

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE,

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED,

UNCLASSIFIED

AD

232 745

Reproduced

Armed Services Technical Information Agency

ARLINGTON HALL STATION; ARLINGTON 12 VIRGINIA

NOTICE: WHEN GOVERNMENT OR OTHER DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS OR OTHER DATA ARE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN IN CONNECTION WITH A DEFINITELY RELATED GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OPERATION, THE U. S. GOVERNMENT THEREBY INCURS NO RESPONSIBILITY, NOR ANY OBLIGATION WHATSOEVER; AND THE FACT THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY HAVE FORMULATED, FURNISHED, OR IN ANY WAY SUPPLIED THE SAID DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS, OR OTHER DATA IS NOT TO BE REGARDED BY IMPLICATION OR OTHERWISE AS IN ANY MANNER LICENSING THE HOLDER OR ANY OTHER PERSON OR CORPORATION, OR CONVEYING ANY RIGHTS OR PERMISSION TO MANUFACTURE, USE OR SELL ANY PATENTED INVENTION THAT MAY IN ANY WAY BE RELATED THERETO.

UNCLASSIFIED

5

AD No. 232745

AD No.

ASTIA FILE COPY

Emergent Leadership and Social Influence

by

E. P. Hollander

FC

Prepared Under ONR Contract 816 (12) -

Variables Underlying Group Expectancies and Leadership

December, 1959

Duplicating assistance furnished by
The Social Science Institute
Washington University

FILE COPY

Return to
ASTIA
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA
•
Attn: TISSS

N-60-2-6

ASTIA
RECEIVED
FEB 26 1960
TIPOR

Emergent Leadership and Social Influence*

E. P. Hollander

Washington University

The term "leader" is of such breadth that it is best at the outset to indicate that we use it here to signify, in general, a status permitting the exercise of influence over certain other individuals. Specifically, our concern is directed toward leaders deriving status from followers who may accord or withdraw it in an essentially free interchange within a group context. Group consent is therefore a central feature in the leader-follower relationships touched on here, though this constraint does not mean a total neglect of conceivable implications from the simple dyad to institutionally based formal groups or societies.

Our intention for the most part is to offer some observations and empirical findings which in the first place strike at the persisting notion of a dichotomy between leadership and followership; the burden of this message will be carried initially by results from sociometric research. In due course, a theoretical model will be offered which treats the emergence of status and assertion of influence as outputs from interaction centered in interpersonal perception. Finally, findings from a laboratory experiment with groups will be introduced, particularly to underscore conceptions from the model concerning perceived competence and conformity in differentially affecting these two outputs.

*This paper was prepared originally for presentation at the Office of Naval Research Symposium on "Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior" held at the Louisiana State University in March, 1959. It is to appear in its present form in a volume by that title to be published under the editorship of Luigi Petrullo and Bernard M. Bass by Henry Holt during 1960. The author is grateful to Kurt W. Back and John G. Darley whose constructive comments have proven useful in preparing this version. In the main, the work summarized here was variously carried on under ONR Contracts 1849 (00) and 760 (06) with the Carnegie Institute of Technology. The views expressed are the author's own, and, as usual, are not to be construed as reflecting those of the Department of the Navy. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any use of the United States Government.

Status in General

There are both different bases for status, and different expectations regarding its operational features. These defy ready cataloguing, but essentially status in our usage here has to do with the placement of an individual along a dimension, or in a hierarchy, by virtue of some criterion of value. To say that an individual has "status" does not describe an intrinsic attribute nor a stable pattern of his behavior; rather it is in the form of an assertion regarding the relationship of that individual to certain others, and their attendant behavior toward him. Interpersonal perception is necessarily integral to this process.

Who perceives what about whom is of central importance not just in terms of the literal case, but also in terms of expectancies. The behavior of the object person is not seen by itself alone; it is also effectively matched against a standard of expectation held by the perceiver. Before a status distinction can arise, therefore, two things must hold: an arousal of a socially-conditioned expectancy, and a flow of information regarding the object person. The perceiver will have had some exposure to the perceived through direct experience, or through secondary sources; this leads to a perceptual differentiation which underpins a shift in "behavior toward."

Granting, as an example, that a millionaire possesses a fairly uniform degree of higher status in our society, he operates without it if he moves about unshaven, unkempt, and unknown, among strangers. Even though an economic criterion and an expectancy already exist for a status distinction, the relevant information is absent. In this instance, the emergence of status is linked to one kind of standard, though a wide array of others could apply (Hyman, 1942). What the relative impact of these will be resides in complex issues of value. In any case, status is not a sole and stable function of some given feature of social interaction between two particular individuals. Cross-pressures of time and place affect the balance.

If leaders occupy a given status relative to followers, we may consider that this is a function of the way the former are at some moment perceived and reacted to by the latter. Gibb has made the point this way: "Followers subordinate themselves, not to an individual whom they perceive as utterly different, but to a member of their group who has superiority at this time and whom they perceive to be fundamentally the same as they are, and who may, at other times, be prepared to follow" (Gibb, 1954, p.915). To be

a follower is not, nor need it be, inconsistent with being a leader, in time. This begs the question of the persisting "dichotomy," which makes it useful to reconstruct a bit of history.

The Changing Approach to Leadership

The tradition of concern and controversy about leadership extends far back into the fabric of social philosophy, providing as it did the first backdrop for the empirical study of leadership. While recent research has seen a displacement of "the leader" from his traditional position at center-stage, not very long ago it was typical to indulge in a quest for "traits" of leadership which were thought to characterize its practitioners broadly.

Though essentially a matter of emphasis, as in the work of Cowley (1931), traits were picked upon largely independent of situational variants. This diffuseness gave way to the recognition of a useful distinction between appointed leaders and those who emerged through the willing response of followers. Partly, this was a response to the burgeoning interest in informal groups with their self-generating status hierarchies; and partly, it grew from the accessibility of sociometric devices providing an avenue for the study of the consensual choice patterns of various groups.

During this phase, popularity as a feature of group-emergent leadership was given weight to a disproportionate degree. Much of the earlier sociometric work equated choice as a roommate, or as a study companion, with choice as a leader, and several well-known and substantial studies gave credence to this presumed parity, though only within a limited context, as for example, in the girls' school study by Jennings (1943).

Eventually, both the trait and popularity emphases were subordinated to a focus on the varying demands for leadership imposed by the immediate situation (e.g., Hemphill, 1949; Carter, Haythorn, Shriver and Lanzetta, 1951). The literature survey by Stogdill (1948) on personal factors associated with leadership was quite decisive in pointing up the disordered state of the earlier viewpoint, across situations. It was not as though the situational view prevailed entirely, however; influential as it was, the literature reflected some dissent (e.g., Gibb, 1950; Bell and French, 1950). We have this appropriate comment by Gouldner: "The group contexts of leadership must be specified if a formalism sterile of action utility is to be avoided. Leadership must be examined in specific kinds of situations, facing distinctive problems. The

opposite shortcoming must also be detoured; in other words, the similarities among some leadership situations or problems must be emphasized. Failure to do so would enmesh our investigation in an infinite analysis of unique situations as devoid of practical potentiality as the formalist approach" (Gouldner, 1950, p. 13).

Still another refinement within the situational framework was an awareness that followers define the situation in responding to leadership; they are not passive creatures of a frozen social matrix. Of his research on the follower as an alert participant, F. H. Sanford has said: "There is some justification for regarding the follower as the most crucial factor in any leadership event and for arguing that research directed at the follower will eventually yield a handsome pay-off. Not only is it the follower who accepts or rejects leadership, but it is the follower who perceives both the leader and the situation and who reacts in terms of what he perceives. And what he perceives may be, to an important degree, a function of his own motivations, frames of references, and 'readinesses' " (Sanford, 1950, p.4).

Several viewpoints may thus be seen to have been held concerning leadership and followership. First, a search for characteristics of the leader, with the presumption that there is some universality among these; second, a concern with group-emergent leadership where popularity among followers may be of significance; third, a focus upon situational factors which determine, or program, the demands made upon leadership and for leadership; and finally, an interest in the more subtle interplay of motives and perceptions between followers and their leaders.

If any current leaning is discernible, it would appear to be in the direction of a focus upon the interaction between individuals and its consequences for influence assertion and acceptance. We become in this way more acute in noting how interpersonal perception affects and accomodates to status differentiation, as seen for example in the recent work of Jones and deCharms (1957) and Dittes and Kelley (1957).

While it is true that two individuals may bear a stable relationship to one another in a given situation, the demands made upon them in a changing situation could reasonably alter their interpersonal behavior, assuming the necessary volitional conditions; being a leader or follower through the course of time or within a given group setting is not then a fixed state. The context for study consequently becomes more than the immediate situation in

which interactions occur, but the past interactions of the parties involved and their impressions of each other, as well. The development of newer sociometric approaches has abetted this focus.

Sociometric Techniques in the Study of Leadership

Leadership and interpersonal attraction have been studied more by sociometric techniques, it is fair to say, than in any other way. It is useful therefore to note in perspective the changing complexion of the service these have provided. In early work, with the sociogram, the essential thing was the interpersonal choice pattern, especially in indicating group members to be isolates or stars. With time scores were generated through the adaptation of the "peer nomination" as one kind of peer rating procedure for evaluation (Hollander, 1954a and 1954b). This approach permits useful indices to be derived of a person's qualities as seen by his fellow group members. A significant parallel development centers about the probing of the basis for group members' perceptions of one another. This extension answers questions regarding the locus of evaluation -- whether in the perceiver, the perceived, the situation in which they are immersed, or various possible combinations and weightings of these. Use of sociometric techniques in this more analytic fashion exposes bases for interpersonal attraction and reciprocal choice. (Tagiuri, 1952).

For the simple case of two persons interacting, attraction is often attributed to a similarity of perception (cf. Homans, 1950; Newcomb, 1956). The literature regarding complementary roles bears out the contention that a common frame of reference, some commerce of understanding, disposes toward interpersonal attraction (Mead, 1934). Thus, in the simplest case of friendship formation, mutually reinforcing patterns of behavior are seen to derive from a shared perception, or attitude.

For several reasons, though, it's mistaken to take this as a direct paradigm of leadership choice. Jennings (1947) has made a useful distinction in this vein, that between "psyche-tele" attraction directed by personal feelings, and attraction governed at least in part by a group standard, her "socio-tele". The chooser is of course the interpreter of this standard. Nevertheless, a greater degree of restraint is introduced in the process of choice by imposing this group set. The situational demands of the group or encompassing institution have a discernible impact on the chooser, as is evident from sociometric analysis.

Thus, depending upon the context, members of a group do indeed distinguish between those they like as friends and those they would wish to have as a leader, and this has been amply demonstrated in a number of studies. In one such study (Hollander, 1956), the friendship choices of officer candidates at the Newport OCS were found to be related variously to choices for other positively-loaded continua, i.e., "leadership qualities," "probability of success in OCS," and "interest in and enthusiasm for training." Simply liking an individual did not mean a positive evaluation of him so far as these other characteristics were concerned. A counterpart of this finding is to be seen in the laboratory work of Bales and Slater (1955), among others.

The traditions of sociometry set limits however, on our understanding of leadership and followership. One continues to find, for example, the assumption of an identity between leadership and such criteria as "want to study with" or "want to play with." Their utility for pinpointing leadership in the influence sense, is questionable. In this regard, Criswell (1949) has noted that these "sets" involve choice in the face of some expectation of reciprocation, thus making mutuality important; to the contrary, leadership choice makes it less important. Generally speaking, whether the leader chooses those who choose him is quite irrelevant to the more central consideration of the frequency with which he is chosen by others.

A collateral issue has to do with the criteria set for leadership and the extent to which these are rigorously specified within an operational setting. If we conceive of the leader's influence in terms of a continuum of power, then we may have a low power loading, as in the case of "lead this group in a discussion," or a high power loading, as in "command this squad in combat." Though an obvious distinction, it has too often been plainly absent from research; one suspects that a push is made for "some measure of leadership" or a "sociometric," and anything at hand or easily concocted gets used. No wonder then that the potential follower, asked to make an evaluation, seeks in vain for a meaningful frame of reference, and then makes a choice based in some abstract orientation toward the class "leaders," or perhaps worse, haphazardly.

These particulars are directed only incidentally at cleaning away the debris which clutters the use of sociometric techniques. More to the point, are the related and troublesome rubrics regarding leadership which still pervade its study. One of the more basic

of these holds that some few members of the group are perceived to have qualities appropriate to leadership and thus are frequent choices for that status. This may be referred to as the "pyramid model," with its peak comprised of leaders and its base of followers; it may be reduced alternatively to a simple continuum from those of high choice, presumed to be leaders, to those of less choice, presumed to be followers. In either case, the assumption is implicit that there exists a universe of peers among which individuals, placed in the vantage point of followers, differentiate others perceived to be "leaders." Followership thus becomes defined by sheer exclusion.

But supposing followership to be more active than passive, this would hardly prove an adequate basis for its appraisal. Is the follower, after all, just someone who is not a leader? To really pursue this one should invert the usual question of "whom to follow?" so as to render it "whom to have follow?" Group members placed thus in the position of leader would be called upon accordingly to differentiate individuals regarding characteristics appropriate to being followers.

If the pyramidal or continuum models are sound, one would expect that such an inversion of procedure would yield a diffusion of choice reflecting the operation of a friendship variable, or at least it should be so if followers are mainly friends. This might mean that some of the individuals otherwise selected as leaders would also be selected as followers, though on the whole one would expect that leaders should have a relatively lower standing on followership than the average standing for the group as a whole.

Research Findings on the "Pyramid Model"

A study taking account of the aforementioned points was completed by the author with Webb, and reported in 1955. Prominent among the considerations prompting that research was the view that the traditional sociometric model of leadership and followership might be open to challenge. Since our procedure rather directly followed the approach discussed, our data serve to address the issue squarely.

Eight sections of aviation cadets (total N = 187) were asked to complete three peer nomination forms upon graduation from a 16-week pre-flight course at Pensacola. The first two of these were on leadership and followership, the third on friendship. Each cadet was to assume that he was assigned to "a special military unit with an undisclosed mission," on both the leadership and followership

forms. Then, for leadership, he was asked to nominate in order three cadets from his section whom he considered best qualified to lead this special unit and three cadets from his section whom he considered least qualified. A similar set was presented for followership with the instruction that the cadet assume that he himself had been assigned to the leadership of this special unit; from among the members of his section, he was instructed to nominate three cadets whom he would want as part of his unit and three whom he would not want.

Both forms stressed the injunction that selections were to be made with regard to abilities which the nominator considered to be important for these positions. The third form solicited the names of three cadets in his section whom the nominator considered to be his best friends.

Scores from the former two nominations were derived by a weighting procedure of the three-two-one variety used elsewhere in similar projects (Hollander, 1954). The corrected split-half reliabilities for these variables were acceptably high: leadership, .94; followership, .91. Friendship, at .41, was understandably lower, due most likely to its diffuse basis.

Correlational analysis revealed leadership and followership nominations to be related to a high degree, $r = .92$. Friendship was found to have a significantly higher relationship with followership, $r = .55$, than with leadership, $r = .47$. But apart from this, friendship nominations were not found to bear appreciably on the basic leadership-followership relationship. Of the three friendship nominees designated by each subject, an average of more than two were not mentioned at all in the leadership nominations made by these same subjects.

One further finding deserves attention in light of previous remarks. If, as has been contended here, followership may be studied in terms of the desires of potential leaders, then one may raise the question of whether actual status on the leadership continuum renders a difference in followership choice. An analysis was then done to correlate the followership scores derived from nominations made by individuals in the top half and those in the bottom half of the leadership score distribution. Its value for followership scores independently summed from these two nominator segments was .82. It would seem therefore that chooser status did not make an appreciable difference in the choice of followers within these groups.

On this the results were clear: the more desired followers tended to be chosen from the upper extremes of the leadership distribution; indeed, the correspondence was marked. Furthermore, the influence of friendship, so often taken for leadership under the heading of "popularity," had little effect on this relationship.

In a later study by Kubany (1957) quite comparable results were found with medical school graduating seniors (N = 87). A high correlation obtained between peer nomination scores for choices on "family physician" and "turn over practice to" ($r = .85$). Neither of these were as highly correlated with "friend and social associate," and each was differentially correlated with peer nomination scores for professional knowledge, skill, and favorable interpersonal behaviors, with the former two of these last characteristics typifying more closely the "family physician" choice. We may consider that where one physician is prepared to give himself over to another for his own, personal care and that of his family, the latter may be viewed as a leader. Though operating within a professional relationship, his influence in interpersonal relations may be quite real; therefore, choices for "family physician" betray a view of the individual more in keeping with leadership. On the other hand, when one physician sees another as someone to whom he would "turn over his practice," this signifies a disposition more in line with followership since the chooser says in effect that this is someone whom he believes would take his directions and conscientiously fulfill them as a self-surrogate (Hollander, 1958b).

These data bolster the previous findings, but mainly in highlighting competence as a valued feature in a multiplicity of joint work situations. That individuals should choose potential leaders as those whom they would also wish to have as followers is not in itself surprising. For one thing, institutional hierarchies plainly create such demands, so that responding well as a follower is apt to be demanded at all levels. Common areas of competence are to be expected. But more important is the way competence may contribute to the development of leadership status, particularly when combined with still other interpersonal characteristics. Beyond one's ability at the task, followership holds an incipient state of leadership. Consequently, any model of leadership is deficient if it fails to account for transitions in status, especially as these are occasioned through the time-linked features of interaction.

Some Theoretical Implications

For emergent status, the findings amassed suggest two things in particular to be important in an individual's attainment of leadership. First, that he be seen as competent in the group's central task; and, second, that broadly speaking he be perceived as a member of the group -- what Brown (1936) has called "membership character." This might be put in other ways; an individual needs to be in a group long enough for others to note his part in fulfilling group goals, and for others to develop a degree of trust or esteem for him.

The first of these elements relates essentially to a task concern, flavored with the demands of the situation, the latter to a social concern. An individual manifesting both should reach a point eventually where it becomes more propitious in the eyes of the group for him to assert influence; to the degree that his assertion is accepted, he is a leader.

The particulars of this process follow obvious lines. Any group member is bound by the expectancies -- whether norms or roles -- which prevail at a time. To directly challenge these would very likely limit upward mobility, unless a person were extremely competent and, what is more, widely perceived as such. It is unlikely that just anyone in a group could achieve leadership by a suggestion for change at an early stage of membership. The social context is not yet favorable; this is the dilemma of the neophyte who is discontent with the ongoing state of affairs. It is a common observation in virtually all freely-interacting groups that the neophyte is frequently the most restricted of all in his sway. This leaves aside, of course, cases of status in one group readily redeemed in another, or of the "expert" not introduced by the traditional rites of admission.

In most instances, however, adherence to the prevailing expectancies of the group is essential for the group member's acceptance. We are in effect speaking then of conformity, but not in the usual sense of fixed behavioral norms to which all group members are expected to display manifest allegiance. Following on Sears' (1951) view of diadic relationships and their characteristics, we conceive of conformity in terms of "group expectancies" which may be person-specific and fluid, or more generally applicable and static. Thus, the prospect is covered that what may be perceived to be non-conforming for one group member may not be so perceived for another. Moreover, this is seen to be a function of status accumulated from past interactions. Here we introduce the construct "idiosyncrasy credit" to refer to status as a summative consequence of being perceived by

others as contributing to the group's task and living up to expectancies applicable at a time (Hollander, 1958a). These credits are essentially positively-disposed impressions of a person held by others; they provide, operationally, the basis for influence assertion and its acceptance. The apparent paradox that leaders are at once said to be innovators and also to be conformers to group norms therefore may be seen as a matter of sequence.

So long as the person does not lose credits by sharp breaks with a past record of competence and conformity to expectancies, he rises to a level of credit which permits deviation from, and even open challenge of, prevailing social patterns of the group. In attaining this level, however, the particular expectancies applicable to him will have undergone change so that it may be less appropriate to behave in the same way. For the attainment of leadership then it would seem that two personal conditions must be fulfilled: accuracy of social perception, and modifiability of behavior.

The relationship of these points to research on emergent leadership is evident in several ways: the finding, for example, that leaders appear to be more socially perceptive (e.g., Chowdhry and Newcomb, 1952) is accounted for in these terms. In maintaining leadership, however, the leader could lose status and find his latitude diminished if he should violate those particularized expectancies associated with his commanding position; this would represent a drainage of credit. Thus, as one case in point, if the leader's motivation to belong -- assumed thus far -- were to be seen by followers as weak or insincere, such an outcome would be predicted. Even more, if the group expects innovation in the face of a perceived change in the situational requirements, inaction by the leader would be far from a "safe" course. Who becomes a leader and retains leadership will therefore depend upon the perceptions held by others, residing in "credits" accrued from past interactions; the incipient leader must be attuned to these, even if implicitly; and this stochastic interchange involves a continual checking against the situation perceived to confront the group.

Experimental Work on Idiosyncrasy Credit

Guided by this model, a controlled study with problem-solving groups was conceived so as to test the effects upon influence acceptance produced by the non-conformity to procedural norms of a task competent member.

In general, it is predictable that with a relatively high level of task competence a group member should have increased influence, to some maximum, over time. However, if he non-conforms to the procedural norms of the group this should curtail his influence. More precisely, it follows from the model that given the display of a constant level of competence on the task by this person, his early non-conformity should diminish his effectiveness in gaining influence acceptance; and, to the contrary, late evidence of non-conformity -- following the accumulation of "credits" -- should yield the reverse effect: once having attained higher status, he should be subject to a shift in expectancies which make this kind of "non-conformity" a confirming feature of status, thus enhancing his influence.

Twelve groups, each composed of male juniors from the College of Engineering and Science at Carnegie, were engaged in a task involving a sequence of fifteen trials requiring group choices from among row alternatives in a seven-by-seven pay-off matrix (see Figure 1). The alleged object was to anticipate a "system" and maximize winnings. A confederate, always the same individual, irrespective of treatment, was present in all groups as a fifth member among four subjects. All communication was carried on through a sound-system of microphones and headsets. The participants had only aural contact with one another, therefore, from individual, partitioned booths.

The key manipulation was non-conformity by the confederate, by various zones of five trials each, to procedures previously agreed upon by the group in a pre-trial discussion. The fifteen trials were considered as three zones -- essentially, early, middle, and late -- with the discussion taken to be part of the first zone. A group choice, whether by majority rule or otherwise (this determined by the group) was required for each trial, following the three minutes permitted for considering alternatives. At the conclusion of each trial, the experimenter announced the outcome, i.e., a negative or positive sum of varying magnitudes representing funds won or lost.

Six treatments were used: non-conformity throughout; non-conformity for the first two zones; for just the first zone alone; for the last two zones; for just the last zone alone; and not at all, a control. Each subject was heard to report his recommended choice at least once during every one of the trials. Had it been accepted by the group as its own, the choice recommended by the confederate would have yielded the higher pay-offs on all but four

Figure 1

	Green	Red	Blue	Yellow	Brown	Orange	Black
Able	-1	-12	+5	-1	-2	+15	-4
Baker	+10	-1	-2	-7	+4	-3	-1
Charlie	-5	+5	-3	+3	-11	-1	+12
Dog	+5	-7	+10	-2	-5	+1	-2
Easy	-4	-1	-1	+1	+13	-10	+2
Fox	-6	+15	-5	-1	-3	-1	+1
George	-1	-1	-2	+10	+4	-2	-8

Group members were instructed: "In any one trial, the task involved is for the group to agree on just one row -- identified by Able, Baker, Charlie, etc. -- which seems to have strategic value. Once the group has determined a row, the experimenter will announce the column color which comes up on that trial. The intersecting cells indicate the pay-off."

trials, i.e., the second, third, sixth, and twelfth, where a loss would have been sustained from accepting his recommendation.

Subjects were designated by number in communicating with one another; the confederate in the first set of treatments was number "5" and, in the replication set, number "4" to test possible position effects. A ready measure of the group's acceptance of the confederate's influence on the task was provided in the number of trials by zone where his recommended response was accepted as the group's, in addition to interaction measures and post-interaction assessments secured from the subjects.

The matrix was specially constructed for this study to present an ambiguous but plausible task where alternatives were only marginally discrete from one another. It derives, at least in spirit, from a small matrix used with success by Moore and Berkowitz (1956) in a group study of their own. The considerably greater number of rows and columns was selected to enlarge the range of possibilities beyond the number of group members, while still retaining comprehensibility. Though the rows are unequal in algebraic sum this appears to be less important as a choice element than the number and magnitude of positive and negative values in each; there is moreover the complicating feature of processing the outcome of the last trials in evaluating the choice for the next. All considered, the matrix was admirably suited to the requirements for ambiguity, challenge, conflict, immediate reinforcement, and ready manipulation by the experimenter.

The confederate, operating either as "4" or "5" in the group, suggested a solution which differed trial by trial from those offered by other members of the group. This was pre-arranged and subject to modification, depending upon unforeseen eventualities. Though contrived, this was in no sense unique behavior since subjects rather typically perceived alternatives differently.

The device of a pre-trial discussion, during which the communication system was "tried out," had special utility for establishing common group expectancies (procedures) from which the confederate could deviate when called for in the design. The subjects had been brought to their booths individually without knowledge of the other participants. Each had then been given a set of written instructions and the matrix to look over briefly, in advance of the experiment. The first indicated order of business was to make use of the communication arrangement to have the group members, always identified by an assigned number, determine certain procedures.

They were to decide on order of reporting, on whether a majority rule should apply and, if so, how large for a group choice to be reached, and on the division of funds later. In the pre-trial discussion, predictable decisions on these matters were reached: members would report their views in order at the beginning of each trial; simple majority rule would prevail; and funds would be shared equally. These were routine decisions, and all were subject to revision during the trials; their importance, however, lay in having a public statement of intent in which members had shared.

In the zones calling for non-conformity, the confederate violated these procedures by speaking out of prescribed turn, by questioning the utility of majority rule, and by unsupported -- but not harsh -- challenges to the recommendations made by others. He manifested such behaviors on an approximate frequency of at least one of these per trial with a mean of two per trial considered optimum. Thus, he would break in with his choice immediately after an earlier respondent had spoken and before the next in sequence could do so; when there were periods of silence during a trial he would observe aloud that maybe majority rule didn't work so well; and he would show a lack of enthusiasm for the choice offered by various others on the matter of basis. Lest he lose credibility and become a caricature, in all instances he chose his moments with care and retained an evident spontaneity of expression.

The task gave quite satisfactory signs of engrossing the subjects. There was much talk about the "system" and a good deal of delving into its basis, made the more so by the academic background of these students; one corroboration of this was found in the returned matrices, littered with diagrams, notations and calculations. Withal, the confederate's tentative accounts of his "reasoning," though quite meaningless in fact, were treated with apparent seriousness nonetheless. But this was probably as much a function of the contrived time constraint, which prevented probing, as it was of his jargon regarding "rotations" and "block shifts." In any case, the confederate at no time claimed to have the system completely in hand. He delayed his response from the sixth trial onward to suggest calculation of an optimum choice in the face of conflicting alternatives; and the four trials where he was "wrong" were so placed as to suggest progressive improvement, but not total perfection.

Most pertinent, however, is the fact that there were no manifestations of suspicion concerning the confederate's authenticity; the others seemed to believe that he was one of them and that he was "cracking" the system; and the post-interaction data fully

substantiated this point as well.^{1/}

Table 1 provides the basis for determining the effects of three major variables on the acceptance of the confederate's influence. The analysis is arranged by zones (Z) of trials, and in terms of the confederate's non-conformity (N-C) in the current zone and immediate past zone.^{2/} The means given in each cell indicate the number of trials, of five per zone, on which the confederate's choice was the group's choice. In a chi-squared test, the effect of position upon this measure was found to be non-significant and is therefore omitted as a distinction in the analysis of variance for the table's data.

Table 1

Mean Number of Trials of Five Each for Three Zones of Time
Where a Group Accepts Confederate's Recommended Solution
With and Without Procedural Non-Conformity by Him
for the Current Zone and Immediate Past Zone of Time

	ZONE I (Trials 1 to 5)		ZONE II (Trials 6 to 10)		ZONE III (Trials 11 to 15)	
	<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>
<u>With</u> Procedural Non-Conformity in Immediate Past Zone	1.67 6*	--	3.25 4	3.00 2	4.00 4	5.00 2
<u>Without</u> Procedural Non-Conformity in Immediate Past Zone	--	2.00 6	5.00 2	3.75 4	5.00 2	4.75 4

*Indicates Number of Groups upon which Cell is Based

¹This presents an opportunity to note my great indebtedness to H. E. Titus who not only took the confederate's role here but served as my close associate in every phase of this study. - E.P.H.

²For Zone I the past zone refers to the discussion period. If he was to non-conform there, the confederate would question majority rule and suggest that the division of funds be left until the end of the experiment rather than agree then on equal shares.

The significant F secured from Zones may be interpreted to accord with prediction. It reveals the ongoing effect of task competence in increasing influence acceptance over time, seen in the rising means across zones. While current non-conformity does not yield a significant effect, past non-conformity does. Horizontally, one finds that the means for "without" past N-C exceed the means for "with" past N-C in all instances but one. Regarding a significant interaction found for current and past N-C, the combination "without-without" yields values (2.00, 3.75, 4.75) characteristically greater than does "with-with" (1.67, 3.25, 4.00), again matching prediction. Finally, the maximum value of 5.00 in Zone II for the combination "without" past N-C but "with" current N-C confirms the model's key prediction, at least within the context of the relative magnitudes available here; the same value is also to be seen in Zone III for the identical combination; still another reading of 5.00 holds there, however, for the inverse combination, but in a tight range of values quite beyond separation of effects for interpretation.^{3/}

Considerable consistency was found too in the post-interaction data. On the item "over-all contribution to the group activity," 44 of the 48 subjects ranked the confederate first; on the item "influence over the group's decisions," 45 of the 48 ranked him first. Two things bear emphasis in this regard: subjects had to individually write in the numbers of group members next to rank, hence demanding recall; and their polarity of response cut across all six treatments, despite significant differences among these in the literal acceptance of influence. That the confederate therefore made an impact is clear; but that it had selective consequence depending upon the timing of his non-conformity is equally clear.

It remains to be said that though the operational variables for studying influence were confined to the task itself, the matter of transfer of effect to non-task elements remains an important one insofar as it betrays alteration of common expectancies, apart from deviating from them. On this point some unquantified but clearly suggestive data are worth noting. In those groups, for example, where the confederate began non-conforming after the first zone, such behavior was accepted with minimal challenge; by the third zone, his suggestion that majority rule was faulty typically netted a rubber-stamping of his choice. Again, if he had already accrued credit, the pattern of interrupting people out of turn was simply imitated by others. Not so, however,

^{3/} For a fuller consideration of this analysis see Hollander, 1959.

when he exhibited non-conformity from the outset; in that event, quite opposite effects were elicited from the others, notably such comments of censure as "that's not the way we agreed to do it, five." These findings then are essentially supportive of the model in corroborating differential impressions conveyed by the confederate's behavior in time.

Conclusions

Two concerns have especially guided the emphasis in this paper: first, the variables yielding status differentiation in terms of potential influence; and, second, the basis for an acceptance of influence. It has been pointed out that social interaction gives rise to what may be thought of as an implicit interpersonal assessment, and that this is compounded of task-related elements and behaviors matched by the perceiver against some social standard, referred to here as an "expectancy."

Where an individual fulfills these conditions in some combination over time, he is said to have accumulated "idiosyncrasy credits" and, at some threshold, these permit innovation in the group as one evidence of social influence. Thus the task competent "follower" who conforms to the common expectancies of the group at one stage of time may become the "leader" at the next stage of time. And, correspondingly, the "leader" who fails to fulfill the expectancies associated with his position of influence may lose "credits" among his followers and be replaced by one of them. The research findings offered demonstrate features of this interchange.

References

- Bales, R.F., & Slater, F. Role differentiation. In T. Parsons, R.F. Bales et al., Family, socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955
- Bell, G.B., and French, R.L. Consistency of individual leadership position in small groups of varying membership. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol. 1950. 45, 764-767
- Brown, J.F. Psychology in the social order. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.
- Carter, L.F., Haythorn, W., Shriver, Beatrice, and Lanzetta, J. The behavior of leaders and other group members. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1951, 46, 589-595.
- Chowdhry, Kamla, and Newcomb, T.M. The relative abilities of leaders and non-leaders to estimate opinions of their own groups. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 51-57.
- Cowley, W.H. The traits of face-to-face leaders. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1931, 26, 304-313
- Criswell, Joan H. Sociometric concepts in personnel administration. Sociometry, 12, 287-300.
- Dittes, J.E. and Kelley, H.H. Effects of different conditions of acceptance upon conformity to group norms. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 100-107.
- Fiedler, F.E. Assumed similarity measures as predictors of team effectiveness. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 381-388.
- Gibb, C.A. The principles and traits of leadership. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1947, 42, 267-284
- Gibb, C.A. The sociometry of leadership in temporary groups. Sociometry, 1950, 13, 226-243
- Gibb, C.A. Leadership, In G. Lindzey (Ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology, 1954, Vol. II, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Gouldner, A.W. (Ed.) Studies in leadership. 1950, New York: Harper.

References

- Hemphill, J.K. Situational factors in leadership. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1949.
- Hollander, E.P. Studies of leadership among naval aviation cadets. Journal of Aviation Medicine. 1954, 25, 164-170, 200.
- Hollander, E.P. Buddy ratings: military research and industrial implications. Personnel Psychol., 1954, 7, 385-393.
- Hollander, E.P. and Webb, W.B. Leadership, followership, and friendship: an analysis of peer nominations. J. abnorm.soc. Psychol., 1955, 50, 163-167.
- Hollander, E.P. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit, Psychol. rev., 1958, 65, 117-127.
- Hollander, E.P. Some further findings on leadership, followership, and friendship. ONR Technical Report, Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, November, 1958.
- Hollander, E.P. An Experimental study of idiosyncratic behavior and status. ONR Technical Report, Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, May, 1959.
- Homans, G.C. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.
- Hyman, H.H. The psychology of status. Arch. Psychol. N.Y. #269, 1942.
- Jennings, Helen Hall. Leadership and isolation. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1943.
- Jennings, Helen Hall. Sociometry of leadership. Sociometry Monographs, 1947, #14, 12-24.
- Jones, E.E. and deCharms, R. Changes in social perception as a function of the personal relevance of behavior. Sociometry, 1957, 20, 75-85.
- Kubany, A.J. Evaluation of medical student clinical performance: a criterion study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Mead, G.H. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago.

References

- Moore, O.K. and Berkowitz, M.I. Problem solving and social interaction. Tech. Rep. No. 1, Contract Nonr-609(16). New Haven: Yale University Department of Sociology, November, 1956.
- Newcomb, T.M. The prediction of Interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586
- Sanford, F.H. Authoritarianism and leadership. Phila.: Institute for Research in Human Relations, 1950.
- Sears, R.R. A theoretical framework for personality and social behavior. Amer. Psychologist, 1951, 6, 476-482
- Stogdill, R.N. Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. J. Psychol. 1948, 25, 35-71
- Tagiuri, R. Relational analysis: an extension of sociometric method with emphasis upon social perception. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 91-104.

UNCLASSIFIED

AD

232 745

Reproduced

Armed Services Technical Information Agency

ARLINGTON HALL STATION; ARLINGTON 12 VIRGINIA

NOTICE: WHEN GOVERNMENT OR OTHER DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS OR OTHER DATA ARE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN IN CONNECTION WITH A DEFINITELY RELATED GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OPERATION, THE U. S. GOVERNMENT THEREBY INCURS NO RESPONSIBILITY, NOR ANY OBLIGATION WHATSOEVER; AND THE FACT THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY HAVE FORMULATED, FURNISHED, OR IN ANY WAY SUPPLIED THE SAID DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS, OR OTHER DATA IS NOT TO BE REGARDED BY IMPLICATION OR OTHERWISE AS IN ANY MANNER LICENSING THE HOLDER OR ANY OTHER PERSON OR CORPORATION, OR CONVEYING ANY RIGHTS OR PERMISSION TO MANUFACTURE, USE OR SELL ANY PATENTED INVENTION THAT MAY IN ANY WAY BE RELATED THERETO.

UNCLASSIFIED