

A Multidimensional Study of Social Influence : Effects of Type of Referent, Source of Power, and Level of Compliance

Jean-Kyung Chung

This study is an attempt to fill in the empirical gap in the social influence literature, by identifying the major factors involved in the social influence process, and by examining how interconnections between these factors produce changes in a person's motivation to comply. Based on existing literature and the pilot studies, the major factors to be considered in the social influence process were identified as (1) the type of normative referent, (2) the source of the referent's power, and (3) the level of compliance. All three major factors were found to have significant effects on the subject's motivation to comply. Moreover, the interrelationships between these factors showed how a referent's social power systematically influences the subject's motivation to comply through some intervening factors. The significance of this approach in documenting empirical results and establishing theoretical networks in studying the multidimensional nature of the social influence process is discussed.

The concept of social influence has drawn much attention in scientific social psychology since early field theorists (Lewin, 1943, 1951) tried to explain social behavior as a joint function of a person's own desires, goals, and abilities, and the pressures and constraints the person perceives in the environment.

Many theorists have adopted this basic field theoretical orientation in

studying the phenomena of social influence under such various names as interpersonal relations (Heider, 1958), social power (French, 1956; French and Raven, 1959), cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949), social exchange (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959), and group problem solving (Kelley and Thibaut, 1969). Some theorists have attempted to look more closely at the nature of the influence process, and the resulting responses. Deutsch and Gerard (1955) differentiated between information social influence and normative social influence, Kelley (1952) distinguished between the two sorts of self-evaluation functions that can be served by a group as the comparison function and the normative function, and Kelman (1961) described the effects of social influence on attitude in terms of three processes: compliance, identification, and internalization.

Later, theories in the information processing paradigm such as Dulany's theory of propositional control, Fishbein and Ajzen's (Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) theory of reasoned action, and Triandis' (1977, 1980) theory of interpersonal behavior, incorporated social or normative influence as one of the important components in the individual decision making process.

The present study attempts to look at social influence as a multidimensional concept. Social influence process is seen as being composed of several factors: The type of normative referent, the sources of referent's social power, and the level of compliance.

Generally speaking, this attempt is in agreement with the argument by a number of researchers that social influence is a multidimensional concept (Allen, 1965; Gamson, 1968; Jahoda, 1959; Shaver, 1977; Stricker, Messick, and Jackson, 1970; Willis, 1965). Shaver (1977) noted that much of the research on conformity and social influence - with its stress on the dependent variable of behavioral compliance - necessarily oversimplifies the process. He argued that the final resultant pressure on the target person can still be represented by the familiar single force vector, but we should keep in mind that there are a variety of different components contributing to that force and that there are several possible responses that may be taken by the target person.

He proposed that social influence be viewed as being composed of three dimensions: the nature of the influencing agent, the source of agent's power, and the nature of the response.

In this light, Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of reasoned action (Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) provides a good starting point in both theory and measurement. The theory deals primarily with the prediction of a behavioral act. In a given situation, a person is assumed to hold or to form a behavioral intention which influences his or her subsequent behavior. According to the theory, there are two major factors that determine behavioral intentions: a personal or attitudinal factor and a social or normative factor.

The attitudinal factor is defined as the actor's attitude toward performing the behavior in question. A person's attitude toward the behavior is proposed to be a function of the person's beliefs that his or her performance of the behavior will lead to certain consequences and the person's evaluation of those consequences.

The normative component of the theory deals with the influence of the social environment on behavior. More specifically, it is defined as the person's perception that most people who are important to him or her think that the person should or should not perform the behavior in question. This subjective norm is, in turn, viewed as a function of $\sum b_j m_j$ where b_j is the normative belief (i.e., the person's belief that reference group or individual j think he or she should or should not perform the behavior), and m_j is the motivation to comply with the referent j .

This provides a useful framework for the present study in many ways. First, the measure of social norms in the theory of reasoned action obtained by $\sum b_j m_j$ is compatible to the notion of a single force vector in that both represent a resultant directional influence on behavioral intention. Second, the theory of reasoned action identifies the subject's perception of the prescriptions of each normative referent concerning the behavior along with his or her motivation to comply with each referent which makes it possible to study the influence of various referents over different behaviors, and under different

circumstances. Third, it also enables one to examine the subject's responses in relation to other variables in the theoretical framework, such as normative belief, attitude, and finally intention. Fourth, the measurement devices have established validity over numerous previous studies using the theory (see Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980).

Purpose of the Study

1. Differentiation between General Referents and Behavior-Specific Referents

One of the most important questions to ask in the study of social influence is who the influencing agents are. This question has been repeatedly addressed by theories from many different perspectives such as studies of social power (Collins and Raven, 1969; French and Raven, 1959), studies linking personality factors to social power (Christie and Geis, 1970), studies on leader characteristics (Gibb, 1969; Fiedler, 1964, 1971), studies on the functions of reference groups (Festinger, 1954; Kelley, 1952; Pettigrew, 1967), and studies on source characteristics in communication such as credibility (Hovland and Weiss, 1951; Kelman and Hovland, 1953; Petty and Cacioppo, 1977), attractiveness (Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Chaiken, 1979), and similarity (Byrne, 1971).

It seems that a step not yet taken in this area is to empirically examine whether there are different types of influencing agents, and if there are, how they are different in terms of other variables such as social power.

Fishbein's standard elicitation procedure (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) for important normative referents for a given behavior provides a basis for formulating some hypotheses concerning these questions. One of the advantages of this elicitation method is that it can identify the important referents for each behavior which makes it possible to make comparisons between the influence of different referents over various situations and behaviors.

A large accumulation of previous empirical research using the theory of reasoned action shows that there are a few general referents that are elicited for almost all behaviors. They are mother, father, boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse,

and close friends. When we have an older population, they also elicit children. Subjects considered these referents' opinions in their decision making on a variety of behaviors such as family planning, voting in the presidential election, smoking cigarettes, attending religious services, driving on the highway, etc.

In addition to these general referents, a few other referents are usually elicited for any given behavior. For example, for the voting behavior, 'my political party', 'labor organizations', 'feminist groups', etc. were elicited, and for the smoking behavior, 'doctors', 'most nonsmokers', 'cigarette manufacturers', etc. were elicited. Since these referents were elicited only for the specific behavior, and not others, we may call these referents "behavior-specific referents."

This apparent difference between the general and the behavior-specific referents, however, has not been closely investigated. One of the purposes of this study is to investigate whether these two types of referents are of different nature. More specifically, the following questions are raised: Do subjects show different compliance responses to the two types of referents? Do they have different sources of power? How does the nature of the referent interact with other variables such as attitude or normative belief to produce different motivations to comply? Does the nature of referent interact with the level of motivation to comply?

2. Sources of Power

The relationship between power and influence has been an intriguing topic since field theorists began studying the process, but accumulation of empirical research has been very slow.

In general, "power" was conceptualized as an agent's potential to bring about some change in the subject's behavior, and "influence" was regarded as the actual change in the behavior as a result of the exertion of power. Based on this conceptualization, this study attempts to test the relationship between power and influence systematically using empirical measures of both variables.

In an analysis based on field theory, French and Raven (1959) distinguished

among five different types of power based on a more or less enduring relationship between one person and another. The bases of power were identified as the following: referent power, reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, and expert power. This provides a useful framework for conceptualizing the different sources of power for general and behavior-specific referents.

It should be noted here that any single powerful agent is likely to derive the power from more than one source at a time. For example, a mother may have referent power, reward power, and coercive power all at the same time.

One of the purposes of this study then is to examine possible relationships between these sources of power. It is of significant theoretical importance to distinguish between the five sources of social power as long as there is construct validity, but in reality, there may not be such fine distinctions between those categories in the subject's perceptions of referent's social power. For example, reward and coercive powers are often closely related to each other, and both lead to dependent behavior (French and Raven, 1959).

With the help of empirical data, and statistical procedures such as correlations and factor analysis, we might be able to identify the actual dimensions of power, and summarize the information with fewer variables.

In the sense that these hypotheses concern different types of social power, they could be viewed in light of other theories of social influence. They may be translated into compliance, identification, and internalization in Kelman's (1961) terms, or restated as normative social influence and informational social influence in Deutsch and Gerard's (1955) terms. In this respect, the major difference between the present approach and these other theories is that this study uses empirical data to derive the dimensions whereas older theories postulated the dimensions from intuition and/or simple observation.

Another problem to be investigated is the possibility that different types of referents may differ in their major source of power over many different situations and behaviors. For instance, it may be the case that general referents derive their power mainly from attraction since they are the individuals who are personally close to the subject, and exert their influence regardless of the behavior in question. On the other hand, certain behavior-specific referents

may be expected to derive their power mainly from their expertise concerning the specific behavior in question, predicting a 2 way interaction between type of referent and source of power.

Since a subject's motivation to comply with a referent in a behavioral situation may be affected by which source of power the referent derives his/her power from, this study proposes to follow through the process to find possible systematic variations. This differentiation between types of referents in relation to their sources of power has more interesting implications concerning the subject's responses when we add the level of motivation to comply on the general vs. the behavioral domain.

3. General and Behavioral Domain Levels of Motivation Measurement

Compliance to the perceived expectations or demands of an influencing agent has been studied from many different perspectives by various researchers (Kelman, 1961; Deutsch and Gerard, 1955; Kelly, 1952). Basically, all of them suggest that response to the influence attempt be clarified based on nature of the influence and the source of power.

A different dimension for conceptualizing and measuring compliance, which is more complementary than contrary to the previous theories, has been proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). They noted that the concept of motivation to comply can be interpreted in different ways. Usually, it is defined as the respondent's general motivation to comply with a referent regardless of the referent's particular demands. Alternatively, it could refer to the person's motivation to comply with the referent concerning a behavioral domain under consideration or even a particular behavior in question.

Previous research (Chung, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1981; Miniard and Cohen, 1981) indicated that measures of motivation to comply on the behavioral domain level may sometimes lead to a better understanding and prediction of the behavioral intention.

In this study, measures of motivation will be obtained on two different levels (general and behavioral domain), and will be examined to find possible interactions between the types of referents, sources of the referent's power,

and levels of motivation measurement. In general, it is hypothesized that whereas the general referents will have more influence on the general level, the behavior-specific referents will exert more influence on the behavioral domain level. This study will also investigate the possibility of a three way interaction between types of referents, levels of measurement, and sources of power.

Method

The problems previously discussed were investigated within the context of two behaviors: 1. vote for the passage of ERA in the coming referendum, and 2. attend religious services.

The choice of these two behaviors were made for the following reasons: 1. Within this population, the intentions of the subjects to perform these behaviors are known to vary. 2. Subjects will be able to identify and/or recognize a number of normative referents with different opinions concerning these behaviors. 3. Subjects will have a fairly accurate perceptions of what the referents' stands are concerning these issues.

Using two behaviors instead of one will help increase the reliability of the results as well as indicate the extent to which the results would be generalizable.

Subjects. In the pilot study prior to the construction of the main questionnaire, a group of 48 college students from the psychology department subject pool participated as subjects. The respondents in the main study were a different group of 58 students from the subject pool. They participated in the study to fulfill the requirement for an introductory psychology course. Of the 58, 31 were men and 27 were women.

Questionnaire. For the most part, the questionnaire was constructed in accordance with Fishbein's theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) using 7-point semantic differential scales. The major part of the questionnaire basically contained measurements of two important concepts; 1. sources of power of the normative referents, and 2. the subject's motivation to comply with each referent. In addition, it also

contained questions about normative beliefs, attitudes toward performing the behaviors, intentions, sex, and religious affiliations. The format of the items which were used to measure the two important concepts will be described in detail in the following along with explanations of the procedures and the rationale with which the items were chosen.

1. Motivation to Comply

Selection of the referents: General referents, by definition, have to be those referents who are elicited as important referents over many different behaviors. Over many elicitations which were done for previous research including such topics as smoking, voting, family planning, and attending religious services, four referents were found to be elicited consistently: they were mother, father, boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse, and close friends. Therefore, these four referents were chosen as general referents for the present study, and were included in the main questionnaire for both behaviors.

In contrast to the general referents, behavior-specific referents have to be chosen for each behavior. In regard to the purpose of the present study, a few criteria were used in selecting the behavior-specific referents: 1. they should have a relatively strong relevance to the behavior in question. 2. They should be familiar persons or groups to the subject population. 3. They should vary in terms of their different sources of power. 4. They should vary in terms of their stands on the issues in question.

In the pilot study, 8 referents for Behavior 1 (vote for passage ERA in the coming referendum) and 8 referents for Behavior 2 (attend religious services) were tested with motivation to comply items and source of power items on both general and behavioral domain levels. After careful examination based on the 4 criteria, 4 referents were chosen for each behavior. (They are shown in Table 1.)

The subject's motivation to comply with each of these referents were measured on two different levels: 1. on the general level and 2. on the behavioral domain level which were "women's issues" for Behavior 1, and "religion" for Behavior 2.

In order to prevent the subjects from perceiving and thus answering the questions on the general level in light of the behavioral domains, the questions on the general level were answered first (12 items for 12 referents), and the questions on the behavioral domain levels followed (8 referents for each behavioral domain) later.

2. Sources of Power

Selection of the items: In order to measure the sources of referent's power, 2 to 3 items were constructed for each of the 5 types of power (French and Raven, 1959) using seven point scales. In constructing these items, efforts were made to word the items to represent the original definition of each basis of power as closely as possible. After testing these items in the pilot study for clarity of wording and reliability, 11 items were chosen.

The 11 source of power items were measured first on the general level (the items started with "In general,"), and then on the behavioral domain level (the items started with "When it comes to women's issues," or "When it comes to religion,"). For the general referents, measurements were obtained on both behavioral domains whereas, for the behavior-specific referents, measurements were obtained only on the relevant behavioral domain.

3. Other variables

In addition, normative beliefs, subjective norm, attitude toward performing the behavior, and behavioral intention were measured concerning each behavior using seven point scales.

Results

Prediction of Intention from Attitude and Subjective Norm

To test the hypothesis that the intention to perform a behavior is predicted by attitude toward performing the behavior and subjective norm concerning the behavior, multiple regression analyses were performed for each behavior.

Results showed significant multiple correlations for both behaviors ($R = .80$

for voting for ERA, and $R = .76$ for attending religious services). Voting for ERA was primarily under attitudinal control whereas attending religious services was strongly influenced by both components. It should be noted, however, that there was a strong relationship between intention and subjective norm for both of the behaviors as indicated by the correlations ($r = .65$ and $r = .63$, respectively).

Given significant correlations between SN and Σb_{jmj} , the estimates of the normative components on the general and the behavioral domain levels were entered in place of SN into a multiple regression with intention. Overall, the results showed that the model predicts intentions well, with multiple correlations ranging from .71 to .81. The multiple correlations obtained with Σb_{jmj} did not differ significantly from the ones obtained with SN. The major finding in the multiple regressions was that, contrary to expectation, measuring motivation to comply on the behavioral domain level did not improve the prediction of SN or the intention.

Analysis of Motivation to Comply

To see whether there is an overall difference between the measures of motivations on the general and the behavioral domain levels, Hotelling's T^2 statistic was computed for the general and the behavioral domain level motivations for each behavior. The results showed significant ($p < .01$) differences between the two levels for both behaviors.

Given the significant overall difference in motivation to comply between the two levels, a 2×2 analysis of variance was performed on motivation scores using (A) general and behavior-specific referents and (B) general and behavioral domain levels as the two factors. Results indicated significant ($p < .01$) main effects for both factors plus a significant ($p < .01$) interaction effect for both behaviors. Overall, subjects were found to be more motivated to comply with the general referents (4.56 for women's issues, and 4.53 for religion) than with the behavior-specific referents (3.41 and 3.44, respectively), and were more motivated to comply on the general level (4.19 for women's issues, and 4.26 for religion) than on the behavioral domain levels (3.76 and

3.71, respectively).

The key finding in this analysis of variance was the interaction between type of referent and level of measurement which indicated that, with respect to the general referents, motivation to comply on the general level is significantly higher than motivation to comply on the behavioral domain level, while motivation to comply with the behavior-specific referents do not show any significant difference between the two levels.

Given these significant main and interaction effects, one-way analysis of variance was performed on each pair of the general and the behavioral domain level motivation scores to examine where the difference mostly stems from and also to see how they differ between the two levels for each referent. Table 1 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance.

Table 1: One-way analysis of variance on motivation to comply on general and behavioral domain levels

	mj (g)	mj (b)	F value
<u>Women's issues</u>			
mother	5.26	4.24	18.42**
father	5.12	4.19	13.84**
boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse	4.88	4.09	10.16**
friends	6.60	4.10	5.26*
Ms. magazine	3.26	3.55	1.36
conservatives	3.41	3.00	2.86
feminist researchers	3.69	3.93	.96
stop ERA	3.26	3.19	.06
<u>Religion</u>			
mother	5.26	4.47	10.63**
father	5.12	4.28	9.52**
boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse	4.88	3.86	16.21**
friends	4.60	3.76	10.42**
minister/priest/rabbi	4.36	4.50	.18
non-Christian friends	3.50	2.95	4.81*
born-again Christians	3.43	3.29	.17
cynics	2.91	2.60	1.50

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Results indicate significant differences between the two levels for 4 referents concerning women's issues, and 5 referents concerning religion. Consistent with the findings from the previous analyses, all of these referents except one were general referents.

For all referents that were found to have significant differences between the levels, motivations obtained on the general level always had higher scores than motivations obtained on the behavioral domain level. In other words, subjects were more motivated to do what the referents think they should do in general than to comply with the referents' normative prescriptions concerning "women's issues" or "religion".

Overall, these results supported the hypothesis that subjects would be more motivated to comply with the general referents on the general level compared to the behavioral domain levels. The counterpart of this hypothesis, however, which stated that the behavior-specific referents will have more influence on the behavioral domain than on the general level was not supported by the data.

Dimensions of Power

Before analyzing the data using all 5 bases of power as independent variables, the 11 items which were used to measure these bases were entered into a factor analysis to examine the pattern of relationships between the items, and to see if the data could be summarized to fewer dimensions without any serious loss of information. The principal axis method was used for the initial factoring, and the resulting factors were orthogonally rotated using the varimax procedure. The results of the factor analysis are presented in Table 2.

In general, Factor I was defined by the items for attraction, expert and negative coercive powers, whereas Factor II was defined by items for reward, coercive, and legitimate powers. The first factor, defined by attraction, expertise, and non-use of coercion may be interpreted as power based on a referent's personal attributes which exerts its influence through the subject's voluntary compliance as a result of free cognitive evaluation. This factor will be described as "Interpersonal Power" in the following presentation. The second factor, on the contrary, seems to represent power based on social or structural relation-

Table 2: Factor analysis on power items

Orthogonally rotated factor matrix			
Items		I	II
Attraction	1	.25	-.03
	2	.25	-.03
	3	.17	.03
Reward	1	-.10	.23
	2	.03	.14
Coercive	1	-.24	.31
	2	-.26	.30
Legitimate	1	-.01	.17
	2	-.00	.16
Expert	1	.28	-.09
	2	.25	-.04
Percentage of total variance accounted for		60.31	14.39

ships between the subject and the referent which works through obligations, responsibilities, expectations, rewards, and punishments. Viewed in this light, the second factor may be close to “force” or “power” in a more strict sense. This factor will be described as “Institutional Power” in the following presentation.

Analysis of the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power

In order to study the two types of power further in relation to other variables such as different levels of motivations and types of referents, two scores representing each factor were computed for each subject by summing over the scales with high loadings on each factor. For the Interpersonal factor, three items for attraction and two items for expert power were summed (five items in total). Items for coercive power also had high negative loadings on Factor I, but since they had even higher loadings on the Institutional Power, they were not included in the computation of the score of Factor I to avoid redundancy of information. For the Institutional Power, the items for reward power, coercive power and legitimate power were added together (6 items in total).

To examine if the data show significant differences in power scores between the general and the behavior-specific referents, between the general and the behavioral domain levels, and also between the two different types of power, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed. The result of the analysis of variance is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Analysis of variance on Power scores: Effects of type of referent, level of measurement, and type of power

Factors A: type of referent (general and behavior-specific)

B: level of measurement (general and behavioral domain)

C: type of power (Interpersonal and Institutional)

Source	df	MS	F
<u>Women's issues</u>			
Main effects			
A	1	8427.82	249.58**
B	1	885.52	119.90**
C	1	6401.84	170.78**
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	938.79	112.98**
A X C	1	276.99	26.03**
B X C	1	.78	.26
3-way interaction			
A X B X C	1	3.98	2.57
<u>Religion</u>			
Main effects			
A	1	4266.48	127.81**
B	1	1796.48	147.55**
C	1	5757.74	137.93**
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	607.67	63.49**
A X C	1	45.63	5.30*
B X C	1	1.75	.55
3-way interaction			
A X B X C	1	11.02	5.24*

* p<.05

** p<.01

Significant main effects were found for all three factors for both behaviors. The results showed that the general referents had greater power (3.33 for women's issues, and 3.02 for religion) than the behavior-specific referents (-5.19 and -3.04, respectively). For both types of referents, Interpersonal Power was greater (2.78 for women's issues, and 3.51 for religion) than Institutional Power (-4.64 and -3.53, respectively). The main effect of the level of measurement indicated that power on the general level (.45 for women's issues, and 1.96 for religion) were greater than power on the behavioral domain level (-2.31 and -1.98, respectively), but the effect of this factor seems better explained in terms of item interaction with the type of referent.

The interaction between the type of referent and the level of measurement showed that the general referents were seen as having significantly greater power on the general level compared to the behavioral domain level whereas the behavior-specific referents did not show such big differences between the levels. These results found with the power scores parallel those found earlier with the motivation to comply where the interaction effect between the type of referent and the level of measurement indicated that, with respect to the general referents, motivation to comply in general are significantly higher than motivation to comply concerning the specified behavioral domains, while motivation to comply with the behavior-specific referents does not show any significant difference between the two levels.

The interaction effect between the type of referent and the type of power indicates that the magnitude of the difference between the Interpersonal and the Institutional Power is greater for the behavior-specific referents than for the general referents. General referents are seen as having considerable Interpersonal Power and little if any Institutional Power. Behavior-specific referents are seen as having little if any Interpersonal Power and negative Institutional Power.

The significant 3-way interaction found with regard to the religious behavior indicated that this power differential is true on the general level but not on the behavioral domain level.

Prediction of Motivation to Comply from the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power

One of the major concerns of the present study was to examine how different types of social power of a referent influence a person's motivation to comply with that referent, and to find out whether the pattern and the extent of the influence vary between the general and the behavior-specific referents and also between the levels of measurements.

To find out how the two different types of social power influence motivation to comply, the motivation to comply with a referent was regressed on the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power. In general, results showed fairly good prediction of the motivation to comply (multiple correlations were mostly within the range between .4 and .7), and the Interpersonal Power received greater weights compared to the Institutional Power in most cases.

In order to find out the effects of the different types of referents and the levels of measurement on the prediction of the motivation to comply from the two power scores, a 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on the z^* transformations of the multiple correlations (Games, 1978). On the regression weights, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed with the predictor variables (the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power) as the additional factor to examine whether the two power scores received significantly different weights as well as the interaction effects. Table 4 presents the results of the analysis of variance on multiple correlations obtained in the prediction of the motivation to comply from the two power scores, and the results for the regression weights are shown in Table 5. The means of the correlations and the weights in each cell of the analysis of variance design are presented in Table 6.

With regard to the multiple correlations, a significant main effect of the type of referent was found concerning the referents for the women's issues indicating that the prediction of the motivation to comply from the two power scores was significantly higher for the behavior-specific referents ($R = .62$) than for the general referents ($R = .49$). In general, the results were in the same direction for religion, but the differences were not great enough to reach

Table 4: Analysis of variance on multiple correlations in the prediction of motivation to comply from Interpersonal Power and Institutional Power

Factors A: type of referent (general and behavior-specific)

B: level of measurement (general and behavioral domain)

	df	R	
		MS	F
<u>Women's issues</u>			
Main effects			
A	1	.16	8.60*
B	1	.00	.06
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	.03	1.59
<u>Religion</u>			
Main effects			
A	1	.02	.45
B	1	.02	.37
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	.01	.30

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

the level of significance.

Results did not show any significant differences between the levels of measurement or any interactions between the two factors.

With regard to the regression weights, a significant main effect of the type of power and a significant interaction effect between the type of referent and the type of power were found for both behaviors. The main effect of the type of power showed that the Interpersonal Power received significantly greater weights compared to the Institutional Power. The key finding, however, was the interaction effect between the type of referent and the type of power. For the prediction of motivation to comply with the general referents, both

Table 5: Analysis of variance on standardized regression weights in the prediction of motivation to comply from Interpersonal Power, and Institutional Power

Factors A: type of referent (general and behavior-specific)
 B: level of measurement (general and behavioral domain)
 C: predictor variable (Interpersonal and Institutional)

Source	df	MS	F
<u>Voting for ERA</u>			
Main effects			
A	1	.04	1.05
B	1	.00	.07
C	1	.40	15.87**
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	.02	.86
A X C	1	.04	16.96**
B X C	1	.01	.43
3-way interaction			
A X B X C	1	.02	.63
<u>Attending service</u>			
Main effects			
A X B	1	.00	.04
B	1	.01	6.12*
C	1	.16	6.12*
2-way interactions			
A X B	1	.01	.30
A X C	1	.12	4.77*
B X C	1	.00	.01
3-way interaction			
A X B X C	1	.01	.23

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 6: Means of multiple regressions and regression weights obtained in the prediction of motivation to comply from Interpersonal Power an Institutional Power

	R		w1		w2	
	GR	BSR	GR	BSR	GR	BSR
<u>Women's issues</u>						
general level	.51	.59	.27	.56	.28	.03
behavioral domain level	.45	.65	.24	.55	.24	.18
<u>Religion</u>						
general level	.51	.59	.27	.46	.29	.18
behavioral domain level	.50	.52	.30	.38	.25	.14

Note: w1 = standardized regression weight of Interpersonal Power
w2 = standardized regression weight of Institutional Power
GR = general referents
BSR = behavior-specific referents

the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power received comparable weights, but with the behavior-specific referents, the Interpersonal Power received much greater weight than the Institutional Power.

Discussion

This study was an attempt to look at the social influence as a multidimensional concept composed of several factors: the type of normative referent, the level of compliance, and the source of the referent's power.

The results were analyzed to study the inter-relationships between these factors, as well as to study the effects of these factors on the subject's motivation to comply with the referents which is used as a measure of the subject's resultant response to the social influence attempt.

Prediction of Intention from Attitude and Subjective Norm: Effects of Measuring Motivation to Comply on the General and the Behavioral Domain Levels

A test of the model for the prediction of intention of the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) showed that, for both behaviors, the intention was predicted well by the model's two components, attitude toward performing the behavior, and subjective norm concerning the behavior.

Given significant results, Σ b_{jmj} 's were entered in place of SN into a multiple regression with intention. Based on previous research (Chung, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1981; Miniard and Cohen, 1981), it was hypothesized that, when the motivation to comply is measured on the behavioral domain level, it will lead to a better prediction of the intention to perform the behavior, compared to the motivation to comply on the general level. Contrary to the previous research, however, measuring the motivation to comply on the behavioral domain level did not improve the prediction of intention.

This finding may be interpreted in two different ways: First, the null hypothesis may be true: measuring the motivation to comply on the behavioral domain level does not improve the prediction of intention. Second, the measure of the motivation to comply on the general and the behavioral domain levels in the present study might not have been quite adequate: (1) the items for the motivation to comply "in general" with some behavior-specific referents might have been answered with respect to the behavioral domain with which the behavior-specific referent is associated, or (2) the scope of the behavioral domains chosen for measuring the motivation to comply on the behavioral domain levels (i.e., women's issues, and religion) might have been too general. The discussion presented in the following sections will give some illumination to understanding this problem.

Further research may shed light on this question by testing different ways of measuring the motivation to comply on several behavioral domains varying in scope (for example, women's issues > status of women > legal status of women > issues concerning ERA, etc.).

Analysis of Motivation to comply

The distinction between the two types of normative referents, the general and the behavior-specific, was made based on the results of numerous previous elicitation procedures done within the framework of the theory of reasoned action. The importance of the concept of the nature of the influencing agent has been acknowledged in the literature, as discussed in the introduction, but the proposed distinction between the general referents and the behavior-specific referents has never been systematically studied. To test whether this distinction would prove to be a useful concept in understanding social influence, the subject's motivation to comply with the two types of referents were analyzed on the general and the behavioral domain levels. Considering the nature of these referents, it was hypothesized that subjects will be more motivated to comply with the general referents on the general level, while they will be more motivated to comply with the behavior-specific referents on the behavioral domain level.

Results of the analysis of variance on the motivation scores showed significant differences between the levels for both factors giving some initial support to the basic idea that the type of referent and the level of measurement are important factors to be considered in understanding the motivation to comply.

These results of the interaction between the two factors also supported the hypothesis that the general referents will have more influence on the general level compared to the behavioral domain level, but did not support the counterpart hypothesis that the behavior-specific referents will exert more influence on the behavioral domain level. This failure to support the hypothesis with regard to the behavior-specific referents may be attributed to the failure on the part of the subjects to answer the items for motivation to comply with the behavior-specific referents "in general" as their motivation to comply regardless of the behavioral domain with which the behavior-specific referents are associated. In other words, motivation to comply with a behavior-specific referent may always be tied to the behavior or the behavioral domain. For example, subjects may always view the "minister/priest/rabbi" or "born-again Christians" in association with religion so that it is hard for them to think

about these behavior-specific referents on a truly general level which would encompass numerous other behavioral domains.

The results suggest that depending on the nature of the referent, subjects tend to view the referent either in general terms or with respect to a specific behavioral domain. This is an interesting finding in its own right, but this problem might be pursued and clarified further by a couple of different approaches: (1) give the subjects careful instructions to keep in mind many different behavioral domains when they answer the motivation to comply items on the general level, (2) ask the subjects to indicate their motivation to comply with a behavior-specific referent with respect to many different behavioral domains (for example, "I want _____ I don't want to do what bron-again Christians think I should do when it coms to a. religion, b. women's issues, c. smoking, d. family planning, etc "). If this were done prior to asking about the motivation to comply in general, a somewhat different pattern of results could emerge.

This would have important implications for the measurement of motivation to comply: If we measure a subject's motivation to comply with some general-referents and some behavior-specific referents in any behavioral situation, we might be measuring the subject's motivation to comply on different levels for different referents even though the items are in exactly the same format. Further research is required to clarify this problem.

Overall, the clear differences between the general and the behavioral domain levels and the sharp split between the general and the behavior-specific referents showed that these factors do influence motivation to comply differentially, and therefore, contribute to understanding of the underlying processes of motivation to comply.

Dimensions of Power: The Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power

One of the purposes of the present study was to find systematic relationships between social power and influence which make it essential to establish the valid measures of social power with empirical basis as well as proper con-

ceptualization. To test the assumption that the 5 sources of power in French and Raven's (1959) theory are not independent of each other, and that we might be able to identify the underlying dimensions of power, and thus summarize the information with fewer variables, a factor analysis was performed, and the results identified two major factors.

The "Interpersonal Power" was based on the referent's personal attributes, whereas the "Institutional Power" was based on the structural relationship between the subject and the referent. This distinction between the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power actually parallels some previous theories of social power and influence, such as Kelman's (1961) notions of compliance, identification, and internalization, Deutsch and Gerard's (1955) theory of informational and normative social influence, and Kelley's (1952) distinction between comparison and normative functions of a reference group.

These theories have different conceptualizations and concerns, but they all seem to share the basic idea that social influence is composed of a number of processes which elicits varying responses on the part of the subjects on a continuum of voluntary and willing compliance vs. forced compliance.

The Interpersonal Power may be viewed as eliciting voluntary compliance through the subject's free cognitive reasoning of what the agent has to offer such as information, expertise, credibility and attraction. On the other hand, the Institutional Power may be viewed as eliciting forced compliance through norms of the structural relationships, obligations, and sanctions.

The merit of the present study, then, as was discussed in the introduction, lies in the fact that the concepts of the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power are based on empirical data while older theories of social power and influence were not, and thus lends itself to further empirical tests relating the concepts of power to other important variables of social influence.

The two types of power were studied further in relation to the type of referent, and the level of measurement. Since the power is seen as one of the major determining factors of the motivation to comply, it was expected that the results of the analysis of power would be similar to the results of the analysis of the motivation to comply.

As expected, the findings replicated the results found earlier with regard to the motivation to comply, giving some initial empirical support to the idea that social power and influence are systematically related; Subjects saw the general referents as having significantly greater power on the general level compared to the behavioral domain level, but did not indicate any differences in their perception of the power of the behavior-specific referents between the general and the behavioral domain levels. Furthermore, the general referents were seen as having considerable Interpersonal Power and little if any Institutional Power, and the behavior-specific referents were seen as having little if any Interpersonal Power and negative Institutional Power. These findings seem to suggest that, for the behavior-specific referents to have power, a combination of attraction and expertise is important while the general referents may use force or right as well.

The Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power as Determinants of the Motivation to Comply

Given the findings discussed above, a more direct test of the effect of the two types of power on the motivation to comply with the referents was performed using multiple regression analysis. Generally, the prediction was significantly higher for the behavior-specific referents, and the Interpersonal Power received a significantly greater weight compared to the Institutional Power. More interestingly, for the prediction of the motivation to comply with the general referents, both the Interpersonal Power and the Institutional Power received comparable weights, but with respect to the behavior-specific referents, the Interpersonal Power received much greater weights than the Institutional Power. This replicated the findings in the previous section where the general referents were seen as having both types of power, and the behavior-specific referents were seen as having hardly any (or negative) Institutional Power.

These results, together with the results of the analysis on the motivation to comply, give some interesting insights to the relationship between the two types of power and their influence on the motivation to comply. As discussed

earlier, it was found that the general referents have considerable influence on both the general and the behavioral domain levels, and that the influence on the general level was greater than the influence on the behavioral domain level. The results of the multiple regression showed that the general referents do not derive their influence from any one type of power consistently. When these results are overlapped with each other, the picture seems to indicate that the general referents have both types of power, and that they can influence motivation to comply on both the general and the behavioral domain levels with both of these powers. The relative importance of the two types of power in influencing the motivation to comply in any specific case would depend on the individual referent and on the behavioral situation.

On the contrary, the behavior-specific referents were found to have a greater weight for the Interpersonal Power consistently regardless of the levels or the behavioral situations. Generally, it seems reasonable to conclude that the behavior-specific referents do not elicit as much compliance as the general referents, and whatever influence they can have on the motivation to comply is based mostly on the Interpersonal Power.

The present approach has shown that the proposed concepts, the nature of the referent, the source of power, and the level of compliance are important dimensions to be studied in understanding the social influence process. The interaction patterns of these factors were examined, as well as the systematic effects of these factors on the motivation to comply. In view of the significance of the field of the social influence and the lack of attempts for inter-experiment and inter-theory accumulation of empirical results in this field, the present approach might prove to be a very useful way of documenting empirical results and establishing theoretical networks for a better understanding of the multidimensional nature of the social influence process, with a gradual refinement of the conceptualizations and the measurements.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Allen, V. L. Situational factors in conformity. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965. pp. 133-175.
- Asch, S. E. Studies of independence and conformities. *Psychological Monographs*, 1956, 70, (9, Whole No. 416).
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. Physical attractiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 7. New York: Academic Press, 1974.
- Bochner, S., & Insko, C. A. Communicator discrepancy, source credibility, and opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1971, 39, 407-419.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Byrne, D. *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Chaiken, S. Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, 3, 1387-1391.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Chung, J. K. Factors influencing the accuracy of prediction of intention and behavior. *Unpublished Master's thesis*, University of Illinois, 1980.
- Collins, B. E., & Raven, B. H. Group structure: Attraction, coalitions, communication, and power. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. (2nd ed.) Vol. 4. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969, pp. 102-204.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. A study of normative and information with S-R behavior theory. In D. Horton & T. Dixon (Eds.), *Verbal behavior and S-R theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 340-387.
- Eagley, A. H. Recipient characteristics as determinants of responses to persua-

- sion. In R. E. Petty, T. M. Ostrom, & T. C. Brock (Eds.), *Cognitive responses in persuasion*. Hillsdale, N. j.: Earlbaum, 1981.
- Festinger, L. A. A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 1954, 7, 117-140.
- Fielder, F. E. A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 1. New York: Academic Press, 1964, pp. 149-190.
- Fielder, F. E. Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1971, 76, 128-148.
- Fishbein, M. A theory of reasoned action: Some applications and implications. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, 1979, 27, Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. On construct validity: A critique of Miniard and Cohen's paper. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, 1981, 17, 340-350.
- French, J. R. P., Jr. A formal theory of social power. *Psychological Review*, 1956, 63, 181-194.
- French, J. P. R., Jr., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959. pp. 150-167.
- Games, P. A. A three-factor model encompassing many possible statistical tests on independent groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1978, 85, 1, 168-182.
- Gamson, W. A. *Power and discontent*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1968.
- Gibb, C. A. Leadership. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. (2nd ed.) Vol. 4. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969. pp. 205-282.
- Heider, F. *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Kelley, H. H. Two functions of reference groups. In G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. Revised

- edition. New York: Holt, 1952. pp. 410-414.
- Kelley, H. H. & Thibaut, J. W. Group problem solving. In G. Lindzey and E Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. (2nd ed.) Vol. 4. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969. pp. 1-101.
- Kelman, H. C. *Processes of opinion change*. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961, 25, 57-78.
- Jahoda, M. Conformity and independence - A psychological analysis. *Human Relations*, 1959, 12, 99-120.
- Lange, R. & Fishbein, M. Effects of category differences on belief change and agreement with the source of a persuasive communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1983, in press.
- Lewin, K. Defining the "field at a given time." *Psychological Review*, 1943, 50, 292-310.
- Lewin, K. *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper, 1951.
- McGuire, W. J. The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*. (2nd ed.) Vol. 3. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Miniard, P. W. & Cohen, J. B. An examination of the Fishbein-Ajzen behavioral intentions model's concepts and measures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1981, 17, 309-339.
- Pettigrew, T. F. Social evaluation theory: Convergences and applications. In d. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on motivation*, 1967. Vol. 15. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967. pp. 241-311.
- Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo J. T. Forewarning, cognitive responding, and resistance to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1977, 35, 645-655.
- Shaver, K. G. *Principles of social psychology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop, 1977.
- Shaw, M. E. & Costanzo, P. R. *Theories of social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. Attitude as the individual's own categories: The social judgment-involvement approach to attitude an attitude change. In

- C. W. Sherif & M. Sherif (Eds.), *Attitude, ego-involvement, an change*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Stricker, L. J., Messick, S., & Jackson, D. N. Conformity, anticonformity and independence: Their dimensionality and generality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, 16, 495-507.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Triandis, H. C. *Interpersonal behavior*. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks/Cole, 1977.
- Triandis, H. C. Values, attitudes, and interpersonal behavior. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, 1979, 27. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.
- Willis, R. H. *Conformity, independence, and anticonformity*. *Human Relations*, 1965, 18, 373-388.

사회적 영향에 관한 다차원적 고찰

정 진 경

본 연구에서는 사회적 영향에 대한 현재까지의 이론들이 이 분야의 경험적, 실험적 자료의 통합에 적절한 방안을 모색하지 못한 점을 지양하여, 사회적 영향의 과정에 개재되는 중요한 요인들을 밝혀내고 그들간의 상호관계를 밝혀내어 응종동기(motivation to comply)에 미치는 영향을 종합적으로 연구하였다. 현재까지의 주요 이론들과 기초연구(pilot studies)를 바탕으로 사회적 영향이 일어나는 과정을 결정하는 중요한 요인 세 가지를 다음과 같이 선정하였다. (1) 규범적 참조인(normative referent)의 유형, (2) 참조인의 사회적 힘의 원천, (3) 응종을 하는 심리적 수준. 연구의 결과, 이 세 가지 요인들이 모두 응종동기에 유의미한 영향을 미치는 것으로 나타났으며, 특히 이 요인들간의 상호작용이 응종동기에 미치는 영향을 분석한 결과, 참조인의 사회적 힘이 피험자의 응종동기를 유발까지의 과정에서, 여러 매개변인들이 미치는 영향이 체계적으로 밝혀졌다. 사회적 영향의 과정을 다차원적으로 고려되어야 할 개념으로 파악하고, 그 과정안의 중요요인을 밝혀 경험적 검증을 해나가는 이러한 접근방법이 이 분야의 다양한 자료와 이론을 비교, 통합 하는데 가져올 수 있는 이점이 설명되었다.