

THE RELATION OF STATUS AND CONFORMITY IN
NATURAL GROUPS UNDER DIFFERING
JUDGMENTAL SCALES

By

ROBERT LEW MONTGOMERY

//

Bachelor of Arts
Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia
1964

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1968

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
MAR 13 1969

THE RELATION OF STATUS AND CONFORMITY IN
NATURAL GROUPS UNDER DIFFERING
JUDGMENTAL SCALES

Thesis Approved:

Nicholas P. Pollis
Thesis Adviser

Wing E. Bee

Mark Muecke

William H. Rambo

Don A. Schweitzer

D. D. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

704761

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The tremendous debt and profound gratitude to Dr. Nicholas P. Pollis is too great to be satisfied merely by this formal admission. The conceptual basis and underlying techniques utilized in this investigation have resulted almost entirely as a function of interaction with this individual over a period of about six years. Without his insight, vision and encouragement this study would not have been accomplished.

A particular debt is also acknowledged to Drs. Mark K. MacNeil, William W. Rambo, and Don A. Schweitzer for their valuable guidance, suggestions, and assistance; to Drs. David L. Weeks and David E. Bee for their help in the statistical design of the study; and to Dr. David M. Shoemaker for his valuable help in analyzing the sociometric data through means of a computer program.

The author also wishes to thank the Oklahoma State University fraternity men whose sincerity and cooperation were vital components in the success of this research. Specific thanks goes to William Farr, Eric Jamison, Joseph Robert Wilson, James Palmer, Thomas Cody, Kent Patterson, Darryl Brown, Lorrin Walker, and Kenneth Elder.

Thanks is also expressed to Darrel K. Troxel, Director of Fraternity Affairs, Oklahoma State University, who helped the author during the beginning phase of an earlier project which served in many respects as a pre-test for the present investigation. In addition to contact with potential observers and future subjects, one of the most positive outcomes of this earlier project was a sociogram given to the fraternities a year

prior to the present investigation. Thus a cross check on the socio-metric data for the present study was available.

Financial support for this study was provided by National Defense Education Act Title IV funds. Gratitude is expressed to those who made these funds accessible for the payment of subjects, observers, and other costs incurred in conducting this study.

Finally, to his wife, Sallie M. Montgomery, for her patience, understanding, encouragement, and help, the author gives his heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Definition of Terms	2
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Results of Empirical Studies	9
Discussion of the Literature	14
Homans' Exchange Theory	18
III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	22
IV. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	25
Subjects	25
Procedure	27
V. RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT	31
VI. INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS	44
Summary and Conclusions	44
Implications for Future Research	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDIX	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Variability Scores for Session I for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 51	32
II. Analysis of Variance for Stability	33
III. Mean Stability Score Values for Status for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 28	34
IV. Mean Stability Score Values for Range for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 28	35
V. 3 X 3 Table for Mean Stability Scores N = 9 Per Cell . . .	36
VI. Analysis of Variance for Assimilation	38
VII. Mean Assimilation Score Values for Status for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 28	39
VIII. Mean Assimilation Score Values for Range for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 28	40
IX. 3 X 3 Table for Mean Assimilation Scores N = 9 Per Cell .	41
X. Analysis of Variance for Variability During Session II . .	42
XI. Mean Variability Score Values for Range for 2 and 3 Groups d.f. = 28	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The relationship between status and conformity in small groups has not been made clear. Results of research indicate that a variety of relationships have been obtained, i.e., direct, inverse, and curvilinear. It is the contention of this investigator that much of the problem lies in the tendency of social psychologists to use single words such as "status," "conformity," and "group" to refer to widely different experiential and behavioral events.

Problems resulting from this tendency are numerous. Some investigators define status by explicitly relating it to small group formation; others define it by providing subjects with "bogus" popularity ratings purportedly coming from other individuals participating in a study. Moreover, some of the investigators purportedly studying conformity may be more accurately described as studying the process of compliance. In addition, some investigators utilize a group of individuals who have had a past history of normative and organizational relatedness with each other; other investigators utilize a collection of individuals (i.e., strangers) who have had no previous history of normative and organizational relatedness with each other and generalize the results of their studies to all "real" groups in the world.

It is the purpose of this research to study the relationship between status and conformity in real groups (i.e., the members have previously established normative and organizational relatedness) and examine the current use of terms such as "status," "conformity," and "group" for the description of several different types of events. At this point an indication of the several different meanings is in order.

Definition of Terms

Status. English and English (1958) describe status as "... the position accorded, formally or informally, to a person in his own group; the acceptance and honor accorded to a person." Kretch, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962) define status as the "rank of a position or an individual in the prestige hierarchy of a group or community."

For Homans (1961), status refers to the stimuli a man presents to himself and to others. This would include the kinds of activity he emits, as well as the kind of clothes he wears or the kind of house in which he lives. Two additional statements should be made to describe fully Homans' concept of status: (1) to qualify as the sort of stimuli that describe a man's status they must be recognized by other men, and (2) people must be able to rank the stimuli with respect to the stimuli presented by other men. Status, therefore, refers to what men perceive about one of their fellows and placing stimuli in rank order.

Another interpretation of status has been offered by Sherif and Sherif (1956). It has the obvious advantage of being explicitly tied to small group formation. As the Sherifs phrase it:

... when interaction continues over a period of time among individuals with persistent, common motives or problems, the reciprocal expectations among them fall into

hierarchical pattern or scale. A differentiated position in this hierarchy is called status (1956, p. 162).

Still another way to conceptualize status is to define it operationally. Harvey (1953) used two sets of operations in defining status: sociometric choices and ratings by an independent observer. The sociometric choice technique analyzes effective initiative and affect structure of a group by getting answers to such questions as: (1) who most often thinks of things to do? (2) who least often thinks of things to do? (3) who would be elected president if you held an election? (4) who would you prefer to sit by in school? (5) who would you choose to go on a camping trip with you?

Ratings by an independent observer refer to observations of the group made by observers who themselves are not members of the group. In the study by Harvey (1953), teachers, counselors, and the experimenter himself rated the subjects on the basis of authority they seemed to wield and the amount of activity they initiated for the group.

Status for members of small groups, then, can be defined either conceptually or operationally. When broadly defined as a concept, the term "status" has many meanings. When status is operationally defined, as in the present investigation, two possibilities emerge. The first is status defined in terms of sociometric ratings and the second depends on the ratings of an independent or participant observer. The criteria for determining status in both sociometric and observer ratings may be either affect or effective initiative. Affect refers to the degree of popularity an individual has with other group members, whereas effective initiative refers to the degree to which an individual can effectively initiate activities for other group members or to the amount of authority an individual seemingly wields.

Conformity. Conformity, as previously noted, has also had a wide variety of meanings attached to it. In one situation, for example, an individual may be pressured by other individuals into wearing a coat and tie while working as a clerk in a store even though this individual intensely dislikes wearing a coat and tie. Another individual, while working in the same situation, may enjoy wearing a coat and tie and thus feel no pressure from his employer or other employees. To a growing number of social psychologists, these are two different stimulus situations for the individual involved; yet, many still refer to the overt behavior in both instances as conformity behavior. Following Pollis and Montgomery (1966), the first example can be labeled compliance and the second example can be labeled conformity.

The problem remains one of definition. "Conformity" refers to those instances where individuals are behaving in keeping with previously internalized judgmental scales. "Compliance" refers to those instances in which individuals are pressured into behaving in a manner contrary to already established judgmental scales.

One of the first well-formulated distinctions of a conformity-compliance nature was made by Festinger (1953). Festinger distinguished between the following two situations: (1) the exertion of influence which results in public conformity with private acceptance, and (2) the exertion of influence which results in public conformity without private acceptance. Hence, the first situation refers to the individual behaving in accordance with what he is privately accepting, whereas the second situation involves an individual behaving inconsistently with what he is privately accepting due to various pressures brought about from other individuals.

Kelman (1961) has developed a theory of social influence in which he distinguishes between compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance for Kelman is basically the same as Pollis and Montgomery (1966) have defined it. It is a process in which a person adopts behavior consistent with the group norm without actually accepting the norm. Kelman goes on to differentiate between identification and internalization. Identification is used in describing the individual who adopts behavior which is consistent with the group norms, but who furthermore identifies with the group and incorporates the group into his self-concept. The principal difference between identification and internalization is largely a matter of stability over time. In the case of identification, the ego-involvement may not be lasting, while internalization implies a more permanent relationship. Kelman arrived at this distinction in analyzing accounts of "brain-washing" initiated by the Communist Chinese. The changes in the American POW's involved more than "public conformity" (compliance) yet the changes were not integrated within the person's value system.

In summary, it may be said that conformity has a wide range of meanings. Most investigators do not bother to distinguish between conforming and compliant behavior. Some writers distinguish between conformity and compliance by explicitly relating them to group processes (Pollis & Montgomery, 1966). Others subsume compliant responding under conformity, referring, for example, to "expedient" and "true" conformity (Kretch et al., 1962) or "public" conformity and "private" conformity (Festinger, 1953; Harvey & Consalvi, 1960; Menzel, 1957). The point to be made, however, is that the differences between adopting outward behavior alone and taking on the normative expectations inwardly is a

real and significant occurrence that may be made most clear by adopting different terms for each situation.

Group. Another distinction which will be maintained for purposes of this research is between "group" and "togetherness" social stimulus situations in studies having to do with conformity. Sherif and Sherif (1956) first made this distinction by describing group situations as those situations in which individuals participate as members of a delineated group structure with specified status and role relationships to one another, and with certain shared norms or ways of carrying out the task at hand. Togetherness situations, on the other hand, are described as transitory situations in which the participating individuals do not have stabilized status and role relationships, and the established standards or norms are peculiar to the people involved and to the situation at hand.

The importance of the group-togetherness distinction has been underlined in several investigations (Pollis, 1964; Pollis & Montgomery, 1966; 1968). On the basis of this research, which shows that togetherness subjects react differently than do group subjects, it seems unwise to extrapolate the experimental findings in togetherness situations to group situations. As with the distinction made between conformity and compliance, the distinction between group and togetherness situations provides a useful means for organizing the available research literature.

Arbitrariness. Finally, whenever possible, a distinction is made between studies in which conformity to norms "natural" to a situation is being studied and those studies in which conformity or compliance to "arbitrary" norms is being studied. The importance of this distinction has been demonstrated by MacNeil (1964; 1967). MacNeil defines a

natural norm as one established in the course of interaction without imposition of any prescribed norm. Arbitrariness of norms may then be defined as the imposition of prescribed ranges that diverge in increased degrees from the natural norms. The mode and range of the natural norm may thus be used as a baseline to evaluate the joint effect of arbitrariness of a norm and the status position of the member introducing the arbitrary norm. The distinction between arbitrary and natural norms defines one of the major variables manipulated in the present research of status and its relation to conformity.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of contemporary research relevant to the relationship between status and conformity indicates that a variety of relationships have been found--direct, inverse, and curvilinear. As noted in the previous chapter, much of the problem is due to the tendency of social psychologists to use the same terms--"status," "conformity," and "group"--to refer to several different experiential and behavioral events. In some situations, for example, the investigator defines status in terms of the sociometric and observer ratings for members of a real group. In other situations, status is defined by providing complete strangers with false information as to how popular the other strangers rated him.

Similarly, problems lie in the tendency for investigators to use the term conformity in situations which are best described as compliance. Thus, if a direct relationship is found between status and conformity, then the response measure taken is most likely one of conformity (i.e., the individual is behaving in keeping within previously internalized judgmental scales). If on the other hand, an inverse relationship is found between status and conformity, then the response measure taken is more likely compliance (i.e., the individual is not behaving in keeping within previously internalized judgmental scales) but which has been erroneously labeled conformity by the investigators conducting the study.

One problem which is integrally related to the confusion is that studies relating status and conformity may be found in laboratory settings (Dittes & Kelley, 1956), field settings (Whyte, 1943), and a combination of both, called laboratory-field settings (Sherif, White, & Harvey, 1955). As field and laboratory-field studies typically deal with real groups in their natural settings, it is difficult to confuse the issues of conformity and compliance, of group and togetherness, and how status is to be defined. Difficulties arise, however, when the investigator enters the laboratory. In some situations the investigator is studying the process of compliance which he labels conformity. In other situations complete strangers are involved in a conformity or compliance task and the investigator generalizes his results to all "real groups" in the world. Thus in addition to distinctions maintained between conformity and compliance and group and togetherness, distinctions between laboratory, laboratory-field, and field studies are made whenever necessary in reviewing the results of the empirical literature.

Results of Empirical Studies

In a famous field study at Bennington College, Newcomb (1943) found that the girls most popular with their peers were also the most conforming to the community norm. This correlational evidence seems to suggest a direct relation between status--in terms of popularity--and conformity. Similar findings have been reported by a number of other field studies (Lionberger, 1953; Marsh & Coleman, 1954; Wilkening, 1952). Marsh and Coleman (1964), for example, found that farm leaders conform to the values and norms of their groups even more vigorously than their followers.

In a compliance situation, Bartos (1958), using 231 active members of the Y.M.C.A., found that the highest status member complied the least. The task in this case was matching lines in a situation patterned after those of Asch. Although the leader was far less compliant than other members, the differences between all other members were quite similar.

Similarly, Menzel (1959) found that doctors who were least accepted by other doctors as measured by a sociometric questionnaire showed more compliance to the norm of being up-to-date than did doctors who were highly accepted. This again points to an inverse relationship between status and compliance, but a direct relationship between status and conformity, if conforming behavior is regarded as that which is consistent with an individual's true feelings.

Related observations in other investigations have been made by Whyte (1943), Harvey (1953), Sherif, White, and Harvey (1955), and MacNeil (1967). These observations indicate that in the process of group interaction it should be easier for the high status individual to conform to his own, previously internalized, judgmental scales while eliciting compliant behavior from those of lower status. That is, the accuracy of the performance of the high status individuals is consistently over-estimated both by themselves and by other members. Accuracy of performance of lower status individuals, on the other hand, tends to be under-estimated both by themselves and by others.

Whyte (1943), in describing the Norton gang in a classic field study, provides some information that is related to the point that has been raised. The Nortons were very interested in bowling. Low status members were neither expected nor encouraged to perform at a high level. High performance of top ranking members, on the other hand, was accepted

as usual and natural. When the performance of a low status member became too high, as it did infrequently, negative sanctions were administered, for this behavior did not fit into the expectations of the group.

Another investigation more in the form of a laboratory-field experiment was carried out by Harvey (1953). Subjects for this experiment were chosen from already existing cliques on the basis of agreement between sociometric questionnaires and the ratings of independent observers. Ten sets of subjects were selected, each set containing the leader, middle ranked, and lowest ranked individual from a natural group. The experimental task was dart throwing and each subject estimated his performance and the performance of his associates when it was his turn. Harvey found that (1) the higher one's status in the group, the more he and other members tend to over-estimate his performance, and (2) the lower one's status in the group, the more his performance is underestimated both by the individual and by other members of the group. This experiment confirms the observations of Whyte's field study concerning the bowling ability of the low status Nortons.

Findings similar to those of Harvey were found in another field experiment by Sherif, White, and Harvey (1955). Rather than studying groups which were already in existence, these investigators produced group structures experimentally. Another difference between this and the Harvey study is that in the Sherif et al. study, judgments were made after the performance of the task. Results, however, were identical.

In a more recent laboratory investigation, MacNeil (1967) studied natural groups by having a norm formation session in both the autokinetic situation and in a shotgun range judgment situation utilizing numerosity estimation. In groups of high solidarity, he found that the leaders

were more effective in initiating arbitrary norms and hence eliciting compliant behavior from other members than were the low status members. In contrast to the high status members who were better able to maintain the prescribed arbitrary norm, low status members quickly abandoned the arbitrary norm.

In another laboratory experiment, Harvey and Consalvi (1960) have shown that conformity is related to status in a distance-between-lights judgment situation. A large number of juvenile delinquents in an institution were given a sociometric questionnaire which was then used to select small groups averaging four to five members. All members of each group were brought together in a dark room and were asked to judge the distance between two lights that flashed simultaneously. The room was constructed so that two sets of lights could be shown to members of the group although it was purported that there was only one set. The subjects were told that they would win a considerable cash prize if they were accurate as a group in estimating the distance between the lights.

In the first phase of the experiment, all subjects were presented with two lights that were 12 inches apart, and their individual judgments of the distance were taken. The group then discussed their judgments and came to a group decision. In the second phase, all but one of the group members were presented with the lights 12 inches apart. Depending on the experimental condition, one group member--either the leader, the second in command, or the individual of lowest status--was presented with lights that were 48 inches apart.

The findings indicated that when the group discussed judgments, the second in command was most influenced by and complied most with the group consensus. The leader and the low status man were least influenced by

the group decision. Hence a curvilinear relationship between status and compliance is implied, with the middle status individual complying more than the low or the high status individuals.

In contrast to the above findings, Harvey and Rutherford (1960) found that low status subjects complied the most. The subjects in this study ranged from grade 3 through grade 11 and status was defined sociometrically. The task was judging two pictures from the Meier Art Judgment Test. In this study, however, only high and low status subjects were considered. Hence, the curvilinear relationship would not have been found, if such a relationship had existed.

In a togetherness experiment (i.e., the subjects were strangers), Kelley and Shapiro (1954) found an indirect relationship utilizing three classes of status--high, medium, and low. Status was defined by bringing subjects into a laboratory situation in sets of five or six at a time. There the subjects introduced themselves to one another, each told the others something about himself, and then each one answered a simple sociometric test in which he was to say how acceptable as a co-worker he found the other subjects. After this, the investigators put each subject into an alcove by himself and handed him a bogus slip of paper showing how he had scored on the sociometric test, i.e., whether his fellow workers had rated him high, average, or low in desirability as a future co-worker. The question under investigation was this: would subjects comply with what they believed were the other subjects' judgments even though it was evident that the judgment was incorrect? An indirect relationship was found to exist with the lower status individuals complying the most.

Using the same experimental procedure, Dittes and Kelly (1956) divided togetherness subjects into four levels of status, rather than

three as in the previous study. . . These members were labeled high, average, low, and very low in status. Again bogus ratings provided each subject with his level of status. The results indicated a curvilinear function. The high status individuals showed the least compliance with the low status subjects next. . . The greatest compliant behavior was demonstrated by the very low status subjects with the average status individuals close behind. Finally, a curvilinear function was found in another laboratory experiment by Wilson (1960) in a compliant situation with status being sociometrically defined.

Discussion of the Literature

In summarizing the results of laboratory, laboratory-field, and field studies, we find that the relation between status and conformity is a complex one. . . Four studies (Lionberger, 1953; Marsh & Coleman, 1954; Newcomb, 1943; Wilkening, 1952) report a direct relationship. Four other investigations (Bartos, 1958; Harvey & Rutherford, 1960; Kelley & Shapiro, 1954; Menzel, 1957) report an inverse relationship. Three other investigations (Dittes & Kelley, 1956; Harvey & Consalvi, 1960; Wilson, 1960) report a curvilinear relationship with the high and low statuses conforming the most to previously internalized standards and the middle status the least.

Differences between studies obtaining direct and inverse relationships may be clarified by means of the distinction between conformity and compliance. . . For example, direct relationships were found by Newcomb (1943), Lionberger (1953), Marsh & Coleman (1954), and Wilkening (1952). In each instance reviewed, the individuals may best be described as

exhibiting behavior in keeping with previously internalized judgmental scales in the order of High>Medium>Low.

Four studies (Bartos, 1958; Harvey & Rutherford, 1960; Kelley & Shapiro, 1954; Menzel, 1957), on the other hand, report an inverse relationship. In each of these studies purportedly dealing with "conformity," it may be said that the situation at hand is best described as one of compliance. That is, individuals were being pressured by the social situation into making judgments contrary to previously internalized judgmental scales with the dependent measure reflecting compliance in the order of Low>Medium>High.

If the conformity-compliance distinction is kept in mind, the studies obtaining inverse results do not in any way invalidate the results of the studies reporting the direct relation between status and conformity, but rather confirm these investigations. Hence, the results of any single experiment may be interpreted as either conformity or compliance resulting in either a direct or indirect relationship.

Related observations (Harvey, 1953; MacNeil, 1967; Sherif, White & Harvey, 1955; Whyte, 1943) indicate that in the process of group interaction it should be easier for the high status individual to conform to his own, previously internalized, judgmental scales while eliciting compliant behavior from those of lower status. That is, accuracy of the performance of the high status individuals is consistently overestimated by themselves and by other members. Accuracy of performance of lower status individuals, on the other hand, tends to be underestimated both by themselves and by others.

In summarizing all of the above studies, the following may be said:

1) The performance of high status individuals tends to be over-estimated both by themselves and by others, whereas the performance of low status members tends to be under-estimated both by themselves and by others.

2) High status individuals are more likely to exhibit behavior in keeping with previously internalized judgmental scales (i.e., conformity), whereas low status individuals are more likely to exhibit behavior inconsistent with previously internalized scales (i.e., compliance).

3) The relationship between status and conformity would therefore be a direct one, while the relationship between status and compliance would be an inverse one.

These three summary statements about field studies and laboratory experiments apparently apply to a wide variety of diverse groups. Examples are girl members of a college community (Newcomb, 1943), members of farm groups (Lionberger, 1953; Marsh & Coleman, 1954; Wilkening, 1952), street gang members in Boston (Whyte, 1943), Y.M.C.A. members (Bartos, 1958), groups of physicians (Menzel, 1957), high school cliques (Harvey, 1953), members of a boys' camp (Sherif, White, & Harvey, 1955), and members of Anglo-American and Latin-American groups (MacNeil, 1967).

Why, then, do some studies obtain a curvilinear relationship between status and conformity? In general, the studies obtaining a curvilinear relationship may be best described as laboratory-togetherness situations in which status is artificially defined and in which conformity develops under circumstances that bear little resemblance to actual life situations.

In one of the often cited studies (Dittes & Kelley, 1956), for example, that yielded a curvilinear relationship, the subjects involved

were complete strangers. As previously mentioned in conjunction with the work of Pollis and Montgomery (1966; 1968) togetherness and group situations involve entirely different parameters. Hence, the Dittes & Kelley study which defined status in terms of "bogus" ratings from strangers has no relevance to other studies in which status is defined in terms of "real" group formation. The fact that its results differ may be taken as evidence for the necessity of maintaining the group-togetherness distinction.

Furthermore, in some of these experiments, perhaps the credibility of the experiment for the subjects involved is questionable. For example, another important study (Harvey & Consalvi, 1960) obtaining a curvilinear relationship, has been challenged in regard to this aspect by MacNeil (1967). The issue seems to rest on whether the subjects were convinced that they were looking at the same set of lights, when in fact one subject was looking at a set of lights 48 inches apart and the other subjects were looking at a set 12 inches apart.

The issue is further confused in that not all studies have included the middle status individual. Hence, the presence or absence of the curvilinear relationship has not had a chance to be adequately demonstrated because many studies have included only high and low status individuals. An example of this would be the Harvey and Rutherford (1960) study.

Finally, little of the work that has been reviewed combined the virtues of the laboratory and real life situations. Concern over this has been voiced by Blake and Mouton (1961) and Sherif (1961). In general, laboratory situations produce little ego-involvement, at least in comparison to real life situations where the personal stakes

with conformity and compliance are high. Moreover, with the exception of MacNeil (1967), little work has been done using "real" groups in the laboratory experiments. Because of the difference in ego-involvement and past historical relatedness and the resulting expectancies on the part of "real" groups, it is hazardous to generalize the results obtained in the laboratory-togetherness situations to those of groups found in real life.

Homans' Exchange Theory

The position taken by the present investigator has been to interpret the curvilinear relationship as being an artifact peculiar only to laboratory experiments. An alternative explanation has been presented by Homans (1961).

Homans (1961) explains the relationship between status and conformity in terms of the risk involved for the individual. The situation most frequently described by Homans is that of a compliance situation in which an individual is pressured by others to make judgments that are contradictory to what he is actually perceiving. Hence in this analysis of Homans, the word "compliance" is used in describing events that Homans would label conformity.

Consider, for example, Homans' high status man. There are four possible reactions in this situation: (1) the individual may comply with the group judgment when the group is wrong; (2) the individual may comply with the group judgment when the group is right; (3) the individual may not comply and the group judgment turns out to be wrong; (4) the individual may not comply and the group judgment turns out to be correct.

If an upper status man complies and the group's judgment is correct, no damage is done to his status but neither does it improve. Much the same is true if the individual complies and the group's judgment turns out to be incorrect. Little damage to his status occurs, since everyone else was also wrong. On the other hand, if the person does not comply and the group's judgment is correct, he will lose some esteem. Even after the loss of esteem the high status individual will still have a great deal left. In Homans' words:

We are talking about people whose status is high and established, and the point about such people is that they have a long way to go before hitting the bottom (1961, p. 351).

Finally, what happens if the upper status man refuses to comply and the group judgment turns out to be incorrect? In this case, the individual significantly increases in esteem. This will be especially true when the correct judgment brings rewards to other members. Therefore, the balance of risk makes it probable that an upper status man will choose non-compliance.

In examining the effect of status on compliance for a person of middle status, it must be remembered that the middle status position is the most unstable. The low status individual has little status to lose; the upper status individual can afford to take the risk involved; the middle status individual, because of his unstable position, cannot afford a status loss. If a middle status man complies to the group's judgment and the group opinion is correct, his position as an accepted member is confirmed. If he gives in and the group is wrong, he does not lose anything as far as status is concerned. On the other hand, if he does not give in and the group's judgment is correct, the individual may suffer a significant decrement in status. Finally, he may refuse to comply and

have the group's judgment turn out to be wrong and gain in status just as the high status member gains. However, as Homans points out, it will take more than one such achievement to get to the top of the status hierarchy, in contrast to a high status individual. For these reasons, the middle status member complies most to other members' judgments.

Now let us consider the low status individual. If a low status individual complies to the group's judgment and the group is correct, very little status change occurs. If, on the other hand, he rejects the group's judgment and it is correct, he has little to lose in the way of status. In the situation in which he rejects the group's judgment and the group turns out to be wrong, the individual has something to gain at least in ego terms if not in terms of status.

Homans, in using the preceding line of thought, explains the curvilinear relationship that has been found by some investigators. In essence, he is attempting to explain the finding that high and low status subjects comply least while middle status subjects comply most in a few of the laboratory findings in terms of the risk involved for status change. The upper status individual has little to gain by compliance, and the lower status individual has little to lose by its opposite. Thus, for different reasons, the behavior becomes biased in the same direction.

Two criticisms emerge in reviewing this theory. First, Homans' explanation is based primarily on research in laboratory-togetherness situations in which status is artificially defined and hence may not necessarily be generalized to conformity or compliance in real groups. Second, this theory explains only a few of the results in the literature

while neglecting other studies that point either to a direct or inverse relationship between status and conformity or compliance.

CHAPTER III

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research is to provide an empirical check on the relationship between status and conformity by studying high (H), medium (M), and low (L) status members of real groups in a laboratory situation with each member possessing a different judgmental scale. While in the process it should be possible to demonstrate the necessity for the distinction drawn between conformity and compliance, group and togetherness and the danger of extrapolating results from laboratory experiments in which status is artificially defined to those obtained in field studies and field experiments in which status is explicitly tied to small group formation.

In order to implement the research, the autokinetic effect (Sherif, 1935) is utilized in two sessions. During Session I, three members of H, M, and L status from each group will participate alone. Following a procedure used in previous research (Pollis & Montgomery, 1966; 1968) each of the three subjects will be anchored through verbal instructions to see the light move within one of three ranges (1-4, 5-9, and 10-15 inches), with each range varying in its degree of arbitrariness.¹

¹The three arbitrary ranges were determined on the basis of a pre-test of 40 subjects in which subjects gave their estimates both alone and together without any imposition of a prescribed range. From least to most arbitrary, they were 1-4, 5-9, and 10-15 inches in terms of frequencies of estimated autokinetic movement.

In Session II, the three subjects, H, M, and L, from each group will return together, with each member possessing a different previously established arbitrary range, in order that conformity to the previously internalized judgmental scale and compliance to those scales possessed by other members can be determined.

With regard to the three levels of arbitrariness (1-4, 5-9, and 10-15 inches) it is expected that, other things being equal, conformity to the previously internalized scale will be greatest for those individuals with the 1 to 4 inch scale (i.e., the natural range), less for those individuals with the 5-9 inch scale, and least for individuals with the 10-15 inch scale. Compliance is predicted to be in the opposite direction with the individual possessing the 10-15 inch scale complying the most, the individual possessing the 5 to 9 inch scale the next most, and the individual possessing the 1 to 4 inch scale the least.

The prediction with regard to the three levels of status is contrary to that of Homans' Exchange Theory. That is, if the curvilinear relationship is an artifact of the artificiality of certain laboratory-togetherness experiments, but not of experiments in which real groups are utilized, as is the contention of this investigator, then conformity would be expected to be in the direction of $H > M > L$ and compliance would be expected to be in the order of $L > M > H$. If Homans' theory is the more adequate, conformity would be expected to be in the direction of $H \approx L > M$ and compliance would be expected to be in the order of $M > H \approx L$.

If, as suggested, a direct relationship between status and conformity occurs, then this evidence would seem to indicate that the conformity-compliance distinction is a useful one. Moreover, it would seem that the curvilinear relationship found by some investigators in

laboratory experiments is possibly an artifact of the artificiality of the situation and hence bears no relationship to the behavior of groups in real life situations.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

Fifty-four naive subjects were selected from 18 clearly delineated groups in four social fraternities¹ on the campus of Oklahoma State University. From each of these 18 groups, a set of three subjects was selected such that there was one subject with high status (H), one with medium status (M), and one with low status (L). Subject selection in terms of H, M, and L was determined on the basis of two criteria: agreement by participant observers and sociometric ratings made by the members themselves.

Observer agreement was obtained by having two members from each fraternity fill out the questionnaire in Appendix A. From the questionnaires, only those groups were selected for which there was a high degree of observer agreement.

Sociometric ratings were obtained by having all members of each of the four fraternities fill out the questionnaire in Appendix B. The administration and collection of these questionnaires was handled by the investigator's observers and a ninety-six per cent return was

¹Originally six fraternities were studied. Two of these were discarded prior to the experiment due to low observer and sociometric agreement.

obtained from those members living in each fraternity house concerned. The results of the questionnaires were then processed by means of a computer program devised by Shoemaker and Pace (1968) for the explicit purpose of clique detection.

In examining the computer output, it was noted that two distinct types of groups were generated, depending upon the type of item being considered. Generally speaking, items 1, 2, and 3 were "who do you like the most" type items and generated status structures that were quite similar to each other, but not to those structures generated by items 5, 6, and 7. Items 5, 6, and 7 were "effective initiative" items and generated status structures similar to each other, but not similar to those generated by items 1, 2, and 3. Item 4 asked, "If you had to depend on a friend's judgment in a difficult situation, who would you trust first?" This item generated status structures sometimes similar to those of items 1, 2, and 3; sometimes similar to those of items 5, 6, and 7; but most frequently status structures that were unique only to item 4.

The groups from which sets of H, M, and L status subjects were chosen had to meet the following criteria across all items: (1) the high status member selected the middle status member in second to fourth choice and selected the low status member either not at all or somewhere between fifth and tenth choice; (2) the middle status member selected the high status member in first to third choice and selected the low status member somewhere between fourth and tenth choice, and, (3) the low status member selected the high and middle status members as first to fourth choices.

From the groups not eliminated on the basis of the above criteria, 18 were selected on the basis of agreement with observer ratings.

Approximately one-half of the groups from which H, M, L, sets were selected were generated by items 1, 2, and 3; the other one-half were generated by items 5, 6, and 7. The 18 sets of H, M, and L subjects were randomly assigned to treatment combinations by placing the names of each H, M, L, set in a box and by matching a given set of treatment combinations with the name of a H, M, L, set drawn at random.

Five sets of three subjects each were selected from five groups in two of the fraternities and four sets were selected from four groups in the other two fraternities. The four fraternities from which subjects were chosen varied in size from 80 to 110 members. Each subject selected for the experiment was paid five dollars for participating. All subjects selected participated in both sessions and no subjects were dropped from the analysis.

Procedure

During Session I, each subject (H, M, or L) participated alone in the autokinetic situation. Through instructions the experimenter anchored each member (either H, M, or L) on either a 1-4 inch range, a 5-9 inch range, or on a 10-15 inch range. The only restriction was that no two members of any one group were established within the same range. Thirty estimates were made by each subject in Session I. As close to 24 hours later as possible, each set of H, M, L subjects from the 18 groups returned for Session II. This session showed the effects of status on conformity to a previously established range. Forty estimates were obtained in Session II for each naive subject.

Instructions for Session I were as follows:

The results of this experiment will be useful for future space flight, so try to make your estimates as accurate

as possible. I will give you the signal "ready" and show you a point of light. The light will start to move. It will move between (1-4, 5-9, 10-15, as the case might be) inches. A few seconds later the light will disappear. Then tell me the distance it moved.

These parts of the instructions were then repeated:

I will give you a signal "ready" and show you a point of light. The light will move between (1-4, 5-9, 10-15, as the case might be) inches. The light will then disappear and you tell me the distance that it moved.

Instructions for Session II were the following:

The instructions for today's experiment are much the same as yesterday. I will give you a signal "ready" and show you a point of light. The light will start to move. The light will disappear and you are to tell me how far it moved. The only difference between today and yesterday is that I cannot tell you the range in which the light is moving.

In both sessions, the subjects sat 15 feet away from an autokinetic apparatus. The entire series of light onsets and offsets was held constant through the use of an automatic timer. A four second interval existed between each light onset and offset; a thirty second interval existed between light offset and the next light onset. If a subject did not see the light move on a particular trial the experimenter reminded the subject that "the light moves every time." During Session I, if a subject saw the light move a distance other than that which fell within his specified range, the experimenter repeated that the light would always move the number of inches specified in the instructions (i.e., either 1-4, 5-9, or 10-15).

At the beginning of each session, subjects were met at the end of a long dark hall that led to the experimental room, and were escorted to their seats in the light-proof experimental room by the experimenter. As only a shrouded pencil flashlight was used to facilitate the seating

process, subjects were not able to obtain a clear notion as to the dimensions of the room or the nature of the experimental setup.

At the beginning of Session I, subjects were randomly assigned seats with the single restriction being that no two subjects in any group could be assigned the same seat. At the beginning of Session II, subjects were asked to take the same seat that they had the day before. During Session II, the order of response from the subjects was allowed to take place naturally; that is, subjects were allowed to decide as to whether they would respond from right to left or from left to right.

As the experiment proved to be very ego-involving and invited many questions, the experimenter told all subjects that it was sponsored by a grant from NASA and was for "purposes of determining whether people can accurately judge the distance that a light moves in a dark room." Questions as to why they were selected to participate in the experiment were answered by saying that they were members of X fraternity and that the experimenter had always gotten good cooperation from that fraternity. For this reason the experimenter had randomly selected individuals from that fraternity's roster in the student directory. Questions that arose as to why certain individuals had to participate in the second session together were answered by telling subjects that time pressures necessitated using more people at the same time and it was possible to do this only if all subjects had different ranges. Thus, the possibility of any one member influencing any other member would be equally probable.

In order to analyze the data with regard to the randomization pattern, the experiment is regarded as a 3^2 factorial arrangement of treatments with two factors, status (H, M, L) and range or arbitrariness (1-4, 5-9, 10-15) each at three levels. The interactions, either AB or

AB^2 , were confounded within three groups (i.e., blocks) in each of six replications (replications are not real). The confounding pattern was the following:

Replication No. 1	AB
Replication No. 2	AB^2
Replication No. 3	AB
Replication No. 4	AB^2
Replication No. 5	AB
Replication No. 6	AB^2

Hence, the following experimental plan was suggested:

	Gp 1	Gp 2	Gp 3
Rep No. 1	00	01	02
	12	10	20
	21	22	11
	Gp 4	Gp 5	Gp 6
Rep No. 2	00	02	01
	11	10	12
	22	21	20
	Gp 7	Gp 8	Gp 9
Rep No. 3	00	01	02
	12	10	20
	21	22	11
	Gp 10	Gp 11	Gp 12
Rep No. 4	00	02	01
	11	10	12
	22	21	20
	Gp 13	Gp 14	Gp 15
Rep No. 5	00	01	02
	12	10	20
	21	22	11
	Gp 16	Gp 17	Gp 18
Rep No. 6	00	02	01
	11	10	12
	22	21	20

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT

Subject responses were recorded in each of the experimental sessions in terms of each subject's estimate of the distance in inches of light movement. Similar to the previous work of Pollis and Montgomery (1966; 1968), an inspection of each subject's estimates in Session I revealed that anchoring subjects to their respective 1-4, 5-9, or 10-15 inch ranges was successful. That is, no subject went outside of his given range during his last twenty estimates in Session I. Although all subjects were successfully anchored to their scales, it was expected that the degree of arbitrariness of these scales would be accurately reflected through measures of variability in the direction of 10-15 > 5-9 > 1-4; greater variability has been taken to mean greater instability of the judgmental framework with the autokinetic effect (e.g., MacNeil, 1964; Sherif & Harvey, 1952; Rohrer et al., and Walter, 1955).

Accordingly, a variability score was computed for each subject by totaling the distance moved from estimate to estimate in Session I and dividing by the number of estimates. An overall analysis of variance for the variability scores in Session I yielded an F value of 44.54 which is statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

Table I summarizes the results using the Duncan's range test in which \bar{X} represents mean variability score values for 1-4, 5-9, and 10-15 inch range subjects; r_p represents the least significant standardized

range values taken from Duncan's tables; and R_p (standard error of a mean multiplied by r_p) represents the least significant range of the distance between any two means among the ordered means of 1-4, 5-9, and 10-15.¹

TABLE I

MEAN VARIABILITY SCORES FOR SESSION I
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS d.f.=51

	Level of Range			Number of Groups	
	10-15	5-9	1-4	2	3
\bar{X} :	1.86	1.43	.87	r_p 3.82	3.99**
				R_p .28	.30

**Significant at the .01 level

Results are in the predicted direction of 10-15>5-9>1-4 with mean variability scores being 1.86, 1.43, and .87 respectively. The range test shows 10-15>5-9 and 5-9>1-4 differences to be statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Hence, although all subjects were successfully anchored to their range in terms of their estimates falling within that range, the degree of arbitrariness of the ranges was accurately reflected through measures of variability in the direction of 10-15>5-9>1-4 in Session I.

Session II constituted the source of crucial data in that a group of three subjects, H, M, and L, returned with each member possessing a

¹For a discussion of the table format employed here with regard to Duncan's Range Test see Frank J. McGuigan, Experimental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960, p. 176.

different range. All estimates of distance falling inside each subject's original scale were cumulated. This constituted the subject's stability score. Stability scores are basic to testing the relative conformity to the previously internalized ranges. The analysis of variance for the effects of stability appear in Table II.

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR STABILITY

Source	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Total	53		
Between all Groups	17	46.52	
Replications	5	24.66	
Groups in Replications	12	55.63	
AB (1, 3, 5)	2	45.82	
AB ² (2, 4, 6)	2	94.37	
Inter-group Error	8	49.67	
AB X Reps.	4	91.70	
AB ² X Reps.	4	7.59	
Within all Groups	36	93.72	
A (Status)	2	217.39	5.63***
B (Arbitrariness)	2	695.72	18.00****
A X B	4		
AB (2, 4, 6)	2	118.04	3.05
AB ² (1, 3, 5)	2	114.82	2.97
Intra-group Error	28	38.65	
A X Reps.	10	33.08	
B X Reps.	10	29.34	
AB X Reps	4	79.59	
AB ² X Reps.	4	34.87	

***Significant at the .01 level

****Significant at the .001 level

As expected, neither Replications, Groups in Replications, nor the interaction of Status and Range are significant. Both the main effects of Status and Range are significant. The effect of Status has an F

value of 5.63 and is statistically significant beyond the .01 level; the effect of Range has an F value of 18.00 and is statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

Table III summarizes the results using Duncan's range test. Results are in the predicted direction of H>M>L with mean stability scores being 19.28, 15.55, and 12.33, respectively. The range test shows H>L to be significant beyond the .01 level, but H>M and M>L are not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE III
MEAN STABILITY SCORE VALUES FOR STATUS
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS d.f. = 28

	Level of Status			Number of Groups	
	H	M	L	2	3
				rp	3.04
				Rp	4.45
X:	19.28	15.55	12.33	rp	4.08**
				Rp	5.98

**Significant at the .01 level

Under the conditions defined in this experiment, these results warrant the generalization that when different autokinetic norms, initially anchored by the experimenter, are internalized by H, M, and L subjects and these subjects later appear in a group situation, conformity to the previously internalized norm is in the direction of H>M>L, whereas compliance is in the direction of L>M>H. The differences between high status and low is statistically significant; the differences

between high and medium and medium and low are not statistically significant.

Results in the predicted direction of 1-4>5-9>10-15 for conformity in terms of stability of range did not occur. Instead, conformity was in the direction of 5-9>1-4>10-15 with stability means of 21.61, 16.33, and 9.22 respectively. These results are summarized in Table IV.

TABLE IV
MEAN STABILITY SCORE VALUES FOR RANGE
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS d.f.=28

	Level of Status			Number of Groups	
	5-9	1-4	10-15	2	3
				rp	3.04*
				Rp	4.45
\bar{X} :	21.61	16.33	9.22	rp	4.08**
				Rp	5.98

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

Duncan's range test shows the 5-9>1-4 comparison to be significant beyond the .05 level and the 1-4>10-15 comparison to be statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Hence, conformity is in the direction of 5-9>1-4>10-15, while compliance is in the direction of 10-15>1-4>5-9.

An explanation for this discrepancy becomes apparent when one looks at the 3 X 3 table in Table V. Here, levels of A (Status) respond much the same across levels of B (Range) except at the 5-9 inch range. At the 5-9 inch level of B, all levels of A, especially the H and M status levels, are much the same. Hence, the following explanation is

suggested: due to the peculiarity of the 5-9 inch member's middle position, he can rapidly move back and forth from top and bottom while remaining very similar to other members without ever leaving his 5-9 inch range. This is particularly true when the 1-4 inch member is near the top of his range and when the 10-15 inch member is near the bottom of his range. Furthermore, this peculiarity of position for the 5-9 inch member occurs irrespective of his level of status. Hence, the differences between H and M and M and L in Table III are not as significant as they might have been if this peculiarity of position did not occur.

TABLE V
3 X 3 TABLE FOR MEAN STABILITY SCORES
N = 9 per cell

Status	Range			
	1-4	5-9	10-15	
	B			
H	21.67	22.50	13.67	19.28
A M	16.33	22.50	7.83	15.55
L	11.00	19.83	6.17	12.33
	16.33	21.61	9.22	

Consistent with the peculiar inversion of the 5-9 and 1-4 inch members found with the stability measure, we would expect certain discrepancies in other Session II measures to occur such as in the ability to assimilate other members into one's own scale and in Session II

variability scores. For example, it has been noted by Pollis (1964) that subjects who are able to maintain their original judgmental frameworks intact tend also to provide a relatively powerful basis for anchoring the judgmental process of others. Hence, we would expect assimilation in Session II to be in the direction of 5-9 > 1-4 > 10-15.

In contrast to the dependent measure of assimilation, we would expect conformity in terms of variability for Session II to be in the direction of 1-4 > 5-9 \approx 10-15. That is, due to the 5-9 inch member maximizing his similarity to the other two members by moving from the top to the bottom of his range from trial to trial, he would more closely approximate the 10-15 inch range than the 1-4 inch range in terms of variability.

Assimilation scores were obtained for each subject by cumulating the total number of estimates falling within the subject's range (made by the other Session II subjects) and dividing by two. The analysis of variance for the ability of Session II subjects to assimilate others into their framework is given in Table VI.

As with stability scores, neither Replications, Groups in Replications, nor interaction of Status and Range are significant. The effect of Status has an F value of 4.32 and is statistically significant beyond the .025 level, whereas the effect of Range has an F value of 39.61 and is statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

The Duncan's range test for the effect of Status is summarized in Table VII. Results are in the predicted direction of H > M > L with mean assimilation scores of 15.08, 11.08, and 10.25 respectively. However, while H > L is significant at $P < .05$, and H > M is significant at $P < .05$, M > L is not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ASSIMILATION

Source	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Total	53		
Between all Groups	17	11.63	
Replications	5	6.15	
Groups in Replications	12	13.82	
AB (1, 3, 5)	2	11.45	
AB (2, 4, 6)	2	22.35	
Inter-group Error	8	12.41	
AB X Reps.	4	22.93	
AB X Reps.	4	1.90	
Within all Groups	36	9.43	
A (Status)	2	120.17	4.32**
B (Arbitrariness)	2	1099.35	39.61****
A X B	4		
AB (2, 4, 6)	2	44.25	
AB ² (1, 3, 5)	2	44.07	
Intra-group Error	28	27.76	
A X Reps.	10	23.17	
B X Reps.	10	32.78	
AB X Reps.	4	33.73	
AB ² X Reps.	4	20.66	

**Significant at the .025 level

****Significant at the .001 level

Under the conditions defined in this experiment, these results warrant the generalization that when different norms, initially anchored by the experimenter, are internalized by H, M, and L subjects and these subjects later appear in a group situation, conformity to the previously internalized norm is in the direction of $H > M > L$, whereas compliance is in the direction of $L > M > H$. The differences between high and low and the differences between high and medium are statistically significant; the difference between medium and low is not statistically significant.

TABLE VII

MEAN ASSIMILATION SCORE VALUES FOR STATUS
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS d.f. = 28

	Level of Status				Number of Groups	
	H	M	L		2	3
\bar{X} :	15.08	11.08	10.25	rp	2.90	3.04*
				Rp	3.60	3.76

*Significant at the .05 level

Results for the effects of Range or Arbitrariness utilizing the dependent measure of assimilation are given in Table VIII. As expected, and similar to the results obtained with the stability measure, results are in the direction of $5-9 > 1-4 > 10-15$ with assimilation means of 20.17, 11.69, and 4.56, respectively. Differences between $5-9 > 1-4$ and $1-4 > 10-15$ are significant beyond the .01 level and to a much greater extent than when stability measures were used. Although this is again discrepant with what was originally predicted, it is consistent with the results found with stability measures. That is, the subjects with the 5-9 inch

scale, because of their peculiar position in the middle, made estimates comparatively often within their scale. This in turn provided a relatively powerful basis for anchoring the judgmental process of others.

TABLE VIII

MEAN ASSIMILATION SCORE VALUES FOR RANGE
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS. d.f. = 28

	Level of Arbitrariness				Number of Groups	
	5-9	1-4	10-15		2	3
\bar{X} :	20.17	11.69	4.56	rp	3.91	4.08**
				Rp	4.85	5.06

**Significant at the .01 level

Similar to the presentation of mean stability scores in Table V, mean assimilation scores are presented in a 3X 3 table in Table IX. Again at the 5-9 inch level, the values of B are similar, irrespective of levels of status. Hence, as with stability measures, the differences between status are not as significant as they might have been if this peculiarity of position had not occurred. The exception to this is the medium status member at the 5-9 inch range, whose scores may be an underestimate as a function of sampling error. If so, then this underestimation reduces the medium status member's overall assimilation mean and in turn makes him very similar to the low status member in his overall ability to assimilate others.

Consistent with the peculiar inversion in the direction of 5-9>1-4>10-15 for stability and assimilation measures, we would expect variability scores for Session II to be in a different direction with the 1-4

inch range being less variable than the 5-9, and the 5-9 inch range more closely approximating the 10-15 inch range. Accordingly, a variability score was computed for each subject by totaling the distance moved from estimate to estimate in Session II and dividing by the number of estimates.

TABLE IX
3 X 3 TABLE FOR MEAN ASSIMILATION SCORES
N = 9 per cell

Status	Range				
	1-4	5-9	10-15		
	B				
A	H	16.58	21.50	7.17	15.08
	M	10.75	18.00	4.50	11.08
	L	7.75	21.00	2.00	10.25
		11.69	20.17	4.56	

The overall analysis of variance for variability measures taken from each subject's estimates in Session II is shown in Table X. Only the Range effects are significant beyond the .05 level with an F value of 3.97.

The effects of Status when using variability scores, though not significant, are in the predicted direction of H>M>L for conformity and L>M>H for compliance. The Variability means for H, M, and L are 2.51, 2.64, and 2.76, respectively.

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR VARIABILITY
DURING SESSION II

Source	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Total	53		
Between all Groups	17	1.664	
Replications	5	.960	
Groups in Replications	12	1.957	
AB (1, 3, 5)	2	2.018	
AB (2, 4, 6)	2	2.591	
Inter-group Error	8	1.783	
AB X Reps.	4	1.497	
AB X Reps.	4	2.068	
Within all Groups	36	.500	
A (Status)	2	.288	
B (Arbitrariness)	2	1.849	3.97*
A X B	4		
AB (2, 4, 6)	2	.27	
AB ² (1, 3, 5)	2	.076	
Intra-group Error	28	.465	
A X Reps.	10	.415	
B X Reps.	10	.566	
AB X Reps.	4	.248	
AB ² X Reps.	4	.559	

*Significant beyond the .05 level

Results of the Duncan's range test for the effect of Arbitrariness of Range appear in Table XI and are in the predicted direction. That

TABLE XI

MEAN VARIABILITY SCORE VALUES FOR RANGE
FOR 2 AND 3 GROUPS d.f. = 28

	Level of Arbitrariness			Number of Groups		
	5-9	10-15	1-4	2	3	
\bar{X} :	2.83	2.82	2.26	rp Rp	2.90 .46	3.04* .49

*Significant at the .05 level

is, the 1-4 inch range shows the least variability, while the 5-9 and 10-15 inch ranges are approximately equal in variability. The variability means are 2.26, 2.83, and 2.82, respectively. While 5-9 > 1-4 and 10-15 > 1-4 differences are significant beyond the .05 level, there is no significant difference between the 5-9 and 10-15 inch ranges. Thus the explanation for the inversion found with the 5-9 inch range being more greatly conformed to than the 1-4 inch range is supported. That is, the 5-9 inch member remains more stable and assimilates other members better, while demonstrating greater variability from trial to trial.

CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Summary and Conclusions

To provide an empirical check on the relationship between status and conformity, high (H), medium (M), and low (L) status members of real groups were brought into a laboratory situation with each member possessing a different judgmental scale. In order to implement the research, the autokinetic effect was utilized for two sessions. In Session I, subjects of H, M, and L status participated in the experiment alone and formed judgmental scales varying in arbitrariness (i.e., 1-4, 5-9, or 10-15 inches). In Session II the H, M, and L subjects returned in groups of 3 in order that conformity to the previously internalized scale might be determined.

Under the conditions of this experiment, main findings may be summarized as follows:

1. Inspection of the data showed establishment of the three scales, varying in their degrees of arbitrariness, for all subjects during Session I. This constituted a successful anchoring of all naive subjects to the desired scales, as that scale was internalized under the different scale conditions of 1-4, 5-9, and 10-15 inches. Although all subjects were successfully anchored to their scales, the degree of arbitrariness of the scale was accurately reflected through measures of variability with arbitrariness being in the expected direction of 10-15 > 5-9 > 1-4 during Session I.

2. Group members of H, M, and L status maintained their relative positions when put under compliance pressure in a test of conformity to previously internalized norms. Conformity was found to be in the direction of $H > M > L$ and compliance was found to be in the direction of $L > M > H$ for the three dependent measures--stability, assimilation, and variability. In no case was evidence found for the medium status member either conforming or complying to a greater extent than the high and low status members. Statistical significance was found for $H > L$, but not for $H > M$, or $M > L$ with the stability measure and for $H > L$ and $H > M$, but not for $M > L$ with the assimilation measure. Statistical significance was not found for $H > L$, $H > M$, and $M > L$ with the variability measure. Although the statistical evidence is not clearcut, taken collectively it tends to support the main hypothesis of conformity in the direction of $H > M > L$ and compliance in the direction of $L > M > H$.

3. Members of groups who possessed ranges varying in degrees of arbitrariness in the direction of $10-15 > 5-9 > 1-4$ inches conformed to these ranges in the direction of $5-9 > 1-4 > 10-15$ if stability and assimilation measures are considered. If variability measures are considered, however, conformity was in the predicted direction of $1-4 > 5-9 > 10-15$ with the 5-9 inch range more closely approximating that of the 10-15 than the 1-4 inch range. The following explanation for these results is offered: the greater conformity to the 5-9 inch range, using stability and assimilation measures, was due to the peculiarity of the subject's range being in the middle and hence his being able to maximize his similarity to other members by moving from top to bottom of his range from trial to trial.

Results obtained support this interpretation. All differences in the direction of $5-9 > 1-4 > 10-15$ were statistically significant when

stability and assimilation measures are considered. When variability measures are considered, conformity to the 1-4 inch range was significantly greater than to the 5-9 inch range. Conformity, in terms of variability, for the 5-9 and 10-15 inch members was approximately equivalent. Finally, as the greater effects of conformity for the 5-9 inch range members occurred irrespective of status (i.e., the means were approximately the same for H, M, and L), when stability and assimilation are considered, differences between levels of status were reduced.

4. The evidence that conformity by H, M, and L status members of a group was in the direction of $H > M > L$, and that compliance was in the direction of $L > M > H$, indicates that the conformity-compliance distinction is a useful one and might go far in explaining discrepancies in the past literature. If an indirect relationship, i.e., one in the direction of $L > M > H$, is found by an investigator, then chances are he is studying compliant behavior rather than conformity. That is, in a compliant situation, we expect an indirect relationship, because individuals are being pressured into making judgments that are contrary to their actual perception of the situation. If a direct relationship is obtained, i.e., $H > M > L$, then the investigator is probably studying conformity, i.e., behavior regarded as keeping within the individual's actual perception of the situation.

In summary, high status members are more likely to exhibit behavior in keeping with previously internalized judgmental scales (i.e., conformity) while eliciting compliance from other members. Low status members are more likely to exhibit behavior inconsistent with previously internalized judgmental scales (i.e., compliance) while eliciting little compliance from other members with regard to their

judgmental scales. Middle status members lie between high and low status members in both their degrees of conformity and compliance.

5. In addition, these obtained findings of conformity in the direction of $H > M > L$ provide evidence that the curvilinear relationship found in other laboratory studies, in which conformity or compliance was greatest by medium status members, might have been a function of the artificiality of the situation and hence bears no relation to the behavior of groups in real life situations. The finding in the present study that high status members undergo less displacement of previously internalized standards than do medium, and that medium status members undergo less displacement than do lows, is similar to the results of field studies and suggests that in "real life," internalized standards undergo less displacement in the order of $H > M > L$. As no curvilinear relationship was found in this study, these results seem to indicate that the distinction made by Pollis (1964) and Pollis and Montgomery (1966; 1968) between group and togetherness is a useful one. That is, it may not be valid to extrapolate the findings of status and conformity in togetherness situations to group situations.

6. Finally, as conformity was in the direction of $H > M > L$ and compliance was in the direction of $L > M > H$, no evidence was found that supports Homans' prediction for conformity in the direction of $H \approx L > M$ and compliance in the direction of $M > H \approx L$. Results of this study, taken in conjunction with the results of other field studies and field experiments, suggest that although Homans' theory might account for the results of a few laboratory-togetherness investigations, it has little relevance for the conformity or compliance of members in real groups. Moreover, as Homan's theory explains the results of only a few laboratory

studies, while neglecting the results of other laboratory studies that point to either a direct or inverse relationship, it is suggested that Homans' theory of conformity and its relation to status be regarded at least as an incomplete description of these events, if not as an inadequate one.

Implications for Future Research

As the individuals in the "groups" in this research were members of fraternities or "formal institutions" it would be unwise to generalize the results of this research to all "small informal groups." Although there is no reason to suppose that the basic relationship found in this study between status and conformity should differ in other groups, perhaps the relationship would be more "clearcut" than it was in this study if small informal groups of higher solidarity were studied in a similar situation. Perhaps the status and role relationships formed among members in a fraternity are not as strong as, for example, those formed among members of a street gang. For this reason, it would be advisable in future research to investigate highly solid "natural" groups which have been intensively studied over long periods of time as did MacNeil (1967) and Sherif and Sherif (1964).

Another implication for future research has to do with a comparison of sociometric groups with structures generated by the "liking" items and those generated by the "effective initiative" items. As this was not of primary concern in this study, the investigator attempted to eliminate it as much as possible by means of selecting H, M, and L subjects within these types of groups who maintained their relative positions across all items. Judging from previous work done by MacNeil

(1967) and Verba (1961), it is possible that the effects of status on conformity found in this experiment are products of differences in the degree of "effective initiative" only and that few of the differences are a result of the members "liking" each other. Hence, if one separated the groups generated on the basis of "liking" and "effective initiative," then possibly no differences might be found in H, M, and L status members in groups selected on the basis of the "liking" items; but large differences in H, M, and L might be found in groups selected on the basis of the "effective initiative" items.

A final implication for future research might be the peculiar inversion of the 1-4 and 5-9 inch ranges found in the stability and assimilation measures even though the 1-4 inch range is the "natural" range established in the majority of autokinetic experiments. Holding status variables constant, perhaps in a given "real life" situation, if three friends have standards differing in degrees of arbitrariness on a given issue, the member with the moderately arbitrary position will be best able to assimilate the other two members into his way of seeing things while maintaining his own position.

In terms of assimilation and contrast theory as proposed by Sherif and Hovland (1961), the member advocating the middle position would be the member best able to assimilate others while avoiding contrast effects, as his range is the closest of anyone's to that of the other two members. For this reason, the final concensus becomes biased toward the moderately arbitrary individual rather than the individual proposing the least arbitrary or most natural position when other factors, such as situation-specific prestige, and group solidarity are held constant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartos, O. J. Leadership, conformity and originality. In G. C. Homans, Social Behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. Conformity, resistance and conversion. In I. A. Berg & B. M. Bass, (Eds.), Conformity and deviation. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.
- Dittes, J. E. & Kelley, H. H. Effects of different conditions of acceptance upon conformity to group norms. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 100-107.
- English, H. B. & English, A. C. A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytic terms. New York: David McKay Co., 1958.
- Festinger, L. An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson, (Eds.), Group relations at the crossroads. New York: Harper & Row, 1953.
- Harvey, O. J. An experimental approach to the study of status relations in informal groups. American Sociological Review, 1953, 18, 357-367.
- Harvey, O. J. & Rutherford, J. Status in the informal group at differing age levels. Child Development, 1960, 31, 377-385.
- Harvey, O. J. & Consalvi, C. Status and conformity to pressures in informal groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 182-187.
- Homans, G. C. Social behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.
- Kelley, H. H. & Shapiro, M. M. An experiment on conformity to group norms where conformity is detrimental to group achievement. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 667-677.
- Kelman, H. C. Processes of opinion change, Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961, 25, 57-78.
- Kretch, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachey, E. L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1962.
- Lionberger, H. F. Some characteristics of farm operators sought as sources of farm information in a Missouri community, Rural Sociology, 1953, 18, 327-338.

- MacNeil, M. K. Persistence and change of norms established under differing arbitrary conditions. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1964.
- MacNeil, M. K. Power of status in norm formation under differing conditions of group solidarity. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1967.
- Marsh, C. P. & Coleman, A. L. Farmers practice adoption rates in relation to adoption rates of leaders. Rural Sociology, 1956, 19, 180-183.
- McGuigan, F. J. Experimental psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1960.
- Menzel, H. Public and private conformity under different conditions of acceptance of the group. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 398-404.
- Newcomb, T. M. Personality and social change: Attitude formation in a resident study. New York: Dryden, 1943.
- Pollis, N. P. Relative stability of reference scales formed under individual, togetherness, and group situations. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964.
- Pollis, N. P. & Montgomery, R. L., Conformity and resistance to compliance. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 63, 35-41.
- Pollis, N. P. & Montgomery, R. L. Individual judgmental stability and the natural group. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 74, 75-81.
- Rohrer, J., Baron, S. H., Hoffman, E. L., & Swander, D. V. The stability of autokinetic judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 595-597.
- Sherif, M. A study of some social factors in perception. Archives of Psychology, 1935, 27, No. 187.
- Sherif, M. Conformity-deviation, norms, and group relations. In I. Berg & B. M. Bass, (Eds.), Conformity and deviation. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.
- Sherif, M. & Harvey, O. J. A study in ego functioning: Elimination of stable anchorages in individual and group situations. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 272-305.
- Sherif, M. & Hovland, C. I. Social judgment: Assimilation and contrast effects in reaction to communication and attitude change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961, paperback edition, 1965.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, Carolyn W. An outline of social psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

- Sherif, M. & Sherif, Carolyn W. Reference groups: Exploration into conformity and deviation of adolescents. New York: Harper, 1964.
- Sherif, M., White, B. J., & Harvey, O. J. Status in experimentally produced groups. American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 60, 370-379.
- Shoemaker, D. M. & Pace, Dorothy J. Computer program for analysis of sociometric data. Behavioral Science, in press.
- Verba, S. Small groups and political behavior: A study of leadership. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Walter, N. A study of the effects of conflicting suggestions upon judgment in the autokinetic situation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1952. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 138-146.
- Whyte, W. F. Street corner society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Wilkening, E. A. Informal leaders and innovators in farm practices. Rural Sociology, 1952, 17, 272-275.
- Wilson, R. S. Personality patterns, source attractiveness and conformity. Journal of Personality, 1960, 28, 186-199.

APPENDIX A

Name: _____

In terms of being friendly and socializing, some of the people in your fraternity may be thought of as constituting sub-groups. Indicate as many of these groups as you are aware of by using as many of the following charts as you need. In addition, next to every person's name in each sub-group, indicate whether you believe him to be a high (H), middle (M) or low (L) status member of that sub-group.

Group 1:

Group 2:

Group 3:

Group 4:

Group 5:

Group 6:

Name: _____

Within each sub-group, list in rank order those individuals who demonstrate the most effective ability for getting plans and activities started.

Group 1:

Group 2:

Group 3:

Group 4:

Group 5:

Group 6:

Name: _____

Finally, it can be said that some of the individuals within each of the previously listed sub-groups are more popular than other individuals in that sub-group. Try to list each member of every sub-group in terms of his popularity in that sub-group by going from the most popular to the least popular.

Group 1:

Group 2:

Group 3:

Group 4:

Group 5:

Group 6:

APPENDIX B

Name: _____

Yr. in College: _____

This is part of a study being conducted in an attempt to get a national picture concerning college fraternity member socialization patterns. It has been hypothesized that socialization patterns started during pledge days are important in setting the pattern as to what happens during Junior and Senior years. Your statements will be held in the strictest of confidence and will not be used in any way to evaluate you. Names are needed only for the coding of IBM cards which will be sent to another campus. Your help is needed and appreciated.

1. List in order of importance those fraternity brothers who constitute your closest circle of friends.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Of the above, with whom do you spend the most time? (List in order of amount of time spent)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. If housing were to be set up in units capable of handling six people, who would be the five people you would choose to live with? (List in order of preference)

1) _____	4) _____
2) _____	5) _____
3) _____	

4. If you had to depend on a friend's judgment in a difficult situation who would you trust first? (List in order of preference)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. If campus civil defense units were created and you were a part of it, who among your friends could get the plans and activities of your group started and see that things get done? (List in order of acceptability)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. Who would you pick to take orders from in the small group of half a dozen or so that you would be with? (List in order of preference)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. Who would you pick to be the Lieutenants? Name Two:

_____	_____
-------	-------

8. Generally, would you say that most of your close friends are also members who pledged the same time as you, or are they from other classes? Why do you think this is so? (Whatever the case may be) Please write a sentence or two concerning this. Thank you.

VITA

Robert Lew Montgomery

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE RELATION OF STATUS AND CONFORMITY IN NATURAL GROUPS UNDER
DIFFERING JUDGMENTAL SCALES

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Grayson, Kentucky, July 2, 1941, the son of
of Everett Deforest and Ruth Glass Montgomery.

Education: Received elementary and two years of secondary educa-
tion in the Grayson, Kentucky school system; graduated from
Bellaire High School, Bellaire, Ohio, June, 1959. Attended
Ohio University from 1959 until 1962; received Bachelor of
Arts degree with a major in Psychology from Bethany College,
Bethany, West Virginia in June, 1964; received the Master of
Science degree from the Oklahoma State University, with a
major in Psychology, in May, 1967; completed requirements for
the Doctor of Philosophy degree in July, 1968.

Professional Experience: Served as a research trainee in mental
retardation while also working as a research assistant in
social psychology at Oklahoma State University from September,
1964 through July, 1966; was a graduate teaching assistant at
Oklahoma State University, from June, 1966 to May, 1967; was
a NDEA fellow at Oklahoma State University from September,
1967 to July, 1968.