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This study tested the effects of power on a leader's acceptance or rejection of a competent attitudinal deviant. Results indicate a strong rejection of the attitudinal deviant. Participants in both the high power and low power condition reported feeling powerful. Therefore, power had no significant effect on the acceptance or rejection of the deviant.
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The D Word: Diversity

As Roger Brown (1974) explained, “To be virtuous... is to be different from the mean—in the right direction and to the right degree” (p. 469).

America was founded on the principle of toleration of dissent, yet there is an observable undercurrent of intolerance. Conservative Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas confided that he prefers to only hire law clerks that share the same ideological and attitudinal beliefs as him. "I'm not going to hire clerks who have profound disagreements with me," Thomas said "That is a waste of my time. Someone said that is like trying to train a pig. It's a waste of your time, and it aggravates the pig” (Toobin, 2007 p. 345).

Justice Thomas’s bias towards like minded law clerks demonstrates the hubris of people’s natural inclination to work with like minded others. However, Justice Thomas’s inclusion in the Supreme Court—a group made up of nine attitudinal deviants—and his own often deviant decisions on the court demonstrate the merit of attitudinal diverse decision groups. Justice Thomas, like many people, is both attitudinal deviant and rejecter of the attitudinal deviant.

Mission statements of various universities and businesses underscore their dedication to diversity. College brochures depict diverse student populations interacting among their pages. Often a group of students is pictured laughing, holding textbooks. The image of the group—an Asian, a black student, a Hispanic girl and maybe a white male—markets the institution as diverse. What is diversity anyway? Is it superficial or deep? Part of the American Way is the acceptance of others, no matter what their opinion. That
tolerance of race, creed, and color, differences written into our founding principles, implies tolerance of deeper diversity—diversity in terms of religious beliefs, political orientation, and even personal opinion. This supports the notion that to be American is to believe in tolerance. That the First Amendment explicitly guarantees the right to express diverse opinions, and implicitly encourages acceptance of those who hold those opinions further supports this notion.

While much of society’s rhetoric claims to want diversity, social psychological data suggest that the actions of people do not necessarily match the culturally pervasive rhetoric. Social psychologists studying groups have found that groups are powerful. Much of the work done in contemporary society is done by teams or groups. A group sent the first man to the Moon. A group designed the atom bomb and dropped it, etc. People can accomplish profound things when they work together, but when people form groups, they also become vulnerable to the perils of groupthink, “a deterioration of mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgment that results from in group pressures” (Janis, 1972 p. 9). Groups composed of like minded thinkers may not question decisions as readily as groups composed of attitudinally diverse members. A mesh of dissenting opinions is at the heart of informed decision making. The ability for leaders or group members to offer dissenting opinions is at the heart of informed leadership.

Roman philosophers Seneca and Cicero thought the dialectic was the epistemologically appropriate path to truth. Cicero believed that from the clash of opposite ideas—seeing all sides of an issue—truth would emerge. Imagine for example a metal smith banging out a coat of armor. Traditionally the metal smith would heat the armor and then hammer it against an anvil. This process is a sort of dialectic between
hammer and anvil, and the armor can be thought of as truth. Imagine the sorry piece of armor one might produce if he were to hammer away when there was no anvil to beat against. The armor would take no shape.

Groups composed of homophilous thinkers are at risk of missing the truth. However, if dissent and a diversity of opinions are important, why then do groups so often reject the dissenter or the attitudinal deviant? Some familiar examples of instances in which an attitudinal deviant might be rejected from a group include the McCarthyism of the 1940's during which Senate committees were formed to hunt down and persecute Communists. During the Spanish Inquisition, people who did not swear allegiance to the Catholic Church were burned or tortured until they conformed. In the south, during the civil rights movement, whites who sympathized with black activists were often persecuted, even beaten. Less severe, but equally emphatic examples of the rejection of the attitudinal deviant are present in every day lives. Imagine how you feel when someone disagrees with you. Imagine the last time you met with an individual who believed the opposite of what you believe. How did you feel toward that person?

Despite the explicitly positive attitude to diversity and freedom of expression, in many cases those who are different are condemned, ostracized, and excluded. In this thesis, I will explore that process and consider the role a leader may play in contributing to this negativity or promoting acceptance of others who are different. Leaders, given their orientation toward the collective, may be capable of perceiving the value that attitudinal deviants have to offer groups and may be able to override what seems to be a natural human inclination to reject attitudinal deviants.
This thesis describes an empirical investigation of the rejection of the deviant and operates under the hypothesis that a powerful leader will be more tolerant of those who disagree with him or her than would a low power leader. Before presenting the results of the study, this chapter will provide an overview of previous work on this topic. In the next few pages I will present a review of the available research concerning group reactions to deviancy, namely that groups reject deviants. Then, I will review available research concerning the psychological effects of power. By the end, this thesis will seek to answer the following question: Will a high power leader include an attitudinal deviant into his/her advisory group more frequently than would a low power leader?

**Reaction to Deviancy**

People, in many cases, do not respond positively when they discover a dissenter—a deviant, an outlier, a minority—in their group. In the next few pages I will discuss research that suggests that agreement creates attraction, whereas disagreement creates repulsion. The analysis will draw on Festinger's social comparison theory and cognitive dissonance theory and how these two processes may lead to conformity and social control. Then, I will discuss Moscovich's research which emphasizes the importance of minority influence and social change. Next, I will discuss the seminal 1951 Johnny Rocco Study conducted by Stanley Schachter which highlights the tendency for groups to initially reject an attitudinal deviant. Then, I will discuss several factors which may affect the tendency for groups to reject attitudinal deviants.

**Similarity-Attraction Effect**

The research of Donn Byrne and Theodore Newcomb suggests that most people prefer others who have values and opinions similar to their own values and opinions. Newcomb
studied college dorm life and found that individuals naturally form groups based around common values, beliefs and experiences (1981). The tendency for people to prefer others who possess similar beliefs and values is known as the similarity-attraction effect. Attraction between two individuals increases as similarity increases (Byrne, 1971). Why do we like similarity? One possible explanation is that people who believe the same things we do tend to validate our own beliefs and make us seem more correct (Byrne, 1971). Also people might assume that groups will be more cohesive if all group members agree (Insuo & Schopler, 1972). Social psychological research on interpersonal attraction suggests that similarity is attractive.

**Attitudinal Deviants and Methods of Rejection.**

Whereas attitudinal similarity is attractive, attitudinal dissimilarity seems to be repulsive. Attitudinal deviance is defined as, “An opinion expressed by one (or a minority of) group member(s) that differs from the modal opinion of a physically present (or realistically simulated) majority of group members” (Levine, 1980, p367). Attitudinal deviance is different from sociological deviance, in which a person deviates from social norms by acting or dressing in deviant fashions (e.g., mohawks, etc.) and operational deviance in which an individual deviates from procedural norms (e.g., breaking rules, cutting in lines, etc.). Milton Rosenbaum’s 1986 classic work on the repulsion hypothesis clearly demonstrates that attitudinal dissimilarity leads to repulsion. Horton and Montoya (2004) expanded on this work by asserting that “attitude similarity/dissimilarity impacts attraction indirectly via cognitive evaluation of the target” (701). This work suggests that attitudinal dissimilarity negatively impacts attraction because attitudinal dissimilarities trigger negatively charged cognitive evaluations.
Groups can reject deviants explicitly or implicitly. Rejection of the deviant can happen in three possible ways: “expelling the deviate from the group, isolating the deviate from all interaction within the group, and depriving the deviate of privileges normally accorded to persons occupying his role” (Levine, 1980, 379). While the outright exclusion of a deviant from a group is a harsher form of rejection, even the more subtle forms of rejection are effective at marginalizing the attitudinal deviant and decreasing his/her opportunities for input into the group. When deviants are isolated from interaction with the rest of the group members, while they may officially remain part of the group, their ability to contribute is null.

Rejection is painful. Williams (2007) suggests that being ignored or socially ostracized can trigger sadness and anger. Furthermore, continued ostracism or rejection can deplete a person’s ability to cope with such rejection, leading to depression and a sense of helplessness. Williams goes further to suggest that the negative feelings one associates with being ostracized and rejected are adaptive; in that, they put pressure on individuals to conform to group norms and get along with the group (Williams 2007).

Research indicates that similarity increases attraction and that dissimilarity leads to contempt, rejection and exclusion. Why, despite the implicit recognition that one should not respond affectively to others who are unusual or different, do people nonetheless shun those who are different—seeking instead the companionship of those who share their qualities? Why do people, like the birds of the old saying, flock together? Two theoretical answers to this riddle are considered here: one based on Festinger’s general studies of interpersonal behavior and cognitive dissonance, and the second Moscovici’s work which suggests that there are different situational norms and that the
reaction to the deviant will depend on which of these norms the group in question adopts and upon the degree and direction of a deviant’s dissent.

**Festinger and Social Control**

Festinger’s two substantial theories of social psychological processes, social comparison theory and cognitive dissonance theory, combine to explain why people often tend to suppress minority opinions. In this light, the rejection of the deviant might be thought of as a means towards social control. Festinger suggested that people have a fundamental drive to compare themselves to others. From this social comparison, Festinger asserted that group uniformity comes from individual needs to “validate opinions not anchored in physical reality” and from group needs to “move toward group goals.” In the former, group members seek uniformity, not to find the “truth,” but to support their own beliefs. Moreover, Festinger noted that “uniformity is a necessary condition for accurate and stable self-evaluation” (Festinger, 1954). Festinger (1950) elaborates, “an opinion, a belief, an attitude is ‘correct, ‘valid,’ and ‘proper’ to the extent that it is anchored in a group of people with similar beliefs, opinions and attitudes” (pp.272-273).

When group members notice the presence of an attitudinal deviant in the group, Festinger hypothesized that members may communicate with the deviant in order to gather information, but ultimately to achieve group conformity. During group communication with a deviant, a finite number of conversational outcomes are available. The group can change the deviant’s opinion, change the group opinion to match the deviant’s opinion, tolerate disagreement, or reject the deviant from the group (Levine, 1980). Festinger hypothesized that perceived opinion discrepancy between a deviant and the group would lead to increased communication between the group and the deviant.
When attitudinal difference is detected within a group of individuals, most likely, the group members will tend to work to increase homophily.

Festinger’s most famous work (1958), cognitive dissonance theory, offers a second explanation for the rough treatment often afforded to an attitudinal deviant. When an attitudinal deviant expresses a diverse viewpoint, this new attitude may cause people to wonder about themselves and the world. While this type of critical thought may seem beneficial, many people tend to be cognitively stingy and prefer to exert the minimal possible mental energy. Therefore, people often prefer to maintain comfortably held beliefs as opposed to endure uncomfortable critical reflection. The example of a basketball fan might help illustrate this point. Imagine a basketball fan who goes to see every game of his favorite team. He believes that basketball is very interesting. Now imagine that an attitudinal deviant comes up to this fan and says, “Basketball is a big waste of time and is boring” This comment does not mesh with the basketball fan’s constructed worldview. He can not both continue to be a basketball fanatic and believe that basketball is a waste of time, therefore he is pressured to alleviate cognitive dissonance and either stop being a fan, or reject the deviant’s position. Matz and Wood (2005) support the notion that attitudinal diversity generates cognitive dissonance. Attitudinally diverse groups reported experiencing greater dissonance and discomfort than those in groups with individuals who all agreed with one another. Further, Matz and Wood found that individuals who experience cognitive dissonance as a result of exposure to attitudinal deviants are motivated toward achieving group consensus and may argue with the deviant, change their position to match the deviant or join an attitudinally
homogenous group. Groups may reject the deviant because attitudinal deviants cause cognitive dissonance.

Moscovichi and Social Change

Moscovichi’s research emphasizes the value of attitudinal diversity and highlights opportunities for minority influence. He believes that “social change is the central process of influence” and can only be investigated by viewing “minorities as influence sources and majorities as influence targets” (Levine, 1990, 387). He believed that the functionalist model placed too much importance on social control and overlooked social change. Moscovici pointed out that the Festinger model made the mistake of assuming that, in groups, the majority opinion equates to correctness and minority viewpoints are, “perceived as incorrect non-opinions rather than as potentially viable alternatives to the majority position” (Moscovici, 1976, p384). Depending on the group’s norms, groups may embrace, tolerate or reject a deviant.

Moscovici’s research highlights some benefits of deep diversity. Research suggests that people tend to look for information that supports their beliefs rather than seek out information that may contradict beliefs. This tendency is called the “conformation bias.” Groups which contain members that express a range of attitudinal opinions are less likely to succumb to the conformation bias. Research suggests that groups and individuals prefer information that supports currently held beliefs. Also, attitudinally homogenous groups have been found to be especially prone to the conformation bias, whereas attitudinally heterogeneous groups are more likely to overcome this bias (Schulz-Hardt, Frey, Luethgens & Moscovici, 2000). Moreover, ideologically diverse groups tend to create more discussion and innovation whereas
homogenous groups tend to create compliance (Moscovici, 1994). Attitudinal minorities are also important because when they succeed in persuading others to change opinions, this opinion change is more likely to be due to real convergence than mere compliance. Minorities tend to influence majority members indirectly by creating conversation as majority members strive to validate their judgments against a minority’s dissent. Minorities are more successful at influencing when they are perceived to be team players. Team players tend to be committed, competent and group centered (Levine & Russo, 1987). According to Moscovichi, three of the most common situation norms are conformity, think-what-you-want-ism, and originality (Moscovici, 1974).

**Schachter**

Stanley Schachter (1951) collaborated with Festinger and documented the effects of group cohesiveness on the rejection of a deviant by placing three different types of confederates—the deviant, the slider and the mode—in several all male discussion groups. Each group read a story about Johnny Rocco, a 13 year old street tough. After reading about Johnny, each group member publicly stated what type of rehabilitation should be given to Johnny, on a seven point scale ranging from one—give Johnny all love—to seven—give Johnny all punishment. The story about Johnny was sympathetic towards Johnny and written in such as way as to elicit an answer ranging from two to four (mostly love) from most participants. The deviant, a confederate, deviated from the normative response by reporting an answer of seven, all punishment. The deviant never changed his opinion. The second confederate, the slider, deviated from the group at first, but over the course of discussion eventually changed his vote to the normative range. The mode acted as a control and agreed with the participants from the beginning.
The Schachter study has been called both “the most influential” (Levine 1989 p. 380.) and “most misrepresented” (Berkowitz, 1971 p. 243) study on the rejection of the deviant. Schachter not only manipulated the type of deviance, as noted above, but also group cohesiveness and the relevance of the Johnny Rocco topic to the group. Schachter’s study found that the groups responded with inclusive or exclusive actions. Both inclusive and exclusive respondents initially directed the majority of their communication toward the deviant, trying to change his mind; however some groups stopped talking to the deviant around the 35 min mark, whereas some groups continued to communicate—often argue—with the deviant until the end of the study. Most groups directed seven times more communication toward the deviant than toward the mode (Mills, 1962). Inclusive groups continued to communicate with the deviant. These groups were often not cohesive and had a task not relevant to the Johnny Rocco case. After 35 minutes of communication, some groups, those that were cohesive and whose task was relevant to the Jonny Rocco topic, tended to stop communicating with the deviant, in effect excluding him from the group. 75 % of cohesive, task relevant groups excluded the deviant during the discussion (Mills, 1962). Schachter found that “greater cohesiveness produces greater rejection” (1951 p. 198). In most conditions, the deviate was rejected from the group more than the mode and slider. Furthermore, relevance of the Johnny Rocco topic had no observable effect on the rejection of the deviant. That is, even if the Johnny Rocco topic was not relevant to task goals, group members still saw the deviant’s attitudinal disagreement as sufficient reason to reject the deviant. With respect to communication, those who ended up rejecting the deviant tended to reject the most
communication toward him. Those who accepted the deviant, often communicated with him less than medium and strong rejecters.

Schachter also found that groups dislike attitudinal dissenters and punish dissenters. At the end of the study, Schachter told the group members that they may need to break up into smaller groups and asked the members to rate which group members they would like to work with again. Almost all groups rejected the deviant in some significant way by either by disliking or excluding him altogether. Participants tended to rate the deviant as low on likeability. The mode was most liked. The deviant was given low level chores and the mode and slider were given more enjoyable tasks. More cohesive groups rejected the deviant more than did low cohesive groups. The mode was liked the most; the deviant was liked the least. Levine points out that even a little bit of dissent from the slider, who eventually conformed to the majority opinion, caused him to be liked less (Levine, 1989). Schachter reported that, “Not only [was] the deviate considered relatively undesirable as a fellow club member, but also least capable of handling the important jobs in teh club” (1951 p.199). Schachter’s study suggests that groups dislike and punish the attitudinal diverse.

Post Schachter: A Grab Bag of Mitigating Factors

Subsequent studies support the notion that groups tend to reject non conformists and describe various intermediary factors that may affect the rejection of an attitudinal deviant. The following studies outline factors that may increase rejection. Research suggests that high status actors are more likely to reject the deviant from a task-oriented group than are low status actors (Lauderdale, Smith-Cunnien, Parker & Inverarity, 1984). A group that thinks of its group members as being very similar to one another is more
likely to respond to deviants with an exclusive reaction (Festinger & Thibaut, 1951). Groups are more likely to exclude deviants whose opinions arise from a role (e.g. racist, bigot etc.) than deviants whose disagreement stems from opinion (Sampson & Brandon, 1964). Participants were “less desirous” of working with a deviant when they were told that a prize would be awarded to groups based on group performance than if participants were told that prizes would be awarded based on individual performance. (Berkowitz & Howard, 1959). The more extreme a deviant’s position, the more majority members view the deviant’s position as less correct (Hensley & Duval, 1976). This supports Festinger’s idea that attitudinal diversity is often not considered as a viable alternative viewpoint, but rather as just plain wrong. In a study regarding treatment for a juvenile delinquent, researchers found that participants disliked punitive deviants more than nurturant deviates (Brown, 1970).

Studies indicate that the following situations can lessen the rejection of a deviant. A deviant’s relative contributions to the task, apologies for dissent, or cultural norms that encourage dissent all reduce the tendency for groups to reject the deviant. Evidence of previous conformity can lessen the rejection of a deviant (Katz, 1982; Hollander, 1960). Groups of low cohesion are more tolerant of opinion deviance than a highly cohesive group (Doise & Moscovici, 1969). With respect to moving and stable attitudinal deviates, groups prefer to work with members that deviate initially but that eventually move toward the majority opinion than those who agree initially but move away from the group opinion (Levine & Ranelli, 1978). Collins and Raven (1969) noted that if a deviant has high referent power, majority members may be motivated to either change their opinion
to match the deviants or to “distort the disagreement by minimizing either the amount or importance of the opinion discrepancy” (Levine, 1980 p380).

Competent Group Members

For good reason, groups are disinclined to admit incompetent individuals to their ranks. Sometimes deviance can mean incompetence. Then, the bias against such individuals seems justified given the group must collaborate to achieve goals, and a substandard member may prevent the group from reaching its goals. At the same time, groups should be compelled to admit competent members. Deviancy, here, means deep diversity, where there is a difference in values, attitude or ideology, rather than competence. In a problem solving discussion group it is reasonable to assume that verbal intelligence as demonstrated by a standard measure (SAT scores) would predict or hint at competency. Research suggests that task competency allows a group member to deviate from procedural norms (Hollander 1960). Still, the question remains, does task competency allow a group member to deviate from ideological norms and still be desirable as a group member? Is the pull of competency enough to overcome an aversion to attitudinal diversity?

While it is clear that groups reject attitudinal deviants, virtually all prior research has examined how groups respond to deviants, and the results yield a clear conclusion: groups are biased against deviants, even when the difference is not relevant to the group’s task. Research indicates that groups respond negatively to an attitudinal deviant, but less is known about the reaction of those who occupy specific roles in the group—leaders, followers, marginal members, task-focused members and so on—react to deviants. A leader, for example, may benefit greatly from forming a team of rivals as opposed to a
group of incompetent yes men. The nature of leadership, and power in general, is examined in the next section.

Power

Schachter found that people often do not like, or prefer to work with attitudinal deviants. People who are powerful, within their groups, may not be as threatened by deviants; and therefore, may be more likely to accept an attitudinal deviant into a work group. But what, precisely is power within a group, and how is the concept of power related to another key aspect of groups: leadership? In 1938, the philosopher Bertrand Russell, observed that “The fundamental concept in social science is Power, in the same sense that Energy is the fundamental concept in physics.” Because power is so fundamental, it “alters individual psychological states” (Kipnis, 1976). Power changes how leaders think about themselves, their work and others. (Keltner, Adnerson & Gruenfeld, 2003). While “power wielding” alone has been argued to be insufficient to produce leadership, most leadership scholars would agree that power is necessary for leadership to occur.

Moreover, taking into consideration the level of power a leader has matters because, the more powerful a person is the more likely the power wielder will be in charge of hiring or forming groups and the more likely s/he is in a position to make important decisions which might benefit from a depth of opinions. Power may mediate people’s inclination to reject deviants.

Does absolute power lead to “absolute corruption?” Is the nature of power such that,” Power leads to its own demise.” In the next few pages I will define power, discuss various sources of power and then explore several psychological effects of power. The psychological effects of power are outlined in two sections. The first discusses potentially
positive effects of power: *action orientation, attention to reward, social disinhibition, and increased optimism/positive affect*. Then, the second section discusses the potential negative effects of power: *decreased perspective taking, increased stereotyping, the tendency to use others as a means to an end, overconfidence, and predilection to engage in risky behavior*.

**Defining Power**

Power is defined as, "an individual's relative capacity to modify others' states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments" (Keltner, Gruenfeld, Anderson, 2003). We might also define power as, the ability to force/guide/persuade other people to do what you want them to do, using any means necessary (Gruenfeld, Keltner, & Thibaut & Kelley, 1959).

**The Source of Power**

Researchers French and Raven (1959) denote five main power bases from which power derives.

Coercive power: the ability for a leader to bring about change through threats and/or punishments.

Reward power: Leaders with this type of power bring about change by offering followers desirable incentives to follow.

Legitimate power: This type of power is derived from accepted social norms which require follower compliance.

Expert Power: Power holders are powerful due to the fact that s/he possesses and demonstrates superior abilities and skills compared to followers.
positive effects of power: *action orientation, attention to reward, social disinhibition,* and *increased optimism/positive affect.* Then, the second section discusses the potential negative effects of power: *decreased perspective taking, increased stereotyping, the tendency to use others as a means to an end, overconfidence, and predilection to engage in risky behavior.*

**Defining Power**

Power is defined as, “an individual’s relative capacity to modify others’ states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments” (Keltner, Gruenfeld, Anderson, 2003). We might also define power as, the ability to force/guide/persuade other people to do what you want them to do, using any means necessary (Gruenfeld, Keltner, & Thibaut & Kelley, 1959).

**The Source of Power**

Researchers French and Raven (1959) denote five main power bases from which power derives.

Coercive power power: the ability for a leader to bring about change through threats and/or punishments.

Reward power: Leaders with this type of power bring about change by offering followers desirable incentives to follow.

Legitimate power: This type of power is derived from accepted social norms which require follower compliance.

Expert Power: Power holders are powerful due to the fact that s/he possesses and demonstrates superior abilities and skills compared to followers.
Referent power: The power holder derives power from having charisma or fame which draws admiration from followers.

Later, Raven (1992) added a sixth power base, informational power: Power derives from having the ability to control information needed by others to reach a goal. Power holders often exert influence or power.

In addition, power can come from membership in groups (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), membership in “opinion majorities” (Nemeth, 1986) and from being wealthy (Domhoff, 1998). Also we tend to associate positive qualities with those whom we perceive to be powerful (Clark, 1990). Being a member of an ideological minority can cause low power (Edenbach & Keltner, 1998). Power may come from a combination of many sources and power may have both positive and negative effects on the psychology within individuals. The question remains which will win out?

**Potentially Positive Effects of Power**

High power individuals are more likely to be action oriented and less thoughtful in their actions (Galinsky et al., 2000). Another way to frame the power dimensions is that low power will result in approach-related tendencies, and high power will result in inhibition-related tendencies (Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003). High power individuals are free to act, low power individuals are restrained and refrain from taking new actions. Participants primed with power were more likely to add active endings to a fairy tail than were low power individuals (Anderson, Keltner & Gruenfeld, 2003). Also participants primed with power and asked to work in front of a fan which is blowing annoyingly at them are more likely to move the fan or turn it off than people primed with low-power (Anderson, Keltner & Gruenfeld, 2003). Anderson, Keltner & Gruenfeld found that high
power individuals are more likely to “hit” in a game of blackjack than were low power participants (2003). Powerful people are more likely to negotiate instead of accept an initial offer and are more likely to make the initial offer in a negotiation than low power individuals (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruenfeld, 2007). Also, high power individuals are more likely to jump to action and help those in distress than are low power individuals (Magee et al., 2007). High power leaders are more active.

High power leaders are more attentive to rewards. “Power triggers behavior approach, which is posited to regulate behavior associated with rewards. In contrast, powerlessness activates the behavior inhibition system, which has been equated to an alarm system that triggers avoidance and response inhibition” (Galinsky, Jordan & Sivanathan, 2009). The powerful are more likely to focus on and act based on task-relevant information (Overbeck & Park, 2001). Low power individuals tend to neglect their goals, which subsequently may impair high achievement. (Smith et al., 2008).

Research suggests that powerful individuals are socially disinhibited. Powerful people are more likely to eat the last cookie, chew with an open mouth and spill more crumbs on a table than those in low power conditions (Keltner et al., 2003). Also, powerful people flirt more aggressively than low-power people. (Gonzaga, Keltner, Londahl, & Smith, 2001). Research suggests that powerful people often have a “decreased ability to control their responses to temptation.” Powerful people tend to have more exposure to situations which require them to self-regulate (Muraven & Baumister, 2001). Researchers suggested that, “rather than functioning like a skill that improves with practice, self-regulation appears to be like a resource that can run out, or like a muscle that tires after too much exercise” (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruenfeld, 2007). Powerful
people are less likely to be inhibited by social conformity norms. Low power individuals
however, are more constrained by the opinion of others. Less powerful children are more
likely to be bullied (Whitney & Smith, 1993).

High power people experience increased positive affect and optimism (Keltner,
Anderson & Gruenfeld, 2003). Low power people experience increased negative mood.
(Link, Lennon, & Dohrenwend, 1993). Powerful people are more optimistic about getting
a good job in the future or avoiding gum disease than are low power individuals
(Anderson & Galinsky, 2006). Because of increased optimism about present and future
events, powerful people see the world as a place of opportunity, whereas low power
individuals are more likely to view the world as full of dangerous obstacles (Galinsky,
Jordan and Sivanathan, 2009). High power individuals smile more. In a recent study
when members of a fraternity were asked to tease each other, high power members
smiled more often while being teased and teasing than did low power members (Keltner,
Gruenfeld and Anderson, 2003). One series of studies found that high power males
perceive ambiguous behavior from women as contain hints of sexual interest (Abbey,
1982). Children of low socio-economic status perceive threats in ambiguous social
situations more than do high socio-economic status children (Schwartz, Dodge, & Coie,
1993).

Powerful people see the world as a place of opportunity. They are action oriented,
attentive to rewards, socially disinhibited and optimistic and may care little about what
low power individuals think of them.

Potentially Negative Effects of Power:
Studies of power, and its effects, also suggest that those who feel powerful also display some negative qualities, in addition to those positive outcomes noted above, including decreased willingness to take on the perspectives of others, increased risk taking behavior, overconfidence, the tendency to objectify others, and the tendency to perceive others as means to selfish ends (Galinsky, Jordan and Sivanathan, 2009).

High power individuals are reluctant to take the perspective of others. “Possessing power seems to almost instantly impair the ability to see things from other people’s points of view” (Galinsky, Jordan and Sivanathan, 2009. 204). For example, Galinsky et al. found that when participants were asked to draw an E on their forehead with a marker, high power participants were more likely to draw the E so that the E looked correct from their point of view, but such that it was backwards to other people; whereas, low power participants were more likely to draw the E backwards so that it would be legible from another person’s point of view.

High power individuals may be more likely to stereotype and pay less attention to the opinions or qualities of low power individuals. High power high school students pay less attention to information about applicants for summer jobs than do low power high school students (Anderson, Keltner, & Gruenfeld, 2003). Power increases stereotyping (Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000). High power individuals judge the ideological positions of others more inaccurately than do low power judges (Ebenbach & Keltner, 1998). High power individuals may not accurately perceive the qualities of low power individuals. Because low power individuals may seek to gain power, they may be more attentive to the true nature of others so that they can figure out how to gain power (Gilbert, 1998). On the other hand, high power individuals may care little for what other
people believe and feel as this knowledge may appear to be unimportant for the powerful individual’s immediate goal attainment (Miller, Norman, & Wright, 1978). Powerful people may pay attention to goal related information; however, they tend to ignore or misperceive information about others’ beliefs, feelings, or unique qualities that define them as an individual. Members of the majority (high power) individuals tend to misjudge low power minority group members as being extremists (Ebenbqach & Keltner, 1998). Finally, high power individuals both focus on stereotype-constant information and give decreased attention to stereotype-inconsistent information (Goodwin, et al., 2000). The power-vigilance hypothesis suggests that low power individuals (like women) judge others non-verbal behavior more accurately, because the low power individuals rely on the beneficence of strong powered individuals, and must therefore learn more about the strong power individuals as to gain favor.

High power individuals are more likely to view others as a means to an end. Powerful individuals tend to disregard Kant’s categorical imperative that one should never be treated as a means to an end, but only as an end in himself. Powerful people tend to view others as tools for the power holder’s own self interest (Gruenfeld et al., 2008). Powerful bosses are more likely to view subordinates as “objects of manipulation. (Kipnis, 1972). Powerful people do pay attention to goal specific information. For example a powerful individual might pay extra attention to a person’s objective qualities like physical ability, appearance, material possessions, etc. Overbeck and Park (2001) showed that high power individuals were more likely to use stereotypes to describe potential job applicants than to use accurate information about the candidates. However, high power individuals did pay attention to the unique characteristics of applicants when
these characteristics pertain to company goals. Also, high power individuals are more likely to take credit for the accomplishments of their subordinates and high power individuals are less interested in socializing with low power subordinates (Kipnis, 1972). Interestingly, high power individuals are more likely to treat a high power opponent more disrespectfully than subjects in the low power condition. (Magee, Gruenfeld, & Galinsky, 2003) The more we are primed with power, we tend to adopt higher selfconcepts and consequentially denigrate lower power individuals (Kipnis, 1976).

Powerful individuals are at risk of being overconfident when making decisions or judgments. (Sivanathan & Galinsky, 2007). Overconfident individuals tend to “overestimate his or her abilities or the accuracy of his or her thoughts and decisions (Galinsky, Jordan, Sivanathan, 2009). Overconfidence in powerful people can manifest itself in three prominent ways: “Miscalibration,” in which a powerful person perceives his or her judgments to be more precise than they really are (Lichtenstein, Fischhoff, & Phillips, 1982); “the illusion of control,” in which powerful individuals erroneously believe that their personal qualities are controlling situational outcomes rather than mere chance (Langer, 1975); and “the better than average effect,” in which high power individuals believe their skills to be greater than the average skill level of others.

Powerful individuals are active, but they are also more likely to take Risks. Overconfidence and active orientation contributes to powerful individual’s inclination to take risks. Remember powerful people are more likely to focus on rewards and also to be less attentive to potential risks. This combination increased the likelihood of risky behavior (Galinsky, Jordan, Sivanathan, 2009). In a series of studies, Galinsky found that high power individuals are more likely to place risky gambling bets, engage in risky
sexual activity and to use risky tactics in negotiations (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006). Taking risks might help powerful people undertake seemingly impossible tasks and persevere through them. However at the same time risky decisions might also cause powerful people to fail and then lose their power.

**Conceptualization**

Schachter, in his groundbreaking dissertation study of reactions to those who disagree with the others in their group, discovered that deviants are more often than not rejected by others. In group after group that he studied he found participants perceived attitudinal deviants as undesirable work partners. Studies of power, however, suggest that this tendency to reject others based on their differences may depend on one’s basal level of capacity to influence others. Keltner and his colleagues (2003), in their analysis of power, found that even though power has negative side effects, it may prompt people to consider, more closely, what others can provide them in terms of rewards. If a leader recognizes that a deviant may create a more effective group, he or she may be more likely to include such people in their groups. High power individuals will be less attentive to a deviant’s attitudinal diversity, less attentive to the inherent risks of including a deviant, and more secure in his/her own beliefs and therefore, more likely to accept the ideological deviant than those in the low power condition. Leaders, I suggest, may be more likely to recognize the benefits of diversity in their groups....and then move into your analysis of diversity.

Deviance and leadership are related. A review of the literature concerning the benefits of diversity on group performance suggests that there is a practical reason for a leader to tolerate deep diversity among group members (Levine, 1989; Moscovici, 1994). On the one hand, diversity causes groups to be less cohesive; however, on the other hand,
the literature suggests that deep diversity can increase group performance. In short, diverse groups may be slightly more uncomfortable, but more productive. Diversity means “objective or subjective differences that exist between group members” (van Knipperberg and Schippers 2007). For the purpose of this study, deep diversity means objective or subjective differences of attitude or ideology that exist between group members. Thus, ethnicity, gender or other superficial signifiers of diversity do not necessarily signify deep diversity.

Teams may benefit from diversity as deep diversity may foster greater team reflexivity. Reflexivity refers to a team’s careful discussion and consideration of team relevant issues. Divergent viewpoints may foster greater and more indepth discussions than would otherwise occur in a homogenous group (Schipppers, Hartog, & Koopman, 2006). While deep diversity has the potential to foster more in depth discussions about important issues, some research suggests that diverse groups may be less cohesive. Sometimes low cohesion can cause conflicts that distract from task goals. However, a highly cohesive, homogenous group may not be open to vigorous ideological discussion, as there are no group members to champion the opposite viewpoint and therefore may be vulnerable to the perils of groupthink.

The current project extends studies of reactions to deviants by examining how a leader will react when faced with the possibility of including a deviant in a group. The proposed project will examine the impact of a leader’s power on his or her evaluation of an ideological deviant. In many organizational contexts, leaders must form tasks forces and work groups. The current study simulated that process, and asked individuals to identify, from a pool of potential group members, three people to form a work group. One
of the possible group members was an attitudinal deviant. This individual expressed opinions that differ from those of the rest of the group members, but the deviant was competent in all other respects. Approximately one half of the subjects were primed to experience a sense of power, and the others were primed to experience a sense of low power. I predict that high power individuals would be more likely to include the deviant in their work groups, indicate a greater desire to work with the deviant and will describe the deviant more favorably than will participants in the low power condition.
Method

This study examined the effects of power on the acceptance of a competent ideological deviant into an advisory group using a mixed model design. Power priming (high power or low power) was the between subjects independent variable. Power was manipulated by having participants in the high-power condition write about a time when they felt powerful; participants in the low-power condition wrote about a time when they felt powerless. Competency and attitudinal conformity are the two within subjects independent variables. Competency is defined as the perceived ability to complete a task based on predictions about general intelligence. Competency was manipulated via SAT scores and by teacher recommendations. Attitudinal conformity was manipulated by the Johnny Rocco rating and the accompanying reasoning behind the decision. The dependent variable was the rejection of the ideological deviant, as measured by the acceptance measure and the group member desirability rating.

Participants

Participants were 40 undergraduate students from the University of Richmond, both men and women, ages ranging from 18-22, selected at random from a pool of volunteers who were recruited for the experiment via brief presentations to Jepson Foundations of Leadership classes. Volunteers were compensated at a rate of 10 dollars for an approximate 30 minute period. 26 Men participated in the study and 14 women participated. The study took place in the Jepson Research Labs.

Procedure
When participants arrived at the lab, they were greeted by a male researcher dressed in dress slacks and a sweater. They were greeted and brought into a Jepson Lab room. The experimenter gave a brief overview of the study and then participants reviewed and signed a consent form. That consent form is shown in Appendix A. The study continued in three parts.

**Phase I: Johnny Rocco and Power Priming**

During the first phase of the study, participants filled out the Writing Sample form, read the Johnny Rocco Excerpt and filled out the Johnny Rocco questionnaire. Participants were given all of these forms at the same time, but were instructed to fill them out in order.

The Writing Prompt form contained basic name-rank-and-file type information about the participant and then at the bottom was a short writing prompt. The writing prompt was described to participants as a "brief writing sample." The writing sample served as the power priming method and was similar to the power priming methods used by Anderson and Galinsky (2003). (see Appendix B) Participants were assigned to high and low power conditions in a random way. The high and low power prompts looked almost identical and the Writing Prompt forms were shuffled. When participants came into the lab, the researcher reached into the pile of forms and selected one randomly. The researcher was not aware which condition subjects were in. The writing prompt for those in the high power condition read: "Please think about a time when you had control over another person’s situation or outcome. Remember how you felt and write three or four sentences describing what it was like to feel powerful." The writing prompt for those in the low power condition read: "Please think about a time when someone else had control
over your situation or outcome. Remember how you felt and write three or four sentences describing what it was like to feel powerless.”

Participants were also given the Johnny Rocco excerpt and asked to read it and then fill out the Johnny Rocco Questionnaire (see Appendix C). The Johnny Rocco excerpt is a sympathetic story written about a 16 year old boy named Johnny Rocco. Johnny has had a hard life and is now living on the streets. He has shoplifted food from a grocery store. The Johnny Rocco questionnaire instructed participants:

“Johnny is to be placed into a juvenile rehabilitation home. Imagine that you are the social worker handling Johnny’s case. It is up to you to decide what type of environment will best rehabilitate Johnny into a functioning member of society. Please select on a scale from 1-7 the appropriate day to day environmental emphasis that you believe will best help Johnny.”

Participants then rated what they considered to be the appropriate environmental emphasis by circling a number on the following seven point scale. 1. The emphasis will be all love and affection. 2. The emphasis will be mostly towards love and affection. 3. The emphasis will be slightly more towards love and affection, but Johnny will still get appropriate punishment if his behavior warrants it. 4. The emphasis will be on equal amount of punishment and love. 5. The emphasis will be mostly harsh punishment. 6. The emphasis will be mostly severe punishment. 7. The emphasis will be the maximum punishment and absolutely no love or affection. The Rocco Excerpt was written in a sympathetic way toward Johnny so as to elicit a normative response of 2-4 from most participants. This tendency was confirmed prior to the experiment via the pretesting of 40 subjects who did not participate in the full thesis study. Pretesting revealed that five people chose a 2, thirty people chose a 3 and six people chose a 4. None of the pretest
participants chose a 1, 5, 6 or 7. Once participants chose their Johnny Rocco rating, they were instructed to explain their reason in three sentences or less.

Phase II: Selection of Group Members.

Once participants completed phase one, the researcher collected their forms and then gave participants four manila filing folders. The participants were informed that these folders contained applications and paper work similar to the ones the participant just filled out. Participants were told that these folders contained the applications of other participants that signed up for the study earlier in the month and who signed up to be group members. The participants were told that they would be the group leader and that they were to look through the information contained in the folders and choose three people that they would like to work with. Participants were told that after they selected their group members, the group would meet to work on a short task. Participants were not instructed what the nature of the group task would be. The participants were given four folders, to look through and read. Each folder contained information about a different applicant. Each folder included three pages. The first page was a brief bio, data about SAT scores (verbal and math) and a 30 word recommendation from a faculty member (see Appendix D). The second page contained a description of the OCEAN personality scale and answers about the applicants O.C.E.A.N. personality scores. These scores were reported on a scale ranging from 1-100. Each folder contained a different Ocean Score. The scores varied between folders by 1-2% from a mean score. The forms were placed at random in the candidates files and reshuffled before each new participant looked through the folders (see Appendix E). Finally, the third sheet of paper contained the applicants Johnny Rocco rating and a short 20 word explanation of the applicants decision. This
The information in the four folders—which represented the four possible group members—was manipulated to create four distinct profiles, as noted below.

Folder A was the **IC, incompetent conformist**, an applicant named **Dan Harris**. He had a low SAT: 1090 (540 verbal and 550 math). Dan had a normative suggestion to the Johnny Rocco question, a 3 of moderate love. He reasoned that, “I think Johnny needs more love to make him know people can help him.” His teacher recommendation states that, “Dan is doing fairly well in class; although it is too early to predict his final grade.”

Folder B was the **CC, competent conformist**, an applicant named **Jim Moore**. He had a high SAT: 1375 (725 verbal, 650 math). Jim had a normative suggestion to the Johnny Rocco question, a 3 of moderate love. He reasoned that, “Johnny will still get appropriate punishment when he needs it, but he will also get some love and forgiveness.” His teacher recommendation stated, Jim is an above average student. He usually participates and gets along with other students.”

Folder C was the **AC, average conformist**, an applicant named **Paul Johnson**. He had an average SAT: 1260 (600 verbal, 660 math). Jim had a normative suggestion to the Johnny Rocco question, a 4, a medium amount of love. He reasoned that, “Equal love and punishment will help Johnny the most. We can’t be too tough, but we also have to be fair.” His teacher recommendation said that, “Paul is a good student. He does his work and is on time to class.”

Folder D was the **CD, competent attitudinal deviant**, an applicant named **Dave Jackson**. Dave had an above average SAT: 1420 (720 verbal and 700 math). Dave had an
ideologically deviant suggestion to the Johnny Rocco question, a 6 of mostly severe
punishment. He reasoned that, “Johnny stole and that is a serious crime. We already gave
him leniency and that did not work. Now we need to try something else.” His teacher
recommendation said that, “Dave is a bright student. His papers are strong. He comes to
class on time. I expect him to do well in my course.”

Along with the four folders, participants were given the Group Member
Selection Inventory form (See Appendix G) and asked to choose from among the four
applicants, three applicants with whom they would like to work and then to choose one
applicant with whom they would not like to work. In addition, participants were
instructed to think of a short nick name or phrase for each of the applicants in order to
help remember something about the applicant. Also, participants rank ordered the four
candidates from 1 to 4, where 1 indicates high desire for inclusion in the group.

Phase III Measures

After Phase II was complete, the folders were collected and the participants were given
five new forms. The participants were allowed to keep a copy of their Group Member
Selection Inventory which contained a list of the group members including the short
nicknames. The participants filled out one measure form for each of the four applicants
(See Appendix H). The measures asked participants to rate each of the candidates on a
seven point scale ranging from competent-incompetent. Also, participants recorded what
they remembered the applicants Johnny Rocco rating to be on a seven point scale from
love-punishment. Participants were asked how unusual the applicant’s beliefs were
concerning the treatment of Johnny on a seven point scale ranging from normal-strange.
Participants evaluated each applicant on the following seven point scales: reasonable-
unreasonable, informed-uninformed, likeable-unlikeable, good judge of people-poor judge of people, open minded-closed minded, clean-dirty, and team player-not a team player. Participants also indicated, on a seven point scale, the degree to which they would be pleased if the applicant had an influential say in the treatment of juvenile defenders and the degree to which the participant would like to participate in a discussion concerning the treatment of juvenile defenders with the applicant. After filling out these measures for each of the four applicants, participants completed a form about themselves (See Appendix I). This form asked participants to rate how important it is to them that their group is composed of members that have different opinions about how to treat Johnny on a seven point scale from not important-important. Participants were asked how important it is that the group gets along and how important is it that group members have similar ideas about the treatment of Johnny. Next participants rated the way they felt during the experiment on the following seven point scales: weak-strong, not powerful-powerful, not in charge-in charge, passive-active, follower-leader, dirty-clean. Then participants were asked to write down their SAT scores.

At this point, the participants were debriefed and paid. During the debriefing, participants were told that the potential group candidates were fictional and that the true purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of power priming and deviant expertise on the acceptance of attitudinal deviance. The participants were told that a full write up of the study would be available during the spring. The participants were then asked to sign a combined confidentiality and payment acceptance form.
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Results

In this study, participants were given information on four candidates and asked to select three participants to include in a work group and to select one of the four participants to exclude from a work group. Participants were then asked to rank the desirability of each candidate and to rate the candidates on a series of bi-polar adjective scales. Also participants filled out a series of bi-polar adjective scales measuring how they felt during the study. The hypothesis that high power individuals would be more likely to include the deviant in their work groups and would rate the deviant in more favorable terms was not supported.

Unless otherwise noted, the data were examined in a 2 (high and low power) x 4 (AD, or attitudinal diversity: three conformists and one attitudinal deviant) analysis of variance (ANOVA) with attitudinal diversity serving as the within-subject factor.

Check of the Power Manipulation

Participants rated themselves on several bipolar adjective scales pertaining to self-perceptions of feelings of power. A one-way ANCOVA with power as the independent variable and SAT scores serving as the covariate yielded a significant main effect of power for the items weak-strong and not powerful-powerful; $F_{s}(1,34) = 14.72$ and 9.22, $p < .01$. The means for weak-strong were 5.71 and 4.35 for the low and high power conditions, respectively. These means for not-powerful and powerful were 5.62 and 4.35. These means indicate that those participants in the low power condition felt more powerful than those participants in the high power condition.
This analysis also revealed, however, a sex difference, for the 2-way interaction of power and sex was also significant for both items; $F_s(1,34) = 6.64$ and 6.23, $p_s < .02$. The means for both variables followed nearly identical patterns, and are displayed in Figures 1 and 2. As these Figures indicate, for the variable weak-strong, the means for low power and high power women were 6.00 and 3.64. The means for low power and high power men were 5.50 and 5.15. Figure 2 illustrates that, for the variable not powerful-powerful, the means for low power and high power women were 5.9 and 3.65. The means for low power and high power men were 5.35 and 5.15.

Figure 1. Means for men and women in the high and low power conditions for the variable weak-strong.
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Figure 2. Means for men and women in the high and low power conditions for the variable not powerful – powerful.
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Check of the Attitudinal Diversity Manipulation

As noted in chapter 2, pretesting indicated that most individuals favored dealing with Johnny Rocco with more love than punishment—all 41 participants in the pretest chose options 4 or below, suggesting more love than punishment. The participants in the study responded similarly; no one chose a 5, 6, or 7. Three participants chose a 1. Seven participants chose a 2. Twenty-five participants chose a 3. And, three participants chose a 4.

Table 1. Johnny Rocco Scores for Pretest and actual participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After looking through the four folders and after selecting 3 members to be part of a group, participants recorded their recollection of each candidates Johnny Rocco rating. Analysis revealed only a significant main effect of AD; $F(1, 34) = 4.90, p < .04$. The means were 3.1, 3.1 and 3.6 (The emphasis will be slightly more towards love and affection, but Johnny will still get appropriate punishment if his behavior warrants it) for the three attitudinal conformist candidates. The mean for the attitudinal deviant candidate was 6.0 (The emphasis will be mostly severe punishment) indicating that participants accurately perceived that Dave Jackson, the Competent Deviant did, in fact, have a deviant opinion. Two participants, however, failed to recognize that Dave Jackson, the Competent Deviant in fact had a deviant score. These two participants were dropped from the study.

**Perception of Competence**

After looking through the four folders and after selecting 3 members to be part of a group, participants recorded their recollection and perception as to the competency of each candidate. Participants rated the perceived competency of all four candidates on a bi-polar adjective scale from competent-incompetent. Analysis revealed only a marginally significant main effect of AD; $F(1, 34) = 3.97, p = .055$. The means for the incompetent conformist, competent deviant, competent conformist, and average conformist were respectively, 3.70, 2.55, 2.69, 2.82, indicating that participants accurately perceived that the low competence conformist was the least competent (3.70) of all members and that the competent deviant was the most competent (2.55).

**Exclusion of the Deviant**
After looking through the folders, participants were asked to select three candidates to invite into a work group and to select one candidate to exclude from the work group. 53% of participants excluded the Competent Deviant from the work groups. Moreover, if the Competent Deviant was included in the work group he was ranked as the first choice candidate 5 times. There was no effect with respect to power. The data did reveal a sex difference with respect to the rejection of the deviant; \( \chi^2 (38) = 4.68 \ p < .05 \). Female participants were almost two times more likely to reject the Competent Deviant than were male participants. 77% of all female participants rejected the Competent Deviant whereas only 40% of all male participants rejected the deviant.

**Perceptions of the Candidates**

Participants filled out a series of seven point bi-polar adjectives scales rating participant perceptions of the four candidates. Analysis of the evaluations (reasonable-unreasonable, informed-uninformed) did not reveal any differences between those in the high and low power conditions and men and women. Across all these items the deviate was rated less positively than the others.

Analysis revealed significant effects of participant perceptions of the candidates for the following adjectives. Unless otherwise noted, the means for the following adjectives will be presented in the order of Competent Deviant, Competent Conformist, Average Conformist, and Incompetent Conformist. There was a main effect for the scale usual-unusual \( F(3, 102) = 49.58, \ p < .001 \), with the means: 4.78, 2.27, 2.2, 2.24. The data revealed a main effect for the scale reasonable-unreasonable \( F(3, 102) = 50.93, \ p < .001 \), with means: 4.9, 2.14, 2.35 and 2.7. Data revealed a main effect for the scale informed-uninformed \( F(3, 102) = 9.30, \ p < .001 \), with the following means: 3.66,
2.38, 2.66 and 3.21. The data revealed a main effect for the scale likeable-unlikeable $F(3, 102) = 25.54, p < .0001$, with the following means: 4.62, 2.47, 2.67, 2.71. The data revealed a main effect for the scale good-bad judge of people $F(3, 102) = 32.84, p < .0001$, with the following means: 4.92, 2.52, 2.92 and 2.83. The data revealed a main effect for the scale open-closed minded $F(3, 102) = 37.57, p < .0001$, with the following means: 5.15, 2.72, 2.8 and 2.94. The data also revealed a main effect for the scale team player- not a team player $F(3, 102) = 17.27, p < .0001$, with the following means: 4.33, 2.69, 2.8, 2.94.

Table 2. Means for the participant’s perception of the candidates as rated on seven point, bi-polar adjective scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usual-unusual</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable-unreasonable</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed-uninformed</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable-unlikable</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-bad judge of people</td>
<td>4.924</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open-closed minded</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team player-not team player</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to report, with respect to each candidate, the degree to which the participant would be pleased if the respective candidate had an influential say in the treatment of juvenile offenders on seven point scale ranging from YES to NO. The data revealed a main effect $F(3, 102) = 75.35, p < .0001$, with the following means: 5.72, 2.15, 2.65 and 2.74.

**Participants Interest in future Interaction with the Candidates**

The data revealed one significant interaction of condition and member; $F(3, 102) = 2.70, p = .05$. Hi power people were not very interested in talking to the Competent
Deviant. The means for the question, “would you like to participate in a discussion concerning the treatment of juveniles with this candidate?” for high and low power are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Demonstrates participant ratings to the question, “would you like to participate in a discussion concerning the treatment of juveniles with this candidate?” ranging from Yes-No. Member 1-4 are respectively, the Competent Deviant, the Incompetent Conformist, The Average Conformist and the Competent Conformist.

Self Reported Importance of Conformity in Group Attitude
Near the end of the experiment, participants were asked to rate, on a seven point scale, from important-unimportant, “how important is it that the group is composed of members that have different opinions concerning the treatment of Johnny Rocco.” Those in the high power condition had higher scores; $F(1, 38) = 5.28, p < .05$, with the means for low power and high power: 4.32 and 5.5, respectively. Thus, high power participants reported that it was less important for the work group to be composed of members that had different opinions concerning the treatment of Johnny Rocco.

**An In/Out Effect**

Three main effects were found concerning whether or not a participant chose to include the Competent Deviant into his/her group. Participants who included the Competent Deviant rated the deviant as higher on the likeable-unlikeable scale than those who chose to reject the deviant; $F(1, 30) = 5.4, p < .027$ with means: in 3.583 out 5.046. Also, participants who included the Competent Deviant rated him more favorable along the good-bad judge of people scale; $F(1, 30) = 12.486, p < .001$ with means: in 4.069 out 5.488. Participants who chose to include the Competent Deviant also reported that they would be more pleased if the deviant had an influential say in the treatment of Juvenile offenders, on a seven point scale ranging from yes-no; $F(1, 30) = 6.233, p < .018$ with means: in 5.056 out 6.150.

**Candidate Nick Names**

In addition to choosing whom to include for group membership, participants were instructed to think up a nickname or short phrase in order to better remember the candidates. A complete list of nicknames is included in Appendix J.
4. Discussion

This study found that, in general, people in leadership roles prefer to work with like minded others. Moreover, this study found that leaders chose to work with an Incompetent Conformist rather than a Competent Deviant in 52% of the trials. The data suggests that leaders are not immune from the similarity-attraction effect. Leaders tend to view attitudinal deviants negatively, even if the deviant is competent. 87% of participants did not report that they thought that the Attitudinal Deviant, the most competent candidate, was the most desirable group member. Even when attitudinal deviancy is not related to a group's task, leaders may reject the most competent group member, simply because he differs from attitudinal norms. Moreover this study found that women were more likely to reject the deviant than men, and that women were more likely to experience a contrast effect with respect to power priming. This study did not support the hypothesis that powerful leaders would be more likely to include the deviant as a group member.

Both men and women primed with low power, reported feeling more powerful towards the end of the study than the men and women who were initially primed with high power. This finding is contrary to conventional wisdom. When a participant is assigned to a leadership role and allowed to select or reject group members he/she is, in effect, being primed with power. The leader role is a powerful role. So, in effect, all participants were primed with power during the middle of the study. Perhaps the powerful feeling of being a leader was made more salient to participants who began the study thinking about a time when they felt powerless. Perhaps this contrast made the
perception of power greater for these participants. On the other hand, the participants primed with power were likely feeling very high on power when they were assigned the leader role. This leader role may have been less of a boost to the participants in the high power condition than it was to the participants in the low power condition. Further research is needed to better understand why women experienced a significantly larger contrast effect in power.

This research reconfirmed the findings of Schachter’s 1951 study: that people tend to reject attitudinal deviants. These findings are in line with Levine’s comprehensive review of the rejection of the deviant (1980) and Festinger’s theories that groups will move to reject a deviant that they can not assimilate (1950; 1954). More research is needed to determine why the participants rejected the deviant. Perhaps they rejected in order to validate their own beliefs about what should be don’t to Johnny Rocco. Perhaps participants rejected the deviant because they viewed his attitudinal deviance as a sign of incompetence. More research is needed to determine if attitudinal deviance is considered a viable, but different attitude, or if attitudinal deviance is seen as simply incorrect.

Very likely, all participants were primed with power when they began to select the group members. Because of the complex nature of power, more research is needed to compare low power vs. high power leaders; however, the results suggest that powerful people are not more accepting or tolerant of deep diversity than are low power people.

This current research was limited by the complex nature of power priming and the rejection of the deviant and by the nature of laboratory research. A laboratory environment is not the real world; therefore drawing conclusions from studies conducted
in a lab is never exact. Also, studying rejection in a laboratory setting is particularly difficult. Ideally a researcher might like to observe members of a real group functioning in the real world, rather than conduct research on the rejection or inclusion of fictional attitudinal deviants. In addition, this study was conducted at a private liberal arts college. Students there, with some exceptions, tend to be white and wealthy. Only four participants in this study were non-white. Perhaps future research might investigate how a more diverse subject pool might react to the attitudinal deviant.

Future research might investigate the contrast effect and try to determine the root cause of the contrast effect. Also, research might benefit from a study which includes leaders that felt low power. This may seem to be an oxymoron, but perhaps some leaders could be primed with low power and then told that they could not choose which group members to include; rather, they could only make suggestions as to who should be included. Also another interesting avenue for future research might include an investigation into the relationship between personality traits and the acceptance of deep diversity. During this study, it seemed that the participants that ended up including the deviant in their groups seemed more quirky or somehow different from the rest of the participants. An indepth study into personality traits and the acceptance of deep diversity might prove fruitful. Also, future research might investigate the contrast effect that was found with respect to power priming. Future research may need to replicate the contrast effect and determine that indeed those primed with low power and then assigned to a leader role do feel more powerful than those primed with high power and then assigned to a leader role. Future research might seek to learn more about this finding. Also future
research might investigate why female participants rejected the deviant more often than did male participants.

Perhaps participants may have rejected the deviant because he was a punitive deviant. Perhaps participants did not dislike the deviant because he was deviant, but because he was punitive. That is to say that the rejection was caused not by an aversion to deviants but by an aversion to punitive group members. So then, future studies might try to replicate the rejection of the deviant by using a non-punitive deviance. However, I do not believe that the rejection of the deviant was due to his desire for punishment but rather his deviance. A future study might re-write the Johnny Rocco case in such a way as to manipulate the normative Jonny Rocco score to a higher level, say a 6. In this study, the attitudinal deviant might want to offer a two when the normative score was a six. More research is needed to determine causality.

For all the institutional rhetoric espousing the virtues of diversity, the current research suggests that leaders may not really care about deep diversity, as defined by a difference of attitude, ideology or opinion. One might like to believe that leaders would be more open to diversity and more attentive to the benefits of diverse viewpoints. However, the premise of the open, tolerant leader is not supported by this data. This study reconfirmed the 1951 Schachter study and applied that research to leaders. Unfortunately, leaders seem predisposed to create groups of like-minded yes men, rather than advisory groups composed of a “team of rivals.”

Perhaps, to help rectify this situation, institutions of leadership training might emphasize the importance of deep diversity in a decision making process. Educational classes might be offered to people in leadership positions within corporations. Also,
institutions might implement policy changes designed to make sure advisory groups are composed of attitudinally diverse members.

The most intelligent candidate may often be an attitudinal deviant. Since most people are of average intelligence, it stands to reason that the normative group response, very likely, will be supported most heavily by people of average intelligence. A person of greater intelligence is likely to perceive the world in a different way than less intelligent people. Therefore, it is not unlikely that the most competent candidates may harbor attitudinally deviant beliefs simply because it is in the nature of those with greater intelligence to be privy to different types of thinking and different information than people of lesser intelligence. When a leader rejects a competent candidate from a group, simply because that candidate harbors an attitudinally deviant opinion, the group mind loses access to diverse opinions and a valuable group member.


Appendix A. RESEARCH SUBJECT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

TITLE: Groups and Teams

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this research study is to learn more about how people work effectively with others in groups.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AND YOUR INVOLVEMENT
If you decide to be in this research study, you will be asked to read information about 4 others students, and then select those students with whom you would most like to work with on a project.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
The principal investigators for this study are Will Stanton, a senior at the University of Richmond, and Don Forsyth, professor of Leadership Studies.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
This project will take about 20-40 minutes of your time to complete. This survey asks only general questions about your personal reactions, so we don’t expect that it will cause you any distress. Your ratings will be kept completely confidential; they will never been shown to other students. But, if at any time you feel you feel upset or uncomfortable, then you should stop answering the survey. You are free to discontinue participation at any time.

BENEFITS
You may not get any direct benefit from this study, but the information we learn from our research may help us understand how people work in groups. Also, it may be that you receive credit for taking part in this study, from your employer or teacher, or even receive a small monetary payment for taking part.

COSTS
There are no costs for participating in this study other than the time you will spend in the session and filling out questionnaires.

ALTERNATIVES
This is not a treatment study, so there is no need to seek alternative treatments. Your alternative to taking part in this study is to complete other studies or not participate in research at all.

CONFIDENTIALITY
We will not tell anyone the answers you give us. Your responses will not be associated with you by name, at any time, and the data you provide will be kept secure. What we find from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers, but your name will not ever be used in these presentations or papers.
VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
You do not have to participate in this study. If you choose to participate, you may stop at any time without any penalty. You may also choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study.

QUESTIONS
In the future, you may have questions about your participation in this study. If you have any questions, contact:

Don Forsyth, Professor
Jepson School of Leadership Studies
Room 233
Jepson, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173
804-289-8461
dforsyth@richmond.edu

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact Dr. R. Kirk Jonas, the Chair of the University of Richmond’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Research Participants, at (804)484-1565) or at rjonas@richmond.edu.

CONSENT
The study has been described to me and I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation in the project at any time without penalty. I also understand that, if I experience discomfort or distress during the course of the study because of any sensitive issues that are raised, I am encouraged to call the University’s counseling center, CAPS, at 289-8119.

I have read and understand the above information and I consent to participate in this study by signing below.

__________________________________________
Signature and Date

__________________________________________
Witness (experimenter)
Appendix B.

Student's Name: ____________________________ Class Year: ________

Date of Birth: _____/_____/_____

Male or Female: ______________________

Major: ____________________________ Minor: ______________________

Writing Sample: Please think about a time when you had control over another person's situation or outcome. Remember how you felt and write three or four sentences describing what it was like to feel powerful.
Appendix C.

The True Story of Johnny Rocco
By Jean Evans

Johnny was born in a large Midwestern industrial city. His parents, Italian immigrants, had settled there at the turn of the century. There were nine other Rocco children when Johnny was born. The neighborhood where the Rocos lived was known as one of the worst slums in the city. It was known too, for its high crime and juvenile delinquency. Johnny’s father worked irregularly—as a bartender, or day laborer. In his drunken rages he often attacked the children and their mother. The little ones learned to scramble across the floor like beetles, finding shelter under tables or beds, where his kicking feet couldn’t reach them. There was seldom enough food in the house. The rent was never paid and Mrs. Rocco lived in constant terror of landlords and evictions. They moved every nine or ten months, but never to a better house or neighborhood.

Johnny’s memories of his early childhood are sporadic. He remembers that the family had a dog, Teddy, when he was a very little boy. Teddy got sick and lay beside the kerosene stove, quiet and shivering. Jonny recalls that Teddy was still alive when one of his older brothers put Teddy, into a sack half-full of trash, carried him to the garbage dump, and left him there to die. Johnny remembers how his father died. A heavy, regular thumping awoke Johnny one night. He got up, and, still dazed with sleep, wandered into the kitchen where the family usually gathered. His father was lying on the floor. There was blood on his face. Johnny recalls, “Blood was coming out of his ears. He was holding the leg of the kitchen table with one hand an’ he was moanin’, and he kept pounding his foot on the floor. He died right there.” Johnny was five years old. A social worker slipped a newspaper clipping into Johnny’s file: “Father killed in a drunken brawl by his best friend.”

By age 10, Johnny had changed schools seven times, had been in at least fifteen different homerooms and was only in the third grade. Johnny confided, “I never had a birthday party. I never had a birthday present. I never had any real good friends.” The only person in that household Johnny loved was his mother. “Sometimes she was wrong,” Johnny says, “but she tried to be good to us.” As soon as each child was old enough to fend for himself, she would turn him out on the streets. It is not surprising then that one after another the Rocco boys became known to the police. At age 15 Johnny was forced out of his home to fend for himself. Later that year he was arrested for trespassing. The police decided to let him off with a warning. Several months later, at age 16, Johnny was arrested for shoplifting food from a grocery store. His case was handed over to a Social Worker.
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JEPSON
School of Leadership Studies

Date: _____/_____/_____

Student’s Name: _______________________________ Class Year: __________

Date of Birth: _____/_____/_____

Male or Female: ______________

Major: __________________ Minor: __________________

This is my authorization to the school to release the requested information.

-------------------------------------------
Student’s Signature

-------------------------------------------

To the Teacher: The above-named student is participating in a University of Richmond study. We ask that you certify the student’s SAT scores for verbal and math, and that you give a brief 3 or 4 sentences describing this student’s general classroom performance.

SAT Scores:
TOTAL ____________ VERBAL ____________ MATH ____________

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Print Name ____________________________________________

Signature __________________________________________ Date __________
Appendix E.
Personality Test Results

The Big Five Personality Factors

Openness to Experience
Describes an individual's pro-active seeking and appreciation of experience for its own sake.

Conscientiousness - Work Ethic
Describes how organized, motivated and thorough an individual is in life and in pursuing goals.

Extraversion
Extraversion describes how energetic and enthusiastic a person is - especially when dealing with people.

Agreeableness
Describes a person's attitudes towards other people.

Natural Reactions (Emotional Reactions)
Measures the different ways people have of reacting emotionally to pressure and stressful circumstances.

In other words... ...

Does the test-taker like to experience new and varied activities or do they prefer routine and familiarity?

Is the test-taker industrious, thorough and well organized?

Is the test-taker outgoing, socially active extravert. Alternatively are they less social, preferring to work and be alone?

Does the test taker show compassion or are they tough and guarded?

Are the test-taker's reactions overly emotional? Do they tend to be apprehensive and anxious - or - are they cool, calm and collected?

Personality Scores (1-100)

| O:   |   |
| C:   |   |
| E:   |   |
| A:   |   |
| N:   |   |