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1.1: **NATURE OF THE SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR:**

India is a classical heart of the globe. Modernized, civilized and sanskritized values are affecting different corners of Indian Society. City planners, demographers and Social workers are facing a lot of challenges in transitional stage of development in country like ours.

At present, most of the psychologists believe that man is a product of social situations. In Watsonian behaviourism behaviour is analyzed in terms of stimulus and response, viz. $B=f(S-R)$. One step ahead, Woodworth (1938) accepted the notion of organismic variable- organism is a central figure between input and output. Another term ‘experience’ also came in light by British Psychologists. They explained it in terms of empiricism. K. Lewin (1936) explained behaviour as function of person (P) and environment (E). This was rather wide approach to explain behaviour in terms of psychology. To some extent, we can say that it was a neo-gestalten approach to explain this term. Other classical and modern schools of psychology have tried to give their philosophies to explain ‘person’ not ‘behaviour’.

Society never begins alone. It needs two persons. Social behaviour reflects a demarcation from behaviour on ground of social situations only. Behaviour conducted by people in different social situations may be termed and explained as social behaviour. Social psychologists always have tried to explain social behaviour in
terms of social interaction. Singh and others (.............) have analysed three levels of social behaviour in contexts of interaction-person to person, person to group, and group to group. Different forms of social behaviour in terms of intra- and inter personal social conducts are studied by researchers.

In Social psychology, a person can be judged on two grounds- personal and social realities. If a person behaves in same manner on different occasions it reflects his consistency of personality. Or, he is judged by different judges on same line then we can conclude high level of reliability and validity in his personality. Here present researcher wants to emphasise that society plays a very crucial role in social dynamics of a person. Social interaction may take difference forms e.g. co-operation, competition conflict etc. In society there are so may forms of group pressure that hinges upon personality of a person. Among them, conformity plays very crucial role. A person is always in combat between individuality and social demands. Such type of conflict-situations always we experience in our daily life. Technically it is called conformity. So conformity is classic example of social behaviour. Because psychology is widening very fast. A series of new factors are emerging before academicians. So conformity should be widened with new horizons of variables and, here it has tried to cover up whole scenario at this juncture.
From different corners, varied definitions of conformity emerged in social psychology and recently, in psychology of personality. Here, it needs a crucial analysis. Mills (1971) defines conformity in following words:

"Conformity is defined as some behavioural or attitudinal change that occurs as the result of some real or imagined group pressure." Asch (1952), Homans (1961), Walker and Heyn (1962), Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962), Secord and Backman (1964) have accepted this well established definition.

Cooper and Worschel (1971) define this term in his book ‘Understand Social Behaviour’ in these wordings:

"In order to classify a behaviour as conformity, it must involve the person’s yielding or giving to the group."

Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) point out that "for there to be conformity, there must be conflict." The conflict, an organismic variable according to Singh (1990), is between the way the individual wants to act and the way in which the group presses him to behave. Finally, they have defined the conformity as "the yielding of individual’s judgement or action to group pressure arising from a conflict
between his own opinion and that mentioned by the group."

Kiesler and Kiesler (1967) indicate through their definition about two dimensions of group pressure—'real' or 'imagined'. And, they have defined conformity "as a change in behaviour or belief toward a group as result of real or imagined group pressure". This definition indicates that individual wants to change his behaviour and act in a way even he would not without the group pressure.

Mills in his book "Experimental Social Psychology" (1971) has described the termed conformity in rather three distinct and divergent ways in which the term is currently being used in the psychological literature. They are—

(a) Conformity as an enduring personality characteristics.

(b) Conformity as a cognitive or attitudinal change as a results of some real or imagined group pressure.

(c) Conformity as "going along with the group" regardless whether the group includes one other members or a hundred others.

Now, incoming paraphrases, there is explanation of these three definitions.
(1) **First definition:** It is a review of conformity as a personality or organismic variable based upon principle of individual differences. It gives us scientific answer to the question why there is variation among group members in the extent to which they conform and the assumption underlying this definition is that, regardless of other relevant variables e.g. ambiguity of the stimulus size of the group, there are some people who consistently conforms more than others.

(2) **Second definition:** If we define the conformity as acceptance of opinion of others at two levels- cognitive and affective, then we can see a similarity between conformity and attitudinal change. Schoplar and Insko in their book 'Experimental Social Psychology' (1972) have differentiated their two terms with three aspects-

(a) The field of attitude change includes both social and non-social influence, while the field of conformity includes only social influence.

(b) The field of attitude change puts relatively greater emphasis upon affective and cognitive change and relatively less emphasis upon behavioural change. While the
field of conformity puts vice-versa emphasis against attitude change

(c) The field of conformity only includes the social influence while this is not the case for the field of attitude change.

(3) **Third Definition:** As the person ages, he learns about reality and corrects his behaviour from two sources of information—personal and social. The personal experiences are gained through trial and error learning often it is called 'Learning the hard way' (Cooper and Warchel, 1976). The second source of information may be supplied by the other persons or groups. The person may learn the 'correct' ways to do things by receiving social information from groups to which he belongs.

Singh (1990) has advocated in his doctoral dissertation that two kinds of realities—personal and social, always impinge their pressure upon us. So most of social psychologists seem conformity as outcome of social reality that may be called external pressure. Conformity to what? For external reality. At this level, conformity may be accepted as social disposition. Again, another issue he raises for its conceptualisation. A person experiences group pressures, he accepts its influences, and further he behaves accordingly or not. Behaviour consists three levels cognition,
affection and conation: and conformity should be explained at these three levels.

1.12 DIMENSIONS OF CONFORMITY:

There are so many dimensions of conformity. Polarity of expression, utility of social energizer, forms of social acceptance and rejection and other cues are basis of dimension of conformity. For its clear exposure, subject matter has been narrated in following headings:

CONFORMITY AND DEVIATION:

Defining conformity and deviation as mirror images of successful and rejected influences of other persons, we should always be attentive in their implementation. If a person avoids influence of other of his group, he may be treated as deviant. If a typical behaviour pattern is accepted procedure for the group as among Buddhists, such behaviour is not deviant. If withdrawal by one member results in the mass withdrawal of many other of group around him, such behaviour is treated as conformity rather than deviating behaviour e.g. such occurrence to the Anchorite monks up through middle of the fifth century A.D. in Egypt (Bass, 1960).

CONFORMITY AND INDEPENDENCE:

Asch (1961) noticed its applied aspect. Conformity should be considered as a
particular way of establishing an appropriate or fitting relation. Responsiveness, to social influence, i.e. conformity is not a psychological category. But an external classification, which consist quite heterogeneous phenomena. He has declared that agreement with others may be based on independent judgement of a person. So, to consider conformity as a psychological homogenous phenomena is as extreme simplification.

Independence is not simply the weakening of conformity or extreme pool of it, nor is conformity the dilution of independence. The respective trends are in opposition of each other, and they have their sources in distinct considerations and motives. The sources of independence and conformity are not the same, although they are always in relation. In the study of conformity, researcher should consider the productive tendencies of persons, as well as productive affects of group.

**CONFORMITY And NON-CONFORMITY:**

Sherif (1951) has analyzed that some individual maintains his conformistic trends through membership in his group, simultaneously relating himself psychologically to other groups or aspiring to belong to other groups is bound to feel frustration, conflicts and tension at a time. At this juncture of non-conformity, dissatisfaction and frustration in his association with a given group prevail. In
this uncertain and ambiguous situation, one may depend to those whose expertness and intentions one trusts. This enumeration is far from completeness; there are other circumstances that produce what we call conformity.

**COUNTER CONFORMITY Vs INDEPENDENCE**

Where group pressure is resisted, we know it as avoidance of conformity— a terminology for it “non-conformity”, that do not cover whole scene. One crucial type is counter conformity where the person is actively opposing the group being negativistic, hostile compulsively dissenting from it. In brief, for the counter conformist, the group serves as a negative reference group.

Distinct from both- conformity and counter conformity another type is of **independence** of judgement and action, wherein the individual makes up his own mind being able to “take the group or ......leave it” As his own good sense would dictate. The independent is might unduly susceptible to the group pressure nor unduly driven by alienation forces from the same. At least, these three are not the same (Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1986).

**COUNTER FORMITY Vs INDEPENDENCE:**

When group pressure is resisted, it is called avoidance of conformity, termed as “Non-conformity”, but it do not cover whole
scene. Where the person is actively opposing the group, being negativistic, hostile, compulsively dissenting from it, such behaviour trend is termed as "Counter-conformity". For him, the group serves as a negative reference group. Distinct from both conformist and counter conformist, another type is of independence who is neither unduly susceptible to the pressure of the group nor unduly driven by forces of alienation from the group. At least, Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) have concluded that conformity, independence and counterconformity are thus not to be understood same.

CONFORMITY, RESISTANCE AND ONVERSION

On the basis of interaction model, Helson (1955), and Sherif (1936) point out that conformity, resistance and conversion share basic psychological processes in interactions. These people point out that:

(a) With an acceptable framework a person can resist giving or accepting information that is inconsistent with that framework.

(b) In the absence of a stable framework he actively seeks to establish him through his own strivings by making use of significant and relevant information provided within the content of interaction.

(c) By controlling the amount and the kind of information available as framework
of orientation, he can be led to embrace confirming attitudes which are entirely foreign to earlier ways of thinking.

(d) Conversion can be produced by demonstrating in adequacy of the presently accepted frame of reference and then introducing another which is much satisfactory.

TWO FORMS OF CONFORMITY:

Kelman (1958) has pointed out that not all actions of confirming are identical in psycho-sense. In expedient conformity known as compliance, the person outwardly agrees with the group but remains inward agreement. And, in “true” confirming, the individual both inwardly and outwardly is brought to agree with the group. So, in case of compliance, as immediate group pressure is removed, he leaves the group scene.
1.13 PSYCHOSOCIAL MODELS AND CONFORMITY:

Social Psychology varies in the explanation of conformity. Different scholars have given their different model in this sense. So, in following paraphrases, certain models are elaborated of different psychologists.

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL MODEL AND CONFORMITY:

An world fame cultural anthropologist Kluckohn (1951) has stated that cultures vary in their interactional response, in accepted or over come forces, in good or bad nature of person, in importance of time, in learned values for goals of behaviour. In every culture, a limited number of problems exist for humans that require their solutions. When the solution already exists in that culture our subsequent responses are changed by that fellow. This changing of response pattern may be described as conformity in numerous ways where we learn different values in that cultural setting from membership.

Here Mead et. Al.(1939) have illustrated a conforming order of primitive societies as whole. At one pole, the Zuni, the Samoans, the Bathonga, and the Manus confirming societies to their group standards. In the Zuni, humility and self abase ment are highly valued. The
Samoan's behaviour must conform to his rank. The Bathonga have a highly co-operative economic order with little opportunity individual originality or rivalry in technology on social affairs. Among the Manus, personal tendencies and needs for affection, loyalty or love are banned. The only motivation behind this pattern to be successful group standard.

At the other pole, the Eskimo, the Obijiwa and the Bachiga have no conforming tendencies. Among the obijiwa, every member in the family owns his own individual property which he can transfer to anyone to his pleasure. Among them, there is no standard way of competing with others. Families and clans tend to break up. The non-conforming Eskimo has no social sanction against murder-widely deviating behaviour is tolerated.

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOUR MODEL
And CONFORMITY:

In this model Bass (1960) has explained conformity as behaviour reflecting the successful influence of other persons-this typical influence means to promote his understanding of one those accepting the successful influence. Further, he has alarmed that it is not to be inferred that successful influence produces only conformity. Here, Rokeach (1960) has noted that successful influence may yield
independent or what we will. At this juncture, it is very difficult to differentiate between two changes one from successful influence and second from individual's own influence for changing. In same series, another question arises that independence can not be restricted only to successful influence. For independent behaviour, non-personal stimuli, idiosyncratic needs and many other motives play their important roles.

Finally, he also advocates that a member will conform to the suggestion of another on a group of others to the extent he perceives himself as less able than the others. Just as conforming behaviour, it is behaviour reflecting the successful influence of other persons, deviating behaviour can be defined as behaviour reflecting the rejected influence of other persons.

AUTHORITARIAN MODEL AND CONFORMITY:

In the interests of conceptual clarification, Rokeach (1961) has analysed disparities, of this term with other parallel terms. Natural scientists always talk about law of determinism for physical/natural movements. Others define conformity as successful influence of others. Here, he gives his opinion that deterministically we would all be incorrigible conformists.
In psychology and sociology, some processes e.g. socialization, acculturation, adaptation and adjustment too are defined in terms of learning to confirm to the norms and values of society. At one step ahead, Parsons (1955,58) analyzes that conformity is treated as an integral and even necessary component of these processes. Such a view has been criticized by Mills (1959) as an apology for the status quo. A similar criticism by Lindner (1952) came in light in his analysis of contemporary conceptions of personality adjustment and maladjustment.

Again it is necessary to make a sharp distinction between conformity and socialization. Socialization through the psychological process of identification and internalization needs to be conceived as being not only in the service of conformity needs but also of independence needs. For conceptual clarity, conformity implies a loss of independence of belief and action by virtue of the inability to distinguish information from source; and socialization adjustment need not necessarily imply such a loss of independence.

GESTALTEN MODEL And CONFORMITY

A major clause of Gestalt and phenomenological approaches (Krech And Crutchfield, 1948 Snygg And Combs, 1949) is that a person's behaviour is a function of his "definition of the situation". So, a person's attributed meaning to a stimulus
is much important rather than stimulus itself in responding. This apology from laws of perception of Gestalt psychology was applied by Asch (1952) most systematically in the analysis of social behaviour.

Thus, Asch has reinterpreted the results, of the large experiment on prestige-suggestion- a subject may react differently to a given political passage accordingly different authors and their imposed different values of prestige suggestion. He says that meaning of the passage literally undergoes a transformation as authorship changes. Similar interpretations are made by Asch to account for the yielding behaviour of subjects in his widely known experiments on the effect of group pressures on distortions in judgement.

**PHENOMENOLOGICAL MODEL AND CONFORMITY:**

Phenomenologists talk about two operational level of behaviour- "inside" and "outside". In prior models, conformity has been defined as "outside" behaviour from this standpoint conformity is no problem because there are no conformist. This group of psychologists believe that conformity is from the "inside" where others believe its appearance from "outside". This "inside" is understandable, reasonable, and even insightful.

According to this model, people behave according to their definition of the situation. When distortions in action,
judgement or perception do occur they are “a consequence of pressures from the social sphere, not of tendencies whose sources is in the individual himself” (Asch, 1952).

As a source of information, this model’s ‘inside’ means the subject’s own reports, often retrospective reports, concerning mental processes and behaviour occurring earlier during own experiencing session. Berg and Bass (1961) have criticized that this model creates conceptual ambiguity on this point-phenomenologists believe that a person’s phenomenal field is organised, or meaningful or understandable so it is reasonable or insightful or understanding. Against this view, a classical example is psychotic’s phenomenal field that may be meaningful and understandable but may also be irrational and insightful.

**REINFORCEMENT MODEL And CONFORMITY:**

Bachrach, Candland, Gibson (1961) have presented this model with different alternatives present in a group. In this model, adequacy or inadequacy to produce and maintain the same behaviour of the group by the individual is crucial point and is determined by group’s reinforcement. Clearly speaking, if group’s reinforcement is adequate, individual produce and maintain adequate, same behaviour of the group- it means it is conformity situation. Or, in case
of vice versa, deviation situation may be experienced by the individual.

So conformity may be defined as a situation in which the group's reinforcement is adequate to produce and maintain behaviour by the individual, and in which the behaviour, in turn, positively reinforcing to the group. Deviation on the other hand, represents a situation in which the group's reinforcement is not adequate to produce and maintain the same behaviour by the individual, which would in turn be reinforcing to the group. Another possibility is that another group, G2 is providing the reinforcements for the individual behaviour, so that deviation from G1 may be a fact of conformity to G2. Other possible differential aspects of such reinforcement may be that a segment or subculture, of G1 may be positively reinforcing while the remainder of the Group is not.

SOCIAL EXCEPTION MODEL AND CONFORMITY:

Pepinsky (1959) has explained anti-directions of conformity on the basis of non conformity and productive model. First of all, nonconformity is defined as individual behaviour that, when viewed over time, is in both observed statistical and inferred psychological senses independent of the prevailing social norms. By such norms are meant the generally accepted standards against which the behaviour of given individuals in given situations is subject to
assessment. Secondly, productive nonconformity is independence that also can be shown to make a positive and significant contribution to either (1) the task accomplishment of a particular group organization, or society, or (2) the task accomplishment of an individual in a particular social setting.

SOCIAL WELFARE MODEL AND CONFORMITY:

Conformity an aspect of social behaviour most often associated with the idea of being well born, is easier to define than non-conformity. (Wechsler, 1961). Broadly speaking, a conformist is a person who does what is expected of him in any given society or subgroup of it i.e. complies with accepted rules of conduct. And nonconformity does not comply rules but defy prevailing thought on mores. He may religious and political dissident, beatnicle, delinquent and deviant. Here, deviancy implies atypically in statistical sense and abnormality in any one of a variety of meanings. A nonconformist may be disapproved, eccentric, immoral, and antisocial. These distinctions are based on cultural relativism that are not mutually exclusive and actually involve considerable overlap. Finally, he comments that non-conformist of today may be the conformist of tomorrow.
1.14 RESEARCHER VIEW ABOUT CONFORMITY:

Analyzing this scene it raised in my mind three sets of questions. First, why seems the great diversity of individuals among the large group, was their behaviour so uniform? Is social pressure sometimes powerful enough to obliterate individual differences? Where were the rugged individualists? In everyday life, is the heroic individualistic act always more easily fantasized than performed? Are we more susceptible to social influence than we realise? Does learning about social influence not liberate us from it? Should I have been displeased at “mindless conformity” or instead pleased at “group solidarity” and “social sensitivity”?

Such questions related to its utilitarian view always impinge to the present researcher and he has some theoretical solution about them, Let us consider last question first. Is conformity good or bad? This is another of those questions that has no scientific answer. However, assuming the values most of us share, two things can be said. First, conformity is at times bad for example, when it leads someone at a party to drink before driving home), at times good (for example, when it inhibits people from cutting in front of us in a theatre line), and at times relatively inconsequential (for example, when it disposes us to wear white when playing tennis).
In some cultures e.g. American and European society, it has negative label (conformity, submission and compliance) than positive ones (communal sensitivity, responsiveness and co-operative team play). People choose labels to suit their judgements. Labels both describe and evaluate. They are, however inescapable, so we should be always clear in our Indus about following labels: conformity, compliance, acceptance.

If you ask to an Indian subject about the acceptance of group pressure and accordingly to behave, majority of the group will respond “no” - we do not behave according to the others’ pressure, we freely behave. If inject them from another direction if you feel as a person acting against group norm. Immediately you will find a frequent positive answer-“No. I behave accordingly group norm”. Most of us are unaware about such pressure. Subconsciously people behave on group scenario in India. So, utilitarian aspect of the conformity should be clearly discussed by the researchers, scholars and social psychologists.

1.15 RESEARCH PARA DIGMS FOR CONFORMITY

The basic paradigms for conformity research can be undertitled in two sections-
A. Non-laboratory techniques.
B. Laboratory techniques.
This classification is based upon the feeling of the subjects that they are under experiment or not. If they feel themselves under experimental manipulations then we say those treatment manipulation-technique as laboratory techniques. These are-

**A: Sherif's Autokinetic Situation:**

The first significant study of conformity was conducted by Muzaffar Sherif in 1935 with the help of an interested perceptual illusion known as the autokinetic phenomenon, in which a stationary point of light seen by an observer in a dark room appears to move. Sherif saw in this phenomenon an opportunity to examine the influence of others on an individual performance of a task.

In this technique a subject is placed in a darkened room and is asked to estimate how for the stationary light "moves". After trials with a number of subjects result shows greater variation in the individual estimates. But after a number of 'trials' the subjects begin to establish standards of their own with which to compare their estimates.

In the next session of the experiment, the same subject is brought together with some (one or two) naïve subjects. The subjects are then asked to continue estimating the light movement and to announce their estimates so that other group members can hear. The individual estimates of the group members converge
show that after a time each person reports that after he sees about the same movement as to other group members.

This experiment shows that an individual can influence another person to conform in an ambiguous situation.

B: The Asch Situation:

Solomon Asch (1951) did not believe that the human is a conforming breed. He felt that one reason of subjects' conformity in the Sherif's study was that the stimulus was in ambiguous situation what they were experienced. Asch devised a unique method for studying conformity.

In this technique, the subjects enter in the laboratory and the E tells him that the experiment is concerned with accuracy and visual perception. He shows the groups of subjects of two cards. On one, there is a single line (standard line), and on the other there are three comparison lines, A, B, C. The E asks each subject to all out the letter of matching line.

Actually, the last subject is real subject and other subjects were experimental confederates who have been instructed how to respond. On several trials the respond unanimously with an incorrect answer. The E is interested in whether the naïve subject will conform to the group's opinion or stick to the correct answer.
C: The Crutchfield Technique:

Crutchfield (1955) has developed a popular variation of the Asch technique. This technique is utilized to defend the economic disadvantage of the Asch-procedure.

The subject in the Crutchfield situation is placed in a small-enclosed booth in which, there is a panel with one row of switches and one row of four lights. The switches are used by the subject to signal his responses while the lights are used to show the responses of the other four "subjects". The subject is told that he is subject 5, and is to respond after seeing the responses of subject 1-4. He is also told that the other subjects will see his response.

In actuality there are five booths, each housing a naïve subject. Each subject believes that he is no.5 and the last person to respond. The experimenter presents the experimental item and manipulates the responses of subjects 1-4 from a control room. Thus, the naïve subjects believe that the responses they have seen are responses from four other subjects, but the experimenter has actually determined their responses (feedback information or false response). After seeing what the other four subjects have answered, the naïve subject respond, and the experimenter records these responses.
D: NON-LABORATORY SITUATIONS:

Without belaboring the point, we can imply regard a non-laboratory situation as any circumstance in which a subject is not aware that he is in an experiment. A whole series of such non-laboratory studies were conducted in the 1950s by social psychologists at the University of Texas.

For example, Lefkowitz, Blake and Moutan (1955) studied the effect of two independent variables upon violation of a 'wait' signal by pedestrians. One variable related to the behaviour of a confederate violation or non-violation of the signal and other to the dress of the confederate (high or low status). The investigators found evidence for conformity to the confederates' violation behaviour, particularly when he wore high status clothes.

Freedman and Fraser (1966) developed a new technique, named 'two' request 'or' foot-in-door' technique. Now-a-days 'sign' technique is well popular.
1.2 : CONCEPT OF CROWDING BEHAVIOUR:

1.21: NATURE OF CROWDING BEHAVIOUR:

India is a country of classics but modernised, civilized and sanskritized values are affecting her with different angles. Urbanization is a challenge for city planners and sociologists. Persons are also in great dissonance, conflict and tension. They are facing a lot of challenges from different modernized arrows of values. Crowding behaviour is one of them; and it is attracting psychologists too for academic purpose.

Human beings have created some of the most beautiful and valuable works on one end whereas at next side we have produced a lot of unimaginable errors. The aesthetic beauty of the Taj Mahal or the gardens of Versailles are testimonies to our ability to create attractive peaceful settings in harmony with nature. But on Earth, many of our large urban centres have so deteriorated of our life that we must ask questions about the rationality of living in them.

Air, water and noise pollution have already reached at apex that is physically culturally and psychologically damaging. The smokes in Tokyo has been so thick many times that police officers have had to carry oxygen masks to assist pedestrians with respiratory ailments. People could not
breathe fresh air without masks. In Cleveland, Ohio, the Cuyahora river is so polluted with industrial wastes that it has actually caught fire. In response to urbanization, hundreds of thousands of city dwellers annually trek to wilderness areas and parks to regain contact with nature. But even here many bring their urban attitudes with them, leaving the scene littered, vandalised, and polluted.

On a day-to-day basis the noise, crowding and sense of alienation within large cities around the world are contributing to health and mental health problems that could be prevented by more liable environments. We are becoming more aware of and more concerned about these crucial environmental issues, sometimes to the point of actually doing something about them in Tokyo, in Cleveland and around the world. But we have a long way to go.

From the point of view of an applied social psychologists, environmental issues are social issues. These are significant problems concerned to a significant number of people. Such problems are involved with situations and behaviours that can be studied, understood and analyzed using the methods of social science. For the past three decades, social scientists and environalists have focussed more and more on how environments affect the people and on how people affect environments. This is the growing interdisciplinary academic area of activity called environmental psychology.
Bell, Fisher and Loomis (1978) define environmental psychology as "the study of the interrelationship between behaviour and the built and natural environment."

Of course the specific effects of the environment on human behaviour had been studied since the early days of psychology. Perception studies looked at environmental stimuli such as light and noise, learning theory has described the effects of environmental events that affected behaviour through the principle of reinforcement. Early industrial psychologists who developed machine theory studied the influence of environmental conditions—such as the effect of light and spatial arrangement on the performance of worker.

The way the environment has suffered demolition and the rate at which there has been a constant increase in population in the last few decades—this indeed a matter of great concern. In addition to the increase in the population, there has been a drastic increase in concentration of population in Urban areas on account of migration for employment in these areas. Accordingly multistoried and ill-spaced buildings have started coming up.

The World's population predicted to be approximately 10.5 billion in 2110 A.D. Raghavachari (1974) projected population growth in India on the basis of actual population 1971 (i.e. 54.9 million for the year 1984). The 1991 census records the total population around 843 million. The
United Nations report on Urbanisation (1968) has observed that in India 34% of the rural families, 44% in urban areas, and 67% in big cities live in one room houses. The figures are much higher for Calcutta where 79% of the families live in one room.

Many studies have shown a number of problems associated with excessive population growth. These problems seems to be interlined. For example, the mere presence of large number of people in a small space creates of feeling of crowding which may in turn lead to mental tension and irritation. This may result in broken homes, increased social distance; and less care for children, etc. In an overcrowded home parents may be forced to ignore their wards who, in turn, may perceive their home to be a relatively unattractive place; they may, therefore, seek refuge from their home to their peer groups and may even engage in socially undesirable activities.

Population growth is, thus, not exclusively, the growth in the size of population, but also the density of population which shows presence of larger number of people in a limited space. Moreover, technological and industrial development has lured people to metropolitan towns for employment, education and the enjoyment of modern facilities. The growth also includes size, density and heterogeneity. Thus these concomitants of population growth together influence human behaviour.
The study of human spatial behaviour is called proxemics- an examination of the ways in which people use physical space to regulate social interaction (Stokols, 1978). Proxemics is concerned with four basis phenomena:

(i) **PERSONAL SPACE:** The maintenance of an invisible boundary around oneself.

(ii) **TERRITORIALITY:** The ownership and defence of physical areas.

(iii) **CROWDING:** The experience of spatial and social interference by others.

(iv) **PRIVACY:** The control of access to oneself.

1.22 **CROWDING BEHAVIOUR IN PSYCHOLOGY:**

At present man is experiencing an intense struggle for his existence. Developing as well as developed countries are confronted with poverty, war violence, and crisis of energy of unprecedented magnitude. With some regional variations these problems are being faced by planners and policy makers throughout the world and they are determining the social harmony and political stability of nations. While this situation is the outcome of number of factors, population explosion emerges as one of the primary factors
shaping the nature and extent of these problems. The growth of the population has consequences for the individual, the social system, and the environment.

It is not an exaggeration to say that while human beings can produce diverse means for controlling the environment they have failed in attaining corresponding control over themselves. One of the major factors which has led to unprecedented growth of population is lack of individual control. Also, at the individual level one rarely perceives the magnitude of the problem which exists at the national level.

CROWDING- is the compression of individuals into a restricted area so that the personal space, or individual distance, normal for a particular species is violated. The result is abnormal behaviour, often hostility, among animals, and decline of the weaker among plants.

CROWD: an assemblage of people that is unorganised and temporary but is drawn together for some particular collaborative activity (as contrasted with audiences, which are passive and relatively organised on with aggregations, which are mere collections of people in the same area for no joint purpose). A crowd may be “active”, as in a mob action, when the group acts deliberately against some identified object or objects; or it may be “expressive”, as in a festival or, celebration, when the participants are largely preoccupied with themselves and their common experience.
Crowding is defined as the need for more space, resulting from a combination of personal and environmental factors. Thus crowding is a psychological experience in contradistinction to physical density or the amount of space per person in any given sitting. In more general terms, they have defined crowding as a syndrome of stress resulting from personal, social, cultural and spatial factors (Stokols, Rall, Pinner and Schopler, 1973).

Schopler and Stokols made several assumptions about the nature of human crowding (a) crowding experiences involve psychological stress; (b) this stress is the consequence of perceived loss of control over the regulation of space (including interpersonal distance); (c) when people experience crowding stress, they initiate coping attempts designed to reduce the stress; and (d) crowding be most intense and difficult to cope with when a person’s need for space is associated with perceived threats to personal security i.e. physical safety and emotional well being. The last assumption is very important because it implies that the more severe the consequences of the person’s inability to obtain more space (physical or psychological), greater will be the stress experienced by that person.
1.23 **DIMENSION OF CROWDING BEHAVIOUR:**

**GENERAL FEATURES OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG PRIMATES**

Social behaviour among animals varies in different forms. The American naturalise and artist John James Audubon observed one of the largest social groups that man has ever known, in the fall of 1813 near Henderson, Kentucky. The species was the passenger pigeon (Ectopistes Migratorius), once incredibly numerous but hunted to extinction by the end of 19th century.

Large number of crowding do not constitute social behaviour among themselves. It is usually true, for instance, that a fish that produces a million eggs cares them less socially than does a fish that produces a single youth and cares it more. A polygamous bird is less social than faithful monogamous one. Overcrowding leads to many social abnormalities for instance, crowded rats develop a "despot" and "pariahs"; and there is almost continuous frenzy of spiteful hissing, growing or fighting. Crowded rats display, in addition, hypersexuality, homosexuality and cannibalism.

Animals sometimes are brought together by some localised attractions on scarcity, as mothers around an electric light, animals at a water hole in the dry African Savana, birds and bees at a fruit bearing
tree, or iguanas crowding to next on Island free of predators. To determine if a grouping is social or not, it is necessary to examine the distribution of the animal within the limits of it needed habitat. Most animals require a certain short of habitat woodland for a squirrel, or nearly bare ground for a horned lark. Within the correct habitat, the animal also requires certain resources such as food, water and resting on sites. The habitats and resources collectively, form the “niche’ of the locally distributed, the animal may be found clumped, even if it is not particularly social if the niche or habitat is patchily or irregularly distributed and the animal can not more easily separated from one patch to another, it is said to live in a “course-grain” environment or to have a “course -grain” niche- such animals often seem social when they are not. If the niche or habitat of an animal is rather uniform so that the animal can move about and fixed it needs in many places, it is said to live in a ‘fine-grain” niche such animals often seem solitary when they actually are reacting to each other and hence are social. Their trend to be solitary because they do not needed to follow others to get to the right environment.

Crowding for any two solitary animals together will produce a dominance hierarchy, in which one animal becomes boss or kills the other. This is a major cause of death in zoos and aquariums but it is not necessarily for social behaviour. Some biologists even say that dominance hierarchies are evidence of antisocial rather
than social behaviour and are expressions of inadequacy in overcrowded social systems. It is certainly true that most peck orders appear in unnatural situations. Such as among chickens in a henyard or animals in a cage. In most animals, the absence of a dominance hierarchy, rather than the presence such, in a crowded context is a sign of a high development of social behaviour.

1.24 ZONES IN CROWDING BEHAVIOUR:

The appropriate personal space we maintain in a given situation varies in relation to numerous other variables. Hall (1966) has identified four different ranges of personal space on spatial zones: intimate, personal, social and public.

(i) The intimate zone involves an interpersonal distance from 0-1.5 feet, and is appropriate for intimate relationship and behaviours making love or comforting a close friend.

(ii) The personal zone (1.5-4.0 feet) is appropriate for interaction among friends and acquaintances. It lies more on verbal communication; the intimate zone involves more touching.

(iii) The social spatial zone (4-12 feet) is appropriate for impersonal contacts in business or similar settings.

(iv) The public distance zone (12-25 feet) involves very formal contact between an
individual such as an actor or politician-and the public/usually in the form of an audience.

Each zone has its own degree of intensity and awareness of sensory inputs: the intimate is very high; the public, very low. Each zone is appropriate for particular relationships, activities, and settings, and not for other, as degraded by the social norms of one's society.

Hall also emphasised the importance of cultural differences in the use of personal space, as well as in other aspects of proxemics. For example, Northern Europeans generally prefer to interact at a greater personal distance than Southern Europeans- a source of difficulties when people from different cultures get together.

A French person may be puzzled as the English person keeps backing away during their conversion. The English person offends and concludes that all French people are pushy whereas the French person ruminates over the aloofness of the English. Thus the use of personal space is portly a cultural characteristics that we gain through our society's socialization process (Stokols, 1978).
1.3 DEMOGRAPHIC AND ORGANISMIC VARIABLES:

Researchers always discuss factors in terms of variables. In terms of variations we try to answer. Frankly speaking, we are trying to develop comparative psychology based on individual variations. We add variations on a contour and find conclusion in terms of principles, rules and theories. As experimental psychologist classifies variables into three categories-independent, dependent and extraneous variables where a psychologist with observational perspective classifies them into demographic, organismic and situational variables. Other classifications e.g. continuous and discontinuous, discrete and constant, relevant and irrelevant; stimulus-, organismic- and response types are also described by different psychologist.

In present study, sex (gender) and family type are included as organismic and demographic variables respectively. Both variables are too much important because of their classical nature is in transition. So we should discuss these two variables in detail here.

SEX OR GENDER ROLES-

In 1970, the field, psychology of women, had not been defined. Today-the study of women and gender has entered the mainstream within social psychology. In the last twenty years, psychological abstracts
has indexed more than 20,000 articles on “Human sex differences” (Myers, 1990).

To compare them, we should always care about both aspects—similarities and differences between males and females. Gender similarities rouse less interest and publicity than gender, related differences. Differences excite scientific curiosity and draw media attention and for that reason may exaggeration our perceptions of the differences between women and men who, are assuredly not of “opposite” sex. Harris (1979) notes—“Neither in any physiological nor in any psychological sense are males and females contrary or antithetical in nature or tendency.”

So, first, their similarities are considerable. In age of teething and walking in overall generosity, helpfulness, and intelligence, and in many other ways, males and females are not noticeable different (Maccoby, 1980). Even in physical abilities, where the gender gap is greatest the overlap between the sexes is considerable with psychological traits, the gender similarities are even greater.

Frankly speaking we as psychologists should be free from purely physiological approach. We are people of psychology so we should explain sexes on the basis of psychological criterion, i.e., hard and tender feelings. Males represent hard feelings and females tender feelings. But neither is pure male or female. Each person represents both types of feelings so we conclude that
every person is male and female both. This is very classic concept of India.

Now, come toward gender differences in social behaviour. Among them are differences in aggressiveness, empathy and non-verbal sensitivity, sexual initiative and social power.

**Aggression**- By aggression, psychologists refer not to assertiveness but to behaviour that intends to hurt. Throughout the world, hunting, fighting, and warring are primarily men's activities. In surveys, men admit to more aggression than do women. In laboratory experiments, men indeed exhibit more physical aggression (Eagly And Steffen, 1986; Hyde, 1986). In the United States, men are arrested for violent crimes eight times more often than women- a trend found in every society that has kept crime records (Kenrick, 1987). India, country of no proper records, also represents same trends- much higher crime tendency among males than females.

**Empathy and Sensitivity**- There is no doubt that average female reports being more empathic, more able to feel what another feels. This is especially there when in surveys women and men describe their emotional responses. To some extent it is also true in laboratory studies, in which women have been more likely to cry and to report feeling distressed at another's distress (Eisenberg And Lennon, 1983).

Many researchers report that women are less competitive and more co-operative
than men and more concerned with social relationship (Gilligan, 1982; Knight And Dubro, 1984). Compared to their friendship with men, both men and women report their friendships with women to be higher in intimacy, enjoyment, and nurturance (Sapadin, 1988). Judith Hall (1984) found that in 94 percent of published studies of adult smiling females smiled more than males. More recent studies outside the laboratory confirm that women's generally greater warmth is frequently expressed as smiling. When La France (1985) analysed 9000 college yearbook photos, and when talberstadt and Saitta (1987) studied 1100 magazine and newspaper photos and 1300 people in shopping malls, parks, and streets, they consistently found that females were more likely to smile. In groups, men contribute more task-oriented behaviour, such as giving information, and women contribute more positive social—emotional behaviour such as giving help on showing support (Eagly, 1987).

One explanation for this male/female difference in expressed empathy is that women tend to be better at reading others' emotions. In her analysis of 125 studies of men's and women's sensitivity to non-verbal cues, Hall (1984) has described that women are generally superior at decoding others' emotional messages. For example, when shown a two second film clip of the face of an upset woman. Woman tend to guess more accurately whether she is angry or discussing a divorce. Women also are more
skilled at expressing emotions non-verbally, reports Hall.

**SEXUAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR:**

Susan Hendrick and her colleagues (1985) report that many studies, including their own, reveal a gender gap in sexual studies: Women are "moderately conservative" about casual sex, and men are "moderately permissive". The American Council on Education's recent survey of a quarter million first year college students is illustrative: "If two people really like each other, it's all right for them to have sex even if they've known each other for only a very short time," agreed 66 percent of men but only 39 percent of women (Astin et al; 1987).

The gender difference in sexual studies carries over to behaviour. Across the world, males are likely to initiate sexual relations and to be less selective about their partners, a pattern that characterises most animal species (Hinde, 1984; Kennick And Trost, 1987). Not only in sexual relations but also in courtship, self-disclosure and touching, males tend to take more initiative (Hendrick, 1988, Kenrick, 1987).

**1.4 REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE:**

The research on conformity has focussed on three different factors that affect conformity. These are following-
A: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIVIDUALS:

In this category, subjects related variables e.g. age, sex, status, competency, birth order and culture of the conformer are described that affect the process of conformity under group pressure.

B: CHARACTERISTIC OF THE GROUP:

Group is an important source of information to compare and to make an actual decision for the person. This aspect of governing variables can be divided into two categories- First, characteristics of the group itself e.g. group size, unanimity, cohesiveness; secondly, characteristics of the confederates e.g. sex, age, status, etc.

C: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITUATION:

The situation under which the conformity is under movement is an important element to determine the nature of the response of the conformer.

These three areas are interrelated but the research can be presented in three parts conforming to the individual group and task classification. Now we will examine the related literature of three aspects of conformity determinants.

1.41 CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL:

The person under conforming behaviour is an important variable itself, but it can be expressed in terms of ‘traits’ and ‘features’ of the person. The main considering variables of this aspect are sex,
age, status, type of personality, birth order, culture, competency of the person.

Now, we turn toward some literature evidences regarding these variables-

**EFFECT OF SEX:**

Role of the gender of the subject in conformity has been widely studied by the researchers. Some found difference in conformity behaviour of both sexes and some found no difference in conformity with sex-difference. In favour of this statement. Females conform more than males, there are many studies conducted by Gerard, Wilhelmy And Conolley, 1968; Julian, Regula And Tollandr, 1968; Peukert, 1975; Endler, 1975; Hamme, 1970. In same pattern of result- conclusion Pasternack (1976) used, naïve majority technique' to administer T. L.: Pasternack's visual judgement scale to 152 groups of children each 12 boys and each 12 girls from each of first 8 grade that served as critical subjects and more asked to make judgements in social pressure, social influence and non-social influence situation. The result was that younger yielded more than older children and girl yeilded more than boys. Peukert (1975) reviewed and discussed studies that showed women conforming more than men. He interpreted that sex determined differences in conformity may be partly due to secondary factors associated with sex difference e.g. need for affiliation.
Contrary to the above findings many investigators found no sex differences in conformity behaviour. Bishop Barbara (1972) studied the susceptibility of 144 lower middle income related person and he found that sex differences in conformity were not significant. Gingrich, 1974; Wiesenthal, 1974; Klien, 1973; Sistrunk, 1972 are also in favour of this conclusion.

Some research evidence indicate that type of material for conformity is also a main figure in determining the role of sex in conformity. Sistrunk and Mc David (1971) pre scaled a large number of issues on a dimension of masculinity- femininity to demonstrate to situational link. In the actual conformity test, the author selected an equal number of items which were judged to be more familiar to men more familiar to women or equal familiar to both sexes. The result clearly showed that conformity was directly related to task-familiarity. Men conformed more or feminine item than did women or than did men or either masculine or neutral items, and women conformed on masculine items than they did on either feminine or neutral items. Endler (1973, 1975) also concluded that females showed significant higher conformity on relative competency conformity items and on verbal and perceptual task too. Such evidence is clear testimony to the importance of the task characteristic in conclusion about sex-difference.
Among Americans tested in group-pressure situations during the last thirty years, there has been a slight tendency for women to conform more than men. Eagly and Carli, 1981; Becker, 1986 discerned this by statistically combining results from the dozens of available studies. They describe the effect as "barely visible to the naked eye". Studies reporting women to be more conforming tend to those in which participants' responses are witnessed by the other group members (as in the Asch experiment), and tend to have been conducted by men some years ago (Eagly et al, 1981; Cooper, 1979; Sohn, 1980). Newer conformity experiments and those conducted by women have less often found females more conforming. Most other gender differences in social behaviour appear uninfluenced by the sex of the investigator, reports Eagly, 1987). Eagly and Wendy Wood (1985) believe that gender differences in conformity may mislead be a product of the social roles that men and women have typically occupied. The male/female difference are not just gender differences, but also status difference in everyday life, men tend to occupy positions of greater status and power than do women, so we often see men exerting influence and women accepting influence.

Overall, we can conclude that the interaction between person and situation rather than person per sex is the source of difference.
EFFECT OF AGE:

Accumulated research reveal that the amount of conformity behaviour differs with the age of subject.

In favour of the hypothesis that younger subjects conform less than older subjects. Several studies are e.g. Hamm (1970) conducted a study on autokinetic judgements. The subjects were selected from three age levels, 7, 10 and 13 years. And, it was concluded that seven years old subjects conformed less than 10 to 13 years old subjects and the increase in conformity with age was greater for males than females.

But certain studies conclude that younger children yield more than older subjects. Results showed that conformity decreases as age increases, means younger conforms more than older (Hoving, 1971; Saltzstein and Osgood, 1975; Psternack, 1970; Sigston and White, 1975). Some studies further improved this hypothesis and concluded that 14-17 years subjects will conform more than adults (age 18-30 years) (Endler, coward, Wisesenthal, 1971).

Klein (1972) attempted to determine the governing age-level for conformity in a laboratory perceptual judgement task. 36 young subjects (16-21 years) were compared with 36 old subjects (60-86 years) regarding susceptibility to social influence upon perceptual judgements. Analysis of variance of frequencies of
comforting behaviour revealed that older subjects conformed significantly more often than yonder subjects. This conclusion is also supported by Janney, Mallory, Rossilo And Johnsimon, (1970); David (1971).

Sistrunk, Clement and Guenthen, (1971) investigated age trend in conformity and found that there is a curvilinear relationship between age and conformity. They found that in the beginning years of life (from birth to 13-14 years) conformity increases, but in period of 14 to 18-21 years conformity behaviour decreases and after this period again conformity increases.

Finally, we conclude that age of the person is also a governing factor in conformity.

**EFFECT OF STATUS:**

Mehrabrian, 1971; Maxwell, 1974 concluded by his studies that those person who were of higher status elicited more affiliation and conformity but there are many studies that go away from this conclusion. Lefkowitz, Blake and Moutan, 1955; Raven And French, 1958 have concluded that conformity is greater when the individual has a somewhat lower status than do other members of the group and when he does not feel completely accepted by the group (Dittes And Kelley, 1956; Kelley And Shapiro, 1954).

Though both groups of the subject-high status and low status of the individual have their rationale for their higher
conformity. Where higher status subjects depend upon the argument of need of affiliation and social praise etc. there lower status persons give a rationale of higher conformity with the help of social acceptance, fear of insecurity etc. Overall, type of persons (high status Vs. Low status) and type of situations may create a situation under whom we can conduct a study to understand the role of status for conformity.

After eighties, certain studies came in light at this direction. Mullen (1985) concludes that as might suspect, higher-status people tend to have somewhat more impact. Studies of jaywalking behaviour, conducted with the unwitting aid of nearly 24,000 pedestrians reveal that the baseline jaywalking rate of 25 percent is decreased to 17 percent in the presence of a non-jaywalking confederate and increased to 44 percent in the presence of a jaywalker (Muller et al, 1988). The non-jaywalker does most to discourage jaywalking when well dressed (although, strangely, jaywalking confederates do not trigger more jaywalking when well-dressed). Clothes seem to “make the person” in :Australia, too. Walker, Harriman, and Costello (1980) found that Sydney pedestrians were more compliant when approached by a well-dressed survey taker than one poorly dressed. Milgram (1974) reports that in his obedience experiments people of lower status tended to accept the
experimenter's commands more readily than people of higher status.

EFFECT OF COMPETENCY:

An individual who believes that he has low ability to perform a certain task should be more likely to look to the group for information than an individual who believes that he has superior ability to perform a task (Worchel And Cooper, 1976).

Many studies have concluded that the subjects who perceived themselves as more competent than the group on the task conformed significantly less than subjects who perceived as less competent (Rosenberg, 1964; Ettinger, 1972; Endler and Hartley, 1974 and Gellen, Endler, Wiesenthal, 1974)

In the 1972, Endler, Wiesenthal and Gellen manipulated competency level and they found that subjects who perceived themselves to be more competent than the group also conformed less.

EFFECT OF BIRTH ORDER:

In the classic studies of Schachter (1959) birth-order was found to be associated with conformity. Schachter hypothesis was that first born babies were much conformists. And, it was supported by
Dubno, Bedrosian and Freedman (1970). For the support of his conclusion, Schachter gave some explanation. He told that first born and only children were found to be more affiliative than later born children. He suggested that extraverts (being affiliated) might be overrepresented among first born children. In a different study, conducted by Mc Cormick and Baer, 1975, a significant interaction between sex and birth order was found in determining extroversion scores, first born males and second born females being more extraverted.

However, there are several studies that have produced entirely negative results, that is, later born babies are more conformists and other have produced complex and inconsistent results (Barbara Havassy-de-Avila, 1971); Bragg and Allen (1971) had concluded that ordinal position of baby does not create no significant difference for conformity.

**EFFECT OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCES:**

A number of investigators have concluded that members of some nationalities tend to conform more than the members of others. In favour of this relationship, Milgram (1961) compared French and Norwegian University students by administering Crutchfield type conformity tests and found a greater independence among the French than among the Norweigians. In same pattern Japanese tended to be more independent than their American counterparts (Frager, 1970) and Russian children are more apt to
conform to social pressure than are American children (Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Sistrunk and Clement 1970, 1972 concluded greater conformity by the Brazilians than by the Americans.

Sistrunk (1972) compared Negro-white subjects and found that Negro yielded more than whites.

A study conducted by Lynn and Hampson, 1975 investigated reason behind cross-national differences in personality based on demographic and epidemiological data. The variables used were national rates of divorce, illegitimacy, accidents, crimes, murder, suicide, alcoholism, chronic psychosis, the coronary heart disease and the per capita consumption of calories cigarettes and caffeine. The theoretical and empirical relationship of these variables to extroversion; and neuroticism was used to set up a model for their relationship among nations. For example, cigarette smoking and divorce were presumed to be indices of extroversion suicide and alcoholism were expected to fall on an axis of neuroticism and accidents, (crime, murder and illegitimacy were then computed for the industrialised western nations that indicated the United States appears to be more extroverted nation and Japan the most introverted.

Wittaker and Meade (1967) repeated Asch's conformity experiment in several countries and found similar conformity rates most-31 percent in Lebanon, 32 percent in
Hongkong, 34 percent in Brazil, but 51 percent conformity among the Bantu of Zimbabwe, a tribe with strong punishments for non-conformity. When Milgram (1961) used a different conformity procedure to compare Norwegian and French students, he consistently found the Norwegian students to be the more conforming. Howere, cultures may change. Subsequent replication of Asch’s experiment with university students Britain and the United States triggered less conformity than Asch has observed two decades previous (Larse, 1974; Nicholson et al, 1985; Perrin And Spencer, 1981).

When the obedience experiments were repeated by researchers in West Germany, Italy, South Africa, Australia, Spain and Jordan and the results were compared to those obtained with American subjects, the obedience rates were generally similar or even higher 85 percent in Munich (Mantell, 1971, Meeus And Raaijmakers, 1986; Milgram,1974)

Bond, 1989, Triandis et al; 1988 concluded that conformity and obedience are universal phenomena but vary by culture. Those of us who grow up in Euro-American cultures are generally taught individualism. Those of us who grow up in Asian cultures are more likely to be taught communalism. The effect of such cultural assumptions was apparent in a cross-cultural comparison of individualism in 12-years-olds (Garbarino And Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Shouval et al; 1975)
EFFECT OF PERSONALITY COREELATES:

The history of social-psychological thinking about the relationship between personality traits and social behaviour parallels the history of thinking about attitudes and behaviour (Sherman And Fazio, 1983). During the 1950s, and early 1960s it was generally believed that people’s actions expressed their inner motives and dispositions. Then, during the late 1960s and 1970s, other attempts to link personal characteristics with social behaviours such as conformity found only weak connections (Michel, 1968). As Milgram (1974) concluded, “I am certain that there is a complex personality basis to obedience and disobedience. But I know we have not found it”.

More recently, during the 1980s, the implication that our personal dispositions make little difference has prompted personality researchers to identify the circumstances under which our traits do predict our behaviour. Myers (1990) concludes that it is interesting to note how the pendulum of professional opinion swings. Without discounting the undeniable power of social forces, the pendulum is now swinging back toward a recognition of the consequences of an individual’s personality.

Following section covers many personality variables that affect conformity scores. These are-

(a) **Intelligence**: A number of studies correlates the intelligence and
conformity. Higher I.Q. - lower conformity and lower 10- higher conformity (Long, 1972; Azchefsley, Reardon And Gail O’ Conner, 1974).

(b) **Self Monitoring- Neuroticism:** Snyder and Monsoon, (1975) conducted a study and the result was that social conformity of high self-monitoring and low-neuroticism subjects differed reliably between discussion contexts low self-monitoring and high-neuroticism subjects were affected by decision contexts.

(c) **Authoritarian-Democratic personality:** In task involving perceptual stimuli, attitudes and opinions, authoritarian has been positively related to conformity to the judgement of others (Crutchfield, 1955; Nadler,1959; Weinert And Rubel, 1956) Generally, it has been found that authoritarians are more conforming and less hostile to high status sources (Roberts And Jossor, 1958; Steiner And Johnson, 1963)

But some studies do not confirm this relationship. However, both, the absence of positive relationship (Endler, 1961) and a negative relationship between authoritarianism and conformity (Wagner, 1955) have been obtained. In same pattern Mitchell (1973) concluded that authoritarians do not perceive the role of the judge in society as a legitimate authority figure.
Some other studies conclude that both ascendants and submissive were affected by the informational social pressure; and compared to ascendants, submissives were more influenced by group pressure in making perceptual judgments of distance, direction and movement (Mudd, 1970; Willis and Willes, 1970; Groomsman and Eisenman, 1971).

(d) **External-Internal type personality:**
In some circumstances extraverts appear to be more open to social influence than introverts. They are more inclined to change their judgement under the influence of prestige suggestions (Sinha And Ojha, 1963) and to change the evaluation of paintings after discovering the name (and thus reputation) of the artists (Mohan and Mohan, 1965). They are more field dependent as measured by Rod and Frame Test (Fine And Danforth, 1975) and extravert children are more responsive to peer influences regarding antisocial behaviour.

On the other hand, introverts are more susceptible to the autokinetic effect (Panek, 1962).

In several other situations no differences between introverts and extroverts have been found (Claridge, 1970). Roberts (1965) found virtually no difference between extroverts and introverts except for a slight tendency for the
introverts to show more gradual (less sudden) changes in religious conviction.

e. **Some Other Personality Correlates:**
Subjects with high affiliation and achievements motives were more conforming than the subjects with low ones (Tasaki and Seki, 1975; Roos, Bierbracier And Hoffman, 1975)

Subjects with low self-esteem were significantly much conformists than high self-esteem related subjects (Singh And Prasad, 1973).

Subjects given a positive experience conformed more than those a negative experience regardless of how the experience had been created and who subsequently exerted the influence (Macarnar And Sarell, 1973)

Saltzstein And Diamond, 1972 reported that middle Moral level subjects were more likely to conform than subjects at either higher or lower moral judgements levels.

Singh (1990) reported that high approval motivated subjects were found to be significant most conformists, low approval motivated subjects were found to be least conformists and middle approved motivated subjects fall in between the two groups.

Subjects having high degree of self disclosure showed most conformity, subjects with low degree of self disclosure
showed least conformity and subjects with average degree of self disclosure showed middle conformity (Singh, 1990)

Pattern of conformity in couples were studied and it was found that both men and women conformed to the partner’s judgements except in the group of long term couples. All subjects were actually influenced by their partners (Stone, 1973).

1.42. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP: The degree of which an individual trusts the group as a source of information or the degree to which he dares to deviate from group norms, are dependent upon a number of factors. The total sector of this group-variables can be divided into two groups. First, features of the group, Second, characteristics of the group members.

Now we will examine the related studies related to these factors:

a. Characteristic of a group:

1. Group Size: Asch (1951) found in his experiments that conformity increased (group size) until the group consisted of four confederates. Then the amount of conformity levelled off so that there was no more conformity to a group of 15 members than to a group of 4. Stang (1976) also proved this conclusion with ‘sign’ petition conformity measure.
In a study the conformity scores indicated a strong linear relationship between group size and ambiguity of stimulus. It means that group size effect can be obtained in ambiguous stimulus situations (Nordholm, 1975).

Wilder (1977) conducted a study in which organisation of the confederates was varied so that subjects perceived them either as a single group, a several distinct group, or as an aggregate of unrelated individuals. It seemed that conformity was found to increase as the number of separate individuals and groups (distinct social entities) in opposition increased.

Overall group size plays an important role to affect the power of group pressure for conformity but its effect varies from situation to situation and need a further investigation.

2. Group Cohesiveness:

All studies related to this issue conclude a positive relationship between conformity and group-cohesiveness. It means higher degree of group cohesiveness among group members causes higher degree of conformity. There is no contradictory result in this field (Festingers And Others 1960; Deutch and Gerard, 1955; Lott And Lott, 1961; Walker, 1962).
3. Group-Unanimity:

A decrease in group unanimity adversely affect the group's power to enforce conformity. Asch (1951,55) set up his comparison of lines experiment so that one other individual supported the subject against the majority. Results showed in this condition, the majority influence on the subject was reduced by 75 percent. The subject committed by only one quarter the errors than he did when opposed by a unanimous majority.

In another experiment, Asch (1955) instructed the partner to support the subject in half of the trials and later to join the majority for unanimity. He concluded that the support of the partner lessened the individual's tendency to conform and after the partner had joined the majority in the 7th trial the subject lost his independence and began to follow the group by answering incorrectly in further modification when the partner would leave the room in the middle of experiment the result showed that the errors committed by the subject tended to rise after the partners left but not as sharply as they did when the partner defected to the other side.

Thus, it clears that group unanimity plays an unique role in conformity and there is a full chance of investigation toward a mixed model
(both types of sexes for subjects and confederates can be understand to know the interaction effect of sex).

b. Confederates-characteristics:
Following variables cover this section for details. These are:-

1. Effect of sex:- A study conducted by Cull (1976) reported that for male subjects (airforce training adolescents ) male confederates induced a significantly greater degree of conformity than female subjects. In another study, black and white, lower and middle class subjects, (18-12 years) of both sexes showed any consistency tendency to conform differentially for male and female confederates.

In cultural differences, Deade and William studied (1973) and found that both Americans and Chinese had sorter resistance’s and fewer opinion changes (measures of conforming behaviour) in the presence of female confederates than in the presence of male confederates.

Overall, conformity is influenced by sex differences and there is a much need of investigation beyond the level of pre-adolescence period of the subjects and confederates both.
2. **Effect of Familiarity:** It takes several forms e.g. friendship, parental relationship etc. between subjects and confederates. These factors play an important role in conformity; and are under consideration below:

(a) **Effect of Peer Group:** Most studies have concluded that the individual tends to present himself, more in the norms of the situation than he presents the peers. No differences were found between sexes (age, 5-19 years subjects) to unlike sex pressure but conformity showed a linear relationship to age (Codol, 1975; Collins and Thomas, 1974; Ausubel And Hill, 1971; Ausubel,1971. Having, Hamm and Galvin (1969) have concluded that peer influence varied with the ambiguity of the task and age of the subjects. They concluded that conformity on ambiguous slides was negatively related to the age, whereas another conclusion was that conformity to completely ambiguous slides was positively related to age.

(b) **Parental Relationship:** Most research findings are that the subjects resist more under the parent and less peer than under the neutral conditions. It means parental control and support are positively related to conformity for the
adolescence period, on one study, findings suggest that conformity to authoritative others, (parent, priests) should distinguished from conformity to peers (best friend) and that supports from parents rather than friend is associated with the adolescents tendency is conform to the expectations of "authoritative others" Darwin and Weigert, 1974; Bixetine, Corte and Bixestine, 1976).

The effect of parental relationship should be broadly studied in different ages in both sexes to know the up-down effect. And, in same respect, the effect of family type e.g. joint family Vs. Individual family can also be studied.

3. **Effect of Status:** Most studies conclude that confederates with high status, influence more to the subjects in any other respect. In other studies, it was found that low authoritarian subjects conform greatly to high status source and vary little to the low status source while high authoritarian were not differentially susceptible to the two sources (Moors and Krupt, 1971). Some model varied to the dress as indicator of status and found significant difference (Bickman, 1974; Singelman and Singelman, 1976).
In summary, many variables related to group characteristics play very faithful roles for conformity and their interactional effects are also interesting but several other variables related to confederates type e.g. intelligent-dull, literate-illiterate, type of family etc. are untouched. Thus these variables can give some challenging conclusions for the dynamics of social improvement and should be under attention for the researchers.

1.43. SITUATION OR TASK
CHARACTERISTICS Certain variables e.g. ambiguity of the stimulus, type of evaluation, reinforcement are studied in this section and that is totally characteristics of manmade manipulations in the laboratory. Following lines now, cover a wide explanation of these variables.

1. Effect of Ambiguity of Situation:

Most of the studies have concluded that more difficult the task is or the more ambiguous the judgement is, the greater the incidence of conformity. In the Asch Conformity situations for instance, when the difference between the length of line decreased, the subject conformed more frequently (Asch, 1952) When subjects were asked to make judgement from their memory
of the true cards, their memory of the true cards, there was a higher incidence of conformity than when the cards were in front of them (Deutsch And Gerards, 1955)

Lewis and James (1970) studied the effect of task difficulty using tone duration as stimuli with three levels of task difficulty. They found conformity increased with the task difficulty. Ronald And Biren (1972) also supported this hypothesis.

Asch (1952); Hetron And Mountan (1966); Empey and Lubech, (1968); Shivley and Mumfor, (1973); Singh and Prasad, (1974); Nordhelm, (1975) found in their work that when the difference between the length of the comparison lines was smaller, conformity was greater than when the difference was longer.

Gerard and Dentesch (1955) concluded that the type of task not only helps to determine the amount of conformity type of group pressure- informational e.g. in Asch type judgement also influence the extent of group pressure.

Some studies reported that conformity pattern are not seemed clear cut in private responding than public responding for unambiguous task (Savell and Helay, 1969).
Overall, as the ambiguity of the task increases, conformity also increases. Thus there is no chance to study the main effect of ambiguousness but we can study the interaction effect of this variable with certain other variables.

2. EFFECT OF RESPONSE TYPE:
One study concluded girls scouts aged 10-12 years that prescriptive norms (under-evaluated or negatively stated norms) are more effective than prescriptive norms (positively stated norms) (Jornblom And Biddle, 1976) and several other studies, though, accept the unique role of over-evaluation and under-evaluation in the laboratory experiments in conformity but they are unable to conclude a clear cut picture for it (Mac Neil and Sherif, 1976).

3. EFFECT OF REINFORCEMENT:
Reinforcement plays an important role in conforming responses. Those responses that are rewarded are more conforming for the subjects. Findings are supported from significant role of reward-punishment phase (Sistrunk, David and Ulman, (1972); Endler, Minden and North, (1973) Sistrunk (1969) concluded that both conformist and independent subjects were conditioned and exstinguised to non conformity by the reinforcement
treatment. But neither was conditioned to greater conformity. So, this field of punishment should be studied by the researcher.