

AN ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANT AND CONFORMING
BEHAVIOR IN LIBERALS AND
CONSERVATIVES

By

PHILLIP DUANE FINNEY

//
Bachelor of Science

University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

Thesis
1974
J514a
cop. 2

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

1974

NOV 25 1974

AN ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANT AND CONFORMING
BEHAVIOR IN LIBERALS AND
CONSERVATIVES

Thesis Approved:

William J. Rambo

Thesis Adviser

Bob Lohm

William C. Scott

N. D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

896464

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Special gratitude must be given to my chairman, William Rambo, whose guiding hand could lead the proverbial blind man through an Iowa blizzard.

The other members of my committee, Bob Helm and Bill Scott, must have sometimes wondered if they were really on my committee, or if I was actually working on this thesis. I thank them for waiting patiently for me to get this paper together.

Doug Myers, my confederate, is the only person I know who could have read Skinner and discriminated between pressing red and white keys, at the same time, so well. His special ability enabled him to preserve his sanity throughout this experiment and enabled me to collect my data.

I also immodestly acknowledge myself. If it weren't for my own special ability, the nimble fingers of a one-hundred year old prize fighter, this thesis would never have been typed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. THE LITERATURE REVIEW | 1 |
| General Introduction | 1 |
| Definitions: Compliance and Conformity. | 2 |
| Definitions: Liberal and Conservative | 3 |
| Liberalism-Conservatism and Compliance | 4 |
| Liberalism-Conservatism and Authoritarianism | 5 |
| Authoritarianism and Compliance. | 8 |
| Evaluation: Authoritarianism and Compliance | 12 |
| Ideology and Conformity. | 14 |
| Conclusions from the Literature. | 16 |
| Hypothesis | 17 |
| II. METHODOLOGY | 18 |
| Phase I. | 18 |
| Phase I Results. | 19 |
| Phase II. | 20 |
| III. RESULTS | 25 |
| Manipulation Check | 25 |
| Data | 25 |
| IV. DISCUSSION. | 38 |
| Further Research--Method | 40 |
| Further Research--Studies. | 42 |
| V. SUMMARY | 44 |
| SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. | 45 |
| APPENDIX A | 48 |
| APPENDIX B | 51 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Means on the <u>Social Attitude Survey</u> | 26 |
| II. Analysis of Variance of <u>SAS</u> Scores. | 26 |
| III. Means for Summary Analysis. | 27 |
| IV. Summary Analysis of Variance. | 28 |
| V. Differences among Trials Means of Summary Analysis. | 29 |
| VI. Analysis of Variance for Liberals | 29 |
| VII. Analysis of Variance for Conservatives. | 30 |
| VIII. Differences among Trials Means for Conservatives. | 30 |
| IX. Means for Males, Females, and Trials in the Baseline Analysis. | 31 |
| X. Analysis of Variance for Baseline Trials. | 31 |
| XI. Means for Liberals and Conservatives across Compliance Trials. | 33 |
| XII. Analysis of Variance for Compliance Trials. | 34 |
| XIII. Differences among Compliance Trials Means | 34 |
| XIV. Means for Liberals and Conservatives across Conformity Trials. | 35 |
| XV. Analysis of Variance for Conformity Trials. | 35 |
| XVI. Differences among Conformity Trials Means | 36 |
| XVII. Revised Analysis of Variance for Compliance Trials. | 37 |

CHAPTER I

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

General Introduction

Most discussions of conformity begin with a statement stressing the enormous conformity literature which has accumulated over many years of investigation. The enormity of this literature is undeniable; a complete review of it would be a major undertaking. Also, these discussions invariably end by espousing the need for more research to clarify the unclear and complex state of this same literature. With the considerable number of variables which seem to affect conformity and the considerable difficulty in designing experiments to properly test these variables, the literature is truly in a complex and sometimes conflicting state.

These conditions strongly dictate the development of this investigation. Previous studies have spent too much time in empirical manipulations of the effects of isolated variables on compliant and conforming behavior. Too little time has been spent in attempts to integrate this information. This is especially true in research dealing with liberalism-conservatism and related ideological concepts. Thus, before any hypothesis regarding the reactions of liberals and conservatives to conformity pressure can be tested, portions of this literature must be integrated so that various alternative explanations

can be developed. Also, testing the relationship between liberalism-conservatism and conformity necessitates the evaluation of literatures closely related to it. Within this framework, the literature on authoritarianism will be related to liberalism-conservatism. This will increase the predictability of the relationship between liberalism-conservatism and conformity. Surprisingly, these areas have not been integrated.

Definitions: Compliance and Conformity

Before describing conformity literature relevant to liberalism-conservatism, a definition of compliance and conformity is required to serve as a standard for its integration. Festinger (1953) offered the best distinction between public compliance and private conformity. Public compliance is a temporary acquiescence in the presence of a source of influence. Conformity is private acceptance of that source's influence. True conformity exists as a persistent behavior continuing in the absence of the original source of pressure.

This distinction is generally accepted among social psychologists; Kelman (1961) and Rokeach (1961) have made similar distinctions. Kelman (1961) distinguished between compliance and internalization. Rokeach (1961) stated the difference by indicating that "Compliance is a function of coercion and is not conformity (p. 249)." Yet, as the following review of "conformity" literature indicates, this distinction has essentially been ignored. Most "conformity" research has investigated only compliant behavior, seldom assessing subsequent responses in the absence of the pressure source.

Definitions: Liberal and Conservative

Several traits and predispositions have been assigned to liberals and conservatives by various authors. Kerr (1944) first pointed out that the American conservative attitude pattern was related to the European fascist (authoritarian) attitude system, especially on such views as opposition to Communism, revolution, and strikes. Kerr (1952) related liberalism to "empathy with elected personnel, devotion to civil liberties, and participation tendency (p. 125)."

Taylor (1960) defined the extreme liberal as having "a relatively intense ideological predisposition characterized by acceptance of minorities and by the rejection of authoritarian power groups and beliefs (p. 2)." Rambo (1972) identified conservatives, in comparison to liberals, as being more inclined towards idealization of self-discipline and hard work, more religious, and more resistant to social change. Finally, McClosky (1958) found that conservatives, in comparison to liberals, are less informed, less intelligent, more socially isolated, submissive, timid, lacking direction and purpose, hostile, suspicious, rigid, compulsive, and aggressively critical of others.

Thus, these authors have noticed a tendency towards rigidity, lower intellectual functioning, and a more submissive nature in conservatives than in liberals. Liberals seem less concerned with submission and power relations and more concerned with intellectual freedom. These definitions suggest that the conservative should be more compliant and conforming than the liberal. However, this prediction is merely a deductive inference and would require experimental verification to be accepted as fact.

Liberalism-Conservatism and Compliance

Research directly testing the relationship between liberalism-conservatism and compliance is limited. Although Mann (1956) suggested that conservatives are more compliant than liberals, only two studies have investigated this relationship.

Hoffman (1953) classified liberals and conservatives on the basis of a ten-item political-religious attitude questionnaire. Subjects indicated their agreement or disagreement with the policies of six political groups--traditional Republicans, anti-New Deal Democrats, New Deal Democrats, Wallace Progressives, Socialists, and Communists. The influence situation involved judgments of the length of two separate lines. The subjects first judged the length of the two lines and then received bogus average judgments for these lines (twice the true length of each line) of "previous subjects." The subjects then made second judgments of the line lengths. Compliers were designated as those who moved their second judgments close to the bogus averages. Finally, compliance and ideology scores were correlated. The results indicated that compliers were more conservative than non-compliers.

Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969) also used a politically-based Thurstone scale as their measurement of liberalism-conservatism. All subjects answered a paper and pencil multiple choice synonym test. For each stimulus word the subjects searched through a list of four alternative response items, from which the correct synonym was selected. Certain items in each test booklet had pencil marks beside one of the alternatives, supposedly indicating that a "previous subject" had felt that those alternatives were correct. Actually, the penciled-in alternatives were incorrect. Compliance was measured by the frequency

which a subject chose the penciled-in alternative as his choice.

Conservatives complied to this pressure more than did moderates; moderates complied more often than did liberals.

Two common characteristics are evident in these two experiments: (1) conservatives respond more than liberals to social-like influences; and (2) the influence came from non-existent groups. That is, real people were not used as influencing agents. Under these circumstances the identification of the behavior as compliance to immediate social influence, or as true conformity, is not possible since the subjects were never observed apart from the conditions which initially identified the source of social pressure. Moreover, Jones, Rambo, and Finney (1973) have demonstrated that liberals tend to be more intellectually inclined and confident than conservatives. Thus, the results of Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969) could have been more a result of intellectual confidence than of a liberal or conservative philosophy of life. However, this explanation of the results of Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969) would not seem to apply to the results of Hoffman's (1953) line-length judgment task.

Nevertheless, these studies do suggest that liberals and conservatives respond differently to social influence. This difference needs to be specified more precisely. Authoritarianism, a related ideology and personality measure, should help clarify this difference.

Liberalism-Conservatism and Authoritarianism

Before the relationship between authoritarianism and conformity is discussed, the adequacy of the relationship between liberalism-conservatism and authoritarianism must be established. Lines of both

direct and indirect evidence will be advance in support of this relationship: (1) direct evidence relating liberalism-conservatism and authoritarianism; and (2) indirect evidence of political party preference and voting patterns.

Direct Evidence

Many researchers have noted that authoritarianism and conservatism are related ideologies. Generally, the correlation of the California Facism Scale (F Scale) with other variables, including conservatism, has been studied (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). High F scores seemed to be related to conservatism. Deutsch (1960) noted that authoritarians seemed less liberal than nonauthoritarians in their political views. Vaughan (1969) described his high F scorers as being "fundamentally conservative." Rokeach (1961) felt that the F Scale was significantly related to political conservatism. Finally, Kerr's (1944) and Taylor's (1960) definitions of liberal and conservative included authoritarian references.

Barker (1963) investigated the liberalism-conservatism and authoritarianism correlation. He studied Rokeach's (1961) contention that the F Scale measured rightist authoritarianism and, thus, was related to conservatism. Subjects completed a battery of scales, including the F Scale, Political-Economic Conservatism Scale (PEC), a Stereotype Test, an Opinionation Scale, and a Censorship Tendency Scale. Both the Stereotype Test and Opinionation Scale measured leftist-rightist orientation. The Censorship Tendency Scale consisted of a list of names of well-known figures of the left and right, as well as a list of left and right organizations. Subjects marked the individuals or

groups they felt needed censoring, thus indicating that they were of the opposite ideology. The F Scale correlated highly with these measures, indicating that it was a measure of rightist authoritarianism and political conservatism.

A follow-up study was also reported in Barker (1963). Subjects completed the F Scale and a political self-labeling scale (for instance, "extreme left" to "extreme right"). The results indicated that high F scorers considered themselves "conservative Republicans." Barker (1963) thus concluded that authoritarianism was related to liberalism-conservatism.

Indirect Evidence

Barker's (1963) party labeling results suggest that voting behavior and political party preference are additional ways to relate authoritarianism to liberalism-conservatism. Many investigators have conducted such studies. Higgins (1965) found that high F scorers favored Goldwater, a self-avowed conservative, in the 1964 presidential election; low F scorers favored Johnson, a liberal Democrat. Higgins and Kuhlman (1967) repeated this procedure, using the 1966 California gubernatorial race between conservative Republican, Ronald Reagan, and liberal Democrat, Pat Brown. High F scorers were found to prefer Reagan, whereas low F scorers preferred Brown.

The 1964 presidential election was also the object of study for Goldberg and Stark (1965). This study reported results similar to Higgins (1965). The motivation of the subjects, however, was given more careful attention in this study. The data suggested that pro-

Goldwater authoritarians were traditional and conservative in religious attitudes, and quite authoritarian in social and ethical attitudes.

The most exhaustive study of authoritarianism, political ideology, and candidate choice was done by Levanthal, Jacobs, and Kudirka (1964) in a study of the 1960 presidential election. High F scorers preferred Nixon over Kennedy; low F scorers preferred Kennedy over Nixon. Moreover, 76% of the high F scorers preferred the Republican party, and 65% of the low F scorers preferred the Democratic party. Also, these subjects rated Kennedy as a liberal, and Nixon as a conservative. Levanthal, Jacobs, and Kudirka (1964) concluded that "The high F subjects consistently supported conservative candidates while low F subjects consistently supported liberal candidates (p. 546)."

These studies indicate that (1) a relationship does exist between authoritarianism and liberalism-conservatism; and (2) conformity research utilizing authoritarianism as a variable can be used in predicting the behavior of liberals and conservatives. Evidence relating authoritarians and compliance must next be advanced.

Authoritarianism and Compliance

Crutchfield (1955) first reported a Pearson correlation of .39 between F Scale scores and compliance scores. Since the report of this correlation, numerous studies have attempted to relate compliance to authoritarianism. The results often reported suggest that high F scorers are more compliant than are low F scorers. White and Vaughan (1963) found that subjects who yielded most to social influence had high F scores. Nadler (1957) used a modified-Asch design and obtained similar results. Both Canning and Baker (1959) and Millon and Simkins

(1957) used the autokinetic situation. Both experiments found the high F scorer was more susceptible than the low F scorer to social influence in this situation.

Vaughan (1969) placed subjects into two different social influence situations. They guessed the number of dots on a display before and after hearing the recorded judgments of five confederates. In a second task the subjects gave titles to an ambiguous drawing. They were then asked to reconsider their titles after the experimenter provided them with a large-group normative title choice. Subjects were assigned to either a high or low compliance group, depending on their performance in the two influence situations. Finally, they filled out a forced-choice version of the F Scale. The results indicated that high, rather than low, compliance individuals tended to have higher F scores.

Small and Campbell (1960) had subjects judge the number of beans in a series of bags. Each subject recorded his judgment on a tablet with six other "previous estimates." These six estimations were actually inflated judgments set by the experimenter. Compliance was measured as a positive change from the subject's initial verbal judgment of the number of beans in the bag to the number he finally recorded on the tablet. The results indicated that compliance was significantly related to authoritarianism--the higher the F score, the greater the degree of compliance.

Beloff (1958) studied high and low F scorers in two situations, acquiescence and conventionality. In the "acquiescence" situation each subject responded to the Thurstone-Chave War Scale, a measure of militaristic tendency. The subjects then heard a tape of four other people responding to the scale. Compliance was measured by the amount that a

subject shifted his initial score toward the position advocated by the "subjects" on the tape.

Both aesthetic and politico-social "conventionality" were measured. For aesthetic conventionality eleven slides of various teapots were shown to each subject who ranked them in order of his preference. Then each individual subject's rank-order was correlated with the mean for all of the subjects combined. The higher the individual's correlation with the group, the more was his aesthetic conventionality. Politico-social conventionality was measured on Eysenck's Inventory of Social Attitudes and scored by Allport's Index of Institutionalization. This also gave an unconventionality score for each subject. Finally, each subject responded to the F Scale.

High F scoring men complied more to group standards than did low F scoring men in all three situations--acquiescence, politico-social conventionality, and aesthetic conventionality. High F scoring women complied more to group standards than did low F scoring women. Yet, F scores for women were unrelated to both measures of conventionality.

A final study relating compliance to authoritarianism was conducted by Wells, Weinert, and Rubel (1956). Subjects were shown a picture of a two-car traffic accident, where one driver (Driver A) was clearly at fault. The social influence situation was Asch-like, where a subject was seated with four confederates. The confederates judged that Driver B was at fault in the accident. The subject always gave his evaluation after the confederates'. Next, the F Scale was administered to each subject. Subjects who complied to the group were then separated from those who did not comply, and the F scores of these groups were compared. The mean F score of compliers was significantly higher than the mean F score of independents.

Though the previous studies indicate that a relationship exists between compliance and authoritarianism, other experiments have reported no relationship between these variables. Hardy (1957) found that F scores were not related to compliance. Hoffman (1957), in a study relating mental pathology to compliance, found authoritarians and nonauthoritarians to be equivalent in compliance. High and low F scorers were placed into the Asch social influence situation in Gorfain (1961). Rank-order correlations between F Scale scores and compliance scores, the number of times a subject agreed with an erroneous group judgment, did not reach significance.

In Grossman and Eisenman's (1971) study a subject completed the F Scale and was then placed into an Asch-like situation. The experimenter read questions from the F Scale to three confederates and the subject. The confederates responded as authoritarians with a low F scoring subject; this pattern was reversed with high F subjects. Compliance was measured by the amount a subject changed his second response to coincide with the group. Under these circumstances both high and low scorers complied to the group.

Weiner and McGinnies (1961) used the F Scale to classify subjects as authoritarian or nonauthoritarian, then placed them with two confederates in a judgment situation. The stimuli were schematically drawn faces with mouths curved either upward, downward, or straight, representing smiling, frowning, or neutral expressions, respectively. The subjects were told that they would briefly see a series of either smiling or frowning faces which they were to identify. Actually, a series of neutral faces was exposed. In response to these neutral faces, the confederates either agreed or disagreed that a particular

face was smiling or frowning. Occasional disagreement alleviated the subject's suspicion about the situation. Subjects in this experiment were influenced by the pressure of the confederates. No difference existed, however, in the frequency of compliant responses emitted by authoritarians and nonauthoritarians.

Evaluation: Authoritarians and Compliance

Evaluation of the authoritarianism-compliance literature and its more important generalization to liberalism-conservatism is a complex matter. All the results either supported the hypothesis that the authoritarian is more compliant than the nonauthoritarian or reported no relationship between these variables. This suggests that a relationship does exist, but other factors also influence specific situations.

One potential situational influence has already been covered. Although Wells, Weinert, and Rubel's (1956) study and the two autokinetic experiments (Canning & Baker, 1959; Millon & Simkins, 1957) are exceptions, the experiments supporting this relationship between authoritarianism and compliance did not use the real physical pressure of other people as their influence agent. Such instruments as tape-recordings (Vaughan, 1969), tablets (Small & Campbell, 1960), and artificial norms (Beloff, 1958) were used in these experiments. On the other hand, all of the experiments which found no relationship generally used Asch-like designs with two, three, or four confederates. Confederates apparently exert an influence that is independent of the pressures which their distorted judgments generate. This influence may be the status, or expertise, that the subjects perceive in them.

Indeed, Adorno et al. (1950) defined authoritarian submission as one of the traits of the authoritarian. This is submission, or compliance, to figures they perceive as having high status or authority, and not a random submission to any influencing agent. Several of the previous studies failed to control this important aspect of the authoritarian personality in their compliance manipulations (Beloff, 1958; Gorfein, 1961; Grossman & Eisenman, 1971; Hardy, 1957; Hoffman, 1957; Small & Campbell, 1960; Weiner & McGinnies, 1961; Wells, Weinert, & Rubel, 1956). The experiments which manipulated status (Canning & Baker, 1959; Millon & Simkins, 1957) placed subjects in a dark autokinetic room. Since darkness placed the subjects in partial isolation, this reduced some of the confederate's pressure.

Thus, the use of peer confederates in studies by Wells, Weinert, and Rubel (1956), Grossman and Eisenman (1971), and Weiner and McGinnies (1961) created a situation in which authoritarians should not comply since they would perceive no status in the source. Experiments which used influence agents other than real people (Beloff, 1958; Small & Campbell, 1960; Vaughan, 1969) possibly gained their successful results from using ambiguous influence sources. Since authoritarians are presumed to be rigid and view the world as black and white, they could easily have perceived a degree of authority in these ambiguous sources and complied accordingly. Several studies (Johnson & Izzett, 1969; Johnson, Torcivia, & Poprick, 1968; Moore & Krupat, 1971) support the validity of this conclusion since they report that authoritarians do comply more to a high status, authoritative source than to a peer source.

In summary, authoritarians apparently will comply more than non-authoritarians if the influence source has high status. Although this evidence suggests that the conservative will comply more than the liberal, the importance of the influence source on conservatives is unknown.

Ideology and Conformity

Up to this point, all reviewing has been of compliant behavior, the changes in opinion or observation resulting from the presence or nearness of sources of social pressure. Only a few studies have gone on to test conformity in which individuals remain with their new responses after the social pressure has been removed. This is an unfortunate state of affairs as many of the previous experiments could have been retested alone to determine whether they returned to their original judgments or remained with those induced by the confederates.

The few experiments which have attempted to measure conformity have lacked adequate procedures and consistent results. Johnson and Steiner (1967) hypothesized that nonauthoritarians are concerned with correctness of judgment. Authoritarians prefer to maintain friendly relationships with authority figures. Thus, compliance of nonauthoritarians should represent genuine changes in belief, but the authoritarian's compliance is acquiescence without conviction. Thus, any compliance of nonauthoritarians should remain as conformity in the absence of the source of influence, but authoritarian compliance should not transfer to conformity. Johnson and Steiner (1967), however, did not test this hypothesis.

On the other hand, Mills and Harvey (1972) developed an argument from the works of Kelman (1961) which suggests that the authoritarian should show more conformity than the nonauthoritarian. As a status-oriented person the authoritarian should "internalize" judgments induced by high status sources and believe the truth of those judgments. The nonauthoritarian is less likely to "internalize" judgments of a high status source; and, therefore, he is less likely to show later conforming behavior. Thus, the arguments of Mills and Harvey (1972) directly contradict what would be expected according to the Johnson and Steiner (1967) hypothesis.

Hoffman (1957) supported Johnson and Steiner's (1967) contention. In a retest of subjects two weeks after the initial compliance experiment, low F scorers retained their compliant views much more than did high F scorers.

In a more recent study, Steiner and Vannoy (1966) defined Reaffirmers as "experimental subjects who reassert their conforming judgments when the source of social pressure is absent (p. 307)." Renouncers were subjects who "tend not to do so (p. 307)." They tested subjects in an Asch-like situation and retested them privately one to two weeks later. Among other scales the F Scale was administered to these subjects. Although F scores of Reaffirmers and Renouncers were not significantly different, they were in the direction predicted by Johnson and Steiner (1967).

On the other hand, Canning and Baker (1959) found that high and low F scorers retreated from their initial compliant responses in equal degrees. Although both high and low F scorers complied, high F scorers demonstrated somewhat more compliance. Later, in the absence of social

pressure, the high F scorers were still more conforming, but both groups returned to their original judgments equally. That is, both groups conformed to a point half-way between their original responses and their compliant responses.

Thus, literature relating conformity to ideology is sparse, much too insufficient to judge whether the hypothesis of Johnson and Steiner (1967), or that of Mills and Harvey (1972), is true. Also, no test of true conformity has been made with liberals and conservatives. Accordingly, predictions about the conforming behavior of liberals and conservatives have no real empirical foundation and will not be made in this study.

Conclusions from the Literature

Two major problems and related conclusions can be drawn from these literatures. A summary of these points will clarify the purpose of this study and the results expected.

First, only two experiments, Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969) and Hoffman (1953), tested compliance in liberals and conservatives. Both experiments found that conservatives were more compliant than liberals, yet neither experiment tested compliance in interpersonal situations. That is, liberals and conservatives have never been tested for compliance with "real" people as sources of influence. Although yet untested, the literature on authoritarianism, as well as these two experiments, suggests that conservatives should be more compliant to such social influences.

Second, as previously noted, few experiments have concerned themselves with conformity, and none have tested liberals and conserva-

tives. Since the literature on conforming behavior of authoritarians is sparse and conflicting, no literature exists upon which to base any predictions for liberals and conservatives in this experiment.

Thus, a method is required for this experiment which uses human social influencers (confederates) and tests both compliance and conformity. Also, the failure to control confounding of compliance with intelligence (Sistrunk & Holcomb, 1969) needs to be avoided.

The method chosen for this experiment involves the "discrimination" between tones. Subjects must state whether a pair of tones are similar or dissimilar. By making it impossible for subjects to discriminate between the tones, this task can be made ambiguous enough for a confederate to be able to exert considerable influence on the subject. Also, compliance and conformity trials can be distinguished within the task by manipulating the presence or absence of immediate influence from a social source. Finally, the tonal discrimination task requires a sensory rather than an intellectual judgment, thus the problem of confounding intelligence between subjects should be removed,

Hypothesis

- (1) Conservatives will be more compliant than liberals to a confederate's influence.

Otherwise, as noted previously, there are no empirical grounds for further predictions. The effects of political beliefs on conforming behaviors are uncertain.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Phase 1

Subjects

Students in twelve sections of introductory psychology at Oklahoma State University (N=606) participated in this phase of the experiment. They did not receive course credit for their participation since the material was administered in class. Participation in this phase was strictly voluntary since students had the opportunity to decline to participate. A smaller subset of sixty students eventually were selected for participation in the second phase of the experiment.

Instrument

Form L of the Social Attitude Survey (SAS: Rambo, 1972) was administered to the subjects (Appendix A). This scale, consisting of 44 Likert items, was designed to measure attitudes related to the liberal-conservative domain. Rambo (1972) reported successful tests of reliability and validity of this scale. In addition, a subject namelist was also constructed on which the students could record their names and phone numbers.

Procedure

The instructor for each introductory psychology section administered the SAS. This prevented subjects from establishing a relationship between Phase I and Phase II of the experiment. Students signed their names on the answer sheets. They were told that a faculty member was investigating current attitudes of students on campus.

During the same class hour the subject namelist was circulated. The instructor told his students that this list would be used by all psychology experimenters who wished to recruit participants for their experiments by phone. This story was also meant to help disguise the relationship between Phases I and II of the experiment.

Scoring

A subject's score was the sum of his responses to the 44 items of the SAS. The most liberal end of the scale for each item was scored 1; the most conservative end of the scale for each item was scored 5.

Phase I Results

Total scores for the individual subjects on the SAS were grouped into a frequency distribution. The mean for the 606 subjects was 135.9; the standard deviation was 18.6. The scores of the subjects on the SAS were then used as a criterion for selection of subjects in Phase II.

Phase II

Subjects

Sixty subjects were selected for participation in this phase of the experiment. Thirty liberals and thirty conservatives, fifteen from each sex for both levels of liberalism-conservatism, volunteered for lab research. Only those subjects who had scored greater than one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than one standard deviation below the mean, on the SAS in Phase I were asked to participate.

After the subjects had been found, they were contacted in either of two ways. In some classes a sign-up sheet was circulated stating that the names on the following sheet had been randomly drawn from the class roll and were eligible for the experiment.

Most subjects, however, were contacted by phone. Each subject was called at home and his participation in the experiment was requested. All subjects received course credit for their participation in this phase of the experiment.

Apparatus

In the lab room a long $8\frac{1}{2}$ ft. by 3 ft. table was divided into three equal-sized booths. The partitions between the booths extended 18 in. beyond the edge of the table on the side on which the subjects sat. Thus, although the subjects sat next to each other, visual contact between them was minimized. Also, except for the mode of communication established by the design of the apparatus, verbal contact was also minimized by these booths.

Headset, a boom microphone, and two telegraph keys were mounted on a wooden panel in each of the booths in which the subject and confederate sat. A white pilot lamp was mounted behind one key; a red pilot lamp was mounted behind the other. The white pilot lamp was labeled "different;" the red was labeled "same." This system was designed so that when a subject pressed one key its accompanying light would come on for the duration of the response. This was achieved through a power source and control panel located in another room.

The two headsets, the four telegraph keys, and the room illumination were all connected to the control panel, so that the experimenter could see the subject's response for a given trial. A tape recorder and microphone were connected to the control panel and enabled inputs to be played to the subjects through their headsets. In addition, this system enabled the experimenter and subjects to communicate with each other at any time during the experiment. Finally, the control panel included a switch which enabled the experimenter to turn the room lights on or off in the experimental lab.

The experimental tape included the instructions to the subjects and the experimental stimuli thereby ensuring standardized procedures of experimental induction. Briefly, the instructions informed the subjects that they would be participating in an experiment involving fine auditory discriminations. The study was investigating the ability of people to discriminate small tonal differences. The subjects would hear pairs of tones and were to report for each pair whether the two tones were the same or different by pressing the appropriate telegraph key (Appendix B).

Subjects were told that they had ten practice trials, twenty trials with full room illumination, twenty trials in darkness, and finally twenty trials with full room illumination again. The instructions indicated that this illumination manipulation was done so that it could be determined if darkness helped increase a person's ability to make such tonal discriminations.

Next, the auditory stimuli were recorded onto the tape by means of an Eico Model 377 Audio Generator. Each stimuli pair was presented in a twenty second sequence. At the beginning of the sequence, the trial number was announced. At "2" the first tone in the pair was presented for $\frac{1}{2}$ second. At "7" the second tone was presented for $\frac{1}{2}$ second. Then, at "9" the confederate (Subject A) was told to make his response, and at "14" the subject responded. The tones in each pair were identical, but the various pairs of tones were randomly selected audible frequencies.

The seventy trials were recorded in the following sequence: (1) Practice Trials (10); (2) Baseline Trials (20); (3) Compliance Trials (20); and (4) Conformity Trials (20). A thirty second break was spaced between each set of trials.

A post-experimental questionnaire was prepared. This questionnaire consisted of several items testing a subject's suspicion about the experiment. Several filler items were also included. Instructions for the questionnaire indicated that the experimenter was interested in improving the experiment and determining if the subject had any hearing problems which might have influenced his performance.

Finally, a response sheet was prepared for the experimenter to record the subject's responses.

Procedure

A subject initially reported to a waiting room where the experimenter met him. The experimenter asked the subject to be seated. A short time later the confederate arrived, and the experimenter announced that the experiment was ready to begin.

The subject and confederate then entered the experimental lab and were seated in separate booths. The experimenter informed the subjects (for simplicity's sake, "subjects" will be used to imply both subject and confederate) that the instructions would be presented auditorily over their headphones. The experimenter then placed the headsets on the subjects and returned to the control room.

Once in the control room the experimenter began the tape and played the instructions to the subjects. After the instructions had been completed and questions answered, the ten practice trials were run. Following this, the tape was again stopped and any further questions were answered. Finally, the remaining sets of experimental trials were administered to the subjects.

Immediately before the Compliance Trials began, the experimenter turned the lab room lights out. Throughout these trials the confederate responded "same" on trials 1, 4, 8, 13, and 16. He responded "different" on the remaining trials. During this period the subject could see the glow from the confederate's pilot lamp reflect off a wall in front of the apparatus.. Thus, before the subject made his own response, he could see the "decision" of the confederate. The glow from these lights constituted the immediate influence attempt upon the subject. If the subject's own judgment of the two tones was different

from the confederate's, he could either change his response and comply to the confederate's response, or remain with his original response.

Next, the room illumination was turned back on and twenty more trials under full room illumination were presented to the subjects. These were the Conformity Trials as the influence source had been removed from the subject. Also, the source could no longer see the subject's responses.

After completion of these trials the experimenter returned to the lab room and administered the post-experimental questionnaire. The subjects were then thanked and dismissed.

Scoring

For each subject the experimenter recorded whether a "same" or "different" response was made on each trial. The "different" responses were then summed for each of the sets of twenty trials.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Manipulation Check

The liberal-conservative variable was checked in a 2 X 2 analysis of variance. This analysis was used so that males and females could be compared for liberal and conservative scores. No difference between males and females of each attitude was expected. These results would indicate that the sex manipulation was independent of the liberal versus conservative manipulation.

Table I shows the means for the four groups on SAS scores. Table II contains the analysis of variance statistics for those scores. Liberals scored significantly different from conservatives ($F=704.1$, $df=1/56$, $p<.0001$); however, the main effect for Sex and the Attitude X Sex Interaction were not significant. Thus, liberals did score differently than conservatives on the SAS. Also, sex was independent of the liberal-conservative manipulation.

Data

During the experiment each response a subject made was recorded. Each "different" response a subject made contributed to his score. Unless otherwise noted, these scores were used in the following data analyses.

TABLE I
MEANS ON THE SOCIAL ATTITUDE SURVEY

| | | Attitude | |
|-----|--------|----------|--------------|
| | | Liberal | Conservative |
| Sex | Male | 102.4 | 167.1 |
| | Female | 106.5 | 165.0 |

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAS SCORES

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------|--------|----|-------|--------|
| Attitude (A) | 56857. | 1 | 704.1 | <.0001 |
| Sex (B) | 13. | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | 144. | 1 | 1.78 | |
| error | 80.8 | | | |

In order to gain a full understanding of the data, several analyses were performed, each tapping different aspects of the study. First, a summary analysis of the sixty experimental trials for both liberals and conservatives was completed. The three major sets of trials (Baseline, Compliance, and Conformity) were each treated as a

separate block of trials. Thus, a 2 X 2 X 3 analysis of variance with repeated measures on the third factor was performed on this data.

Means and results of this analysis are presented in Tables III and IV.

TABLE III
MEANS FOR SUMMARY ANALYSIS

| | | Baseline | Compliance | Conformity | \bar{X} |
|--------------|--------|----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Liberal | Male | 9.40 | 9.60 | 9.33 | 9.44 |
| | Female | 8.40 | 9.73 | 9.93 | 9.35 |
| Conservative | Male | 9.60 | 11.13 | 10.60 | 10.44 |
| | Female | 9.20 | 11.00 | 10.93 | 10.34 |
| \bar{X} | | 9.15 | 10.38 | 10.20 | 9.91 |

Only the Trials effect was significant ($F=8.76$, $df=2/112$, $p<.01$). A Newman-Keuls test was used to compare the three Trials means (Table V). This analysis revealed that a significant response shift occurred among subjects between the Baseline and Compliance Trials. This shift was maintained through the Conformity Trials. In order to fully understand what was happening in the Trials shift, two forms of subanalysis were performed. First, liberals were separated from conservatives, and

analyses of the entire sixty trials were done on each of these groups. Second, the Baseline, Compliance, and Conformity Trials were separated, and analyses of each of these blocks of trials for liberals and conservatives were performed.

TABLE IV
SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------------|-------|-----|------|------|
| Attitude (A) | 46.16 | 1 | 2.21 | |
| Sex (B) | .28 | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | .00 | 1 | <1 | |
| error _b | 21.29 | 56 | | |
| Trials (C) | 26.11 | 2 | 8.76 | <.01 |
| A X C | 3.13 | 2 | 1.05 | |
| B X C | 5.17 | 2 | 1.73 | |
| A X B X C | 1.02 | 2 | <1 | |
| error _w | 2.98 | 112 | | |

Analysis of variance for liberals across the three blocks of trials is shown in Table VI. No effects were significant indicating that liberals were unresponsive to the influence of the confederate in this experiment.

Results for a similar analysis for conservatives are presented in Table VII. A significant Trials effect was found ($F=6.54$, $df=2/56$, $p<.01$). A Newman-Keuls test was used to evaluate the three Trials means. As indicated in Table VIII, a significant response shift ap-

peared between the Baseline and Compliance Trials. This shift remained during the Conformity Trials. Thus, a shift in the conservative judgments account for the significant Trials effect found in the summary analysis.

TABLE V
DIFFERENCES AMONG TRIALS MEANS OF SUMMARY ANALYSIS

| | \bar{T}_1 | \bar{T}_3 | \bar{T}_2 |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\bar{T}_1=9.15$ | _____ | 1.05* | 1.22* |
| $\bar{T}_3=10.20$ | | _____ | .17 |
| $\bar{T}_2=10.37$ | | | _____ |
| * $p < .01$ | $W_2 = .83$ | $W_3 = .94$ | |

TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR LIBERALS

| Source | MS | df | F |
|--------------------|-------|----|------|
| Sex (A) | .16 | 1 | <1 |
| error _b | 34.72 | 28 | |
| Trials (B) | 5.63 | 2 | 2.83 |
| A X B | 5.09 | 2 | 2.19 |
| error _w | 2.32 | 56 | |

TABLE VII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CONSERVATIVES

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------------|-------|----|------|------|
| Sex (A) | .10 | 1 | <1 | |
| error _b | 7.92 | 28 | | |
| Trials (B) | 23.68 | 2 | 6.54 | <.01 |
| A X B | 1.03 | 2 | <1 | |
| error _w | 3.62 | 56 | | |

Next, each major trial block was analyzed separately. Within each block the twenty trials were broken into four blocks of five trials. Thus, 2 X 2 X 2 repeated measures analyses of variance were conducted. Results for the Baseline Trials analysis are in Tables IX and X.

TABLE VIII
DIFFERENCES AMONG TRIALS MEANS FOR CONSERVATIVES

| | \bar{T}_1 | \bar{T}_3 | \bar{T}_2 |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\bar{T}_1=9.40$ | _____ | 1.37* | 1.67* |
| $\bar{T}_3=10.77$ | | _____ | .30 |
| $\bar{T}_2=11.07$ | | | _____ |
| *p<.01 | $W_2=1.30$ | $W_3=1.48$ | |

TABLE IX
 MEANS FOR MALES, FEMALES, AND TRIALS IN THE BASELINE ANALYSIS

| | Trial Block | | | | \bar{X} |
|---------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Males | 1.88 | 2.62 | 2.17 | 3.00 | 2.42 |
| Females | 2.10 | 2.32 | 1.83 | 2.60 | 2.21 |
| Trials | 1.99 | 2.47 | 2.00 | 2.80 | 2.31 |

TABLE X
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BASELINE TRIALS

| Source | MS | df | F | P |
|--------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Attitude (A) | .94 | 1 | <1 | |
| Sex (B) | 1.84 | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | .33 | 1 | <1 | |
| error _b | 2.10 | 56 | | |
| Trials (C) | 10.21 | 3 | 14.18 | <.001 |
| A X C | .77 | 3 | 1.02 | |
| B X C | 2.26 | 3 | 3.14 | <.05 |
| A X B X C | 1.08 | 3 | 1.50 | |
| error _w | .72 | 168 | | |

The means in Table IX provide the basis for an explanation of the significant Trials effect ($F=14.18$, $df=3/168$, $p<.001$) and Sex X Trials Interaction ($F=3.14$, $df=3/168$, $p<.05$). The means for the Trials effect reveal a cyclical, increasing, then decreasing rate of responding "different." This pattern seems to indicate that the subjects were still searching for a stable norm for the task. Also, the Sex X Trials Interaction means reveal that, after the first few trials, men gave more "different" responses than did women. This response difference seemed to be increasing across trials accounting for the Sex X Trials Interaction. However, the most important results of this analysis are the findings that (1) the subjects had not yet established stable norms for this discrimination task, and (2) liberals and conservatives did not differ in their rates of responding "different" at this point.

A similar analysis for Compliance Trials, Tables XI and XII, revealed another significant Trials effect ($F=9.44$, $df=3/168$, $p<.001$) and an Attitude X Sex X Trials Interaction ($F=5.33$, $df=3/168$, $p<.01$). The triple-interaction was of little consequence to this study and will not be discussed. However, the Trials effect was important. Another Newman-Keuls test was made for these means (Table XIII).

These results indicated an increasing trend for responding "different" across trials until a maximum response rate was achieved and maintained in Trial Block 3. In review, Tables VI, VII, and VIII revealed that during these trials only conservatives tended to respond to the compliance pressure from the confederate. This Attitude effect did not reach significance ($F=3.28$, $df=1/56$, $p<.10$), although the trend was strong. Inspection of the Trials means for liberals and conservatives indicates the reason for this marginal result. Both liberals and con-

servatives emitted more "different" responses across Compliance Trials. Still, conservatives were giving more such responses than liberals for each trial block indicating that they were more responsive to the influence of the confederate.

TABLE XI

MEANS FOR LIBERALS AND CONSERVATIVES ACROSS COMPLIANCE TRIALS

| | Trial Block | | | | \bar{X} |
|---------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Liberals | 1.93 | 2.13 | 2.76 | 2.73 | 2.39 |
| Conservatives | 2.33 | 2.66 | 3.00 | 3.10 | 2.77 |
| Trials | 2.13 | 2.45 | 2.88 | 2.91 | 2.58 |

The same analysis of variance for the Conformity Trials can be found in Tables XIV and XV. Again, both the Trials effect ($F=13.52$, $df=3/168$, $p<.001$) and Attitude X Sex X Trials Interaction ($F=27.97$, $df=3/168$, $p<.001$) were significant. Also, the Trials effect is again of primary interest. Table XVI is the summary of the Newman-Keuls test for this effect. This test revealed that Trial Block 2 had significantly more "different" responses than did any other trial block.

TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPLIANCE TRIALS

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------------|------|-----|------|-------|
| Attitude (A) | 7.34 | 1 | 3.28 | <.10 |
| Sex (B) | .00 | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | .08 | 1 | <1 | |
| error _b | 2.24 | 56 | | |
| Trials (C) | 8.21 | 3 | 9.44 | <.001 |
| A X C | .11 | 3 | <1 | |
| B X C | .14 | 3 | <1 | |
| A X B X C | 4.64 | 3 | 5.33 | <.01 |
| error _w | .87 | 168 | | |

TABLE XIII
DIFFERENCES AMONG COMPLIANCE TRIALS MEANS

| | \bar{T}_1 | \bar{T}_2 | \bar{T}_3 | \bar{T}_4 |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\bar{T}_1=2.13$ | _____ | .32* | .75** | .78** |
| $\bar{T}_2=2.45$ | | _____ | .43** | .46* |
| $\bar{T}_3=2.88$ | | | _____ | .03 |
| $\bar{T}_4=2.91$ | | | | _____ |

*p < .05
**p < .01

W2, .05 = .28 W2, .01 = .43
W3, .05 = .40 W3, .01 = .49
W4, .05 = .44 W4, .01 = .54

TABLE XIV
 MEANS FOR LIBERALS AND CONSERVATIVES
 ACROSS CONFORMITY TRIALS

| | Trial Block | | | | \bar{X} |
|---------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Liberals | 1.93 | 2.23 | 2.77 | 2.73 | 2.42 |
| Conservatives | 2.33 | 2.67 | 3.00 | 3.07 | 2.77 |
| Trials | 2.13 | 2.45 | 2.89 | 2.90 | 2.59 |

TABLE XV
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CONFORMITY TRIALS

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Attitude (A) | 4.51 | 1 | 1.83 | |
| Sex (B) | .96 | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | .06 | 1 | <1 | |
| error _b | 2.47 | 56 | | |
| Trials (C) | 8.52 | 3 | 13.52 | <.001 |
| A X C | 1.06 | 3 | 1.68 | |
| B X C | .06 | 3 | <1 | |
| A X B X C | 17.51 | 3 | 27.79 | <.001 |
| error _w | .63 | 168 | | |

TABLE XVI
DIFFERENCES AMONG CONFORMITY TRIALS MEANS

| | \bar{T}_1 | \bar{T}_4 | \bar{T}_3 | \bar{T}_2 |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| $\bar{T}_1=2.23$ | _____ | .12 | .29 | .85* |
| $\bar{T}_4=2.35$ | | _____ | .17 | .73* |
| $\bar{T}_3=2.52$ | | | _____ | .56* |
| $\bar{T}_2=3.08$ | | | | _____ |

* $p < .05$ $W_2 = .42$ $W_3 = .44$ $W_4 = .48$

One final analysis of variance was made. It was noted earlier that during the Compliance Trials the Attitude effect was not significant. In this last analysis each subject's "same" or "different" response which agreed with the confederate's response contributed to his score. The results of this analysis are presented in Table XVII. The Trials variable was omitted in this analysis. The difference in compliant responses between liberals and conservatives was significant ($F=4.41$, $df=1/56$, $p < .05$). Conservatives made more compliant responses than did liberals ($\bar{X}_{cons}=12.5$; $\bar{X}_{lib}=11.1$).

TABLE XVII
REVISED ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPLIANCE TRIALS

| Source | MS | df | F | p |
|--------------|-------|----|------|------|
| Attitude (A) | 28.02 | 1 | 4.41 | <.05 |
| Sex (B) | 1.35 | 1 | <1 | |
| A X B | 1.36 | 1 | <1 | |
| error | 6.36 | 56 | | |

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this experiment are consistent with those of Hoffman (1953) and Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969). These results provide additional information, however, not contained in these studies: conservatives are more compliant than liberals when directly confronted with either accepting or rejecting discrepant tonal discrimination judgments of a confederate. Also, this experiment demonstrated that conservatives are more conforming than liberals. Neither Hoffman (1953) nor Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969) made this comparison.

Since this experiment was primarily exploratory, its general purposes were to find a methodology suitable for the study of compliance and conformity in liberals and conservatives and to use it to determine if differences in these processes did exist between these attitude groups. Despite the importance of the difference found between liberals and conservatives, comments regarding unpredicted results of the experiment, the methodology, and future experiments are equally important.

One minor result was the lack of difference between sexes in either compliance or conformity within either the liberal or conservative subjects. This finding has the implication that further research need not control for sex differences. This result should ease investigators' attempts to obtain an adequate number of extreme liberal and conservative subjects.

A third aspect of these results involve the Baseline Trials. Though the two tones of each pair were never different, subjects were told that some of the pairs would be different. Apparently, the acceptance of this premise made subjects respond "different" a high number of times ($\bar{X}=9.15$) in the Baseline Trials. This response rate was the same for both liberals and conservatives of either sex. Considering the instructions for the experiment as a type of influence situation, it appears that liberals and conservatives were equally responsive to these instructions. Thus, neither conservatives, nor liberals, are free from external influences. All people comply and conform to some types of social influences. They do differ, however, in the degrees to which they submit to specific influences. Indeed, although this experiment indicated that experimental instructions are powerful influence agents for both liberals and conservatives, conservatives are more responsive than liberals to influences coming directly from the judgments, or decisions, of other people.

Finally, the analysis for blocks of trials within each of the Baseline, Compliance, and Conformity phases of the experiment provided evidence of the type of process working within each subject during the experiment. As previously mentioned, the analysis for the Baseline Trials indicated that the subjects lacked a stable norm, or modal "different" response rate, around which they made their tonal decisions (Table IX).

In the Compliance Trials, however, a consistent pattern emerged (Tables XI, XII, and XIII). Both liberals and conservatives consistently increased their rates of responding "different" over these blocks of trials. Yet, for each block of trials conservatives made

more "different" responses than did liberals accounting for the finding that conservatives are more compliant than liberals. The increasing number of "different" responses over trials is still indicative of the subject's awareness of the confederate's responses and their increasing compliance to those responses. Compliance seemed to have been elicited in the subjects by this experimental procedure.

A different pattern emerged in the Conformity Trials. The subjects first reduced their "different" response rate from an average of 2.91 in the last five Compliance Trials to an average of 2.23 in the first five Conformity Trials. But during the next five Conformity Trials they again increased their "different" response rate to an average of 3.08. In the remaining trials the subjects again gradually decreased the number of times they responded "different." This pattern suggests that subsequent to their removal from the confederate's influence the subjects returned to their initial response pattern. Yet, the sharp rise in "different" judgments in the next block of trials indicates that the influence of the confederate was still having an effect on the subjects. This influence was short-lived, however, and in the final blocks of trials the subjects reduced the number of times they reported that the two tones were different.

Further Research--Method

The method used in this experiment proved somewhat effective in testing compliance and conformity in liberals and conservatives. Several subjects in the experiment reported in the debriefing questionnaire that they saw a glow from the confederate's pilot lamps when the room lights were out. However, they considered this to be a flaw in

the apparatus and not a deception designed to influence them. Thus, this subtle influence does not make subjects suspicious of the purpose of the study, but is noticeable enough for subjects to observe its occurrence.

The method used in this experiment, however, was not perfect. First, the pilot lamps on the apparatus were somewhat brighter than necessary and should be made dimmer. Possibly a fainter glow would appear more accidental, rather than appearing a large oversight in the methodology. This could make the experiment appear more "professional" and increase the subject's feeling that the research is important and deserving of his full effort and attention.

Second, a few flaws in the experimental tape should be removed by recording it again. Though the tones on this tape were adequate, their quality could be improved. The majority of the tones were sufficiently accurate for the experiment. Nevertheless, a few of the tones did last either longer or shorter than one-half second. Also, the loudness of the tones within a few pairs varied. These variations should be corrected before further research is done with this tape. The high number of "different" responses in the Baseline Trials could have partially resulted from discriminations along these dimensions rather than along the prescribed pitch dimension. If this were the case, a better quality tape would somewhat decrease the number of "different" responses in the Baseline Trials and allow a greater response shift during Compliance and Conformity Trials. Maximal separation of groups could be achieved this way. However, the few tonal discrepancies were constant across subjects and were not likely an influence on the results of this experiment.

Further Research--Studies

This experiment was primarily exploratory and a test of methodology. Its success opens up several possibilities for further research. Using this same apparatus several characteristics of the confederate could be varied and the effects of these manipulations on compliant and conforming behavior in liberals and conservatives tested.

One such manipulation involves the esteem, or task-related ability, of the confederate relative to the subject. Research on authoritarians has found that authoritarian and nonauthoritarian people are differentially responsive to the esteem of an influence source. Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain this difference, but the most promising explanation seems to be McGuire's (1968). McGuire's (1968) personality-persuadability model described two components, yielding and reception, involved in conformity. According to McGuire (1968), yielding involves a general willingness to conform to any source and is a characteristic of an authoritarian. Reception involves a comprehension of the credibility of the source of influence. The greater the comprehension of the source's credibility, the more he will conform to the demands of a highly credible source, and the less he will be willing to conform to the demands of a low credibility source. The less a person's ability to comprehend a source's credibility, the more he will conform to that source's demands. McGuire (1968) feels that nonauthoritarians are able to comprehend the credibility of a source, while authoritarians are not. Thus, McGuire (1968) predicts that nonauthoritarians will maximally conform to a credible source, but will not conform to a noncredible source. Meanwhile, authoritarians, as yielding

and noncomprehending persons, will conform moderately to both credible and noncredible sources. These predictions have been supported by Johnson, Torcivia, and Poprick (1968) and Johnson and Izzett (1969).

The present study, as well as Hoffman (1953) and Sistrunk and Holcomb (1969), suggests that conservatives are more yielding than liberals. Jones, Rambo, and Finney (1973), in finding that liberals are more intellectually-inclined and confident than conservatives, suggests that liberals are more able than conservatives to comprehend the credibility of a source. These studies lead to the prediction that liberals and conservatives should respond to an esteem manipulation in a manner similar to that of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. One possible esteem manipulation involves confederates of different levels of "previous experience" in the experimental task. The confederate could be introduced as having been previously remarkably accurate, about average, or poor in a previous session in the same experimental task. If conservatives are more yielding and less receptive than liberals, then liberals should be more influenced by levels of this manipulation. Liberals should change their degree of compliance with changing levels of source credibility; conservatives should not.

Another manipulation which could be tested in the same theoretical framework involves the status of the confederate. Status could be varied by introducing the confederate as either a graduate student, college sophomore, or high school student. Again, assuming liberals and conservatives conform in the manner prescribed by McGuire (1968), liberals should be more responsive than conservatives to this manipulation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This experiment was designed to test differences in compliant and conforming behavior in liberals and conservatives. Rambo's (1972) Social Attitude Survey was used to identify liberal and conservative subjects. A set of distorted judgments of a confederate in a faked auditory discrimination task was used in order to elicit judgments in the subject which either conformed, or did not conform, to those of the confederate.

The small amount of research done with liberals and conservatives, and vast amount of related research with authoritarians, in compliance situations yielded the prediction that conservatives would be more compliant than liberals. No prediction about conformity was made as no direct research on this problem with liberals and conservatives, or related or consistent research with authoritarians, has previously been done.

Results of this experiment found conservatives to be more compliant and conforming than liberals to a confederate's influence. Also, males and females did not differ in their response patterns. This experiment suggests that further research could more clearly define the differences between liberals and conservatives in compliant and conforming behavior. The effects of both the esteem and status of a confederate on liberals and conservatives could be tested using this same method.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Barker, E. N. Authoritarianism of the political right, center, and left. Journal of Social Issues, 1963, 19, 63-74.
- Beloff, H. Two forms of social conformity: Acquiescence and conventionality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 99-104.
- Borgatta, E. F., & Lambert, W. W. (Eds.). Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Canning, R., & Baker, J. Effects of the group on authoritarian and non-authoritarian persons. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 579-581.
- Crutchfield, R. S. Conformity and character. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 191-198.
- Deutsch, M. Trust, trustworthiness, and the F scale. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 138-141.
- Festinger, L. An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson (Eds.), Group relations at the crossroads. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Goldberg, P. A., & Stark, M. J. Johnson or Goldwater: Some personality and attitudinal correlates of political choice. Psychological Reports, 1965, 17, 627-637.
- Gorfein, D. Conformity behavior and the "authoritarian personality." Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 53, 121-125.
- Grossman, J. C., & Eisenman, R. Experimental manipulation of authoritarianism and its effects on creativity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 238-244.
- Higgins, J. Authoritarianism and candidate preference. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 603-604.
- Higgins, J., & Kuhlman, D. Authoritarianism and candidate preference II. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 572.

- Hardy, K. R. Determinants of conformity and attitude change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 289-294.
- Hoffman, M. L. Some psychodynamic factors in compulsive conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 383-393.
- Hoffman, M. L. Conformity as a defense mechanism and a form of resistance to genuine group influence. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 412-424.
- Johnson, H., & Izzett, R. Relationship between authoritarianism and attitude change as a function of source credibility and type of communication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 317-321.
- Johnson, H., & Steiner, I. D. Some effects of discrepancy level on relationships between authoritarianism and conformity. Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 73, 199-204.
- Johnson, H., Torcivia, J., & Poprick, M. Effect of source credibility on the relationship between authoritarianism and attitude change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 179-183.
- Jones, W., Rambo, W. W., & Finney, P. D. The relationship between political ideology and intellect as a function of participation. Journal of Social Psychology, in press.
- Kelman, H. C. Processes of opinion change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961, 25, 57-78.
- Kerr, W. A. Correlates of politico-economic liberalism-conservatism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1944, 20, 61-77.
- Kerr, W. A. Untangling the liberalism-conservatism continuum. Journal of Social Psychology, 1952, 35, 111-125.
- Levanthal, H., Jacobs, R. L., & Kudirka, N. Authoritarianism, ideology, and political candidate choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 539-549.
- McClosky, H. Conservatism and personality. American Political Science Review, 1958, 52, 27-45.
- McGuire, W. J. Personality and susceptibility to social influence. In E. F. Borgatta and W. W. Lambert (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Mann, R. D. A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 241-270.

- Millon, T., & Simkins, L. D. Suggestibility of authoritarians and equalitarians to prestige influence. American Psychologist, 1957, 12, 404.
- Mills, J., & Harvey, J. Opinion change as a function of when information about the communicator is received and whether he is attractive, or expert. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 52-55.
- Moore, J., & Krupat, E. Relationships between source status, authoritarianism, and conformity in a social influence setting. Sociometry, 1971, 34, 122-134.
- Nadler, E. B. Yielding, authoritarianism, and authoritarian ideology regarding groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 408-410.
- Rambo, W. W. Measurement of broad spectrum social attitudes: Liberalism-conservatism. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1972, 35, 463-477.
- Rokeach, M. Authority, authoritarianism, and conformity. In I. A. Berg and B. M. Bass (Eds.), Conformity and deviation. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Sherif, M., & Wilson, M. O. (Eds.). Group relations at the crossroads. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Sistrunk, F., & Holcomb, C. G. Liberals, conservatives, and conformity. Psychonomic Science, 1969, 17, 349-350.
- Small, D. O., & Campbell, D. T. The effect of acquiescence response set upon the relationships of the F scale and conformity. Sociometry, 1960, 23, 69-70.
- Steiner, I. D., & Vannoy, J. Personality correlates of two types of conforming behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 307-315.
- Taylor, I. Similarities in the structure of extreme social attitudes. Psychological Monographs, 1960, 74, 1-32.
- Vaughan, G. M. Authoritarian scales as criterion of conformity. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 776-778.
- Weiner, H., & McGinnies, E. Authoritarianism, conformity, and confidence in a perceptual judgment situation. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 55, 77-84.
- Wells, W. D., Weinert, G., & Rubel, M. Conformity pressure and authoritarian personality. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 42, 133-136.
- White, K., & Vaughan, G. Some sex differences in relating transsituational conformity to personality. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1967, 24, 190.

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL ATTITUDE SURVEY (FORM L)

1. There should be no authority that has the right to determine the type of reading material that is available in the community.
2. I firmly believe that this country has been built on a foundation of truth and righteousness.
3. If a child is ever to learn self-discipline he must first be exposed to firm discipline at home.
4. Many of our current social problems could be solved if there was a fairer distribution of wealth in this country.
5. As a general rule, how a man behaves is a result of reason and choice; he is not forced to act in a certain way by the circumstances under which he lives.
6. There are many times when I feel that we are changing things too much rapidly in this country.
7. A person born to the most humble circumstances can succeed in this country if he has the ability and ambition to get ahead.
8. Many of our most difficult social problems cannot be solved unless the Federal Government becomes more involved with individual communities.
9. Our society should place much more emphasis on the importance of private property and ownership as an essential condition for freedom.
10. Many of our so-called intellectuals get so wrapped-up in complicated ideas that they overlook the basic truths that apply to man and his world.
11. I'm sure that environmental factors exert some influence in determining a man's social achievements, but what he inherits in the way of character and ability plays a much more significant role.
12. Many governmental programs are nothing but poorly veiled handouts to the lower class who, in turn, keep the politician in office.

13. The basic structure of our society is built upon religious heritage.
14. Although our jails should attempt to return a man to a productive life in the community, they should also serve as a strong reminder that when a man breaks the law, he will be punished.
15. We must experiment with social affairs just as we experiment with physical and biological matters.
16. Although a good break is sometimes important, I believe that men rise in a society largely through their own efforts.
17. There are natural leaders and natural followers, and the country would be better off if more people really appreciated this idea.
18. There are many aspects of our society that are unfair and should be changed.
19. He is not much of a person who does not feel great love, gratefulness, and respect for his parents.
20. In times of great national trouble the people and their leaders should turn to God for guidance.
21. Much of the trouble in our country could be avoided if our schools would return to the teaching of patriotism and Americanism.
22. One can never justify breaking the law by claiming that he is following the dictates of his conscience.
23. I know that man has progressed far through science and reason, but I also know that there are many important truths that man will never completely comprehend.
24. It seems that the real power in this country has been shifting from the practical, hard-headed, business leaders to fuzzy-thinking, ivory tower intellectuals who know very little about the real world.
25. Finding fault with this country generally comes from those people who lack the skill or ambition to make something of themselves.
26. I believe that truth endures, hence ideas that withstand the test of time are more likely to be closer to the truth than are ideas that are new.
27. If the lower classes would not let their houses run down so, perhaps they would be more acceptable as neighbors.
28. A man who manages to succeed in business is likely to possess the sound judgment, practical intelligence, and personal characteristics that are required by public office.

29. When I look about at Nature, I see a well ordered plan. The family and all human groups can best secure happiness when they conform to this natural ordering.
30. Many social reformers feel that it is acceptable to destroy both the good and the bad aspects of the society in order to achieve their objectives.
31. I think we are moving away from the time when people were happier and life was simpler.
32. As a general rule, poor people are just as happy as rich people.
33. Labor unions have demonstrated the benefits people may expect when they join together in the pursuit of their own interests.
34. The decent people of this country, the ones who work for a living and have respect for the law, are not the ones we see agitating for social change.
35. God's laws are so simple and beautiful that I do not understand why man has turned away from them to a set of fuzzy ideas that are constantly changing.
36. The saying "Mother knows best," still has more than a grain of truth.
37. Very few people today seem to be willing to do hard work. I see this as a fundamental weakness in our country.
38. There is an absolute truth that is revealed to man through his belief in God.
39. There is greater leadership potential in the business community than is generally found in other sectors of the society.
40. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents or else he will lose respect for them.
41. Today we pamper our children, keep our lower classes on the dole, and neglect the traditions that made this country great.
42. During the recent past this country has been undergoing a steady decay in national character and morality.
43. Despite all the recent criticism and attack, I still feel that this country is basically good and decent.
44. I believe that religion and patriotism are among the highest virtues a man can display.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE SUBJECTS

Although most scientific instruments present their information by means of visual displays like gauges and dials, some must be read by considering the characteristics of an auditory signal. For example, oceanographers frequently employ sonar to detect objects beneath the ocean's surface. These instruments rely on an operator's ability to be able to detect small differences in the tone of a signal. Untrained listeners probably could not hear the subtle changes in the signal that the trained listener would be expected to detect. We know, however, that with practice people do improve their sensitivity to auditory signals, and it is the intent of this study to investigate the effects of practice on an individual's ability to hear small differences in the tone of auditory signals that are presented for a very short duration.

In this experiment you will be presented with a series of paired tones, and you are to judge whether the two tones in each pair are the same, or whether they are different. The pairs of tones will vary from high to low, and in some instances the tones in the pair will be identical. In other instances they will be different. When they are different, the difference will always be a small one and difficult to detect.

The experiment will consist of three sets of twenty trials, each trial involving a pair of tones that you will judge to be identical or

different. For each trial you will hear the following sequence of events. First, the trial number will be announced, and this will serve as a ready signal that the first tone of the pair will soon be presented. When the first tone is presented, it will be for a very short duration, so you will have to listen carefully. After a brief delay the second tone will be presented, and you will then be asked to make your judgments. The listener in Booth A will be asked to respond first. He will have five seconds to make his response, after he is told to do so. If he judges the two tones to be different, he will press the white key on his right. If he judges the two tones to be identical, he will press the red key on his left. Next, the listener in Booth B will be asked to express his judgment in the same fashion. Since these responses and the instructions are being handled mechanically, you will always respond in the same order, individual A followed by B. B will have five seconds to make his judgment. Then, the next trial will be announced, and both listeners should get ready for the next trial.

The first series of twenty trials will be followed by a second. But this time the room will be darkened, and the listeners will hear the paired tones in darkness. Have you ever noticed a person trying to hear a faint sound? Many times he will close his eyes, thereby shutting out distracting visual stimuli and attending only to the sound. This second phase of the experiment will attempt to investigate whether individuals do significantly improve their ability to detect small tonal differences when visual distractions are greatly reduced. Throughout the entire experiment we shall ask you to keep your eyes open at all times. Since we want to determine the effects of visual stimuli on a person's sensitivity to tones, we want to be sure you do

not close your eyes during any phase of the experiment. We will, in effect, open and close them for you when we raise and lower the illumination of the room. Other than this difference in level of illumination, this second phase of the experiment will be identical with the first. Remember, if the two tones appear identical, press the red key on your left when you are instructed to respond. If they sound different, then press the white key on your right.

The third series of twenty trials will be the same as the first. The room illumination will be raised, and we shall present twenty additional trials with the task remaining the same.

Before we begin I will give you ten practice trials, so that you will be sure that you understand the task. If you have any questions now, or after these ten trials, you may speak to the experimenter over your headset. Do you have any questions?

VITA

Phillip Duane Finney

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANT AND CONFORMING BEHAVIOR IN LIBERALS
AND CONSERVATIVES

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Des Moines, Iowa on October 3, 1949, the
son of Mr. and Mrs. Claire D. Finney.

Education: Graduated from West Waterloo High School, Waterloo,
Iowa in 1967; received the Bachelor of Science degree from
the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa in May, 1971 with a
major in psychology.

Professional Experience: Served as a Graduate Research Assistant
in the Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University,
1971-1974; Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Department of
Psychology, Oklahoma State University, 1972-1974.