psychological Conformity (<u>n</u> = 54)	\bar{X}	6.30	6.48	1.3	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	1.82	1.68		

Table 8
Pearson Correlations between Psychological
Conformity and Attitudinal Non-Conformity
for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>P</u>
Individual Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.36	< .01
Social Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.19	< .07
Closedmindedness (<u>n</u> = 58)	-.09	n.s.

variable and the individual equality index ($\underline{R} = -.36$, $p < .01$; $\underline{R} = -.19$; $p < .07$, respectively), but not between psychological conformity and the closedmindedness index ($\underline{R} = -.09$, $p = n.s.$).

Attraction to the Group

Two items directly measured an individual's feelings toward specific people in the camp. One measured the endorsement of the statement "I will probably outgrow my movement friends," while the other item required the respondent to indicate the strength of his/her bonds with the individuals that were nominated as close friends. The composite index constructed from these two items will be referred to as "attraction to the group." The mean for this composite index is 4.21. Because this variable is being measured on a 1-5 scale (where 1 corresponds to "very weak" bonds) it is apparent that the overall feelings toward the group are quite positive. (The standard deviation is .79.)

According to the hypothesis, an inverse relationship is expected between attraction to the group and non-conformity. It was therefore expected that non-conformity would decrease as attraction to the group increased.

Table 9 contains the bivariate correlations between the "attraction to the group" variable and each of the three dependent variables. The correlations between both the individual justice index and attraction to the group and between closedmindedness and attraction to the group are in

Table 9
Pearson Correlations between Attraction to the
Group and Attitudinal Non-Conformity for the
Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.20	< .08
Social Justice (<u>n</u> = 56)	-.02	n.s.
Closedmindedness (<u>n</u> = 58)	-.18	< .10

the right direction ($\underline{R} = -.20$, $p < .08$; $\underline{R} = -.18$, $p < .10$, respectively). The correlation between social justice and attraction to the group was not significant ($\underline{R} = -.02$, $p = n.s.$).

Attraction and psychological conformity were not found to be correlated ($\underline{R} = .09$, $p = n.s.$).

Popularity

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between popularity and non-conformity.² Table 10 contains the correlations between an individual's level of attitudinal non-conformity (as measured by the deviation scores on the dependent variables) and the number of nominations that he or she received. While there appears to be a significant positive relationship between the closedmindedness index and popularity ($\underline{R} = .21$, $p < .05$), there does not appear to be any relationship between popularity and the social justice variable ($\underline{R} = .12$, $p = n.s.$; $\underline{R} = -.09$, $p = n.s.$, respectively).

It was also hypothesized that more "popular" people would score lower on a psychological measure of conformity. The hypothesis appears to be substantiated by the results of the correlation. There is a significant negative correlation between an individual's level of psychological

²In sociometric research, popularity has been traditionally measured by the number of nominations that a person received (Jenning, 1956).

Table 10
Pearson Correlations between Popularity Level
and Attitudinal Non-Conformity

Dependent Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice	.12	n.s.
Social Justice	-.09	n.s.
Closedmindedness	.21	< .05

conformity and the number of nominations he or she received ($R = -.25$, $p < .03$). This means that the more nominated (e.g. popular) individuals were lowest on psychological conformity.

Multiple Regression Results for the Combined Effects of the Independent Variables on Attitudinal Non-Conformity

Now that the independent relationships between attitudinal non-conformity and the three major independent variables (consensus, attraction to the group, and psychological conformity) have been discussed, it is appropriate to examine their joint effects. To do so, these three independent variables were entered--on one step--into a standard regression equation. Once again, the dependent variable, attitudinal non-conformity, was measured by the distance between the individual and the group score at Time 2.³

Table 12 presents the amount of R^2 change⁴ that occurred when each variable was introduced into the equation, the significance levels for these variance contributions, as

³In order to determine the influence of Time 1 scores on Time 2 scores, partial correlations were conducted. The results, presented in Tables 11 and 11a, indicate that the relationship between the group score and the individual score at Time 2 was not artifactual. Although the individual's Time 1 score contributes a greater percentage of the variance to the individual's Time 2 score, in all cases the group's scores at Time 2 also contribute a significant proportion of the variance.

⁴The R^2 change refers to that component of variation which is associated with a particular variable.

Table 11

Partial Correlations between an Individual's
Time 1 and Time 2 Scores Controlling for the
Group Score at Time 2

Variable	<u>R</u>	p
Individual Justice	.45	< .001
Social Justice	.04	n.s.
Closedmindedness	.52	< .001

Table 11a

Partial Correlations between an Individual's
Time 2 Score and his Group's Time 2 Score,
Controlling for the Individual's Time 1 Score

Variable	<u>R</u>	p
Individual Justice	.35	< .01
Social Justice	.36	< .01
Closedmindedness	.43	< .01

Table 12

Percentage of Variance Contributed to Attitudinal Non-Conformity by
Consensus, Attraction to the Group, and Psychological Conformity

Dependent Variables	Consensus		Psychological Conformity		Attraction		Total \underline{R}^2
	\underline{R}^2	Ch. \underline{F}	\underline{R}^2	Ch. \underline{F}	\underline{R}^2	Ch. \underline{F}	
Individual Justice	.06	3.13*	.14	7.89**	.03	1.58	.23
Social Justice	.45	39.23**	.007	.64	.001	.15	.46
Closedmindedness	.04	1.84	.007	.36	.04	1.90	.08

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

well as the total percentage of the variance accounted for by all the independent variables.

The three independent variables accounted for 23% of the variance for the individual justice index and 13% of the variance for the closedmindedness index. The three independent variables accounted for the largest percentage of the variance (46%) for the social equality variable.

The consensus variable, which measured the amount of attitudinal diversity within each group, was the variable that, overall, contributed most to the variance. The R^2 change for the consensus variable was .04 ($F = 1.84$, $p = n.s.$) for the closedmindedness index, .06 ($F = 3.13$, $p < .05$) for the individual justice index and .45 ($F = 39.23$, $p < .001$) for the social equality variable. Thus, the R^2 change that consensus contributed was found to be statistically significant in all cases except for closedmindedness--where a strong trend is apparent.

As can be seen from Table 12, a much smaller percentage of the variance was contributed by the other two variables--psychological conformity and attraction to the group. The R^2 change for psychological conformity was .007 for the social equality variable ($F = .64$, $p = n.s.$), .007 for the closedmindedness index ($F = .36$, $p = n.s.$), and .14 for the individual equality index ($F = 7.89$, $p < .01$).

The attraction to the group variable contributed a non-significant amount to the total variance. Its R^2 change contribution was .04 ($F = 1.90$, $p = n.s.$) for the closed-

mindedness index and .03 for the individual equality index ($F = 1.58$, $p = n.s.$). Attraction to the group contributed only .001 R^2 ($F = .15$, $p = n.s.$) to the social equality variable.

Because the popularity variable contributed such a negligible amount ($< .001$) to the total variance on all dimensions, it will, from now on, be omitted from the multiple regression tables.

Results for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets

Relationships between the Individual Variables and Non-Conformity

The findings that have been presented until this point have pertained to the entire friendship set that included both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship choices. The present section will examine the separate and joint effects of the independent variables (consensus, attraction to the group, and psychological conformity) on non-conformity, contrasting the results for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets.

Consensus and attitudinal non-conformity. Since consensus reflects the amount of attitudinal convergence among an individual's referents, it was hypothesized that consensus and non-conformity would be more strongly related in reciprocated than in non-reciprocated friendship sets. This relationship is expected because reciprocated friendship sets are characterized by strong social ties.

Table 13 presents these bivariate correlations for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets.

The results confirm this hypothesis. The correlations between group consensus and conformity for all three dependent variables in the reciprocated friendship set were higher than those in the non-reciprocated set. In the reciprocated group, two of the three correlations--for social justice and individual justice--were significant ($\underline{R} = .46, p < .001$; $\underline{R} = .26, p < .05$, respectively), while the correlation for closedmindedness demonstrated a weak trend ($\underline{R} = .12, p = n.s.$). Only one correlation--for social equality ($\underline{R} = .29, p < .05$)--was significant in the non-reciprocated set.

a. Consensus and attraction to the group. Although it was originally hypothesized that consensus would be related to attraction to the group, it was previously shown (Table 6) that this prediction was not borne out in the entire friendship set. Yet, Table 14 indicates that when the reciprocated and non-reciprocated sets are analyzed separately, non-significant correlations in the right direction emerge for the reciprocated group on all three dependent variables. The correlations obtained for the non-reciprocated set were all highly non-significant.

Attraction to the group and attitudinal non-conformity. Table 15 contains the bivariate correlations between attraction to the group and attitudinal non-conformity for the two types of friendship sets. The correlation for the

Table 13
 Correlations between Consensus and Attitudinal
 Non-Conformity for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated
 Friendship Sets

	Reciprocated		Non-Reciprocated	
	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice	.26	< .05	.08	n. s.
Social Justice	.46	< .001	.29	< .05
Closedmindedness	.12	n. s.	.09	n. s.

Table 14
 Correlations between Consensus and Attraction
 to the Group in Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated
 Friendship Sets

	<u>Reciprocated</u>		<u>Non-Reciprocated</u>	
	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice	.20	< .10	.03	n.s.
Social Justice	.17	n.s.	.04	n.s.
Closedmindedness	.14	n.s.	.007	n.s.

Table 15

Correlations between Attraction to the Group
and Attitudinal Non-Conformity in Reciprocated
and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets

	<u>Reciprocated</u>		<u>Non-Reciprocated</u>	
	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice	-.15	n. s.	-.21	< .10
Social Justice	-.32	< .05	-.15	n. s.
Closedmindedness	-.03	n. s.	-.10	n. s.

social equality variable is significant ($\underline{R} = -.32, p < .05$), for the reciprocated group and the correlation for the individual justice index is in the right direction ($\underline{R} = -.15, p = n.s.$). The correlation for the closedmindedness index is not significant ($\underline{R} = -.03, p = n.s.$). Similar results were obtained for the non-reciprocated set. The correlation between the individual justice index and attitudinal non-conformity demonstrated a trend ($\underline{R} = -.21, p < .10$), while the correlation for the social justice variable was in the right direction ($\underline{R} = -.15, p = n.s.$). In the non-reciprocated set, the correlations between attraction to the group and attitudinal non-conformity on the closedmindedness index was not significant.

Psychological conformity and attitudinal non-conformity.

Table 16 indicates that significant correlations emerged between psychological conformity and attitudinal non-conformity for both friendship sets on the individual justice dimension ($\underline{R} = -.32, p = .05; \underline{R} = -.36, p = .05$, for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated sets, respectively). No significant correlations were found between psychological conformity and attitudinal non-conformity, for either friendship set, on the social justice dimension or on the closedmindedness dimension.

Multiple Regression Results for the Combined Effects of the Independent Variables on Attitudinal Non-Conformity

Several trends can be seen when the multiple regression results for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets are compared (Table 17). Once again, the level of

Table 16
 Correlations between Psychological Conformity
 and Attitudinal Non-Conformity in Reciprocated
 and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets

	<u>Reciprocated</u>		<u>Non-Reciprocated</u>	
	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual Justice	-.32	< .05	-.36	< .05
Social Justice	.08	n.s.	-.15	n.s.
Closedmindedness	.12	n.s.	-.06	n.s.

group consensus emerges as the strongest predictor of attitudinal non-conformity. As hypothesized, consensus contributes a greater percentage of the total variance to the reciprocated than to the non-reciprocated friendship set. (In reciprocated, \underline{R}^2 Ch. = .21 [\underline{F} = 11.43, p < .001] for social justice, .07 [\underline{F} = 2.94, p < .05] for individual justice, and .02 [\underline{F} = .55, p = n.s.] for closedmindedness. In non-reciprocated, \underline{R}^2 Ch. = .08 [\underline{F} = 2.63, p < .05] for social justice, .006 [\underline{F} = .12, p = n.s.] for individual justice, and .009 [\underline{F} = .21, p = n.s.] for closedmindedness.)

As was the case for the entire friendship set, the other two variables predicted much more weakly to non-conformity. The only significant contribution made by the attraction to the group variable occurred in the reciprocated set on the social justice dimension (\underline{R}^2 Change = .04, \underline{F} = 2.83, p < .05).

Psychological conformity contributed a significant proportion of the total variance in both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets on the individual justice dimension (\underline{R}^2 Ch. = .12, \underline{F} = 5.29, p < .01; \underline{R}^2 Ch. = .14, \underline{F} = 6.06, p < .01, respectively). This means that on the individual justice dimension the relationship between psychological conformity and non-conformity is not a function of the strength of the social bonds.

The independent variables were able to account for the largest proportion of the total variance on the social justice dimension in the reciprocated friendship sets

Table 17

Percentage of Variance Contributed to Attitudinal Non-Conformity by
Independent Variables for Reciprocated and Non-Reciprocated Friendship Sets

Dependent Variables		Consensus		Psychological Conformity		Attraction to the Group		Total R ²	
		Rec.	Non-Rec.	Rec.	Non-Rec.	Rec.	Non-Rec.	Rec.	Non-Rec.
Individual Justice	R ² F	Ch. 2.94*	.07 .006 .12	.12 .14 5.29**	.008 .04 1.83	.20 .19			
Social Justice	R ² F	Ch. 11.43**	.21 .08 2.63*	.008 .004 .46	.04 .006 2.83*	.42 .10			
Closed- mindedness	R ² F	Ch. .55	.02 .009 .21	.04 .01 1.45	.003 .01 .29	.06 .03			

* p < .05.
** p < .01.
*** p < .001.

(total $\underline{R}^2 = .42$). Interestingly, the two independent variables that pertained most directly to social properties (consensus and attraction to the group) were those that contributed significantly to the variance on the social justice dimension (except for the non-significant contribution of attraction to the group in the non-reciprocated set).

In a similar vein, psychological conformity (which is an individual property) contributed significantly to the variance in both types of friendship sets--only on the individual justice dimension. The total \underline{R}^2 contributed by the independent variables to individual justice was .20 for the reciprocated and .19 for the non-reciprocated sets.

The total \underline{R}^2 change contributed by all the variables (in both types of friendship sets) on the closedmindedness dimension was very small (total \underline{R}^2 for reciprocated = .06; non-reciprocated = .03). It is therefore not surprising that none of the independent variables contributed a significant proportion of the variance.

CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Attitude Change in a Field Setting

This research was undertaken to determine whether the variables that related to attitudinal non-conformity in an experimental setting would also relate to attitudinal non-conformity in a field setting. The variables that were included (e.g. consensus, psychological conformity, attraction to the group) were those that were found to relate to non-conformity in laboratory studies. Because this study was conducted in a field setting, these variables were free to vary. Their combined influence on non-conformity was assessed using a multivariate research design.

The setting, a Jewish socialist summer camp, was particularly conducive for this study because it resembled a natural experiment in several ways. Previously unacquainted adolescents, from different regions of the country, were brought to an isolated location for two months. During this time they were involved in an intensive educational experience geared to bring their attitudes in line with those espoused by the social movement. The campers were provided with instruction concerning the history of Zionism and specifically the tenets of socialist Zionism. The goal of the summer program was to heighten their sense of Jewish

identity and to motivate them to eventually settle on an Israeli agricultural collective (kibbutz).

This educational experience was unique because it simulated the social conditions that it endorsed ideologically. Because socialist distributive principles based on equality were at the heart of the movement's belief system, the camp was run as a collective. Campers pooled the money that they brought with them, responsibilities were rotated and hierarchies were eliminated. Although movement leaders were present, they functioned more as consultants than as administrators. Over the course of the summer, their involvement receded even further as the campers assumed the major responsibilities for running the camp.

The results can be understood against this backdrop. A major shift toward a socialist philosophy is evident in campers' strong endorsement of social justice at the end of the summer. Their attitudes concerning this dimension changed significantly over the two months. Increased closed-mindedness can be understood as an orientation towards perpetuating a cohesive social structure. These findings documenting a highly successful attitude change attempt contrast sharply with reports of other attitude change studies. Rokeach (1973), for instance, suggested that such attempts are generally unsuccessful because interventions fail to affect people's underlying values.

The effectiveness of the present intervention was most likely related to its scope, intensity, and duration.

Unlike the majority of attitude change experiments, the intervention assessed by this research consisted of a totally involving program aimed at changing the campers' values.

Although the movement was successful in its effort to change certain attitudes, other attitudes remained resistant to this influence attempt. No increased endorsement occurred for the more strongly worded authoritarian items such as "people who believe that discipline is necessary to run a movement are my kind of people."

Predictors of Non-Conformity

Psychologists and sociologists hold different views about the determinants of attitude change. While sociologists typically locate the major source of influence in the social situation, psychologists tend to concentrate on an individual's predispositions. In this study, consensus corresponds with the situational variable, while psychological conformity constitutes a personality variable. The relationships of these two variables with non-conformity were looked at under two contrasting conditions: when the social bonds between the people are relatively strong ("reciprocated"), and when they are relatively weak ("unreciprocated"). It was expected that the strength of bonds will have more impact on the situational variable (consensus) than on the personality variable.

The results indicate that consensus was the variable most strongly related to non-conformity. The more attitudinal unity there is among an individual's reference group, the more likely an individual will be to conform to the group's mean attitude. Statistically significant relationships between consensus and non-conformity were found for both the social and for the individual justice dimensions. These significant results emerged for the bivariate correlations as well as when the influence of other variables were controlled for through a regression procedure. The correlation between consensus and non-conformity on the closedmindedness dimension was in the predicted direction, but was not significant.

After consensus, the strongest predictor of attitudinal non-conformity was psychological conformity. Significant correlations were discovered between this variable and non-conformity on the individual justice dimension and on the social justice dimension, but not on the closedmindedness dimension. Yet when other sources of influence were controlled for, psychological conformity only had an impact on the individual justice dimension.

We now turn to the relationships among consensus, psychological conformity, and reciprocated relationships. Reciprocated and non-reciprocated sets were distinguished in order to determine whether any of the relationships were mediated by the strength of the social bonds. It was hypothesized that the influence of consensus in reciprocated

relationships would be greater than its influence in non-reciprocated relationships. The assumption underlying this hypothesis is that a person is more likely to be influenced by closer rather than by more distant referents.

The results support these hypotheses. In the reciprocated set, consensus was significantly related to non-conformity on the social justice and on the individual justice dimensions. These results were obtained both for the bivariate relationships and when other variables were controlled for. In the non-reciprocated set, consensus was significantly related to non-conformity only on the social justice dimension. (This relationship was also obtained when other variables were controlled for.) This means that for individual justice, the relationship between consensus and non-conformity is dependent upon the strength of the social bonds. On this dimension, consensus has an impact on non-conformity only when there are strong bonds between the people. To summarize, it appears that an individual's attitudes concerning social justice are influenced both by his close and non-close referents, while his attitudes towards individual justice were influenced only by his close referents.

For the psychological conformity measure, the analysis of reciprocated and non-reciprocated sets paralleled the results obtained for camper's entire network of social relations. Psychological conformity is significantly correlated with individual distributive justice--both for the

reciprocated and for the non-reciprocated sets (using bivariate correlations as well as a multiple regression procedure). Thus it appears that the relationship between psychological conformity and non-conformity is not dependent upon the strength of the social bonds between the members.

Contrary to the initial hypothesis, attraction to the group was not significantly related to non-conformity on any of the dimensions. While the correlations between attraction and both social and individual justice were in the predicted direction, they were not statistically significant. Yet it appears that for the sample studied here, an individual's personal feelings toward the group are less important than ideological cohesiveness (represented by the consensus variable) and his own psychological predispositions.

Although attraction to the group was not significantly related to non-conformity for the entire group, these two variables were related on the social justice dimension in the reciprocated friendship set. This breakdown reveals that the relationship between attraction to the group and non-conformity was originally masked by the inclusion of non-close referents. It emerged only in the context of stronger (e.g. reciprocated) social bonds and only on the social justice dimension.

The relatively weak influence of attraction found in this study can be understood in a number of ways. Firstly, although there was some variability in the intensity of

campers' feelings towards their friends, with very few exceptions, all of the feelings expressed were positive ones. As Downing (1958) noted, where attraction levels are similar, differences in conformity may not emerge.

In addition, because of the camp's emphasis upon social cohesion, it is possible that there was a positive response bias. By contrast, consensus, an indirect way of measuring group influence, was highly related to the dependent variable. We can conclude that in settings such as these, where cohesiveness is highly valued by the group, self-reported measures of attraction are less likely to pick up subtle differences in attitudes towards the group. More indirect social structural measures--such as consensus--may be preferable.

Popularity¹ was found to be the variable that was most weakly related to non-conformity. It was significantly related to non-conformity only on the closedmindedness dimension. In fact, popularity was the sole independent variable that significantly correlated with non-conformity on this dimension. Yet, even on this dimension, when the effects of other independent variables were controlled for, the relationship between popularity and non-conformity disappeared. Given the very small percentage of the variance

¹Popularity was measured by the number of friendship nominations that an individual received from other campers. Such nominations were considered to reflect the extent to which a camper was sought after as a friend by the other campers.

of the closedmindedness dimension (8%)² that was accounted for by the independent variables, it is not surprising that none of the independent variables emerged as significant when a regression was conducted. Popularity was also not found to be significantly related to non-conformity on any of the dimensions when it was analyzed for the reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendship sets.

A study conducted by Merei (1949) can help us understand the minimal influence of popularity obtained in this study. In his study, leaders conformed to group norms in order to preserve their position in a group. Under some circumstances more popular members of a group become representatives of its values and norms--and as such conform more rather than less.

It is possible that in a field setting both processes that relate popularity to conformity operate. In some instances popular people may be leaders, conforming to group norms to serve as role models (Merei, 1949). Others may be

²This contrasts with 23% and 46% of the variance accounted for by the independent variables on the individual justice and social justice dimensions, respectively. These findings correspond with Rokeach's (1973) results. Through research on his "two-value" model, he discovered that Americans typically rank freedom high, but differ significantly in their valuation of equality. Rokeach found that equality is the dimension that best distinguishes between conservatives and liberals: while liberals rank equality high, conservatives rank it low. He concluded that this suggests that these two ideological differences evident in American politics are reducible to variations on one value alone--equality--rather than on two values.

attitudinally independent, having acquired their quota of "idiosyncrasy credits" (Hollander, 1959). It is possible that no single process relating popularity to conformity was illustrated in this study, because both of these processes operated simultaneously.

The Conformity Process and the Dimensions on which Conformity Occurs: Are They Related?

One striking finding of this study concerns the conformity process itself. Both from the literature on conformity and from the literature on other psychological areas, one repeatedly encounters the assumption that although the magnitude will vary depending on the dimension being studied, the process itself will remain invariant. Undoubtedly, this is a desirable assumption in that it permits researchers to generalize from the confines of their findings to other populations and settings.

Yet this study's results challenge the assumptions underlying this practice. The findings indicate that the process of conformity differed according to what dimension was being measured. The independent variables associated with the dimension that was more central³ to the camp's ideology appeared to differ from those associated with dimensions that were less central to the camp's ideology.

³Centrality can be determined either by the amount of attitudinal change that occurred over the summer or by how strongly the attitude was endorsed at the end of the summer (see Table 2).

The social justice dimension was most affected by the consensus variable. It is likely that in this case a social structural variable is evoked because the conformity process concerns a socially relevant attitude.

Conversely, the individual justice dimension, that focuses to a greater extent on the rights of the individual than on the rights of the collective, evoked a more personality related independent variable--psychological conformity. As the conformity process becomes more "self-oriented," personality variables seem to play an increasingly prominent role. Similarly, the closedmindedness dimension, a personality variable, was also not affected by the socially relevant independent variable--consensus.

In some respects, the conformity process described here parallels many social psychological laboratory studies. In examining the predictors to conformity, we have seen that when a psychological process involves less socially central variables, the individual is more affected by personality variables than by social variables. In laboratory situations where it is very difficult to tap socially central attitudes, significant relationships are frequently found between personality variables and psychological processes.

Another perspective concerning the relationship between value centrality and the role of group pressure was provided by Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1960). They suggested that the magnitude of group pressure toward uniformity will be greater the more important the function to be

served by uniformity. In the present case equality, which has been identified as the socially central value, can be perceived as essential for group maintenance. It is therefore consistent with this theory that consensus, which represents "pressure toward uniformity," was found to be the variable most strongly related to social justice.

The Impact of Strong Social Bonds

An individual's own level of attitudinal conformity and non-conformity was found to be related to the amount of attitudinal agreement among his reference group. In order to see whether stronger referents have more of an impact than weaker referents, a person's reference group was broken down into these two sets of friends. Reciprocated relationships accounted for the larger proportion of the significant effects of consensus. The results indicate that a person's attitudes are best predicted from knowing his friends' attitudes and especially his close (e.g. reciprocated) friends' attitudes.

Distinguishing between reciprocated and non-reciprocated relationships demonstrates how the significant relationship between non-conformity and consensus for the entire camp was attributable to its relationship with the reciprocated set. In addition, this breakdown caused a previously masked relationship--between attraction to the group and strong social bonds--to emerge. These results are consistent with those of other researchers who found correlations

between mutually positive relationships and conformity to group standards (Lott & Lott, 1961; Boissevain, 1974).

Useful Research Modalities in Studying Conformity

Because these results were obtained under specific conditions, it is important to discuss how this situation differs from other contexts in which conformity has been studied. The field methodology utilized in the present research has notable advantages as well as several disadvantages. It provided the researcher with the opportunity to measure the effects upon attitudinal non-conformity of a range of independent variables that were free to vary. In addition, a high level of external validity was achieved because the research took place in a natural setting and because the dimensions being investigated were meaningful to the participants.

In many ways, conditions of the present research resembled those of a natural experiment. The campers were involved in an environment that was specifically structured to affect their basic beliefs. We also knew from the post-measures that this attempt was successful. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to create such a totally involving experience in a laboratory. As a consequence, experiments rarely tap an individual's core values nor do they often succeed in triggering high levels of attitude change.

Most laboratory conformity studies have been based on situations that have subjected the individual to a very concentrated form of group pressure. Experimental manipulations are typically constructed to insure that every subject is exposed to the same level of group influence. In such situations, the subjects respond in the presence of others, but are not given the opportunity to interact freely with them.

By contrast, in field settings, group influence is usually a naturally occurring phenomenon. It is therefore not possible to regulate its intensity or to keep its contents "uniform." In the present case, although the camp's ideology was clearly identifiable, there is no way to control the precise "dosage level" received by each individual.

Although attempts have been made experimentally (Hollander, 1971) to distinguish between movement conformity and congruence conformity, the results of this study do not clearly support one process over another. Movement conformity which corresponds with radical attitudinal swings, appeared to be operating in the case of the social justice dimension. The attitudinal shifts that occurred on the other two dimensions seem to correspond with congruence conformity because they consisted of an enhanced endorsement of the originally supported position.

This distinction might be another exemplification of the different processes that produced non-conformity. It

points to the strong possibility that when large-scale attitudinal change occurs, it is induced by social structural rather than by personality variables.

Normative and comparative conformity have also been distinguished in the experimental research (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). Comparative conformity has been attributed to an individual's own needs for certainty, whereas normative conformity has been attributed to an individual's desire to be part of the group.

Once again, no single process "fits" the results of the study. Neither attraction to the group, the predicted mediating variable of normative conformity, nor psychological conformity, the predicted mediating variable of comparative conformity, emerged as the predominant predictors. It appears that the processes involved cannot be simply delineated. We can therefore conclude that identifying the motivational bases of conformity probably requires more rigorous control of the independent variables.

Another variable that is often controlled for in experimental research concerns whether the subject is privately or publicly committed (Raven, 1959; Deutsch & Gerard, 1955) to his attitude choice. Researchers are interested in this distinction because private commitment usually corresponds with private acceptance. In the present research, each subject's responses were recorded privately. Therefore, it can be said with a fair degree of certainty that when these measures were taken, the responses

reflected the subjects' own opinions. What the research cannot determine is whether or not at some point in the process, the individual camper was involved in a public commitment type of situation, and if so, how this affected his subsequent attitude.

The amount of attitudinal discrepancy existing between the individual and the group is a factor that is usually manipulated in experiments that involve a public commitment condition (Fisher et al., 1956). Although this research was based on the actual attitudinal discrepancy between an individual camper and the group, it is not clear to what extent the camper was aware of the discrepancy or the size of the discrepancy. Because a major component of the camp's programs involved discussing these ideological issues, it is probable that each camper had many opportunities to compare his views with those held by others. Needless to say, this kind of comparison is implicit and is not equivalent to receiving "harder" information concerning the group's position.

It is interesting to speculate about the possibility that the different dimensions were not all likely to be discussed publicly. The two dimensions more relevant to the individual than to the collective--individual justice and closedmindedness--were least likely to be public discussed. Social equality, the dimension that pertained most to the group, was more likely to be the focus of discussion. It was also the dimension that changed most over time.

Although this methodology gave the researcher a richer understanding of the inter-relationships among the independent variables and their combined impact on non-conformity, a gap in our knowledge still remains. That gap is related to the lack of "process" measures in the present research. Without such measures it is impossible to demonstrate how the various reference groups actually enforced the group standards.

Directions for Future Research

Because of the uniqueness of this particular setting, it is desirable to determine whether the results replicate in other field settings. A less ideological setting might be selected in order to investigate the role of consensus when the socially relevant attitudes are not as highly charged as they were in the camp setting.

Future research would also benefit from a greater understanding of the conformity process itself. Therefore, an attempt should be made to map the course of the participants' attitude change. One way to do this would be to collect multiple measures--perhaps in the form of a time series design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Greater attention should be paid to monitoring those activities specifically aimed to bring about attitude change. Knowing how individuals respond in these situations will possibly shed light upon the process through which a person moves from public to private commitment.

Finally, it is important to find out whether or not the changes that were found were long-lasting. Even though central attitudes changed significantly over the course of the summer, a waning of intensity is likely to occur once the campers are removed from the setting. For this reason, it would be advisable, where feasible, to collect post measures.

Implications and Conclusions

Perhaps the single most important finding of the study was that different dimensions evoke different conformity processes. Although in general the best way to predict an individual's attitudes is by knowing the attitudes of his close friends--this is especially the case when the attitudes in question are relevant to the social structure. It seems that when the attitudes being tapped are socially relevant, as they were in the case of the social justice dimension, the individual becomes more vulnerable to the influence of his immediate social group. Another process appears to be evoked when the attitude pertains more to the individual than to the collective--as was the case with the individual justice dimension. Under conditions where the individual is more "self-oriented," personality rather than social variables play a larger role in the conformity process.

The study described here aimed to identify circumstances under which individuals have a certain latitude for non-conformity. The results of the research indicate that

an individual has more freedom to be attitudinally independent when the attitudes involved are personal than when they are socially relevant. In situations where the attitudes are related to the collective, the individual is more likely to be attitudinally constrained by the norms of his immediate referents. In addition, we find that individuals with friends whose opinions are less uniform, are more free to be attitudinally non-conformist.

The results of this study highlight the importance of conducting research in diverse settings. Not all the variables that cause non-conformity in experimental settings predicted non-conformity in this field setting. Certain relationships between the independent variables and non-conformity were contingent upon specific features of the field setting such as strength of social bonds or the centrality of attitudes to the group.

Studies of social processes, such as non-conformity, in field settings are valuable because they aid us in generalizing from experiments and because they point to the types of interactions that predict conformity and non-conformity in natural settings. A body of research that combines detailed laboratory studies of conformity and non-conformity with field research would enable us to reach a more complete understanding of these processes.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Table A

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Number of Campers	74
Response Rate	93%
Percent Females	49
Average Age	16.4

Appendix B
Questionnaire

Fairness¹

Pretend that you and the campers you've just listed have been invited to form a baseball team and play a rival team. However, only 9 of you can play, although everyone would like to play.

A decision must be reached about who is to play on the team. There are many things that you and your friends might consider in making this decision. We have listed some of these points of view below. Please read and consider each one and then give it a score from 1 (not important) to 9 (very important) according to how important you feel the point is.

1. The object of the game is to win.
not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very important
2. The best players on the team should play the most.
not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very important
3. All the players on the team should have the same chance to play in the game.
not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very important

¹Used to measure individual and social justice dimensions.

Attitudes about Camp²

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
1. Only by having rules and structure do young people learn about setting their own limits.	—	—	—	—	—
2. Strong movement leadership is critical.	—	—	—	—	—
3. For the movement to succeed a clear chain of command is necessary.	—	—	—	—	—
4. People who believe that discipline is necessary to run a movement are my kind of people.	—	—	—	—	—
5. People don't know what they are talking about if they believe that a movement can exist without demanding total commitment from its members.	—	—	—	—	—
6. It's wrong for a person to publicly disagree with another movement member in the presence of non-movement members.	—	—	—	—	—
7. Too many differences of opinion within one's own movement can be dangerous.	—	—	—	—	—
8. I would have no difficulty getting along with people who encourage differences of opinion among the members of their movement.	—	—	—	—	—
9. The money that campers bring to camp should be placed in a "kupah" (pool) and distributed equally among all the campers.	—	—	—	—	—

²Used to measure closedmindedness dimension.

Friends³

We would like to ask you several questions about the different types of relationships that you have with campers at this camp. Please write in the coded numbers--instead of the names.

Your Code Number: _____

Are there campers here whom you feel close to and would share personal feelings with? Yes _____
No _____

If there are--list their Coded Numbers below.

- | | |
|----------|-----------|
| 1. _____ | 7. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 8. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 9. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 10. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 11. _____ |
| 6. _____ | 12. _____ |

Ties⁴

Think about the people whom you have mentioned. How strong are your ties to these people?

- | | Very
Weak
Ties | Somewhat
Weak
Ties | Moderate
Ties | Somewhat
Strong
Ties | Very
Strong
Ties |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. My ties to the people mentioned in these questions are: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

³Used to identify referents and to measure popularity.

⁴Used to measure attraction to the group.

Social Behavior⁵

1. When in a group of people I usually did what others wanted rather than making suggestions.
not at all true 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very true
2. I don't like campers who make a point of being different.
not at all true 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very true
3. I would rather not be too different from others.
not at all true 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very true
4. I was not at all responsive to social pressure.
not at all true 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very true

⁵Used to measure psychological conformity.

Appendix C

Operationalization of Independent and Dependent Variables

Variable Name	Operationalization	References	
		Description of Measure	Items in Questionnaire
Independent Variables			
CONSENSUS	Extent of convergence among a person's referents regarding the following attitudes: a. Attitudes towards Distributive Justice b. Attitudes concerning Closedmindedness	pp. 23-24	pp. 81-82
ATTRACTION TO THE GROUP	Self-reported strength of friendship bonds with friends.	pp. 24-25	p. 83
REFERENTS	Those listed by each camper as kids whom they can "share feelings with." To obtain a measure of the strength of social bonds with these campers, this list can be broken down into two subsets comprising: a. Reciprocated Nominations b. Non-Reciprocated Nominations	p. 24	p. 83

Appendix C (continued)

Variable Name	Operationalization	References	
		Description of Measure	Items in Questionnaire
Independent Variables (continued)			
PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDISPOSITIONS TO CONFORMITY	Self-reported orientation towards others (e.g. ". . . I usually did what others wanted rather than making suggestions.")	p. 24	p. 84
POPULARITY	The total number of nominations received by each camper	p. 25	p. 83
Dependent Variable			
ATTITUDINAL NON-CONFORMITY	The deviation of an individual's score from his group's score on a set of attitudes that have changed over time	p. 34	

Appendix D

A Critique of Theoretical Assumptions and Methodological Tendencies in Conformity Research

The Theoretical Assumption that Conformity is Inevitable

There is a long tradition of viewing conformity as the inevitable result of social pressure. Tarde, LeBon, and Ross were among those who portrayed man as a passive recipient of group pressure. It was to this hypothesized reaction that Tarde was referring when he stated: "social man is a somnabulist" (cited in Asch, 1952).

Research, beginning in the 1920's, employed a paradigm that exposed a subject to the purported judgment of an identified group which deviated from the subject's own view. This model, which is still being utilized, typically depicts subjects as automatically assuming the group's frame of reference instead of providing their own frame of reference--or anchoring their judgments elsewhere. The results of this line of research are directly related to the methods employed. Experiments in the laboratory were carefully structured so that conformity was often the only available option.

The Theoretical Assumption that Conformity is Uni-Directional

Another characteristic of theory and research in this area is its sharp distinction between those who influence and those who are influenced. The direction of the influence or control typically flows from the group to the individual

members. The Asch paradigm that utilized a group composed of trained stooges to endorse a deviant choice exemplifies this approach (Crutchfield, 1955; Deutsch & Gerard, 1955; Allen & Bragg, 1965).

In their involvement with the "social construction of behaviors," the researchers neglected to examine intra-group processes that might have accounted for the results or that might have depicted the individual as more than a mere target of influence.¹

Structuring the experiments in this manner accentuated the behavior of the conforming individual without shedding light on the attitudes and orientations related to his conformity. This methodology tended to eliminate lesser levels of conformity by focusing on those who were most influenced while ignoring the others. In this way, it did not address the limits of conformity.

Although the pitfalls of this passive view of the individual were recognized, they were not dealt with empirically. Asch (1962) himself cautioned against an uncritical acceptance of a psychological model that:

described social action generally in terms of passivity and equated group influence with arbitrary control. The model was an individual deprived of autonomy.

¹Sherif's (1936) research involving the autokinetic effect was somewhat of an exception in this regard. By obtaining pre-intervention measures, he was able to demonstrate the limits of group influence. But, this procedure is not typically utilized in conformity research.

The Methodological Tendency to Limit the Subjects' Options
For Rational Decision-Making

In both the Asch and the Sherif studies, the most widely used paradigms, the subjects are provided with a stimulus and confronted with the group opinion. For example, in the Asch (1956) study the subject is given an objective stimulus and is required to make a perceptual judgment. The subject is then unexpectedly confronted with social forces that make it difficult and uncomfortable for him to arrive at an adequate judgment.

Both of these approaches short-circuit reality by producing effects through social pressure rather than through rational processes. Either all responses were equally legitimate because of the stimulus ambiguity (e.g. Sherif's study), or the appropriate responses were denied because of the overwhelming social pressure (e.g. Asch's study). As Hollander (1962) has noted: "conformity can be a technique through which valid knowledge about the environment is attained." If this is so, then it bears little resemblance to either of these experimental approaches. Since more cognitive or rational decision-making is rarely an option in conformity research, the subjective and emotional elements of the experience tend to predominate. Asch has stated (1962) that according to this approach:

social action was characterized by thoughtlessness and unreasonableness. The role assigned to thinking was mainly that of an inhibitory process, serving as a brake upon the more primitive and permanent forces of suggestion.

The Methodological Tendency to Limit Subjects' Options for Non-Conformity

Although recently the disadvantages as well as the advantages of conformity have been investigated, the dominant tradition has been to focus on the prevalence and desirability of conformity. Thus Sherif and others who researched this subject through the 1950's emphasized the need for cooperation and tended to define disagreements within small groups from the point of view of the majority. Since the ultimate goal was intra-group cohesiveness, those adhering to minority opinions within the group were regarded as "deviants."

In contrast, more recent research has begun to point out the disadvantages of conformity. Kelley and Shapiro (1954) believed that conformity may impede a group's adaptation to a changing reality, while Moscovici and Faucheux (1972) stated that it can generate boredom, stereotyping, and rigidity. This orientation resulted in a body of research on the "strength of active minorities." Moscovici (1969) emphasized the possibility of non-conformity to a larger group: "a minority poses its own judgments and opinions as having the same value, as being equivalent to those of the majority." Nemeth (1979) and others have similarly argued that minorities cause majorities to re-assess their original positions and to consider a range of alternatives. He also posited that this process helps the individuals involved to re-evaluate their own decisions as

well as to generate new solutions.

Research has revealed several variables associated with the effectiveness of an active minority including: the consistency of the minority's position, the minority's confidence in its position, and the reasonableness of the minority's arguments (Nemeth, Swedlund, & Kanki, 1974; Moscovici, Lange, & Naffrechaux, 1969).

Evidence for the effect that minorities can have on the processes of conformity and obedience is found in the Asch (1951) and in the Milgram (1960) studies. When the subjects were provided with one supportive peer in the Asch experiment, conformity decreased from 30% to 5%. Similarly, when Milgram included a "disobedient model," 90% of the subjects defied the experimenter, as opposed to only 35% in the "obedient" condition.

While this research demonstrated the ways in which independent minorities can minimize group pressure, it failed to specify the parameters of minority impact. At this point, a greater synthesis of these issues appears desirable.

REFERENCES

- Allen, V. Situational factors in conformity. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Allen, V., & Bragg, B. The generalization of nonconformity within a homogeneous content dimension. Unpublished manuscript, 1965.
- Allport, F. A structuronomic conception of behavior: Individual and collective. I. Structural theory and the master problem of social psychology. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 3-30.
- Asch, S. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), Groups, leadership and men. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951.
- Asch, S. Social psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
- Back, G. Intensive group psychotherapy. New York: Ronald Press, 1954.
- Back, W. Influence through social communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 9-23.
- Bennett, E. Discussion, decision, commitment and consensus in group decisions. Human Relations, 1955, 21, 251-273.
- Berkowitz, L. Group standard, cohesiveness and productivity. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 509-519.
- Berkowitz, L., & Howard, R. Reactions to opinion deviates as affected by affiliation need and group member interdependence. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 81-91.
- Berkowitz, L., & Macauley, J. Some effects of differences in status level and status stability. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 135-147.
- Blalock, H. Causal inferences in nonexperimental research. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964.
- Boissevain, J. Friends of friends. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

- Bott, E. Family and social network. London: Tavistock Publications, 1957.
- Bovard, E. Group structure and perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 389-405.
- Brehm, J., & Cohen, A. Re-evaluation of choice alternatives as a function of their number and qualitative similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 373-378.
- Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Cartwright, D. The nature of group cohesiveness. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Coleman, J., Blake, R., & Mouton, J. Task difficulty and conformity pressures. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 120-122.
- Converse, P., & Campbell, A. Political standards in secondary groups. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Cooley, E. Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner, 1902.
- Crutchfield, R. Conformity and character. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 191-198.
- Deutsch, M. Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31, 137-149.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. A study of normative and informational social influences on individual judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 629-636.
- Dittes, J., & Kelley, H. Effects of different conditions of acceptance upon conformity to group norms. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 100-107.
- Downing, J. Cohesiveness, perception, and values. Human Relations, 1958, 11, 157-166.
- Durkheim, E. The division of labor in society. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949.

- Eisman, B. Some operational measures of cohesiveness and their correlations. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 183-189.
- Emerson, R. Deviation and rejection: An experimental replication. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 688-693.
- Etzioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Festinger, L. Informal social communication. Psychological Review, 1950, 57, 271-282.
- Festinger, L., Schacter, S., & Back, K. Social pressures in informal groups: A study of a housing project. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.
- Festinger, L., Gerard, H., Hymovitch, B., Kelley, H., & Raven, B. The influence process in the presence of extreme deviants. Human Relations, 1952, 5, 327-346.
- Festinger, L. An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif & O. Wilson (Eds.), Group relations at the cross-roads. New York: Harper, 1953, pp. 232-256.
- Festinger, L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.
- Festinger, L. Theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, California: Stanford U. Press, 1957.
- Festinger, L., & Thibaut, J. Interpersonal communication in small groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 92-99.
- Fisher, J., Rubenstein, I., & Freeman, R. Intertrial effects of immediate self-committal in a continuous social influence situation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 200-207.
- Frank, J. Some determinants, manifestations and effects of cohesiveness in therapy groups. International Journal of Psychotherapy, 1957, 7, 53-63.
- Freud, S. Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In J. Strachey (Ed.), The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.
- Fromm, E. Escape from freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehard, Winston, 1941.
- Gerard, H. The anchorage of opinions in face-to-face groups. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 313-325.

- Golembiewski, R. The small group. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Gordon, R. Interaction between attitude and the definition of the situation in the expression of opinion. American Sociological Review, 1952, 50-58.
- Hardy, J. Determinants of conformity and attitude change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 289-294.
- Harper, F. The sociometric composition of the group as a determinant of yielding to a distorted norm. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1961.
- Hare, P. Handbook of small group processes. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hochbaum, G. The relation between group members' self-confidence and their reactions to group pressures to uniformity. American Sociological Review, 1954, 6, 678-687.
- Hollander, E. Conformity, status and idiosyncrasy credit. Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 117-127.
- Hollander, E. Reconsidering the issue of conformity in personality. In H. David & J. Brengelmann (Eds.), Perspectives in personality. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1960.
- Hyman, H. Reflections on reference groups. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 383-396.
- James, W. The dilemma of determinism. In The will to believe. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921.
- Janis, I. Personality correlates of susceptibility to persuasion. Journal of Personality, 1954, 22.
- Jennings, H. Leadership and isolation: A study of personality in interpersonal relations. New York: Longmans, Green, 1943.
- Jones, E., & Gerard, H. Foundations of social psychology. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Kanter, R. Commitment and community. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

- Kateb, G. Utopia and its enemies. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.
- Kelley, H. Salience of membership and resistance to change of group anchored attitudes. Human Relations, 1955, 8, 275-290.
- Kelley, H. Two functions of reference groups. In H. Hyman & E. Singer (Eds.), Readings in reference group theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Kelley, H., & Shapiro, M. An experiment on conformity to group norms when conformity is detrimental to group achievement. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 667-677.
- Kiesler, C. Group pressure and conformity. In J. Mills (Ed.), Experimental social psychology. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1969.
- Lott, A., & Lott, B. Group cohesiveness, communication level and conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 408-412.
- McDavid, J., & Sistrunk, F. Personality correlates of two kinds of conforming behavior. Journal of Personality, 1964, 32, 420-435.
- Mann, F., & Baumgartner, H. Absences and employee attitudes in an electric power company. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1952.
- Merei, F. Group leadership and institutionalization. Human Relations, 1949, 2, 23-49.
- Merton, R., & Rossi, A. Contributions to the theory of reference group behavior. In H. Hyman & E. Singer (Eds.), Readings in reference group theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Milgram, S. Liberating effects of group pressure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 127-134.
- Moscovici, S., & Faucheux, C. Social influence, bias and active minorities. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 6, 149-202.
- Moscovici, S., Lange, E., & Naffrechoux, M. Influence of a consistent minority on the responses of a majority in a color perception task. Sociometry, 1969, 32, 365-380.

- Mouton, J., Blake, R., & Olmstead, J. The relationship between frequency of yielding and the disclosure of personal identity. Journal of Personality, 1956, 24, 339-347.
- Nemeth, C. The role of an active minority in intergroup relations. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Co., 1979.
- Nemeth, C., Swedlund, M., & Kanki, B. Patterning of the minority's responses and their influence on the majority. European Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 53-64.
- Newcomb, T. Personality and social change. New York: Holt, 1943.
- Raven, B. Social influence on opinions and the communication of related intent. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 119-128.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rokeach, M. The nature of human values. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Sartre, J. P. Being and nothingness. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Schacter, S. Deviation, rejection and communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 190-207.
- Schroder, H. Dispositional effects upon conformity at different levels of discrepancy. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 244-258.
- Sherif, M. The study of some social factors in perception. Archives of Psychology, 1935, 27(187).
- Sherif, M. The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Sherif, M. A preliminary study of inter-group relations. In J. Rohrer & M. Sherif (Eds.), Social psychology at the crossroads. New York: Harper, 1951.
- Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

- Stouffer, S., Suchman, E., DeVinney, L., Star, S., & Williams, R. The American soldier: Adjustment during army life (Vol. 1). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Talmon, J. Utopianism and politics. London: Conservative Political Centre, 1957.
- Thibaut, J., & Strickland, L. Psychological set and social conformity. Journal of Personality, 1956, 25, 115-129.
- Toennies, F. Community and society. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957.
- Truax, L. The process of group psychotherapy. Psychological Monographs, 1961, 75(No. 51).
- Tuddenham, R., & MacBride, P. The influence of the sex composition of the group upon yielding to a distorted norm. Journal of Personality, 1958, 46, 243-251.
- Walker, E., & Heyns, R. An anatomy of conformity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- White, A. Attitude change as related to perceived majority opinion. Research Lab Air Force R & D. Randolph AFB, Texas: Research Report #AFPTRC 57-79.
- Wolf, A., & Schwartz, E. Psychoanalysis in groups. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1962.