

## Effect of Importance of Freedom and Attraction to Group Members on Influence Produced by Group Pressure

Jack W. Brehm and Millard Mann  
*Duke University*

An analysis of group influence processes indicates that the functional relationship between attraction to a group and influence exerted by the group depends on the importance to the individual member of any freedom that is threatened by group pressure to conform. This proposition was tested by an experiment in which the effect of group conformity pressure on public and private opinions was measured under two levels of attraction to the group crosscut by two levels of importance of freedom. The results were as predicted. It was found that when the importance of freedom was relatively low, the greater was the attraction to other group members, the greater was the amount of both public and private influence. But when the importance of freedom was relatively high, the greater was the attraction to other group members, the less was the amount of both public and private influence. The condition of high importance of freedom with high attraction to the group produced a boomerang effect on private opinions and a trend toward a boomerang on public opinions. A sleeper effect was found when the group pressure to conform was removed; subjects in the condition of high importance of freedom and high attraction to the group changed positively on a measure of private opinion. It was concluded that the evidence supported a reactance theory analysis of group influence processes. Limiting conditions and other qualifications were discussed.

Early work on group influence processes (Back, 1951; Berkowitz, 1957; Festinger, 1953; Schachter, Ellertson, McBride, & Gregory, 1951) held that when a member is in disagreement with the rest of his group, his tendency to come into agreement increases as his attraction to the group increases. Somewhat later work (French, Morrison, & Levinger, 1960; Raven & French, 1958a, 1958b; Zipf, 1960) pointed out a variety of factors that may increase a group member's resistance to change. And, as Cartwright and Zander (1968) noted in their review of work on group influence processes, it is generally agreed that resistance to change decreases as attraction to the group increases. Thus, an increase in attraction both increases pressure

to change and decreases resistance against doing so. However, an analysis of group influence processes in terms of reactance theory (Brehm, 1966) leads to a quite different conclusion. The purpose of the present article is to show how reactance can reverse the effect of group attraction on the tendency to agree with the group.

Briefly, reactance theory assumes that individuals believe themselves to have behavioral freedoms, such as being able to hold a particular position on an opinion issue. It is hypothesized, then, that when a person feels a freedom has been threatened or eliminated, reactance is aroused. Reactance is defined as a motivational state that is directed toward the restoration of whatever freedom has been threatened or eliminated. One way to restore a threatened freedom is to exercise it, that is, to engage in the behavior in question. For example, if a person thought he was free not to engage in a particular behavior X, and were then subjected to pressure to do X, he could restore his freedom by doing not-X. Furthermore, the more important to him is the freedom not to do X, the greater is the

---

This article is based on the undergraduate honors research of the second author. The research grew out of a conference on Processes of Minority Influence organized by the Social Science Research Council and funded by the National Science Foundation. The research was supported by NSF Grant GS 3205 to the first author.

Requests for reprints should be addressed to Jack W. Brehm, Department of Psychology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706.

magnitude of reactance when pressured to do it, and the greater is his consequent tendency to do not-X.

As previous theory and research indicate, the amount of pressure to come into agreement with a group increases as the member's attraction to the group increases. Thus, for a group member who disagrees with the group, increases in attraction to the group increase the perceived threat to his freedom to decide for himself on the issue. Where the importance of this freedom is relatively low, little reactance is aroused and the individual's tendency to come into agreement is primarily a function of the pressure to agree. The greater is his attraction to the group, the greater is the pressure to agree and the more he tends to change toward the group's position. But when the importance of the threatened freedom is relatively great, the magnitude of reactance is relatively large, and the individual's tendency to come into agreement is determined by reactance as well as by the pressure to agree. With high importance of freedom, increases in attraction to the group produce more pressure to come into agreement but also produce large increases in reactance. Large amounts of reactance tend to cancel out any tendency to come into agreement with the group. If the magnitude of reactance is greater than the pressure to agree, the individual changes away from the group's position. In general, then, increases in attraction to the group produce increases in change toward the group position only to the extent that the freedom threatened by the group pressure is low in importance. The more important is the freedom, the less does increase in attraction produce increases in change toward agreement. If a freedom is sufficiently important, increases in attraction result in decreases in change toward the group, or result in increases in boomerang attitude change.

In summary, two hypotheses can be stated. If a member finds himself in disagreement with the rest of his group, and the group explicitly pressures him to move toward agreement, (a) when the pressure threatens a freedom of relatively low importance, the greater his attraction to other group members, the greater is his change toward the

group's position, and (b) as the importance of the threatened freedom increases, the positive relationship between attraction and change tends to reverse. The first hypothesis asserts that the long-accepted relationship between attraction and change holds only when the freedom threatened by the pressure to change is relatively low in importance. The second hypothesis asserts that there is an interaction between importance of freedom and attraction to the group; when the importance of freedom is relatively high, increased attraction results in little or no increase in positive change and can result in increased negative change.

An interesting question may be raised about the nature of any reactance-produced resistance or boomerang effect. It is possible that any resistance or boomerang effect would be confined to the individual's public position, and that his private position would at the same time change toward the group position. That is, the attempt to restore freedom might be purely public rather than both public and private, since it is only the public behavior that is subject to surveillance by the group. To obtain evidence on this point, both public and private measures of opinion must be obtained.

A second point of interest concerns how the individual responds once explicit pressure to change has been removed. Theoretically, removal of the explicit pressure reduces reactance and leaves intact the motivation to change toward agreement with the group that derives from disagreement and attraction to the other group members. Thus, a third hypothesis is: (c) Even when the freedom to make one's own judgment is important, once the explicit pressure to change has been removed, the greater the attraction to other members, the greater is the change toward their position (a sleeper effect).

#### METHOD

In order to test the hypotheses, it was first necessary to give each subject the impression that he was a member of a group, that he was unanimously opposed by other members of the group on an issue of importance to the group, and that he was under explicit pressure by the other members of the group to change his position in favor of the majority. Within this general context, it was necessary to create two levels of the subject's attraction to other group members and two levels of the importance of

the freedom to hold one's own position on the issue. Finally, it was necessary to measure both public and private opinion change due to the group's pressure to change and to measure any further private opinion change after the group pressure to change had been removed. These needs were met by adapting methods used by Burdick (1955) and McBride (1954).

### *Procedure*

Male undergraduates from elementary psychology courses at Duke University volunteered for an experiment entitled, "Group Decision Making in Ecology." While these students are required to participate in a certain amount of research, they may select freely among a variety of research activities. Subjects were scheduled in groups of five or six, and when they arrived they were seated around a hexagonal grouping of trapezoidal tables.<sup>1</sup> On each table was a pad of note paper, a pencil, and a card with an identifying letter lying face down. After being seated, subjects were told that they were going to make an evaluation from reports on the Alaska oil pipeline—from environmentalists, oil interests, and the Defense Department—and decide what impact the environmentalists' paper would have in the final recommendations made by a group of Rand Corporation scientists to the Administration and Congress.

Before proceeding to the business of the group, each subject was asked to identify himself to the rest of the group and to tell a little about his interests, hobbies, etc. This was done in an effort to have subjects feel they were members of a group and in order to serve as the basis for the manipulation of attraction to the group. After each subject had introduced himself, all subjects were asked to fill out a questionnaire that required rating each other group member on a scale ranging from -5 (dislike extremely) to 5 (like extremely). These questionnaires were then collected.

To provide a rationale in which importance of freedom could be manipulated and explicit pressure to change might be brought to bear by group members, subjects were told that a foundation was subsidizing this research. The experimenter explained that the foundation funds were to be used to approximate a real-life situation as closely as possible. It had therefore been decided that each group would receive a \$15 participation fee that they could divide among themselves as they saw fit. In addition, an individual prize was to be awarded to the subject whose judgment came closest to the correct position, that is, the position picked by the group of scientists.

*Manipulation of importance of freedom.* A booklet of reports on the issue was then handed to each subject. The covering page gave additional instructions and included the manipulation of the importance of freedom. Some subjects learned that the

prize for individual accuracy of judgment was \$2 (low importance), while others learned that it was \$10 (high importance).

When the reports had been read, the experimenter explained that it was necessary to keep a record of the discussion and to ensure against all nonverbal communications. Shields were then erected so that subjects could not see each other, and the experimenter explained the system of balloting, writing notes to discuss the issue, and rebaloting. The subjects were instructed to turn over their cards in order to learn their identifying letters, which would be used to show the distribution of opinion within the group and with which they would address and sign their discussion notes. All subjects were actually given the letter, B.

*Manipulation of attraction.* At this point the experimenter noted that other groups had expressed interest in learning the outcome of the attraction questionnaire, and so, he explained, he had prepared a summary sheet to show each person how he had been rated by others in the group. Low attraction was created by informing subjects that their ratings on the 11-point scale were -2, -1, -1, 0, and 0; high attraction was created by informing subjects that their ratings were 3, 3, 2, 2, and 1 (one score would be omitted in groups consisting of five persons).

*Balloting and discussion.* Following the attraction manipulation, the first ballot was passed out, and subjects were asked to indicate their position and sign their letter so that the results for the whole group could be recorded. The ballot consisted of the question, "How much weight do you think the environmentalists will have in the final decision?" followed by a 30-point response scale labeled "very little" at one end and "determining factor" at the other. The ballots were collected, ostensibly tallied, and a form presumably showing the resulting group distribution was then given to each subject. Each form was actually designed to give the subject the impression that he was opposed by all other members of the group. The other letters, A, C, D, E, and possibly F, were all shown at the opposing side of the scale within a range of 7 points and with an average distance from the subject of about 15 points.

When the ballot results had been distributed subjects were told they could begin their note writing. Within a few minutes the experimenter began circling the table to pick up completed notes and to pass out notes. All notes distributed were pre-written by the experimenter. Each subject first received a note from C that asked his reason for his choice of position. He then received a note from A that stated he (B) did not seem to agree with the group and stated an argument for the group's side of the issue. The third and fourth notes were designed to make explicit the group pressure to agree. The third note, signed by D, said, "Why don't you change your mind? If you do, I'll vote \$6 of the \$15 group fee for you." The fourth note, signed by E, said, "I've been in contact with D and agree with his offer. Why don't you change?" After

<sup>1</sup> A confederate was used to bring two groups up to the size of five.

delivery of the fourth note, the experimenter announced that the discussion was over. The whole discussion period lasted about 15 minutes.

*Public and private measures.* A second ballot was then given to each subject, and they were reminded to sign their letters to their ballots so that the results could be shown to the group. Upon completion and collection of this public measure, the experimenter passed out a two-page questionnaire and asked subjects, as a favor, to fill it out in order to aid another experimenter in the department who was doing research on the same general topic. The experimenter explained that the questionnaire was of no interest to him, that they should put neither their names nor their letters on it, and that the questionnaires would simply be collected and turned over to this other researcher for his own use. One item on this questionnaire was identical to the group opinion ballot, and it constituted the measure of private opinion on the issue. The second page of the questionnaire contained questions designed to measure the success of the experimental manipulations.

*Removal of group pressure and final ballot.* When the questionnaires had been collected, the experimenter announced that it was time for the group to vote on the distribution of the \$15 group participation fee, and he distributed a form for that purpose. This form asked the subject to write in the amount of money he thought should be given to each person, including himself, identified by letter. Subjects were told not to put any identification on this sheet. These sheets were then collected.

Finally, the experimenter asked for another ballot to be filled in, stressing that it was this vote that would count for the individual prize. Subjects were told to put their full names on the sheet so that they could be contacted if they won. This, of course, was the measure of opinion after the group pressure had been removed. The ballots were collected, the shields removed, and a careful debriefing session followed.

### *Summary of Design*

Two levels of importance of freedom were crossed by two levels of attraction to other group members. Fifty-two subjects were run in groups of 5 or 6, and they were randomly assigned to the four experimental conditions within these groups with the restriction that condition numbers be equal. The initial measure of opinion was taken after the induction of importance and attraction but prior to the introduction of group pressure. After introduction of the explicit group pressure to change, there was a public and then a private measure of opinion. After the group pressure had been removed, a final private measure of opinion was taken.

## RESULTS

Thorough pretesting was done to ensure that the rationale was believable, the issue was of concern to the subjects, and the amounts of money were credible. The post-

experimental interviewing revealed very little suspicion on the part of subjects, and no subject data were deleted from the analysis of results. Although subjects were run in groups, and there was a small amount of group interaction at the beginning of each experimental session, subjects were assumed to be independent of each other for the statistical analysis of results. This assumption of independence seems justified because subjects were isolated from each other prior to the introduction of any influence processes and because subjects within groups were randomly assigned to the four experimental conditions.

### *Success of Manipulations*

The second page of the anonymous questionnaire contained questions designed to measure the success of the experimental manipulations. Two questions were relevant to the manipulation of attraction to the group, and two questions were relevant to the manipulation of importance of freedom.

To measure attraction, one question asked, "How much did the group like you?" Responses were made on an 11-point scale running from -5 (labeled Dislike Extremely) to 5 (Like Extremely). The mean perceived liking by others in the low-attraction condition (-1.04) was clearly less than the mean perceived liking by others in the high attraction condition (1.31). An analysis of variance revealed a strong main effect between high- and low-attraction conditions,  $F(1, 48) = 22.37$ ,  $p < .001$ , and no other effects.

The second question, which used an identical response scale, asked, "In general, how much did you like the other members of the group?" The mean response was -1.19 in low-attraction groups and 1.38 in high-attraction groups. An analysis of variance of these data yielded a strong main effect for the attraction manipulation,  $F(1, 48) = 23.48$ ,  $p < .001$ , and no other significant effects. Thus, the evidence from these two questions indicates that the attraction manipulation was reasonably successful.

The first question designed to measure importance of freedom was "How important was

it to take your own stand on the issue?" Responses were made on an 11-point scale that ran from 0 (labeled No Importance) to 10 (Very Important). While the means were 4.46 in the low-importance and 5.20 in the high-importance condition, neither this difference nor any other effect was found to be significant by an analysis of variance. It may well be that subjects interpreted "take your own stand" to mean a public defense of their position. This interpretation is essentially irrelevant to the importance of freedom dimension, and its use by subjects would account for the lack of effect obtained on this question.

The second question to measure importance asked, "How concerned were you that the group make an accurate estimate?" Responses were made on an 11-point scale that ran from 0 (Didn't care) to 10 (Very concerned). It was expected that concern for accuracy of the group estimate would vary inversely with the importance to the individual of the freedom to make his own judgment. In accordance with that expectation, these means were 6.34 in the low-importance and 4.38 in the high-importance condition. An analysis of variance of these responses revealed a weak though reliable main effect for importance,  $F(1, 48) = 6.79$ ,  $p < .05$ . Taken together, the responses to the two questions concerning the importance of freedom indicate that the manipulation of importance may have been weak. However, it may also be that these questions were not good measures, for, as

can be seen below, the major results indicate that the manipulation of importance of freedom was effective.

A filler question on the questionnaire asked subjects, "How useful did you find the discussion?" While it was not anticipated that this question would show a difference, an analysis of variance yielded a main effect for the attraction variable,  $F(1, 48) = 7.29$ ,  $p < .01$ . Subjects in low-attraction conditions thought the discussion less useful (3.34) than did subjects in high-attraction conditions (5.12). It seems plausible that subjects in the low-attraction conditions may have judged the discussion to be relatively useless because they were relatively uninterested in what the group was doing.

### *Influence Processes*

The subjects were about equally divided initially regarding whether they thought the environmentalists would have much or little influence. Because we were primarily interested in the amount of change in opinion shown in each condition and because all subjects were led to believe that they were on the other side of the scale from the rest of the group, initial opinions were computed as deviations from the center of the scale. As can be seen in the first column of Table 1, these means were moderate and similar among the four experimental conditions.

*Public and private responses to group pressure.* During the discussion, each subject received a note ostensibly from each of four other group members. The first note asked the subject why he held his position, the second argued for the group position, and the third and fourth notes promised to give the subject a larger than normal share of the group participation fee if he would only agree with the rest of the group. At the end of the discussion, a ballot was taken that ostensibly would be made public so that everyone in the group could see how each other person, identified by letter, stood.

It was expected that, where the importance of freedom was low, the greater was the attraction to the group, the greater would be the tendency of the individual to comply publicly. But where the importance of the freedom was high, group pressure to comply

TABLE 1

MEANS OF INITIAL POSITION AND OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CHANGES UNDER PRESSURE TO CHANGE, AND OF PRIVATE CHANGE AFTER PRESSURE IS REMOVED

Condition	Initial position <sup>a</sup>	Under pressure to change <sup>b</sup>		Pressure removed (private) <sup>b</sup>
		Public	Private	
Low importance				
Low attraction	7.15	3.70	2.39	1.31
High attraction	8.00	8.62	6.38	3.77
High importance				
Low attraction	7.62	5.61	3.69	1.15
High attraction	8.00	-2.31	-2.85	4.92
MS <sub>e</sub>	15.93	31.45	24.10	50.24

<sup>a</sup> Initial position was tabulated as a deviation from the center of the scale. Possible scores ranged from 1 to 15.

<sup>b</sup> A positive value indicates change toward the group position. All measures were on a 30-point scale.

should produce reactance and a consequent reduction in the positive relationship between attraction and compliance. As can be seen in the second column of Table 1, the changes in public position conform quite well to this analysis. Where the importance of freedom was low, the high-attraction condition produced greater compliance (8.62) than did the low (3.70),  $F(1, 48) = 5.01$ ,  $p < .05$ . In contrast, where the importance of freedom was high, the high-attraction condition produced less compliance (-2.31) than did the low (5.61),  $F(1, 48) = 12.97$ ,  $p < .001$ . The interaction of attraction and importance of freedom was highly significant,  $F(1, 48) = 17.05$ ,  $p < .001$ .

The measure of private change was taken immediately after that of public, and it was taken in order to see whether the reactance effects due to the group pressure were limited to public responses. As can be seen in the third column of Table 1, the means for private change are quite similar to those for public. Again, the interaction between attraction and importance was highly significant,  $F(1, 48) = 14.98$ ,  $p < .001$ . There were no reliable differences between the public and private measures.

The negative change obtained in the condition of high importance of freedom and high attraction to the group was submitted to further analysis to see if it was reliable. On the public measure, 8 out of 10 subjects who showed any change at all showed a boomerang effect ( $p = .11$ ), and the  $F$  value (2.20) fell short of significance. On the private measure, however, 10 out of 11 subjects who showed any change at all showed a boomerang ( $p = .02$ ), and the  $F$  value (4.37) was also significant ( $p < .05$ ). Thus, there was a reliable boomerang effect on private change, and a trend toward a boomerang on public change.

*Acceptance of the inducement.* When subjects were given a chance to distribute the group participation fee as they saw fit, they could indicate their overt acceptance of the inducement for conformity by giving themselves a disproportionately large amount. It was found that six of the subjects in each of the low-importance conditions accepted the inducement, eight accepted it in the condition of high importance and low attraction, and

only one accepted it in the condition of high importance and high attraction. These data are entirely consistent with the opinion change data.

*Removal of group pressure.* Once the group members had filled out the forms to distribute the group participation fee, the explicit pressure to conform to the group was removed. At this time a private measure of opinion was taken that would ostensibly be used to determine if there were a winner of the individual accuracy prize. This measure allows an assessment of what position was thought to be correct in the absence of both public conformity and reactance pressures. If private opinion change in the absence of explicit pressure is a direct function of attraction to the group, then the high-attraction condition should show more positive change than the low even where the importance of freedom is great. The mean changes from initial opinions to the last measure are shown in the last column of Table 1. While an analysis of variance of these data shows that the main effect for attraction fails to reach significance,  $F(1, 48) = 2.51$ ,  $p < .20$ , it is notable that the highest mean (4.92) is found in the condition of high attraction and high importance of freedom. In other words, those subjects who showed a boomerang tendency to the group pressure to conform actually showed somewhat more positive change than did subjects in other conditions once the pressure to conform had been removed. As can be seen in Table 2, the differences between private measures while the group pressure was applied and after it was removed are quite dramatic. All conditions showed a slight decrement in acceptance of the group position except for those in the condition of high attraction and high importance of freedom, who showed a highly reliable,  $F(1, 48) = 22.54$ ,  $p < .001$ , positive change. This effect strongly supports the contention that the boomerang tendency produced by the joint effects of group pressure, attraction to the group, and importance of freedom is due to reactance.

#### DISCUSSION

The present experiment has shown that when a member finds himself in disagreement with the rest of his group, and he is offered

TABLE 2  
MEAN CHANGES IN PRIVATE OPINION DUE TO REMOVAL  
OF GROUP PRESSURE

Importance of freedom	Attraction to group	
	Low	High
Low	-1.09	-2.61
High	-2.54	7.77

Note.  $MS_0 = 34.82$ .

special rewards by the group for compliance, the degree of his public compliance and private acceptance is determined by a joint function of his attraction to the group and how important is his freedom to hold his own position on the issue. Where the importance of freedom is relatively small, both public and private compliance are a direct function of attraction to the group. However, as the importance of freedom increases, the magnitude of the direct function between attraction and compliance tends to decrease. Where the importance of freedom is relatively great, both public compliance and private acceptance decrease as attraction to the group increases.

This experiment also demonstrated that the negative relationship between attraction and compliance that is obtained when the importance of freedom is relatively great can be greatly reduced by removal of the explicit pressure to comply. Though statistically nonsignificant, the evidence suggests that, once the explicit group pressure has been removed, there remains a direct relationship between attraction and private acceptance. The lack of a stronger relationship between attraction and positive influence may be due to the fact that pressure to agree with other members was not totally removed. After the allocation of rewards, members presumably still felt pressure to come into agreement with others to whom they were attracted, and this pressure too should arouse some reactance. Theoretically, there will almost always be some reactance when there is pressure to change, and it is not surprising that many studies have reported marginal positive influence effects (e.g., Back, 1951; Berkowitz, 1957).

The results are clearly consistent with the

analysis of group influence processes in terms of reactance theory that was presented in the introduction of this article. Nevertheless, two points should be noted about the particular conditions under which the present test was carried out. First, the manipulation of attraction to the other members of the group was carried out by leading subjects to believe they themselves were liked or disliked by the other members. While this operation apparently was successful in creating differing degrees of attraction to the group, it doubtless had other effects as well. For example, those in the high-attraction condition probably felt more accepted by other members than did those in the low-attraction condition. It is therefore possible that the boomerang tendency observed in the condition of high attraction with high importance of freedom depends, at least to some extent, on the feeling of being accepted. Just as Hollander (1958) has postulated that "idiosyncrasy credits" may allow a leader to deviate from group norms, so in the present case may the feeling of acceptability allow subjects to show opinion change away from the group. Further research is needed to determine whether the acceptability factor is important for the pattern of results obtained.

Second, the group pressure to change was made explicit to subjects by the offer of a reward for compliance. Theoretically, the arousal of reactance does not require that either rewards for compliance or threats for noncompliance be involved in order for group pressure to serve as a threat to freedom. The offer of rewards was used in the present experiment in order to dramatize the group pressure as a threat to freedom. Since it was used, however, further research is needed to show whether such explicit group pressures are necessary for the effects obtained.

*Social power analysis.* French and Raven (1959) have stipulated conditions under which boomerang attitude change should obtain, and it may be useful to contrast their analysis with the present experiment. They hold that negative influence may occur when coercive power (use of threats), illegitimate power, or negative referent power is used to obtain change. Each of these uses of power intro-

duces a negative valence that tends to become associated with the behavior that is the target of inducement.

It is apparent that neither coercive power nor negative reference power was involved in producing the boomerang tendency found here. The offer of an extralarge share of the group participation fee would constitute reward power rather than coercive power. Similarly, the condition of high attraction to the group constitutes high positive reference power rather than negative reference power.

The question of the legitimacy of the influence attempt is less easily determined on a priori grounds. While the subjects were told at the beginning of the session that they would be able to divide the group participation fee among themselves in any way that they saw fit, it is possible that subjects would not normally have thought of making an uneven distribution, and they may have thought that the offer to give them more was an unfair way to put pressure on them. However, the results of this pressure are difficult to understand as a product of illegitimate power. First of all, the effects differed as a function of whether freedom was important, an effect not clearly predicted in terms of the legitimacy concept. Second, once the group pressure had been removed, private attitudes of subjects who had shown a boomerang tendency became relatively positive. If the boomerang effect had been due to negative valence associated with an illegitimate influence attempt, it is not apparent that the negative valence would have disappeared after the illegitimate distribution of rewards had presumably been carried out. Thus, an explanation in terms of illegitimacy of the influence attempt does not seem compelling.

### *Implications*

The reactance theory analysis presented here can be extended to other forms of pressure toward uniformity in groups and to other dimensions of social power. It may be expected, for example, that other determinants of cohesiveness aside from attraction would also have the capability to increase the threat to freedom that results from group influence attempts.

However, there remains a question about when group influence attempts arouse reactance. Grabitz-Gniech (1971) interpreted her experiment to mean that when a group decides upon an issue of relevance to the group, members would give up their freedom to differ. It is apparent that her generalization does not hold for the present experiment, and it remains unclear what conditions determine whether freedom is given up or reactance is aroused.

*A sleeper effect.* Those subjects for whom both importance of freedom and attraction to the group were great revealed not only a boomerang to group pressure to conform, but also positive change once the group pressure had been removed. This kind of sleeper effect should be latent in all influence attempts that arouse reactance. If an influence attempt has aroused reactance, and because of that has been ineffective, positive influence can still be brought about by removing the pressure to change. For example, a therapist who has had little or no success in getting a patient to adopt new styles of behavior may find that those styles are adopted after the therapeutic relationship is terminated. Or to take another example, a group of demonstrators may find that the attitudes of people they are trying to influence will change favorably only after their demonstration has ceased. And finally, the forced busing of children to schools has obviously threatened or eliminated the freedom of parents to send their children to neighborhood schools. While the resistance of parents to forced busing has been apparent, if the forced busing has positive effects on the attitudes of the parents, these effects may remain hidden until the "force" involved in busing is removed. In summary, the paradox is that influence attempts tend to fail to the extent that they arouse reactance, and to that same extent, they may succeed as soon as they stop.

### REFERENCES

- Back, K. Influence through social communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1951, 46, 9-23.
- Berkowitz, L. Liking for the group and the perceived merit of the group's behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1957, 54, 353-357.

- Brehm, J. W. *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Burdick, H. *The compliant behavior of deviates under conditions of threat*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1955.
- Cartwright, C., & Zander, A. *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Festinger, L. An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.), *Group relations at the crossroads*. New York: Harper, 1953.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Morrison, H. W., & Levinger, G. Coercive power and forces affecting conformity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1960, *61*, 93-101.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1959.
- Grabitz-Gniech, G. Some restrictive conditions for the occurrence of psychological reactance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1971, *19*, 188-196.
- Hollander, E. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, 1958, *65*, 117-127.
- McBride, D. *The effects of public and private changes of opinion on intragroup communication*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1954.
- Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P., Jr. Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. *Journal of Personality*, 1958, *26*, 400-409. (a)
- Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P., Jr. Legitimate power, coercive power, and observability in social influence. *Sociometry*, 1958, *21*, 83-97. (b)
- Schachter, S., Ellertson, N., McBride, D., & Gregory, D. An experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity. *Human Relations*, 1951, *4*, 229-238.
- Zipf, S. G. Resistance and conformity under reward and punishment. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1960, *61*, 102-109.

(Received October 23, 1973)