

The Psychology of Conformity: Mechanisms, Contexts, and Consequences

Yongzhuo Chen

University College London, WC1E 6BT London, United Kingdom

cyz2455609616@hotmail.com

Abstract. Conformity represented one of the most pervasive and revealing phenomena in social psychology, encompassing both the adaptive and destructive facets of human behavior. This paper revisited the evolution of conformity research from its classical foundations to its modern applications. It first outlined the theoretical bases of informational and normative influence, highlighting contributions from Sherif's and Asch's paradigms and subsequent expansions through social impact theory and self-categorization theory. Methodological developments were then traced from controlled laboratory studies to cross-cultural research, neuroscientific investigations, and computational analyses of digital behavior. Contemporary extensions illustrated how conformity manifested across digital media, cultural contexts, organizations, educational systems, and political participation. While conformity fostered cooperation and cohesion, it could also stifle dissent, amplify misinformation, and entrench inequality. Ethical concerns, cultural biases, and ecological limitations persisted, yet new interdisciplinary approaches—including neuroimaging and big data—offered promising tools for examining social influence in complex environments. The paper concluded that conformity remained a dynamic mechanism through which individuals negotiated belonging, identity, and power. Recognizing its dual potential for both social stability and constraint was essential for understanding collective behavior in the digital and globalized age.

Keywords: Conformity; Social Influence; Normative Pressure; Informational Influence; Digital Media; Cross-cultural psychology; Social Identity.

1. Introduction: The Invisible Force of Conformity

Conformity is one of the most pervasive yet often underestimated forces shaping human behavior. It is embedded in daily life, from the small acts of aligning one's clothing choices with social expectations to the more consequential adoption of political, cultural, or organizational norms. Even seemingly trivial decisions can be influenced by the subtle cues of others. This instinctive adjustment to align with the group illustrates the powerful psychological phenomenon of conformity.

Psychology formally defined conformity as the alteration of one's beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors in response to perceived or imagined group pressure (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Aronson, 2018). This definition emphasized that conformity was not merely external compliance but also involved deeper cognitive and affective processes, whereby individuals internalized group expectations to avoid social rejection or to gain certainty in ambiguous contexts. The concept was central to understanding social influence more broadly, as it underpinned cultural transmission, social order, and collective behavior while also exposing the vulnerabilities of individuals to group pressures that might promote prejudice, authoritarianism, or misinformation.

The significance of studying conformity lied in its dual nature. On the one hand, conformity enabled cooperation and predictability, which were essential for stable societies. Social norms allowed people to coordinate actions, establish trust, and reduce uncertainty. Without conformity, large-scale collective projects, from traffic systems to political institutions, would collapse under the weight of divergent individual choices. On the other hand, conformity might impose considerable costs. Excessive conformity could stifle innovation, perpetuate discrimination, and justify harmful collective actions, as observed in historical examples such as the compliance of citizens under authoritarian regimes (Kelman & Hamilton, 1990). Understanding when and why people conform thus illuminated both the functional and dysfunctional aspects of social life.

Historically, foundational research established the mechanisms of conformity through landmark experiments. Sherif's (1936) worked with the autokinetic effect demonstrated that individuals in ambiguous situations converge on group norms, highlighting informational influence — the reliance on others to interpret reality. Asch's (1951, 1956) line judgment studies revealed normative influence, whereby individuals conform even against their better judgment to gain acceptance. These experiments provided the basis for distinguishing between informational and normative pressures (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955), which remained central to contemporary theory. Yet the importance of conformity extended beyond these classic dichotomies. It was intertwined with identity, culture, and power, which shaped when individuals prioritize belonging, accuracy, or resistance.

Recent decades have seen a resurgence of interest in conformity due to the rise of digital media, globalization, and interdisciplinary research. In digital spaces, conformity manifested in new forms such as algorithm-driven recommendations, viral social trends, and echo chambers, which amplified both cohesion and polarization (Bakshy, Messing, & Adamic, 2015; Sunstein, 2017). Cross-cultural psychology has also highlighted striking differences in conformity patterns between collectivist and individualist societies, challenging the assumption of universal principles (Bond & Smith, 1996; Gelfand et al., 2011). Meanwhile, neuroscience has revealed distinct brain systems involved in informational versus normative conformity, linking social influence to reward circuits and emotion regulation (Klucharev et al., 2009). These diverse perspectives underscored the contemporary relevance of conformity as a subject that cut across psychology, sociology, politics, and communication studies. This paper aims to examine the developmental evolution of conformity through a literature review.

This paper will trace the evolution of conformity research across four dimensions. First, it examined the foundational theories and landmark experiments that established the conceptual and empirical groundwork. Second, it evaluated the methodological paradigms through which conformity has been studied, ranging from controlled laboratory tasks to neuroimaging and digital big data. Third, it explored contemporary extensions, including digital environments, cross-cultural contexts, and applied domains such as organizational behavior and education. Finally, it outlined future research directions, identifying unresolved tensions, ethical considerations, and opportunities for interdisciplinary integration. Through this comprehensive review, the paper sought to highlight both the enduring insights of classic research and the emerging challenges posed by conformity in a rapidly changing world.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 The Dual-Process Model: Informational and Normative Influence

One of the most enduring frameworks for understanding conformity is the dual-process model, which distinguishes between informational and normative social influence. The informational pathway referred to situations in which individuals adopt group norms or judgments because they believed others possess more accurate knowledge. By contrast, the normative pathway emphasized conformity motivated by the desire for acceptance and the avoidance of social rejection (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955).

The origins of informational influence can be traced to Sherif's (1936) pioneering autokinetic study, which examined how individuals responded when asked to estimate the movement of a point of light in a darkened room. In the absence of objective reference points, participants' estimates converged over repeated trials, producing a shared group norm. This finding suggested that, when confronted with ambiguous or uncertain tasks, individuals turn to others for cues about reality. Later work reinforced this principle, demonstrating that group discussion reduced uncertainty by pooling informational resources, which was especially relevant in high-risk or ambiguous settings such as medical decision-making (Kaplan & Miller, 1987).

Normative influence, in contrast, was most famously captured in Asch's (1951, 1956) line judgment experiments. When confederates unanimously provided incorrect answers to a simple

perceptual task, a significant proportion of participants conformed despite knowing the group was wrong. Approximately one-third of responses aligned with the erroneous majority, and three-quarters of participants conformed at least once. The striking feature of these findings was not the dominance of social truth but the willingness to align with the group for the sake of acceptance. Replications and meta-analyses have confirmed the robustness of normative pressures across contexts, although the strength of conformity varied with group size, task difficulty, and cultural setting (Bond & Smith, 1996).

Together, these studies illustrated the central tension between accuracy and belonging. Informational influence reflects the human need for certainty, while normative influence reflected the need for affiliation. The dual-process model therefore remained a cornerstone in the study of conformity, even as subsequent theories have expanded and complicated its scope.

2.2 Social Impact Theory: Quantifying Influence

While the dual-process model captured the motivational underpinnings of conformity, Latané (1981) proposed social impact theory to describe the dynamics of influence in more quantitative terms. According to this framework, conformity was shaped by three variables: strength (the importance of the influencing group), immediacy (the proximity of the group in time and space), and number (the size of the group). Empirical research confirmed that conformity increases with group size but plateaus after about three to four members (Asch, 1956; Mullen, 1983). Moreover, sources of influence that were physically or psychologically closer exert greater pressure. This theoretical model has been applied beyond laboratory contexts to domains such as jury deliberations, organizational settings, and online behavior (Tanford & Penrod, 1984; Latané, Liu, Nowak, Bonevento, & Zheng, 1995).

Social impact theory broadened the field by moving beyond simple motivational dichotomies to emphasize how structural features of social contexts determined the strength of conformity. It suggested that influence was not merely a psychological process but also a function of social geometry, with measurable variables predicting the likelihood of alignment with group norms. This perspective paved the way for later computational and network-based models of conformity, particularly in the digital age.

2.3 Self-Categorization and Social Identity Theories

A further expansion of conformity research arose from the social identity tradition. Turner (1991), building on Tajfel's (1974) social identity theory, proposed that conformity should not be seen as passive compliance but as an active expression of group membership. Individuals internalized in-group norms as part of their self-concept, meaning that conformity was driven not by external pressure but by internalized identity. This theory repositioned conformity as an act of self-definition rather than submission. For instance, members of a political movement might conform to group slogans or rituals not because of fear of exclusion, but because such actions affirmed their belonging to a valued in-group (Abrams & Hogg, 1990).

Empirical research supports this framework. Abrams et al. (1990) demonstrated that participants were more likely to conform to the judgments of in-group members than to those of out-groups, even when the out-group was numerically larger.

This perspective has profound implications for understanding conformity in diverse societies. It suggested that conformity is often not about suppressing individuality but about affirming collective identity, which helped explain phenomena such as solidarity movements, cultural practices, and ideological alignment.

2.4 Minority Influence and Independence

While much research emphasizes majority influence, an important complementary tradition explores how minorities shape group norms. Moscovici (1980) argued that minority groups, though numerically smaller, could exert disproportionate influence when they were consistent, confident,

and principled. This “conversion theory” posited that while majority influence typically produces public compliance, minority influence could promote private acceptance by stimulating deeper cognitive processing.

Empirical support comes from Moscovici, Lage, and Naffrechoux’s (1969) classic color perception experiment, in which a consistent minority labeling blue slides as green influenced participants’ judgments on a subset of trials. Later studies confirmed that minority influence operates through mechanisms of validation and elaboration, encouraging individuals to reconsider assumptions (Wood, Lundgren, Ouellette, Busceme, & Blackstone, 1994). The recognition of minority influence balanced the conformity literature, emphasizing that social influence is not unidirectional and that resistance can foster innovation.

2.5 Integrating Cognitive and Neuroscientific Approaches

Table 1. Comparative summary of conformity theories

Theory	Core elements (what explains conformity)	Applicable scenarios (when it’s most likely)	Key limitations / boundary conditions
Dual-Process Model (Informational vs Normative Influence; Deutsch & Gerard, 1955)	Two motives: accuracy (informational) and affiliation/acceptance (normative). Ambiguity amplifies informational reliance; unanimity and evaluation apprehension amplify normative pressure. (Sherif, 1936; Asch, 1951/1956)	Informational: ambiguous tasks, novel environments, high uncertainty, expertise asymmetries. Normative: public responses, cohesive groups, high stakes for belonging, unanimous majorities. (Kaplan & Miller, 1987; Bond & Smith, 1996)	Potential confounding of motives in practice; under-specifies structural/contextual parameters; lab paradigms may overstate public compliance; cultural variability in normative weight.
Social Impact Theory (Latané, 1981)	Influence = f(Strength, Immediacy, Number); diminishing returns beyond ~3–4 sources; “social geometry” of influence. (Asch, 1956; Mullen, 1983)	Settings with clear, countable sources and varying proximity/importance (e.g., juries, classrooms, teams, online ratings). (Tanford & Penrod, 1984)	Descriptive/quantitative but light on mechanisms; assumes additivity/independence of parameters; may not capture identity dynamics or network topology effects; plateaus vary by task and culture.
Self-Categorization / Social Identity (Turner, 1991; Tajfel, 1974)	People internalize in-group norms; conformity is identity-consistent self-definition, not passive compliance; in-group prototypicality matters. (Abrams & Hogg, 1990)	Identity-salient contexts (political groups, fandoms, professions), intergroup settings, norm talk by in-group prototypical members; private as well as public alignment.	Can underplay informational uncertainty and raw majority size; effects moderated by identity strength, status, and comparative context; multiple identity memberships can cross-cut norms.
Minority Influence / Conversion Theory (Moscovici, 1980)	Consistent, confident, principled minorities stimulate validation and deeper processing; shifts often private/latent. (Moscovici et al., 1969; Wood et al., 1994)	Innovation, social change, scientific dissent; environments where consistency and credibility are visible (committees, editorial boards, movements).	Effects often small/slow; requires perceived integrity/ingroup relevance; vulnerable to dismissal when minority seen as out-group or low-status; context can punish dissenters.
Cognitive & Neuroscientific Accounts (Klucharev et al., 2009; Berns et al., 2010)	Disagreement with the group elicits “prediction-error”/social pain signals (e.g., rACC, striatum); reinforcement-learning updates move judgments toward norms.	Rapid, trial-by-trial judgments (ratings, recommendations), feedback-rich settings, norm discovery in uncertain environments; links micro-signals to behavior change.	Small samples; correlational fMRI/“reverse inference”; ecological validity limits; neural markers don’t uniquely map to social influence; culture/task features still crucial.

In recent years, cognitive neuroscience has provided new insights into the mechanisms underlying conformity. Klucharev et al. (2009) demonstrated through functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) that deviations from group opinion activate the rostral cingulate zone and ventral striatum,

regions associated with error prediction and reward processing. These neural signals predicted subsequent adjustments toward group norms, suggesting that conformity operates through reinforcement-learning systems. Normative influence, meanwhile, has been linked to neural circuits involved in social pain and affect regulation, such as the anterior cingulate cortex and amygdala (Berns, Capra, Moore, & Noussair, 2010).

These findings integrated psychological theories with biological mechanisms, reinforcing the idea that conformity was not only a social phenomenon but also a fundamental part of human cognition shaped by evolutionary pressures for cooperation and survival. Such interdisciplinary work underscored the importance of studying conformity across levels of analysis, from neural circuits to cultural systems (As shown in Table 1 below).

3. Methodological Paradigms

3.1 Classical Laboratory Paradigms

The foundations of conformity research were laid through carefully controlled laboratory studies that sought to isolate and quantify social influence. Asch's (1951, 1956) line judgment experiments remained the most iconic example. Participants were asked to identify which of several comparison lines matched a standard line in length, an unambiguous task. However, when surrounded by confederates who unanimously gave incorrect answers, roughly one-third of participants conformed on critical trials, and 75% conformed at least once. The strength of the Asch paradigm was its ability to reveal the striking power of normative influence even in situations where the correct answer was obvious.

These classical experiments were followed by methodological innovations that allowed for greater efficiency and broader exploration of variables. Crutchfield (1955), for example, introduced the "Crutchfield apparatus," which allowed multiple participants to be tested simultaneously by presenting group responses electronically. This design maintained the illusion of group consensus while reducing logistical burdens, though it diminished the immediacy of face-to-face interaction. Studies using these methods confirmed that conformity was sensitive to group size, task difficulty, and unanimity, with even a single dissenter reducing conformity rates dramatically (Allen & Levine, 1971).

These early paradigms remained highly influential. They provided clear, replicable evidence of social influence and allowed researchers to systematically manipulate conditions, such as majority size or task ambiguity, to map the contours of conformity. However, their artificiality and reliance on simple perceptual tasks also limited their ecological validity, prompting researchers to pursue more diverse methodologies.

3.2 Survey, Field, and Naturalistic Approaches

To complement laboratory studies, researchers developed field and survey-based methods to examine conformity in real-world contexts. Rosenberg (1961), for example, observed peer influence on political attitudes during adolescence, while Reingen (1982) demonstrated conformity in consumer behavior by showing that donation rates increased when people observed others contributing. These field studies provided ecological validity by embedding conformity in naturalistic environments, though they often sacrificed experimental control.

Naturalistic approaches also included archival analyses. Studies of jury deliberations (Tanford & Penrod, 1984) showed how social pressure and majority consensus shape verdicts, echoing the mechanisms observed in laboratory experiments. Observational work in classrooms and workplaces similarly confirmed that individuals adjust their behavior to align with peer norms, from academic effort to workplace productivity (Ryan, 2001; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Such studies highlighted the importance of conformity in institutional and everyday life, bridging the gap between laboratory demonstrations and broader social processes.

3.3 Cross-Cultural and Comparative Designs

A significant methodological advance came from the introduction of cross-cultural research. Bond and Smith's (1996) meta-analysis of 133 Asch-style studies conducted in 17 countries revealed systematic cultural differences: conformity was higher in collectivist cultures such as Japan and Fiji than in individualist cultures like the United States. These findings emphasized that conformity cannot be understood in isolation from cultural values and social norms. Later comparative studies expanded this framework by examining differences between "tight" and "loose" cultures, defined by the strength of social norms and tolerance for deviance (Gelfand et al., 2011). Methodologically, these cross-cultural approaches helped shift the field from WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) samples to more globally diverse populations, though challenges remain in ensuring true cultural representativeness (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010).

3.4 Neuroscientific and Psychophysiological Methods

Advances in neuroscience have introduced new tools to study the biological underpinnings of conformity. Using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), Klucharev et al. (2009) demonstrated that disagreement with group opinion activates the rostral cingulate zone and ventral striatum, areas associated with error detection and reinforcement learning. These neural signals predicted subsequent conformity, suggesting that social influence is integrated into the brain's learning systems. Other studies have identified distinct neural circuits for normative influence, such as activation in the anterior cingulate cortex and amygdala, which are linked to social pain and affect regulation (Berns, Capra, Moore, & Noussair, 2010).

Beyond neuroimaging, psychophysiological measures such as skin conductance and heart rate variability have been used to assess the emotional arousal associated with social disagreement (Falk, Way, & Jasinska, 2012). These methods provide convergent evidence that conformity is not merely cognitive but also affective, engaging both rational error-monitoring systems and emotional regulation processes. Neuroscientific approaches thus enrich the study of conformity by linking psychological theories to biological mechanisms.

3.5 Big Data and Computational Approaches

In the era of digital communication, conformity can also be studied at unprecedented scale through computational methods. Analyses of social media platforms allow researchers to track conformity in real time across millions of interactions. Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral (2018), for instance, examined the spread of true and false news on Twitter, finding that false news spread more rapidly and widely, in part because individuals conformed to perceived popularity cues. Big data approaches can quantify informational and normative pressures in digital ecosystems, offering ecological validity and statistical power beyond traditional experiments.

4. Contemporary Extensions: Digital, Cultural, and Applied Perspectives

4.1 Conformity in the Digital Age

The digital era has transformed how individuals interact with social norms. Platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, and Twitter incentivize conformity through visible indicators of popularity such as likes, retweets, and follower counts. These cues served as proxies for social approval and amplified normative influence by encouraging users to align with mainstream trends (Nesi, 2020). For example, adolescents often replicate viral challenges or fashion styles not merely for personal enjoyment but to maintain relevance within online peer groups.

Algorithmic amplification intensified these dynamics. By prioritizing "trending" content, algorithms not only reflected but also shaped perceptions of normativity, reinforcing informational influence by signaling what was considered correct or widely accepted (Bakshy, Messing, & Adamic,

2015). Moreover, digital environments facilitated rapid feedback loops in which conformity is rewarded with visibility and engagement, further entrenching collective patterns of behavior.

At the same time, online conformity has darker consequences. Echo chambers and filter bubbles encourage alignment with ideological in-groups while deepening intergroup polarization. Sunstein (2017) argued that such “cyberbalkanization” fosters conformity within groups but intensifies hostility between them. This dual effect highlights both the integrative and divisive potential of digital conformity, suggesting that future research must account for how technological infrastructures mediate social influence.

4.2 Education and Peer Influence

Conformity also plays a vital role in educational settings, particularly during adolescence when peer approval becomes a central motivator. Studies have shown that students conformed to peer norms in domains ranging from classroom participation to substance use (Ryan, 2001; Steinberg & Monahan, 2007). Peer influence can thus either promote positive outcomes, such as academic engagement, or negative outcomes, such as risky behavior.

Educational research highlight strategies for channeling conformity constructively. For instance, interventions that create prosocial peer norms—such as emphasizing cooperative learning or anti-bullying values—harness normative influence to encourage positive behaviors (Paluck, Shepherd, & Aronow, 2016). By contrast, environments that stigmatized dissent or overemphasized competition may exacerbate harmful conformity, suppressing individuality and reinforcing exclusion. These findings underscored the need for educators to manage group dynamics carefully, ensuring that conformity serves developmental growth rather than social constraint.

5. Dissuasion

Although conformity research has yielded invaluable insights, it is not without limitations. The most prominent critiques center on ethical issues, sampling biases, and ecological validity. Early studies such as those of Asch (1956) and Milgram (1963) relied heavily on deception, raising concerns about informed consent and participant welfare (Baumrind, 1985). While these experiments provided compelling demonstrations of social influence, they also highlighted the tension between scientific rigor and ethical responsibility. Contemporary researchers have attempted to address these concerns by developing less deceptive paradigms, using virtual agents or computer-mediated designs, yet the ethical legacy of classical studies continues to inform debates about how conformity should be studied.

Another limitation lies in the historical overreliance on narrow samples. Foundational research was conducted primarily with white, male, Western university students, a group that was neither representative nor culturally diverse (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). As a result, early findings risk overgeneralization. Cross-cultural studies have revealed substantial variation in conformity across societies, underscoring that social influence is shaped by cultural, economic, and historical conditions (Bond & Smith, 1996; Gelfand et al., 2011). Addressing this gap requires greater investment in diverse samples that reflect the realities of global populations, particularly as digital platforms create new forms of transnational conformity.

A further critique concerns the ecological validity of classical paradigms. Many laboratory studies reduced conformity to simplified perceptual tasks, such as line judgments, which may not capture the complexity of real-world decision-making. Conformity in domains such as politics, health, or digital communication involves multiple, overlapping motivations that extend beyond informational and normative influence. Although field studies and big data approaches have begun to address this issue, the challenge remains to balance control with realism. Future research should therefore adopt a more interdisciplinary approach.

Neuroscience has already demonstrated that conformity engages both cognitive and affective systems, linking social influence to error monitoring, reward processing, and social pain (Klucharev

et al., 2009; Berns et al., 2010). Integrating these insights with sociological and political analyses could illuminate how conformity operates across levels of analysis, from neural circuits to institutions. Computational methods also hold promise for studying conformity at scale, particularly in digital environments where influence spreads rapidly across networks (Vosoughi, Roy, & Aral, 2018). By combining experimental precision with large-scale ecological validity, researchers can better capture the dynamics of conformity in contemporary societies.

Another important direction involves resilience and resistance. While much attention has been devoted to explaining why individuals conform, less research has explored how they resist harmful pressures. Studies of minority influence (Moscovici, 1980) have shown that consistent dissent can shift majority opinion, while psychological constructs such as critical thinking and self-efficacy have been identified as protective factors against conformity (Nemeth & Ormiston, 2007). Exploring how resilience operates in contexts such as misinformation, organizational decision-making, or authoritarian regimes could provide practical strategies for fostering independence without undermining social cohesion.

Conformity research must also grapple with the ethical and societal implications of its findings. In the digital age, where algorithms shape social norms and misinformation spreads rapidly, understanding conformity is not merely an academic pursuit but a societal necessity. Policymakers, educators, and technologists must consider how to design environments that encourage healthy alignment with prosocial norms while guarding against destructive conformity. For example, interventions in schools that promote inclusive peer norms have been shown to reduce bullying (Paluck et al., 2016), while transparency in algorithmic design may mitigate the uncritical adoption of trending content. The challenge for future scholarship is to bridge theory with application, ensuring that knowledge about conformity informs efforts to build more resilient and democratic societies.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, conformity remains one of the most fundamental and revealing phenomena in social psychology. From Sherif's early demonstrations of informational influence to contemporary analyses of online networks, the study of conformity has illuminated the delicate balance between accuracy and belonging, stability and innovation, compliance and resistance. Theoretical advances such as social identity theory and social impact theory have enriched our understanding of why people conform, while methodological innovations have expanded research from laboratory tasks to neuroscientific and computational approaches.

However, the study of conformity also highlights persistent challenges: the ethical dilemmas of deception, the cultural biases of early samples, and the difficulty of capturing real-world complexity in controlled settings. Addressing these limitations requires interdisciplinary collaboration and greater attention to diversity, context, and resilience. As digital environments reshape the conditions of influence, and as societies confront global challenges requiring collective coordination, the insights of conformity research are more relevant than ever.

References

- [1] Allen, V. L., & Levine, J. M. (1971). Social Support and conformity: The Role of Independent Assessment of Reality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 7(1), 48–58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(71\)90054-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(71)90054-0).
- [2] Aronson, E. (n.d.). *The social animal* 12th edition: Elliot Aronson: Macmillan learning. 12th Edition | Elliot Aronson | Macmillan Learning. <https://store.macmillanlearning.com/us/product/The-Social-Animal/p/1464144184>.
- [3] Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 70(9), 1–70. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093718>.

- [4] Asch, S. E. (1961). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. *Documents of Gestalt Psychology*, 222–236. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520313514-017>.
- [5] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, 348(6239), 1130–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160>.
- [6] Baumrind, D. (1985). Research using intentional deception: Ethical issues revisited. *American Psychologist*, 40(2), 165–174. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.40.2.165>.
- [7] Berns, G. S., Capra, C. M., Moore, S., & Noussair, C. (2010). Neural mechanisms of the influence of popularity on adolescent ratings of Music. *NeuroImage*, 49(3), 2687–2696. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.070>.
- [8] Billig, M., Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1991). Social Identity theory: Constructive and critical advances. *Contemporary Sociology*, 20(6), 944. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2076221>.
- [9] Bond, R., & Smith, P. B. (1996). Culture and conformity: A meta-analysis of studies using Asch's (1952B, 1956) line judgment task. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(1), 111–137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.1.111>.
- [10] Centola, D. (2010). The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science*, 329(5996), 1194–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185231>.
- [11] Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. (2001). The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 956–974. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069440>.
- [12] Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social Influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55(1), 591–621. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015>.
- [13] Cinnirella, M., & Green, B. (2007). Does 'cyber-conformity' vary cross-culturally? exploring the effect of culture and Communication Medium on social conformity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(4), 2011–2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.02.009>.
- [14] Crutchfield, R. S. (1955). Conformity and character. *American Psychologist*, 10(5), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040237>.
- [15] Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 629–636. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046408>.
- [16] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>.
- [17] Falk, E. B., Way, B. M., & Jasinska, A. J. (2012). An imaging genetics approach to understanding social influence. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00168>.
- [18] Gelfand, M. J., Jackson, J. C., Pan, X., Nau, D., Pieper, D., Denison, E., Dagher, M., Van Lange, P. A., Chiu, C.-Y., & Wang, M. (2021). The relationship between cultural tightness–looseness and covid-19 cases and deaths: A global analysis. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(3). [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(20\)30301-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(20)30301-6).
- [19] Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., Duan, L., Almaliach, A., Ang, S., Arnadottir, J., Aycan, Z., Boehnke, K., Boski, P., Cabecinhas, R., Chan, D., Chhokar, J., D'Amato, A., Subirats Ferrer, M., Fischlmayr, I. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754>.
- [20] GERBER, A. S., GREEN, D. P., & LARIMER, C. W. (2008). Social pressure and voter turnout: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 102(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s000305540808009x>.
- [21] Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x0999152x>.
- [22] Jones, A. M. (1973). Irving L. Janis. victims of groupthink: A psychological study of foreign policy decisions and fiascoes. pp. III, 276. Boston, Mass.: Houghton mifflin, 1972. \$4.50. *THE ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 407(1), 179–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271627340700115>.

- [23] Kaplan, M. F., & Miller, C. E. (1987). Group decision making and normative versus informational influence: Effects of type of issue and assigned decision rule. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(2), 306–313. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.2.306>.
- [24] Kelman, H. C. (1990). *Crimes of obedience: Toward a social psychology of authority and responsibility*. Yale Univ Press.
- [25] Klucharev, V., Hytönen, K., Rijpkema, M., Smidts, A., & Fernández, G. (2009). Reinforcement learning signal predicts social conformity. *Neuron*, 61(1), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.11.027>.
- [26] Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, 36(4), 343–356. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.36.4.343>.
- [27] Latané, B., Liu, J. H., Nowak, A., Bonevento, M., & Zheng, L. (1995). Distance matters: Physical space and Social Impact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8), 795–805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295218002>.
- [28] Moscovici, S., Lage, E., & Naffrechoux, M. (1969). Influence of a consistent minority on the responses of a majority in a color perception task. *Sociometry*, 32(4), 365. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786541>.
- [29] Moscovici, Serge. (1980). Toward a theory of conversion behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 209–239. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)60133-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60133-1).
- [30] Mullen, B. (1983). Operationalizing the effect of the group on the individual: A self-attention perspective. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(4), 295–322. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(83\)90025-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(83)90025-2).
- [31] Nemeth, C. J., & Ormiston, M. (2007). Creative idea generation: Harmony versus stimulation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(3), 524–535. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.373>.
- [32] Nesi, J. (2020). The impact of social media on Youth Mental Health. *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 81(2), 116–121. <https://doi.org/10.18043/ncm.81.2.116>.
- [33] Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., & Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: A Social Network experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3), 566–571. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514483113>.
- [34] Reingen, P. H. (1982). Test of a list procedure for inducing compliance with a request to donate money. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(1), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.67.1.110>.
- [35] Rosenberg, M. (1968). *The logic of survey analysis*. Basic Books.
- [36] Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescent motivation and achievement. *Child Development*, 72(4), 1135–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00338>.
- [37] Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392563>.
- [38] Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A Social Psychological Analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56(4), 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.4.319>.
- [39] Slater, M., Antley, A., Davison, A., Swapp, D., Guger, C., Barker, C., Pistrang, N., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2006). A virtual reprise of the Stanley Milgram Obedience Experiments. *PLoS ONE*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000039>.
- [40] Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1531–1543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1531>.
- [41] Sunstein, C. R. (2017). #Republic. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400884711>.
- [42] Tanford, S., & Penrod, S. (1984). Social Influence Model: A formal integration of research on majority and minority influence processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(2), 189–225. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.2.189>.
- [43] Turner, J. C. (1991). *Social Influence*. Brooks/Cole.
- [44] Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>.
- [45] Wood, W., Lundgren, S., Ouellette, J. A., Busceme, S., & Blackstone, T. (1994). Minority influence: A meta-analytic review of social influence processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(3), 323–345. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.3.323>.