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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An understanding of conformity and nonconformity is particularly important in these days of social unrest. Most of the research has emphasized understanding the process of conformity, with nonconformity either being ignored or considered the opposite of conformity. This unidimensional approach with conformity on one end and nonconformity on the other was conceptualized by Allport (1) in his J curve hypothesis of conformity. Asch (3) continued the unidimensional approach by contrasting conformity with independence. This unidimensional approach has been followed in a vast amount of literature which contrasts conformity with either nonconformity or independence.

There are certain difficulties which are encountered in studying conformity and nonconformity. Many studies have failed to distinguish between congruence conformity, which is measured in terms of the extent of agreement between a given response and the normative ideal, and movement conformity, which is defined as a change in response due to group pressure (21).
Another difficulty encountered in the study of conformity was suggested by McGee (29) when he did a study designed to determine whether or not individuals who tend to choose acquiescent options in response to test items would tend to display socially oriented behavior. Seven measures of acquiescence and two independent behavioral tasks were administered to 104 undergraduate psychology students. McGee found that the agreeing response tendency had very little if any relationship to social behavior.

Diab (14) suggested that deviation and conformity are really one and the same process. He argued that when a person deviates from a certain standard or norm, he is in fact conforming to another standard or norm. This is in opposition to the view expressed by Asch (4) that deviation and conformity are in opposition to each other and have their sources in distinct considerations and motives.

Recently a two-dimensional approach to the study of conformity has been adopted which contrasts conformity with two varieties of nonconformity: independence and anticonformity, or counterformity as it is sometimes referred to. Theoretical descriptions of the independent and counterformity persons have been given by several authors.
Although they did not support their views with research, Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachy (25) pointed out that not all nonconformity is the same. One type of nonconformity is counterformity, in which the person is actively opposing the group, being hostile, negativistic and compulsively dissenting from it. The counterformist may be driven to repudiate the groups beliefs or actions even when he believes the group is right. This kind of nonconformity is to be distinguished from independence of judgement in which the person is neither unduly susceptible to the pressure of the group nor unduly driven by forces of alienation from the group. Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachy (25) also distinguished between two types of conformity, expedient conformity, in which the individual outwardly agrees with the group but remains in inward disagreement, and true conformity, in which the individual both inwardly and outwardly is brought to agree with the group.

In another theoretical article Crutchfield (12) further elaborated on the definition of the independent person. He stated that the independent person is able to maintain an optimal balance between self reliance and group identification. He is able to escape the oversocialization of the extreme conformist, which involves violating the validity of his own
experiences and betraying his own thought processes and judgments, and yet does achieve a sufficient degree of socialization so as to not divorce himself from the essential resources of society's thinking, as in the case of the extreme counterformist. According to Crutchfield (12) the truly independent person is often highly conventional in ways that facilitate group life but do not impede his own aims. The independent person has learned to accept society without denying himself.

Crutchfield (12) also theorized about the motivations of the counterformist. He suggested that the motivation impelling the counterformist involved needs for defending his identity, becoming emancipated from the group's authority and expressing hostile impulses toward others. The counterformist strives for difference for difference's sake.

Willis (45) is another advocate of two varieties of nonconformity. However, in addition to conformity, independence and anticonformity, Willis (45) suggested the response mode of variability. Variability occurs when the individual invariably changes his response if given an opportunity, without regard for the fact that one of the responses is defined as correct and the other as wrong. Variability reflects complete indecision. As soon as the person responds one way, he changes his mind.
The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior (16) recognized three types of conformity as well as independence and nonconformity. The "cognitive" conformer is looking for a solution; he needs information and accepts the opinion of the group as being the most likely answer. The "expedient" conformer believes he has the correct answer, but goes along with the group on the wrong answer in spite of this. The "passively suggestible" conformer lacks confidence in himself and his opinions and therefore accepts the groups opinion in the belief that they must be right and he must be wrong.

Related Research

Asch (3) contributed greatly to research on conformity by developing a method of measuring movement conformity, or yielding to group pressure. A group of seven to nine individuals was instructed to match the length of a given line with one of three other lines. One of the three comparison lines was equal to the standard; the others differed considerably. All but one of the subjects had met previously with the experimenter and were instructed on certain trials to respond verbally with wrong and unanimous judgments. This placed the critical subject in the position of a minority of one against a wrong and unanimous majority. The critical
subject's estimate might be correct and therefore a measure of independence from the majority, or in error, in which case the number of errors was taken as an index of the effect the majority exerted on the minority of one.

Crutchfield (11) criticized Asch's (3) technique because of the severely unfavorable ratio of confederates to true subjects. To improve upon this procedure he constructed an apparatus consisting of five adjacent electrical panels. The subjects could not see each other in these panels, but they could all see slides which were projected on a wall directly facing the subjects. These slides called for various kinds of judgments—lines, figures, vocabulary items, etc.—to which the subjects replied on the electrical panel. The subjects were told that the apparatus was so wired that information could be sent by each man to all the others. Although the subjects believed the panel lights were a communication system between booths, actually all the lights were controlled by the experimenter. In this way each of the subjects could be confronted with an apparent unanimous group opinion contrary to his own.

The Asch (3) technique and the Crutchfield (11) technique are the two most commonly used methods of measuring movement conformity, or a change in response due to group pressure.
A large variety of paper and pencil tests have been devised to measure congruence conformity, or the extent of agreement between a given response and the normative ideal.

Conformity and nonconformity have been studied with regard to the situational variables that affect conformity behavior and with regard to the relationship between the personality of the individual and his tendency to conform, remain independent or anticonform. A few examples of situational studies will be given, but the remainder of the research survey will concern itself with the relationship between personality and conformity due to the vast amount of literature on this subject.

One situational variable which has been studied is group size. Gerard, Wilhelmy and Conolley (17) asked 154 high school students to make judgments of Asch's lines in groups of 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 under two treatments of perceived contingency. In one treatment the subjects were induced to perceive that the others might be following the leader, but in the other treatment condition the subjects were led to believe that the others were responding independently. It was hypothesized that conformity to group opinion should increase with group size if the subject perceives the others as independent operators, but if he
perceives them as dependent in their responses, the subject would be unaffected by an increase in group size. The results showed that conformity increased as the size of the group increased under both treatment conditions.

Another situational variable which has been studied is group attractiveness as a determinant of conformity. Rotter (35) did a study in which twenty-eight students were divided into groups of three and asked to complete a modified version of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. Then each subject was asked to indicate how well he liked the other two members of the group based on the answers to the Strong Blanks. The subjects were then handed summaries which indicated how well the other group members liked them. These summaries were filled in by the experimenter, with half the subjects receiving a "liked" rating and the other half a "disliked" rating. Conformity was measured by a modification of the Asch line judgment. Group attractiveness, i.e., liking for the group, was found to be unrelated to yielding.

Costanzo, Reitan, and Shaw (10) studied conformity as a function of experimentally induced competence. With the use of a Crutchfield apparatus 26 subjects, assigned to groups of four, viewed geometric figures of different sizes and were told to judge which of the three figures was largest in area.
The subjects were told to write down their answers on a sheet of paper. The experimenter supposedly "graded" the papers and announced aloud whether the subject had been correct (high competence) or incorrect (low competence) on each of the ten practice trials. The experimenter actually randomly manipulated levels of competence, varying the number of high competent and low competent members in each group.

The subjects were then presented a set of twenty stimulus cards and were told to respond by means of switches. Since all the switches were controlled by the experimenter, this placed each subject in the position of being a minority of one against a unanimous but erring majority, as in the traditional Crutchfield situation. In this study, however, the supposed competence levels of the subjects in the simulated majority were known to each subject as well as his own supposed competence.

It was hypothesized that the low competent members would conform more than the high competent members to the unanimous but erring majority. It was further predicted that conformity would vary with the number of supposedly high competent members in the simulated majority.

As predicted, low competent individuals conformed more than those high in competence regardless of the levels of
competence in the majority. The results also indicated that the greater the number of the supposedly high competent individuals in the simulated majority, the greater the conformity of the minority subject.

The relationship between levels of prior agreement with others and conformity was studied by Julian, Regula, and Hollander (23). Levels of agreement with others were created in a Crutchfield situation by having a 100 per cent agreement condition, a 75 per cent agreement condition, a 50 per cent, 25 per cent, and 0 per cent agreement on judgments. Conformity was assessed during a second phase in terms of the number of trials of twenty in which the subject matched the erroneous judgments of the others. Level of agreement was found to be curvilinearly related to conformity with highest conformity following unanimous agreement, least conformity following strong majority support (75 per cent) and moderate conformity following agreement from a minority of peers.

The large majority of studies relating conformity to personality employ the unidimensional approach, with conformity on one end and nonconformity or independence on the other. Some of these studies describe the general personality characteristics of either conformers or nonconformers.
on the assumption that the traits assigned to conformers are opposite to those assigned to nonconformers. Other studies relate conformity to specific personality traits, such as anxiety or dependence, on the assumption that conformers have either more or less of these specific traits than nonconformers.

One of the earliest studies relating conformity to general personality characteristics was done in 1930 by Barry (5). Barry developed a paper and pencil test which he called a test for S. According to Barry, S seemed to measure the amount of resistance to social stimuli. For want of a better word, compliance was identified with high positive values for S while negativism or the habitual resistance to social stimuli was identified with negative values for S. Barry stated that the correlates of high positive values for S seem to be amenability, deference to the opinion of others and, in some cases, punctiliousness. The dominant motive in the person with high S score would be social rather than individual. Persons with low S scores tended to be critical, derogatory and irritable.

In another early study, Allport and Solomon (2) measured conformity by lengths of conversation in the library and church. Allport and Solomon concluded that
judging from investigations with other types of behavior, individuals possessing high degrees of talkativeness, sociability or other traits which deviate considerably from the average fall far out on the steps of lesser conformity. He also stated that the fact of conformity means a less complete expression of natural individual differences, particularly near the mean.

In a more recent study, Hoffman (19) measured conformity in terms of the extent to which reported judgments of two distances were changed in the direction of announced bogus group-average judgments. Those conforming most and least were divided into two groups and given a sentence completion test, two attitude questionnaires and thirteen cards from the Thematic Apperception Test. The conforming group, compared to the group which did not conform, scored lower on various measures of ego strength and significantly higher on measures of parental dominance, intropunitive handling of hostility, inability to tolerate impulses, overconcern for the well-being of parents, overidealization of and less ability to critically evaluate parents, strict moralism, success strivings, positive attitude toward authority and conservative political and religious attitudes.
The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior (16) used a Crutchfield technique to measure conformity and a wide variety of personality tests to study the relationship between conformity and personality. According to this report, conformers have inadequate self-perception, are high on scales of doubt and anxiety, feel inferior and are unable to cope under stress. Nonconformity is related to intelligence, ego strength, dominance, ascendancy, masculinity and social acuity, or the ability to understand other people.

In reviewing a large variety of studies relating personality to conformity, Blake and Mouton (7) stated that the kind of person who is least able to resist conformity pressures is submissive, lacking in self-confidence, less intelligent, lacking in originality, authoritarian-minded, lacking in achievement motivation, conventional and searching for social approval.

Bass (6) also reviewed a large variety of studies on conformity and personality and stated that yielders to simulated group pressure were much more likely to be conventional, nurturant, affiliative, conscientious and sociable. He suggested that conforming behavior was correlated with the generalized tendency to acquiesce, the generalized need for certainty and assuredness and generalized feelings of insecurity.
Crutchfield (12) in measuring conformity by the use of his technique has correlated conformity with several personality variables. He stated that conformers have a rigidity of cognitive processes, are lower in ego strength and ability to cope with stress, have more emotional constriction and lack spontaneity. They have a repression of impulse and a tendency toward indirect expression of hostility. Conformers have pronounced feelings of inferiority and inadequacy, lack self confidence, are less insightful and are less realistic in self conception. According to Crutchfield (12) the conformist exhibits an intense preoccupation with other people and dependence on them, while at the same time a disturbed and distrustful attitude towards others. Conformers are more anxious, insistent on securing a stable and safe environment, and desirous of avoiding uncertainty and ambiguity at any cost. In another study Crutchfield (13) stated that those with lower conformity scores tend to be superior in intelligence, originality, ego strength, self-confidence and effective social relations.

Moeller and Applezweig (33) related conformity as measured by an Asch type situation to needs for social approval and self approval as measured by the Behavior Interpretation Inventory. They hypothesized that persons
with high social approval and low self-approval motivation would yield to a unanimous but erring majority more frequently than would persons with high self approval and low social approval motivations. The results were in accord with the major hypothesis.

Centers and Horowitz (9) measured conformity by a questionnaire designed to elicit expression of opinion. In the experimental groups a paragraph was added to the instructions which stated that the opinions of numbers of well-known and important people would be indicated by means of an asterisk at one of the choice alternatives. They then related conformity to inner-directedness and other-directedness as measured by the I-O Social Preference Scale. The results indicated that other-directed persons were more influenced to conform in their views in the direction of the fictitious important people than the inner-directed persons.

In contrast to these studies, Endler (15) found no relationship between conformity and general personality characteristics. Endler used as his conformity measure a forty-eight item scale consisting of twenty-three conformity items and twenty-five neutral ones. Personality was measured by the Public Opinion Survey and eight scales from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The EPPS scales were
achievement, deference, autonomy, affiliation, succorance, dominance, abasement, and aggression.

The studies cited above describe the general personality characteristics of conformers and nonconformers. The following studies relate conformity or nonconformity to specific personality traits, rather than general personality characteristics.

Taylor and Vaughan (40) did a study relating clinical depression to conformity. The neurotic depressive subjects were twenty-two undergraduate students referred by a professional clinical psychologist. They displayed symptoms of dejection, lethargy, feelings of isolation, disinterest in everyday affairs and a reluctance to make decisions. Scores on the Depressive Scale of the MMPI were also gathered. The normal subjects were selected from bottom quartiles on the Depressive Scale. The conformity measure was a Crutchfield visual signaling apparatus. The results indicated that conformity scores for depressives as a whole were approximately 54 per cent lower than for normals. Taylor and Vaughan indicated that the low conformity of the depressives seems to derive from their general state of disinterest and consequent social apathy.
Another specific personality trait that has been studied in connection with conformity is authoritarianism. Smith, Murphy, and Wheeler (38) measured conformity by an Asch-type conformity situation and correlated it with scores on the California F Scale and Army GT scores (general intelligence). F scale scores were negatively correlated with intelligence and positively correlated with Asch-type conformity. Intelligence also showed a significant negative correlation with conformity. When the effects of intelligence were partialled out, the positive correlation between the F scale and conformity remained significantly high, but when removing the effects of authoritarianism the negative correlation between intelligence and conformity was no longer significant. It seemed that the California F Scale did have some value in predicting conformity behavior, but within the limited range tested, intelligence per se did not.

Another study on conformity and authoritarianism was done by Vaughan and White (42). This study differed from other studies in that conformity was measured in the transitiuational sense and a forced choice version of the F scale, known as the FCF scale, was used to measure authoritarianism. Three measures of conformity were used: group pressure through the use of the Crutchfield technique; normative pressure which
involved the manipulation of artificial norms to induce opinion shift in individual subjects; and the Social Acquiescence Scale, a questionnaire which has been found to discriminate between high and low scores on the acquiescence dimension. The high conformity and low conformity groups were selected from the upper and lower quartiles of group pressure and normative pressure and from a median cut on the Social Acquiescence Scale. The results indicated that high conformity subjects scored significantly higher on the FCF than did low conformity subjects.

The need for affiliation is another personality trait that has been studied in connection with conformity. McGhee and Teevan (30) measured need for affiliation by stories written to four Thematic Apperception Test slides. Subjects were divided into high and low need for affiliation groups depending upon whether their score was above or below the median score. Conformity was measured with the use of a modified version of the Crutchfield apparatus in which only perceptual tasks were used so that a situation might be established in which the subject's judgment was clearly objectively correct but differed from that of an erring unanimous majority. The results indicated that the high need-for-affiliation subjects conformed significantly more than the low-need-for-affiliation subjects.
Hardy (18) studied the effects of affiliative motivation and social support upon conformity. Subjects were divided into high, medium, and low-need for affiliation groups on the basis of a TAT-type measure of affiliative motivation. The subjects were given a pretest concerning their attitude toward divorce. Then each subject met with a group of six students, all confederates of the experimenter, in which their previously measured attitude toward divorce was either unanimously opposed, or opposed with the exception of one supporter. The critical subject was then given a post-test questionnaire about divorce. Conformity was measured as shifts in the direction of group influence. The results indicated conformity to be a joint function of affiliative motivation and conditions of social support. The group with medium need scores conformed under both conditions. The high-need group conformed under conditions of no support, but not under support conditions. The low-need group changed more under conditions of support than no support, but were considered as responding more to the content of the influence situation than to its social structure.

Walker and Heyns (43) studied need for affiliation and need for achievement in connection with conformity. By using good friends and supposedly putting them in two groups,
a conflict was created between need for affiliation and need for achievement. In order for a girl to achieve in her group, she had to encode or scramble the largest number of words. In the decoding group, the girl that could decode or unscramble the highest percentage of words would achieve. Therefore, if a girl encoded or scrambled a large number of words, it was difficult for her friend to decode the highest percentage. Actually all the girls were in the encoding group. The girls all received a written request from the experimenter, which they thought was from their friend in the decoding group, to "please slow down." Those subjects who tested high in need for affiliation and low in need for achievement on previously administered personality tests conformed to their friend's request to slow down. Those who tested high in need for achievement and low in need for affiliation did not conform to their friend's request to slow down.

Levy (27) measured conformity with a Crutchfield situation and personality with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. He found need for affiliation to show a positive relation to conformity.

The relationship between dependency and group conformity has also been studied. Kagen and Mussen (24) defined dependency
as "the need for emotional or authoritative support in most situations, difficulty in making independent decisions and taking on responsibilities and the dread of loneliness."

According to Kagen and Mussen, since the dependent individual would regard the opinion of a group as wiser and more reliable than his own, it might be predicted that he would conform to group judgments. Dependency was measured by responses to eight TAT cards in which the hero sought help from another in solving a personal problem or was disturbed over loss of love and support. Conformity was measured by an Asch type conformity situation. The results indicated that every one of the 10 subjects who produced two or more dependency themes yielded to the incorrect majority opinion.

In another study, Bradbard (8) used the Navran Dependency Scale derived from the MMPI to classify subjects along a continuum of expression of dependence, ranging from dependency-denier (low score) through dependency-flexible to dependency-acceptor (high score). Bradbard hypothesized that both dependency-acceptors and dependency-deniers would show higher amount of yielding in a Crutchfield conformity situation than would dependency-flexibles. The hypothesis was not supported. High dependency scores, which he termed dependency-acceptors, were significantly related to high conformity scores.
In studying conformity in a Crutchfield situation, Sistrunk and McDavid (36) used two classes of judgments, soluble tasks, involving perceptual judgments of differences that were discriminable with at least 95 per cent accuracy by pretest subjects, and insoluble tasks, involving perceptual judgments of indiscriminable pairs of identical stimuli in which the contrived majority agreed on an arbitrarily selected member of an indiscriminable pair. Forty measures of personality were used. It was inferred from these measures that conformity to a group of unanimous peers who have expressed a judgment in obvious contradiction to logic and reason is associated with timidity, deference to others, tendencies to avoid argument or conflict with others and generally components of deference and dependence. Conformity to judgments of a unanimous group of peers in an otherwise ambiguous situation is associated with not only components of deference and dependence, but trust and faith in other people, conventionality and persistence in seeking closure and successful completion of problems or tasks undertaken.

Anxiety is the trait most thoroughly researched in connection with conformity. Meunier and Rule (31) in relating test anxiety to conformity used the seventeen-item Test Anxiety Scale as a measure of anxiety and an Asch situation
as a measure of conformity. High test-anxious persons conformed significantly more than low test-anxious persons in this study.

Meyers and Hohle (32) used three test-anxiety scales and an Asch conformity situation to study the relationship of test-anxiety to conformity. They found a positive relation between conformity and test anxiety.

Walters, Marshall, and Shooter (44) investigated the effects of anxiety and isolation upon social influence. Anxiety was measured by two self-report anxiety scales. On the assumption that the giving of suggestions and the dispensing of social reinforcers such as right and good could be regarded as alternative ways of inducing susceptibility to social influence, susceptibility measures were responses of subjects to contrary judgments of distances and the speed with which the subjects were conditioned to emit a specific response. The subjects were divided into four groups, isolated anxious, isolated nonanxious, nonisolated anxious, and nonisolated nonanxious, and tested for suggestibility in the autokinetic situation. Anxious subjects showed a greater increase in suggestibility in response to contrary judgments than did nonanxious subjects and were more quickly conditioned to a specific class of judgments. No differences were found between isolated and nonisolated subjects.
Janis (22) hypothesized that persons with high neurotic anxiety would exhibit low persuasibility, whereas a high degree of socially oriented anxiety would give rise to high persuasibility. Neurotic anxiety, social anxiety and test anxiety were measured by the Sarason Anxiety Questionnaire. It was hypothesized that test anxiety is another form of social anxiety and would therefore lead to high persuasibility also. Persuasibility was measured by observing the opinion changes shown by fifty-three subjects after each was exposed to a series of five persuasive communications. There was no significant difference in persuasibility among subjects who scored high and low on neurotic anxiety. Persons who scored high on social anxiety and test anxiety were more persuasible than those who scored lower; however, the results were significant at only slightly beyond the 10 per cent level.

In contrast to the above reports (16, 22, 31, 32, 44), which indicated that high anxiety is related to high conformity or persuasibility, Holder (20) found that high anxiety was related to low conformity. Holder stated that the type of conformity to which he was referring was the extent to which an individual agreed with the value attitudes of his peers. His measure of conformity was the Inventory of Value
Integration, which represented the extent of the subject's agreement with the value attitudes of 75 per cent of the norm group, composed of the subject's peers. Holder hypothesized that subjects who were judged to have MMPI profiles within the normal range would have significantly higher scores on conformity than subjects whose profiles were judged to be in the non-normal range. He also hypothesized that conformity and anxiety, as measured by the Welch Anxiety Index, would be inversely related to each other. The group judged to be non-normal on the MMPI was found to be less similar in value attitudes to their peer group than the group judged to be normal. The results also indicated that low conformity was accompanied by higher anxiety, but deviantly high conformity was accompanied by only slightly lower anxiety than the middle conformity range.

Vaughan and Taylor (41) also found high anxiety related to low conformity. Vaughan and Taylor used as their high-anxiety group students who were referred by a professional clinical psychologist as experiencing an acute anxiety state. The low-anxiety subjects were selected by a questionnaire-type personality test. The measure of conformity was yielding to group pressure in a Crutchfield-type situation. The results indicated that high anxiety was related to low
conformity among males, but there was no difference in conformity among anxious and nonanxious females.

Mangan, Quartermain and Vaughan (28) also found high anxiety related to low conformity. In this study the Taylor Scale of Manifest Anxiety was used as the anxiety measure and a Crutchfield situation was used as the conformity measure.

In contradiction to all of the above mentioned studies on anxiety and conformity, Smith and Suinn (39) found no relationship between anxiety and conformity. The anxiety measures used were the Manifest Anxiety Scale and the General Anxiety Test. The conformity measure was the Conformity Test, involving rationally derived items previously proven to have high internal consistency.

There has been very little research done using the two-dimensional approach to conformity, contrasting conformity on the one end with two types of nonconformity on the other. Although Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachy (25) define the two types of nonconformity and Crutchfield (13) speculated at length about the probable personalities of the independent and conformer, they did not do any actual research in which they separated subjects into three groups and correlated personality characteristics with conformity, independence and anticonformity.
Willis (46) did a study to demonstrate that conformity, independence and anticonformity reactions can be brought under experimental control and can be substantially and differentially produced in the laboratory. By simultaneously manipulating a number of independent variables, conditions for one group were designed to maximize conformity, those of a second group to maximize independence and those of a third to maximize anticonformity. Differences among the experimental groups were sizable and supported his prediction that these three response modes could be produced. Willis indicated that he was concerned with responses, however, and not the processes underlying these responses.

Pepinsky (34) did a study of girls on a college campus who were rated as nonconformers by their peers, but nevertheless were highly productive. She contrasted these girls with girls who were described as nonconforming, but were not productive. Using a wide variety of personality measures, she described productive nonconformers as being high in ego strength and having an internalized, well-integrated set of standards. They have both spontaneity and self control; they can be alone without discomfort, but are able to form warm, nonexploitative attachments. They accept some limits as inevitable, but their attitude toward authority is one of
critical respect, rather than of unquestioning servility. They conform on trivial matters, but can maintain their positions under pressure on matters they feel are important. Their typical set is one of constructive restructuring. Because they can see both sides, they sometimes have difficulty making decisions, but they can and do get things done.

Pepinsky (34) stated that in negative conformity there is a rebellion against authority without the development of an integrated set of personal standards. There may be a confused wavering between one set of values and the other, and in some instances there appeared to be an internalization of a set of defensive-repressive standards representing an attempt to deny a need for other—an affiliative reaction formation.

On the basis of the opinion-change test, Linton and Graham (26) divided subjects into three groups, changers, nonchangers and negative changers. Subjects were asked questions on three controversial topics. At a later session the subjects were given supposedly authoritative articles on the topics which took a definite stand on the issue. Then the subjects were again asked the original questions. Changers were those that changed in the direction of the article, nonchangers were those whose opinions on all three
issues remained uninfluenced by the articles, and negative changers were those whose opinion changed in the opposite direction of the influencing article. The personalities of the subjects were measured by an authoritarian-personality questionnaire, a check-list personality inventory, a human-figure drawing and the Rorschach test.

On the basis of these tests, changers were described as immature, unimaginative, weak, and passive. They use repression as a characteristic defense and rely on external supports. Non changers were described as independent without being rebellious, imaginative, tactful and valuing subjective feelings, ideas and intellectual activity. Negative changers, according to Linton and Graham (26), see the world as a hostile, destructive place. They maintain an image of themselves as strong people by projecting feelings of inadequacy on others. They are affected by sources of influence but fight against being influenced.

Smith (37) contributed greatly to the understanding of conformity, independence and anticonformity by developing a twenty-eight item attitude scale, designated the "Nonconformity Scale," which empirically differentiates between conformers, independents and anticonformers, or rebels as they are referred to in his study. Smith defined the conformer as one who agrees
consistently with modal social attitudes and responds in keeping with the hypothetical usual or normal response. The independent is defined as one who agrees with some modal responses and disagrees with others and behaviorally neither categorically acts against nor is totally accepting of the modal response from situation to situation. The rebel disagrees consistently with modal social responses and responds in opposition to the hypothetical usual or normal response.

Smith (37) measured behavioral correlates of conformity, independence and rebellion by the Figure Preference Test, which is a response-style scale, and the two-person nonzero sum game, which is a situational test. Between-groups differences did not reach the .05 level of significance on the Figure Preference Test. The rebels were more competitive than either of the two groups on the two-person nonzero sum game. Independents were more cooperative than both conformers and rebels on the game, with conformers and rebels not differing significantly.

Personality correlates of the three groups were measured by the Rorschach test and the well-being scale, the self-control scale, and the achievement-via-conformity scale of the California Psychological Inventory. The results of the Rorschach test revealed no significant differences between
the three groups on experience-balance subtypes, space, or popular responses. However, movement responses were significantly more common among rebels than among either independents or conformers. The results of the California Psychological Inventory indicated that the independents scored significantly higher on the well-being scale than did either the conformer or the rebel. The rebel scored lower than the conformer, but not significantly so. The independents showed significantly more self-control than did either the conformer or the rebel, with the conformer and the rebel scoring very similarly on this dimension. The rebels indicated less achievement via conformity than did the conformer and the independent.

At the conclusion of his study, Smith (37) stated that significant differences on the Rorschach and the game suggest that beneath surface-level differences, conformers and rebels may be similarly motivated. The rebel and the conformer may be at different ends of the attitude continuum, but the personality dynamics underlying the overt responses seem to share a similar base. Smith stated that rebels have characteristics of conforming nonconformers, while both rebels and conformers differ from the independents on several dimensions.
Purpose of the Study

As a review of the literature indicates, conformity and nonconformity has been studied in many ways and in relation to many aspects of personality. The conception of conformity which considers conformity, independence and anticonformity as separate response modes hold much promise in clarifying the conflicts in the literature and in helping to understand these methods of behavior and their relationship to personality.

The development of an easily administered and easily scored test by Smith (37) which differentiates conformers, independents, and anticonformers facilitates study of these three groups. The suggestion by Smith (37) that conformers and anticonformers might have similar motivations underlying their different surface behavior seems worthy of further study. The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior (16) also suggested similar motivations by stating that the contra-suggestible person has a great deal in common with the conformer. However, they did not elaborate further on this point.

If conformers and anticonformers do indeed have similar underlying motivation for their different surface behaviors, this might explain why researchers such as Endler (15) found no relationship between conformity and personality. On a test
measuring only conformity-nonconformity without measuring independence, the anticonformists would score as nonconformers. However, on a personality test which revealed underlying motivations, the anticonformers would score similarly to the conformers, causing the results of the experiment to be confused and perhaps suggesting to the researcher that there was no relationship between personality and conformity.

Statement of the Problem

Although there have been suggestions about the similarity of motivations of conformers and anti-conformers, to date there has been no scientific investigation into this area. The purpose of this research then was to conduct an exploratory study into this area, using the Smith nonconformity scale as a measure of conformity, independence, and anticonformity. Is there a similarity of underlying motivations in conformers and anticonformers, particularly in relation to the personality traits, need for affiliation, dependency needs, and anxiety?

Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses are based on the survey of the literature. Several studies (18, 27, 30, 43) have indicated that conformers are high in need for affiliation.
Pepinsky (34) in describing negative conformity suggested that it might be a form of affiliative reaction formation. From these studies the hypothesis that conformers and anticonformers are equally high in need for affiliation was formulated.

High conformity has been related to high dependency needs in several studies (8, 13, 24, 36). If anticonformers are similarly motivated, it would follow that they are equally high in dependency needs.

There seems to be a conflict in the literature on the relationship of anxiety to conformity. Perhaps this conflict could be resolved if a scale such as the IPAT Anxiety Scale were used which measured both overt and covert anxiety. It would seem logical that conformers and anticonformers would differ on overt anxiety, but if their underlying motivations were similar, they would be equally high on covert anxiety.

The specific hypotheses based on these studies are as follows:

1. There will be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents and anticonformers on the dependent variable of need for affiliation. The between-groups differences will be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. There will be no
between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers on need for affiliation, with both groups showing a higher need for affiliation than the independents.

2. There will be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of dependency needs. The between-groups differences will be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. There will be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher dependency needs than the independents.

3. There will be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of overt anxiety. The between-groups difference will be between conformers and independents, anticonformers and independents and conformers and anticonformers. Conformers will show the highest overt anxiety, independents a median amount and anticonformers the lowest overt anxiety.

4. There will be a significant difference among the groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of covert anxiety. The between-groups differences will be between conformers and independents
and anticonformers and independents. There will be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher covert anxiety than the independents.
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CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 73 members of two intact freshman psychology classes at North Texas State University. Although the subjects did not volunteer in advance to participate in this study, they were told before the tests were given that they were free to leave. Therefore, they may be considered as volunteers. The subjects were not classified as to age, sex, social class or other variables as it was not considered necessary for the purposes of this study.

Description of Instruments

Three objective paper and pencil tests were used for this study; the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire.

The Nonconformity Scale was developed as a measure for defining three groups, conformers, independents and
anticonformers, or rebels as referred to by Smith (5). Some items were taken from existing attitude tests such as the Cattell 16 P.F. test, with new items designed by Smith. The scale was developed by having ten judges from the graduate school and faculty of the University of Miami Psychology Department rate 125 items. After being given a comprehensive definition of the rebel, the conformer, and the independent, the judges were to respond to each item in terms of how he thought a rebel, an independent and a conformer would respond to the item, that is, whether he would agree or disagree with the item.

The modal attitudes of the conformers, rebels, and independents were defined by the judges' agreement as to how the three groups would respond to the scale items. From the 125 items, 36 items garnered judges' agreement indexes of 75 percent or better. The first 36-item edition of the Nonconformity Scale was administered to 21 male junior college students. Following an item analysis and the rating by judges of an additional group of 77 newly constructed statements, the scale assumed its final form, consisting of 33 items, 28 of which were scorable and 5 filler items. The total score on the Nonconformity Scale resulted from assigning numbers 1 to 9 to percentage
options on the basis of the direction in which the item was keyed. For an item where an extreme conformist would agree 100 per cent, a subject agreeing 100 per cent would be given a score of 9 and a subject disagreeing 100 per cent would be given a score of 1. For an item where an extreme conformer would disagree 100 per cent, a subject disagreeing 100 per cent would receive a score of 9 and a subject agreeing 100 per cent would receive a score of 1. Therefore, the highest scores on the scale defined the conformer, the lowest scores defined the anticonformer, or rebel, and the median scores defined the independent.

Smith (5) validated his test on a sample of 162 male undergraduates and found significant differences between the three groups in regard to certain personality and behavioral characteristics.

In a follow-up study Smith (6) administered the Nonconformity Scale to 177 male undergraduates at a Midwestern university. Significant differences between the three groups were found on three scales of the California Psychological Inventory, the achievement-via-conformance scale, the well-being scale and the self-control scale. A new factor, psychological anomie, was tested, and it was
found that anticonforming subjects expressed more anomic feelings than the conformers or the independents.

To date, these two studies by Smith (5, 6) are the only ones in which the Nonconformity Scale has been used. Therefore, no other information is available as to the validity and reliability of the scale than what is given in the two studies by Smith.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule has generated a considerable amount of research as evidenced by the fact that 326 articles about the scale are listed in the Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook by Buros (1). In connection with validity the correlations between the EPPS scores and corresponding self-ratings, when computed on an individual basis, ranged from -.59 to .90 with a median of .39. Test-retest reliability ranged from .55 to .87 with a median of .73.

Although the entire EPPS was administered, the only scales that were scored were affiliation, deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy and dominance. The need-for-affiliation scale of the EPPS was scored separately as an indicator of the need to make friends, participate in friendly groups and in general to be with friends (3). The deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy and dominance
scales were combined to form an indirect measure of dependency in accordance with a study done by Zuckerman, Levitt and Lubin (7). A combination or ratio score of dependency was formed by converting the raw scores to Edwards standard scores and taking the ratio of deference plus succorance plus abasement to the total sum of deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy and dominance. According to Zuckerman, Levitt and Lubin (7) these scales of the EPPS constitute an indirect measure of dependency because the elimination of the social desirability factor in the EPPS plus the pairing of fifteen needs makes it difficult for the subject to grasp what is being measured.

Zuckerman, Levitt, and Lubin (7) used this indirect measure of dependency in a study using 78 student nurses as subjects. Peer ratings of dependency were obtained on each subject, using a scale adapted from Leary's Interpersonal Check List. This scale contained the dimensions of pride-shame, dominant-submissive, and independent-dependent. Each subject was rated by approximately fifty peers. The EPPS indirect measure of dependency was found to correlate significantly with the peer ratings.

The IPAT Anxiety Scale is a brief, easily scored questionnaire. Construct or concept validity is estimated
at .85 to .90 according to the IPAT Anxiety Scale Manual (2). Test-retest reliability on 170 medical students over two-year retests has centered at a value of .60. The twenty covert items are relatively indirect and hidden in purpose. The twenty overt items serve as a record of actual symptoms and as an indication of how conscious the patient is of his problems (2). According to the Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook by Buros (1) the impressive systematic research background of the IPAT commends it for use as an overall measure.

In a study by Levitt and Persky (4), student nurses who were dropped from school had significantly higher covert-overt ratios on the IPAT than did those who remained in school. Also, IPAT scores were found to be significantly elevated in hypnotically induced anxiety states. These findings were considered to bear favorably on the construct validity of the IPAT.

Design

The design for this study consisted of comparing three groups on four separate dependent variables. Therefore, the statistical test of significance was four simple analyses of variance, each one determining the relationship of membership in the groups to one of the dependent variables.
The subjects were assigned to groups on the basis of scores received on the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith. The twenty-four subjects receiving the highest scores on the Nonconformity Scale were assigned to Group I, labeled conformers. Conformers are operationally defined in this study as people who agree consistently with modal social attitudes and behaviorally respond in keeping with the hypothetical usual or normal response (5).

The twenty-five subjects receiving the next highest scores were assigned to Group II, labeled independents. Independents are operationally defined as people who agree with some modal responses and disagree with others, thus reflecting no consistent tendency to disagree nor to agree with socio-cultural norms across a variety of situations. Behaviorally the independent neither categorically acts against nor is totally accepting of the modal response from situation to situation (5).

The twenty-four subjects receiving the lowest scores on the Nonconformity Scale were assigned to Group III, labeled anticonformers. Anticonformers disagree consistently with modal social responses and behaviorally respond in opposition to the hypothetical usual or normal response (5).
The assignment of subjects to the groups constitutes the independent variable of this study. The dependent variables in this study are need for affiliation, dependency needs, overt anxiety, and covert anxiety.

Need for affiliation as used in this study is defined by the scores received on the affiliation scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. According to the Edwards Manual, need for affiliation measures the desire to be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends (3, p. 11).

Dependency needs are defined by the score received by taking the ratio of the Edwards standard scores on the scales of deference, succorance and abasement to scores received on the scale of deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy and dominance. The concept of dependency, which this ratio score measures, is the compliant or moving-toward-people personality. The three traits of the compliant personality are a marked need for affection and approval from others (succorance), a tendency to subordinate oneself to others and to inhibit assertiveness and criticality (deference and abasement) and the tendency toward self-blame.
and guilt (abasement). Needs at the opposite poles are autonomy and dominance (7).

Anxiety is operationally defined by the scores received on the **IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire**. According to the IPAT Manual (4), the IPAT is primarily designed to measure free-floating manifest anxiety level, whether it be situationally-determined or relatively independent of the immediate situation. The division into covert and overt anxiety is intended to indicate the degree to which the patient is or is not conscious of his anxiety, perhaps also of his wish to consciously emphasize it. The twenty covert items are relatively indirect and hidden in purpose, particularly to the naive, lay examinee. The twenty overt, conscious, symptomatic items serve first as a record of actual symptoms, secondly as an indication of how conscious the patient is of his problem and third, in special cases, as a clue to attempts to distort and over-emphasize symptoms.

**Procedure**

The subjects met at their regular class time and were seated at desk-chairs. They were given the following instructions:
I would appreciate it if you would fill in these three questionnaires to be used as part of the research for my master's thesis. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so please be frank.

I am going to pass out a sheet with 50 numbers on it. Please circle one number and put this number on all three answer sheets.

The directions are clearly printed on each test. Read them carefully and begin working. If there are any questions, I will be happy to answer them. As soon as you are through with the first test, come up and get the second. When you are through with the second test, come and get the third. That way you can work at your own rate and leave when you are finished.

I appreciate your cooperation in this matter. This is strictly voluntary, however, and if you don't want to fill in these questionnaires, feel free to leave.

The subjects were given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule first, then the IPAT Anxiety Scale and then the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith. It was felt that by giving the tests in this order, it would be more difficult for the subjects to grasp what was being measured, and therefore, it would be easier to get a measure of underlying motivations.

The Nonconformity Scale, the deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy, dominance and need for affiliation scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; and the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire were hand scored. All of the raw scores of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were converted to standard scores by the use of the standard
scores given in the Edwards Manual (3). The dependency ratio, as previously described, was computed. On the basis of scores received on the Nonconformity Scale the subjects were divided into conformers, independents and anticonformers. The range of scores of the group labeled conformers was from 156 to 202. The range of scores of the group labeled independents was from 139 to 154. The range of scores of the group labeled anticonformers was from 100 to 138. Scores for the three groups on need for affiliation, dependency needs, overt anxiety and covert anxiety were recorded on four separate sheets. These dependent variable scores were fed into an IBM 1620 computer and an analysis of variance for each of the dependent variables was done by the computer. The results of this analysis were used to test the research hypotheses.
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CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Table I lists the means and standard deviations of the four dependent variable scores for the three groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers. The analyses of variance for the data will be presented in the same order in which the hypotheses were stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>I**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Affiliation</td>
<td>49.0416</td>
<td>44.3200</td>
<td>46.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency Needs</td>
<td>.6062</td>
<td>.5992</td>
<td>.5662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert Anxiety</td>
<td>17.9166</td>
<td>19.5200</td>
<td>17.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conformers.  **Independents.  ***Anticonformers.
In the first hypothesis of this study, it was stated that there would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents and anticonformers on the dependent variable of need for affiliation. It was further hypothesized that the between-groups differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. It was also predicted that there would be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers on need for affiliation, with both groups showing a higher need for affiliation than the independents. The results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CONFORMERS, INDEPENDENTS, AND ANTICONFORMERS ON NEED FOR AFFILIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>273.2800</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>136.6400</td>
<td>1.0918</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8760.4000</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>125.1485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9033.6800</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An F of 3.10 was needed for significance at a P of .05 with 2 and 70 degrees of freedom. The computed F did not
reach that level, which indicated that there was no significant difference among the groups labeled conformers, independents and anticonformers on the variable of need for affiliation. Since there was no significant difference among the groups, it was not necessary to run \( t \)-tests for differences between pairs of means. Hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected. A visual inspection of Table I shows that conformers were slightly higher in need for affiliation than anticonformers, with independents indicating a slightly lower need for affiliation than either of the other two groups.

In the second hypothesis of this study, it was stated that there would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the variable of dependency needs. It was further hypothesized that the between-group differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. It was also predicted that there would be no between-group differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher dependency needs than the independents. The results of the statistical test of significance are presented in Table III.
Table III

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Conformers, Independents and Anticonformers on Dependency Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.0219</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>2.8470</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>.2699</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.2918</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table III, the computed F did not exceed 3.10, which was required for significance at a P of .05. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no significant difference among the groups labeled conformers, independents and anticonformers on the variable of dependency needs. Since there was no significant difference among the groups, it was not necessary to run t-tests for differences between pairs of means. Hypothesis 2 is therefore rejected.

A visual inspection of Table I indicates that conformers were very slightly higher in dependency need than independents, whereas anticonformers indicated the lowest dependency needs.

In the third hypothesis of this study, it was stated that there would be a significant difference among groups
labeled conformers, independents and anticonformers on the dependent variable of overt anxiety. It was further hypothesized that the between-groups difference would be between conformers and independents, anticonformers and independents and conformers and anticonformers. It was also predicted that the conformers would show the highest overt anxiety, independents a median amount and anticonformers the lowest overt anxiety. The results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CONFORMERS, INDEPENDENTS, AND ANTICONFORMERS ON OVERT ANXIETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>167.6980</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>83.8490</td>
<td>1.6290</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3602.9330</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>51.4704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3770.6310</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by Table IV, the computed F did not exceed the one required for significance at a P of .05. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no significant difference among the groups labeled conformers, independents, and
anticonformers on the variable of overt anxiety. Since there was no significant difference among the groups, it was not necessary to run t-tests for differences between pairs and means. Hypothesis 3 is therefore rejected. A visual inspection of Table I indicates that the independents had the highest amount of overt anxiety, the anticonformers a median amount and the conformers the lowest amount of overt anxiety.

In the fourth hypothesis of this study, it was stated that there would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of covert anxiety. It was further hypothesized that the between-group differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. It was also predicted that there would be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher covert anxiety than the independents. The results of the statistical test of significance are presented in Table V.

An inspection of Table V shows that the computed F did not exceed the one required for significance at a P of .05. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no significant difference among the groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the variable of covert anxiety.
Since there was no significant difference among the groups, it was not necessary to run t-tests for differences between pairs of means. Hypothesis 4 is therefore rejected. A visual inspection of Table I indicates that the independents had the highest amount of covert anxiety, with the conformers having very slightly more covert anxiety than the anticonformers, but both groups indicating less covert anxiety than the independents.

This research was conducted as an exploratory investigation into the underlying motivations of conformers and anticonformers as defined by the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith (2). The hypotheses of this study were based on the suggestions by Smith (2) and the Foundation for Research on...
Human Behavior (1) that there might be a similarity of underlying motivations in conformers and anticonformers. There are several weaknesses of the present study which need to be considered before one could conclude that the hypotheses of this study, concerned with the underlying motivations of need for affiliation, dependency needs and covert and overt anxiety, were completely without merit.

One of the major weaknesses of the present study was in the area of subject selection. Since two intact freshman psychology classes were used, the subjects were in no way a random sample, even of freshman psychology students at North Texas State University. Another possible weakness in subject selection is that both males and females were used in this study, whereas Smith (2) developed and refined the Nonconformity Scale with the use of male subjects only. Also, the number of subjects used was not sufficient for a really definitive investigation.

The factor that probably contributed most to the non-significant results was the homogeneity of the subjects used in regard to conformity, independence, and anticonformity as defined by Smith (2). The lowest possible score on the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith (2), is twenty-eight, defining extreme anticonformity. The highest possible score
is 252, defining extreme conformity. The range of scores in this sample was from 100 to 202, which definitely skewed the entire distribution of this study in the direction of conformity. Since the range of scores of the group labeled conformers was from 156 to 202, the range of scores of the group labeled independents was from 139 to 154, and the range of scores of the group labeled anticonformers was from 100 to 138, it is perhaps not surprising that there were no significant differences among the three groups on the dependent variables.

If this study were to be replicated using many universities from different parts of the country, it is possible that a wider distribution of scores on the Nonconformity Scale would be obtained which include both anticonformers, independents and extreme conformers. In this case, it is possible that the hypotheses in this study might be confirmed.

Another possible weakness in this study concerns the measuring instruments used to measure the dependent variables of need for affiliation, dependency needs, covert anxiety and overt anxiety. Since this study was designed to measure underlying and perhaps unconscious motivations, it is possible that the measures used to test the dependent variables were
not subtle enough. The fact that the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule measures fifteen different needs, including need for affiliation, made it seem likely that the subjects could not grasp the fact that need for affiliation was being measured. Also the use of the deference, succorance, abasement, autonomy and dominance scales of the Edwards to compute a dependency ratio seemed to make it difficult for the subjects to grasp that dependency was being measured. However, the Edwards does ask rather direct questions and perhaps the use of projective techniques to measure affiliation and dependency would have been better. The IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire is supposed to be relatively disguised on the covert part, especially for the naive layman. Perhaps the fact that these subjects were interested enough in psychology to be enrolled in a psychology class might mean that they were able to grasp what was being measured. In this case, also, a projective measure of anxiety might have been more effective.

It is felt that if this study were replicated so that the weaknesses were corrected, valuable information might be obtained which would contribute to our understanding of the processes of conformity, independence and anticonformity and their relationship to personality. This understanding
might be of help to those who are concerned with the seemingly
great increase in nonconformity in the present society.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if conformers and anticonformers as defined by scores received on the Nonconformity Scale, developed by Smith, were similar in their underlying motivations, particularly in the areas of need for affiliation, dependency needs, overt anxiety and covert anxiety.

Members of two freshman psychology classes were administered the Nonconformity Scale, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire. On the basis of scores obtained on the Nonconformity Scale, the subjects were divided into three groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers. Need-for-affiliation was measured by the need for affiliation scale of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Dependency needs were measured by a dependency ratio calculated by taking the ratio of the Edwards scores on scales of deference plus succorance plus abasement to the sum of deference plus succorance plus abasement plus autonomy plus dominance. Overt and covert
anxiety was measured by the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire. Four separate analyses of variance were computed, yielding the following results on the following hypotheses:

1. There would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of need for affiliation. The between-group differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. There would be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers on need for affiliation, with both groups showing a higher need for affiliation than the independents. Since the differences among the groups were nonsignificant as a P of .05, it was not necessary to run t-tests to make further comparisons between means. Therefore, hypothesis one was rejected.

2. There would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of dependency needs. The between-group differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. There would be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher dependency needs than the independents. Since the differences among the
groups were nonsignificant at a \( P \) of .05, it was not necessary to run \( t \)-tests to make further comparisons between means. Therefore, hypothesis two was rejected.

3. There would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of overt anxiety. The between-groups difference would be between conformers and independents, anticonformers and independents and conformers and anticonformers. Conformers would show the highest overt anxiety, independents a median amount and anticonformers the lowest overt anxiety. Since the differences among the groups were nonsignificant at a \( P \) of .05, it was not necessary to run \( t \)-tests to make further comparisons between means. Therefore, hypothesis three was rejected.

4. There would be a significant difference among groups labeled conformers, independents, and anticonformers on the dependent variable of covert anxiety. The between-group differences would be between conformers and independents and anticonformers and independents. There would be no between-groups differences between conformers and anticonformers, with both groups showing higher covert anxiety than the independents. Since the differences among the groups were nonsignificant at a \( P \) of .05, it was not necessary to run
t-tests to make further comparisons between means. Therefore, hypothesis four was rejected.

A replication of this study was recommended, using a larger number of subjects from various universities so that a broader range of scores on the Nonconformity Scale might be obtained and the three groups might more adequately represent conformers, independents, and anticonformers. It was further recommended that some additional or new dependent variable measures be used that might more adequately measure underlying motivations.
APPENDIX A

NONCONFORMITY SCALE DEVELOPED BY SMITH

TITLE ON SCALE--ATTITUDE SCALE

1. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

2. I find it difficult to get rid of a salesman.

3. I am generally cynical about members of the opposite sex.

4. I trust people in most ways.

5. People all behave the same because they are afraid to be different.

6. I must admit that I would find it hard to have for a close friend a person whose manners or appearance made him somewhat repulsive, no matter how brilliant or kind he might be.

7. To get along well in a group you must go along with the other persons.

8. The only way to show that you are an individual today is to perform the unusual or unacceptable act.

9. There is less need to take risks once one has lived past the early, troubled years.

10. I think I am about average in my political, religious, and social beliefs.

11. Science must have as much to say about moral values as religion does.
12. Most people would be happier if they lived more with their fellows and did the same things.

13. I prefer team games to games in which one individual competes against another.

14. Humiliating experiences bother me.

15. It bothers me if people think I am being too unconventional or odd.

16. The unfinished and the imperfect often have greater appeal for me than the completed and polished.

17. It is time to replace the old with the new in all areas.

18. I don't act rude, even when doing so would discourage irritating people.

19. A group in which people disagree will be an ineffective group.

20. The wise person gives up adventurous schemes once he has reached a mature age.

21. One should be quite careful so as not to appear foolish.

22. I believe you should ignore other people's faults and try to get along with almost everyone.

23. I suspect people who seem very friendly upon first meeting them.

24. Most laws today are so insulting to a person that they deserve to be broken.

25. Persons who cling to the old ways are almost invariably afraid of new policies and ideas.

26. It might be better to legalize the use of drugs and narcotics.

27. There is practically never an excuse for officially banning a book.

28. I like to fool around with new ideas, although they often turn out to have been a waste of time.
29. A drunken woman is no more disgraceful than a drunken man.

30. Some of my friends think that my ideas are impractical and even a bit wild.

31. I don't care if people think I'm eccentric.

32. Americans are like sheep—afriad to stray from the flock.

33. When I'm clearly told not to do something I generally don't do it.
## APPENDIX B

### SCORING KEY FOR NONCONFORMITY SCALE

A indicates agreement by conformer  
D indicates disagreement by conformer  
0 indicates filler item

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

SAMPLES OF ANSWER SHEET INDICATING PERCENTAGE OPTIONS ON NONCONFORMITY SCALE

1. 100% 75 50 25 0 25 50 75 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dis-agree</th>
<th>Dis-agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>com-</td>
<td>moder-</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pletely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moder-</td>
<td>com-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>pletely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 100% 75 50 25 0 25 50 75 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dis-agree</th>
<th>Dis-agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>moder-</td>
<td>com-</td>
<td>pletely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com-</td>
<td>moder-</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pletely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A line is drawn at the percentage the subject feels expresses his opinion on the question. A score of 9 is given if the subject scores in the direction of the conformer. The scores descend through 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 if the subject scores in the opposite direction of the conformer.
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